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The police community in the United States began to adopt the philosophy of community policing in the early 1970s as a solution to rising crime rates. Since that time a great many police departments have officially stated that they have embraced and practice this concept. When later studies began to question the effectiveness of community policing in reducing crime rates, measures such as reduction of citizens’ fear of crime and citizen’s attitudes toward police became the secondary measures of success of this philosophy. Few comprehensive studies have specifically looked at the degree of congruence between police agency adoption of the community policing philosophy and the line officer’s acceptance and regular practice of this concept across multiple small to medium size agencies in an effort to discern a trend. This dissertation looks at the degree of congruence between an agency’s purported adoption of the practice of community policing and the acceptance throughout all ranks including the line officers regular practice of this concept.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with the utmost humility that I thank those without whose guidance, support, and encouragement, this achievement would not have been possible.

I offer my heart-felt "thanks" to my family who has always supported me throughout this difficult and arduous task, including my frequent whining sessions. This achievement belongs as much to you as it does to me. To my wife Patti, whom I have put through more difficulties than she should have had to bear, I am finished! My sons Benjamin and Andrew, who helped, supported, and listened without complaint, and my daughter Erin who knows the endless toils of pursuing a Ph.D. as she too is walking this same path. Each of you has given more to support my efforts than I had the right to ask. I am honored and humbled to be part of your family.

To my brother Brian, also a Michigan State Trooper, who was always there supporting me in so many ways—that encouraging comment, a shared brook trout fishing trip in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, and a trip to Knob Creek often enough to make the difference.

I offer a very special thank you to my mom and dad who instilled in me a humility and work ethic that paved the way for this achievement. I only wish you were here to share this special time. God bless you both.

Thank you Dr. James Visser, Public Affairs and Administration Department, Western Michigan University, my dissertation committee chair and advisor, for your critical guidance, patience, and support; Dr. Robert Peters, Chair, Public Affairs and
Acknowledgements—continued

Administration Department, Western Michigan University, for your encouragement and faith in me and for your guidance while serving on my dissertation committee; and Dr. Barry Goetz, Sociology Department, Western Michigan University, who provided guidance in the specific area of community policing that I chose as my dissertation topic, for your service on my committee. I cannot say enough about my committee members’ selflessness in assisting me in this great accomplishment.

To Ms. Julie Scrivener who provided support in editing, proofreading, assistance in negotiating the maze of requirements to usher this dissertation to the finish line, I humbly offer my eternal gratitude. My hearty “thank you” to Holly Banfield and Michele Behr, who so often offered your most gracious assistance, well beyond what could have been expected. Keep doing what you do!

I thank those of you whose names do not appear who helped guide me in this journey. Thank you to the judges, law professors, professors at Western Michigan University, the “Fab Four,” Bob Sobie, and others who offered friendship and guidance when I needed it most. As Dr. Brent Smith, our quantitative methods guru professed, “You don’t earn a Ph.D. by yourself”; you, my friends, are living proof of that.

Finally, I salute the police officers, tribal officers, and deputies with whom I have had the privilege and pleasure to work with, in some very trying circumstances. Police officers face with unflinching steadfastness situations that would make most turn and flee in fear. Officers must always be prepared to step in harms way to protect the public from life-threatening harm, that is their oath. Officers take into their nightly dreams sights that
Acknowledgements—continued

will haunt them until they finally pass into another world. With this hardened skin of armor, we wilt at the sight of a child in need or the sight of yet another victim of domestic abuse. Many of you continue to stand. Others of you are no longer with us having paid the ultimate price. Those of you who have been there, know. This meager effort is offered on your behalf. Migwetch!

Robert G. Muladore
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ...................................................................................................... ii

LIST OF TABLES .............................................................................................................. x

LIST OF FIGURES ............................................................................................................ xi

DEFINITIONS ....................................................................................................................... xii

CHAPTER

I. INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT ....................................................... 1
   Research Questions ................................................................................................. 9

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .............................................................................. 12
   More Effective Methodologies—Not More Officers ............................................. 13
   Defining Community Policing ............................................................................. 14
   An Officer’s Understanding .............................................................................. 17
   Paradigms ............................................................................................................. 18
   Environmental Factors ....................................................................................... 24
      Gender ............................................................................................................. 24
      Age ............................................................................................................... 25
      Educational Level ......................................................................................... 25
      Year of College Graduation ...................................................................... 24
      Rank ............................................................................................................. 26
      Years of Police Experience ..................................................................... 27
      Years of Military Experience ................................................................ 27
### Table of Contents—continued

#### CHAPTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical Development of Community Policing</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Era</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform Era</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Problem-Solving Era</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overview of the Various Community Policing Models</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Oriented Problem-Solving Model</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics Directed Model</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Model</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Politics of Community Policing: A Disservice</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus of the Research</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. METHODOLOGY/RESEARCH DESIGN</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of Results</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Sources</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Effectiveness of the Three Community Policing Categories</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH and PR Indexes</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Index (Philosophy Index)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Index (Practice Index)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing for Significance and Association</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
CHAPTER

Limitations ........................................................................................................... 74

IV. FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND INTERPRETATIONS .................................... 77

Introduction ........................................................................................................... 77

Section 1: Agency and Respondent Characteristics ........................................ 79

Agency Demographics .................................................................................... 79

Respondent Demographics ............................................................................ 82

Section 2: Congruency Between Officers and Supervisors for the Community Policing Philosophy and Practice Indexes ........................................... 83

Key Elements of Community Policing ............................................................... 83

Congruence in Community Policing Philosophy ........................................ 87

Congruence in Community Policing Practice ................................................ 89

Section 3: Testing Congruence for Significance ............................................. 91

Section 4: Testing for Significance and Association of the PH and PR Officer and Supervisor Responses Tested Against the Environmental Independent Variables .......................................................... 95

Independent Variables and the Relationship to Dependent Variables .......... 105

PH Index: Bivariate Relationships With Independent Variables .................. 105

PR Index: Bivariate Relationships With Independent Variables .................. 108

Section Five: Summary of Findings of the Chapter ..................................... 111

V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS ......................................................... 114
# Table of Contents—continued

## CHAPTER

Summary .................................................................................................................... 114
Focus of This Study ................................................................................................ 115
Causes of the Lack of Congruence ..................................................................... 119
  - Lack of Sufficient Training Prior to Implementation ........................... 119
  - Small Unit Implementation ......................................................................... 120
  - Supervisor – Officer Dichotomy ................................................................ 121
Social Control and Learning Systems ................................................................. 122
Significance of the Study ....................................................................................... 124
Community Policing Models ................................................................................ 126
Further Research ...................................................................................................... 127
Conclusion ................................................................................................................ 131
Recommendations ................................................................................................... 134

## APPENDICES

A. Sample Letter Requesting Approval to Conduct Research ..................... 144
B. Sample Letter of Approval to Conduct Research ..................................... 146
C. HSIRB Approval Letter Dated April 15, 2005 ........................................... 148
D. Consent Document—Line Officers ............................................................... 150
E. Street-Level Officer Survey ......................................................................... 152
F. Consent Document—Supervisory Officers ............................................... 158
G. Supervisory Officer Survey (All Levels Above Street Level Officer) .... 160
Table of Contents—continued

APPENDICES

H. Departmental Informational Survey ................................................................. 166
I. Data Analysis Methodology ........................................................................... 170

BIBLIOGRAPHY ....................................................................................... 175

ix

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
LIST OF TABLES

1. Surveyed Police Agency Categories ................................................................. 56
2. Characteristics of Sworn Officer Survey Respondents ................................. 82
3. Descriptive Analysis of the Means Differences Between Officers and Supervisors on Two Questions That Reflect Key Elements of Community Policing ................................................................................................................................. 84
4. Descriptive Analysis of Mean Differences of Responses on the PH Index Questions ............................................................................................................................... 88
5. Descriptive Analysis of Mean Differences of the Responses on the PR Index Questions .................................................................................................................. 90
6. Congruence Between Police Officers and Supervisors for the Philosophy and Practice of Community Policing Indexes .............................................................. 92
7. Congruence Between Sworn Officer Ranks for the Philosophy and Practice of Community Policing Indexes .............................................................. 94
8. Environmental Influences on Congruence Between Community Policing Philosophy and Practice Between Officers and Supervisors .................................................. 96
9. Bivariate Relationships Between PH Index and Independent Variables ........ 105
10. Bivariate Relationships Between PR Index and Independent Variables .......... 109
LIST OF FIGURES

1. Congruence is necessary between community policing philosophy and regular practice of community policing for a successful implementation .............................. 6

2. Necessity of congruence across all rank levels when implementing community policing .................................................................................................................. 8

3. Steps for successfully implementing community policing ............................................................................................................................... 135
## DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>911</td>
<td>A public safety dispatching system for citizens to dial the three digit 911 to activate an emergency response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPS</td>
<td>Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPE</td>
<td>Citizen-Oriented Police Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPPS</td>
<td>Community-Oriented Policing and Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COPS</td>
<td>Community-Oriented Problem Solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTP</td>
<td>Community-Oriented Traffic Policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPTED</td>
<td>Community policing through environmental design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENP</td>
<td>Enhanced Neighborhood Policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FBI</td>
<td>Federal Bureau of Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Neighborhood-Oriented Policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Neighborhood Policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCAP</td>
<td>Proactive Community Attack on Problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td>Royal Canadian Mounted Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCP</td>
<td>Strategic Community Policing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCR</td>
<td>Uniform Crime Reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

*Community policing has promised so much. Now is a good time to step back and see what it delivered.*

Jeremy Travis (2004: x)

Police agencies often adopt a community policing approach to law enforcement for one of a host of reasons. Some departments embrace this philosophy on the false premise of securing funding to aid in resolving budget shortfalls. In Houston, officers remarked that they had received no training in a grant funded “Operation Siege,” but did state that they were told the department had money for overtime (Sadd & Grinc, 1994). Maguire (1997: 554) recognized that agencies seeking federal Crime Act funds *must* implement community policing. Indeed, the pressure to implement some community policing effort exists at the highest policy-making levels. As reported in the Congressional Record, “Police agencies that want strong public support, the right image, or federal funding to hire new police officers under the Crime Act must implement community policing” (U. S. Congress, 1994). Congress has acted by providing some $10 billion over a ten-year period to encourage the adoption of community policing (Eisler & Johnson, 2005). Some agencies practice community policing methodologies without consciously realizing it. Other agencies sincerely attempt to implement community policing in their agency by training and assigning officers to functions consistent with the community
policing philosophy, but fail to follow up to assess whether the officers actually perform these functions on a regular basis. Some departments have applied for and received community policing grants only to drop this policing philosophy after the grant funds cease. Skogan and Hartnett (1997) sum up the widespread adoption of community policing as, "The adoption is so popular with the public and city councils that scarcely a chief wants his department to be known for failing to climb on the bandwagon" (p. vii).

As Maguire, Kuhns, Uchida, and Cox (1997: 368) put it, "Police chiefs are pressured by citizens and local government officials to start 'doing' community policing." Some have gone so far as to call efforts at adopting some form of community policing image management or a public relations gimmick (Greene & Mastrofski, 1988). Eck and Rosenbaum (1994) feel that the lack of measures to assess community policing effectiveness, equity and efficiency, have made it easier for some police officials to enact cosmetic changes disguised as reforms. Bayley (1994: 34) has described the professional culture of police as "police executives constantly looking at and emulating the premiere agencies to ensure their departments are also considered efficient, modern, and progressive." In fact, the term community policing itself has been misunderstood and subject to differing interpretations and definitions. As Greene and Mastrofski observed, "...many people do not understand what the term means" (Maguire, 1997, p. 2).

Community policing is a philosophy of policing that stresses police-citizen cooperation to address the root causation of crime as well as the fear of crime. The community policing philosophy, to be effective, must be fully embraced department-wide by both sworn and civilian members (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1994). This philosophy has been progressively implemented in the United States since the early 1970s (Thurman,
Zhao, & Giacomazzi, 2001). Though the community policing concept can be applied to rural and urban settings, it has been predominately utilized in urban settings that are more conducive to frequent officer-citizen interactions (Neighborhood-oriented policing, 1994). To further encourage this policing concept, federal grant dollars were appropriated for departments that started community policing within their agencies. Over thirty-five years have passed since the concept of community policing was first adopted in the United States.

Researchers have advocated that structural change in police organizations is essential to an effective adoption of community policing and have concluded that little structural change has occurred in agencies that have adopted this philosophy when compared to those agencies which have not over the last sixteen years (Maguire, 1997). Maguire et al. (1997) used survey responses from police departments to determine if community policing was being practiced by those agencies. A study in 1992 by Trojanowicz (1994) asked police departments if they practiced community policing. Some ten months later in 1993, the Police Foundation (Wycoff, 1994) asked police departments if they practiced community policing. Fifty departments, which in 1992 responded they practiced community policing, reported ten months later that they did not. Roth, Roehl, and Johnson (2004) sought to determine whether agencies had implemented community policing by surveying either the agencies’ chief executive or a spokesperson designated by the chief. Sadd and Grinc (1994) conducted interviews of a cross section of police personnel, city employees, and community members in their eight jurisdiction cross-site evaluation of relatively large departments. Weisel and Eck (1994) conducted a seven-agency study that consisted of interviews, surveys, and researcher observations of
larger agencies. Lurigio and Rosenbaum (1994) conducted a review of ten previous studies that used quantitative surveys of police staff including line officers. However, none of these studies specifically measured the degree of congruence of sworn officer philosophy and the actual practice of community policing across all ranks in their cross-site studies.

Wycoff (1994: 133–34) posed the question of whether agencies are really practicing community policing or just think they are or are departments just saying they are engaged in community policing to increase their popularity or to gain federal funding. Other researchers have questioned the sincerity of the purported adoption of community policing concepts by police departments. Herman Goldstein (1994) observed:

...community policing, is often used without concern for its substance. Political leaders and, unfortunately, many police leaders hook onto the label for the positive images it projects, but do not engage or invest in the concept. (p. viii)

Bayley (1988: 225) opines “Community policing on the ground often seems less a program than a set of aspirations wrapped in a slogan. Greene, Bergman, and McLaughlin (1994) in their study of the Philadelphia police department found some organizational changes aimed at implementing community policing were cosmetic while others were substantive. The question remains whether the efforts to implement community policing are real or merely a ploy to gain public favor or grant dollars.

Researchers have characterized the transition to community policing as a battle for winning the hearts and minds of police officers (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994). This battle is so well known that Lurigio and Rosenbaum (1994: 147) coined the acronym “WHAM” for “Winning Hearts and Minds” as a component of organizational change (Skogan &
Hartnett, 1997: 70). Dantzker (1997) states that successful implementation of community policing necessitates the achievement of line officer job satisfaction. This officer satisfaction translates into the ultimate quality with which the program is applied.

Lurigio and Skogan (1994) have suggested that the ultimate success of the implementation of a community policing method depends on the police officer. That is the focus of this research, to assess the degree to which small to medium size police agencies have adopted community policing, not as professed by police administration, but rather as actually accepted and implemented by the officers responsible for the implementation, the line police officer.

The specific issue of whether the adoption of a community policing methodology by a police agency has been manifested from official department policy, to the managers, then the supervisors, and finally down to the street level officer, who is charged with carrying out the philosophy on a regular basis, remains unknown. As observed by Weisel and Eck (1994), the activity of engaging community policing is reflected at the line officer level. As Rubenstein (1973) has observed, sergeants are most officers' "real employers" (Skogan & Hartnett [1997: 72]). This stresses the importance of ascertaining the congruence among the line officer, the supervisor, and all ranks up to the chief, in adopting and implementing community policing. This researcher believes that the best source of whether a police department has actually adopted community policing is to ask those whose primary function it is to implement it, the police officer. If the officers do not fully implement these concepts on a regular basis, then the effectiveness of the concept is either doomed to fail or it will be much less effective than it could have been with little or no crime reduction or easing the fear of crime in citizens will be realized from these
efforts. What may be a top priority for police management may not have been implemented by the officer on the street. This top-down adoption and regular practice of the community policing philosophy is termed *congruence* for purposes of this research.

The idea of congruence being required to achieve a defined end result and has been postulated by Visser and Wright (1996). For purposes of this research, congruence is viewed from two distinct perspectives. First, to successfully implement community policing, this researcher believes that there must be congruence by employees between acceptance of the community policing philosophy and the regular practice of community policing methods. While it can be expected that minor variances between *acceptance* and *practice* will occur among the employees (see Figure 1), a significant level of congruence is necessary for a successful implementation.

![Figure 1. Congruence is necessary between community policing philosophy and regular practice of community policing for a successful implementation.](image_url)
The second level of congruence must occur between all ranks of officers in the police agency. Civilian employees must also accept and contribute to the acceptance and practice as reflected in the literature; however, for purposes of this research, the focus of this study is restricted to sworn officers. As this research suggests, chiefs have touted their agencies’ adoption of community policing for one or more of a host of reasons. To be successful, however, all officers at all ranks must collaborate in buying in to the philosophy of community policing and in turn must utilize community policing methods on a regular basis to focus on the root causation of the problems. Minor differences in interpretation or understanding between officers and between rank levels will result in less than a perfect degree of congruence (see Figure 2). However, there must be significant understanding and agreement on accepting the community policing philosophy and the regular practice of these methods across all ranks.

Another factor affecting the lack of congruence in departments are attempts at implementing community policing in small units within the agency in the belief the department is “doing” community policing. Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994) have pointed out, to be effective, community policing must be implemented department-wide. Moore (1992) found that officers who are not required to regularly implement community policing look with disfavor at their own fellow officers who are assigned to small unit community policing functions. Wilkinson and Rosenbaum (1994) found that agency cultural and organizational mores are not conducive to the community policing unit approach. This researcher’s observations during some twenty-nine years of police experience suggests that small units of any type of police specialty generally tends to cause tension and create animosity between those assigned to the unit and the general
Figure 2. Necessity of congruence across all rank levels when implementing community policing.
street level officer. In the case of community policing by unit, this will tend to cause the philosophy and practice to be met with an increased resistance by the general population of street officers in the agency.

Research Questions

Research questions were drafted to focus on the issue of congruence between the acceptance of the community policing philosophy and the regular practice, as well as congruence across all ranks of sworn officers:

1. Is there a chain of congruence between an agency’s adoption of the philosophy of community policing, the extent to which the officers embrace the community policing philosophy, and the extent to which officers practice it on a regular basis?

2. Under which conditions will a lack of congruence between community policing, philosophical acceptance by employees, and the regular practice of this philosophy occur?

3. To what degree are the philosophies of community policing congruent between supervisors and officers?

4. Are crime rates positively impacted in departments where congruence exists between the department and its officers in embracing and practicing CP?

5. Does the adoption of one of the three categories of community policing methodologies have a greater crime reduction impact than the other two categories?

Whether a chain of congruence exists between an agency’s adoption of community policing, the extent to which the officers embrace the community policing philosophy, and the extent to which officers practice it on a regular basis, are dependent on a
number of factors including: (1) whether the agency was committed to adopting the community policing philosophy due to belief in the benefits of this methodology (rather than having adopted this policing methodology for less sincere reasons, such as receipt of federal funds to aid an ailing budget, political pressures to be innovative, a desire to adopt the “newest and greatest” idea, or other rationale); (2) the extent to which officers have embraced the community policing philosophy (this is a function of officer’s gender, age, educational level, year of college graduation, rank, military experience, and the steps the department took prior to implementation to build acceptance of the philosophy); (3) the degree to which officers practice it on a regular basis; and (4) the daily events impacting the officer (workload, supervisor support for the community policing philosophy, evaluation criteria for officer productivity, number of officers in the agency, whether the department evaluates the implementation by individual officers of community policing, and type of community policing model used by the agency). The research hypotheses appear in Chapter III, the Methodology Section.

A secondary focus of this research sought to determine the degree to which congruence is present in the sample agencies and the impact on crime rates in departments where congruence is found as well as in those departments where congruence is lacking. It was found that departments implement various tactics within the community policing gamut at different times, adding several, dropping one or more, adding others, in a rolling methodology. Therefore, the design of this study was not able to tie the amorphous adoption methodology of the agencies to a specific impact on crime rates. Therefore, the impact on crime rates has been left to future research that can specifically focus on a
small number of agencies, the specific timing of implementation tactics, and the potential
effect on crime rates.

I believe that a significant number of police departments have implemented a
community policing method where the actions of the officers on a regular basis do not
match the purported community policing goals of the agency. In other words, little
follow-through has been done by agencies to insure that their officers practice the com­
munity policing philosophy on a regular basis to match the stated intent of the depart­
ment. This hypothesis has been substantiated to some degree by Martin and Groesch
(2005) and Muladore (2005). As observed by Skogan and Roth (2004: xxviii), police
have a “…remarkable ability to wait out efforts to reform them. Important aspects of
police culture mitigate against change.” If this practice is true, these results may provide
administrators with information to guide them in maximizing the effectiveness of their
community policing methodology by refocusing officers’ efforts. Those factors that
positively affect officer acceptance in small to medium size departments will be iden­
tified. These results may have significant implications for grant funding managers at the
federal level whose intent it is to encourage the practice of community policing methods
in the United States while conserving precious grant resources.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Police officers are not terribly different than employees in other professions when it comes to embracing and implementing new ideas. However, given the risk factor to officers inherent in their profession, they may be even more resistant to changing the way they do their business. Indeed, Skogan (2004) overviews the ethnographic studies of the police culture relating to resistance to change as "...nearly insurmountable—us-them boundary between sworn officers and all others..., ...strongly reinforced behavior..., expectations of macho behavior, bravery in the face of hostile behavior..., and the constant danger of police work..." as a unified culture of policing (p. 138). Guyot (1979) suggests that police organizations have been some of the most resistant public bureaucracies, capable of resisting and ultimately thwarting change efforts. This research seeks to determine the degree to which police officers have accepted and implemented on a regular basis the policing methodology known as community policing in smaller police departments that comprise some 80% of the police departments in the United States. A background of social research in this area of police officers weighing and accepting new ideas provides a rich backdrop to set the stage for this inquiry.
More Effective Methodologies—Not More Officers

It has been recognized that crime problems in urban America will not be resolved nor eliminated by increasing the numbers of police officers or police firepower. In the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment, Kelling found as a result of the yearlong experiment that neither eliminating nor doubling the level of traditional motorized patrol had any effect on crime, arrests, fear, citizen attitudes, or any other identifiable conditions. Citizens did not even notice the variations in patrol frequency or levels (Kelling, Pate, Dieckman, & Brown, 1974). Zhao, Scheider, and Thurman (2002) have also reported that hiring more police officers has not had a significant impact on reducing crime rates. As stated by Newman (1972: 1):

We are witnessing a breakdown of the social mechanisms that once kept crime in check and gave direction and support to police activity. The small-town environments, rural or urban, which once framed and enforced their own moral codes, have virtually disappeared. We have become strangers sharing the largest collective habitats in human history.

Community leaders, educators, and individuals realize that public policy must migrate away from traditional reactive policing methods toward a participative proactive model to enhance public safety. To address methods that deter crime, city planners, family and consumer sciences professionals, and law enforcement have been working on common strategies to reduce crime and improve the quality of life for residents. It is well known that criminals look for locations where they will not be readily observed, questioned, or arrested (Martin & Brinn-Feinberg, 2001). It is believed that the application of the principles of community policing methods can deter nuisance crimes that give rise to
Defining Community Policing

Over time this police-citizen cooperative concept has used a variety of monikers. Eventually, the community policing method with the shortest name prevailed as the catch phrase for this concept (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1994). Community policing began as an innovative concept of police-citizen cooperation to solve crime, reduce citizen fear, and minimize social decay (Kratcoski & Dukes, 1995). It has been described as democracy in action as it requires active participation of local government, civic and business leaders, public and private agencies, residents, schools, churches, and many other partners (Understanding community policing, 1994). The duties of the police started with a general focus of maintaining an orderly functioning of cities and evolved into a focus on controlling the dangerous criminals in the mid- to late nineteenth century, then on to the form of social control we recognize today (Monkkonen, 1981). Currently, the philosophy of community policing has come to be understood as comprising three critical elements: (1) engaging and interacting with the community, (2) solving community problems, and (3) adapting the internal organizational elements to support these new strategies (Bayley, 1994; Community Policing Consortium, 1994).

Over the last two decades, students and practitioners of policing began developing ideas that have become collectively known as “community policing,” a term that was fuzzy, as many believed it should be since its essence involves tailoring implementation specifics to meet local needs and resources. There exists a lack of a clear understanding
of what constitutes community policing and there is a shortage of carefully designed studies to examine how this concept has been operationally defined and whether such operations have achieved their desired results (Rosenbaum, Yeh, & Wilkinson, 1994). It has been described as including input from internal customers (police and non-police employees) and external customers (residents, business owners, and visitors) (Morash, Ford, White, & Boles, 2002: 278). A number of drastically different tactics have been labeled as "community policing" such as citizen police academies, cooperative truancy programs, problem-solving models similar to SARA (Scanning, Analysis, Response, and Assessment), foot patrol, bicycle patrol, DARE (Drug Awareness Resistance Effort), and Neighborhood Watch (Roth & Ryan, 2000). Goetz and Mitchell (2003) suggest police engage in "reintegrative" community policing to stem social disorder to prevent crime. Bayley (1994: 140) feels that community policing is a new name for crime prevention that has been practiced by small-town police all along.

Contemporary views of community policing methodology include foot patrol, information gathering, problem solving, community organizing, citizen interaction, patrol, and rapid response tactics (Kelling & Moore, 1988). A review of the literature on common community policing activities by Maguire et al. (1997) revealed some 31 common activities that have been used in national surveys. Community policing and social norms theory are connected in that both attempt to address citizen fear (Waldeck, 2000). It has been recognized that different communities can and often do have very different needs and expectations of their police department (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1993; Dunham & Alpert, 1998; Marenin, 1989). Some believe that community policing has also become a catch-all phrase used to include many types of police tactics having little
to do with actual police-citizen cooperation, including use as a political tool to calm constituencies (Klinenberg, 2001). Others such as Meese (1993) believe that the term community policing has very different meanings in different jurisdictions. Mastrofski and Ritti (2000) believe police should not focus on people processing activities; rather they should focus on people changing activities. Ultimately, there remains significant disagreement in professional circles regarding a finite definition of community policing (Bayley, 1994: 104).

Some researchers report that though crime rates have rarely been reduced through community policing implementation, they have had a positive impact on residents’ perceptions of crime and the attitudes toward the police (Rosenbaum, Hernandez, & Daughtry, 1991; Skogan, 1990, 1994). Hayeslip and Cordner (1987) report that when researchers and policy makers began to question the ability of policing methods to reduce the incidence of crime, they turned to the reduction of citizens’ fear of crime and attitudes toward police as secondary targets of patrol innovation. Clark and Hough (1984) report that it has been accepted that police strategies cannot directly reduce serious crime, but that community-oriented programs may, by reducing citizen fear and social decay, indirectly reduce crime over a long period of time. This research looks into the specific issue of whether this perceived failing of community policing to reduce crime has resulted from a lack of congruence between the department’s official adoption of the concept, the acceptance by supervisory staff, and whether the adoption and implementation by the street-level officer on a regular basis (congruence) has actually occurred.
An Officer’s Understanding

The ultimate success of the implementation of community policing depends on the line police officers that are responsible for employing these efforts at the street level (Lurigio & Rosenbaum, 1994). A number of police officers currently employed were trained to believe that the function of the police is restricted to fighting crime, patrol duties, conducting investigations, performing order maintenance, writing reports, and making arrests without the aid of the citizenry. Without proper implementation procedures, these officers often lack the basic knowledge of community policing concepts and how to implement these programs (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994). The lack of proper implementation knowledge may cause the program to fail or the program may not achieve the goals of crime reduction, a decreased fear of crime, and increased citizen satisfaction with the police. With the proliferation of community policing in the United States dependent on the street-level police officer to ensure successful implementation, careful and systematic introduction to departmental personnel is critical to the success of the effort. With problem-oriented policing (POP), one form of policing under the community policing umbrella, Capowich and Roehl (1994) found that police must de-emphasize responses to incidents. Rather they must:

...go beyond taking satisfaction in the smooth operation of their organization; it requires that they extend their concern to dealing effectively with the problems that justify creating a police agency in the first instance. (Goldstein, 1990, p. 35)

Weisel and Eck (1994) concur with Sparrow, Moore, and Kennedy (1990) and Sadd and Grinc (1994) who reported that the existing police culture is the single largest obstacle to implementing a new policing strategy. It follows that where community policing has
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been successfully implemented—i.e., crime rates reduced, fear of crime reduction, and citizen satisfaction improved—officer buy-in was achieved prior to implementation.

For an officer to embrace a policing method that is foreign to him and who predominately knows only traditional policing practices, a basic understanding of why police resist change is in order. Police officers tend to keep things simple. The “tell me why and I’ll do it” mentality is common among officers. It is this understanding or lack of it that may well be the pivotal issue in having a successful community policing philosophy implemented in a police department that represents a paradigm shift.

Paradigms

It has been argued that shifting from traditional policing method to community policing represents a paradigm shift (Skolnick & Bayley, 1986; Sparrow et al., 1990). A paradigm has been described as a set of rules that sets boundaries and establishes how one is to operate within those boundaries (Barker, 1993). Paradigms blind people from seeing new solutions due to self-imposed boundaries that Herbert Simon (1946) termed bounded rationality. Outsiders who are not constrained by the existing rules and boundaries are often those who create change resulting in new paradigms. These outsiders look at situations from a fresh perspective or multiple perspectives unencumbered by the norms of the situation. They may see linkages between problems and potential solutions that the insiders may simply look past. Once a paradigm shift occurs, everyone starts from zero knowledge under the new paradigm. The philosophy of community policing is significantly different than the traditional methods of policing that were popular in the reform era of the 1930s through the 1970s and clearly represents a paradigm shift for
police officers and their supervisors. As Bayley (1994) perceives it, “the intellectual reassessment of policing in the 1980s has generated so much sustained activity that it is fair to refer to community policing as a movement” (p. 104). Greene et al. (1994) suggest that community policing has been argued to be a paradigm shift citing Skolnick and Bayley (1986) and Sparrow et al. (1990). Maguire and King (2004) talk in terms of transformations rather than paradigm shifts as advanced by Aldrich (1999: 163) regarding significant organizational change. Aldrich posits three possible dimensions of change, changes in: (1) goals, (2) boundaries, and (3) activities. The community policing movement clearly involves all three of these dimensions.

This shift from reactionary policing to a community-oriented type of policing typically involves another issue, that of resistance to change. Donald Schon (1971) illustrated that society is ever changing in spite of the natural tendency to remain in a stable state. His research led him to postulate that organizations must create learning systems to engage employees to address the constant change by evolving to maximize opportunities that come along. Peter Senge (1999) postulated that little significant change would occur if driven only from the top of an organization. He felt that “Top management buy-in is a poor substitute for genuine commitment and learning capabilities at all levels in an organization” (p. 12). The study of Madison, Wisconsin by Wycoff and Skogan (1994) found that officers, even officers with many years of experience, could shift from traditional views of policing to one supportive of the philosophy of community policing. Bayley (1994: 146–47) has observed that unless police departments make particular roles, in this case community policing activities, a function to be specifically carried out on a regular basis, they will not be effectively implemented. Frederick
Mosher (1982) also observed that no society is permanent. He stated that new public administration focuses on problems and problem solving. This is a foundational tenet of the community policing approach to policing. Mosher further advanced the concept that there is a move toward task forces, groups, and the development of new programs to solve social issues. The concept of community policing that requires officers to work with citizens’ groups to resolve issues in a collaborative method is consistent with the larger global trend (Kettl, 1996). The essence of implementing community policing is for a single officer to assume ownership and responsibility of a particular patrol area and have regular contact with the people in the officer’s area to provide leadership to collectively resolve the problems of lawlessness and disorder (Bayley, 1994: 108).

From a social perspective, policing historically (at least since the reform era) has been internalized and isolated, often excluding outsiders from the police brotherhood (Skogan, 2004: 138). Implementing community policing faces a tough challenge as a typically strong police culture and a general lack of understanding of community policing philosophies can create substantial resistance to change (Rosenbaum & Lurigio, 1994). Change to a community policing philosophy forces police officers to open up to outsiders and to create trusting relationships with people outside of the close-knit police family creating great resistance to that attempted change (Allen, 2002). Officers will need to understand these philosophical methods to effectively interact with groups and manage with them to achieve common goals. Mary Parker Follett suggested that the essence of management is having power with rather than power over those one works with (Metcalf & Urwick, 1940). The community policing officer must learn to work with citizens, groups, businesses, and government rather than trying to direct and control them.
Police management theory draws heavily from public administration theory. Community policing officers are asked to implement policy decisions and to perform numerous and previously foreign functions to successfully accomplish the policy directives of management. It is imperative that officers are educated and well versed in the skills needed to expertly perform their new roles. They need to develop skills in the implementation of policy, decision-making, and group dynamics, ensuring a democratic process for the resolution of issues, and overcoming resistance to change, to name a few core topics. These functions of implementing policy place community policing methods fall squarely within the field of public administration theory.

In the 1990s, it was discovered that insufficient attention had been given to the organizational, administrative, and personnel changes needed to create, expand, and institutionalize this new philosophy of policing. The community policing movement had been initially tried without first creating the organizational environment to sustain the movement on a larger scale. The issue to be faced by administrators became how to create organizational support, and how to encourage behaviors, consistent with community policing initiatives to instill these behaviors in police officers that make it happen in the field (Rosenbaum et al., 1994).

Successful implementation of community policing necessitates the achievement of line officer job satisfaction that results in a level of quality with which the program is applied (Dantzker, 1997). Overall, the ultimate success of the implementation of a community policing philosophy depends on the police officer. Officer attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors must be changed before a community policing effort can be put into practice (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994). Officers have expressed their beliefs that community
based work is not "real" police work (Manning, 1978). Community relations units have been know as "grin and wave" squads (Moore, 1992: 135). Van Maanen (1978) found officers' attitudes so locked into traditional policing paradigms that they described non-compliant people they regularly interacted with as "assholes" and the police function as engaging in "asshole control." Reuss-Ianni (1993), in her study of the New York police department, spoke to a number of precinct officers who expressed comments regarding citizen involvement with the police such as: "They ought to keep the hell out of our business. They just get in our way" (p. 100). These types of attitudes can be expected to impede officer acceptance of community policing concepts in spite of stated agency policies. Rigid, quasi-military bureaucracies that many police agencies continue to follow fail to include input from citizens as well as the line police officers (Angell, 1971; Berkley, 1969; Bittner, 1970; Greene, 1981). Oppressive police organizations often teach officers to follow policies to the letter or swift and sure discipline will result. This strips officers of any incentive for displaying initiative or taking unapproved risks. This equates to officers following the "book" and when in doubt, asking for direction (Bayley, 1994: 64) rather than showing any degree of self-initiative to minimize the risks.

Improving police officer job satisfaction has involved adopting a "problem-oriented" policing approach (Goldstein, 1977, 1979). The police need to shift from a people processing function to that of people changing (Mastrofski & Ritti, 2000). This problem-oriented approach is found in community policing and foot patrol programs. The aim is in improving the officers' understanding and response to community problems by redesigning the job of the police officer (Greene, 1989). By delegating decision-making authority to line officers, job satisfaction increases. This in turn reinforces the
community policing concepts so that the officers are more likely to accept these new practices.

To support the police officer, supervisors must also accept and practice the concepts of community policing, or the values taught to the new officers in the academy will be quickly abandoned and their conduct will quickly conform to mindlessly obeying orders and regulations (Meese, 1993). Without buy-in at all levels of the agency, the effort to implement community policing will be thwarted. Supervisory and mid-level management have sunk community policing efforts in several cities (Skogan & Hartnett, 1997: 12). Assistance of other police officers to handle other necessary functions such as rapid-response cars (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994) to handle the 911 emergency calls (unless absolutely necessary for the community policing officer to respond or assist) is essential to free up community policing officers. Community policing officers must remain free to police consistent with the community policing philosophy. Further, supervisory support is necessary to activate assistance from other municipal and private resources necessary to resolve identified neighborhood issues. Community policing officers need to work in close support with specialized police resources such as detectives, narcotics, juvenile, crime laboratory, and gang units.

The transition from the traditional form of reactive, incident-driven policing, to a contemporary style of proactive, problem-directed, community-oriented policing, demands a comprehensive strategy that must be based on long-term institutional change. It is the community policing officer who makes the system work and the theories, strategies, and tactics associated with community policing that the experts discuss ultimately
boil down to a single officer on the street, intervening one-on-one in an effort to make the community safer (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994).

Environmental Factors

Many factors affect officer buy-in to new concepts that they are asked to believe in and adopt as part of their regular activities. Officers come from a variety of backgrounds with varying individual factors that potentially affect if and how they accept new ideas. These variables need to be accounted for in any study to ensure the study outcomes produce valid data. The environmental factors utilized in this study include: gender, age, educational level, rank, years of police experience and military experience (DeLong, 1997). Factors pertaining to offenders affecting crime rates agreed upon by the crime experts include employment status, income, education levels, gender, age, ethnic mix, and family composition (Bayley, 1994). However, offender status is not the focus of this study. I selected the environmental variables based partly on the basis of the existing literature and on my twenty-eight years “in the field” as a police officer in the capacity of officer as well as supervisor and manager.

Gender

Research suggests that female officers are less resistive to change than male officers (Lunneborg, 1989). With the introduction of women into police work, it was found that they favored a crime prevention style of policing rather than the traditional male domination model (Appier, 1992: 91). Whether this remains true today will be answered by the data collected. Community policing requires officers who will gravitate from an
enforcement mentality to a more patient and holistic understanding philosophy involving citizen’s input to successfully implement this concept (DeLong, 1997).

**Age**

Younger officers have been socialized in an era where they are often more open to change and accepting new ideas. Educational and training programs in the police field in recent years have introduced officers to the community policing philosophy. Older officers may not have had this same exposure to these concepts, making the community policing philosophy more foreign to them. Further, officers who were older when community policing was introduced may have already become set in their ways regarding policing tactics and may be more resistant to change. According to Jerome Skolnick (1994), changes in maturity and experience levels are more likely to occur at five-year increments; therefore, age groupings have been set at these five-year levels for officers on the background survey questions. This may tend to make older officers more resistant to the “new” method of policing. Another factor affecting police attitudes may be the policing styles portrayed by the police on television shows such as COPS, Miami Vice or a host of other action packed police chronicles. More impressionable officers may assimilate the macho, arrest-oriented portrayal, as the “right” way to deliver police services.

**Educational Level**

Previous research has shown that education has the effect of producing more open mindedness or flexibility in a person’s belief system as well as projecting less authoritarianism than officers with less education (Guller, 1972). It has been shown that the
greater the level of education, the lower the level of authoritarian attitude in police officers (Dally, 1975; Smith, Locke, & Walker, 1968). Other research has shown greater flexibility in beliefs with higher levels of education (Parker, Donnelly, Gerwitz, Marcus, & Kowalewski, 1976; Roberg, 1978; Trojanowicz & Nicholson, 1976). Police officers with higher levels of education have shown a greater awareness of ethnic and social issues and have a greater acceptance of minorities (Weiner, 1976). Educated officers have also been shown to have a stronger desire for professionalism (Miller & Fry, 1978; Roberg & Kuykendall, 1993).

**Rank**

It is believed that officers of a higher rank will generally tend to buy in to directives from the police chief. My experience is that street level officers, being removed from the direct oversight of the chief, tend to do what they personally believe will work to combat crime and to make their job easier rather than simply do what they are told to do. Reuss-Ianni (1993) found officers did what was necessary to accomplish the job. Officers of a higher rank often readily side with management due to being selected for their capacity to embrace current management philosophy and to further their career ambitions by supporting their supervisors. Reuss-Ianni (1993) found this to be the case in New York City police department and found this behavior part to be part of the “management cop culture.”
Years of Police Experience

My experience indicates that older officers tend to be more resistant to change than newer officers. Older officers tend to have more solidified paradigms that set boundaries and the rules for operating within those boundaries (Barker, 1993). Paradigms can blind officers from seeing new solutions due to these self-imposed boundaries termed “bounded rationality” by Simon (1946). Younger officers tend to be less rigid in their beliefs since they have not yet developed long-term institutional paradigms.

Years of Military Experience

Many police departments continue to be influenced by the military model of organization and policing methods (DeLong, 1997). These departments and their officers who chose to retain the military style of policing (also known as traditional policing) often refuse to accept community policing as a policing philosophy and strategy (Martin & Groesch, 2005; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). The military and policing models both involve a war mentality that promotes the militaristic philosophy in policing (DeLong, 1979). Officers with military experience may be more prone to resist a move from traditional policing with the emphasis on strong enforcement by arresting offenders to a more problem-sharing approach found in community policing. The military has historically followed three paradigms: (1) the Offensive Model that is typified by the conquest mentality, (2) the Defensive Model that can be described as the siege mode, and (3) the Pro-fensive Model that has been described as the flexible power mentality by
Military experience may indicate a greater resistance to accepting the community policing methodology.

These environmental factors influence an officer’s opinion on issues such as the utility of the community policing philosophy as an effective tool in combating crime and the fear of crime. This is especially true of officers who have been trained in traditional policing methods and function as law enforcement officers rather than community policing officers. One other important factor affecting police officer behavior is the officer’s full understanding of concepts that they are supposed to implement in their daily activities.

Essential to a full understanding of the concept of community policing is an understanding of the evolution and rationale of this methodology. With this historical understanding comes insight of how various historical events have impacted policing tactics and have changed the approaches to crime reduction and the fear of crime by citizens. For officers to be able to embrace a new concept, especially a foreign one, it is necessary for them to understand the underlying rationale for the evolution of policing methods in police work so they will buy in to the new concepts.

Twenty-eight years of “working in the field” both on the street and in administration has shown me that the greater an understanding of the underlying rationale for a new concept, the greater the likelihood officers will accept it. Many police officers have been heard to complain that community policing is just social work or non-policing activity (Martin & Groesch, 2005; Skogan & Hartnett, 1997: 71) and that enforcement focused policing (traditional policing methods) is the only thing that impacts crime rates.

Some officers seem to believe that community policing is a new concept (Patterson, 1995). Indeed, a good deal of the literature in the United States suggests that com-
Community policing began in the 1970s. A closer review of the literature suggests that community policing actually began in 1829 in London, England (Kratcoski & Dukes, 1995; Parrish, 1983; Patterson, 1995; Rawlings, 1994; Smethurst, 1914). A solid understanding of the origin of the philosophy of community policing as well as the changing theories of policing in general, including the rationale for these changes, will provide a deeper understanding of the historical evolution of policing aiding in a greater acceptance of the community policing concept by police officers.

Historical Development of Community Policing

In understanding resistance to change, it is helpful to recall the old maxim that holds: “Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it” (Santayana, 1905: 284). As Patterson (1995: 5) has observed,

Unfortunately, many officers seem to think the history of police work began the day they first pinned on a badge and strapped on a gun belt. For this reason, each emerging movement in law enforcement tends to be seen as something completely new, without historical context. Such is largely the case today with community policing which lacks definitiveness regarding its origin.

The concept of community policing is not a new one, though not always known by that name. The concept of community policing originated in 1829 with the passage of the Metropolitan Police Act in London, England (Kratcoski & Dukes, 1995; Parrish, 1982; Patterson, 1995; Rawlings, 1994; Smethurst, 1914; Stephens, 2001). The core element of the community policing concept was the establishment of a cooperative crime fighting coalition between the citizen and the police to reduce the rising crime problem (Great Britain, Metropolitan Police Office, 1829). According to Robinson and Scaglion (1987:
...the police institution is unique to the English people, originates from the people, is dependent on them for their support, and without that support, its effectiveness and even its existence would be in doubt.” Bayley (1994: 102) has recognized that the “police cannot solve society’s crime problems alone. They need the assistance of the public....” With the emergence of community policing in the United States in the 1970s, policing in the last 141 years has come full circle from police-citizen cooperation to virtually no citizen involvement, and finally back to community policing that focuses on police-citizen interaction to combat the root causation of crime. A more in-depth review of the evolution of community policing is necessary for a full and rich appreciation and understanding of why policing has metamorphosed back to a police-citizen cooperative methodology.

In looking for the key variable that provided the cohesiveness and viability to the concept of democracy, Alexis de Tocqueville identified the abundance of voluntary associations (Trojanowicz, 1982). It is likely that American judges, attorneys, and police officers of the 1800s and 1900s had a good sense of values of community, the decisions required relative to crime and social control, and the resources required to maintain the community in a healthy state (Tocqueville, 1835/1961). Democratic ideological fears of adopting an institution from monarchical Europe helped ensure that local political representatives would control American police departments. This local control eventually resulted in the misuse of police agencies by politicians and corruption flowed over into police departments (Miller, 2000).

The first American police department to advance beyond the night watch concept and organize along the professional lines of Peel’s model was the New York City police...
department in 1845 (Fogelson, 1977). Since the 19th century the United States has seen three specific periods of policing methodology that have been predominately, but not exclusively, directed at urban areas. The majority of information that has been learned from researchers has come from studies that have focused on large metropolitan police departments that were the first to implement these programs (Maguire et al., 1997; Neighborhood-oriented policing, 1994). These three periods of policing strategy include: the political era, the reform era, and the community problem-solving era (Fleissner & Heinzelmann, 1996).

Political Era

The political era was named for the close relationship between the police and politics. It covered the period from the 1840s through the early 1900s when various interest groups struggled for control of police departments (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Historically, Americans felt the police should be under local control rather than national control like many European countries. The American political machine, exemplified by Tammany Hall and Boss Tweed, used the police to round up voters and carry out numerous other orders from politicians in exchange for their very positions. The officers helped political leaders by encouraging citizens to vote for politicians who put them in their jobs and at times assisted in rigging elections (Fogelson, 1977). “Cops saw themselves as beholden to corrupt ward politicians who expected them to turn a blind eye to protected vice” (Lardner & Repetto, 2000: 70). American police derived their authority and resources from the local political leaders. Though police were obligated to follow the law, their allegiance to local politicians was so tight they were referred to as adjuncts
to local political machines. Political machines reciprocated by recruiting and retaining police officers.

This period had its strengths in the areas of the support from the citizens as well as police familiarity with the neighborhoods they patrolled. They also maintained social order within the neighborhoods, performing functions well beyond simply enforcing the law. The officers’ familiarity with citizens was accomplished by officers performing many services including foot patrol, crime prevention and control, order maintenance, assisting with soup lines, assisting in providing lodging for immigrants, and helping politicians find work for the millions of ethnic immigrants. There is evidence that this police-citizen closeness prevented riots and other displays of disorder and reduced the incidence of crime. As a result of this closeness to communities and citizens, the police became intimately connected with the social and political fabric of the local ward (Kelling & Moore, 1988).

Reform Era

Later, reformers moved away from these foundational police-citizen approaches to a focus only on crime fighting to create highly disciplined, paramilitary police organizations independent of local politics that no longer involved citizens in police work (Moore & Kelling, 1983). During the 1930s through the 1970s, a time known as the reform era, American police changed their policing strategy to a narrow focus limited strictly to crime fighting. Reformers moved to create highly disciplined, paramilitary police organizations independent of local politics that were limited to crime fighting and enforcement of the law as a solution to eliminate patronage by the police when graft and
corruption of politics pervaded police departments (Miller, 2000). David Thacher (2001) pointed out that it is natural for police departments to attempt to remain autonomous to isolate themselves from politics, given the recent past history of political corruption. The police have had a difficult task in choosing the most effective policies to carry out their functions. Criminal law was used as the source of police legitimacy and these agencies became known as *law enforcement* agencies rather than as *police agencies*.

Police in this reform era narrowed their function to crime control and criminal apprehension. Duties that required police to solve community problems were now seen as social work and rejected (Kelling & Moore, 1988). The emphasis was on uniform enforcement policies with little officer discretion that drastically reduced the influence of politicians. The change to centralized bureaucracies further reduced the ability of local politicians to influence the police at the ward level.

Municipalities engaged in public relations campaigns touting the police as the solution for crime. This paved the way for 911 emergency call centers and introduced reactive policing methods that centered on police officers scurrying from one call to the next with little time to interact with citizens. With a recent reputation for corruption, brutality, and downright incompetence on the part of the police, municipal police reformers rejected politics as the basis of police legitimacy that they saw as the problem in American policing. The move to separate police from politics was so strong that in Philadelphia it became illegal for police to live on their beats so as to isolate officers as completely as possible from political influences (Kelling & Moore, 1988).

The hierarchal military model with a clear division between politics and administration in police departments was consistent with the prevailing general management
philosophy of the early to mid-1900s as advanced by Woodrow Wilson (1887), Frank Goodnow (1900), Frederick Taylor (1911), Max Weber (1946), and Herbert Simon (1946). Police departments seized upon the principles of division of labor and unity of control that touted organizing under the pyramidal bureaucratic hierarchy model to focus control in a single central office that greatly limited officer discretion. This quasi-military model fit well with the structured law enforcement mentality in use at that time.

With this shift in management style, police became impersonal and detached, excluding citizen involvement with a heady confidence that the police would manage the problem of crime (Kelling & Moore, 1988). New officers were subject to stricter hiring standards and more effective training that further reduced influence and control by politicians (Johnson, 1981). Police relied heavily on new technology such as radios, 911 emergency telephone systems, and mobile patrols without seeking assistance from citizens to solve crime (Fleissner & Heinzelmann, 1996). Police left the foot beats for the perceived omnipresence of the patrol car and the politically neutral method of responding to crime after the fact.

Another significant factor influencing the move away from interaction with citizens and toward strict crime fighting was the creation of the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) maintained by the FBI. These data encouraged police administrators to focus on activities that were visible in these crime statistics that became accepted measures of police effectiveness. Officers’ effectiveness was judged by the number of arrests made and response times to calls for police service with the overall measure of effectiveness the comparison of the officer’s activity to the UCR statistics. Officers who desired to advance their careers engaged in reportable types of policing activity and shunned citizen
contact and problem solving that was not a reportable activity. The measures that were put into place to assess an officers' effectiveness were the same systems that caused diminished citizen-police contact. Further, police agencies that obtained federal grant funding were often required to document quantitative measures attributable to the federal funding that were used to justify continuation grants. This movement away from close interaction with citizens resulted in the distrust of the police and the loss of a highly effective crime reduction tool, that of citizen involvement and the information they possessed.

Two other reasons causing decreased interaction between police officers and citizens was the increased incidence of crime demanding more of the officer's time conducting investigations with less citizen contact and the increasing fiscal difficulties of cities. During the 1960s crime began to rise. Police budgets lost financial support when cities experienced fiscal difficulties. As a result, financial cutbacks resulted in substantial losses in the number of police officers employed. These factors necessitated retaining fewer officers to do more work with less time for citizen contact (Moore & Kelling, 1983).

The effects of the reform era have acted to cement policing beliefs and tactics of that time period especially in older officers trained in these methods. These policing methods minimized the problem-solving requirements that are central to the community policing philosophy. Where traditional policing focuses on detecting and arresting offenders, community policing requires officers to look past the crime to the underlying causation and with citizens' involvement, design solutions to prevent the occurrence of crime in the first place. This places additional burdens on the officer and given the past history of policing may be natural for officers to resist. The evolution to a community policing methodology has appeared to be beneficial to management, but it remains to be
seen whether line officers feel the same way and have embraced the practice on a regular basis. Officers indoctrinated to the traditional policing concepts since the 1970s are leaving their positions due to retirement. It remains to be seen if traditional policing methods have been truly replaced by the community policing philosophy.

Community Problem-Solving Era

The third era of policing known as the community problem-solving era (also known as the community policing era) was started in the United States during the 1970s when some of the most innovative police administrators and academics implemented this concept with its more humanistic approach (Thurman et al., 2001). The rigid organizational structure of the military model of policing with its authoritarian management style had been increasingly called into question regarding its ability to address the problems facing the police (Tafoya, 1990). This criticism contributed to the move toward the more humanistic community policing model. General management philosophy started to shift from the rigid “one best way” touted by Max Weber (1946) and others with authority and decision-making discretion held only by top managers to the more humanistic approach advanced by Roethlisberger and Dickson’s (1939) Westinghouse experiments, Maslow’s (1943) hierarchy of needs theory, and Herzberg’s (1959) motivation hygiene theory. This new theory called for flattened organizational structure thereby pushing decision-making down to the line police officer with less emphasis on counting the officers’ activity. This humanistic movement in policing spread quickly under many names with many variations to police agencies that started to buy into this new management philosophy.
Another major factor in the move to integrate police with citizens in problem-solving efforts through community policing has been the recent crisis in public confidence in large city policing. The legitimacy of the police existence was questioned. Commissions in cities such as Los Angeles (Independent Commission on the Los Angeles Police Department, 1991, also known as the Christopher Commission), Philadelphia (Philadelphia Police Study Task Force, 1987), and New York City, (The Knapp Commission Report on Police Corruption, 1973), have called for the adoption of community policing as the policing methodology to resolve the use of force and the long history of unresponsive and inequitable treatment against minorities. “Community policing can be viewed as an attempt to forge links between police and previously excluded communities” (Eck & Rosenbaum, 1994: 11). Mastrofski, Worden, and Snipes (1995) observe that community policing suggests that police officers are more than simply crime fighters—they should be guided by the preferences of the community when deciding whether to make an arrest.

The community policing concept, marked by police-citizen interaction, was initially accomplished by police foot patrol that expanded to many police departments in the United States since the 1970s. Research established that one important factor could help with crime reduction: information. The police once again realized that this information regarding crime and the criminals responsible for these offenses could be obtained from citizens. This resulted in police agencies changing from working closely with politicians and citizens up until the early 1900s, to becoming autonomous to avoid politics and corruption from the 1930s to the 1970s, and then moving back to closeness with citizens in the name of community policing in the 1970s.
This Americanized concept of community policing has been defined by Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990: 5) as:

... a new philosophy of policing based on the concept that police officers and private citizens working together in creative ways can help solve contemporary community problems related to crime, fear of crime, social and physical disorder, and neighborhood decay.

To define community policing another way in more concrete terms, Wilson and Kelling (1989: 51) define community policing as:

Community-oriented policing means changing the daily work of the police to include investigating problems as well as incidents. It means defining as a problem whatever a significant body of public opinion regards as a threat to community order. It means working with the good guys, and not just the bad guys.

Citizen fear reduction has been linked to order maintenance (Kelling & Moore, 1988). A large source of citizen fear stems from acts of social disorder evidenced by minor misconduct such as public drunkenness, prostitution, aggressive panhandling, and vandalism. These minor acts of misconduct that give rise to the fear of crime on the part of citizens and lead to further crime have been described as the “broken windows” theory. This theory advanced by Wilson and Kelling (1982) suggests that when police work to fix broken windows and other signs of social disorder (minor crimes and signs of disorder), citizen’s fears are reduced by the perception that social control is being maintained, their environment is safe and further crime is further reduced.

The primary goals of community policing can be greatly aided by establishing and maintaining effective relationships with citizens who become involved in problem-solving issues while working to reduce their fears of victimization. Under the concept of community policing the officer is not simply a crime fighter, but rather the officer is
guided by the preferences of the community served (Mastrofski et al., 1995). Meese (1993: 1) has observed:

As the emphasis and methods of policing change, the position of the police officer in the organization changes also. Instead of reacting to specified situations, limited by rigid guidelines and regulations, the officer becomes a thinking professional, utilizing imagination and creativity to identify and solve problems. Instead of being locked in an organizational straitjacket, the police officer is encouraged to develop cooperative relationships in the community, guided by values and purposes, rather than be constrained by rules and excessive supervision. To make this possible, much thought must be given to designing the structure of police organizations and to careful recruiting, selecting, training, and supporting officers in the field. Changes must be made in all of these areas to create a new police philosophy that allows officers to function with greater autonomy than previously allowed.

A National Institute of Justice study concluded that the goal of community policing was to increase interaction and cooperation between police and citizens and to reduce and prevent crime while increasing the feelings of safety among residents (Mastrofski, Parks, & Worden, 1998). Crime prevention and community policing are necessarily linked and share a common purpose, making the public safer and communities healthier (Crime prevention and community policing, 1997). These two concepts share the common goal of reducing the threat of crime and enhancing the sense of safety to positively influence the quality of life and develop an environment where crime cannot flourish (Crime Prevention Coalition, 1990).

Citizens groups have become versed in crime reduction concepts involving criminal opportunity reduction, problem solving, crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED), and both political and legal action (Kelling & Coles, 1996). Often, the most serious problems, which police departments typically focus their effort on, are not what the residents are most concerned with. The issue centers on a quality of life meas-
ure, but as perceived by the residents, not as is typically perceived by the police (Stewart-Brown, 2001). Residents often view issues as problems that the police don't regard as important. Vagrants loitering, abandoned buildings, and youths congregating, are situations that create fear in citizens and detract from the quality of life of residents. Police conditioned to engage in high profile activities such as making arrests do not view the presence of vagrants or abandoned buildings as important enough to spend their limited time and resources on. This causes a disconnect between the citizens' concerns and the priorities of the police. Community policing practices attempt to change this situation of disparate views of what the most pressing problems are and for the police and citizens to work in collaboration to identify and resolve issues jointly. Citizen perceptions of neighborhood conditions such as crime, social disorder, and physical decay also impact their level of satisfaction toward the police (Reisig & Parks, 2002).

The current theme of community policing that requires collaboration with nearly everybody is consistent with the broad trend across the United States in both government as well as the private sector. Broad public policy now generally disfavors autonomy in government pursuits in favor of close working relationships between public and private entities within society, the creation of public-private partnerships, and inter-local efforts (Kettl, 1996). The community policing problem-solving strategy is based on decentralized control down to the patrol officer. The use of 911 call centers is discouraged under this model except in serious emergencies. The reactive 911 dispatching based approach is traded for the proactive attempt by the police to change the social, political, and fiscal circumstances to bring citizens' wants in line with police resources.
The literature clearly shows the requirements of a community policing officer are greatly increased from the job of traditional policing. The question remains whether officers have stepped up to the challenge and not only embraced the community policing concept, but practice it on a regular basis.

Overview of the Various Community Policing Models

Attempts by police agencies to develop community policing methods have resulted in a number of similar but differing applications that vary in terms of name and methodological content (Cheurprakobkit, 2002). Philosophically, the programs share the common element of police and citizens sharing a larger number of non-threatening, supportive interactions where police listen to citizens, take seriously problems identified by them, and work together to solve the problems identified by the community (Wycoff, 1988). Though the elements of these various community policing methods vary, they can be grouped by their approach and efforts at reducing crime and conserving scarce financial resources. Many of them can be loosely grouped under the term “community policing” (Goldstein, 1987, 1990). Community policing is a philosophy rather than a specific policing tactic or program (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1994). A philosophy can be defined as the set of values of a culture. Each community must decide what specific approach is best suited to meet their particular problems (Stephens, 2001).

Of the eleven models of community policing implementation methods found in the existing literature that were reviewed for this research, three categories emerged into which each of these programs fit. I have called the first group of community policing methods the Community-Oriented Problem-Solving (COPS) community policing model.
The second category has been termed the *Statistics Directed* community policing model.

The final category has been designated as the *Comprehensive* community policing model.

**Community-Oriented Problem-Solving Model**

The community policing methodologies reviewed that fit into the *Community-Oriented Problem-Solving* (COPS) community policing model revealed that this implementation methodology shares six common elements, namely: (1) the establishment of a close working relationship between residents and the police (*partnerships*); (2) decision-making vested in the officer rather than being retained by management (*decentralized decision-making*); (3) analysis of existing problems confronting a neighborhood (*problem solving*); (4) tactics applied to prevent crime from occurring in the first stead (*crime prevention*); (5) applying a solution to the identified problems (*application*); and (6) assessment of action taken to determine the effectiveness of the solution applied (*assessment*). These elements are consistent with the definition provided by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Service, U. S. Department of Justice (COPS, 2004).

Problem solving is a core element that reflects an attitude, which has been captured by Peters and Waterman (1982) where police treat citizens (neighborhood residents) as adults. Other researchers talk in terms of philosophical, strategic, tactical, and organizational components underlying community policing (Cheurprakobkit, 2002). These methods attempt to de-emphasize the 911 emergency call systems to move from a reactive policing method to a proactive approach to change the social, political, and fiscal circumstances to bring citizens’ demands in line with police resources (Kelling & Moore, 1988). The methodological approaches studied that follow this philosophy include:

Statistics Directed Model

The second grouping of implementation methods reviewed is termed Statistics Directed community policing model that is comprised of five elements consisting of: (1) crime statistics driven policing (statistics), (2) limited decentralization of decision-making only down to command officers (limited decentralization), (3) police-citizen collaboration (partnerships), (4) analysis of existing problems (problem solving), and (5) applying a solution (application). Rather than the police focusing their efforts on citizens’ perception of the problems facing the neighborhood and working with the citizens to resolve them, crime statistics drive police activity and act to focus the department’s priorities and resources on measurable crime reduction. This approach is similar to the traditional policing methodology. The policing methods under this category do contain some of the elements found in the COPS category. Some of these implementation methodologies reviewed include: Compstat (Buntin, 2002), Proactive Community Attack
on Problems (PROCAP) (Judd & Shiver, 1999), and Strategic Community Policing (Brown, 2000).

Comprehensive Model

The third and final group, termed the Comprehensive community policing model, includes a single methodology known as Community Policing Through Environmental Design (CPTED). This method includes not only the six conventional community policing elements of the COPS category (partnerships, decentralized decision-making, problem solving, crime prevention, applying a solution, and assessment), but also contains a broad and comprehensive additional environmental design component. The concept behind this additional element is that the physical environment allows opportunities for crime to occur by providing safe havens for criminals to act undetected. This is the essence of crime prevention theory. The environmental element contains three sub-components: (1) natural surveillance, (2) territoriality, and (3) access control.

The first environmental element known as natural surveillance involves keeping the location in question open to view by the public to deny secluded areas for criminals to ply their trade. Surveillance has the effect of reducing irrational fears and deterring crime (Newman, 1972). An application of this principle occurred in Tallahassee, Florida on a golf course where golfers were robbed on a number of occasions by youths hiding in nearby bushes. After reviewing the problem, police recommended cutting away brush and installing a perimeter fence. These environmental changes stopped the robberies and golfers interviewed subsequent to the remedial measures indicated they felt much safer (Tucker & Starnes, 1993). Simply utilizing translucent materials denies would-be crimi-
nals a safe haven in which to commit crime such as glass enclosures on stairwells to allow observation from passersby (Crowe, 1991).

The second principle of CPTED is *territoriality*. Newman (1972) defines territoriality as the capacity of the physical environment to create perceived zones of territorial influence. The inclusion of environmental changes such as sidewalks, fences, shrubbery, attitudes of residents, and other amenities creates a perceptible and identifiable boundary. This element is used to create a sense of pride and responsibility in the location so residents and owners keep the property well maintained to avoid the “broken windows” dilemma. This principle also induces residents to become involved and to report crime and testify in criminal cases as necessary. This principle is consistent with the idea of the social capital concept advanced by Jane Jacobs (1961) in her book, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*, and the idea of citizen participation and spatial reconstruction to maximize social interaction through environmental design as advanced by Archon Fung (2001).

The final principle of CPTED is known as *access control*. This concept allows police and citizens to manage the flow of pedestrian and vehicular traffic around the zone of territorial influence, whether it is a residential area, public facilities, or businesses (Davis, 2002). Newman (1972) refers to the concept of access control as “defensible space.” Lehrer (2001) observed that in Cape Coral, Florida, officers knew very few residents. This was due in large part to the poor architecture and city design that lacked sidewalks and tended to make casual contact difficult or impossible between police and citizens. This poor access control design also impedes casual contact between the citizens. In a study for the National Institute of Justice, Newman and Franck (1980) found

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
that accessibility to government housing was an important cause of crime, fear of crime, and instability of the neighborhood.

The Politics of Community Policing: A Disservice

One other issue outside of the focus of this study, but that has had a significant impact on the successful implementation of community policing in the United States, is the negative effect from the political federal push for quick and wide-scale adoption of community policing. Little attention has been paid to the effect of federal politics on the community policing movement in the literature. The haste by politicians to implement community policing before many departments had access to sufficient data on how to successfully implement this methodology had resulted in a grave disservice to American police agencies. To address the more systemic failure of the community policing movement in the United States, a look at the politics behind the push for and funding to encourage community policing, is enlightening and may provide a focus for the lack of success of the community policing effort in the United States. Roberg (1994: 255) notes this lack of overall success and suggests caution in implementing community policing efforts: "Due to the potential harmful effects of misguided efforts, either intentional or unintentional, community policing should be supported only if it is properly defined, implemented, and evaluated (preferable by outside sources)." Roberg (1994: 255) continues his assessment of a measured approach to implementing community policing until an agency is ready:

Due to the serious potential side effects that may accrue from unprepared departments attempting to move too quickly into community policing, it is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
crucial to understand that, in general, “going slow” in order to establish a proper foundation is a necessary requirement for successful change.

In defense of the police departments, political gamesmanship by politicians dumped billions of dollars into the community policing effort, presumably aimed at swaying presidential elections, that did a grave disservice to the police agencies by forcing a rapid spread of community policing before agencies and personnel were properly prepared. I believe this explains a significant portion of the failure of the community policing movement as shown in this study. Rather than methodically implementing, learning, and applying the lessons learned, billions of dollars were thrown at police departments to quickly add 100,000 new police officers and to implement community policing.

The federal policy relating to community policing was enacted with the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968, 42 U.S.C. 3796, as amended and the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, Title I, Part Q, Public Law 103-322. In signing this law, President William Clinton created a funding source of $30.2 billion for grants to state and local governments from 1995 through 2000 to recruit and put on the streets an additional 100,000 police officers. The stated purpose of this new law was, among other goals, to implement community policing programs to combat serious crime and to reduce the fear of crime in citizens. This federal policy is not new.

Almost every candidate for Congress in 1995 pledged to do more to fight crime than J. Edgar Hoover ever dreamed of doing (Sterling, 1995). In fact, every Congress since 1980 has passed some form of anticrime legislation. In addition to this public support and Congressional backing, the 1994 Crime Bill with its many issues was also supported by mayors, police and prosecutors (Lewis, 1993). The International Association
of Chiefs of Police (IACP) weighed in on this important issue to police chiefs by alerting their members to contact their legislators regarding encouraging their support on the crime bill (Voegtlin & Wilding, 1999). The crime bill came out of the Executive Office at a time when the Republicans controlled the Senate and House of Representatives.

The strategy on the crime bill, drafted by Senator Biden and Representative Schumer, worked for three reasons. The bill’s language sounded tough rather than typically liberal as Democratic crime bills have typically been structured. This garnered the support of many police unions (Stinson, 1991). The second reason for success is that the bill contained more powerful, value-related pictures, images and stories. The Democratic bill contained voter approved issues of “more cops,” “fewer guns,” “Police Corps program,” and “community policing.” The bill advanced by then-President George H. W. Bush contained abstract legalese issues such as *habeas corpus* and the *exclusionary rule*. The final reason for the bill’s success was due to the broadness of the issues. To appease the conservatives, the Democratic politician touted the increased number of police and the death penalty provisions. To appeal to liberals, the same politician talked of the gun control measures and community policing provisions. Due to the broad base of support and the fact that criminals are viewed negatively by the public and have little legislative power according to the “social construction theory” advanced by Schneider and Ingram (1993), anticrime legislation is easier to pass than many other legislative issues.

The 1994 crime bill was designed to provide more police and fewer guns (Chemoff, Kelly, & Kroger, 1996: 539). The funding also provided for state and local community policing efforts (Krauss, 1991). The Democratic bill addressed providing funds for community policing programs for state and local officers (Krauss, 1991). This
strategy seized the crime initiative from the Republicans who, for over 20 years, led the crime fighting charge (Chernoff et al., 1996). The Democrats realized that to pass their landmark anticrime legislation, they would need to capture the White House during the 1992 election with a strong anticrime candidate. Bill Clinton took a tough crime stance in the beginning of his campaign that ultimately helped him win the presidency. Clinton operated on many political levels by fighting fiercely for the support of police unions (Devroy & Marcus, 1992) and television ads in the south stressing his support for the death penalty (Ifill, 1992). Clinton stressed his message of 100,000 new police officers: "The simplest and most direct way to restore order in our cities is to put more police on the streets" (Wattenberg, 1995). However, as the literature shows, additional police presence does little to affect crime rates (Zhao et al., 2002).

The Department of Justice (DOJ) with over 30 years of law enforcement assistance program oversight was given responsibility and oversight of the implementation of the community policing grant provisions of the crime bill. The DOJ created the Office of Community Oriented Policing (COPS) to directly oversee and administer the day-to-day operations and handle the grant process (Murphy, 1995). Stephen K. Moore, director of fiscal Policy Studies at the CATO Institute, opined that the crime bill cost taxpayers $30 million and will do almost nothing to fight crime. He stated that not since Nixon created the revenue sharing program has the federal government created a more expensive slush fund (Moore, 1995). It is felt that the COPS program merely accelerated the rate of ongoing funding rather than moving law enforcement in a new direction (Roth & Ryan, 2000).
Though Clinton and Gore claim credit for the declining crime rates due to the crime bill, criminologists say demographics, an aging population, and tougher sentencing by the states are responsible for the declining crime rates. Reporting tricks have been responsible for making the crime bill appear more effective than it actually was, according to several studies (How Many Cops?, 2000). Perhaps one of the biggest falsehoods is that the touted additional 100,000 police officers may have in actuality peaked at some 57,175 new officers in 2001 ("How Many Cops?," 2000). This estimated total number of police officers added varies depending on the source. Roth and Ryan (2000) estimate between 69,000 and 84,600 officers will actually be added rather than the 57,175 new officers reported in the Houston Chronicle article. All evaluations and other accounts tend to support the conclusion that far fewer officers were actually hired than the 100,000 promised by Clinton with the possible exception of the National Institute of Justice study (Roth & Ryan, 2000). Roth and Ryan were employed by the Justice Department so that may have provided some incentive to provide as high an estimate as possible. The political events leading up to the passage of the crime bill, that flooded police departments with billions of dollars that agreed to quickly add officers, may have done a grave disservice to the community policing effort. However, this swift, haphazard event may have been just what was needed to recognize the pitfalls of trying to change longstanding police officer attitudes overnight. Maybe now, the path to successful implementation of community policing by a measured approach, has been identified.
Focus of the Research

Previous studies have shown that the ultimate success of the implementation of community policing depends on the line officers that are responsible for employing these efforts at the street level (Lurigio & Rosenbaum, 1994). Studies to date have predominantly focused upon whether agencies have adopted and implemented community policing rather than the extent to which the individual officers have actually accepted and employed these community policing methods on a regular basis as professed by their chiefs and supervisors.

Few studies of small to medium size agencies were found that have looked at the degree of congruence in police agencies of acceptance and practice from the chief down to the line officer who is responsible for implementing the philosophy in their daily activities. Eck and Rosenbaum (1994) have recognized that police organizations need to make better use of the knowledge and experience of the street level officers. The classic work by Reuss-Ianni (1993) established that policy initiatives from management were slow to be adopted by street level officers suggesting the concept of congruence may be lacking in many policy decisions. She found that two opposing cultures existed in the New York City police department: the street cop culture characterized by cohesiveness, mutual protection and doing what was necessary to get the job done, and the juxtaposed management cop culture typified by a focus on public administration and scientific management for guidance in running the department. Others have made this same observation. The goal of this research is to specifically ascertain the street level officers’ views from a multi-state random sampling of eighteen small to medium size departments.
No studies have been located in the existing literature in which the notion of congruence has been linked to outcomes. Visser and Wright (1996) have postulated the necessity of congruence being required to achieve a defined end result. The connection between congruence and the acceptance and regular practice of community policing methods is believed by this researcher to be pivotal in the ultimate success or failure of the community policing implementation. This research focuses on whether the officer on the street has actually implemented the agency’s adoption of community policing methods, as this philosophy by definition requires and the extent to which the officer uses it on a regular basis to truly focus on the root causation of crime. The purpose of this research is to help fill the existing void in the literature by examining the characteristics and conditions of congruence.

This congruence, or lack thereof, has not been compared to crime rates in an effort to establish a link. Studies reviewed have looked at whether the agency has adopted a community policing philosophy and compared the philosophy to crime rates, citizen satisfaction, and officer satisfaction with little inquiry to determine if congruence existed between the adopting agency, supervisors, and whether the officers actually accepted the concept and practiced it on a regular basis. A few studies like the Chicago study (Skogan & Hartnett, 1997) used a series of surveys of some officers and observations in that single large agency. The survey was distributed to one third of the officers in the prototype five districts (p. 49). No studies were located that have looked at a cross section of agencies and specifically ascertained whether congruence exists among police agencies in general, meaning whether an agency’s complement of officers as a whole embraces community policing methods throughout all ranks and community policing
methods are regularly practiced by line officers. What also has not been answered is in what percentage of departments does congruence exist. A second question is whether a correlation exists between departments where community policing is embraced and practiced regularly by officers and those departments whose officers do not in comparison with the resulting effect on crime rates in those jurisdictions, which should be the focus of future research.

More specifically research questions in this study ask:

1. Is there a chain of congruence between an agency’s adoption of the philosophy of community policing, the extent the officers embrace the community policing philosophy, and the extent to which officers practice it on a regular basis?

2. Under what conditions will a lack of congruence between community policing, philosophical acceptance by employees, and the regular practice of this philosophy occur?

3. To what degree are the philosophies of community policing congruent between supervisors and officers?

4. Are crime rates positively impacted in departments where congruence exists between the department and its officers in embracing and practicing community policing?

5. Does the adoption of one of the three categories of community policing methodologies have a greater crime reduction impact than the other two categories?

Further, this inquiry seeks to determine under which conditions will a lack of congruence between community policing, philosophical acceptance by employees, and the regular practice of this philosophy by line officers occur. To arrive at an answer this research focuses on the degree of congruence between supervisors and officers. Additionally, no studies have attempted to group the different community policing implemen-
tation methods into categories as has been done in this study in an attempt to answer the question of whether one grouping of methodologies is more effective in reducing the incidence of crime over the other two categories. These issues are the focus of this research.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY/RESEARCH DESIGN

The primary focus of this research is to determine whether police departments have actually implemented community policing to the degree that the agency executive purports to have done. In the police agencies sampled, I sought to determine the degree of congruence between police officers and their supervisors. The methodology used was to conduct data collection not only from the chief executives, but also from the line officers that are charged with the ultimate responsibility of implementing the philosophy. These line officers are in the best position to know whether their agency as a whole has actually accepted, and the officers themselves have implemented, community policing.

Further, data were collected to assess whether the ranks between the line officer and chief, who provide policy directives and supervision, have embraced and assisted in the implementation of the concept of community policing. For purposes of this research, the acceptance and practice of the community policing philosophy from officer to supervisors and to the chief has been termed congruence. I believe that the degree of congruence is directly related to the degree of acceptance and practice of the concepts of community policing.

The survey instrument was selected to gather the desired data since this method allowed for data collection from large representative populations. The questions selected on the survey instrument were derived from a concept mapping exercise that looked at
the environmental influences on police agencies that have implemented the community policing methodology. From the hypotheses developed, survey questions were drafted to ensure data relevant to the variables would be collected and to maximize reliability and operational validity of the model (O'Sullivan, Rassel, & Berner, 2003).

Sampling of police departments was achieved by a random sampling methodology. The Great Lakes region was selected primarily due to proximity to the researcher's residence. A list of all police departments in each of the six Great Lakes states was obtained from the UCR maintained by the FBI. Agencies from each of the six states were grouped into four categories to allow for comparisons among the various sizes of agencies. These size groupings represented natural size clusters of total sworn officers in each agency. The categories are shown in Table 1.

Table 1
Surveyed Police Agency Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>20–34 Officers</th>
<th>35–50 Officers</th>
<th>&gt; 50 Officers</th>
<th>Total Depts.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Depts.</td>
<td>No. of Depts.</td>
<td>No. of Depts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The category sizes by number of total sworn officers are shown across the top of the table. The number of agencies in each state within each category is shown with the percentage of each size grouping for agencies in each category. The percentages are derived from the total agencies subject to the random selection after subtracting the smallest grouping of agencies of less than 20 officers (1,340 agencies) that were not used in this study from the total number of agencies within the six states (2,067). The smallest agency category of less than 20 sworn officers was not sampled on the assumption that the smallest agencies would not have sufficient human and financial resources to effectively implement community policing in a significant way.

The three sizes of agency categories based on the total number of sworn officers sampled were 20–34 (small), 35–50 (medium), and more than 50 (large) sworn officers. The largest agency surveyed had 167 officers. One department from each of the three categories was randomly selected from each state by picking a random number and selecting the agency from each state representing the random number. One alternate department from each state for each category was also selected in the event a primary selected agency chose not to participate. Two agencies did choose to decline the invitation to participate when initially contacted. Prior to data being collected, a third agency changed their position and opted not to participate. In each case, the alternately selected agencies were invited to participate which they did in all three instances. This initial selection of a primary and alternate agency was done to minimize the possibility of selection bias.
Accuracy of Results

The data was used to determine if officers regularly practice community policing. All sworn officers of the selected agencies were requested to complete the survey instrument, built on a 5-point Likert scale, to minimize sampling and selection errors. The goal of the data gathering was to obtain data from respondents as close to 1,000 responses (big number theory) as possible. However, with an $N$ as small as 384 responses, a 95% confidence level with a standard 4% sampling error would be obtained (O’Sullivan et al., 2003: 156). The survey resulted in an $N$ of 562 usable responses, resulting in a confidence level of 95% and a sampling error of 4%. This number of responses should allow for the results to be generalized (external validity) to other police agencies in the Great Lakes region. Maguire et al. (1997) found regional differences of participation in community policing activities thereby potentially precluding generalizing these results beyond the Great Lakes region.

The total possible $N$ for the eighteen police departments in this survey was 1,176 sworn officers. The actual number of responses obtained was 562 for a 48% response rate. The total possible $N$ for line level officers from all departments was 885 with an actual $n$ of 345 for a 39% response rate. The total possible $N$ for supervisors (sergeant rank through chief) was 291 with an actual $n$ of 217 for a response rate of 75%.

Data Sources

The degree to which police officers practice community policing methods on a regular basis was measured by using a survey instrument containing twenty-eight Likert-
scaled statements developed by this researcher through the concept mapping methodology (see Appendix E). These questions were directed to police officers to determine the degree to which they practice community policing methods on a regular basis.

A second survey instrument was administered to all officers above the rank of street-level officer (see Appendix G). These supervisory and command officers were asked to respond to twenty-eight Likert-scaled questions similar to those provided to line officers. However, these questions were, in some instances, designed to determine the supervisor’s perception of the degree the line officers have embraced and regularly practice the philosophy of community policing rather than to assess the supervisor’s acceptance and practice of community policing methods. These responses were compared to the officers’ actual responses regarding their actual acceptance and practice of community policing on a regular basis.

Crime rates in each of the police agency’s jurisdictions were to be compared to the degree of congruence to assess whether crime rates were affected by the degree of congruence in the police agencies. Given the results of the survey from both a quantitative and qualitative perspective, crime rates were not relevant as the methodology used by police departments to implement community policing was typically on a phased-in, ad hoc basis. Departments added one or more activities consistent with the overarching community policing philosophy; some time later one or more activities were either added or dropped, while other activities are added or dropped over the course of years. Some of the agencies encouraged community policing efforts department-wide, while others used from a few to some small portion of their agency to engage community policing activities. Additionally, several departments were strongly supportive of community policing...
only to change chiefs who focused on other issues allowing the impetus toward community policing efforts to take a backseat to new priorities. These factors make a comparison to crime rates impossible given my research design that failed to anticipate the implementation strategies used by police agencies. Therefore, no particular start date could be ascertained from which to compare crime rates with congruence levels so no attempt was made to do so.

The Effectiveness of the Three Community Policing Categories

A third survey was used to determine the particular approach each agency utilized to implement community policing in their jurisdiction (see Appendix H). An administrative officer was interviewed with the researcher recording the responses on the survey instrument to allow for probing with follow-up questions to determine the full extent of agency participation against a list of 31 recognized community policing tactics discussed by McGuire et al. (1997). In this research, I attempted to classify the numerous community policing implementation efforts used by the eighteen departments studied. Using a qualitative approach, I termed the three categories as Community-oriented Problem-solving (COPS), Statistics Directed, and Comprehensive, community policing models.

The goal in looking at these three groupings of community policing methods was to attempt to categorize the many efforts into a few uniform groupings and to ascertain whether one grouping was more effective as a general approach to implementing a community policing effort. For example, as an initial observation, the use of statistics to direct police resources is contrary to the core philosophy of community policing clearly established in a large body of the literature that postulates that citizen input on problems
should drive the deployment of police resources. The literature suggests that the police should focus their resources on what the citizens believe constitutes a problem, not what the police perceive as a problem. A body of the literature recognizes the COPS approach as a common approach. Indeed, a federal COPS office has been created to advance this philosophy by offering resources and grant funds to police departments. The third category, the Comprehensive model, uses the elements found in the COPS model, plus the much broader environmental component that encompasses sociological teachings.

Each of the eighteen departments participating in this research was asked questions from the departmental survey as to how they implemented their efforts. From that information it was hoped that each agency's implementation effort could be placed into one of the three categories and crime rates would be compared to determine the most effective type of implementation methodology. As stated earlier in this research, given the nature of the research design, crime rates and the link to the community policing efforts could not be made. This researcher believes this inquiry merits further investigation of a future effort with the proper focus on the research design so that meaningful data may be obtained and the hypothesis tested.

### Variables

The independent/dependent variables in this study are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variables</th>
<th>Dependent Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental factors</td>
<td>Acceptance of the CP philosophy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of the CP philosophy</td>
<td>Regular practice of CP methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congruence across all ranks</td>
<td>Degree of officer's regular practice of CP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Environmental factors used in this research include: gender, age, educational level, rank, duties, years of police experience, years of military experience, and number of officers in the department (agency size). I felt these environmental factors were instrumental in helping to shape officers’ perceptions and these factors are supported by the literature.

Gender (coded: 0 = male, 1 = female): this variable will measure the differences in philosophy and practice in regard to community policing. Do male or female officers have different levels of adopting the community policing philosophy and is there a difference in the degree of the regular practice of community policing by male or female officers?

Age (coded: ages 21–25 = 1, 26–30 = 2, 31–35 = 3, 36–40 = 4, 41–45 = 5, 46–50 = 6, 51–55 = 7, 56–60 = 8, 61+ = 9): most police agencies require officers to be at least 21 years of age so that starting age was used as the first age category. Five-year age intervals were used since changes in experience and maturity levels are more likely to occur during these time periods (Skolnick, 1994).

Educational Level (coded: high school = 1, Associate’s degree = 2, Bachelor’s degree = 3, Master’s degree = 4, Ph.D./J.D. degree = 5): research on police officers with higher education has shown that officers with a higher level of education tend to be more flexible in their beliefs and show less authoritarianism (Parker et al., 1976; Robeg, 1978; Trojanowicz & Nicholson, 1976). Evidence exists that suggests higher levels of education make the officers more aware of social and ethnic issues and they have a greater level of acceptance of minorities (Weiner, 1976).
Rank (coded: patrolman = 1, sergeants = 2, lieutenants = 3, captains = 4, chiefs/deputy chiefs = 5): this measure was included to attempt to determine the acceptance of the community policing philosophy at the different rank levels to measure the level of congruence across all ranks. A second determination sought was the supervisors’ belief of the degree they felt their officers embraced the community policing philosophy and the degree the officers actually practiced the concepts on a regular basis compared to what the officers reported. Again, this was to measure the degree of congruence across all ranks within the agencies.

Duties (coded: patrol assignment = 0, other duties = 1): I felt that an officer’s assignment might have an impact on their attitude toward community policing, e.g., patrol duties versus officers in other functions, such as administrative, detective, narcotic, or other assignments. This information was obtained to compare officers at different ranks in these two categories to determine the answer to this question.

Years of Police Experience (coded: using five year increments of actual years of full police powers): this information was captured on the survey background information questions prior to the survey questions. This information is used to measure whether the number of years of police experience affects the acceptance and regular practice of community policing concepts.

Military Experience (coded: as a dichotomous variable, 1 = military experience, 0 = no military experience): this information was captured on the survey background information questions prior to the survey questions. This information is used to measure if military experience affects the acceptance and regular practice of community policing concepts.
Number of Officers in the Department (coded: small agencies, 20–34 officers = 1, medium agencies, 35–50 = 2, and large agencies over 50 officers = 3). However, the data was collected by individual agency. The question to be answered is whether agency size affects the degree of acceptance of the philosophy and regular practice of community policing methods.

PH and PR Indexes

Survey questions 6–9, 13, 19, and 23 comprise the PH Index (philosophy index) (see Appendix E). Survey questions 11–12 and 14–18 comprise the PR Index (practice index) (see Appendix G). The PH Index questions were used to measure the general philosophy of line officers regarding community policing. The PR Index questions measured the actual regular policing practice regarding community policing methods by line officers. The officers were asked if they supported the concept of community policing and if they regularly practiced it. The questions posed to supervisors asked what they believed their officers’ views were in an effort to assess if congruence existed regarding what the officers actually believed and did compared with what their supervisors believed the officers believed and did in regard to community policing methods.

The two indexes were constructed from seven different questions each since a single question or source of information is rarely an adequate or reliable indicator. Combining data into an index provides a more operationally valid and reliable measure (O’Sullivan et al., 2003). Each index was constructed by adding all responses to each of the seven survey questions, weighted equally, and dividing by the number of survey questions, then dividing by the number of responses, to obtain a mean response for each
of the two indexes, PH Index and PR Index. Since the questions were positive for community policing philosophy and practice, high scores of 4 or 5 indicated a strong acceptance of the community policing philosophy and regular practice of community policing activities. Low scores of 1 or 2 indicated a low acceptance of the community policing philosophy or irregular or little practice of community policing activities. Variables were analyzed by using STATA statistical analysis software with the results reported in Chapter IV.

PH Index (Philosophy Index)

*I support my department's adoption of Community Policing because I think Community Policing works.* (Q#6). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other philosophy index questions, the officer’s general philosophy toward the concept of community policing. This statement is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

*In general, I support how my department is implementing Community Policing.* (Q#7). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other philosophy index questions, the officer’s belief of the commitment of the agency toward the community policing philosophy. A high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.
Community policing methods have provided me more job satisfaction than traditional policing methods. (Q#8). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other philosophy index questions, whether the officer receives more job satisfaction from practicing community policing methods than from traditional policing methods as a general attitude toward community policing. This statement is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

I involve citizens when trying to resolve the causes of crime. (Q#9). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other philosophy index questions, whether the officer accepts the philosophy of community policing so as to reach beyond the protective parameters of the traditional policing methods of not opening up to “outsiders” in responding to calls of crime. This statement is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

Solving the root cause of crime is generally more effective than traditional policing methods that focus primarily on making arrests. (Q#13). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other philosophy index questions, the officer’s understanding of one of the basic tenets of community policing, that of dealing with the causation of crime rather than the symptoms. This statement is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees
with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

*Resolving non-crime related matters is as important as working on criminal matters.* (Q#19). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other philosophy index questions, whether the officer has faith in and supports the community policing philosophy as being able to assist in resolving crime related issues by focusing on non-criminal matters. This statement is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

*My supervisor supports the concept of community policing.* (Q#23). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other philosophy index questions, whether the officer perceives his direct supervisor as buying into the community policing philosophy which may directly affect the degree to which the officer will have the confidence to support community policing. This statement is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

**PR Index (Practice Index)**

*When responding to a call or making an arrest, I also try to solve the root cause of the incident or crime.* (Q#11). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other practice index questions, if the officer regularly incorporates one of
the core community policing methods in his regular duties. This statement is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

*When responding to a call or making an arrest, I usually involve citizens in solving the problem.* (Q#12). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other practice index questions, whether the officer regularly practices community policing methods by opening up to citizens for meaningful input in resolving community problems. This statement is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

*When trying to solve crimes, I generally contact neighbors and business owners for information about who may have committed the crime.* (Q#14). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other practice index questions, the depth of commitment and the resulting regular practice of another core community policing methodology. This statement is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

*I keep in regular contact with community and business groups to keep abreast of crime patterns in my patrol (area of responsibility) area.* (Q#15). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other practice index questions, the degree to which the officer regularly uses the various basic key community concepts. This state-
ment is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

*I generally make my own decisions regarding where I will work (within my area of responsibility) and what I will do to minimize crime.* (Q#16). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other practice index questions, the degree of authority and autonomy delegated to the line officer by the employing agency consistent with the community policing philosophy and the officer’s acceptance of this responsibility to put into practice the community policing philosophy. This statement is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

*I usually use my time to prevent crime before it occurs rather than react to calls of crimes.* (Q#17). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other practice index questions, whether the officer proactively uses available time to pursue community policing methods rather than waiting for the next call characteristic of traditional policing. This statement is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

*When not tied up on calls, I stop to talk to citizens and business owners to develop relationships with them.* (Q#18). This statement was designed to discover, in conjunction with the other practice index questions, whether officers sought ways to foster
community support and involvement of community policing. This statement is a positive community policing statement and a high score of 4 or 5 suggests that the respondent agrees with the community policing philosophy while a low response of 1 or 2 suggests the officer favors traditional policing methods.

Data Analysis

Initially, multiple regression analysis was run on the PH Index and PR Index against the independent variables to ensure that the proper independent variables had been selected, the model was properly designed, and the results were statistically significant (Cook & Campbell, 1979). The purpose of regression analysis was to determine the dependence of the dependent variable on one or more explanatory (independent) variables (Gujarati, 2003). The $N$ used in the model was 552. The $p$ value associated with the $f$ value was 0.0000 for the PH Index and 0.0005 for the PR Index. These results were less than the alpha of 0.05 indicating that the independent variables reliably predict both dependent variables and the null hypothesis could be rejected. There is a significant relationship between the independent variables with the two dependent variables. However, the percentage of variance explained in the model was only 7.3% for the PH Index and 5% for the PR Index. With $R^2$ results this low these results cannot be used to predict. The independent variables were then analyzed using scatter plots. These plots revealed that the data was non-linear in nature. The fact that the data was non-linear negated using multiple regression to test for significance. Further, three independent variables—Gender, Military, and Duties—are dichotomous nominal variables, further negating the use of multiple regression to test for significance (O'Sullivan et al., 2003: 445). Since
multiple regression is not appropriate for analyzing non-linear data, chi-square and \( t \) tests were used to test for significance in place of the multiple regression analysis.

**Testing for Significance and Association**

Tests for significance indicates the probability that an observed relationship occurred by chance (O'Sullivan et al., 2003: 409). Tests of statistical significance are termed inferential statistics. Measures of association indicate the strength of the relationship between two variables and are known as descriptive statistics. Tests for significance and association are used together to either confirm or discount a hypothesized relationship (O'Sullivan et al., 2003: 409).

To be safe, both chi-square and the \( t \) test were used to test the data for significance. Both statistics are commonly used (O'Sullivan et al., 2003: 367). Chi-square was selected since it is a widely used and understood test for statistical significance (O'Sullivan et al., 2003: 368). Three characteristics of chi-square are that it does not provide information on the direction of association, the amount of association increases with sample size, and it is not a reliable measure of probability for Type I errors where cells in a table have less than 5 responses. In data sets where only a few cells have fewer than 5 frequencies, relatively small errors result. Where cells have fewer than 5 frequencies, combining categories can be considered (O'Sullivan et al., 2003: 369). This was done with some of the data where low frequencies were encountered.

The \( t \) test requires four assumptions to be met, which with this research data, all of the assumptions have been arguably met. These assumptions include: (1) measurements are made on an interval or ratio scale, (2) members of the sample have been ran-
domly selected from the defined population, (3) standard deviations of the scores for the
two groups should be approximately equal, and (4) the populations from which the
samples have been drawn are normally distributed. These data were obtained by use of
the 5-point Likert scale questionnaire. Departments were randomly selected from the
Great Lakes region and individual respondents were self-selected on a random basis by
deciding whether to participate or not. This may not satisfy true random selection cri-
teria. Standard deviation of the scores is approximately equal based on a review of the
data. The populations from which the samples have been drawn are normally distributed.
The \( t \) test was run and the results are reported in Chapter IV, Section 3. Where one or
more of the assumptions for \( t \) tests are questionable, the Mann-Whitney \( U \) test is advised
as a follow-up test (Burns, 2000: 182). In this research, the randomness of individual
respondent selection may be questionable necessitating a follow-up test.

Mann-Whitney \( U \) was used as a secondary check where the \( t \) test was used. Since
the \( t \) test is more robust than Mann-Whitney \( U \), the latter was only used to check the
results of the \( t \) tests but not reported in all instances. For the Mann-Whitney \( U \), the scale
of measurement must be at least ordinal. The rationale for this test suggests that if a
treatment effect exists, one group of scores will be higher than the other. If no treatment
effect exists, the data will be randomly mixed (Burns, 2000: 189). The Mann-Whitney \( U \)
test ranks all scores from both groups in one sample, then tests to ascertain whether there
is a systematic clustering into two groups paralleling the samples (Burns, 2000: 189).
The data in this research shows one group of data is greater than the other satisfying the
criteria for using Mann-Whitney \( U \). The results of this analysis and the significance of
these findings are reported in Chapter IV, Section 3.
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Since the data is mixed between nominal and ordinal levels, a nominal measure must be used to measure association (O’Sullivan et al., 2003: 404). Gamma and Cramér’s $\nu$ were run to test the mixed data for association. Gamma is a common measure used for data measured at the ordinal level and is a sensitive measure. Values of .30–.40 suggest a moderate relationship. Cramér’s $\nu$ is a statistic used to measure association for nominal measured data. Values of .20–.40 suggest a moderate relationship (O’Sullivan et al., 2003: 404).

The mean responses for each of the environmental factors queried in the survey were calculated to ascertain which of the factors indicated a higher PH Index score. The results are reported in Chapter IV, Section 4. The higher the PH Index result the higher the indication of acceptance of the community policing philosophy. Each environmental factor response mean was calculated to determine which of the factors showed the highest regular implementation of community policing activities.

In Chapter IV, the bivariate relationships between the independent variables were tested against both the PH Index and the PR Index. The coefficient of determination was run to assess the degree of association of each independent variable against both the PH Index and PR Index. The $\nu$ test was used to test for significance. The $r^2$ was generated for each independent variable to determine the degree of variance explained by each variable. The $p$ value was calculated and compared against the alpha of .05 to assess whether the null hypothesis could be rejected. The correlation coefficient or Pearson’s $r$ was used as a test of goodness of fit and as a measure of association. A result of 1.00 indicates a direct relationship, whereas a result of 0.00 designates a null relationship (O’Sullivan et al., 2003: 432).
Limitations

Several issues may affect the data obtained in this study. First, officers’ perception of confidentiality in their survey instrument may have affected the responses they provided and skewed the data. The survey instrument clearly indicated that officers were not to place their name on their survey. It also stated in the survey directions that the information is confidential and will not be released to anyone other than the student-investigator. Once the officer completed the survey, they were instructed to give the completed survey directly to the student-investigator or if the student-investigator was not present, to individually drop the survey in the mail in the addressed, stamped envelope provided. Finally, officers were told in person and in the survey directions that they were free to not participate and their employer would take no adverse actions against them for participating or not participating in the survey. This survey methodology was used to build a level of trust between the researcher and the respondents and to minimize the officer’s apprehension in an effort to invoke candid responses to the survey questions.

Another issue of concern was obtaining an adequate number of responses from the selected police departments so as to ensure a representative sample from each department surveyed. The chief of each agency was contacted to obtain their approval and assistance in inviting their officers to participate in this survey. Adequate time was allotted for all officers who wished to participate even if they were on vacation by providing them with a survey instrument in a pre-addressed envelope with postage provided for completion upon return from leave status.
It is believed that the anonymous nature of the survey contributed to a level of trust and cooperation, as officers understood their responses would not be shared with their department protecting their individual responses. When present, I directly accepted the completed surveys from the officers as they completed them so that no one other than me would ever see the officer who completed the survey. No identifying information was placed on any survey that provided further confidentiality protection. Finally, respondents were told that no one other than myself, my dissertation advisor, and the HSIRB representative at Western Michigan University, knows which states and which agencies participated in this study.

Police officers are inherently suspicious of people they do not know especially if those persons are not police officers (Allen, 2002). I believe knowledge of my police experience and my personal presence at twelve of the agencies provided a level of credibility and aided in obtaining access to the desired data from both the departments as well as the individual officers. I also believe this resulted in candid responses to the survey questions. Indeed, officers from nearly all departments indicated that this researcher’s background was pivotal in obtaining the degree of access gained in furtherance of this study. It is believed that this data reflects the officers’ true perception and reality of the degree to which they have accepted and implemented community policing on a daily basis irrespective of the claims of their departments of having done so on a department-wide basis.

Toward the end of the data collection, due to a change in my employment, I was required to mail surveys to the last two states involving six police agencies. A stamped return envelope was provided with each survey so that officers could seal and mail their
own survey to maintain total confidentiality. The response rates from the agencies that I personally visited and the agencies to which I mailed the surveys showed comparable response rates. The letter I sent with the survey instruments is believed to have created a level of trust insuring candid responses from those agencies as well as providing knowledge of my police background. The results of the data confirmed this belief since it was consistent with data from the other four states.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, AND INTERPRETATIONS

Introduction

The primary research question with sub-questions and the hypothesis that guided this research are shown below. In Section 1, Table 2 reports the characteristics of sworn officers completing this survey by percentage with the number of responses for each category. In Section 2, Table 3 reports the findings regarding the degree to which the various categories of sworn officers embrace key elements of community policing regarding the acceptance of this policing philosophy. This table also reports the degree to which agency decision makers and officers view the adequacy of initial and in-service training in the community policing philosophy. Table 4, in response to research sub-question 3, reports the degree of congruence between police officer rank and the supervisory ranks relating to the acceptance of the philosophy of community policing. Table 5, in response to research sub-question 3, reports the degree of congruence between the police officer rank and all supervisory ranks regarding the actual practice of community policing methods. In Section 3, Table 6, in response to research question 1, reports the overall degree of congruence by comparing the mean scores by rank as measured by the PH and PR indices. In Section 4, Table 7, in response to research question 2, reports the findings on the impact of the various environmental factors tested in this research that are hypothesized to impact on the degree of officer philosophy and practice of community policing.
policing. Section 4, Table 8, reports the bivariate relationships between the PH Index and the independent environmental variables. Section 4, Table 9, reports the bivariate relationships between the PR Index and the independent environmental variables.

The primary research question with hypothesis is:

1. Is there a chain of congruence between an agency’s adoption of the philosophy of community policing, the extent to which the officers embrace the community policing philosophy, and the extent to which officers practice it on a regular basis?

   H1: The agency will implement CP as it professes to have done.
   H2: The agency will implement CP irrespective of grant funding availability.
   H3: Officers in police agencies implementing CP will embrace the CP philosophy.
   H4: Officers embracing the CP philosophy will practice it on a regular basis in the field.

The four other sub-research questions and hypotheses are:

2. Under what conditions will a lack of congruence between community policing, philosophical acceptance by employees, and the regular practice of this philosophy occur?

   E1a: A higher percentage of (Environmental Factor*) officers will embrace the CP philosophy than (Environmental Factor) officers.
   E1b: A higher percentage of (Environmental Factor) officers will practice CP on a regular basis than (Environmental Factor) officers.

   *Environmental factors tested: Gender, age, education, rank, years of police experience, and years of military service.

3. To what degree are the philosophies of CP congruent between supervisors and officers?

   H5: A higher percentage of supervisors will embrace CP than their officers.
   H6: Supervisors will perceive their officers as embracing CP more than the officers actually do.
   H7: Supervisors will perceive their officers practicing CP on a regular basis more than the officers actually do.
Given the transitional implementation strategies used by the police agencies in this study, this research design did not anticipate and was not able to address the impact on crime rates.

4. Are crime rates positively impacted in departments where congruence exists between the department and its officers in embracing and practicing CP?

H8: Crime rates will be lower per capita where community-policing implementation has a strong level of congruence.

The research design used did not anticipate the evolving methodology of implementing various community policing activities and was therefore unable to address research question 5.

5. Does the adoption of one of the three categories of community policing methodologies have a greater crime reduction impact than the other two categories?

H9: One of the types of community policing philosophy will have a greater reduction in crime than the other types of methodology.

Section 1: Agency and Respondent Characteristics

Agency Demographics

Three police agencies were selected at random from each of the six states in the Great Lakes region. As explained in the methodology chapter, one small, one medium, and one large agency from each state were used in this survey-based study.

Of the six small agencies, all six reported that they currently practiced community policing. Five of the six medium-sized departments reported that they practice community policing. Of the six large agencies, all six stated they currently practiced community policing. Of the eighteen departments, the official position of the agencies in seventeen
of the eighteen departments participating in this survey (94.4%) stated they practiced community policing.

I believe that police departments that desire to implement major change such as the adoption of a community policing method of policing must at a minimum: (1) assess the degree of readiness of personnel to embrace the proposed change, (2) provide adequate initial training covering the concepts and methods of implementation for current as well as employees added after the initial implementation, (3) provide ongoing in-service training to enhance the initial training, (4) conduct regular assessments of the effectiveness of the implementation strategies, and (5) regularly evaluate each employee to determine the degree to which they are implementing the community policing philosophy and make adjustments in the implementation strategy as needed.

The primary focus of this research is to determine whether congruence is present in agencies that purportedly practice community policing. I believe that where congruence is found in police departments, they will have implemented the five steps mentioned above. The agency background questionnaire asked questions to obtain data regarding these minimum implementation requirements.

In seventeen of the eighteen agencies surveyed, only seven (38.9%) provided initial training to all officers in community policing methods prior to implementation. Another seven agencies (38.9%) provided some initial training to some of their officers. The partial training occurred in agencies where specialized units were responsible for implementing community policing or where older officers had been given initial training but the training stopped so that newly hired officers did not receive any initial training.
Five agencies (27.8%) reported that they provided their officers in-service training after the initial training. One agency indicated that selected officers receive in-service training in community policing methods.

One agency (5.5%) had an assessment procedure in place to determine if officers were practicing community policing methods on an ongoing basis. It was not stated if that information was used to determine training needs or other areas that might improve the community policing efforts.

An attempt was made to determine the rationale for departments to move to a community policing philosophy by including a question on the departmental survey. Rationale for adoption of this philosophy reported by agencies included: an actual belief in the methodology, a desire to qualify for grant funds, the perception of keeping pace with the latest trends in the police community, and pressure from government leaders to implement community policing.

Community policing grants were received by ten (58.8%) of the seventeen agencies that reported they had implemented community policing. Three small, two medium, and five large agencies applied for and received grants. Of these ten agencies, four reported that they practiced community policing prior to receiving grants for this purpose. Six agencies started community policing with the award of grant funds for this purpose. Of these same ten agencies, all ten (100%) reported that they continued practicing community policing after grant funding stopped.

Thirteen (76.5%) of the seventeen agencies felt that community policing in their agencies had reduced the incidence of crime. Fourteen of the seventeen departments (82.5%) reported that they believed their implementation of community policing reduced
the fear of crime in citizens. Eight of the seventeen agencies (47.1%) stated that they practiced community policing for reasons other than crime reduction or for reducing the fear of crime reduction of their citizens. The most common answers for this were that it was good public relations and to keep up with the most current trends in policing.

Respondent Demographics

Of the 1,186 total sworn officers of all ranks employed by the surveyed agencies, 569 chose to complete the survey for a 48% overall response rate. Seven additional completed responses were received after all analyses were conducted and were not included. See Table 2.

Table 2
Characteristics of Sworn Officer Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>(N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Female</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>(72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officer</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>(345)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supervisors</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>(217)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeants</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>(140)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenants</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>(41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captains</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs/Deputy Chiefs</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>(18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean calculated from a 5-point Likert scale; 5 = Strongly Agree
*Seven respondents did not disclose their rank and were excluded from analysis.
Of the 569 responses, seven respondents did not disclose their rank leaving 562 that were used for analysis. Of the total number of respondents, 72 females (12.8%) of all ranks opted to respond to the survey. There were 345 responses (61.4%) from police officers with the remaining 217 responses (38.6%) from supervisory officers (from the sergeant through chief ranks). A total of 140 sergeants (24.9%), 41 lieutenants (7.3%), 18 captains (3.2%), and 18 chiefs/deputy chiefs (3.2%), responded to the survey.

Section 2: Congruency Between Officers and Supervisors for the Community Policing Philosophy and Practice Indexes

Key Elements of Community Policing

The literature recognizes two key elements of community policing. The first is that police departments need to actively work with citizen groups to determine citizen priorities and involve the citizen groups in resolving neighborhood issues. The second major element is for the agency to have an established mechanism to involve citizens in solving not only criminal issues, but also in resolving non-criminal neighborhood issues. Table 3 contains the responses to these two questions as reported by officer and supervisory ranks. Table 3 also reports the results of responses, by officer and supervisory ranks, of the adequacy of initial and ongoing in-service community policing training.

The results show that the policy makers, the chiefs/deputy chiefs, reported a higher degree of agency-citizen group collaboration than did the police officer rank and supervisory ranks below the chief rank. Similar results were obtained for the agency-citizen involvement in problem-solving issues. However, regarding the perception the agency has an established method for citizen participation, supervisor mean scores were
Table 3

Descriptive Analysis of the Means Differences Between Officers and Supervisors on Two Questions That Reflect Key Elements of Community Policing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Elements of Community Policing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. The agency works with citizen groups as part of the community policing effort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officers</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors (except Chiefs/Deputy Chiefs)</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs/Deputy Chiefs</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. The agency has an established method for citizen participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officers</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors (except Chiefs/Deputy Chiefs)</td>
<td>3.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs/Deputy Chiefs</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Agency provides adequate initial community policing training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officers</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors (except Chiefs/Deputy Chiefs)</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs/Deputy Chiefs</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Agency provides adequate community policing related in-service training</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Officers</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors (except Chiefs/Deputy Chiefs)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs/Deputy Chiefs</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Elements of Community Policing Questions:
SQ#1: My department has worked with citizen’s groups to develop working relationships with them.
SQ#2: My department has an established method for citizens to get involved in problem-solving regarding issues affecting their neighborhoods.

Note: Mean calculated from a 5-point Likert scale; 5 = Strongly Agree
less than both officers and chiefs. The cause for these results cannot be ascertained from the data collected. Supervisors are in a position to know policy considerations as well as being able to know the specific efforts taken by their department. It might be that supervisors are in the best position to see a lack of congruence between policy and implementation. These two questions were intended to determine if the agency actually had a method and did actually work with citizens groups to the degree the agencies reported by asking the officers who are responsible for engaging the groups in their work areas. This data suggests the agencies as a whole have a higher belief their departments are working with citizen groups than is actually occurring.

This data suggests that the responses by the policy-makers regarding the degree officers practice community policing is refuted by the officers’ and supervisors’ responses. These scores also suggest that the agencies do not regularly involve citizens in problem solving regarding neighborhood problems. This element is core to the community policing philosophy according to the existing literature. This data suggests that officers do not systematically involve citizens in problem solving and are missing opportunities to develop police-citizen relationships. It also suggests that if the official agency policy does not mandate involvement with citizens in resolving community problems from a departmental perspective, there is little incentive for officers to do so on their own initiative. This translates into the officers not involving citizens in daily issues, which in turn means that the primary focus of community policing is not being practiced. The purpose of these two questions was to determine from the officers who are responsible for implementing community policing, whether their departments have actually adopted and supported this philosophy irrespective of their agencies’ official stated position.
These results also show the degree that agencies provided initial training on how to implement community policing compared to the officers' perceptions of the adequacy of initial training. The data is somewhat surprising in that chiefs/deputy chiefs reported a score of 3.28 on the 5-point Likert scale of the adequacy of initial training. Given the scope of the undertaking to implement a philosophy as encompassing as community policing, I would have expected the median response to have been much higher for this group. Officers reported a median score of 2.82 indicating a lower perception of the adequacy of the initial training than the chiefs/deputy chiefs reported. The in-service training received after initial training indicated a median score by the chiefs/deputy chiefs of 2.61 while the officers reported a median score of 2.62. This response by both policymakers and police officers was surprisingly low and suggests an acknowledgement that insufficient in-service training was provided. Prior to any new police practice being implemented, especially one that most likely would meet with potentially significant initial resistance from many officers at all rank levels as the literature suggests, it seems that agency administration would have ensured that those charged with implementation understood, supported, and were trained in the philosophy and methods of implementation prior to implementing the concept. The evidence suggests this did not happen in regard to community policing in all but one agency surveyed. Another surprise was that supervisors reported a lower mean response than officers and chiefs in response to the questions of whether adequate in-service training in community policing methodology was provided to officers. This suggests that as supervisors, the lack of appropriate implementation is observed in the actions of officers. Follow-up research in this area
might prove to be fruitful. I would expect to see similar findings in many of the police agencies in the Great Lakes region and possibly beyond.

**Congruence in Community Policing Philosophy**

Table 4 reports the data in response to research question number 1, which focuses on the degree of congruence across all ranks. This question looks at the philosophy index to compare the responses of the police officer rank with that of the supervisory ranks. This question represents the primary focus of this research.

1. Is there a chain of congruence between an agency’s adoption of the philosophy of community policing, the extent to which the officers embrace the community policing philosophy, and the extent to which officers practice it on a regular basis?

   H1: The agency will implement CP as it professes to have done.
   H2: Officers in police agencies implementing CP will embrace the CP philosophy.
   H3: Officers embracing the CP philosophy will practice it on a regular basis in the field.

The purpose of constructing the philosophy index was to obtain a general measure of the officers’ philosophy toward the concept of community policing by combining several indicators to form a single measure. Seven questions were used to form the philosophy index. It is recognized that a more operationally valid and reliable measure is obtained when several indicators are used rather than a single indicator (O’Sullivan et al., 2003).
Table 4

Descriptive Analysis of Mean Differences of Responses on the PH Index Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Policing (CP) Philosophy Index Elements</th>
<th>Sworn Officer Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officers Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#6: CP Works</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#7: Support Implementation</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#8: CP Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#9: Involve Citizens</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#13: Root Causes of Crime</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#19: Non-crime Issues Important</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#23: Supervisor Supports CP</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH Index Mean</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PH Index Survey Questions:

SQ#6: I support my department’s adoption of community policing because I think community-policing works.
SQ#7: In general, I support how my department is implementing community policing.
SQ#8: Community policing methods have provided me more job satisfaction than traditional policing methods.
SQ#9: I involve citizens when trying to resolve the causes of crime.
SQ#13: Solving the root cause of crime is generally more effective than traditional policing methods that focus primarily on making arrests.
SQ#19: Resolving non-crime related matters is as important as working on criminal matters.
SQ#23: My supervisor supports the concept of community policing.

Note: Supervisor PR Index questions asked about the degree to which they thought police officers were actually practicing community policing in the field.

In response to SQ#6 (community policing works), officers’ mean response of 3.40 was significantly higher than supervisors’ response of 3.02. Chiefs/deputy chiefs’ mean response was similar to the officers at 3.39. The same trend can be seen for SQ#7 (support how agency implemented community policing). Interestingly, SQ#13 (attacking the...
root causation of crime), officers’ response was 3.75 indicating officers tended to favor focusing on the causation of crime rather than simply making arrests. The scores suggest that supervisors (3.34) and chiefs/deputy chiefs (3.22) did not view focusing on the root causes of crime as important as the officers did. SQ#23 asked if the respondents’ supervisors supported community policing. The trend in these responses showed that as rank increased, the more those respondents believed their supervisors supported the community policing philosophy.

The literature reveals that as of 1999, some 64% of the police departments in the United States representing 86% of the population have community policing programs. This is up from 34% of the police departments with community policing programs in 1997 (Hickman & Reaves, 2001). These cited studies queried the chiefs as to whether the agency had adopted community policing. This study revealed that from the officer’s perspective, their agencies do not actually work with citizens groups and have established methods to involve citizens in problem solving to the extent purported by the agency. This data casts doubt on the number of police departments that actually have implemented meaningful community policing efforts. An inference can be drawn that a number of agencies have either adopted partial community policing efforts or worse, state they have adopted a community policing philosophy when in fact they have not done so in actual practice.

**Congruence in Community Policing Practice**

Table 5 reports the results of the degree to which officers actually practice community policing compared to the belief that supervisors believe their officers are prac-
ticing community policing. This is a look at the degree of congruence between agency perception and the officer’s actual practice of community policing methods.

Table 5

Descriptive Analysis of Mean Differences of the Responses on the PR Index Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Policing Practice Index Elements</th>
<th>Sworn Officer Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officers Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#11: Solve Root Cause</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#12: Involve Citizens</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#14: Contact neighborhood people</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#15: Regular contact with citizens</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#16: Decide my work patterns</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#17: Prevent crime before it occurs</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SQ#18: Develop community relations</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PR Index Mean</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean calculated from a 5-point Likert scale; 5 = Strongly Agree

PR Index Survey Questions:

SQ#11: When responding to a call or making an arrest, I also try to solve the root cause of the incident or crime.
SQ#12: When responding to a call or making an arrest, I usually involve citizens in solving the problem.
SQ#14: When trying to solve crimes, I generally contact neighbors and business owners for information about who may have committed the crime.
SQ#15: I keep in regular contact with community and business groups to keep abreast of crime patterns in their patrol (area of responsibility) area.
SQ#16: I generally make their own decisions regarding where they will work (within my area of responsibility) and what they will do to minimize crime.
SQ#17: I usually use their time to prevent crime before it occurs rather than react to calls of crimes.
SQ#18: When not tied up on calls, I stop to talk to citizens and business owners to develop relationships with them.

Note: Supervisor PR Index questions asked about the degree to which they thought their police officers were actually practicing community policing in the field.
A broad review of this data shows that officer responses to the practice index questions were similar to the chiefs/deputy chiefs' responses. However, the other supervisor responses were lower in almost every instance. This data suggests a general lack of congruence across all ranks regarding the degree officers practice community policing methods. Supervisors believe officers are not practicing these methods to the degree the officers themselves feel that they are. Supervisors reported a mean response of 2.92 to SQ#17 (prefer to prevent crime rather than respond to it). Officers reported a mean score of 3.55 indicating they believed they attempt to prevent crime. Chiefs/deputy chiefs (3.39) perceived officers tried to prevent crime to a lesser degree than the officers. This lack of congruence may stem from a lack of understanding of what community policing methods are actually required since the degree of initial and in-service training on community policing philosophy and practice could be interpreted as being perceived as insufficient by all ranks.

Section 3: Testing Congruence for Significance

Table 6 shows a comparison of PH Index and PR Index mean scores between officers, supervisors and chiefs/deputy chiefs.

For the PH Index, using the t test, with an alpha of .01, the lack of congruence between the mean officer and supervisor scores was significant, \( F(341, 209) = 3.37, p = .00 \). Using the Mann-Whitney U test, for the PH Index, with an alpha of .01, the lack of congruence between the mean officer and supervisor mean scores was significant, \( F(341, 209) = 3.14, p = .00 \).
Table 6
Congruence Between Police Officers and Supervisors for the Philosophy and Practice of Community Policing Indexes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sworn Officers by Type</th>
<th>Philosophy PH Index Mean</th>
<th>Practice PR Index Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Offices</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors*+</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chiefs/Deputy Chiefs*#</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**t Test**
PH Index, mean scores for officers and supervisors $F(341, 209) = 3.37, p = .00$
PR Index, mean scores for officers and supervisors $F(341, 209) = 4.26, p = .00$

**Mann-Whitney U Test**
PH Index, mean scores for officers and supervisors $F(341, 209) = 3.14, p = .00$
PR Index, mean scores for officers and supervisors $F(341, 209) = 4.15, p = .00$

Note: Mean calculated from a 5-point Likert scale; 5 = Strongly Agree
Congruence between mean officers and supervisor scores were significant, $F(341, 209) = 3.37, p = .00$. alpha of .01.
* Supervisors and chiefs/deputy chiefs were asked about the degree to which they thought their police officers were embracing CP philosophy and engaging in CP practice.
+ Includes all supervisors from sergeant through chief rank.
# Includes only chiefs and deputy chiefs, provided only to show the mean trend.

For the PR Index, using the $t$ test, with an alpha of .01, the lack of congruence between the mean officer and supervisor scores was significant, $F(341, 209) = 4.26, p = .00$. Using the Mann-Whitney $U$ test, for the PR Index, with an alpha of .01, the lack of congruence between the mean officer and supervisor mean scores was significant, $F(341, 209) = 4.15, p = .00$.

This data shows that officers had a PH Index score of 3.38, supervisors showed a lower acceptance of the community policing philosophy with a score of 3.17, while chiefs/deputy chiefs had the highest philosophy index score of 3.52. The same trend is
seen for the practice index with officers’ score of 3.53, supervisors posted a 3.31, and chiefs/deputy chiefs recorded a mean score of 3.66. Both the PH Index and PR Index mean scores suggest that chiefs/deputy chiefs had a higher acceptance of the community policing philosophy and held a higher belief officers were actually practicing community policing than the officers were actually doing. Notably, supervisors had a lower mean score on the PH Index suggesting that they held a lower acceptance of the community policing philosophy score than the officers. The literature discusses that the sergeant, as the first-line supervisor, is in essence the street officers’ de facto employer. If the supervisor has a low level of acceptance of the community policing philosophy, officers seeking to comply with their supervisor’s philosophy may well take their lead, negatively affecting the officers’ view toward community policing. Supervisors also reported a lower PR Index mean score indicating they felt their officers were not practicing community policing methods to the degree the officers felt they were. This result may be the product of a lack of training as to what community policing actually entails. With virtually no department regularly assessing the degree to which officers were actually practicing community policing, or evaluating officers on community policing measures, a tremendous opportunity to reach a common understanding on exactly what officers were expected to do is lost. Supervisors should know what officers should be doing to further the community policing efforts and should supervise and evaluate officers on established criteria consistent with the community policing philosophy. The evaluation should be used as a tool to help officers continually improve on ways to incorporate community policing in daily activities.
As shown in Table 7, rank showed a surprising result. The officers reported a mean PH Index score of 3.38. Sergeants scored a 3.15. Lieutenants reported a mean score of 3.19 while captains scored 3.23. Chiefs/deputy chiefs reported a 3.50. Officers scored higher than all other ranks except the chiefs/deputy chiefs. Other than the officer grouping, as rank increased from the sergeant level upward, the PH Index score increased. Considering that the age factor reported the highest PH Index at the lowest age group and generally the youngest officers are at the officer rank, this result is surprising. Rank was significant at alpha .10 for the PH Index, chi-square 122.88 ($d/104$), $p = 0.100$, and at alpha .05 for the PR Index, chi-square 134.19 ($d/100$), $p = 0.013$.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Philosophy</th>
<th>Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Officer</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sergeant</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lieutenant</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief/Deputy Chief</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean calculated from a 5-point Likert scale; 5 = Strongly Agree

Using chi-square, significance indicated for the PH Index and rank at the alpha .10, 122.88($d/104$), $p = 0.100$.
Using chi-square, significance indicated for the PR Index and rank at the alpha .05, 134.19 ($d/100$), $p = 0.013$.
Section 4: Testing for Significance and Association of the PH and PR Officer and Supervisor Responses Tested Against the Environmental Independent Variables

Testing the data for significance determines whether a relationship between variables may be non-random such that the null hypothesis may be rejected; however, the relationship may be too small to merit attention. Tests for association indicate the strength or magnitude between two variables (O'Sullivan et al., 2002: 409).

The $t$ test and chi-square were used to test for significance for the reasons explained in Chapter III, Methodology/Research Design. Cramér’s $V$ was used to test for association for the nominal level independent variables and Gamma was used to test for association for the ordinal level independent variables. Table 8 reports the PH Index and PR Index mean scores, $t$ test and chi-square results, and Cramér’s $V$ and Gamma for officers and supervisors, broken out by each of the environmental factors tested in this research: gender, age, education, patrol/non-patrol duties, years of police experience, years of military service, and department size. Analysis was run on the raw data.

The following discussion of the lack of congruence between officers and supervisors for the environmental independent variables analyzed against the PH and PR Indexes, as set out in Table 8, uses all supervisors collectively, from sergeant through the rank of chief. The reason for grouping respondents into all line officers and all supervisors is to allow comparison of data to assess the degree of congruence between the line police officers and supervisors.
Table 8

Environmental Influences on Congruence Between Community Policing Philosophy and Practice Between Officers and Supervisors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Factors</th>
<th>Officers PH Index</th>
<th>PR Index Mean</th>
<th>All Supervisors PH Index</th>
<th>PR Index Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t test</td>
<td>-1.39(df/341)</td>
<td>.11(df/22)</td>
<td>1.14(df/218)</td>
<td>.50(df/218)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>30.22(df22)</td>
<td>*35.13(df22)</td>
<td>28.27(df27)</td>
<td>30.92(df25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramér’s $V$</td>
<td>.2968</td>
<td>.3200</td>
<td>.3585</td>
<td>.3749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t test</td>
<td>.88(df/343)</td>
<td>-.81(df/343)</td>
<td>**2.69(df/215)</td>
<td>*2.36(df/215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>33.86(df22)</td>
<td>20.68(df22)</td>
<td>37.53(df27)</td>
<td>25.08(df25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramér’s $V$</td>
<td>.3133</td>
<td>.2448</td>
<td>.4159</td>
<td>.3400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Duties:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Patrol</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t test</td>
<td>-1.35(df/342)</td>
<td>-.8960(df/342)</td>
<td>**-2.45(df/215)</td>
<td>*-2.22(df/215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>15.67(df22)</td>
<td>13.22(df22)</td>
<td>33.44(df27)</td>
<td>30.18(df24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cramér’s $V$</td>
<td>.2134</td>
<td>.1961</td>
<td>.3925</td>
<td>.3729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Size:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small (20–34)</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (35–50)</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large (&gt;50)</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>49.97(df/44)</td>
<td>36.33(df/44)</td>
<td>47.94(df/54)</td>
<td>47.02(df/50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>-.1138</td>
<td>-.0970</td>
<td>-.0944</td>
<td>-.1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Factors</th>
<th>Officers</th>
<th>All Supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PH Index Mean</td>
<td>PR Index Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Degree</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>*120.96(df/88)</td>
<td>***234.57(df/88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td>.0169</td>
<td>-.0381</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PH Index Mean</th>
<th>PR Index Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-45</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-55</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56-60</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61+</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2$                                     **138.1(df/154) ***148.5(df/154) ***232.09(df/189) ***224.10(df/175)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PH Index Mean</th>
<th>PR Index Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.1224</td>
<td>.0534</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Years Police Experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PH Index Mean</th>
<th>PR Index Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-35</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-40</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2$                                     *125.61(df/132) *128.91(df/132) ***252.62(df/216) ***295.72(df/200)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PH Index Mean</th>
<th>PR Index Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gamma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-.1586</td>
<td>-.1115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Mean calculated from a 5-point Likert scale; 5 = Strongly Agree

* = significance at .05, ** = significance at .001, *** = significance at .005

Note: Significance was calculated from the raw data. Mean values are included here to show the variance between officers and supervisors.
The greatest level of acceptance of the community policing philosophy for all environmental factors based on a means analysis is for the PH Index is seen in female officers had a mean of 3.49 while male officers reported a 3.36, indicating female officers tended to display a more positive attitude toward community policing than male officers. All officers had a mean of 3.38 on the PH Index while supervisors had a significantly lower mean of 3.18. For the PR Index, the mean for all officers was 3.54 while supervisors posted a lower mean of 3.31. These results suggest a lack of congruence across the variable gender. In analyzing the raw data, only the officer rank for gender run against the PR Index was significant utilizing chi-square, 35.13 (df/22). Cramér’s $V$ reported a moderate strength of association of .3200. This data suggests that female officers are more accepting of the philosophy of community policing than male officers but male officers actually practiced community policing slightly more than female officers. Female supervisors felt their officers accepted the philosophy more than male supervisors did; however, male supervisors felt their officers actually practiced this methodology more than female supervisors did.

Military experience has been compared similarly with traditional policing philosophy and methodology consistent with a take-charge mentality. Officers without military experience reported a mean response of 3.33 on the PH Index while officers with military experience had a PH Index mean of 3.19 indicating officers with no military experience exhibited a more favorable attitude toward community policing. On the PR Index, officers without military experience posted a mean of 3.46 while the mean score of officers with military experience was lower at 3.41. Supervisors without military experience had higher mean scores than supervisors with military experience for both the PH and PR
Indexes. Officers' mean results were higher than supervisors both with and without military experience for both the PH and PR Indexes. Comparing mean scores, the data suggests a lack of congruence between officers and supervisors. The results of the $t$ test indicated this independent variable was significant for supervisors for both the PH and PR Indexes. Both officers and supervisors without military experience more readily accepted the community police philosophy and practiced the concept to a greater degree.

In comparing the nature of duties for officers in a patrol function with officers in non-patrol functions, it was found that patrol officers had a lower mean PH Index score with a 3.29 while officers assigned to non-patrol functions reported a 3.33 mean score. In comparing officers with and without a patrol assignment, both groups posted a 3.44 on the PH Index. Supervisors' mean results showed non-patrol assigned supervisors had higher mean scores on both the PH and PR Indexes than supervisors assigned to patrol duties. Interestingly, for non-patrol assignments, officers and supervisors had the same mean scores on both the PH and PR Indexes. This result suggests congruence for the variable duties for non-patrol employees in both officer and supervisor groups. However, for the patrol assigned officers, the officers showed higher mean scores on both indexes than supervisors, indicating a lack of congruence. The patrol officers and supervisors represent the primary contact with citizens and the front line that can implement community policing effectively. The $t$ test indicated officers' means analyzed against PH and PR Indexes were not significant; therefore, the possibility the results were due to random chance cannot be eliminated. The supervisors showed significance for the PH Index, $-2.45$ ($df=215$), indicating that when assignments moved from non-patrol assignments to patrol assignments, acceptance of the community policing philosophy decreased. A
moderate strength of association was shown by Cramér's $V$ at .3925. Supervisors also showed significance on the PR Index, -2.22 ($df$215) with moderate strength of association reported by a Cramér's $V$ of .3729. The significance indicated that when assignments moved from non-patrol assignments to patrol assignments, supervisors' perception of the degree officers were actually practicing community policing decreased. Assignment to non-patrol functions showed a higher acceptance of the community policing philosophy and a higher practice of the methodology. The only exception is found for officers regarding the actual practice of the community policing methodology where the patrol/non-patrol assignment showed the same mean score of 3.44.

Mean scores for the independent variable department size showed a trend for PH Index indicating that the smallest agencies had the highest mean score for officers of (3.57), and supervisors (3.30), medium sized agencies for officers of (3.37), and supervisors (3.12), and large agencies for officers of (3.34), and supervisors (3.17). For the PR Index, the same trend was observed with the small agency mean for officers of (3.70), and supervisors (3.48), medium sized agencies for officers of (3.55), and supervisors (3.28), and large agencies for officers of (3.51), and supervisors (3.26). The mean score results suggest that smaller agencies tend to have a more positive attitude toward the community policing philosophy and actually practice community policing on a more regular basis. In comparing the mean results between officers and supervisors, the officers had higher mean scores on both the PH and PR Indexes than did the supervisors suggesting a lack of congruence. The results of chi-square analysis indicated that neither officers nor supervisors were significant on the PH or PR Indexes. A clear trend was consistent for officers and supervisors on both indexes. Small departments had a greater
acceptance and regular practice than medium size agencies, which in turn had higher acceptance and practice than the large departments. The one deviation was found for supervisors on the PH Index where large agencies (3.17) were slightly higher than medium size agencies (3.12).

Education was measured as: high school = 1, associate degree = 2, bachelor’s degree = 3, master’s degree = 4, and graduate degree = 5. The lowest mean PH Index score was reported by the officer rank with a high school education at a 3.24. As the education level increased, the PH Index scores increased. The Ph.D. level reported a 3.93. The only group not following the trend was the master’s degree officers who reported a slightly lower mean score than the bachelor degree group. Officers’ PR Index scores rose from the high school group to the associate degree group, only to decrease at the bachelor’s and master’s groups. The Ph.D. group then rose above all other groups. No discernible pattern was noted for the supervisors on the PH Index but the PR Index showed 3.36 for the high school group that decreased for each higher level of education until the Ph.D. group that showed the highest mean score. Chi-square indicated significance for the officers on the PH Index at the alpha of .05, 120.96 (df/88), with a Gamma indicating a weak association, .0169. On the PR Index, chi-square indicated that officers were significant at the alpha of .005, 234.57 (df/88), and an inverse and weak level of association was indicated by a Gamma of -.0381. This suggests that as education increased the practice of community policing methods decreased. The associate degree group did not follow this trend with a mean higher than the high school group. Supervisors were not significant on either the PH or PR Index. A trend was noted on the PH Index for officers where the acceptance of the community policing philosophy rose with
the level of education. The data suggests that overall group of supervisors exhibit a lower positive perspective toward the philosophy of community policing and perceive the officers are practicing it on a lesser basis, than the officers do. This tends to confirm this research hypothesis that a lack of congruence exists between officers and supervisors regarding the acceptance of the community philosophy and the actual practice of these methods.

Age was measured in five-year groupings for all officers from the officer rank through the rank of chief/deputy chief, with the first age group from 21–25 years of age since most departments required new officers to be a minimum age of 21 years. This first group reported the highest PH Index score of 3.65. The trend of the age groups showed a consistent decrease in scores down to the oldest group of 61+ years with a mean of 2.14. Only the age group of 51–55 showed a slightly higher mean over the previous age group of 46–50. However, the overall trend showed that as the age increases, the mean PH Index scores decrease. Chi-square indicated significance at the alpha .005 for both the PH Index for officers 138.1 (df/154) with a weak degree of association reported by Gamma of .1224 and supervisors 232.09 (df/189) with a weak degree of association indicated by a Gamma of -.1101 indicating that as age increased the PH mean scores decreased. The trend generally followed this result; however, individual age groups fluctuated from age group to age group. For the PR Index for officers’ chi-square indicated significance at the alpha .005, 148.5 (df/154) with a weak degree of association reported by a Gamma of .0534 and for supervisors chi-square was significant at the alpha of .005, 224.1 (df/175) with a weak level of association reported by a Gamma of -.1249 indicating an inverse relationship. Generally, with some variance, a trend was noted for officers and
supervisors on both the PH and PR Indexes, as age increased, the acceptance and practice of community policing decreased.

Years of police experience showed a clear trend. The years of service was reported in years of experience in five-year groupings. Officers with 1–5 years of police experience reported the highest PH Index mean score of 3.56. The last grouping of 36–40 years of police experience showed the lowest mean PH Index score of 2.14. The trend showed that as years of police experience increased, the PH Index mean score decreased. Chi-square significance for officers at alpha .05 on the PH Index, 125.61 (df/132) with a Gamma of -.1586 suggesting a weak inverse association and for the PR Index, significance, 128.9 (df/132) with a weak association indicated by a Gamma of -.1115 indicating an inverse relationship. Supervisors were significant at alpha .005 with chi-square on the PH Index, 252.62 (df/216) and a weak association indicated by a Gamma of -.0877 indicting an inverse relationship. For supervisors on the PR Index, chi-square indicated significance at 295.7 (df/200), and Gamma indicating a weak degree of association -.1367 suggesting an inverse relationship. As with age, the years of police experience showed a general trend. As the years in police work increased, acceptance and practice of community policing methods decreased.

In looking at all of the environmental factors as a whole, a pattern can be ascertained. The most accepting officer of the community policing philosophy would be theoretically comprised of female, with no military experience, young, highly educated, with few years of police experience at the officer or chief/deputy chief rank employed in a small agency. The officer with the lowest PH Index score and the least accepting of the community policing philosophy would be a male officer, with military experience, older,
with a high school education, many years of police experience, at the sergeant rank employed in a large agency. This of course is a generalization as individual scores in each of the environmental categories covered a range of scores by respondent officers.

Looking at the PR Index data, the same trends are noted. The one notable exception is seen with the environmental factor education. The high school factor mean score is 3.44. The associate degree group rose to 3.50. From that point on for the higher levels of education, the practice index mean scores steadily deceased until the terminal degree group. Bachelor’s degree respondents reported a 3.42, master’s level respondents posted a 3.36, and terminal degree respondents showed a 4.14. In other words, as education increased past the associate degree group, these officers practiced community policing less and for supervisors this data shows that they believed their officers practiced community policing less. This is opposite of the PH Index which rose as education increased.

One glaring dichotomy is observed in the data. Both age and years of police service produce a decrease in acceptance and practice of community policing. Yet as rank increases from the sergeant level upward, acceptance and the view subordinate officers practice community policing increases. Typically the highest-ranking officers are older and have many years of police experience. This suggests that officers who are promoted may be more accepting of change and new ideas and those officers who are seen as being less inclined to change are not promoted. Conversely, it may be that officers who are not promoted begin to feel advancement is hopeless and begin to ignore the directives from those who have been promoted and simply do the minimum to put in their time until retirement. Implementing community policing takes effort and without commitment by officers of all ranks the successful implementation simply will not occur.
Independent Variables and the Relationship to Dependent Variables

**PH Index: Bivariate Relationships With Independent Variables**

The $t$ test was utilized to run the PH Index against each contextual variable individually to determine the significance of each variable in the bivariate relationship. Correlation analysis (Pearson's $r$) was run to determine the degree to which each independent variable explains the model in the bivariate relationship. The $r^2$ was calculated to determine the degree to which each independent variable explains the model in the bivariate relationship. Table 9 reports that none of the correlation coefficients or the $r^2$ results show a strong association with the dependent variable PH Index.

**Table 9**

Bivariate Relationships Between PH Index and Independent Variables

| Independent Variable | Coefficient of Determination | $t$ Score | Significance ($p>|t|$) | Correlation Coefficient (Pearson’s $r$) | $r^2$ |
|----------------------|------------------------------|-----------|------------------------|----------------------------------------|------|
| Gender               | 0.1582                       | 1.97      | 0.049                  | 0.1022                                 | 0.0069|
| Age                  | -0.0725                      | -4.39     | 0.000                  | -0.1744                                | 0.0333|
| Edu                  | 0.0431                       | 1.42      | 0.157                  | 0.0661                                 | 0.0036|
| Rank                 | -0.0429                      | -1.57     | 0.118                  | -0.0561                                | 0.0044|
| Duties               | 0.04                         | 0.62      | 0.537                  | 0.0521                                 | 0.0007|
| Yrspol               | -0.0170                      | -5.00     | 0.0000                 | -0.1951                                | 0.0428|
| Yrsmil               | -0.0172                      | -2.26     | 0.024                  | -0.1054                                | 0.0090|

*An alpha level of .05 was used.*
While values of $r$ in the social sciences of .40 to .60 are generally acceptable (O’Sullivan et al., 2003: 432), the highest values seen are yrspol (-0.1951, an inverse relationship) and age (-0.1744, an inverse relationship), with both variables suggesting a weak relationship. These results suggest that as officers age and their tenure increases, their attitude toward community policing diminishes.

The $r^2$ indicates the proportion of the variance in the dependent variable associated with or explained by the independent variable. In this study, the two highest independent variables were reported in age (0.0333) and yrspol (0.0428). Age explained 3.3% of the variance and yrspol explained 4.3% of the variance.

The first independent variable, gender, has a coefficient of .1582. This suggests that female officers had a more favorable view of community policing than male officers. Female was coded as a 1 and males were coded with a 0. Male scores multiplied by 0 will result in a 0 score. The significance value ($p > |t|$) of 0.049 is less than the alpha of 0.05 making this independent variable statistically significant in the bivariate relationship.

The independent variable age has a reported coefficient of -0.0725 which means that as age increases, the philosophy index score (pro-community policing) will decrease. The PH Index is scaled as a 5 indicating a positive view of community policing and a 1 indicating a negative view. Stated otherwise, younger officers have a more favorable opinion of the community policing philosophy. The significance value of 0.000 is less than the alpha of 0.05 making this independent variable statistically significant in the bivariate relationship.
The independent variable education has a reported coefficient of 0.0431 indicating that as the level of education rises the PH Index score will increase. The significance score of 0.157 indicates this variable is not statistically significant in the bivariate relationship with PH Index since it is greater than the alpha of 0.05.

The coefficient score for the independent variable rank is -0.0429. This means that as rank decreases the PH Index score decreases. However, the PH Index mean scores were highest at the chief/deputy chief level, decreasing down through the sergeant rank that recorded the lowest PH Index score with officer scores almost as high as chief/deputy chief scores. Officers’ PH Index mean was slightly less than the chief/deputy chief scores. Officer responses represented 61.4% of the responses. The youngest members of agencies generally represent the officer rank. Therefore, this result is not surprising. The $t$ test score of 0.118 indicates this variable is not statistically significant at the 0.05 alpha.

The independent variable duties was coded as 0 = patrol assignment and 1 = all other non-patrol assignments. The coefficient score was 0.04, indicating that non-patrol assigned officers have a more positive attitude toward community policing. The result of the $t$ test produced a $p$ value of 0.157 is higher than the alpha of 0.05 indicating this variable is not statistically significant.

Yrspol reported a coefficient of -0.0170 indicating that as an officer has more time in the department the PH Index score will decrease. Older officers will have a more negative opinion of community policing. The $t$ test produced a $p$ value of 0.000 indicates this variable is statistically significant at the alpha of 0.05.
The variable yrsmil was -0.0172. This indicates that as an officer’s military service increases the PH Index score, or attitude toward community policing, decreases. The \( t \) test resulted in a \( p \) value of 0.024, which indicates this variable is significant at the alpha of 0.05.

**PR Index: Bivariate Relationships With Independent Variables**

The \( t \) test was run against the PR Index and each contextual variable individually to determine the bivariate relationships between each variable and the PR Index. Correlation analysis (Pearson’s \( r \)) was run to determine correlation coefficients. Several multivariate models were then run to examine the effects of each contextual variable controlling for the others.

While values of \( r \) in the social sciences of .40 to .60 are generally acceptable (O’Sullivan et al., 2003: 432), the highest values seen are yrspol (-0.2131, an inverse relationship) and age (-0.1711, an inverse relationship), with both variables suggesting a weak relationship. These results suggest that as tenure as a police officer and age increases, the officers’ attitude toward community policing diminishes. Table 10 reports that none of the correlation coefficients show a strong association with the dependent variable PR Index.

The \( r^2 \) indicates the proportion of the variance in the dependent variable associated with or explained by the independent variable. In this study, the two highest independent variables were reported in age (0.0305) and yrspol (0.0438). Age explained 3.3% of the variance and yrspol explained 4.3% of the variance.
Table 10
Bivariate Relationships Between PR Index and Independent Variables

| Independent Variable | Coefficient of Determination | t Score | Significance ($p > |t|$) | Correlation Coefficient (Pearson’s $r$) | $r^2$ |
|----------------------|-------------------------------|---------|-------------------------|----------------------------------------|------|
| Gender               | 0.0251                        | -0.31   | 0.754                   | 0.0192                                 | 0.0002 |
| Age                  | -0.069                        | -4.20   | 0.000                   | -0.1711                                | 0.0305 |
| Edu                  | 0.0119                        | -0.40   | 0.692                   | -0.0312                                | 0.0003 |
| Rank                 | -0.0683                       | -2.53   | 0.012                   | -0.1131                                | 0.0113 |
| Duties               | 0.0036                        | -0.06   | 0.955                   | 0.0162                                 | 0.0000 |
| Yrspol               | -0.0170                       | -5.06   | 0.0000                  | -0.2131                                | 0.0438 |
| Yrsmil               | -0.0017                       | -0.22   | 0.823                   | -0.0098                                | 0.0001 |

*An alpha level of .05 was used.

The first independent variable gender has a coefficient of 0.0251. This means that female officers actually practiced community policing methods more than male officers. Female was coded as a 1 and males were coded with a 0. Male scores multiplied by 0 will result in a 0 score. The significance or $p$ value of 0.754 is greater than the alpha of 0.05 making this independent variable statistically not significant in the bivariate relationship.

The independent variable age has a reported coefficient of -0.069 which means that as age increases, the practice index score (practicing community policing for officers, or, for supervisors, believing their officers are practicing community policing) will decrease. The PR Index is scaled as a score of 5 indicating officers are actually practicing community policing activities (supervisors believing their officers are practicing community policing activities) and a 1 indicating do not practice community policing.
activities (supervisors believing their officers are not practicing community policing activities). Stated otherwise, younger officers will actually utilize community policing activities more than older officers. The $p$ value of 0.000 is less than the alpha of 0.05 making this independent variable statistically significant in the bivariate relationship.

The independent variable edu (education) has a reported coefficient of 0.0119 that indicates that as the level of education rises the PR Index score will increase. This means that as education increases the practice of community policing activities will increase. The $p$ value of 0.692 indicates this variable is not statistically significant in the bivariate relationship with PR Index at the alpha 0.05.

The coefficient for the independent variable rank is -0.0683. This means that as rank decreases the PR Index score decreases (for supervisors, the higher the rank the less they believe their officers are practicing community policing). However, it was found that the PR Index mean scores were highest at the chief/deputy chief level, decreasing down through the sergeant rank that recorded the lowest PR Index score. Officers’ PR Index mean jumped up to slightly less than the chief/deputy chief scores. Also, officer responses represented 61.4% of the total responses. Since the youngest members of agencies tended to have more education, this result is not overly surprising. The $t$ test produced a $p$ of 0.012 which indicates this variable is statistically significant.

The independent variable duties was coded as 0 = patrol assignment and 1 = all other non-patrol assignment. The coefficient was 0.0036 indicating that non-patrol assigned officers practice or believe departmental personnel use community policing activities more than patrol assigned officers. The result of the $t$ test indicated a $p$ of 0.955 is higher than the alpha of 0.05 indicating this variable is not statistically significant.
Yrspol reported a coefficient of -0.0170 indicating that as an officer has more time in the department the PR Index score will decrease. Older officers will practice community policing activities less than officers with less time in the department (supervisors with more time in the agency will perceive their officers as practicing community policing less). The t test resulted in a p value of 0.000 indicates this variable is statistically significant at the 0.05 alpha level.

The coefficient for the variable yrsmil was -0.0017. This indicates that as an officer’s military service increases the PR Index score, or actual practice of community policing activities, decreases. The t test produced a p value of 0.823 which indicates this variable is not statistically significant at the alpha 0.05 level.

Section Five: Summary of Findings of the Chapter

The data from this study suggests a lack of congruence in police departments in the Great Lakes region of the United States regarding officer acceptance of the community policing philosophy as well as the actual regular practice of this policing method.

Not surprisingly, the chief/deputy chief’s responses were more favorable toward community policing when compared to the other rank levels. Surprisingly, the youngest officers with the least police experience recorded the next highest support for the community policing philosophy and the highest regular practice of this philosophy. This is contrary to the findings of Sadd and Grinc (1994: 35). Chiefs and young officers showed a surprising degree of congruence. However, supervisors (sergeants, lieutenants, and captains) showed significantly lower mean scores for both acceptance of the community policing philosophy and the actual practice of this methodology than both the officers and...
the chiefs/deputy chiefs. The degree of congruence between supervisors and that of officers and chiefs was much less than between officers and chiefs.

Observations to be gleaned from this data suggest:

- There exists a lack of congruence, or common desire to accept the concept of community policing and actually practice the methodology on a regular basis.
- Female officers are more accepting of the community policing philosophy than are male officers.
- Military experience negatively affects the acceptance and practice of community policing.
- Officers in non-patrol assignments have a greater degree of acceptance, but the same degree of actual practice of community policing.
- Officers in smaller police agencies have a higher degree of acceptance and practice of community policing than officers in larger agencies.
- Generally the more education the officer has, the greater the level of acceptance of the community policing philosophy. However, the level of education did not affect the actual practice of community policing concepts.
- As age increases, the level of acceptance and actual practice of community policing decreases.
- As years of experience in police work increases, the degree of acceptance and practice decrease.
- As rank increases from sergeant upward, the degree of acceptance and practice increase.
• One glaring dichotomy is observed where though as age and experience increase and the acceptance and practice decrease, chiefs with greater age and more time in police work have the highest acceptance and belief officers practice community policing.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Chapter IV provided an in-depth summary of the findings of this study. Environmental factors—including gender, age, level of education, rank, duties, years in police work, military experience, and agency size—all play a part, to varying degrees, in the acceptance of the community policing philosophy and ultimately in the actual regular practice by officers. This cross-site study of eighteen agencies in six states of small to medium size departments showed that the environmental factors minimally affected officer attitudes regarding the philosophy of community policing and the actual practice of community policing methods, however. Demographic characteristics including age, years of service and educational level have been found to be significant in impacting positive attitude toward community policing (Carter, Sapp, & Stephens, 1989; Skolnick & Bayley, 1988). In a more recent study of large agencies by Weisel and Eck (1994), it was found that there was no variance in positive attitudes toward community policing based on the variables; years of service, level of education, race, or gender. Weisel and Eck suggest different personnel types may affect implementation. Goldstein (1990) suggests any new implementation will see a variety of officers, some of which will act as, supporters, pacifists, resisters or saboteurs. Wood, Davis, and Rouse (2004) found in their study that a collective phantom subculture, consisting of seven individual sub-
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cultures, for officers and supervisors opposed to police reform models such as community policing exists.

The data in this study for the environmental factors explained only a small percentage of the variance. Other unknown factors play a significant role in the acceptance and practice of community policing. Further research is needed to determine the additional factors that influence the development of congruence across all ranks when implementing a community policing methodology. Weisel and Eck (1994) suggest the most effective strategy for institutionalizing community policing may simply be to move ahead and get new officers on board. As Moore (1994) put it, it is important for both society and the police field to continue the current binge of innovation allowing use of the field’s own imagination and experience without too much heavy-handed research intervention.

Focus of This Study

Much of the existing research on the community policing revolution since the 1970s focused generally on large urban police departments and the associated community social problems. The resistance to change from large institutionalized police forces, and the sheer magnitude of implementing any policy change in these behemoths has been documented by Reuss-Ianni (1993), Wycoff and Skogan, (1994), Greene et al. (1994), and Capowich and Roehl (1994) to name only a few. A review of the literature shows that the selected agencies often employ a number of officers in excess of 300–400 and often a significantly higher number into the thousands. In comparison to large agencies, little is known about community policing in small agencies (Cordner, 1989). In fact,
nearly 15,000 of the 17,000+ police agencies serve populations less than 50,000 with little known about them (Reaves, 1990). Maguire et al. (1997) found only three published studies that have looked at the patterns of community policing implementation among a cross section of nonurban police agencies. I believe that the numerous existing studies have focused predominately on large departments that I believe have unique characteristics and problems not always found in small to medium size agencies.

Few studies exist that have looked into a cross section of small to medium size police agencies to determine if a chain of congruence exists between an agency’s adoption of the philosophy of community policing and whether the line officers actually practice it. Ford and Morash (2002) talk about a police culture that involves the various rank levels from officer, sergeants, management, up to the chief. Davis and Ford (2002) state that to achieve effective change, the knowledge regarding the change must be shared and a consensus obtained across all organizational levels. This study terms this rank-culture/consensus issue as congruence and the necessity of congruence to achieve the desired outcome, successful implementation of the community policing concept.

Most of the existing studies have only asked the executives of police departments whether they have implemented a community policing methodology. As Greene (2004: 50) cautions, much of the current evidence of a transitioning to community and problem oriented policing has been derived from self-reported data that may have over-reported such transitioning. The rationale in this study for the surveying of officers of all ranks was to assess the true nature of agency adoption of community policing methods. A study funded in part by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services by Roth et al. (2004) was specifically designed to survey the chief executive or someone designated
by the chief to present the official agency position. These researchers suggest that even if
the chief's responses are not accurate, the responses reflect what the chiefs believe com-
munity policing should look like. I suggest, given the variety of reasons that motivated
chiefs to have claimed they have implemented community policing, in this study as well
as in the literature, responses that do not include all rank strata are of little if any use in
assessing the state of current police practices. Given the pressure to be seen as pro-
gressive and to obtain federal grant dollars, the answer to whether an agency has imple-
mented community policing of course, has been a resounding, yes.

A few recent studies have looked at cross-site results: Sadd and Grinc (1994), an
eight-department study; Weisel and Eck (1994), a six-agency study; and Wilkinson and
Rosenbaum (1994), a two-agency study. The studies of these agencies generally included
larger departments employing hundreds of officers. This six-state, eighteen-department
cross-site study, of three agency size groupings from each state, employing officers in
groups of 20–34, 35–50, and agencies employing 50 or more officers, with the largest
agency employing only 167 officers, looks at the officers who implement policies.

As Skogan and Roth (2004) observed, to determine if police departments are
overcoming the police culture of change resistance, on-site analyses and surveys to a
large number of agencies is necessary to determine if they are in fact changing toward
community policing. An effort has been made in this study to determine if agencies have
actually adopted and officers regularly practice community policing in their departments
as represented by official position of the departments. This data was analyzed to assess
the degree of congruence of acceptance of the community policing philosophy and
regular practice across all ranks within the agencies. The results of this study indicate
that the percentage of departments that even come close to fully implementing a community police methodology was at best around 11%. Even these agencies that show more than minimal steps toward an integrated community policing implementation have not properly and realistically prepared their officers to successfully implement the concept of citizen-police collaboration.

One of the most surprising data observations was the low PH Index and PR Index mean scores on the part of officers at all rank levels. Given the attention and potential that envelops the community policing philosophy, I anticipated that the mean scores would have been in the range of 4.0 to close to a 5.0 for at least the chiefs. The actual mean scores were in the 3 to 3.6 ranges, hardly a wholehearted buy-in at any rank. The literature is clear that sincere buy-in at all levels of an agency is essential to successfully implement community policing.

Based on the agencies’ responses to the agency background survey questions in this research, it is clear that while 94% of the departments profess to have implemented community policing, only 78% provided any initial training to the officers who were expected to implement it. Further, only 33% provided any in-service training for the community policing methodology that represents a full-blown paradigm shift that the officers were expected to implement. A mere 11%, or two departments, one that fully implemented and one department that partially implemented, a system to assess the degree officers were practicing on an on-going basis, the actual practice of community policing. It was unclear if and how that information was subsequently used and for what purpose. It was clear that agencies had not established a uniform definition for their agency what community policing was to them, the methods officers were expected to use
implement it, little if any supervisory criteria had been established with which to supervise the officers’ implementation, and the traditional quantitative evaluation methods were generally used to evaluate officers’ efforts in the implementation of this new methodology. It does appear from this study that agencies and officers have begun to embrace community policing, but further work is needed to truly adopt the philosophy and further put into practice methods that will honestly include the citizenry to resolve community problems.

Causes of the Lack of Congruence

Lack of Sufficient Training Prior to Implementation

What has been determined from this study is that congruence from the chief down through the ranks to the street level officer is lacking in the acceptance of the community policing philosophy and the regular practice of community policing methods. The full explanation for this lack of congruence cannot be fully determined from the data produced, and should be the subject of further research. However, several factors have been identified that this researcher believes impacted on the lack of congruence in the agencies participating in this research. First, a general lack of consistent understanding of the definition of community policing to be adopted for an individual jurisdiction and an acceptance of that understanding was not created at all rank levels prior to implementing the community policing approach. Roberg (1994) acknowledges a definitional problem for community policing continues to exist making it difficult to determine who is actually “doing” this method of policing. Second, inadequate initial training on implementation
methods as well insufficient in-service training to cement these concepts during implementation, was noted. Third, unlike the literature suggests should occur, the evaluation criteria for officers in the surveyed agencies failed to change to community policing/problem-solving evaluation criteria. Instead officer evaluation criteria continued to use quantitative measures consistent with traditional policing methods, sending mixed signals to the officers. Fourth, there was a lack of assessment of the extent to which officers were implementing community policing methods on a regular basis. Finally, little if any follow-up was conducted and used to assess the degree to which community policing goals were being accomplished including the impact on jurisdictional problems.

Small Unit Implementation

The literature generally agrees that community policing efforts must be adopted department-wide by all employees, civilian as well as sworn, embracing the philosophy and implementing the practice in daily affairs. Those agencies in this study that attempted to implement community policing by creating a unit within the agency, failed to understand the basic tenet of community policing that required department-wide participation. In discussing the community policing unit with officers, it was apparent the officers felt the unit was not part of the mainstream functioning of the agency. This suggests that the negative attitudes developed by officers not involved in the community policing unit toward the small unit officer would make it difficult to integrate the concept agency-wide. The public can see these efforts as being disconnected when an agency mixes traditional policing with community policing as a subterfuge for a true adoption of community policing. Wilkinson and Rosenbaum (1994) found that although a commu-
nity policing effort might survive in a small unit within a department, it would not thrive. As the literature indicates, partial implementation creates animosity between officers practicing traditional policing and the community policing unit officers as was found in this study. Roth et al. (2004) suggest that when transitioning from a small unit prototype to a department-wide community policing effort, former small unit officers can become disappointed. To adopt community policing with any hope of a realistic result, department-wide implementation coupled with a philosophical shift in policing methodology must occur at all rank levels.

**Supervisor – Officer Dichotomy**

A significant difference in mean scores for supervisors and officers, especially at the first-line supervisor level, was observed from the results of the survey. The design of this study did not provide data with which to answer the questions of why this occurred. Skogan and Roth (2004) suggest that the sergeants as first-line supervisors may have only a dim comprehension of what community policing is supposed to be. If this is true, that may provide an explanation for the lack of congruence. Elizabeth Reuss-Ianni (1993) found in her study of the New York Police Department that policy was slow to be assumed by line officers. She found two independent cultures she termed *management cop culture* and *street cop culture*. Reuss-Ianni found differences between these two groups in value systems, expectations, and loyalties. Supervisors were found to be loyal not to those they supervised but rather to social and political networks that bring them rewards such as future promotions or lucrative jobs after retirement. Supervisors were found to enforce policy when necessary to cover for themselves, creating distrust.
between them and the street officer. The street cop remained loyal to fellow officers for whom they relied for their very safety. Typically this loyalty was limited to their own work unit. Street officers tended to follow informal policy since it was more expedient in accomplishing the tasks being handled by the officer unless certain supervisors were working who would not tolerate the deviation. This self-initiative is the cornerstone of the philosophy of community policing. Whether this two-culture phenomenon found in the New York police department is also present in smaller agencies like those studied in this research and whether it may explain the differences in the degree of acceptance of the community philosophy shown by the data in this study, remains to be discovered. The work of Reuss-Ianni does provide a starting point for future research concerning the officer-supervisor mean differences.

Social Control and Learning Systems

Patrick K. Murphy (1995), Director, Police Policy Board, United States Conference of Mayors, suggests that social and economic injustice has more to do with crime than the expenditure for police, courts, and prisons. Simply put, better and more effective policing is needed. Policing has come a long way since the era of civil rights legislation of the 1950s were the police were under considerable criticism for their inefficiency, ineffectiveness, and lack of accountability (Greene, 2004). The federal government can and should assist in research and act as a clearinghouse for the exchange of ideas (Murphy, 1995). Communities must exercise social control in conjunction with the police. The police role is to assist people to prevent and reduce crime in their neighborhoods. The police should not be expected to be solely responsible for crime control. A major police
function is to protect the constitutional rights of people to govern themselves. Community policing philosophy is an attempt to do just that.

Donald Schon (1971) advanced the idea that government should learn for society by creating learning systems thereby being able to diffuse the ideas gleaned from the periphery of government. In this case, the periphery is the local governmental entities and their police departments. Once the federal government identifies the most successful programs they should diffuse that information back to local government for use in implementing their own version of community policing that meets their local needs. The creation of the COPS Office within the U. S. Department of Justice is an example of Schon’s theory where government learns for society. The COPS office has done so by providing grants to local government, who in turn develop the best ideas on dealing with crime. COPS then functions as a clearinghouse to diffuse these best ideas back to all other local governments with grant funds to ensure implementation for the less fiscally able entities. The failing with the COPS office is their responding in too rapid a fashion with grant funds due to the pressure by politicians to carry out political directives for political reasons. This in turn resulted in wasting enormous amounts of taxpayer money on agencies not yet ready to implement community policing, creating doubt and frustration regarding the viability of the philosophy of community policing.

Police agencies were given the opportunity for funding to implement community policing. The funding required prompt implementation of community policing without adequate time to fully assess the most successful community policing models. Given the political pressures, police departments did the best they could at that time. This study in conjunction with the existing literature shows that to implement community policing
effectively that achieves congruence, a comprehensive and measured approach to implementation is necessary. The concept should be implemented when the jurisdiction, the community, the agency, and the officers are fully trained and ready, but not before.

Significance of the Study

The results of this study have a significant impact on the existing and long-standing perception of the degree of acceptance or congruence within police agencies, at least in the Great Lakes region of the United States, to which the community policing philosophy has been implemented.

The existing literature acknowledges that with the passage of Title I of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, community-oriented policing became official federal policy under the Department of Justice (Hickman & Reaves, 2001; Zhao, Schneider, & Thurman, 2002). Following passage of this act, federal grants for community policing programs encouraged and funded many start-up community policing programs. Since 1994, nearly $9 billion have been awarded to police agencies for community policing related grants through 1999 (Roth & Ryan, 2000). With the vast amount of funding available to police agencies for “community policing,” it is inevitable that jurisdictions might try to place new and existing programs within the umbrella of the COPS (Community Oriented Policing Strategy) definition of community policing. The literature generally agrees that a large percentage of police departments in the United States have adopted some form of community policing. This perceived large-scale adoption of community policing may have been premature without adequate study and time to prepare officers so as to gain their support. It has been reported that as of 1999,
some 64% of the police departments in the United States representing 86% of the population have community-policing programs (Hickman & Reaves, 2001). Rosenbaum and Wilkinson (2004: 79) observe that there is scant empirical work on which to conclude agencies or their employees have transitioned to community or problem oriented policing. The results of this study suggest that the actual percentage of police departments that have truly implemented community policing efforts is significantly lower than that reported in the literature, at least in small- to medium-sized police departments in the Great Lakes region. Greene (2004: 32) suggests that if police departments have indeed been successful in transitioning to community policing from traditional forms of policing, this move should be observable in broadened network relationships, changes to the formal organization of policing meaning the way police work is done. These changes were not observed during this study. The results of this study were consistent with Greene’s (2004: 39) observation where he suggests, “...evidence for institutional shift in policing is, at best, weak. Although agencies have adapted aspects of the rhetoric of community and problem oriented policing, crime fighting and crime suppression remain the mainstay of the police.” This study focused on whether the individual agencies implemented community policing as reported by the officers charged with the implementation rather than the agency head who may have a strong interest in reporting their agency has indeed adopted community policing. While Greene (2004) suggests police agencies have begun to engage in problem solving, agencies remain focused on crime solving and police response issues as evidenced by the recent move to zero-tolerance policing advocated by Goldstein’s broken windows theory.
Community Policing Models

In this research, three community policing models were proposed into which the community policing methodologies reviewed in the literature can be classified and further studied. The three classifications of models included the Community-Oriented Problem-Solving (COPS) model, the Statistics Directed model, and the Comprehensive model. The intent was to discover the basic core models that explain the various community policing efforts in use today. It was felt that this basic understanding would assist agencies to have a place from which to begin their implementation, better improve existing methodologies, and to aid agencies by providing knowledge of available methods who have yet to implement community policing but who desired to do so. The ultimate intent was to determine if one classification might be more effective than the others in reducing the incidence of crime, improve police-citizen perception, and reduce the fear of crime by citizens.

The data did provide minimal information to identify which departments fit into which classification. However, additional research with a focus on the particular agency methodology using a larger number of agencies is needed to test these classifications against crime rates. Terrill and Mastrofski (2004) found evidence that implementation of a broken windows form of aggressive policing in Indianapolis, Indiana aimed at strict enforcement of minor crime compared to a more low-key community policing methodology in St. Petersburg, Florida showed a proclivity for a more coercive and aggressive policing approach under the broken windows type of policing. Mastrofski, Willis, and Snipes (2002) recognize two general categories of community policing efforts—the no-
nonsense and aggressive approach—falling into the *broken windows* model. They recognized the second type of policing approach as more friendly, concerned and low-key approach typical of community policing methodology. As previously discussed, the rolling implementation methods used by the agencies in this study precluded the ability to study the crime rates against the implementation of the community policing methodologies to determine if any linkages were present. This would provide an interesting research project and should be done.

**Further Research**

Given the small degree of variance explained by the independent variables in these data, it is obvious that other variables exist that significantly impact on officer acceptance of the philosophy and practice of these methodologies. Further research into the other potential causes is warranted. Other possible causes for the officers’ and supervisors’ attitudes and regular practice of community policing as measured by the PH and PR Indexes are discussed below.

1. One glaring dichotomy is observed in the data regarding both age and years of police service that produced a decrease in acceptance and practice of community policing. Yet as rank increased from the sergeant level upward, acceptance and the view subordinate officers practice community policing, also increased. Typically the highest-ranking officers are older and have many years of police experience. This suggests that officers who may be more accepting of change and new ideas are promoted and those officers who are seen as being less inclined to change are not promoted. Conversely, it may be that officers who are not promoted begin to feel advancement is hopeless and
begin to ignore the directives from those who have been promoted and simply do the minimums to put in their time until retirement. Implementing community policing takes effort and without commitment by officers of all ranks the successful implementation simply will not occur. Further research into the specific causation for the acceptance or failure to accept the philosophy of community policing is necessary including the degree and causation of congruence between all ranks of officers in police agencies. A closer look into the promotional process and selection criteria is warranted to ascertain whether officers who accept the community policing philosophy are promoted more often than officers who do not. This lack of promotional opportunity or other rewards for the non-promoted officers may cause officers to not embrace new policies like community policing.

2. Another factor was noted when interviewing officers across the agencies surveyed regarding a change at the top of the organization. A change at the rank of chief often saw a refocusing of the priorities of the agency. Tilly (2004: 180) reported similar results where the longevity of implementation turned on exceptional individuals that often did not survive their departure. The support by agency personnel of the community policing philosophy often shifted away from community policing with the installing of a new chief. Roth et al. (2004) reported the change in the chief has spurred rapid change, but in this eighteen-agency survey the change was generally found to move away from community policing in favor of gang activity or some other priority. This may have been due to the personal priorities of the new chief, or it may have been the result of new priorities of city councils. Where lower echelon employees perceive a wavering of priorities, this may cause them to wait out the changes, as officers may perceive them as
being a low priority. This is an area worthy of further research, as the support and direction from the chief may affect the operations throughout the agency.

3. The push for quick implementation of community policing from the COPS Office by disbursing substantial grant funds to foster implementation, may have caused a cart-before-the-horse implementation effort. Further research into the methodology of implementation including an assessment of officers’ readiness for change prior to the implementation may provide insight into whether the method of implementation resulted in a lack of congruence or other cause and hence an ineffective adoption from the onset.

4. Three community policing categories were proposed in this research in an effort to assist in evaluating existing methods as well as a guide for agencies who desire to implement community policing. These categories were developed from a review of existing agency community policing efforts gleaned from the literature. A review of additional agency methodologies would assist in determining if these categories are able to explain the array of implementation methods currently in use by police agencies. As the literature acknowledges, community policing is police-citizen collaboration to solve citizens’ issues rather than issues as perceived by the police as most important. The Statistics Driven model is contrary to the basic community policing tenet. The statistics driven model uses the traditional quantitative measures to allocate police resources and to assess police success. The focus on a traditional police measure while suggesting officers focus on solutions for underlying crime and neighborhood issues may contribute to the lack of congruence and acceptance of community policing. Further research in this area may show that this category is not in keeping with the community policing philosophy or
it may show that a combination of directing police resources to focus on citizen’s issues along with statistics directed police resource allocation is a proper approach.

5. Police officer training received in the police academy gives very little attention to the philosophy of community policing and the methods to successfully implement it. Though this study was designed to be quantitative in nature, certain unplanned qualitative methods were used as the opportunities arose. This included interviews with numerous officers while administering the survey instruments with common threads being observed. These conversations convinced this researcher that very little formalized community policing education was received at the police academies across the six states involved in this study. This lack of training at the academy as well as in-service training at the department may erode officer confidence in the new method of policing resulting in a lack of support. Further research into the curriculum of police academies would be helpful in understanding the foundational knowledge base in the area of community policing that new officers brought with them to their agencies.

6. Another possible explanation for the lack of congruence may possibly be found in Reuss-Ianni’s (1993) management cop culture and street cop culture dichotomy. It was not ascertained if this phenomenon was present in smaller agencies that participated in this study. Whether this officer-management dichotomy is present in departments like the smaller agency sizes participating in this study and the impact on attitudes would be enlightening and should be studied further.

7. The individual make up of officers and supervisors was looked into in this study by testing the environmental variables of gender, age, educational level, rank, duties, years of police experience, military experience, and agency size. Other individual
psychological factors such as personal biases, prejudices, experiences, and phobias may also impact on attitudes for innovative policies such as community policing. Quasi-experimental research testing such factors with a pre-test, post-test prior to implementing community policing may provide insight into those factors that influence attitudes.

8. One last variable that should be looked into is the degree to which the existing policing culture affects the attitudes of officers toward new ideas such as community policing. Given the strong cultural bias of not trusting non-police officers, it might be enlightening to determine whether this culture all but precludes the possibility for developing a positive attitude toward a philosophy across all ranks that would require openly working with citizens to resolve the problems raised by citizens rather than the problems perceived by the police. Officers openly favoring this new approach may find lack of support if not hostility for such a break with traditional roles.

Conclusion

Presidential administrations have thrown money at police departments in an effort to have them adopt community policing to curb crime without the necessary research and preparation to ensure a successful implementation. I suggested in the literature review that the funding to add 100,000 police officers to American streets was a veiled tactic to win a Presidential election. Skogan and Roth (2004: xxvi) echoed a similar theme where they observed, “The 1994 Act had at least one of its intended effects: major police groups endorsed the presidential candidate who sponsored it.” Indeed, Congress has responded by providing grant funds measured in the billions of dollars. Police managers saw a window of opportunity to obtain federal funding to implement community policing.
and the police officer on the street has been asked to shoulder this strange new burden with little understanding or training, accept it at face value, and loyally march onward. Police work is dangerous. Police officers are men and women not unlike the rest of society. They handle society’s dirty work, but they too wish to be able to go home to their families at the end of their shift. However, as observed by Egon Bittner (1970: 46), the difference between police work and other occupations is the capacity of police to distribute “non-negotiable coercive force employed in accord with an intuitive grasp of situational exigencies.” Bayley (1994: 69-70) sums up street level police work as:

Those engaged in it being the buck privates of policing. Officers have a grubby, physical job requiring physical contact with dirty, foul smelling clients often covered with urine, vomit and blood. Working hours are long and consist of days as well as evenings and weekends with exhaustion from swinging through different shifts. On top of all of this, officers must function in conditions involving rain, snow, and blistering heat. The officer must always be prepared to step forward to protect the public from life-threatening danger. They never forget this. Officers strap on guns, don body armor, pack batons and pepper spray on their belts, and check for handcuffs. The paradox is that though police officers must prepare for war, they spend most of their duty time in peaceful ways.

The data in this study suggests that most agencies jumped on the community policing bandwagon for one or more of any number of reasons, but only got one leg on the wagon.

In a study of two cities in Illinois (Aurora and Joliet), Rosenbaum and Wilkinson (2004) found efforts by these two police agencies resulted in little change in officer job satisfaction or officer perception of supervisory support for community and problem oriented activities. Further, there was little evidence that management efforts were changed to provide greater support to officers, or that officers’ job functions were changed in a measurable way. Wood et al. (2004) suggest department subcultures and
significant experience working with shifting bureaucratic and political winds, police are very adept at adopting the language and appearing to embrace new models when in fact they have not. These results are consistent with the lack of congruence postulated in this research. Police agencies have made a partial effort to implement community policing when they have time, as the agency executives’ change, as the support increases or decreases depending on the new chief’s views and priorities. Minimal initial training and virtually no on-going training has been provided prior to implementing community policing. I suggest that most of these problems are not the fault of police agencies where were directly or indirectly rushed into adopting anything they could call community policing. Roberg (1994) recognized that implementation is a long-term process of 10 years or more that will require well-planned and incremental changes. Attempts for quick migrations to community policing will undoubtedly fail. Officer evaluations continue to use traditional quantitative criteria promoting adherence to traditional policing methods (Weisel & Eck, 1994).

Roth et al. (2004) suggest there is hope. They feel that there is ample evidence that the police field has accepted the concept of partnership-based problem solving as useful. Wood et al. (2004) feel that political leaders and citizens cannot impose a new organizational culture of policing. Only police insiders can construct a new cultural environment to give meaning and direction to the work of policing. They suggest that it will be the interplay between the cultural agency of police leaders and structural conditions set by political and legal dynamics that will set the future course of urban policing. Reisig and Parks (2004) concluded in their study of community policing and the effect on the quality of life of citizens that community policing was positively correlated to quality
of life issues. Citizens who believed a collaborative relationship existed between them and the police expressed a greater feeling of safety and satisfaction with their community. The Michigan Regional Community Policing Institute (RCPI) was created by a grant from the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) to further the development of the community policing effort (Morash & Ford, 2002). Giacomazzi and McGarrell (2002) found in their study of the Spokane, Washington police department and Project ROAR (Reclaiming Our Area Residences) that resident satisfaction rose significantly, positive physical change in the neighborhood were reported, decreases in visible signs of disorder were noted, but crime rates were only modestly reduced. These studies show positive results from ongoing community policing efforts. The evidence indicates community policing can work and is working in selected agencies. The knowledge of how to do it right is available. Now the commitment and a renewed effort is required to reap the benefits of the community policing movement that touts police-citizen collaboration.

Recommendations

The following 8 recommendations are viewed by this researcher as critical to fully and successfully implementing the community policing philosophy in a police agency. They are only being touched on here and would require a much deeper analysis for implementing community policing in a particular jurisdiction. See Figure 3.

1. Not only must the police department truly want to adopt a community policing philosophy, but also the governmental body of that jurisdiction must strongly support and share in the responsibility to bring sufficient resources to bear to ensure the success of the implementation. Sadd and Grinc (1994: 41) suggest that if the initial
Figure 3. Steps for successfully implementing community policing.
move to “community policing involves the entire city government from the beginning, then police and citizens alike can be educated regarding how to deal with quality-of-life conditions that do not fall within the purview of the police department.”

Community policing requires that the police partner with citizens, governmental departments, and business to keep neighborhoods clean, free of deteriorating buildings, abandoned cars, and other signs of disorder that can be dealt with through the enactment and enforcement of ordinances. Beyond educating community leaders, the residents must also understand their role. Too often community policing is pushed as a police initiative alone when it should be advanced as a community initiative (Sadd & Grinc, 1994). Community theory suggests that informal social processes with neighborhoods primarily maintaining social order and not the police. The limited evidence of informal social control suggests these efforts may be difficult to implant in neighborhoods suffering from social disorganization (Eck & Rosenbaum, 1994; Rosenbaum, 1986, 1988; Skogan, 1990). Safe building design to deter crime, traffic patterns, and public support are critical to fully engage this philosophy. Ford and Morash (2002) talk of exploration and commitment, and planning and implementation phases. Patrolling in cars, making detection and enforcement a priority, and the move to professional policing, has contributed to policing criminals rather than policing with and for the community (Tilley, 2004). This is an erosion of Sir Robert Peel’s concept of the goals of policing that envisioned “…the prevention of crime…” and the “…preservation of public tranquility…” through collaboration with citizens (Reith, 1956: 135). The media and neighborhood groups need to be regular partners with government in community issues. Community policing is much more than the police officer on the street trying to accomplish social order alone.
The definition of and stated efforts to conform to the community policing philosophy must be clearly established and disseminated to all employees to ensure a uniform understanding of the direction the agency is heading. Traditional policing focused only on crime fighting. Community policing views calls involving domestic disturbances, landlord-tenant disputes, ambulance calls, missing persons, and similar calls within their realm of responsibility. Carter (2002: 267) suggests “If the public, who finance the police and from whom the police derive their authority, regularly call the police department to handle these incidents, then handling such incidents is implicitly part of the police role.” I suggest that the range of legitimate police activities needs to be identified with some degree of certainty to create a common understanding among all employees.

2. Citizens are transitioned into police officers at the police academy. This is where new officers first start to form their foundational perceptions of what a police officer is, what they do, how they do it, and with whom they do it. It is critical that the training staff at the police academy understands, support, and teaches community policing methods and fully integrates the community policing philosophy in the lesson plans for all courses taught. Sadd and Grinc (1994) found in their study of eight police departments that in those cities the data suggests that:

...policy makers may have gravely underestimated the difficulty of gaining the support of these groups and suggest strongly that police departments must make the education of police officers in the theory and practice of community policing a priority. (p. 35)

This initial officer training has not received the attention in the existing literature as being instrumental in new officer understanding and acceptance of this philosophy. Wilkinson and Rosenbaum (1994) suggest there is agreement that officers must be allowed freedom
to be creative problem solvers and resource facilitators, with less rigid organization, and officers and supervisors must be provided with the necessary skills to excel in their new role by providing radically different training programs. Police officers are expected to operationalize these concepts that are frequently beyond the current capacities of most officers for which they were selected and trained (Lurigio & Rosenbaum, 1994). This initial academy and in-service training must meet the challenge and be taught by officers who believe in this same philosophy. Eck (2004) suggests that officers typically receive eight hours or less of in-service training in problem solving prior to implementing a community policing effort. Problem solving is core to the community policing methodology. Community policing is typically understood to involve problem solving and community engagement for which officers and supervisors have little training. Schafer (2002) reported in his study that in spite of management’s belief officers had sufficient initial training to implement community policing, officers stated they lacked the skills necessary to identify and resolve the problems they encountered. New officers had insufficient relevant training. This suggests police academy training failed to prepare new officers to assume the duties in a community policing environment and the police agency failed to provide the necessary in-service training.

3. An assessment of the acceptance by employees is a necessary next step. Following the assessment, an educational approach is necessary with employee participation from all levels and not simply a top down push. Ford and Morash (2002) recognize the high failure rate for planned change efforts (citing French and Bell, 1999) that often results from neglecting the organization’s culture (citing Cameron & Quinn, 1999). Peter Senge (1999) found that little significant change would occur when driven only from the
top of an organization. Trainers well versed in all aspects of community policing should lead the training. Resistance to change can be significant, especially in the police realm as the literature recognizes. Mastrofski et al. (2002) suggest officers are of one of four types: professionals, reactors, tough cops, or avoiders. The professionals were the most supportive, reactors adapted to some of the aspects of community policing, but the tough cops and avoiders engaged in activities that were contrary to this philosophy. To the extent these types of officers exist in a department moving to community policing, these sub-cultures must be identified and worked with to gain their support. Resistance to change is not limited to the line officers. Ford and Morash (2002) recognized that officers at the supervisory levels can be lukewarm to proposed change. The necessary skills must be taught to officers of each rank level regarding their role in ensuring the success of the project. This process may take one or more years of education and training prior to the implementation actually commencing.

4. Once the process is put into action on the street, supervisors must know how to supervise from a community policing perspective. Midlevel managers have often been allowed to continue traditional control function rather than allowing sergeants and officers the latitude to perform the community policing function. The move to community policing necessitates managers to encourage participation from officers and citizens with less emphasis on directing and controlling (Alley, Bonello, & Schafer, 2002). They should know how to mentor officers so that the officers develop and learn from each application of the various tactics. Problem solving is key to getting at and resolving the root causation of crime. Involvement of stakeholders, citizens, victims, witnesses,
neighborhood groups, and others builds long-term relationships that are much more important than any single incident.

5. Officers as well as supervisors must be evaluated based on community policing criteria. Officers will do what they know they will be evaluated on. Where evaluations are based on numbers, number of arrests made, number of citations written, or other quantitative activities, officers will follow that direction and respond by producing those numbers accordingly. The results of this study are consistent with the findings of Weisel and Eck (1994) who confirmed in their six-agency study that traditional measures of police officer effectiveness such as number of arrests, report preparations, and personal appearances were the most highly rated performance factors. Traditional quantitative measures such as numbers of arrests are crude measure of effectiveness. With community policing, other measures such as whether the police have detected problems of greatest importance to citizens and whether these identified problems been reduced as a result, should be used to gauge police effectiveness (Eck & Rosenbaum, 1994). Conversely, where officers are evaluated on solving a long-standing problem or a particular issue, they will respond and function in a manner that puts them in the best light on the evaluation criteria. Roth et al. (2004) found in their study that 35% of the agencies migrated performance evaluation criteria to community policing related criteria. However, the results of this study clearly indicate that agencies continue to assess officer performance on quantitative measures of traditional police activities. The Uniform Crime Reports and grant criteria force a quantitative mentality throughout the agency and that impact must be minimized. That trend must be reversed to implement community policing effectively.
A continuous assessment of the level and effectiveness of implementation for each officer and supervisor must be conducted on a regular basis. Police organizations cannot control front-line decisions in a practical way. Police do not deal with mistakes or lack of implementation in this case, like professionals by reviewing mistakes then making corrections in training and behavior. Rather, police managers are prone to apply discipline punishing individual officers since it's never acknowledged to be the organization's fault (Bayley, 1994: 65). Departmental rules and procedures generally proscribe police behaviors rather than assist officers in determining the appropriate behavior (Goldstein, 1977). Reuss-Ianni (1993) reported that the New York police department kept a list of the top overtime earners resulting from making arrests. The officers were often accused of stealing overtime pay and felt like they were treated as crooks for doing their job of arresting offenders. As a result of these punitive practices, officers stopped arresting offenders. Officers and lower ranking supervisors quickly learn to be cautious; they tend to not make decisions when possible. Bayley presents the paradox nicely, "The command and control system of police management ... seeks to regulate in minute ways the behavior of individuals who are required by the nature of their work to make instant and complex decisions in unpredictable circumstances" (1994: 64). A more professional and collaborative method of dealing with failure between officers and supervisors must be implemented in place of punitive systems remaining in use in many police organizations today. Community policing advocates have observed that police organizations need to make better use of the experience and knowledge of street officers (Eck & Rosenbaum, 1994). Also, federal grant policy-makers must reassess the grant criteria to ensure grant funds are used in the most effective manner and craft measures of success in criteria other...
than strictly quantifiable measures. They should not continue to assess program success or continuation funding based on traditional quantitative measures of police success if they truly wish to foster the community policing philosophy.

6. Ongoing effective in-service training to review, assess, and improve current community policing methods and problem areas must occur. Ford and Morash (2002) term this phase monitoring and institutionalization. They discuss the need to conduct gap analyses to identify the shortcomings, detect the reason for them, and take corrective action to resolve the deficiencies. To effectively implement this philosophy, continuous training and review must occur in perpetuity. Ford (2002) discussed the concept of organizational development and the need for internal processes within agencies implementing change to facilitate learning as change is developed and implemented. This concept is consistent with Schon's learning systems theory discussed earlier in this dissertation. Ford (2002) (citing French & Bell, 1995, and Kotter, 1995) discusses the need for leaders to establish a sense of urgency for the proposed change to obtain buy-in from officers. Kotter (1995) advocates the establishment of a guidance team to sustain the change effort. This would also assist in spanning gaps created by changes in police chiefs noted in this study. Where officers are found to have missed opportunities to address the causation of crime or community problems, supervisors must work with the officers to increase the officer's knowledge of ways to address those particular problems as well as ways to attack general community problems.

7. The 911-response mentality, though also necessary in community policing, can and should be minimized to the extent possible. As acknowledged by the literature, 911 call centers should be reserved for true emergency response. Community policing
officers who have established contacts with citizens can and should handle most of the common issues to reduce the dependence on emergency responses.

8. From the time of the first professional police department in London, England in 1829 until now, policing has indeed come full circle regarding police-citizen cooperation in solving society’s problems. Society must remember the lessons from the past. It is now time to eliminate the use of the words law enforcement officer and law enforcement agency given the historical rationale for the move to those monikers. It is now time to return to the term police officer and police department to convey a general, non-threatening, connotation more conducive of the community policing philosophy. Kelling (1999: 10) also suggested that perceptions can erode effective reform when he observed, “For many people, thanks in part to how it has been presented by many police leaders, community policing is viewed as ‘soft’ policing comparable to community relations, or worse yet, social work.” Perception becomes reality and police officers will view themselves by what they are called. This will assist in continuing the changing perception of the public toward the police, as the term police officer is much less threatening than law enforcement officer, and accurately reflects the changing duties of police officers and police departments under the community policing philosophy. This change will also help officer attitudes migrate away from a mentality of strictly enforcing laws to one of aiding and working with citizens to further engage in problem-solving to address community problems that may not always be criminal in nature, but important none the less, in conjunction with the citizens they serve.
Appendix A

Sample Letter Requesting Approval to Conduct Research
May 15, 2005

Anywhere Police Department
123 Main Street
Somewhere, Michigan 48000

Dear Chief xxxx:

I am a retired Michigan State Police Officer. In my public safety career, I have worked for two other agencies during my twenty-eight years, including one small township police department and one public safety department at a Michigan University where I am currently employed. I am also a graduate of the FBI National Academy, 176th Session. I have recently completed coursework at Western Michigan University for a Ph.D. degree in Public Affairs and Administration. I am currently working on my dissertation as the final requirement for this degree. My topic is Community Policing.

To complete my dissertation, I require data. If you would be willing to assist, I plan to obtain this data from your officers as well as several other police departments that have adopted the concept of community policing. I intend to invite all sworn officers of your department to respond voluntarily to a twenty-eight question survey. This survey should take no longer than ten minutes. I would ask that no officer place their name or any other identifying information on the completed survey. Also, I will not disclose the name of any officer who participates in this survey. Each survey will be totally anonymous to protect the confidentiality of your officers. Once I enter the data into a database, I will destroy all surveys. I will either be present to collect completed surveys or ask that each officer mail their survey by placing it in the stamped envelope I will provide if I am unavailable. Confidentiality will be protected for your department and officers.

I also ask that an official designated by you complete a departmental information questionnaire to obtain basic information on your department. Again, I will be the only person who will know which departments participated in this study. I will not divulge your department's name or any information you provide. I will only identify departments by indicating that the study was conducted in the Midwest. No connection to your department or data will be possible. Also, I have made every effort to minimize the time required to provide the requested information.

This research is very important to my pursuit of a Ph.D. degree. I respectively ask for your permission to survey your officers. If you grant my request, I will need a letter on department stationary granting this permission. To assist, I am attaching a sample approval letter to minimize your time necessary on this request. I have also attached the two surveys with the letter of instructions for your review.

Sincerely,

Robert G. Muladore
Appendix B

Sample Letter of Approval to Conduct Research
May 15, 2005

Mr. Robert Muladore

address

address

RE: Approval To Conduct A Survey

Dear Mr. Muladore:

I have read your request letter of December xx, 2004 in which you request permission to conduct a written survey of officers of this department in conjunction with your pursuit of a Ph.D. degree at Western Michigan University. I understand that the data collected will be used to complete your dissertation in pursuit of that degree.

I have reviewed your request, the instructions to the survey, the survey instrument, and the departmental background survey. I have considered your methodology with the steps you intend to follow to ensure the confidentiality of both the officers of this department as well as the identity of this agency.

I am satisfied that your request is proper and that confidentiality for officers of this department as well as the department’s identity will be safeguarded. I therefore give you permission to conduct your survey with this department.

I have assigned Officer xxxxxxx to act as the contact person on behalf of the department. He/She may be reached at (xxx) xxx-xxxx to schedule distribution of your officer survey, departmental background survey, and any other issues related to your request.

Sincerely,

Chief xxxxxxx
Appendix C

HSIRB Approval Letter Dated April 15, 2005
Date: April 14, 2005

To: James Visser, Principal Investigator
    Robert Muladore, Student Investigator for dissertation

From: Mary Lagerwey, Ph.D., Chair

Re: HSIRB Project Number: 05-407

This letter will serve as confirmation that your research project entitled “Implementing Community Policing Successfully: An Analysis of the Degree of Police Engagement with the Philosophy and Practice of Community Policing” has been approved under the exempt category of review by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board. The conditions and duration of this approval are specified in the Policies of Western Michigan University. You may now begin to implement the research as described in the application.

Please note that you may only conduct this research exactly in the form it was approved. You must seek specific board approval for any changes in this project. You must also seek reapproval if the project extends beyond the termination date noted below. In addition if there are any unanticipated adverse reactions or unanticipated events associated with the conduct of this research, you should immediately suspend the project and contact the Chair of the HSIRB for consultation.

The Board wishes you success in the pursuit of your research goals.

Approval Termination: April 14, 2006
Western Michigan University, Department of Public Affairs and Administration  
Principal Investigator: Dr. James Visser  
Student Investigator: Robert G. Muladore

Anonymous Survey Consent – Line Officers

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled “Degree of Police Engagement with Community Policing” designed to analyze the degree of agreement between the line officer, supervisors, and the agency head. The study is being conducted by Dr. James Visser and Robert G. Muladore from Western Michigan University, Department of Public Affairs and Administration. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements of Robert G. Muladore.

To eliminate any possibility of your agency obtaining your responses, please place your survey, completed or not, face down into the box under the exclusive control of Mr. Muladore so that no one other than Mr. Muladore will ever see your responses. It is important that you respond to the survey questions openly and honestly. You are directed not to put your name or any other identifying information on the survey so that the survey will remain anonymous and your responses cannot be linked to you in any way.

Information obtained from this survey is intended to be used by police departments to improve police-citizen relations and reduce crime.

This survey is comprised of 28 multiple choice questions that you are asked to complete and will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the form. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank or not to participate in this survey. The completed and uncompleted surveys will be collected by Mr. Muladore at the end of the survey session by having the respondent place the complete survey face down in a drop box under his control. Mr. Muladore will remove the drop box and its contents from the site at the conclusion of the session.

If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. James Visser at (269) 387-8937, Robert G. Muladore at (517) 543-5799, the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269) 387-8293 or the vice president for research at (269) 387-8298.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. You should not participate in this project if the stamped date is more than one year old.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Appendix E

Street-Level Officer Survey
Street Level Officer Questionnaire

Please complete the following information. This information will be used for data analysis only. Neither you or your department, or the city in which you work will be identified. No one including me will be able to connect your questionnaire to you in any way. Do not put your name or any other identifying mark on your completed survey.

This confidential data is very important to my research. I am asking for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire. However, should you decide you do not want to complete this information, you may refuse to participate, refuse to continue or you may refuse to answer specific questions. You will not be subjected to any penalty or effect on your employment status since no one will know who filled out the questions. You should mail the completed questionnaire directly to me in the postage paid return envelope that I have provided. Whether you complete this information or not, please deposit your survey in the mail.

Confidential Background Information:

Sex: 

Male
Female (BQ#E1)

Age: 

21-25 ____
26-30 ____
31-35 ____
36-40 ____
41-45 ____
46-50 ____
51-55 ____
56-60 ____
61+ ____ (BQ#E2)

Education (Highest Level Completed) (BQ#E3)

High School
Associate’s Degree (2 year Community College)
Bachelor’s Degree (4 year College)
Master’s Degree
Doctoral Degree
Other (please specify the type of degree) _______________________________

Year of Graduation ________ (BQ#E4)

Position in the Department: (BQ#E5)

__________________________________ Rank
Division

___ Years of police experience (with full police powers) (BQ#E6)

___ Years of military experience (BQ#E7)

Instructions for completing the questionnaire:

1. Please read each question carefully and choose the answer that most closely supports your perceptions.

2. Whether you complete the survey or not, please place the completed survey into the stamped envelope provided and mail it back to me.

3. Do not write your name on your survey.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this research!

This survey consists of a short series of statements. Please circle the response which most closely reflects your opinion: strongly agree = sa, agree = a, neutral = n, disagree = d, strongly disagree = sd.

In this survey, traditional policing refers to a reactive, enforcement-focused style of policing. Community policing refers to a proactive, working with residents/business owners to reduce the incident of crime before it occurs (social service type of policing) style of policing.

1. My department has worked with citizen’s groups to develop working relationships with them (SQ#H1.1).

   sa a n d sd

2. My department has an established method for citizens to get involved in problem-solving regarding issues affecting their neighborhoods (SQ#H1.2).

   sa a n d sd

3. Community policing in my department involves changing the physical environment (e.g., controlling access to high crime areas, cutting trees to eliminate secluded areas, adding lighting to dark areas, etc.) to minimize the opportunity for crime to occur (SQ#H1.3).

   sa a n d sd
4. My department has provided me with adequate training prior to implementing community policing (SQ#H1.4).
   sa a n d sd

5. My department provides me with adequate yearly in-service community policing training (SQ#H1.5).
   sa a n d sd

6. I support my department’s adoption of Community Policing because I think Community Policing works (SQ#H3.1).
   sa a n d sd

7. In general, I support how my department is implementing Community Policing (SQ#H3.2).
   sa a n d sd

8. Community Policing methods have provided me more job satisfaction than traditional policing methods (SQ#H3.3).
   sa a n d sd

9. I involve citizens when trying to resolve the causes of crime (SQ#H3.4).
   sa a n d sd

10. The best way to reduce crime is to arrest offenders (SQ#H3.5).
    sa a n d sd

11. When responding to a call or making an arrest, I also try to solve the root cause of the incident or crime (SQ#H4.1).
    sa a n d sd

12. When responding to a call or making an arrest, I usually involve citizens in solving the problem (SQ#H4.2).
    sa a n d sd
13. Solving the root cause of crime is generally more effective than traditional policing methods that focus primarily on making arrests. (SQ#H4.3).

14. When trying to solve crimes, I generally contact neighbors and business owners for information about who may have committed the crime (SQ#H4.4).

15. I keep in regular contact with community and business groups to keep abreast of crime patterns in my patrol (area of responsibility) area (SQ#H4.5).

16. I generally make my own decisions regarding where I will work (within my area of responsibility) and what I will do to minimize crime (SQ#H4.6).

17. I usually use my time to prevent crime before it occurs rather than react to calls of crimes (SQ#H4.7).

18. When not tied up on calls, I stop to talk to citizens and business owners to develop relationships with them (SQ#H4.8).

19. Resolving non-crime related matters is as important as working on criminal matters (SQ#H4.9).

20. Community policing takes more time than traditional policing methods but I can use it effectively within my normal workload (SQ#E8a).

21. Because of my heavy workload, I practice Community Policing when I have time (SQ#E8b).
22. I support Community Policing because I know my supervisor supports it (SQ#E9a1).

23. My supervisor supports the concept of Community Policing (SQ#9a2).

24. I practice Community Policing because I know my supervisor supports it (SQ#E9b).

25. I would support Community Policing if I was evaluated on Community Policing activities rather than the traditional activities numbers (e.g., number of tickets written, number of arrests made, etc.) (SQ#E10a).

26. I would practice Community Policing regularly if I were evaluated on Community Policing activities rather than the traditional activities numbers (e.g., number of tickets written, number of arrests made, etc.) (SQ#E10b).

27. I would support Community Policing if there were enough officers to handle calls so that I would have time to practice Community Policing methods (SQ#E11a1).

28. I would practice Community Policing on a regular basis if there were enough officers to handle the calls from dispatch so I would have the time to practice Community Policing (SQ#E11b).

If you wish to add any comments, please do so below. If you need more room, please use the back of this page.
Appendix F

Consent Document—Supervisory Officers
Western Michigan University, Department of Public Affairs and Administration
Principal Investigator: Dr. James Visser
Student Investigator: Robert G. Muladore

Anonymous Survey Consent – Supervisory Officers

You are invited to participate in a research project entitled “Degree of Police Engagement with Community Policing” designed to analyze the degree of agreement between the line officer, supervisors, and the agency head. The study is being conducted by Dr. James Visser and Robert G. Muladore from Western Michigan University, Department of Public Affairs and Administration. This research is being conducted as part of the dissertation requirements of Robert G. Muladore.

To eliminate any possibility of your agency obtaining your responses, do not put your name or any other identifying information on the survey so that the survey will remain anonymous and your responses cannot be linked to you in any way. It is important that you respond to the survey questions openly and honestly. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank or not to participate in this survey. Please place the survey, completed or not, in the provided pre-addressed, pre-stamped envelope to Robert Muladore, 2779 Narrow Lake Road, Charlotte, MI 48813 by a specified date.

Information obtained from this survey is intended to be used by police departments to improve police-citizen relations and reduce crime.

This survey is comprised of 28 multiple choice questions that you are asked to complete and will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the form. You may choose to not answer any question and simply leave it blank. If you choose to not participate in this survey, please mail your survey back to Mr. Muladore in the stamped envelope provided.

If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. James Visser at (269) 387-8937, Robert G. Muladore at (517) 543-5799, the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board (269) 387-8293 or the vice president for research at (269) 387-8298.

This consent document has been approved for use for one year by the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board as indicated by the stamped date and signature of the board chair in the upper right corner. You should not participate in this project if the stamped date is more than one year old.
Appendix G

Supervisory Officer Survey (All Levels Above Street Level Officer)
Supervisory Officer Questionnaire  
(All Levels Above Street Level Officer)

Please complete the following information. This information will be used for data analysis only. Neither you or your department, or the city in which you work will be identified. No one including me will be able to connect your questionnaire to you in any way. Do not put your name or any other identifying mark on your completed survey.

This confidential data is very important to my research. I am asking for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire. However, should you decide you do not want to complete this information, you may refuse to participate, refuse to continue or you may refuse to answer specific questions. You will not be subjected to any penalty or effect on your employment status since no one will know who filled out the questions. You should mail the completed questionnaire directly to me in the postage paid return envelope that I have provided. Whether you complete this information or not, please deposit your survey in the mail.

Confidential Background Information:

Sex:  
____ Male  
____ Female (BQ#E1)

Age:  
21-25  ____  
26-30  ____  
31-35  ____  
36-40  ____  
41-45  ____  
46-50  ____  
51-55  ____  
56-60  ____  
61+  ____ (BQ#E2)

Education (Highest Level Completed) (BQ#E3)  
____ High School  
____ Associate’s Degree (2 year Community College)  
____ Bachelor’s Degree (4 year College)  
____ Master’s Degree  
____ Doctoral Degree  
____ Other (please specify the type of degree) ______________________________

Year of Graduation ___________ (BQ#E4)
Instructions for completing the questionnaire:

1. Please read each question carefully and choose the answer that most closely supports your perceptions.

2. Whether you complete the survey or not, please place the completed survey into the stamped enveloped provided and mail it back to me.

3. Do not write your name on your survey.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this research!

This survey consists of a short series of statements. Please circle the response which most closely reflects your opinion: strongly agree = sa, agree = a, neutral = n, disagree = d, strongly disagree = sd.

In this survey, traditional policing refers to a reactive, enforcement-focused style of policing. Community policing refers to a proactive, working with residents/business owners to reduce the incident of crime before it occurs (social service type of policing) style of policing.

1. My department has worked with citizen’s groups to develop working relationships with them (SQ#H1.1).
   
   sa a n d sd

2. My department has an established method for citizens to get involved in problem-solving regarding issues affecting their neighborhoods (SQ#H1.2).
   
   sa a n d sd
3. Community policing in my department involves changing the physical environment (e.g., controlling access to high crime areas, cutting trees to eliminate secluded areas, adding lighting to dark areas, etc.) to minimize the opportunity for crime to occur (SQ#H1.3).

4. My department has provided me with adequate training prior to implementing community policing (SQ#H1.4).

5. My department provides me with adequate yearly in-service community policing training (SQ#H1.5).

6. My officers support my department’s adoption of CP because they think CP works (SQ#H3.1).

7. In general, my officers support how my department is implementing CP (SQ#H3.2).

8. CP methods have provided my officers more job satisfaction than traditional policing methods (SQ#H3.3).

9. My officers involve citizens when trying to resolve the causes of crime (SQ#H3.4).

10. My officers generally feel the best way to reduce crime is to arrest offenders (SQ#H3.5).

11. When responding to a call or making an arrest, my officers also try to solve the root cause of the incident or crime (SQ#H4.1).
12. When responding to a call or making an arrest, my officers usually involve citizens in solving the problem (SQ#H4.2).

\[
\text{sa a n d sd}
\]

13. My officers believe that solving the root cause of crime is generally more effective than traditional policing methods that focus primarily on making arrests (SQ#H4.3).

\[
\text{sa a n d sd}
\]

14. When trying to solve crimes, my officers generally contact neighbors and business owners for information about who may have committed the crime (SQ#H4.4).

\[
\text{sa a n d sd}
\]

15. My officers keep in regular contact with community and business groups to keep abreast of crime patterns in their patrol (area of responsibility) area (SQ#H4.5).

\[
\text{sa a n d sd}
\]

16. My officers generally make their own decisions regarding where they will work (within my area of responsibility) and what they will do to minimize crime (SQ#H4.6).

\[
\text{sa a n d sd}
\]

17. My officers usually use their time to prevent crime before it occurs rather than react to calls of crimes (SQ#H4.7).

\[
\text{sa a n d sd}
\]

18. When not tied up on calls, my officers stop to talk to citizens and business owners to develop relationships with them (SQ#H4.8).

\[
\text{sa a n d sd}
\]

19. Resolving non-crime related matters are as important to my officers as working on criminal matters (SQ#H4.9).

\[
\text{sa a n d sd}
\]

20. Community policing takes more time than traditional policing methods but I can use it effectively within my normal workload (SQ#E8a).

\[
\text{sa a n d sd}
\]
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21. Because of my heavy workload, I practice Community Policing when I have time (SQ#E8b).

22. I support Community Policing because I know my supervisor supports it (SQ#E9a1).

23. My supervisor supports the concept of Community Policing (SQ#9a2).

24. I practice Community Policing because I know my supervisor supports it (SQ#E9b).

25. I would support Community Policing if I was evaluated on Community Policing activities rather than the traditional activities numbers (e.g., number of tickets written, number of arrests made, etc.) (SQ#E10a).

26. I would practice Community Policing regularly if I were evaluated on Community Policing activities rather than the traditional activities numbers (e.g., number of tickets written, number of arrests made, etc.) (SQ#E10b).

27. I would support Community Policing if there were enough officers to handle calls so that I would have time to practice Community Policing methods (SQ#E11a1).

28. I would practice Community Policing on a regular basis if there were enough officers to handle the calls from dispatch so I would have the time to practice Community Policing (SQ#E11b).

If you wish to add any comments, please do so below. If you need more room, please use the back of this page.
Appendix H

Departmental Informational Survey
Department Information Survey
(To be completed by administration regarding departmental data)

This survey consists of a short series of statements. In this survey, traditional policing refers to a reactive, enforcement-focused style of policing. Community policing refers to a proactive, working with residents/business owners to reduce the incident of crime before it occurs (social service type of policing).

1. Does your department practice community policing? (DQ#H1.6)
   - Yes
   - No
   - Comments

2. Is community policing practiced by the entire department? (DQ#H1.7)
   - Entire department
   - Specialized unit
   - Other (specify)

3. Is any system in place to determine if all employees practice community policing regularly? (DQ#H1.8)
   - Yes
   - No
   - What is the method used?

4. How many hours of implementation training did each employee receive prior to implementing community policing? (DQ#H1.9)

5. Do employees receive in-service training in community policing? (DQ#H1.10)
   - Yes
   - No
   a. How often?
   b. How many hours?
6. Has your department received community policing grant funding? (DQ#H2.1)
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
   a. What year did the funding start? (If you had multiple grants back to back years, consider that one grant) ___________
   b. What year did the funding stop? ___________

   Comments ________________________________________________________________

7. Did your department implement community policing without having received grant funding for this purpose? (DQ#H2.2)
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

8. If yes to the above question, has your agency received grant funding for community policing after the implementation of community policing? (DQ#H2.3)
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

9. Regarding question #7, did your agency continue to practice community policing after the grant funding stopped? (DQ#H2.4)
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

10. Approximately what percentage of your officers do you think accept community policing? (DQ#H3.6)
    a. If not fully accepted throughout your department, who generally accepts it and who does not? ________________________________
       ________________________________________________________________
       ________________________________________________________________

11. Department size:
    _____ Number of sworn officers (DQ#E11a2)
    _____ Number of civilian employees (DQ#E11a3)
12. Has community policing reduced the fear of crime in your citizens?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

13. Is it your department’s position that community policing has reduced crime in your jurisdiction?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
   Comments ____________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________

14. Is it your department’s position that community policing has reduced the fear of crime in your citizens?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
   Comments ____________________________________________________________
   _________________________________________________________________

15. Is community policing practiced in your department for reasons other than crime reduction and fear of crime in citizens? (Examples might include; public pressure, pressure from city council, peer pressure, good public relations tactics, etc.).
   _____ Yes
   _____ No
   a. If yes, why? _______________________________________________________
      _________________________________________________________________
      _________________________________________________________________

16. Are there any other comments you would like to add? ________________
    _________________________________________________________________
    _________________________________________________________________
    _________________________________________________________________
    _________________________________________________________________

Please use the space below for additional space or comments. Thank you for help.
Appendix I

Data Analysis Methodology
Data Analysis Methodology

Background question #E1a (BQ#E1a) was cross-tabulated against the PH Index to determine whether a higher percentage of female officers embrace community policing on a regular basis than male officers.

BQ#E1b was cross-tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of female officers practiced community policing than male officers.

BQ#E2 was cross-tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of younger officers embraced community policing on a regular basis than older officers.

BQ#E2 was cross-tabulated against the PH Index to determine whether a higher percentage of younger officers practiced community policing on a regular basis than older officers.

BQ#E3 was cross-tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of more educated officers embraced community policing on a regular basis than less educated officers.

BQ#E3 was cross-tabulated against the PH Index to determine whether a higher percentage of more educated officers practiced community policing on a regular basis than less educated officers.

BQ#E4 was cross-tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of recently graduated officers embraced community policing on a regular basis than officers who have not recently graduated.

BQ#E4 was cross-tabulated against the PH Index to determine whether a higher percentage of recently graduated officers practiced community policing on a regular basis than officers who have not recently graduated.
BQ#E5 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of higher ranking officers embraced community policing on a regular basis than lower ranking officers.

BQ#E5 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of higher ranking officers practiced community policing on a regular basis than lower ranking officers.

BQ#E6 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of less experienced officers embraced community policing on a regular basis than officers with more experience.

BQ#E6 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of less experienced officers practiced community policing on a regular basis than officers with more experience.

BQ#E7 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of officers with less military experience embraced community policing on a regular basis than officers with more experience.

BQ#E7 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of officers with less military experience practiced community policing on a regular basis than officers with more experience.

BQ#E8 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of officers with a lighter workload embraced community policing on a regular basis than officers with a heavier workload.

BQ#E8 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of officers with a lighter workload practiced community policing on a regular basis than officers with a heavier workload.
BQ#E9 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of officers with strong supervisor support of community policing embraced community policing on a regular basis than officers with less supervisor support.

BQ#E9 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of officers with strong supervisor support of community policing practiced community policing on a regular basis than officers with less supervisor support.

BQ#E10 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of officers who are evaluated using criteria that include community policing factors embraced community policing on a regular basis more than officers who are not evaluated on community policing factors.

BQ#E10 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of officers who are evaluated using criteria that include community policing factors practiced community policing on a regular basis more than officers who are not evaluated on community policing factors.

BQ#E12 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of officers in agencies who have take greater steps to build officer acceptance before implementing community policing embraced community policing on a regular basis more than officers who are employed by agencies who have not done so.

BQ#E12 was cross tabulated against the PR Index to determine whether a higher percentage of officers in agencies who have take greater steps to build officer acceptance before implementing community policing practiced community policing on a regular basis more than officers who are employed by agencies who have not done so.
The responses to BQ: Rank was segregated by supervisors and officers and the percentages for each agency as well as all agencies collectively were calculated with supervisor responses compared to officer responses to ascertain if a higher percentage of supervisors embrace the philosophy of community policing more than the officer do.

The responses to BQ: Rank was segregated by supervisors and officers and the percentages for each agency as well as all agencies collectively were calculated with supervisor responses compared to officer responses to ascertain if supervisors perceived their officers embrace the philosophy of community policing more than the officers actually do.

The responses to BQ: Rank was segregated by supervisors and officers and the percentages for each agency as well as all agencies collectively were calculated with supervisor responses compared to officer responses to ascertain if supervisors perceived their officers practice the philosophy of community policing more than the officers actually do.
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