

Criminal Justice Review

<http://cjr.sagepub.com>

The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing: A Case Study

Allison T. Chappell

Criminal Justice Review 2009; 34; 5 originally published online Dec 2, 2008;

DOI: 10.1177/0734016808324244

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://cjr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/34/1/5>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:

[Georgia State University, College of Health and Human Sciences](#)

Additional services and information for *Criminal Justice Review* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://cjr.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://cjr.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations <http://cjr.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/34/1/5>

The Philosophical Versus Actual Adoption of Community Policing

A Case Study

Allison T. Chappell

Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia

Community policing is the operating philosophy of the majority of American police departments in the new millennium. Though most departments claim to engage in community policing, research has shown that implementation of the strategy is uneven. One way to investigate the implementation of community policing is to study patrol officer attitudes toward community policing because research has shown that attitudes are related to behavior. The present study used qualitative data to explore the extent to which patrol officers have endorsed and implemented community policing in one medium-sized agency in Florida. Furthermore, the research sought to gain insight into the organizational barriers that prevented officers from adopting community policing in their daily work. Results indicated that although most officers agreed with the philosophy of community policing, significant barriers, such as lack of resources, prevented its full implementation in this agency. Implications of the findings and directions for future research are discussed.

Keywords: *policing; community policing; problem solving; police attitudes; participant observation*

Community policing is currently touted by academicians and practitioners as the answer to crime and disorder problems and police–community conflict (Cordner, 2001; Greene & Mastrofski, 1988; Rosenbaum & Lurigio, 1994; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990; Walker, 1999). The federal government has also been supportive, providing financial incentives to agencies that agreed to participate in community policing activities. For example, the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS), a branch of the Department of Justice, provided funding to local police agencies to hire 100,000 new community policing officers in the 1990s (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2000). The results of a recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) study suggested that the funds contributed to a decline in crime (United States Government Accountability Office, 2005).

The definition of community policing has been the subject of much debate. Agencies, practitioners, and researchers tend to define it differently, though most definitions contain similar principles, including problem solving, community involvement, and organizational decentralization (Adams, Rohe, & Arcury, 2002; Chappell & Lanza-Kaduce, 2004; Skogan, 2004). Quality of life and crime prevention are also emphasized (Community

Author's Note: The author wishes to thank John MacDonald and Kara Hoofnagle for their assistance in the preparation of this manuscript. She also thanks the three anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions in revising the manuscript.

Policing Consortium, 2006; Skogan, 2004). Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990) offered the following definition of community policing:

Community policing is 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, social and physical disorder, and neighborhood decay. The philosophy is predicated on the belief that achieving these goals requires that police departments develop new relationships with law-abiding people in the community, allowing them a greater voice in setting local police priorities and involving them in efforts to improve the overall quality of life in their neighborhoods. It shifts the focus of police work from handling random calls to solving community problems. (p. 5)

Community policing has been a topic of considerable research attention since the 1980s. Evaluations of community policing programs usually focus on large police agencies with specialized community policing units and evaluate the effectiveness of community policing by looking at variables such as crime rates, fear of crime, citizens' perceptions, and other quantitative outcomes (MacDonald, 2002). Other studies investigate the relationship between community policing and measures of police attitudes (Cordner, 1991; McElroy, Cosgrove, & Sadd, 1993; Pate & Shtull, 1994; Rosenbaum, Yeh, & Wilkinson, 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1994). Given the well-documented subcultural resistance to police innovations, examining police officer attitudes toward community policing is an important area of research because some research has indicated that attitudes are related to behavior (see Engel & Worden, 2003). There is still a need to examine the actual implementation of community policing in local police agencies (Skogan & Frydl, 2004).

The decision to institute community policing is usually made at the command level (i.e., by the chief or command staff) of a police agency.¹ Hierarchical centralized bureaucracies are often resistant to change (Gaines, Worrall, Southerland, & Angell, 2003; Hannan & Freeman, 1984). Implementation problems, organizational cultural barriers, and various forms of inflexibility can interfere with attempts to transform organizations (Gaines et al., 2003). In fact, Weisburd and colleagues (Weisburd, Mastrofski, McNally, Greenspan, & Willis, 2003) discovered that police organizations were most likely to change in ways that reinforced the traditional bureaucratic structure and least likely to change in ways that challenged that structure. Community policing, with its emphasis on decentralization, certainly challenges the traditional, bureaucratic structure of police organizations. Therefore, there may be a degree of discrepancy between the adoption of the community policing philosophy at the command level and the implementation of that philosophy at the street level. Indeed, the formal effects may be swamped by informal practices and culture.

The present study examined attitudes and behaviors of police officers in one police agency that claimed to fully endorse the philosophy and practice of community policing. The purpose of the study was to discern through participant observation techniques the extent to which patrol officers working the street have endorsed and implemented community policing and problem solving. Once data collection began, it became obvious that there was a lack of full implementation of such strategies in this agency. Thus, a related goal emerged—to gain insight into the barriers preventing officers from adopting community policing and problem solving techniques in their daily work.

The current study is important for several reasons. First, community policing is, by definition, a local phenomenon (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990; Weisburd & McElroy, 1988). Therefore, it continues to be of practical importance to investigate how it is carried out in different police agencies. Second, the majority of studies of community policing implementation are based on large, big city departments (but see studies on rural agencies by Thurman & McGarrell, 2003 and Weisheit, Wells, & Falcone, 1994). Thus, there is still a need to investigate community policing implementation in medium-sized agencies. The present study aims to investigate community policing implementation in a smaller, less extraordinary police department (Willis, Mastrofski, & Weisburd, 2004). Third, most existing studies are based on quantitative data. In this study, qualitative data are used to investigate officers' attitudes and behaviors related to community policing and problem solving. Finally, there is still relatively little research on community policing implementation (Wilson, 2004; Zhao, Thurman, & Lovrich, 1995). Indeed, a report by the Committee on Law and Justice concluded that more research is needed on community policing (Maguire, Kuhns, Uchida, & Cox, 1997; Skogan & Frydl, 2004).

Literature Review

Community Policing

Community policing is based on the assumption that police officers should partner with the community to solve problems that generate repeat calls for service. In order for this to happen, officers must be given the discretion to make independent decisions and act as advocates on behalf of the neighborhoods they serve. Citizens will be a part of the problem-defining process as well as the problem-solving process. The focus is on quality of life, decreasing fear of crime, and cleaning up neighborhoods. Theoretically, confronting quality of life issues will lead to less citizen fear and an increase in informal social control, which will eventually lead to a decrease in crime (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990).

Community policing requires partnerships between officers and citizens. This is accomplished in various ways, including the following: (a) putting police on permanent beats so that they get to know residents; (b) setting up mini-stations in neighborhoods; (c) instituting foot and bike patrols; (d) enlisting community organizations to clean up dilapidated buildings, pick up trash, and fix broken windows; and (e) making the area uninviting to criminals (Community Policing Consortium, 2006; Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Other programs include neighborhood watches, involvement with youth in athletic leagues and after-school programs, target hardening and environmental design improvements, and codes enforcement and nuisance abatement (Langworthy & Travis, 2003).

In addition to changes in police practice, community policing involves a major organizational change. Corder (2001) suggested that community policing involves different structures (decentralization, flattening of the layers of hierarchy, less specialization, teamwork, and hiring civilian employees), changes in management (including coaching, mentoring, empowerment of line officers, and selective discipline), and the collection and utilization of more information (including the use of community surveys, performance appraisals, program evaluations, information systems, crime analysis, and geographic

information systems). Therefore, in order for community policing to be successful, administration and management must be on board—from recruitment, selection, and training—to the expectations made of supervisors and the measures of officer productivity (Goldstein, 1987). In short, the move toward a community policing model is an exercise in extensive change management.

The success of community policing has been debated. Due to variations in community policing definitions and implementation, it is impossible to provide a definitive answer as to whether community policing has been a successful program (Skogan & Frydl, 2004). Moreover, there has been little progress toward developing a standard measurement procedure for gauging the implementation of community policing (see Wilson, 2004). Still, evaluations over the years have found that some community policing tactics, such as foot patrol, mini-stations, and problem solving, have been successful in reducing fear, improving relationships between the police and the public, and even reducing crime (Bayley, 1988; Skogan & Frydl, 2004; Skogan & Hartnett, 1997; Skogan et al., 1999). For example, studies by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) and the Police Foundation have concluded that community policing has improved cooperation between the police and the public, led to increased involvement of citizens, increased information-sharing between citizens and police, improved citizens' attitudes toward the police, and reduced fear of crime (Fridell, 2004). Furthermore, there is evidence that community policing has led to reduced conflict between police and citizens, increased job satisfaction of officers, and reduced crime against property and persons (Fridell, 2004).

Other studies have looked at the relationship between receiving federal funding for community policing and various outcome variables. For example, a recent GAO study concluded that the receipt of a COPS grant was associated with increased use of problem-solving methods. Furthermore, the study found that COPS grants were responsible for a decline in the crime rate (General Accounting Office, 2005; also see Zhao, Scheider, & Thurman, 2002). At the same time, other studies have failed to uncover such positive results (Muhlhausen, 2001; Worrall & Kovandzic, 2007).

It is clear from a number of studies that there is often a lack of full implementation of community policing in agencies that indicate they have fully endorsed its philosophy and practice (Cordner & Biebel, 2005). Due to federal funding opportunities associated with community policing, there has been a strong incentive for police agencies to at least claim to do community policing. The financial incentive, coupled with varying levels and types of implementation, make it difficult to discern the extent to which community policing is effective at changing police behavior and community outcomes. Equally perplexing is the fact that existing research provides little guidance for delineating the obstacles for implementing community and problem-solving policing techniques at the individual police-officer level.

Police Attitudes

Acceptance of community policing by police officers themselves is a critical factor in the success of the community policing strategy (Ford, Weissbein, & Plamondon, 2003; Lewis, Rosenberg, & Sigler, 1999; Mastrofski, Worden, & Snipes, 1995; Sadd & Grinc, 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1994). Lurigio and Skogan (1994) characterized the implementation of community policing as a battle for the hearts and minds of police officers. There is

an explicit assumption that attitudes are related to behavior, and that officers who believe in the philosophy are more likely to engage in the activities associated with it, such as problem solving, working with the community, and crime prevention (Engel & Worden, 2003; Mastrofski et al., 1995). A few studies have demonstrated that officer commitment to community policing is linked to subsequent community policing behavior (Ford et al., 2003; Lurigio & Skogan, 1994; Mastrofski et al., 1995), whereas others have found no such relationship (DeJong, Mastrofski, & Parks, 2001).

Numerous studies have investigated officer's attitudes toward various aspects of community policing (Cordner, 1991; McElroy et al., 1993; Pate & Shtull, 1994; Rosenbaum et al., 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1994). Some have found increased job satisfaction among officers practicing community policing (Adams et al., 2002; Greene, 1989; Pelfrey, 2004; Trojanowicz & Banas, 1985; Yates & Pillai, 1996), whereas others have found conflict in departments implementing community policing strategies (see Greene, 1989; Lurigio & Rosenbaum, 1994; Sadd & Grinc, 1994; Schwartz & Clarren, 1977), particularly when community policing is not adopted department-wide² (Wilkinson & Rosenbaum, 1994). Other outcomes have included more positive views of the community and local businesses (Boydston & Sherry, 1975), more positive views of police on behalf of citizens (Trojanowicz & Banas, 1985; Wycoff & Skogan, 1994), enjoyment of an expanded police role, and opportunities for advancement (Rosenbaum et al., 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1994).

For example, Wycoff and Skogan's (1994) evaluation of an experimental police district (EPD) in Madison, Wisconsin, found that officers felt supported by their supervisors, saw themselves as a team, and believed in the community policing reform. Officers in the EPD ranked higher on job satisfaction and had a better relationship with the community. Furthermore, departmental records indicated that disciplinary problems, absenteeism, and tardiness were reduced.³ Similarly, Lurigio and Skogan (1994), evaluating the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) project, found that officers involved with CAPS were more likely to endorse community policing and wanted more resources devoted to it. They also found that minority officers, especially African Americans, older officers, and officers with higher rank expressed more favorable attitudes toward CAPS. Another study (Ford et al., 2003) examined the relationship between police attitudes and receptivity toward the organizational adoption of community policing. They found that the level of commitment to community policing was directly related to the frequency of performing community policing activities. Their findings point to the importance of assessing officers' attitudes when implementing an organizational change, such as community policing.

In contrast, the Vera Institute of Justice evaluated officers' attitudes in the eight Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing (INOP) sites and found less positive results (Sadd & Grinc, 1994). Their findings suggested that patrol officers were resistant to the changes associated with community policing. The authors concluded that the reason for this may be that the officers did not have enough knowledge and training in the area of community policing and saw it as less than real police work.

Barriers to Implementation

With any organizational change, there will be barriers to contend with. One commonly discussed barrier is the lack of structural change (including decentralization of the command

structure needed to grant line officers autonomy to solve problems) that has occurred in agencies claiming to have implemented community policing (see Maguire, 1997). Another commonly recognized barrier is the traditional police subculture that tends to value crime fighting and law enforcement over community-building and problem-solving (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994; Paoline, Myers, & Worden, 2000). Both have been recognized as significant barriers to the full implementation of community policing in police agencies.

Skogan (2004) outlined common reasons why community policing efforts fail: resistance in the ranks, resistance by police managers, resistance by police unions, and resistance by special units. They also fail as a result of competing demands and expectations (such as homeland security), lack of interagency cooperation, problems evaluating performance, lack of community involvement, police misconduct, and leadership transitions. Zhao, Lovrich, and Thurman (1999) looked at impediments to community policing between 1993 and 1996. They found that community policing faces "overall internal structural and operational impediments in police organizations" (p. 85). These include problems balancing community policing activities (e.g., foot patrol) with maintaining rapid response times to 911 calls, resistance from middle management, officers' beliefs that community policing is soft on crime, and resistance toward community policing officers by patrol officers.

Alpert, Flynn, and Piquero (2001) discussed the importance of updating performance measures to reflect the principles of community policing. Because they send a message about what is valued in an organization, appropriate performance evaluation criteria are essential if we expect officers to change their behavior. They argue that officers will not see community policing as important unless it is tied to the evaluation process (Alpert et al., 2001).

Other barriers include unclear mission statements and goals, lack of resources, and problems with training (Giacomazzi & Brody, 2004; Zhao et al., 1995). Some research indicates that lack of resources presents a significant barrier to community policing implementation (see Sadd & Grinc, 1994), whereas others have found no such relationship (He, Zhao, & Lovrich, 2005). For example, Sadd and Grinc (1994) discovered that officers in Norfolk, Virginia, resented the expenditures on community policing activities when their entire department was lacking resources. Similarly, officers in Houston argued that community policing was impossible to implement with scarce resources. Goldstein (1990) suggested that police agencies conduct analyses of officer workload to ensure that officers are given enough time to engage in community policing and problem-solving activities. Other suggestions include utilizing differential response times, hiring civilians to take nonemergency reports, and forming partnerships with other agencies in an effort to share costs (Moslow, 1994; Sadd & Grinc, 1994; Skogan & Frydl, 2004).

Finally, training is a barrier to community policing implementation. Research has consistently shown that, despite the movement toward community policing, training has been slow to catch up. Most academy and field training hours continue to be devoted to law enforcement and crime-fighting activities (see Alpert & Dunham, 1997). Without proper training, officers will be less likely to understand the philosophy of community policing and/or how to translate the philosophy into effective practice (King & Lab, 2000).

Because the implementation of community policing varies substantially by agency, it is difficult to gauge its implementation, measure its impact, and confront its challenges (Greene, 1993; Wilson, 2004). Even in departments that ostensibly adopt the philosophy department-wide, the extent to which it is a part of everyday operations is still questionable. Many

departments report that they do community policing, but only assign a few specialized personnel to that particular role, whereas others split their force between rapid response teams and problem-solving officers (Skogan & Hartnett, 1997). Regardless of the implementation strategy, police departments must continue to deal with traditional crime problems, including responding to calls for service and making arrests, while deciding how to implement community-policing and problem-solving.

Current Study

This research sought to assess the extent to which community policing was accepted and practiced by a sample of patrol officers in one police agency that had ostensibly adopted the community policing model department-wide. The purpose of the data collection effort was to discern the extent to which patrol officers (a) endorsed the philosophy of community policing and problem solving and (b) utilized techniques consistent with community policing and problem solving in their daily activities. As research progressed, it became obvious that there was a lack of commitment to the community policing philosophy at the patrol level in this agency. Thus, a final goal was to assess the reasons for the lack of commitment.

The present study makes a contribution to our knowledge of community policing in several ways. First, community policing, by definition, is a local phenomenon. One of the overarching goals of community policing is to tailor policing to local residents' needs and wants (Eck & Rosenbaum, 1994; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). Thus, each community policing case study adds to our understanding of the way it is being implemented in different departments. The lessons learned from these studies can help police leaders implement community policing in their own agencies. Second, most existing studies of community policing have been conducted in the largest police agencies, like Los Angeles, New York City, Houston, and Chicago (see Greene, 2000; Skogan & Hartnett, 1997; Wycoff & Skogan, 1986). Such departments likely confront different challenges compared to the majority of small- and medium-sized departments (e.g., more complicated bureaucracies, more serious crime problems; see Zhao, Thurman, & Ren, 2008). Third, most existing studies have used quantitative data. Such studies are important, but they often lack the ability to increase our understanding of why officers may or may not engage in community policing and problem solving. This study relied on qualitative data to provide the "detailed, context-specific understanding of emerging levels of commitment to community policing and the factors that link beliefs with actions" (Ford et al., 2003, p. 179). Finally, most community policing implementation occurred in the 1990s. Now that the community policing philosophy has had time to settle in, it is important to reexamine its implementation and the barriers associated with it in the 21st century (Zhao et al., 2008).

Agency Setting

The agency (XPD) is a medium-sized municipal police department in Florida. It serves a town of approximately 100,000 people and is home to a major university. At the time of data collection, there were 275 sworn officers and 90 nonsworn personnel.⁴ The agency has an aviation unit, a K-9 unit, a forensics unit, a SWAT (special weapons and tactics) team, mounted patrol, and a motorcycle unit.

In 1985, community policing began as a separate unit of XPD. In the 1990s, the agency moved toward a department-wide community policing philosophy. Their mission statement reflects the importance of building partnerships with community residents and business owners to solve problems and enhance quality of life. Current practices include permanent assignments and geographic accountability (the agency is decentralized to three districts); community involvement (neighborhood crime watch groups, citizen's academy); foot, bike, and horse patrol; crime analysis; police substations in high-crime neighborhoods; and working with social service agencies and schools. The department regularly held meet-the-officer days, participated in National Night Out (and similar activities that aimed to increase trust between police and residents), published a monthly newsletter, and had a weekly television show. Furthermore, ranking members of the department are vocal supporters of community policing and publicly reinforce the idea that patrol officers should be engaging in problem-solving and community-building activities. XPD expects officers to use the SARA⁵ problem-solving model. In fact, the police agency was the recipient of a Goldstein award for problem-solving in the early 1990s. The regional training academy is based on a community policing, problem-solving model.

The author regularly met with ranking members of the department and attended the department's version of Compstat meetings. It was clear to the author that most members of the command staff were committed to community policing. For example, officers were often formally recognized for their problem-solving efforts at Compstat meetings (e.g., officer of the month) and command staff regularly spoke about ongoing problem solving efforts (e.g., coordinating with the local community college to provide computers to low-income children) and community-building activities (e.g., neighborhood watch [meetings and picnics], meet-the-officer days, and neighborhood cleanups). In fact, it was common for Compstat presentations to include photos of officers engaging in such activities.

It is important to note that XPD lacked two important components of community policing: their performance evaluation system was outdated (i.e., it primarily reflected traditional measures of policing performance) and they lacked in-service training in community policing. Both components are seen as major impediments to community policing implementation (see Alpert & Moore, 2000; Haarr, 2001).

Data and Methods

Students in an upper-level undergraduate community policing course at a large state university were offered an extra credit opportunity to go on one 10 hour ride along with the XPD. They were required to assess the degree to which community policing and problem solving were part of the police activity they observed. They also queried officers about whether they had received training in community-policing and what their views were toward community-policing and problem-solving. Depending on responses and rapport, students were instructed to probe where appropriate. For example, if officers were not supportive of community policing or had reservations about it, observers probed the officers about their reasons for resistance.

By the time students completed their ride along, they had 2 months' education in community policing theory and practice. The community policing course covered the theories and philosophies of community policing as well as sophisticated studies⁶ of community

policing implementation and effectiveness. We also discussed research design limitations and implications of the studies that we read. Furthermore, students were provided 2 hours of training on the use of participant observation in research. The preparation session consisted of an overview of bias and reactivity in research and interviewing (Mastrofski & Parks, 1990) as well as the importance and practices of notetaking, maintaining objectivity, and lessening observer effects.⁷ The students were well-versed in community policing philosophy and practice by the time they participated in their ride along.⁸ Participant observation is an appropriate methodology for determining differences and similarities between formal goals and informal implementation, and allows the officers to be observed in their natural environment. According to Babbie (1992), "field research is especially appropriate to the study of those topics for which attitudes and behaviors can best be understood within their natural setting" (p. 286).

Students studied a questionnaire⁹ developed by the author prior to participating in the ride along (to provide questions to ask the officers), but they were not allowed to take the questionnaire with them on the ride along (to minimize observer effects). Thus, they conducted unstructured interviews with the police officers that they rode with (Babbie, 1992, p. 293). The questionnaire also served as an outline upon which their narratives were based. It was made clear that students should omit answers to questions that they did not gather complete data on. Fifty-four students completed ride alongs.

Ride-along officers were chosen by the commanders of each district. The author requested that each student ride with a different officer to minimize threats to validity.¹⁰ Students rode with officers in all three patrol districts on all three shifts (day, evening, night).¹¹ The police department was promised anonymity and students were instructed not to reveal officers' names in their narratives.

Student narratives were analyzed by the author and a graduate student. Emergent themes, patterns, similarities, and dissimilarities were recorded. Keywords and observations were noted, color coded, and substantiated by further analysis and reading of the narratives until succinct themes had been developed.

Data consisted of qualitative narratives from observations and interviews with 54 officers. The qualitative narratives ranged in length from one page to six pages. Narratives contained a summary of the ride-along activities and a judgment on the extent to which community-policing and problem-solving were a part of the policing observed. Although the police department explicitly endorsed community policing, the ride alongs offer insight into the extent to which community policing was (or was not) internally and informally supported by a sample of patrol officers. They offered a view of the departmental environment and the extent to which community policing was practiced at the patrol level in the department.

Results

Tables 1 and 2 present the demographics of the police officer sample as well as statistics on the ride alongs themselves. Of the 54 officers observed,¹² 49 (90.7%) were male, 47 (87%) were White, 4 were Black, and 2 were Hispanic (see Table 1). The average age of the officers was 32 and the average tenure was 5.4 years (median 3, mode 2; see Table 2). Twelve of the officers (22%) had military experience and 51 (94%) of them were at the rank

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics of Police Officer Sample (*N* = 54)

Officer/Ride-Along Characteristics	<i>n</i>	Percent
Gender		
Male	49	90.7
Female	5	9.3
Race/ethnicity		
White	47	87
Black	4	7.4
Hispanic	2	3.7
Other	1	1.9
Military experience		
Yes	12	22.2
No	40	74.1
Unknown	2	3.7
Rank		
Patrol officer	51	94.4
Corporal	2	3.7
Sergeant	1	1.9
Ride-along Shift		
Day shift (7 a.m.-3 p.m.)	11	20.4
Evening shift (3 p.m.-11 p.m.)	35	64.8
Night shift (11 p.m.-7 a.m.)	8	14.8
Type of training curriculum		
Traditional	17	31.5
Community policing	10	18.5
Unknown	27	50.0
Endorsement of community policing		
Yes	26	48.1
No	27	50
Unknown	1	1.9
Participation in problem solving		
Yes	19	35.2
No	35	64.8
Citizen contacts (per officer)		
5 or less	21	38.9
6 to 10	19	35.2
11 or more	14	25.9
Traffic stops (per officer)		
None	22	40.7
1 or more	32	59.3
Arrests (per officer)		
None	35	64.8
1 or more	19	35.2

of patrol officer. Thirty-five (64.8%) students completed their ride alongs during the evening shift (3 p.m. to 11 p.m.), 11 (20.4%) completed them during the day shift (7 a.m. to 3 p.m.), and 8 (14.8%) completed them during the night shift (11 p.m. to 7 a.m.; see Table 1).

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics of Police Officer Sample (N = 54)

Officer/Ride-Along Characteristics	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range
Age	32	5.3	24-43
Tenure	5.4	4.8	1-18
Percentage of time spent on reactive policing	73.25	29.26	1-100
Percentage of time spent on proactive policing	25.17	27.91	1-100

Observers asked the officers what type of academy training they had. The regional police academy had recently adopted a community policing and problem-solving philosophy, thus it was interesting to know whether or not the officers completed the traditional curriculum or the newer curriculum. Many officers, however, completed their training in another jurisdiction. Seventeen (31.5%) of the officers were trained in a regional traditional-style police academy, whereas 10 (18.5%) of the officers were trained in a regional community-oriented style police academy. The remaining 27 (50%) either completed the training elsewhere (e.g., out of state) or did not provide this information (see Table 1).

Observers asked officers whether or not they endorsed (or believed in) community policing. They were also asked to judge whether or not their officer engaged in problem-solving techniques during their ride along. Overall, 26 (48.1%) officers said they believed in the community policing philosophy and 19 (35.2%) were observed by students using problem-solving techniques. Observers were asked to count citizen contacts, traffic stops, and arrests during their ride along. Twenty one (39%) engaged in 5 or fewer citizen contacts during the ride along, 19 (35%) engaged in 6 to 10 citizen contacts, and 14 (26%) engaged in 11 or more citizen contacts. Twenty two (40.7%) conducted no traffic stops and 32 (59%) conducted one or more traffic stops during the ride along. Thirty-five officers (64.8%) made no arrests, and 19 officers (35.2%) made one or more arrests during the ride along (see Table 1). Finally, students were asked to estimate the percentage of time the officer spent being reactive versus proactive.¹³ On average, officers spent almost 75% of their time reacting to calls for service and about 25% of their time being proactive (see Table 2). Herein, the themes from the qualitative data are discussed.

Implementing Community Policing

Although about half of the officers believed that community policing was a good idea, many of the officers focused on barriers to the full implementation of community policing in this agency. Next, the author focuses on three broadly defined obstacles to community policing discussed by officers during the ride alongs: lack of resources, time, and organizational resistance.

Lack of resources. Many officers felt that the primary barrier to the implementation of community policing was lack of resources, especially as it relates to personnel. Specifically, officers told stories about how the department did not have enough “manpower” to implement community policing. The consequences of having too little manpower (i.e., being

understaffed) were that there were too many calls for service to handle to focus on problem solving and meeting community residents. One officer commented, "XPD is too understaffed to fully execute community policing. It would work if they were fully staffed so that they could have time to communicate more one on one with the people" (White male, age 26, evening shift).

Another officer said, "I love the idea of community policing in XPD but we are too understaffed" (White male, age 38, day shift).

A student wrote, "The officer told me from the get-go that we wouldn't be doing anything proactive or practicing community policing because they were too short-staffed" (White male, no age given, day shift).

Similarly, another officer spoke about the agency's funding: "While it may look good on paper—the implementation of [community policing] is not reality. XPD does not have the funding or manpower to implement it" (White male, age 26, night shift).

Sadd and Grinc (1994) also found that resources were an impediment to community policing. They found that, in some cities, officers believed that community policing was difficult to implement due to a lack of resources. Future research should investigate the resources needed to successfully implement community policing.

According to the officers in the sample, lack of manpower meant that officers were assigned to larger beats than what is ideal in community policing, so officers were unable to get to know community residents. A few officers illustrated this to the students who rode along with them by driving the students around the periphery of their beat to show them the difficulty of building relationships with people in such a large area. One 35-year-old male officer on the day shift commented, "It is difficult to implement community policing because the size of our zones are so large."

A 38-year-old male officer on the evening shift argued, "Do you see a community? There is too much area to cover." Another officer asked, "Do you see how big this area is?" (White male, age 40, evening shift).

The literature suggests that size of beat is crucial to the successful implementation of community policing. Skogan and Hartnett (1997) argued that officers must be assigned to one area to ensure beat integrity, thus enabling officers and community members to build a relationship. In other words, "Agencies that assign fixed shifts and beats generally enjoy a higher success rate. Long-term and/or permanent shift assignment—the ultimate forms of decentralization—allow officers to learn more about people, places, issues, and problems within neighborhoods" (Sparrow, 1988, p. 5).

Relatedly, it has been argued that smaller police agencies are better at implementing community policing (Skolnick & Bayley, 1988; Weisheit et al., 1994). This is likely due to the fact that officers in smaller agencies have always been practicing a policing style that is similar to community policing, and that smaller agencies have fewer bureaucratic hurdles to overcome (Weisheit et al., 1994). Beats should be organized along natural neighborhood boundaries (Greene, 2000). That is, a beat should be defined by the common characteristics and interests of the populace, such as race or ethnicity, language, culture, and socioeconomic status (Greene, 2000). Beats should cover a whole neighborhood, rather than bisect it, and be small enough that officers can work within community networks. More research is needed on the relationship between beat size and officers' willingness and ability to perform community policing activities.

Some studies have found that the lack of resources is a significant barrier to the implementation of community policing (Sadd & Grinc, 1994), whereas others have found that resources are unrelated to community policing implementation (He et al., 2005). It is important that the police are provided with enough resources to get the job done (Goldstein, 1990). The literature suggests various ways to creatively deal with this barrier, such as partnering with other agencies in an effort to share costs and developing differential response systems (e.g., prioritizing calls for service; taking nonemergency police reports over the phone, by mail, or via the Internet; hiring civilians to take nonemergency reports) (Moslow, 1994; Sadd & Grinc, 1994; Skogan & Frydl, 2004).

Other researchers point to the importance of using resources more effectively, citing the evidence that more officers on the street does not necessarily equate to more satisfied constituents or a lower crime rate (Kelling, Pate, Dieckman, & Brown, 1974). Regardless of the strategy, it is important that police administrators make the structural changes necessary for community policing to work. This is especially true with regard to beat size. If beats are too large for officers to establish community, community policing is not likely to succeed.

Time. Community policing scholars have discussed the importance of officers having enough time to engage in community policing and this has often been tied to lack of resources. In the present study, the issue of time emerged as a distinct theme for two reasons. First, time constraints, as a result of responding to so many calls for service, were noted by officers as a reason why they do not practice community policing. Second, several students noted that the officer they rode with seemed to have an abundance of time, which, notably, was not used for community policing and problem-solving activities.

In terms of time constraints, many officers noted that time was limited. For example, one student commented, "I spoke with several officers and they quoted concerns such as time constraints of responding to service calls as a reason why community policing is difficult to implement."

Another officer wants to get involved, but lacks the time: "He told me that he would like to be more proactive and get involved but there are not enough hours in the day" (Black male, age 28, day shift).

An officer on the dayshift was too busy for community policing. Her student rider commented: "My officer didn't have time for community policing; she was too busy responding to calls and filling out reports from the calls" (White female, age 32, day shift).

Interestingly, many students also said they had a lot of down time during their ride along. One student and his officer on the evening shift watched a baseball game while they waited for calls to respond to. Another student and her officer went to play with the K-9 unit during their down time. Other students discussed how they spent time looking for illegally parked vehicles so that they could write parking tickets. "Sam said that, usually, he sits in front of the ATM at the grocery store and people will park next to him in a handicapped spot and get out to use the ATM. He gets out and writes them a ticket. All of our time was spent responding to calls or patrolling parking lots for illegally parked vehicles. We did not even venture into the realm of community policing" (White male, approximately 40, day shift).¹⁴

Clearly, at least some of the officers had extra time that they could have used to work on community policing and problem solving. This may indicate that the resource problem cited by so many officers is more of a perception than a reality. It should be noted that

cultural resistance to community policing invariably includes officers believing that responding to calls for service leaves them with too little time to practice community policing (Glensor & Peak, 1995). Another study found that officers did not engage in community policing or problem solving during their uncommitted time (Famega, Frank, & Mazerolle, 2005). They suggest that officers will not proactively engage in community policing and problem solving unless supervisors provide them with clear directives to do so (Engel & Worden, 2003).

There are practical implications to this finding. First, some officers may simply not be willing to engage in proactive community policing activities unless they are given clear guidelines regarding what to do and how to do it. Second, they may not have had enough training to know how to do proactive problem solving and community engagement. Indeed, Sadd and Grinc (1994) found that many officers knew very little about community policing because they had not been trained. Third, when officers are not evaluated on problem solving and community policing, there is no incentive to engage in such activities. These issues suggest that officers need more training and that the XPD should update their performance evaluation rubric to reflect problem solving and community policing. Finally, it may imply a need for separate units. Although usually not a suggested method of community policing implementation (see Skogan, 2004), it is likely that many officers joined the policing profession when crime fighting and law enforcement were the primary missions. These officers may never be willing to participate in community policing activities. Some research indicates that community policing specialists spend more time on problem-solving activities than do patrol generalists (Parks, Mastrofski, DeJong, & Gray, 1999).

On the other hand, there are ways that police departments can assess resource needs. Goldstein (1990) suggested that an agency may be able to obtain more time for officers to practice community policing by conducting analyses of calls for service and officer workload to assess how they spend their time. The data generated would provide information regarding resource needs and help to ensure that resources are allocated appropriately. Furthermore, research indicates that, overall, response time is not that important and quick response times only matter in a small percentage of cases (e.g., crimes in progress) (Percey, 1980). Therefore, if nonemergency calls can be shifted to nonsworn personnel (or handled via phone or Internet), sworn officers would have more time to engage in problem solving and community policing (Moslow, 1994).

The larger issue, of course, is that officers must focus on resolving substantive crime and disorder problems because focusing on these deep-seated issues will reduce calls for service in the long term. Therefore, making the effort to be creative with calls for service early on so that sworn personnel can focus on community problems is in an investment in the future of the community. In the long run, it will reduce what initially feels like a need for more resources and personnel. The goal is to reduce calls for service so that ultimately fewer resources are needed.

Organizational resistance. Many officers commented on different aspects of the culture in XPD. Comments tended to relate to the lack of change in the organizational structure of the agency. Police scholars note that organizational change (e.g., decentralization) must occur in order for a cultural shift to take place and for community policing to come to fruition (Adams et al., 2002; Skogan & Hartnett, 1997).

Comments by officers suggested that the culture of XPD had not been redefined in terms of community policing and officers have not endorsed the philosophy. One student wrote,

When I was at roll call, everyone laughed when the sergeant told me that I would ride along with officer X to learn about community policing. 'Don't worry, we're not laughing at you, we're laughing at the community policing part!' Even the top guys were laughing.

Other observers noted the following examples of organizational resistance: "Officer X, who seemed to have trouble distinguishing community policing from 'liberal gibberish' just laughed when I brought up the subject" (White male, 30s, night shift).

Another officer provided a more concise response when asked about community policing. "When I asked [him] what he thought of community policing, he called it 'crap'" (White male, approximately 40, day shift).

The following excerpt is from a student who had the opportunity to discuss the issue with a group of officers. He concluded,

What was even more funny was the officers' view of community policing. They had no interest in it at all or in using problem-solving techniques, simply because they know the people they deal with don't want that. The police feel that no matter what they do, people they arrest and catch committing crimes will always hate them (White male, age 26, evening shift).

This quote suggests that officers believe that community policing is geared toward offenders. Although that may be true in some cases (e.g., information gathering), community policing is a much broader concept that is geared toward increasing quality of life, building relationships with community residents (especially those that are law-abiding), and solving community-defined problems. It does not mean, however, that officers will not continue to enforce the law against those who break it. This finding clearly suggests that the officers (who expressed this) do not have a clear understanding of the philosophy and goals of community policing. Again, it indicates that the officers need more training, education, and perhaps mentoring in the philosophy and skills of community policing.

Cultural resistance has been cited as one of the biggest impediments to community policing (Giacomazzi & Brody, 2004; Paoline et al., 2000). Clearly, many of the officers saw community policing activities as unworthy of their time and consideration. Some officers were more open to the idea but were still less than optimistic about its potential for success. The following two officers referred to problems with more seasoned XPD officers:

My officer told me that although he enjoys interactions with the public, many of the senior officers do not. They often sit in dark parking lots by themselves. He said that during their down time the officers are supposed to be doing community policing (White male, age 26, evening shift).

Another officer commented, "A lot of officers do not take it seriously and just wait for the next call. If everyone doesn't believe it will work, the odds of it being successful are really low" (White male, age 26, evening shift).

Finally, a night shift officer summed it up this way: "I believe community policing is a great idea and that is all it will ever be" (White male, age 29, night shift).

These observations reflect clear examples of organizational or cultural resistance within the police agency. The police subculture must be redefined to value the participation of other service providers and citizens as partners. Similarly, the successful transition to community policing requires a change in the management and organization of the agency. Midlevel management must provide administrative support and believe in the philosophy themselves, so that they can model attitudes and behaviors for patrol officers (Glensor & Peak, 1995; Wilson, 1968). Research shows that the failure of past innovations may have in part been attributed to lack of managerial support (Sherman, 1973). Although this issue is beyond the scope of the current study, future research should investigate the relationship between middle management support for community policing and patrol officer behavior (Engel & Worden, 2003).

Training in community policing and problem solving must be provided and required for all officers and administrators. Two officers mentioned the lack of training in community relations. In fact, one of them said that the police academy presented an adversarial relationship between the officer and the community. Obviously, if we expect officers to do community policing, they must be trained in such skills at the academy as well as in field- and in-service training (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). In Chicago, officers who felt that they were well-trained in community policing held much more positive views toward community policing compared to officers who did not feel well-trained. They were also more optimistic about its impact on crime (Skogan & Hartnett, 1997).

Importantly, only one of the officers mentioned his supervisor's endorsement of community policing. An observer wrote, "community policing is very important and he told me his sergeant thinks so too which also gives him motivation to do community policing" (White male, age 27, evening shift).

Many scholars agree that patrol officers adopt the beliefs of their immediate supervisors; thus their endorsement of community policing is critical (Engel & Worden, 2003; Ford et al., 2003; Rosenbaum et al., 1994; Wilson & Bennett, 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1994). Similarly, officers must be rewarded for problem-solving efforts and the activities associated with community policing as this sends the message that community policing is more than just lip service (Lewis et al., 1999). All levels of management must understand, support, and believe in the philosophy if they expect patrol officers to implement it. One observer sums up her experience this way:

Community policing is not an integral part of the police work I observed. I believe that this might have been because of how busy they were responding to calls for service. I did not observe any proactive police initiated contacts. When I spoke about community policing, the officers brushed it off and at some points laughed at it. I definitely do not think it is part of XPD . . . I also noticed this during briefing before the shift. The head officer was reading off arrests from the night before and he was congratulating those officers who had made many arrests. He did not speak about the community. He was speaking more about traditional policing (White female, age 25, evening shift).

The above quote brings together several challenges to community policing noted by officers in the narratives, such as time constraints, organizational resistance, and lack of reinforcement by supervisors. Next, we focus on officers who endorsed community policing.

Officers Who Embraced Community Policing

Several officers were proponents of community policing and discussed the benefits of it with the students who rode with them. For example, an observer noted the following in an interview with a 43-year-old White male officer from the day shift:

He has gotten to know everyone who attends neighborhood meetings and it makes his job easier in the community. He enjoys knowing who lives where he patrols so that he can better serve the people and he actually knows what is going on in the community. People invite him to their get-togethers and it makes him feel more like a part of the community instead of just a law-enforcer.

A few other officers mentioned neighborhood meetings, getting to know business owners, enjoying the aspect of knowing the community, and having permanent beat assignments. Some students witnessed foot patrols in the downtown area and information-gathering techniques used by several officers. Many officers drove around their beat and waved to residents, mediated disputes, and discussed the importance of knowing how to communicate with citizens. One officer played football with the children in one of the neighborhoods in his beat. A student commented,

The way [my officer] handled situations was kind of like a father, where he was trying to see what caused the problem and solve it, and at the same time be a type of friend to the people he came into contact with.

What does this tell us about the officers who claimed to have no time or resources to engage in community policing or problem solving? Clearly, making time for such activities is an option for some officers. This could be due to differences in beat activities or shift assignments. For example, officers on the day shift with a smaller beat may have more free time to engage in proactive activities, whereas officers on the evening/night shift may be too busy responding to calls for service to engage in community policing and problem solving. Again, this speaks to the importance of establishing appropriate beats and assessing workload.

Another observer writes:

The officer felt that if you maintained close ties to the community that citizens wouldn't be as fearful of him when he was driving or walking around at night. He wanted a positive relationship so when problems arose, suspects wouldn't flee or run away. . . . The officer thought it was important to know most people's names and where they lived so he could start conversations with them and familiarize himself with the citizens and what they are involved in . . . the officer made significant attempts to acquaint himself with individuals walking throughout his zone that he had not previously met (White male, age 27, evening shift).

The examples above illustrate the fact that at least a few officers are implementing community policing in this agency. Perhaps these officers will model their behavior for their colleagues, and the community policing philosophy will begin to permeate the traditional police subculture that characterized the majority of the sample.

Discussion and Conclusion

Community policing has existed in theory since the 1970s, but over 30 years later, its implementation still varies substantially across police agencies. Scholars have recognized many barriers to its implementation, including lack of community involvement, lack of organizational change, and a traditional police subculture that values law enforcement over problem solving. The present study looked at a small sample of officers from a police agency that had ostensibly adopted community policing department-wide to assess the extent to which patrol officers endorsed the philosophy and put it into practice. Furthermore, it sought to increase our understanding of the barriers that prevent line officers from implementing community policing. Results indicated that lack of resources, time constraints, and the organizational culture are significant barriers to community policing implementation in this agency.

This study is important for several reasons. First, community policing is a local phenomenon. By definition, strategies associated with the community policing philosophy should be tailored to the local community (Weisburd & McElroy, 1988). Thus, investigating the way it is done (or not done) in different types of agencies and communities continues to be important. Second, much of the extant research on community policing implementation was conducted in large agencies using quantitative methods. There continues to be a need to investigate community policing in medium-sized agencies using qualitative methods. Finally, there are still relatively few studies on community policing implementation, and the Committee on Law and Justice has called for more research in this area (Skogan & Frydl, 2004).

Results of the present study indicated that even in an agency that has claimed to fully adopt community policing, significant barriers to its implementation still exist. Data suggested that community policing in this agency is likely more of a departmental philosophy than a set of operational procedures. It appears to have been adopted at the command level but has not trickled down to the line level.¹⁵ This is an example of loose-coupling between administrative priorities and operational procedures. In other words, there is a disjuncture between the stated organizational goals of the agency and everyday police tasks (Maguire & Katz, 2002; Mastrofski, Ritti & Hoffmaster, 1987). Interestingly, past research suggests that patrol officers have more negative attitudes toward problem solving and community policing than those in the higher ranks (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994; Skogan et al., 1999).

Many of the officers viewed community policing as a good idea and have a positive attitude toward it but believe that XPD is not equipped to put it into practice. They believe that XPD does not have enough resources, and this in turn affects beat size and officers' relative time available to spend on problem-solving activities. Even officers who are enthusiastic about the philosophy will seldom practice it if they do not have the support that they require (Engel & Worden, 2003). This finding is similar to Schafer (2002) who found that many officers agreed with community policing in theory (i.e., positive global attitudes) but had concerns about the way it was operationalized in their particular department (i.e., negative specific attitudes).

The traditional police subculture is a significant barrier to the successful implementation of community policing in this agency. Some officers are cynical or simply laugh at the idea

of community policing. An explanation for this could be that they have not seen the positive results of community policing and/or that the organization has not sufficiently prepared them for the change in philosophy and practice. Organizational change must take place—including training of all officers, supervisors, and ranking personnel—to ensure that officers not only understand the philosophy of community policing and problem solving but that they possess the skills needed to implement it well (Glensor & Peak, 1995).

Implications

Scholars have offered many explanations for community policing resistance. Research has shown that there is often conflict between the street cops and the management cops (Reuss-Ianni, 1983), which may help to explain community policing resistance among patrol officers in this agency. It is clear that the administration has adopted at least the rhetoric of community policing, but again, the results of the present study showed that their beliefs (or rhetoric) have not trickled down to the patrol officers in this sample. Extant research points to the importance of supervisory influences (Engel & Worden, 2003). It is possible that middle management is the missing link to fully implementing community policing in this agency. Perhaps more effort should go toward training middle management in the skills and philosophies of community policing. Indeed, supervisors work closely with line officers and therefore have a direct impact on line-officer behavior (Engel & Worden, 2003).

Most officers in this sample were either apathetic about community policing or unsure how to implement it. This points to the importance of training and incentives. This agency did not provide or require regular in-service training for officers in community policing. Furthermore, field training in the agency was based on the San Jose field training officer (FTO) model and did not reflect community policing or problem solving. It is imperative that officers have the knowledge and skills to effectively implement the strategy. Similarly, it is likely that there are few meaningful incentives for officers to engage in problem solving and community policing. Agencies must make officers internally accountable for engaging in proactive activities by tying career advancement (e.g., raises, promotions) and rewards to the tasks that make community policing a success (Alpert et al., 2001; Kelling, 1992). Officers are unlikely to put forth an effort toward implementing a new strategy if a reward structure is not in place. Officially, police agencies send the message that they do not value community policing if they do not measure the activities associated with it.

Clearly, some officers participated in community policing and appeared to enjoy it. This may indicate that community policing would be better implemented in this agency as a separate unit, although this strategy is not recommended by most policing scholars (see DeJong et al., 2001; Skogan, 2004). Although most scholars agree that community policing should be a department-wide philosophy, it may be unrealistic to expect officers to engage in community policing activities when they must simultaneously answer calls for service. When an officer knows that she or he may receive a 911 call at any moment, she or he may be reluctant to begin a conversation with a neighborhood resident or business owner in fear that she or he could have to leave abruptly to answer a call for service. A solution to this problem is to conduct a workload study to measure the amount of time officers spend on crime issues, calls for service, and report writing.

Such a study would generate information about the number of officers and time needed to fulfill those basic duties. Based on the results, the agency could allow their officers a certain amount of time per day or week to be free from the radio and engage in community policing activities. Of course, workload demands will vary by beat, so any study should take that into account.

This was a case study of one department; therefore, results should be interpreted with caution as they may not be generalizable to other police departments. The data come directly from undergraduate student observations of officers on one 10 hour shift. The shift that they chose could have been an unusual one and/or the students could have misinterpreted the information. In addition, reactivity could have threatened the validity of the results. The key factor is that, in most cases, students were immediately taken into the officers' confidence. The fact that the observers were undergraduate students (rather than graduate students or trained observers/interviewers) could also impact the validity and reliability of the results. However, results indicated that officers felt comfortable talking to the students and sharing their views on community policing and problem solving. Another limitation is that ride-alongs were not selected randomly; they were chosen by the commanders in each district. Though command staff were asked to randomize the ride-along assignments, it was impossible to ensure that they did so and this could impact the validity of the results. Future research could correct these limitations by using graduate students or trained interviewers and ensuring that shifts and officers are drawn from a random sample.

In conclusion, many quantitative studies have investigated police attitudes toward community policing. It is important because it is believed that in order for community policing to be successful, police officers must believe in it. Furthermore, most existing studies have only looked at whether (or not) officers believed in the philosophy but have lacked the ability to answer the question, *why?* This study adds to our understanding by disentangling the reasons why officers struggle with the implementation of community policing. Future research should continue to investigate officers' views so that agencies struggling with the implementation of community policing can advance their understanding of the barriers and make the necessary changes to ensure that community policing is a success.

Notes

1. It should be noted that the decision to implement community policing could also come from the local government. The idea could also be generated by line-level police officers or local residents.

2. For example, when community policing is implemented as a separate unit, officers who serve in the unit may not be seen as real police officers by their traditional counterparts (Sadd & Grinc, 1994; Skogan, 2004).

3. A reviewer correctly suggested that these findings could be due to selection bias, as officers self-selected into the XPD.

4. According to informal conversations with command staff, the agency was somewhat understaffed at the time of this study.

5. Scan, Analysis, Respond, Assess.

6. For example, they read seminal studies of problem solving and community policing (Cordner, 2001; Eck & Spelman, 1987; Goldstein, 1979, 1987; Wilson & Kelling, 1982) as well as more recent studies of community policing in Savannah, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Boston, and New York City.

7. Students were instructed how to measure the phenomena they saw on their ride along in an effort to maximize interrater reliability.

8. The fact that they were undergraduate students cuts both ways: It is possible that the officers did not view them as credible researchers due to their youthfulness, but at the same time, officers likely felt less threatened by an undergraduate student than a more experienced and sophisticated researcher.

9. Questionnaire available from the author on request.
10. As names were eliminated from the narratives, this cannot be proven. It is based on the word of the district commander.
11. Day shift (7 a.m. to 3 p.m.), evening shift (3 p.m. to 11 p.m.), and night shift (11 p.m. to 7 a.m.).
12. This information is based on the primary officer only, even though students occasionally had the opportunity to talk with other officers (e.g., during meals, on breaks).
13. Reactive policing was defined as responding to calls for service, whereas proactive policing referred to instances where officers engaged in problem solving, follow up investigations, traffic stops, community outreach (e.g., neighborhood meetings, talking to people in the community), and so on.
14. These officers did not differ significantly from the rest of the sample. They were negative toward community policing but did not cite time constraints as a barrier. This finding was discussed with one of the members of the command staff. He explained the negativity by saying that most of the patrol officers were rookies and therefore had not had enough experience to recognize the benefits of community policing.
15. However, one of the command staff told me that community policing actually began at the patrol level of the organization.

References

- Adams, R., Rohe, W. M., & Arcury, T. A. (2002). Implementing community-oriented policing: Organizational change and street officer attitudes. *Crime & Delinquency*, 48, 399-430.
- Alpert, G. P., & Dunham, R. G. (1997). *Policing urban America*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Alpert, G. P., Flynn, D., & Piquero, A. R. (2001). Effective community policing performance measures. *Justice Research and Policy*, 3, 79-94.
- Alpert, G. P., & Moore, M. (2000). Measuring police performance in the new paradigm of policing. In G. P. Alpert & A. R. Piquero (Eds.), *Community policing: Contemporary readings* (2nd ed., pp. 215-232). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Babbie, E. (1992). *The practice of social research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Bayley, D. H. (1988). Community policing: A report from the devil's advocate. In J. R. Greene & S. D. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality?* (pp. 225-238). New York: Praeger.
- Boydston, J. E., & Sherry, M. E. (1975). *San Diego community profile: Final report*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2000). *Local police departments, 1997*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Chappell, A. T., & Lanza-Kaduce, L. (2004). Integrating sociological research with community-oriented policing: Bridging the gap between academics and practice. *Journal of Applied Sociology/Sociological Practice*, 21(6), 80-98.
- Community Policing Consortium. (2006). *About community policing*. Retrieved August 23, 2006, from <http://www.communitypolicing.org/about2.html>.
- Cordner, G. W. (1991). A problem oriented approach to community-oriented policing. In J. R. Greene & S. D. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality?* (pp. 135-152). New York: Praeger.
- Cordner, G. W. (2001). Community policing elements and effects. In R. G. Dunham & G. P. Alpert (Eds.), *Critical issues in policing* (4th ed., pp. 493-510). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Cordner, G. W., & Biebel, E. P. (2005). Problem-oriented policing in practice. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 4, 155-180.
- DeJong, C., Mastrofski, S. D., & Parks, R. B. (2001). Patrol officers and problem solving: An application of expectancy theory. *Justice Quarterly*, 18, 31-61.
- Eck, J., & Rosenbaum, D. P. (1994). The new police order: Effectiveness, equity, and efficiency in community policing. In D. P. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promises* (pp. 3-24). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Eck, J., & Spelman, W. (1987). Who ya gonna call? The police as problem-busters. *Crime & Delinquency*, 33, 31-52.
- Engel, R. S., & Worden, R. (2003). Police officers' attitudes, behavior and supervisory influences: An analysis of problem solving. *Criminology*, 41, 131-166.

- Famega, C. N., Frank, J., & Mazerolle, L. (2005). Managing police patrol time: The role of supervisor directives. *Justice Quarterly*, 22, 540-559.
- Ford, K. J., Weissbein, D. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2003). Distinguishing organizational from strategy commitment: Linking officers' commitment to community policing to job behaviors and satisfaction. *Justice Quarterly*, 20, 159-185.
- Fridell, L. (2004). The results of three national surveys on community policing. In L. Fridell & M. A. Wycoff (Eds.), *Community policing: Past, present, and future* (pp. 39-58). Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, The Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Gaines, L., Worrall, J. L., Southerland, M. D., & Angell, J. E. (2003). *Police administration* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- General Accounting Office. (2005). Community policing grants: COPS grants were a modest contributor to declines in crime in the 1990s. Washington, DC: Author.
- Giacomazzi, A., & Brody, D. (2004). The effectiveness of external assessments in facilitating organizational change in law enforcement. *Policing*, 27, 37-55.
- Glensor, R. W., & Peak, K. (1995). Implementing change: Community-oriented policing and problem solving. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 65(7), 14-21.
- Goldstein, H. (1979). Improving policing. A problem-oriented approach. *Crime & Delinquency*, 25, 236-258.
- Goldstein, H. (1987). Toward community-oriented policing: Potential, basic requirements, and threshold questions. *Crime & Delinquency*, 33, 6-30.
- Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented policing*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Greene, H. T. (1993). Community-oriented policing in Florida. *American Journal of Police*, 12, 141-155.
- Greene, J. R. (1989). Police officer job satisfaction and community perceptions: Implications for community-oriented policing. *Journal of Research in Crime & Delinquency*, 26, 168-183.
- Greene, J. R. (2000). The road to community policing in Los Angeles: A case study. In G. P. Alpert & A. R. Piquero (Eds.), *Community policing: Contemporary readings* (2nd ed., pp. 123-158). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Greene, J. R., & Mastrofski, S. (1988). *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality?*. New York: Praeger.
- Haarr, R. N. (2001). The making of a community policing officer: The impact of basic training and occupational socialization on police recruits. *Police Quarterly*, 4, 402-433.
- Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural inertia and organizational change. *American Sociological Review*, 49, 149-164.
- He, N. P., Zhao, J. S., & Lovrich, N. P. (2005). Community policing: A preliminary assessment of environmental impact with panel data on program implementation in U.S. cities. *Crime & Delinquency*, 51, 295-317.
- Kelling, G. L. (1992). Measuring what matters: A new way of thinking about crime and public order. *City Journal*, 2, 21-34.
- Kelling, G. L., Pate, A., Dieckman, D., & Brown, C. (1974). *The Kansas City preventive patrol experiment: A technical report*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- King, W. R., & Lab, S. P. (2000). Crime prevention, community policing, and training: Old wine in new bottles. *Police Practice and Research*, 1, 241-252.
- Langworthy, R., & Travis, L. (2003). *Policing in America. A balance of forces* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lewis, S., Rosenberg, H., & Sigler, R. (1999). Acceptance of community policing among police officers and police administrators. *Policing*, 22, 567-588.
- Lurigio, A. J., & Rosenbaum, D. P. (1994). The impact of community policing on police personnel: A review of the literature. In D. P. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promises* (pp. 147-163). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lurigio, A. J., & Skogan, W. G. (1994). Winning the hearts and minds of police officers: An assessment of staff perceptions of community policing in Chicago. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40, 315-330.
- MacDonald, J. M. (2002). The effectiveness of community policing in reducing urban violence. *Crime & Delinquency*, 48, 592-618.
- Maguire, E. R. (1997). Structural change in large municipal police organizations during the community policing era. *Justice Quarterly*, 14, 547-576.
- Maguire, E. R., & Katz, C. M. (2002). Community policing, loose coupling, and sensemaking in American police agencies. *Justice Quarterly*, 19, 503-536.

- Maguire, E. R., Kuhns, J. B., Uchida, C. D., & Cox, S. M. (1997). Patterns of community policing in nonurban America. *Journal of research in Crime & Delinquency*, 34, 368-394.
- Mastrofski, S. D., & Parks, R. (1990). Improving observational studies of the police. *Criminology*, 28, 475-496.
- Mastrofski, S. D., Ritti, R. R., & Hoffmaster, D. (1987). Organizational determinants of police discretion: The case of drinking-driving. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 15, 387-402.
- Mastrofski, S. D., Worden, R. E., & Snipes, J. B. (1995). Law enforcement in a time of community policing. *Criminology*, 33, 539-563.
- McElroy, J. E., Cosgrove, C. A., & Sadd, S. (1993). *Community policing: The CPOP in New York*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Moslow, J. J. (1994). False alarms: Cause for alarm. *FBI law enforcement bulletin*, 63, 1-5.
- Muhlhausen, D. (2001). *Do community oriented policing services grants affect violent crime rates. A report of the heritage center for data analysis*. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation.
- Paoline III, E., Myers, S. M., & Worden, R. E. (2000). Police culture, individualism, and community policing: Evidence from two police departments. *Justice Quarterly*, 17, 575-605.
- Parks, R. B., Mastrofski, S. D., DeJong, C., & Gray, K. (1999). How officers spend their time with the community. *Justice Quarterly*, 16, 483-518.
- Pate, A. M., & Shtull, P. (1994). Community policing grows in Brooklyn: An inside view of the New York City police department's model precinct. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40, 384-410.
- Pelfrey, W. V. (2004). The inchoate nature of community policing: Differences between community policing and traditional police officers. *Justice Quarterly*, 21, 579-601.
- Percey, S. L. (1980). Response time and citizen evaluation of the police. *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 8, 75-86.
- Reuss-Ianni, E. (1983). *Two cultures of policing: Street cops and management cops*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Rosenbaum, D. P., & Lurigio, A. J. (1994). An inside look at community policing reform: Definitions, organizational changes, and evaluation findings. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40, 299-314.
- Rosenbaum, D. P., Yeh, S., & Wilkinson, D. L. (1994). Impact of community policing on police personnel: A quasi experimental test. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40, 331-353.
- Sadd, S., & Grinc, R. M. (1994). *Innovative neighborhood-oriented policing: Descriptions of programs in eight cities*. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Schafer, J. A. (2002). "I'm not against it in theory...": Global and specific community policing attitudes. *Policing*, 25, 669-686.
- Schwartz, A., & Clarren, S. (1977). *The Cincinnati team policing experiment: A summary report*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute and Police Foundation.
- Sherman, L. (1973). *Team policing: Seven case studies*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- Skogan, W. (2004). Community policing: Common impediments to success. In L. Fridell & M. A. Wycoff (Eds.). *Community policing: Past, present, and future* (pp. 159-167). Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, The Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Skogan, W., & Frydl, K. (Eds.). (2004). *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.
- Skogan, W., & Hartnett, S. M. (1997). *Community policing, Chicago style*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Skogan, W. G., Hartnett, S. M., Dubois, J., Comey, J. T., Kaiser, M., & Lovig, J. H. (1999). *On the beat: Police and community problem solving*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Skolnick, J., & Bayley, D. (1988). Theme and variation in community policing. *Crime and Justice*, 10, 1-37.
- Sparrow, M. K. (1988). *Implementing community policing. Research in brief*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Thurman, Q. & McGarrell, E. (2003). *Community Policing in a rural setting* (2nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Trojanowicz, R. C., & Banas, D. W. (1985). *Job satisfaction: A comparison of foot patrol versus motor patrol officers*. East Lansing, MI: National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center, Michigan State University, School of Criminal Justice.
- Trojanowicz, R. C., & Bucqueroux, B. (1990). *Community policing: A contemporary perspective*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- United States Government Accountability Office. (2005). *Community policing grants: COPS grants were a modest contributor to declines in crime in the 1990s* (GAO-06-104). Washington, DC: Author.

- Walker, S. (1999). *Police in America: An introduction* (3rd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Weisburd, D., & McElroy, J. D. (1988). Enacting the CPO role: Findings from the New York City pilot program in community policing. In J. R. Greene & S. D. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality?* (pp. 89-102). New York: Praeger.
- Weisburd, D. S., Mastrofski, S., McNally, A. M., Greenspan, R., & Willis, J. (2003). Reforming to preserve: COMPSTAT and strategic problem solving in American policing. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 2, 421-456.
- Weisheit, R. A., Wells, L. E., & Falcone, D. N. (1994). Community policing in small town and rural America. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40, 549-567.
- Wilkinson, D. L., & Rosenbaum, D. P. (1994). The effects of organizational structure on community policing: A comparison of two cities. In D. P. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promises* (pp. 53-74). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Willis, J. J., Mastrofski, S. D., & Weisburd, D. (2004). COMPSTAT and bureaucracy: A case study of challenges and opportunities for change. *Justice Quarterly*, 21, 462-496.
- Wilson, D. G., & Bennett, S. F. (1994). Officers' response to community policing: Variations on a theme. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40, 354-370.
- Wilson, J. M. (2004). A measurement model approach to estimating community policing implementation. *Justice Research and Policy*, 6, 1-24.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1968). *Varieties of police behavior*. New York: Atheneum.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). Broken windows. *Atlantic Monthly*, 249(3), 29-38.
- Worrall, J. L., & Kovandzic, T. V. (2007). COPS grants and crime revisited. *Criminology*, 45, 159-190.
- Wycoff, M. A., & Skogan, W. G. (1986). Storefront police offices: The Houston field test. In D. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *Community crime prevention: Does it work?*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Wycoff, M. A., & Skogan, W. G. (1994). The effects of a community policing management style on officers' attitudes. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40, 371-383.
- Yates, D. L., & Pillai, V. K. (1996). Attitudes toward community policing: A causal analysis. *Social Science Journal*, 33, 193-209.
- Zhao, J., Lovrich, Q. C., & Thurman, N. P. (1999). The status of community policing in American cities: Facilitation and impediments revisited. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 22(1), 74-92.
- Zhao, J., Scheider, M. C., & Thurman, Q. (2002). Funding community policing to reduce crime: Have COPS grants made a difference?. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 2, 7-32.
- Zhao, J., Thurman, Q. C., & Lovrich, N. P. (1995). Community-oriented policing across the U.S.: Facilitators and impediments to implementation. *American Journal of Police*, 1, 11-28.
- Zhao, J., Thurman, Q. C., & Ren, L. (2008). An examination of strategic planning in American law enforcement agencies: A national study. *Police Quarterly*, 11, 3-26.

Allison T. Chappell is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology and Criminal Justice at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia. She earned her PhD in sociology from the University of Florida in 2005. She conducts research in the areas of policing, occupational socialization, and the sociology of law. Her work has appeared in journals such as *Deviant Behavior*, *Crime & Delinquency*, and *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*.