Public Safety Canada | Sécurité publique Canada

ARCHIVED - Archiving Content

ARCHIVÉE - Contenu archivé

Archived Content

Information identified as archived is provided for reference, research or recordkeeping purposes. It is not subject to the Government of Canada Web Standards and has not been altered or updated since it was archived. Please contact us to request a format other than those available.

Contenu archivé

L'information dont il est indiqué qu'elle est archivée est fournie à des fins de référence, de recherche ou de tenue de documents. Elle n'est pas assujettie aux normes Web du gouvernement du Canada et elle n'a pas été modifiée ou mise à jour depuis son archivage. Pour obtenir cette information dans un autre format, veuillez communiquer avec nous.

This document is archival in nature and is intended for those who wish to consult archival documents made available from the collection of Public Safety Canada.

Some of these documents are available in only one official language. Translation, to be provided by Public Safety Canada, is available upon request.

Le présent document a une valeur archivistique et fait partie des documents d'archives rendus disponibles par Sécurité publique Canada à ceux qui souhaitent consulter ces documents issus de sa collection.

Certains de ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans une langue officielle. Sécurité publique Canada fournira une traduction sur demande.

Canada

Community Policing in America: Changing the Nature, Structure, and Function of the Police

by Jack R. Greene

ABSTRACT

This essay reviews the rise of community- and problem-oriented policing as major vehicles to improve the effectiveness of police efforts in communities and as means of reforming police organizations. The essay considers the historical development of various models of policing, examining the assumptions embedded in each of these often-competing emphases. The essay goes on to review extant research on the impacts of community policing on communities, police organizations, police work, and police officers. Findings from various studies suggest that community and problem-oriented policing have had modest impacts on community crime but larger impacts on the quality of interaction between the police and the public. In addition, extant research suggests that police organizations are slowly adopting the philosophy and practices of community and problem-oriented policing and have shown some change in police structure and service delivery. Changes associated with problem solving within police agencies are less evident in the research literature. More often than not, the police are using traditional approaches to respond to problems identified in community settings. Finally, the research literature suggests that police officers' conception of their roles and their attachment to police work are improving with the adoption of community and problem-oriented policing roles. Police job satisfaction is

Jack R. Greene is Professor of Criminal Justice and Dean of the College of Criminal Justice at Northeastern University.

also seen as increasing for officers associated with community policing efforts. The essay concludes with a consideration of the forces that are continuing to shape American policing and the need to tackle the largest obstacle identified in opposition to community and problem-oriented policing—namely, the police bureaucracy.

ABSTRACT

Community policing, or variations of it, has become the national mantra of the American police. Throughout the United States, the language, symbolism, and programs of community policing have sprung up in urban, suburban, and even rural police departments. For more than 15 years and through at least one generation of police officers, community and problem-oriented policing have been advanced by their advocates as powerful organizing themes for an emergent style of public safety. How these themes have impacted American policing is yet uncertain. The range and complexity of programs associated with community and problem-oriented policing have often precluded systematic scientific investigation. Moreover, community and problem-oriented policing are themselves "moving targets"—changing and modifying themselves in what is an often turbulent environment for law enforcement. Eck and Rosenbaum (1994, 3) note:

> Community policing has become a new orthodoxy for cops. Simultaneously ambitious and ambiguous, community policing promises to change radically the relationship between the police and the public, address underlying community problems, and improve the living conditions of neighborhoods. One reason for its popularity is that community policing is a plastic concept, meaning different things to different people. There are many perspectives on community policing, and each of them is built on assumptions that are only partially supported by empirical evidence.

The organizing themes of community policing suggest that law enforcement can be more focused, proactive, and community sensitive. Moreover, community policing portends significant changes to the social and formal organization of policing. On the level of social organization, community policing is thought to break down the barriers separating the police from the public while inculcating police officers with a broader set of community service ideals. Organizationally, community policing is thought to shift police policymaking from a traditional bureaucracy to one emphasizing greater organizational-environmental interaction. Simultaneously, the shift to community policing is said to be accompanied by a flattening of the police hierarchy and the development of coordinated service delivery with any number of public and private agencies that affect neighborhood safety. These are indeed profound changes should they continue to be implemented and shape the institution of American policing.

In recent years, community and problem-oriented policing ideas have captured the imagination of police officials, community activists, the public at large, and especially academics. The rhetoric of community policing—now embodied in the passage of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994—has received Presidential utterance as well as the creation of a major effort to put 100,000 community police officers on America's streets. Police departments

throughout the country now actively compete for Federal support for their community policing efforts (Maguire et al. 1997). Today, the crime control agenda of the United States and many other countries includes a visible place for community policing and its many derivatives (see Skolnick and Bayley 1988).

The promises of community policing are many. They include strengthening the capacity of communities to resist and prevent crime and social disorder; creating a more harmonious relationship between the police and the public, including some power sharing with respect to police policymaking and tactical priorities; restructuring police service delivery by linking it with other municipal services; reforming the police organization model; and creating larger and more complex roles for individual police officers. This new style of policing is said to produce more committed, empowered, and analytic police officers; flatten police hierarchies; and open the process of locally administered justice to those who are often the object of justice decisionmaking. This shift also makes crime prevention, not crime suppression, the ascendant goal of policing.

Goldstein (1987) initially outlined several requirements necessary for the police to shift from traditional to community or problem-oriented policing. First, the adoption of community policing requires that it be an organizing philosophy integrated into the entire police agency and not be seen simply as a new project or a temporary specialization. This is what happened to team policing—the most recent failed experiment in American law enforcement (see Sherman, Milton, and Kelly 1973).

Second, for community policing to take root in police agencies, according to Goldstein, it must help create a new working environment within these agencies so that new values of policing emerge in the management and tactics of the police. Third, community policing must overcome resistance from the subculture of the police, a subculture that is focused on danger, authority, and efficiency (Skolnick 1966): the values of more traditional policing. Although in recent years it has been argued that police agencies actually have several internal subcultures, Goldstein was concerned that those introducing changes into policing be cognizant that the cultures of policing have successfully resisted, and in fact defeated, change attempts. Finally, to be adopted by both the police and the public, Goldstein suggested that community policing must focus on resolving substantive community crime and disorder problems, not simply responding quickly to calls for assistance and then completing paperwork. Such threshold requirements require that those who advocate and implement community policing see it as an alternative paradigm to traditional policing, a shift that has considerable import for the police and the public (see Kelling and Moore 1988).

Despite claims and counterclaims, what we actually know about the efficiency and effectiveness of community and problem-oriented policing is rather small in comparison to what we do not know, although literature and practice in this arena are growing exponentially. This essay reviews the development of community and problem-oriented policing in America with an eye toward understanding its variations, assumptions, and impacts.

Much of the emphasis on community policing seeks to make the police more effective in dealing with neighborhood crime and disorder and to avoid longstanding criticisms of the police being ineffective, inefficient, and insensitive.

This review begins with a brief overview of the historical development of American policing, with a particular concern for understanding how the police structure in America came to be and the range of purposes of the police. Following this discussion, four generalized models of policing are presented. Traditional, community, problem-oriented, and zero-tolerance policing are outlined to define their characteristics and assumptions. Such distinctions assist in understanding the evolution of policing and the change in focus that these differing styles represent.

As community policing anticipates several types of impacts—on communities, the police organization, police work groups, and individual police officers—the next sections of this essay focus first on outlining the anticipated impacts of community policing and then on reviewing whether these impacts have been substantiated in the research literature.

Finally, this essay briefly considers several important future issues associated with the ongoing development of community policing. Such a review should shed light on what has become a major focal point for reorganizing American policing and, indeed, American communities.

The Road to Community Policing

Perhaps like the road to hell, the road to community policing is paved with good intentions. These intentions have two geneses. First, much of the shift from traditional to community policing can be traced to a longstanding history of attempts to reform the police and make them more civilly and legally accountable. Second, much of the emphasis on community policing seeks to make the police more effective in dealing with neighborhood crime and disorder and to avoid longstanding criticisms of the police being ineffective, inefficient, and insensitive. Ironically, as we will see later in this essay, the historical

premises that sought to change American policing themselves restrict this reform. Nonetheless, much of the emphasis on community policing is the result of making the police more thoughtful about what they do in communities to help alleviate crime and disorder problems. Such reforms have pressed the American police for change for nearly a century.

It is perhaps understandable that policing is continually in the throes of critique and reform because much of American government finds itself in the same position. Since the early 19th century, American government, particularly city government, has been in a continual state of political, social, and economic transformation. These transformations were largely the result of significant immigration to what became urban America. Such transformation has invariably involved questions of justice and the role of the state in shaping and controlling everyday life. Moreover, as the police are the most visible element of government in civil society, they have often become both the symbolic and substantive lightning rod for civic reform.

> Throughout the nineteenth century, the structure of municipal government became progressively more complicated. The various institutions of city government—boards of health, police departments, fire departments, street and maintenance departments, water and sewer services—each had their own history and particular reason for being. Municipal government had grown by bits and pieces, like a building constructed without any plan. . . . All cities offered variations on the same theme. Smaller cities successfully resisted the urge to "professionalize" city services and continued to be governed by part-time amateurs. All large cities, however, were forced to deal with the threat of disease, violence, and other conditions, arising from overcrowding and growth. (Judd 1988, 37–38)

Implicitly, and more often explicitly, the police have been part of the transformation of American government. In fact, American government shifted from what might be termed the Colonial Era, when government was small and generally in the hands of a political elite, to the Populist Era, when government ownership shifted to a wider array of participants. This occurred over a period of approximately 100 years and was largely completed by the end of the Civil War. By that time, America had itself transformed—from an agrarian to an urban society, from a nativist to an immigrant society, from a simple to a complex society, and from the farm to the factory (see Judd 1988). The legacy of this transformation was to redistribute political power in fundamental ways—from the countryside to the cities and from wealthy landowners to the waves of Eastern European immigrants who gained political preeminence in cities. Policing was indeed caught up in these profound changes in American society (Walker 1977).

Policing, together with other forms of municipal employment, became a primary means for immigrant classes to bootstrap themselves into American life. As waves of immigrants washed into America's burgeoning cities, the ethnicity of police departments often reflected the origins of the newly arrived population. In fact, police departments in New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Chicago, among others, can trace their heritage to major patterns of emigration from Ireland, Italy, and Germany.

"The 'lawlessness' of the police—their systematic corruption and non-enforcement of the laws—became one of the most paramount issues in municipal politics during the nineteenth century."

In the United States, every several years there is an attempt to reform the police. In between allegations of corruption and efforts to reform the police (Walker 1983), American policing has continually sought public support and affirmation. Unlike their British and European counterparts (Berkley 1969; Miller 1975; Manning 1986), American police historically have been isolated from the publics they serve, relied on personal as opposed to constitutional authority, and lacked the communal attachments necessary for effective citizen-police interaction. Contributing to the communal isolation of the American police has been a shift in organizational strategy emphasized throughout most of the 20th century. This shift to professionalize the police generally separated these professionals from their clients, often in profound ways. This shift is coupled with the occupational subculture of policing, a subculture that reinforced the separation of the police from the public (see Skolnick 1966).

In a review of the shifts in police strategy in the 20th century, Kelling and Moore (1988) suggest that the earliest organizational strategy of the police was essentially political. Here the police were primarily concerned with the maintenance of political, and often corrupt, relationships with those in power. Policing was often associated with the rise of political machines in the early 1900s and their dominance in civic life, especially in the then-burgeoning American cities. Police were tied directly to the political patronage systems of the time, and their actions helped those in power while punishing political enemies and the underclass, which generally was defined as persons of a different ethnic heritage. At this time, the police problem was less that the police overenforced the law, but rather that they selectively underenforced the law. As Walker (1977, 25) suggests:

> The "lawlessness" of the police—their systematic corruption and non-enforcement of the laws—became one of the most paramount issues in municipal politics during the nineteenth century. Repeated reform movements arose with an eye to alter police practices. The heart of the matter

> was not the question of law enforcement itself but the social and political dynamics of the urban community. Police corruption was part of the political machine, a means by which party favorites were allowed to conduct illegal businesses and by which the cultural styles of different ethnic groups were preserved.

Ultimately, the political era yielded to an administrative and reform era of policing (Fogelson 1977) in which administrative control, policymaking and decisionmaking distance from political and social communities, and law and professionalism guided the police response. The reform era sought first to make the police legally accountable. This philosophy still dominates much American police administrative thinking, most particularly in attempts to control police violence. Ironically, it is the legacy of this reform, represented in tightly controlled and inflexible police bureaucracies, that is most at issue when moving the police toward community and problem-oriented policing.

The lawlessness of the police had become legend by the beginning of the 20th century. Reformers sought to divide the police from political control, or at least partisan political control, and make their actions more administratively reviewable while introducing the then-emerging science of administration. All this was done in the name of controlling the police while introducing presumed efficiencies into police administration. Symbolically, this movement also sought to convince the public that the police were indeed professional and that the police organization was in control of its actions. Of course, this was always an illusion (see Manning 1977).

During the reform era of policing (beginning roughly in the 1920s and lasting until the 1960s), the police expanded on the military style of organization and administration (actually modeled on Sir Robert Peel's efforts in England in the early 1800s and adopted by 19th-century American police departments in a rather symbolic manner until the 20th century); improved response technology through the introduction of telephones, radio cars, and dispatch systems; and attempted to instill uniformity in police practice through training. These reforms all sought to build a foundation for policing and to raise the status of the police from political hacks to professionals.

In doing so, the police drifted away from the public, often seeing the public as hostile and interfering. Institutionally, the police became inward looking as well. Speed of response overtook policing neighborhoods as a priority, and secondary measures of effort eclipsed those of effectiveness. In fact, many of these institutional myths (Crank and Langworthy 1992) persist to the present. Routinely the police present themselves to their publics in uniform, as selectively organized and capable of rapid response to emergencies. Such presentational strategies help to

maintain the public legitimacy of the police and may be one of the major obstacles to overcome in the implementation of community and problem-oriented policing (see section "Four Models of Policing: From Traditional to Community to Problem Oriented to Zero Tolerance").

Despite the general failure of community relations and team policing, it is from these early efforts that the community and problem-oriented policing movement in the United States can trace its roots.

Beginning in the late 1950s and continuing into the 1960s, the police as a formal institution of government encountered perhaps its most formidable challenge—a direct and frontal assault on the legitimacy of the police and indeed of the legal system itself. The civil rights and Vietnam antiwar movements, as well as the emerging youth culture of the 1960s, effectively merged two groups that had previously been socially and politically separated—minorities, particularly blacks, and urban and suburban middle-class white youths. The convergence of these two social and political movements confronted American policing in direct and visible ways.

In response to these confrontations, the police, generally speaking, became militant. They were often directly confrontational with these groups, producing what Stark (1972, 15–16) has termed police riots:

> Readers of the Kerner Commission Report or the Skolnick report or any of dozens of other books, reports, and articles on recent events in black ghettos or during student and anti-war demonstrations will have recognized that sometimes police behavior is indistinguishable from that attributed to rioters. It is not merely that sometimes the character of the police response in certain situations provokes riots, which it does, but that on some occasions the police seem to be *the major or even the only perpetrators of disorder, violence and destruction. Such occasions are police riots.* (author's emphasis)

The nationally televised 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago and the riots that ensued perhaps for the first time portrayed the police as institutionally unaccountable. Moreover, the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders concluded that the spark of most urban riots in the late 1960s was poor or aggressive police action, generally taken in a minority community. Riots in Los Angeles, Detroit, Philadelphia, Newark, and elsewhere portrayed a disintegrating social structure often precipitated by police action. The police were at once the cause and the solution to social unrest. Liberals saw them as the cause of problems, conservatives as the solution. The country was divided

on these issues, and the police were caught between significant ideological shifts in American political and social life. As the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968, 206) commented:

> Almost invariably the incident that ignites disorder arises from police action. Harlem, Watts, Newark and Detroit—all major outbursts of recent years—were precipitated by routine arrests of Negroes for minor offenses by white police. But the police are not merely the spark. In discharge of their obligation to maintain order and insure public safety in the disruptive conditions of ghetto life, they are inevitably involved in sharper and more frequent conflicts with ghetto residents than with the residents of other areas.

The American police were sorely in need of reform once again. Beginning in the early 1970s, the police as an institution began to experiment with ways that put the police into closer interaction with the public, generally on matters of mutual interest. The community relations' movement begun in the late 1940s and into the 1950s carried over to this time, as did the rise of alternative forms of policing, such as team policing. In both instances (community relations and team policing), there was an attempt to create more public support for the police while at the same time providing them with a clearer preventive role in community public safety.

Community relations issues were more "eyewash and whitewash" than substantive in many communities, a way for the police perhaps to placate the public. Team policing, by contrast, was an important attempt to change the focus and structure of the police, although by all accounts team policing captured neither the imagination nor the organization of the American police. Despite the general failure of community relations and team policing, it is from these early efforts that the community and problem-oriented policing movement in the United States can trace its roots (see Greene and Pelfrey 1997).

Four Models of Policing: From Traditional to Community to Problem Oriented to Zero Tolerance

Current trends in U.S. police reform, falling under the broad label of community policing, began in the mid-1980s and continue to the present. These trends stress a contextual role for the police, one that emphasizes greater interaction with the community in resolving persistent neighborhood crime and disorder problems (Wilson and Kelling 1982; Goldstein 1987; Kelling and Moore 1988). This newest in a long tradition of reforms has many implications for police role

definitions, strategic and tactical operations, and understanding about the limits of formal and informal social control.

There are those who charge that community policing is more rhetorical than real (cf. Manning 1988; Weatheritt 1988) or that it follows a long line of circumlocutions "whose purpose is to conceal, mystify, and legitimate police distribution of nonnegotiable coercive force" (Klockars 1988, 240). Others assert that such efforts represent "the new blue line" of police innovation and social experimentation (Skolnick and Bayley 1986) and the resurgence of improved relations between the police and the public (Wycoff 1988).

The differences in definition, emphasis, and results associated with community and problem-oriented policing continue to the present. In fact, a new orientation toward zero tolerance—i.e., cracking down on street-level disorder—has risen to effectively challenge community and problem-oriented policing as a means of reducing crime and fear (Cordner 1998) (discussed later). In an effort to help clarify the differences in policing emphases, exhibit 1 examines several dimensions of policing as they shift under differing philosophies and eras of policing.

Exhibit 1 depicts several dimensions of policing under traditional, community, problem-oriented, and zero-tolerance policing. Twelve aspects of police role and function, interaction with the community, formal and social organization, and service delivery are expressed in this exhibit. The comparisons made are offered as ideal types; i.e., they seek to represent the more general expectations implied by the models, not necessarily how each is ultimately operationalized and implemented in any particular police agency. Such a heuristic provides a useful way to contrast and compare potentially differing paradigms of policing.

Obviously, within each model there is a degree of overlapping definition, effort, and emphasis. The evolution of policing suggests that each successive era of policing has evolved slowly from its predecessor (Kelling and Moore 1988; Greene and Pelfrey 1997). In fact, shifts in policing have been glacial, occurring over considerable timeframes (generally more than 15 to 20 years), not cataclysmic (occurring in much shorter timeframes). Consequently, modern-day policing as we know it reflects elements of all of these models.

Traditional policing

Traditional policing, as it has come to be known, reflects the goals of the early reformers of the police, previously discussed. The emphasis was to separate the police from politics and to hold them more accountable to the body politic and the law.

Traditional policing, as characterized by much discussion over the past 30 years, has a narrow law enforcement and crime control or crime repression focus. It is centered on serious crime, as opposed to maintenance of community social order or general service delivery. The police are crimefighters under this model, and they shun any form of social work activity. Under the traditional model, police work is synonymous with catching crooks and is largely reactive, i.e., the police respond to calls for assistance from the public.

Applying the law and deterring crime are the central focuses of all police activities under the traditional model. The crimefighter model of policing still resonates significantly within American police.

Under traditional policing, the police have a narrow range of interventions. Generally speaking, under this model the police must rely entirely on the coercive power of the criminal law to gain control (Bittner 1970). The threat of arrest is the dominant mode of acquiring compliance from the community. Under such arrangements, aggressive street tactics coupled with broad application of the criminal law results in tremendous line officer discretion, which generally is unregulated. Although the police organization creates the appearance of control through highly ritualized command and control systems, police officers have wide latitude in decisionmaking in the field (see Manning 1977).

With the traditional model of policing, the police culture is inward looking, expressing the working personality characteristics outlined by Skolnick (1966) and others. Concerned with danger, authority, and efficiency, the police are said to be socially isolated from the community at large.

The values that are often tied to the cop culture stemming from the traditional model of policing include skepticism and cynicism among the police, the development of a code of secrecy to fend off external control and oversight, and often a general disdain for the public at large. Minimizing contact with the public and staying out of trouble, often through work avoidance (see Van Maanen 1974), have been documented practices of traditional policing.

Traditional policing suggests that institutionally and individually the police seek to minimize external interference with police work and administration. This is done largely by the police adopting a professional mantle, i.e., they identify themselves as authoritatively independent from their clients. The professional model adopted here sees the client as a passive entity to be directed by the police. Moreover, the police as an institution and as a working group culture seek to distance themselves from the body politic and politicians.

Within the context of traditional policing, the police organization is presented in classic Weberian (Weber 1947) terms in which the demarcation between

Exhibit 1. Comparisons of social interactions and structural components of various forms of policing

Social interaction or structural dimension	Traditional policing	Community policing	Problem-oriented policing	Zero-tolerance policing
Focus of policing	Law enforcement	Community building through crime prevention	Law, order, and fear problems	Order problems
Forms of intervention	Reactive, based on criminal law	Proactive, on criminal, civil, and administrative law	Mixed, on criminal, civil, and administrative law	Proactive, uses criminal, civil, and administra-tive law
Range of police activity	Narrow, crime focused	Broad crime, order, fear, and quality-of-life focused	Narrow to broad—problem focused	Narrow, location and behavior focused
Level of discretion at line level	High and unaccountable	High and accountable to the community and local commanders	High and primarily accountable to the police administration	Low, but prima-rily accountable to the police administration
Focus of police culture	Inward, rejecting community	Outward, building partnerships	Mixed depending on problem, but analysis focused	Inward focused on attacking the target problem
Locus of decisionmaking	Police directed, minimizes the involvement of others	Community-police coproduction, joint responsibility and assessment	Varied, police identify problems but with community involvement/action	Police directed, some linkage to others agencies where necessary
Communication flow	Downward from police to community	Horizontal between police and community	Horizontal between police and community	Downward from police to community
Range of community involvement	Low and passive	High and active	Mixed depending on problem set	Low and passive
Linkage with other agencies	Poor and intermittent	Participative and integrative in the overarching process	Participative and integrative depending on the problem set	Moderate and intermittent
Type of organization and command focus	Centralized command and control	Decentralized with community linkage	Decentralized with local command accountability to central administration	Centralized or decentralized but internal focus
Implications for organizational change/ development	Few, static organization fending off the environment	Many, dynamic organization focused on the environment and environmental interactions	Varied, focused on problem resolution but with import for organization intelligence and structure	Few, limited interventions focused on target problems, using many traditional methods
Measurement of success	Arrest and crime rates, particularly serious Part 1 crimes	Varied, crime, calls for service, fear reduction, use of public places, community linkages and contacts, safer neighborhoods	Varied, problems solved, minimized, displaced	Arrests, field stops, activity, location-specific reductions in targeted activity

organization and environment is definitive and ardently maintained. By doing so, the police organization renders the environment incapable of changing its internal dynamics and ensures for itself some sense of control over the environment. In the parlance of organizations, police agencies under the traditional model see maintaining themselves as their primary goal. They are focused on maintaining structure and function—the means of policing—without much consideration to the ends of policing, such as safer communities.

Measures of success are primarily focused on crime and crime control, most particularly serious violent and property crime, as counted through the Uniform Crime Reports' Part 1 crimes.[1] As a closed system, the organization creates what Manning (1979) has called reflexivity—a process in which the organization defines its efforts, measures them, and then declares success on the basis of such organizationally defined imperatives. This model is means, not ends, focused (Goldstein 1979, 1990), and it measures effort, not results.

Community policing

Rising from the often-negative critique of traditional policing, community policing seeks to balance the role of the police environment and organization in pursuit of a broad range of community-based outcomes. Common core elements of community policing programs include a redefinition of the police role to increase crime prevention activities, greater reciprocity in police and community relations, area decentralization of police services and command, and some form of civilianization (Skolnick and Bayley 1986). Each of these changes is viewed as a necessary condition to realizing greater police accountability to the community. At the same time, these efforts suggest that, if they are adopted, the police can become more effective and efficient.

Community policing has increased the police focus to include issues such as public safety, crime, fear of crime, and community quality of life. Communities are seen as participants in shaping police objectives and interventions as well as in evaluating them.

Much of community policing literature is focused on capacity building within communities, i.e., building and sustaining a community partner to work with the police on matters of neighborhood crime and disorder. As Mastrofski, Worden, and Snipes (1995, 540) observed:

> "[C]ommunity building" focuses on crime prevention, victim assistance and building greater rapport with racial minorities. The police strengthen citizens' capacity and resolve to resist crime and recover from it. This requires positive relationships with those "invested" in the neighborhood.

> Crime prevention and victim assistance do not involve law enforcement directly. To the extent that a community policing program concentrates on community building, it de-emphasizes law enforcement activities.

Such community building efforts must actively engage the community in an open and rather straightforward discussion about community life and the role of the police and the community in establishing local order. Such efforts also depend in large measure on the openness of both the police and the community and the willingness of the community to engage in what are often large-scale volunteer efforts (see Bayley 1994; Bayley and Shearing 1996). Town Watch, for example, is a massive community volunteer effort supported by the commitment of homeowners in local neighborhoods. From the perspective of the police, such efforts require horizontal communication between the community and the police and regular feedback about community conditions and the effectiveness of police interventions.

Partnership is the watchword for community policing efforts. In virtually all discussion of this style of policing, it is asserted that the police must partner with the community and other public and private agencies that serve a local community and that have some impact on community quality-of-life issues. As Skolnick and Bayley (1986, 5) suggest, "[C]ommunity policing should be said to exist only when new programs are implemented that raise the level of public participation in the maintenance of public order." In raising such public participation, it is asserted that the police and the public actually coproduce public safety.

In addition to the environmental openness implied of community policing, this model of policing links informal and formal social control in important ways. The police culture is shifted from its classic inward focus to one embracing external factors—communities, individuals, and other government agencies. Moreover, this model suggests that the range of police goals is greatly expanded from crime control to reducing fear of crime, improving social relationships and social order, and bettering community quality of life—i.e., people's sense of well-being in any particular neighborhood or business setting. These are large tasks for the police, and they require a very different set of officer skills, especially communication and interaction skills.

The implications of community policing goals and efforts shift concern for both the means and ends of the police. From the perspective of means, the police are to embrace a wide array of tools that take them well beyond their limited use of the criminal law. The use of civil and administrative law, for example, is seen as a way of broadening the capacity of the police and the community to intervene in local order and crime problems. Today, the police

use civil abatement and other civil court proceedings to gain compliance from unruly businesses (typically bars), as well as from landlords who fail to adequately screen and supervise their tenants (especially those dealing drugs).

Such interventions significantly broaden the reach of the police, perhaps giving them even more discretion. At the same time, under norms of community policing, the police are expected to build a reference for a wide array of social and community services that might be brought to bear on community problems. In fact, the police role is often seen as shifting from the first government responder to social diagnostician and community mobilizer. Such linkages with external social service agencies are seen as improving ownership for community problems and linking different service providers in a joint effort to address community safety issues. At the same time, such linkages to the community are anticipated to help constrain and structure police use of discretion (see Mastrofski and Greene 1993).

From the perspective of the police organization and service delivery system, community policing is a way of making police agencies less bureaucratic, specialized, and hierarchical. On the ground, police officers are seen as generalists, not specialists, a hallmark of the industrial organization from which police systems were modeled. Decentralized management and service delivery are cornerstones of the community policing movement, under the argument that the structure of traditional policing greatly inhibits the capacity of the police to deliver effective and efficient services to a visible and active clientele. The police organization under community policing is seen as being in a dynamic state, actively engaged with the environment and creating many boundary-spanning roles linking the organization to its immediate task environment as well as social, cultural, and economic environments.

Measuring success in a community policing framework requires that the police capture much more information about communities, social control, and local dynamics and link their efforts to community stabilization and capacity building. Quite often, this shifts the measurement of policing activities from reported crime to calls for police service, a measure thought to better reflect the range of problems communities confront (see Greene and Klockars 1991). In addition, measures of community health might also include willingness to use public places, community volunteerism, business starts, home ownership increases or decreases, home improvements in neighborhoods (an indirect measure of homeowner confidence in the neighborhood), and local perceptions about safety and the police.

Problem-oriented policing

While community policing has a broad community building mandate, problem-oriented policing is more focused and, as its name implies, problem specific. The central thrust of problem-oriented policing is to make the police more thoughtful about the problems they address and their methods of intervention. In short, the police are to be more analytic. As Eck (1993, 63) suggests, "Under the problem-oriented approach, the problem, not the criminal law, becomes the defining characteristic of policing." Problem-oriented policing arose from concerns that the police were too focused on their means (the traditional model) and not on their ends, specifically on the impact of their interventions (see Goldstein 1990).

Problem-oriented policing seeks to formalize a methodology for the police to address persistent community crime, disorder, and fear problems. The SARA (Scan, Analyze, Respond, Assess) model of problem solving has received the most attention in this regard. Using SARA, the police are to scan communities for problems, analyze the dynamics of these problems in a thorough and systematic way, design a response to address the defined and analyzed problem, and then assess the impact of the response on the identified problem.

Problem-oriented policing overlaps somewhat with community policing to the extent that the community is often engaged in problem definition and discussions about interventions. And, in contrast to traditional policing, problem-oriented policing also makes police decisions and actions more transparent to both the public and police supervisors.

Eck (1993) suggests that problem-oriented policing can take one of two distinct forms. The first, as envisioned by Goldstein (1990), involves careful analysis of the problem, the search for solutions that can address the problem, the effective implementation of a solution, and the assessment of the impact of the intervention. This has become the model for problem-oriented policing. The second approach is less demanding and likely more prevalent. In what Eck (1993) calls enforcement problem-oriented policing, the police shortcut much of the analysis and apply traditional methods to the response. Directed and tactical patrols are seen as illustrative of this approach (see Eck 1993, 68). This approach, of course, runs the risk of problems being defined narrowly and addressed by rather traditional police methods (see "Zero-tolerance policing").

Problem-oriented policing has important implications for how the police go about their business in the community, how they organize and supervise police work, and how the police agency is structured under such an arrangement. Given that problem solving is seen as an activity for a police officer or a group of police officers, centralized command and control systems must yield to

officer discretion and inventiveness. The focus in such an arrangement is for the police organization to facilitate, not control, officer actions in the field. Of course, this requires that supervisory, middle, and senior command personnel share power with police officers, who are solving problems in neighborhood settings.

Additionally, under the anticipated norms of problem-oriented policing, the police organization must improve its organizational intelligence—its understanding of how police interventions work, under what circumstances, with what effort, and for how long. This requires that the police agency assess interventions carefully, catalog the impact and effectiveness of interventions, and revise its learning about current and future interventions as experience with them grows. Rather than command and control, the police organization under problem-oriented policing must learn and diagnose its own internal technology for converting police efforts to community impacts.

Police discretion, although reasonably high under the problem-oriented approach, is checked to the extent that problems must be identified, analyzed, and solved. To do so requires considerable communication about problems and responses within and outside of the police department. This in turn helps to make decisions visible to the community and particularly to police administrators who oversee the problem assessment and response implementation process.

Measurement of success under problem solving, like Sir Robert Peel's first principle,[2] is the absence of the problems, or rather the absence of them recurring. Additionally, problem solving recognizes that some problems may be difficult to solve entirely, but their recurrence can be significantly delayed or the consequences of the problem can be significantly reduced. By doing so, the police can measure the extent to which they have had an impact on the targeted problem. Another concern with problem solving is the extent to which the police displace crime, both temporally and spatially.

Zero-tolerance policing

In recent years, American policing has witnessed yet another emerging style of policing—zero tolerance. Some argue that this style of policing is actually the result of misinterpreting or misrepresenting community and problem-oriented policing (see Rosenbaum, Lurigio, and Davis 1998, 192–194). Others argue that zero tolerance is the application of community and problem-oriented policing to its fullest. William Bratton championed this orientation while serving as police chief in New York City. The zero-tolerance emphasis got its greatest boost in the early 1990s in New York, as the police there adopted many aggressive

street tactics and as crime in that city, and throughout the country, declined. As Bratton summarized:

> [R]educe disorder and you WILL reduce crime. The strategy is sending a strong message to those who commit minor crimes that they will be held responsible for their acts. The message goes like this: behave in public spaces, or the police will take action. Police will also check you out to make sure that you are not creating chronic problems or wanted for some other more serious offense. Police will also question you about what you know about other neighborhood crime.[3] (emphasis in original)

Zero-tolerance policing can be seen as a variant of problem-oriented policing, and one that may reflect Eck's enforcement problem-oriented policing. Perhaps the initial discussion that fueled debate about shifting the police from their traditional orientation was the broken windows thesis offered by Wilson and Kelling (1982). This thesis suggested that serious crime was the result of the slippery slope of neighborhood decay and the inattentiveness of the police in addressing little problems before they became big problems. A cycle of decline (Skogan 1990) results where communities continue to deteriorate, in part because of increases in social and physical incivilities.

Under this model, the police are expected to attack order problems in communities in the hope that such an approach will dissuade and otherwise deter more serious criminal behavior from occurring. Maintaining order in aggressive ways, then, is the chief goal of this approach (Williams and Pate 1987; Sykes 1986; Reiss 1985; Kelling 1985; Kelling and Coles 1996). This argument is essentially built on a deterrence model wherein the police are deployed to address many of the problems that annoy society, particularly in public places. These behaviors, according to the broken windows theory, are thought to be precursors of more serious criminality. Aggressive panhandling (particularly in places like subways), street-level prostitution, street-level drug use, disorderliness, and the like are the targets of such approaches. The focus is almost entirely on order maintenance: establishing the perception and reality of orderly behavior in public spaces.

The theme of broken windows might be addressed in at least two possible directions—one focused on capacity building within communities, the other on aggressive police actions. Such choices characterize a continual debate in American policing, i.e., whether the police should focus on the crime prevention models associated with community and problem-oriented policing or whether they should focus on a crime attack model, often associated with traditional and zero-tolerance policing models.

Under the broad umbrella of community policing, paying attention to community disorder, preventing it by organizing the community, speaking with offenders (particularly for minor crimes), and changing the physical environment within which crimes occur are interventions that focus on the broader problems and issues associated with such behaviors. This, in fact, is the model under which community crime prevention operates in many countries. As Hope (1995, 21) suggests, "[C]ommunity crime prevention refers to actions intended to change the social conditions that are believed to sustain crime in residential neighborhoods." These efforts typically muster the support of local social institutions to jointly address crime and disorder problems. By doing so, community crime prevention seeks to embed these efforts in the local social structure. This, of course, is the underlying philosophy of community policing, previously discussed.

Sometimes, however, community social institutions are fragile and may not be capable of engaging in prevention efforts. And, although it may be argued that there is always a community there, the level of social organization within that community may be incapable of working with the police or other government agencies (see Greene and Taylor 1988). Under such circumstances, rather than focusing on capacity building and community crime prevention, a form of "kick ass" policing (Wilson and Kelling 1982) has arisen in many cities.

Fueled by concerns that community policing is seen as soft on crime and by growing public criticism that disorderly people (e.g., the "squeegee guy") interfere with daily commerce, police departments across the country have focused on removing the signs of incivility from America's street corners, sometimes in very forcible ways.

Zero-tolerance policing has its roots in the suppressive aspects of policing. In some respects, it returns the police to a more traditional stance vis-a-vis law enforcement, a direction that is actively supported within many American police departments. This has significant implications for the police in mobilizing communities, one of the central features of both community and problem-oriented policing. As Klockars (1985, 319) suggests:

> Police can gain compliance with their demands for order by "kicking ass" . . . but endorsement of such behavior must rest on the view that people whom the police seek to control in that way do not deserve or cannot comprehend better treatment. That line of reasoning is barely plausible when the vision of those who get their asses kicked is confined to derelicts, winos, street prostitutes, panhandlers and juvenile gangs. But it is patently offensive when we realize that the order maintenance tasks of modern police officers require them to direct, control, and discipline persons from all walks of life—including *us.* (emphasis added)

Zero-tolerance policing has recently been linked with place-specific interventions and crimes and situational analysis on the part of the police. Hot spot analysis suggests that a small number of locations in any particular city account for the abundance of community crime and disorder problems. Through the use of sophisticated crime mapping techniques, these locations are made visible to the police and the community. More often than not, these places are then subjected to aggressive police tactics attempting to dry up the hot spot. Such techniques have been focused on street robbery and drug activities as well as on an array of order maintenance activities.

The concern with order, as the central focus of zero-tolerance policing, narrows police attention to the proximate causes of the problem—namely the people or places that create disorder. But as Skolnick (1994) has suggested, order without law is problematic in a democratic society:

> The concept of "order" reflects ideas about how citizens should conduct themselves. These ideas, engraved sharply and punitively in the substantive criminal law, generate penalties for misbehavior ranging from death for homicide to years of imprisonment for a variety of offenses. The procedural law sets limits on what prosecutors and police can do to enforce the substantive law. Because both "order" and "law," substance and procedure, are important but conflicting aspirations, their inherent conflict imposes a fundamental, enduring dilemma for policing a democratic society.

Under the zero-tolerance approach, the demand for order may result in a deterioration of law, particularly the lawfulness of the police. Moreover, there are concerns that the normative legitimacy of the police, particularly in minority neighborhoods, will be undermined when the police are seen primarily as a punitive force in society.

Recent events in New York City involving police assaults on minority group members and the torture of a Haitian immigrant have cast doubt on the efficacy of zero-tolerance policing, particularly the policing of minority communities. These events have been witnessed in several American cities, and in most instances they occur through aggressive police street tactics, not unlike the precipitous events of the urban riots documented by the Kerner Commission in the 1960s. Such actions reveal the delicate relationship between the police and those policed. As Rosenbaum, Lurigio, and Davis (1998, 192) suggest:

> Poor minority communities are the most inclined to demand aggressive enforcement in violation of civil liberties, and they are also the most likely to complain about it and dislike the police as a result. Thus enforcement is not a simple yes-no option. It requires careful planning, the consent of the

Zero-tolerance policing may be returning the community to a passive role in crime and order maintenance in favor of a more aggressive and active role on behalf of the police.

public, solid working relationships built on trust, a role for the community whenever possible, and the thoughtful exercise of police discretion.

Many of the efforts to organize communities rely on the good will of the community to participate in capacity building and crime prevention efforts. Marshaling community volunteers for any number of public safety efforts, ranging from neighborhood cleanups to Town Watch, requires trusting and open communication (for a review of citizen involvement in crime prevention, see Rosenbaum, Lurigio, and Davis 1998, 17–58, 171–230; Friedman 1994). Zero-tolerance policing, while satisfying short-term interests in gaining order, may actually return the police and the community to a conflictual relationship. Just as important, zero-tolerance policing may be returning the community to a passive role in crime and order maintenance in favor of a more aggressive and active role on behalf of the police. This is equally true of the relationship of the police department to other agencies, although agencies that can bring some repressive impact on a location, such as the revocation of a bar license, are often found aligned with zero-tolerance efforts.

Organizationally, zero-tolerance policing has resulted in a general bifurcation of police departments, once again along specialist lines. On one hand, many police departments have publicly pursued community and problem-oriented approaches as means of gaining greater community support and, to some degree, involvement in public safety issues. This has resulted in a community and problem-oriented policing emphasis, which is often visible to the public. Perhaps less visible is a more subtle trend in American policing—the militarization of the police and the equipping of special street-tactical units that are actively engaged in "asshole control." The "velvet glove" of community policing frequently conceals the "iron fist" of these street crime and intervention units, which are often modeled after elite military combat units.

Measuring success under norms of zero-tolerance policing has its roots in problem solving, although many of these efforts revert to measurement by counting things like field stops (pedestrian and car) and the types of behavior (mostly negative) occurring in targeted locations. Such measures can create the tautological expression of agency effectiveness by defining efforts as successes and then measuring them as outcomes.

Understanding Community Policing Interventions

To better understand how community and problem-oriented policing are doing as both police interventions in communities and as means for refining and changing police organizations, it is important to see these efforts as a series of interventions that affect different things. In theory, these interventions occur at several levels. They supposedly impact communities, police organizations, and the nature of police work, including police officer attachment to the community, crime prevention values, and a broader set of community service ideals.

By making the levels of intervention and change clear and explicit, including the anticipated outcomes for community policing, we can begin the process of building effective monitoring and evaluation systems to assess whether community and problem-oriented policing are substantive or rhetorical. Such an understanding can dramatically improve efforts to implement and evaluate community and problem-oriented policing initiatives in the future.

Here we consider the range of impacts that community policing is expected to have. Community policing can be seen as part of a causal set of relationships expected to have impacts that differ from those associated with traditional policing. Community and problem-oriented policing, the focus of this essay, are anticipated to affect communities, police departments, police work groups, and police officers in important and predictable ways. Although it is not possible to trace all of the causal connections associated with community and problem-oriented policing, four levels of intervention are examined briefly here.

At the *environmental level,* community and problem-oriented policing interventions seek to engage the police and the community in a public safety coproduction relationship. The police are to seek broader linkages with external groups and organizations. They are also expected to focus on community capacity building and crime prevention. By mobilizing communities and focusing on discrete and identifiable crime, disorder, and fear problems, it is anticipated that the community can become more crime resistant, have greater community efficacy, and in turn be less affected by crime and disorder. Such efforts are often aimed at stabilizing neighborhoods, increasing neighborhood bonds and communication, increasing the capacity of the neighborhood to mediate in conflict situations, and ultimately strengthening neighborhood cohesion. These activities are rooted in the notion that cohesive neighborhoods are more crime resistant. If properly implemented, such activities should reduce fear of crime, increase neighbors' use of public spaces, reduce neighborhood disorder, and ultimately reduce crime and victimization in neighborhoods.

At the *organizational level,* community policing interventions are seen as affecting several police department issues. First, these interventions are expected to impact the police agency's technology (i.e., the way in which the department converts inputs to outputs). This includes how (or if) the department currently defines and solves problems and how it values what it produces. Community policing interventions are also associated with affecting the department's structure (i.e., the way the organization divides labor and differentiates its parts) and how (or if) that structure supports community policing initiatives. This includes impacts associated with the organization's culture (i.e., the values, beliefs, symbols, and assumptions that undergird organizational life) as well as the department's human resource systems (i.e., the mechanisms for selecting, training, rewarding, and socializing personnel toward community policing objectives). Here the concern is with imbuing the organization with a set of values and missions that translate into actions that embrace the community as a partner to crime prevention and that value analytic and thoughtful police interventions.

Finally, changes associated with community policing are seen as needing to impact the police agency's effectiveness assessment processes (i.e., the systems internal to the police organization that gather, evaluate, and disseminate information about how the organization is doing). If community-based policing is to become a lasting strategic intervention (Kelling and Moore 1988; Moore and Stephens 1991), it will need to confront several organizational change issues, particularly if it intends to replace or modify the structure and culture of traditional policing. The reason rests on the idea that the traditional organizational model of policing—with centralized authority, command and control, elaborate rules and policies, and the like—actually will impede the police agency's ability to do community and problem-oriented policing. Flatter, less specialized, and more community-focused organizations are envisioned for the police under the norms of community and problem-oriented policing.

In addition to organizational-level issues, community policing as a change intervention is expected to impact several issues associated with *work groups* within police organizations. They include the establishment and clear communication of group performance norms consistent with community policing outcomes. Beyond creating and communicating group performance norms, the community-oriented police agency is expected to specify group composition in terms of the knowledge, skills, and functions of police groups operating within community settings. Similarly, the police agency seeks to improve interpersonal communication and information sharing within the agency, especially across groups defined under a community policing philosophy and structure. Finally, if community policing is to become the vanguard of change within police agencies, it will need to clarify task definition among groups of police officers, including investigators.

Community-based policing also has several implications for *individual-level* change within police agencies as well. In terms of individual-level outcomes, community policing anticipates changes in police officer effectiveness, primarily through the mechanism of problem solving. Additionally, police officer performance, job satisfaction, and job attachment are anticipated to improve through attachment to community policing initiatives. Finally, police officer role definitions are expected to broaden under community policing. Such outcomes presume greater task identity (and consensus) among officers; greater officer autonomy in decisionmaking, job enrichment, and job enlargement; increased feedback to officers regarding their community and problem-focused activities; and increases in the depth and range of skills officers are trained for and employ as part of their community policing methodology.

In regard to the measurement of change as implied in community policing efforts, exhibit 2 provides an overview of these levels of intervention, their anticipated internal changes or dynamics, and their corresponding community policing/problem-solving outcomes. Using the conceptualization presented in exhibit 2, we can look at the impact of community and problem-oriented policing on communities, police organizations, police work, and police officers. Such impacts will give us a better understanding of the capacity of community and problem-oriented policing to achieve their intended ends.

Impacts on communities

Recently, communities have become more specific and direct targets for criminal justice interventions, most particularly those associated with community and problem-oriented policing. Attached to a broader community crime prevention movement that began in the 1960s, current efforts involving police and citizen interaction attempt to make communities crime resistant first by mobilizing the community in its own defense (Hope 1995, 21–89) and second by organizing the community for greater surveillance of public places. This gives the community a coproduction (Skolnick and Bayley 1986) role in crime prevention while at the same time increasing community guardianship and the management of public places, a cornerstone of the situational crime prevention movement (see Clarke 1995, 91–150; Felson 1986, 1987, 1995).

Community policing has sought from its beginning to engage the community in matters of public safety while building and strengthening the capacity of communities to resist crime. For example, Operation Weed and Seed focuses on creating a visible and active police presence to impact distressed neighborhoods (weeding), as well as capacity building (seeding) in these same neighborhoods to sustain gains once achieved (see Roehl et al. 1995). More limited or focused crime interventions, such as the Boston Gun Project (see Kennedy

Exhibit 2. Levels of change for community policing

Level of intervention	Change issues anticipated	Community policing outcomes
Environmental ⟶	Linkage with ⟶ External organizations and groups Political and economic support Define and maintain an organizational set	Reduced crime/fear Cohesive neighborhoods Increased public safety Greater public support Reduced hazard/violence Community problems solved
Organizational ⟶	Technology ⟶ Structure Culture Human resources Effectiveness assessment	Change in information flow Decisionmaking (strategic) Decisionmaking (tactical) Improved training Changing symbols and culture Improved communications Revised performance measures Decentralization Role generalization Improved analysis
Group ⟶	Performance norms ⟶ Group composition Interpersonal relations Task definition	Team cohesiveness Task consensus Quality decisions Group effectiveness
Individual ⟶	Task identity ⟶ Autonomy Feedback Skills	Increased police officer effectiveness Increased performance Increased job satisfaction Broadened role definition Greater job attachment/ investment

1998), also pursue dual strategies. In the case of the Boston project, the first strategy sought to identify youths who were likely to use guns to resolve disputes, while also mobilizing government and community social institutions to address this serious and lethal community problem on several different fronts and in a coordinated and systematic manner. Programs like Town Watch are also seen as community capacity building efforts, often linked to increasing surveillance of public places (Rosenbaum 1986, 1988; Rosenbaum, Lurigio, and Davis 1998), although their impact is less certain.

Order maintenance in communities with some existing consensus about order creates many positive opportunities for the police and the community to interact. Indeed, in communities with some level of social organization, there is often a capacity and motivation for the community to work with the police. "The more organized the neighborhood's means of giving voice to its preferences, the easier it is for the police to obtain input, deal with diversity of viewpoints within the neighborhood, and mobilize the community to support and assist police officers" (Mastrofski and Greene 1993, 89). Such activities are also seen as an organizing framework for consensus building within communities (see Etzioni 1993). Preserving order is seen as a central feature of many community and problem-oriented policing initiatives (see Moore 1992).

In addition to preserving the order in any particular neighborhood, community policing seeks to recontextualize the police. That is to say, community policing involves efforts to better link police and community. Among other things, this is thought to improve officers' local knowledge and community acceptance, participation, and assessment of police services. This is typically done by putting the police in closer proximity to local social and economic institutions, building more effective alliances between the police and the public, and attempting to solve persistent and complex community crime and disorder problems (see Kelling and Coles 1996; Hope 1995). Cumulatively, these efforts, it is hoped, will help stabilize communities, thereby making them less crime prone.

In an assessment of the community impacts of community and problem-oriented policing, Cordner (1998) suggests that the evidence is generally mixed. Some studies suggest declines in crime, fear, disorder, and calls for service. However, given design and research limitations identified more than a decade ago by Greene and Taylor (1988), much of the research remains difficult to interpret and generalize. There are, however, some promising findings on which more rigorous assessments can be made in the future.

The cumulative findings of the fear reduction and foot patrol programs of the early 1980s suggested that changes in police strategy might have had different effects on communities. In the Houston and Newark studies, for example, there were indeed modest crime prevention effects, although these programs appeared to influence community perceptions and fear of crime more than they did crime itself. Such findings provided the foundation for several elaborate community policing programs that have been conducted since the 1980s. These programs, involving more sophisticated research methodologies and more observable implementation of community and problem-oriented programs, have now led to a clearer picture of the impacts of these programs on neighborhoods.

Neighborhood impacts associated with community and problem-oriented policing are varied and complex. They include resident perceptions of safety, fear of

crime, use of public places, actual victimization, calls for service, reported crime, self-protection measures, and community cohesion. Given the range and complexity of outcome measures associated with community policing, it is often difficult to make comparisons across sites.

Skogan (1994), in an assessment of community policing impacts on neighborhood residents, examined six programs conducted in Oakland California; Birmingham, Alabama; Baltimore; Madison, Wisconsin; Houston; and Newark, New Jersey. In evaluating these programs, Skogan (1994) assessed their effects on fear of crime, disorder, victimization, the quality of police services, and drug availability. His findings suggested that fear of crime was most affected by these interventions and that it generally went down in five of the six sites. Disorder and victimization, by contrast, both declined in three of the six sites.

Communities' favorable assessments of police services either remained the same or increased in the communities receiving community and problem-oriented policing services as compared with similar communities not receiving these services. In the site where drug availability was a community impact measure (Oakland), community policing efforts produced a decline in the availability of drugs in these communities. Skogan (1994, 180) concluded:

> The evidence reviewed suggests that community policing is proceeding at a halting pace. There are ample examples of failed experiments and cities where the concept has gone awry. On the other hand, there is evidence in many evaluations that a public hungry for attention have a great deal to tell police and are grateful for the opportunity to do so. When they see more police walking on foot or working out of a local sub station they feel less fearful. Where officers have developed sustained cooperation with community groups and fostered self-help, the public has witnessed declining levels of social disorder and physical decay.

Perhaps the most sophisticated effort to assess community policing has been under way for several years in Chicago. In 1993, the Chicago Police Department launched a community policing program called CAPS (Chicago's Alternative Policing Strategy), which Skogan and his colleagues have been assessing for several years (see Skogan et al. 1995; Skogan and Hartnett 1997).

A recent assessment of community policing impacts on neighborhoods in Chicago, conducted by Skogan and Hartnett (1997), suggested that these efforts indeed had a significant impact on community problems and the quality of community life. In regard to police responding to community concerns, perceptions about police effectiveness in dealing with crime, and community fear of crime, Skogan and Hartnett (p. 208) found:

> Residents who subsequently observed them [the police] in action were more satisfied with police responsiveness to community concerns, thought they were more effective at dealing with crime, and felt safer. The impacts here are in shaping residents' perceptions about the police, their willingness to work with the police, and their beliefs that the police are actually attempting to address community defined problems.

In respect to crime and disorder resolution, Skogan and Hartnett (1997, 235) report, "There was some evidence of improvement in the lives of residents of every program area." Perceptions that major crime was declining were confirmed through community surveys, and a victimization survey revealed declines in selected crimes across the targeted neighborhoods. These declines included drops in burglary, auto theft, street violence, and drug- and gang-related activities.

Despite such enthusiastic support for community impacts and the evidence from the Chicago experience, sustained evidence of such positive community impacts remains scant. However, the general decline in crime over the past several years is attributed in part to the activities of the police, many of which are community and problem focused. As Moore (1994, 294) concludes:

> Almost nothing is certain about the effects of community policing programs. These programs are so varied that it will be a long time before we can say something definitive about the whole set of programs, the individual elements of the set, and the particular features of particular programs. And it will obviously be a long time before we can say important things about the strategy of community policing as opposed to the operational programs.

The absence of community impacts associated with community policing is largely related to the high variability of community and problem-oriented policing programs under way across America, coupled with the tendency to assess these programs largely in the context of qualitative case studies. As Rosenbaum and his colleagues (1998, 183–184) suggest:

> To date, few carefully planned demonstration projects have been linked to well-designed quantitative evaluations of community policing. With a handful of exceptions, community policing has been studied primarily through qualitative field methods. Community policing researchers have conducted case studies of organizational processes and problem-solving activities and have occasionally supplemented them with quantitative outcome measures.

Systematic analysis of the range of community and problem-oriented policing interventions has yet to emerge in the research literature on policing. Despite billions of Federal dollars that were distributed to police departments to further community policing over the past 5 years, there is little systematic linkage between these efforts and community capacity building or crime prevention. The declining crime rate in America is presumed to be linked to these efforts, but the dynamics of this linkage are presently unknown.

Impacting police organizations

One of the promises of community policing is that it will make police agencies kinder and gentler, both to their constituents and to their employees. Criticisms of the police bureaucracy, particularly under the traditional model of policing, are that it has alienated both the producers and consumers of police services. Such alienation creates great tension between the police and those policed. This tension builds into mutual suspicion of the others' interests and intentions. Moreover, such tension effectively precludes building a partnership between the police and the community on matters of public safety—a central feature of community and problem-oriented policing.

Remember that in the professional reform era of policing, it was asserted that the police needed to maintain professional distance from the community. This distance was partly a means of gaining internal control over the police and increasing their commitment and adherence to professional standards (defined largely by police administrators) and partly a means of reducing the likelihood that the police would be corrupted by their clients—the community. Over time, the gap intentionally placed between the police and the community widened.

Part of the organizational dilemma for policing under norms that emphasize community attachment and problem solving is linking the tactics of officers to a larger organizational philosophy and strategy. The control-centered professional bureaucratic model embraced by the police as part of their earlier reforms generally did not include strategic and long-term thinking. The presentational strategies of the police have remained response driven, tactical, and focused on community expectations that the police can indeed control crime (Crank and Langworthy 1992).

The implications of an absent strategic focus in many police departments are far reaching. Substantively, the absence of a long-term plan has left many police agencies adrift. That is to say, absent a plan for the future, most agencies focus on incremental changes in both resource availability and allocation. Part of the organizational problem in shifting from a traditional to a community-oriented model of policing is the current structure and delivery system embedded in

policing. For example, often we hear police chiefs say that community and problem-oriented policing services are more expensive than traditional services or that these services actually compete within the agency for resources and focus. An alternative view is that the environment of policing has indeed shifted and the police organization will need to change to adapt to significant environmental changes.

In the logic of organization analysis, environments play an important role (see Thompson 1967). For most organizations, there are two levels of environment: the general environment that encompasses the organization as a whole and individual task environments that influence aspects of the organization's operations. In policing, both the general environment and task environments have been shifting for a considerable period of time. What is less clear is police departments' adaptation to these changing environments (see Zhao 1996).

The police do not operate in a vacuum and cannot be divorced from their external environment. Moreover, the environment in which police organizations find themselves today requires a model of organization that emphasizes policing as an open system.

Changes in the external environment of policing have been profound over the past 30 years. These changes have involved municipal finances, service support, and customer awareness. Each has pushed police organizations and administrators to be more open in policy and decisionmaking and more responsible to the needs of constituents. These external forces have also pressed police organizations to be more creative and flexible (see Zhao 1996, 71–82).

Scant resources, greater demand, and greater civic awareness have combined in the 1990s to make strategic planning a more necessary activity in public service bureaucracies, including the police. Coupled with rising expectations about participation in the coproduction of public safety, communities are eager and vocal about their participation with the police (see Skolnick and Bayley 1986; Skogan 1994; Friedman 1994).

The absence of a strategic emphasis also has implications within police departments. Without a road map of where the agency is going, it is difficult for police managers to muster line-level support for changes in police services or styles of interaction with the public. Moreover, without announced direction, those who would resist such efforts are relatively free to continue to passively, and at times actively, resist those changes. This resistance to change is a major obstacle to the implementation of community and problem-oriented policing. This resistance comes from line-level officers who may believe that community and problem-oriented policing is soft on crime, who do not accept

a crime prevention versus a crimefighting role, and who cling to union and civil service regulations and procedures to better control their work and the workplace (Zhao, Thurman, and He 1999).

Alienation of line-level police officers has also occurred over years of neglect in the traditional model of policing. Here, it is argued that police organizations over the years have produced a class of alienated workers, who frustrate change efforts and who, more importantly, may take out these frustrations on the public at large. These frustrations stem partly from the complexity of the work performed and the situational aspects of police work and partly from line officer distrust of the police administration. This distrust has been learned over a period of years, as the central administration of police agencies is often seen as punitive and nonsupportive of what is a complex field experience. This often creates the idea that central police administration is simply a mock bureaucracy (Gouldner 1954) in which punishment is selectively invoked and support is rarely forthcoming.

In many respects, there continues to be a struggle within police agencies regarding the focus and definition of police work. The culture of line officers continues to stress police independence and the crimefighting roles of the police, while administrative personnel now emphasize open systems approaches, including building partnerships and solving problems. This cultural clash has yet to be resolved in American policing, despite nearly 15 years of an emphasis on community and problem-oriented policing.

In addition to workplace culture issues, the segmentation of police work—i.e., breaking down police work to initial response, followup criminal investigation or other special unit intervention, case preparation, and prosecution—also contributes to worker (police officer) alienation because it removes the police from the intent and consequences of their work. Under norms of production-oriented organizations, like those in industry, line workers begin to lose sight of the overall goals of the product, identifying more directly with the suboptimal goals of their particular function. When this occurs, it is said that the organization has problems sustaining worker motivation as well as product quality.

Community and problem-oriented policing can be viewed from the perspective of organizational change strategies. At the onset of any institutional change, symbolism often outstrips practicality (Edelman 1977). The rhetoric of community policing, of necessity, preceded its coming to the police (Greene and Mastrofski 1988). Rigorous studies of the collection of innovations subsumed under the rubric of community policing were initially few in number (Greene and Taylor 1988), but they have improved over the past 5 years or so. Although initial studies of community policing rested on the use of limited case studies to define the

complexity and effects of this program innovation (for example, see Eck and Spelman 1987; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990), more recent research seeks to tease out the complexity of these efforts in real world settings (see Skogan and Hartnett 1997).

At present, our knowledge about how these changes are reshaping police organizations and service delivery is quite limited. What is known is that the pace of organizational changes in policing is glacial—slow and at times torturous. Moreover, several have identified the police organization as the primary obstacle to improving police services to the community (for a review, see Rosenbaum, Lurigio, and Davis 1998, 183–190).

For the purposes of this review, organizational changes can be assessed on several levels. First, we can consider whether police departments have indeed adopted community and problem-oriented policing as part of their overall strategy. Additionally, we can examine if the structure of policing is changing in any fundamental ways that might be associated with community and problem-oriented policing. Third, we can briefly assess whether the nature of police work is changing as a result of adopting community and problem-oriented policing strategies. Finally, we can assess if police agency intelligence—i.e., the way information is collected and decisions are made—has been affected in recent years.

Changing strategy and structure

Many have commented on changing police organizations as the central feature to ensure the long-term survival of community policing (see Sparrow, Moore, and Kennedy 1990; Moore 1992; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990; Lurigio and Rosenbaum 1994). These changes imply shifts in the underlying philosophy of policing, a broadening of the police domain, and a reorientation of internal police operations.

On the philosophical level, it is clear that many police agencies have adopted the language and symbolism of community and problem-oriented policing. In a study of the broadening of the police domain, Zhao, Thurman, and Lovrich (1995) found that police organizations across America have indeed been broadening their role over several years.

Transitional problems in moving from traditional to community policing are largely centered on the need to balance community policing patrol strategies (foot and bike patrols, community mini-stations, and "park and walk" programs) with rapid responses, particularly to potentially violent crime.

Using data from a survey of police agencies conducted by the Division of Governmental Studies and Services at Washington State University, assessments of police organizational change in light of implementing community policing were undertaken. A total of 215 police agencies completed these surveys in 1993, which were used as the basis for this analysis. Zhao and his colleagues (1995, 19) found that:

> Based on the number of COP [community-oriented policing] programs implemented and the frequency and the distribution of COP development nationally, these data suggest that police departments across the U.S. have been expanding the organizational domain in these three areas [technology employed, population served, and services rendered] during the past three years. In turn, such expansion in the organizational domain is consistent with organizational change in COP values that we might expect to see if police organizations indeed are moving toward the COP philosophy.

Police agencies throughout the United States have been adopting models of organization and training that bode well for community and problem-oriented policing. Zhao, Thurman, and Lovrich (1995) identified three factors around which organizational reform in policing is occurring. The first factor is focused on improving police officer performance skills. The second factor seeks to improve middle management within police agencies, and the third factor is associated with implementing community-oriented policing programs in culturally diverse communities with the intent of improving police and citizen interaction and community relations.

The reform of police agencies along the lines of community and problem-oriented policing has not been obstacle free. Actually, quite the opposite is true. Changes to internal police routines and structures have been likened to "bending granite" (Guyot 1979). Zhao and his colleagues (1995) identified several impediments to organizational change under the norms of community and problem-oriented policing. They include resistance from middle managers and line officers, internal confusion as to the operational definition of community-oriented policing, concerns that community-oriented policing might be soft on crime, lack of police officer training, and resistance from police unions.

Similarly, problems exist in the external environment's adoption of community-oriented policing as an operating strategy for the police. Impediments identified by Zhao, Thurman, and Lovrich (1995) include community concerns about fighting crime, pressure for immediate results, and a lack of support from other government agencies. Finally, transitional problems in moving from traditional to community policing are largely centered on the need to balance community policing patrol strategies (foot and bike patrols, community mini-stations, and

"park and walk" programs) with rapid responses, particularly to potentially violent crime. These tensions continue to plague the adoption of community and problem-oriented policing in American police departments, although they are not insurmountable.

In an assessment of organizational change accompanying the adoption of community and problem-oriented policing styles in American police departments, Zhao (1996) suggested that current attempts are "mired" in the emergence stage of organizational change. As Zhao (p. 83) concluded, "Organizational change is not a particularly new problem for American policing, but the process of change remains painfully slow." Perhaps more importantly, Zhao and his colleagues' work suggested that, although the rhetoric of community and problem-oriented policing has to some extent penetrated the language and symbolism of the American police, there has been little structural change accompanying such rhetoric.

Changing police work

The nature of police work, i.e., the ways in which the job of policing is conducted, has not significantly changed in more than 100 years. At its base, policing is an information-gathering and -processing function that seeks to identify a wide variety of problems and/or conditions in community settings that give rise to crime, disorder, fear, and victimization and then to respond to those problems and/or conditions. As an information processing system, the police have come to rely on the public as the primary source of information and mobilization of police responses (Black 1980).

The central question in shifting from traditional to community or problem-oriented policing is "Does the nature of police work actually change?" That is, do the police do something different, and is this difference measurable? In traditional policing, the police responded to incidents, took reports, interviewed witnesses and victims, investigated accidents, and submitted reports to their supervisors and detectives. Much of the effort to measure police work has as a consequence measured the things that the police do, but not the impact of what they do on community safety and quality of life. Today, police agencies measure efforts, including car and pedestrian stops or inquiries, calls for service received and responded to, arrests made, accidents investigated, and the like, in a precise fashion. Such effort measures reflect what the police organization has traditionally valued and the general nature of police work.

Under the newer models of community and problem-oriented policing, it is necessary to better understand how the police solve problems, by what means,

and with what effects. This requires adjusting ongoing efforts to measure the performance of individual officers as well as police organizations. According to Oettmeier and Wycoff (1998, 373–374):

> Revision of performance measurement systems to reflect the diverse responsibilities of an ever-broadening police role is something many executives still need to accomplish in the 1990s, regardless of whether they have any interest in changing their organization's current approach to policing. Changes in policing philosophies only make more apparent the need for managers to acknowledge and support activities that effective officers have conducted but that have gone officially unrecognized.

Community and problem-oriented policing have important implications for the nature of police work as well as for how police officers understand, accept, and adopt new and often more complex roles. Such changes in the scope and range of police activities at both the organizational and individual levels require that those responsible for implementing community and problem-oriented policing pay particular attention to the reacculturation of police organizations and the resocialization of police officers.

> [P]olice departments will not be prepared to achieve effective problem solving and community partnerships until the beliefs, perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors of individual police officers become more compatible with the redefinition and enlargement of their jobs as prescribed by the community policing model. To ignore police personnel and organizational constraints placed on their activities is to risk program failure due to apathy, frustration, resentment, perceived inequity, fear of change and other factors that militate against the successful implementation of community policing. (Lurigio and Rosenbaum 1994, 147).

Under the community and problem-oriented policing model, police work is said to be affected by changes in the intelligence by which policing is undertaken as well as in the objectives of policing itself. That is to say, policing shifts from response-driven calls for service to a system in which the police actively identify problems and community concerns and then proactively institute programs to ameliorate problems in community settings. They do this in part by shifting their focus from being a secondary intervention (respond to crisis) to a primary intervention (prevent or ameliorate problems). This, of course, requires that the police service delivery system, its organization, and its operatives (police officers) be reoriented in significant and powerful ways.

In addition to changing the very nature of police work, community and problem-oriented policing are thought to also affect how police officers identify with

their work, the community, and the police organization. Under these models, it is assumed that police officers will broaden their role definition, be enthusiastic when working with the community, and come to participate in an organizational system that values initiative, discretion, and risk taking. Once police officers identify with their work in the ways envisioned by community and problem-oriented policing, it is further anticipated that they will have greater job satisfaction and job attachment and that such improvements to job identity will ultimately affect the culture of policing. As Skogan and Hartnett (1997, 70) suggest:

> At the beginning, community policing is a battle for the hearts and minds of members of the patrol force. Their hearts and minds are indeed important, for police departments are decentralized, low-technology human service organizations in which the motivation and skill of those delivering the services at the street-level is of paramount importance.

The cornerstones of community and problem-oriented policing in respect to police work and police officer job psychology, then, relate to improving organizational intelligence and worker participation and identification with the goals of new policing. These are exceedingly critical workgroup and individual-level impacts assumed of community and problem-oriented policing, and they are discussed in more detail in the following section.

Improving organizational intelligence

For policing to change the character of its work, there is the fundamental need to address two important issues. First, police organizations will need to be analytic about the causal networks in which they seek to intervene, as well as about the variable impacts of a wide range of police interventions. Such organizational intelligence improves both the target of policing and the method by which policing is undertaken. It also suggests that knowledge of crime, disorder, fear, and quality of life is a prerequisite to attempting to intervene in such complex social phenomena.

The second issue raised by community and problem-oriented policing is focused on police officer intelligence—i.e., to say how the police interact with their clients, how decisionmaking occurs, and how problems are solved. Such an individual-level focus requires that we understand how the police convert information about crime, victimization, and community disorder into decisions and actions that address such problems lawfully and with the clients' interests in mind.

Changing both the information and analysis made by and available to police agencies and linking them to individual officer decisionmaking are intentional

Community and problem-oriented policing propose to provide the police with an analytic framework to affect police work directly—in the selections of targets and problems—and to guide the police organization in assessing its outputs, outcomes, and impacts.

consequences of adopting a community or problem-oriented style of policing. The underlying theme in this discussion is in creative thinking and adaptive problem solving at both the organizational and individual levels. In organizational parlance, this means changing the technology by which policing is conducted, i.e., the conversion of inputs (community support, information about crime, victimization, etc.) into outputs and outcomes (e.g., stronger and safer communities). Presumably, this new technology involves the police doing something that is somehow different from their past technology (responding to crime once called).

At both the organizational and individual levels, problem solving is said to be reshaping police intelligence. This occurs in a process that involves scanning the environment, defining problems, analyzing the causes and consequences of these problems, designing and implementing appropriate responses, and assessing the impact of interventions—the SARA model (Eck and Spelman 1987; Goldstein 1990).

As previously discussed, the SARA model seeks to have the police use information at both the strategic and tactical levels. In doing so, both police organizations and police officers benefit from a better understanding of problems, responses, and effects. This in turn places the police at the forefront of prevention rather than at a place where their interventions are secondary to the problems for which they are summoned.

At the level of police organization, historically the police have collected information on serious and nonserious crime, traffic violations, juvenile offenders, arrestees, and the general conditions associated with crime. Within police departments, this information has traditionally been kept in many unrelated information systems—typically in filing cabinets and other paper storage facilities or informally in the work and craft experiences of the police themselves. Once collected, this information has had little utility in predicting future problems and/or police responses. As police agencies have historically lacked an analytic framework for using this information and the means to collate diverse information sources, the police organization has suffered in its attempt to be anything more than reactive to crime and disorder. Of course, community and problem-oriented policing propose to provide the police with an analytic framework to affect police work directly—in the selections of targets and

problems—and to guide the police organization in assessing its outputs, outcomes, and impacts.

At the individual police officer level, experience has generally substituted for analysis. That is to say, officers were largely left to their own devices in selecting problems to address and in the selection of means to address these problems, if they were addressed at all. More often, information obtained by police officers was seen as private, giving the officer some control over his or her work conditions and possibly an edge with fellow officers (Bittner 1970). Informants, for example, have been and continue to be seen as "belonging to a particular officer," and the information they provide is generally acted upon by that officer. At the individual officer level, this results in some officers developing and refining these skills and a large number of others not doing so, or more importantly, seeing such skill development as unimportant.

With the advent of computerization and its adoption by the police, the capacity to link differing sources of information to better understand discrete problems was greatly enhanced. Despite such an enhancement, it is not at all clear that the police systematically exploit multiple information sources in their pursuit of a better understanding of crime, disorder, victimization, fear, and community quality of life. Even current efforts to target locations for police interventions through computer mapping fall considerably short of systematically integrating information to improve police system responses. Rather, current crime mapping efforts frequently have been restricted to displaying serious crime patterns almost exclusively.

In a critique of problem solving, Clarke (1998, 315–327) suggested that much of what occurs under the label of problem solving is shallow, unanalytic, and largely ineffective. As Clarke suggests, the police fail in most of the problem-solving steps. During scanning, the police often fail to clearly specify the problem they seek to address. This creates considerable variance in what the police think they are addressing. Analysis of problems, according to Clarke (1998, 318), is also quite rudimentary: "[D]uring an investigation of calls for service or crime reports, they rarely identify patterns about how often or when a crime is occurring, or about where the problem is concentrated. They also make a few attempts to disaggregate statistics to determine the precise nature of the problem."

When it comes to responses, Clarke suggests that much of what falls under the guise of community and problem-oriented policing is really traditional police tactics, such as crackdowns, street sweeps, and arrests, often masked as community and/or problem-solving interventions. These tactics may be being applied to poorly defined and analyzed problems. Finally, Clarke argues that the most unused aspect of problem solving is the assessment of results. As

institutionalized policing has little history with evaluation of extant programs, much of what passes for evaluation is really conjecture and anecdote. As a consequence, Clarke sees significant failures in the presumed new technology of the police (see also Rosenbaum, Lurigio, and Davis 1998, 194–195, for a similar critique of problem solving). As a result, the tentative conclusion that can be derived from the limited assessments of current police problem-solving activities is that they are often superficial and in many police agencies have not impacted the internal definition of the process of police work.

Currently, many police departments across America have adopted a framework for response that includes elements of problem solving. This framework is evolving, and, with support and cross-communication among police agencies, the new technology of policing will continue to emerge. But, as a cautionary note, it is clear that the police imagination remains captured by 19th-century ideas about crime and police response, most particularly as zero-tolerance policing has gained popularity among the police and politicians in recent years.

One potential concern about shifting the police from a traditional focus to one emphasizing the community and/or problem solving relates to the criteria that the police use to make decisions, particularly decisions to arrest. This moves the discussion from the level of organizational or system intelligence to that of the individual police officer.

In its original formulation, Black (1980) asserted that, absent compelling legal grounds (e.g., offense seriousness), extralegal factors may creep into police decisions to make an arrest. The demeanor of the suspect, the ability of the victim or complainant to lobby for police action, race, sex, age, and other factors may be brought to bear on such decisions.

Although there is considerable disagreement about whether a person's aggressive demeanor may actually constitute a violation of the law, thereby making such police decisions more lawful (Klinger 1994), there remains concern that police and community cooperation may lead to misuse of the law. Under norms of community and problem-oriented policing, it is expected that the police develop a close working relationship with the public, a relationship that might influence police decisionmaking, for example, to take action against outsiders (those not from the communities involved in these partnerships). From the perspective of police decisionmaking, then, community and problem-oriented policing may introduce different criteria for decisions into local police actions, most particularly those associated with arrest (see Mastrofski and Greene 1993). In fact, many have argued that the law and city ordinances are insufficient in guiding police action (see Goldstein 1990) and that, therefore, community norms should indeed be interjected into the decisionmaking process.

In testing this idea, Mastrofski and his colleagues (1995) examined police field decisionmaking in Richmond, Virginia, a city that had adopted a community and problem-oriented focus. A total of 120 police officers were observed in 1,630 citizen encounters over 1,300 patrol hours. In all, Mastrofski and his colleagues concluded that there were changes to officer decisionmaking in Richmond, but that they did not introduce more extralegal factors into decisionmaking when community policing officers were compared with those espousing a more traditional focus: "Pro-community-policing officers arrest more selectively and with less regard to legal considerations. They show no greater susceptibility to extralegal influences than do their more traditionally oriented colleagues" (1995, 549). Although confined to a single study, this finding seems to suggest that there is a potential shift in decisionmaking when community and problem-oriented approaches are advocated but that the shift does not necessarily compromise the law.

Impacts on work groups and officers

Intended outcomes of community and problem-oriented policing are that police officers will (1) do their jobs differently; (2) identify with role changes associated with these new styles of policing; and (3) improve their attachment to work, the police profession, their departments, and one another—in short, improve job satisfaction. The improvements in individual officer job enactment and job attachment are tied to beliefs about police officers becoming cynical and disengaged from their departments and from the public at large. Here, the thinking is that the police can become more sensitive to community cultural norms and work within those norms to resolve disputes that lead to crime and disorder. These models also assume that police officers can engage the community in creative problem solving that will translate into using means other than the criminal law to resolve community crime, disorder, and fear problems.

In a few of the projects where there are community-focused data, such as the one conducted in Miami (Alpert and Dunham 1988), it is clear that police sensitivity to community norms and conversance with community expectations is at once a longstanding complaint in minority communities and an occupational prerequisite if the police are to become truly community oriented. These findings suggest that police and community relations remain problematic in urban areas and that substantial police role changes will be necessary to improve these relations.

In San Diego, a program to actively involve police officers in understanding the communities they police resulted in positive police officer attitudinal changes (Boydstun and Sherry 1975). In Baltimore County, Maryland, a problem-oriented approach to policing resulted in improved police officer job satisfaction and

strengthened officer orientation toward resolving community problems (Hayslip and Cordner 1987). In Philadelphia, a community-police educational program focused on communications and police-community problem solving demonstrated positive attitudinal results among participating police officers (Greene 1989; Greene and Decker 1989). And, in Miami, Alpert and Dunham (1988, 119–120) reported:

> [N]eighborhood climate and the frequent interactions of people in close association are much more influential in forming attitudes toward the police. . . . [I]n a highly stratified, multi-ethnic metropolitan center like Miami, neighborhood climate not only varies tremendously, but strongly influences one's perceptions of the police. . . . [P]olice officer effectiveness could be enhanced greatly if he received training specific to his district. This training would include knowledge concerning unique characteristics of the neighborhoods in the officer's district and the most appropriate and effective policing styles for those neighborhoods.

In Houston and Newark, research conducted through the Police Foundation (see Skogan 1990; Skolnick and Bayley 1986) suggested that the community improved its evaluation of police performance, including the quality of interaction with the police, with the advent of programs that sought to bring the community and police closer together after years of conflict and animosity. In Houston, this was brought about by creating community stations where community response teams attempted to mobilize and engage the community on matters of crime and disorder. In Newark, the police response was to employ more traditional police methods (saturation patrol and more aggressive street enforcement tactics), but to do so with the focus of improving community quality of life by reducing the signs of crime in neighborhoods—unruly behavior and abandoned property (typically automobiles).

In New York City, a program called the Community Patrol Officer Program (CPOP) sought to introduce a form of community policing to that city. CPOP officers were given responsibility for a wide variety of community and problem-solving activities. They were to mobilize communities and to identify and solve community problems (see Farrell 1988; Weisburd and McElroy 1988).

Although the initial assessment of this program focused on field supervisors and the adjustments they made to oversee CPOP officers, subsequent analyses of CPOP (McElroy, Cosgrove, and Sadd 1993) suggested that there were significant changes in attitudes for CPOP officers participating in the program, particularly in attitudes toward the community and toward being a police officer. Here, officers in CPOP expressed more favorable attitudes toward the community and their identification with their jobs following their participation in

the program. Interestingly, these same officers grew more critical of their department over the same time period.

In an assessment of role adaptation and job satisfaction among police officers in Joliet, Illinois, Rosenbaum and his colleagues (1994, 331–342) compared officers in this department who were part of the Neighborhood-Oriented Policing (NOP) Program with officers from a neighboring community without such a program. Many aspects of job attachment and satisfaction were employed in this study. Pretest and posttest measurements revealed several interesting findings.

First, NOP officers, compared with their counterparts in the neighboring jurisdiction, reported more favorable attitudes toward community policing. Second, NOP officers were more likely to report that their jobs had broadened and that they perceived an increase in job autonomy. They also reported higher job satisfaction and higher confidence in their ability to solve problems. Rosenbaum and his colleagues interpreted these findings cautiously, as some of the differences among the groups were attributable to declines in the non-NOP officers as opposed to increases among NOP officers. Nonetheless, they also concluded that these responses reflected growing officer buy-in into the overall community policing program in Joliet.

In one of the more recent studies of police officer adaptation to community and problem-oriented policing in Chicago, Skogan and Hartnett (1997) found "evidence of modest opinion shifts" in police officers who participated in the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) Program, previously discussed. These modest changes were reflected in CAPS officers becoming more optimistic about their interventions being thought of as effective in regard to traditional police concerns (e.g., crime reduction), their ability to actually solve problems, the impact of the program on police autonomy, and their satisfaction with the Chicago Police Department. Interestingly, this study also found that the CAPS Program had a wider association with general improvements in police attitudes toward beliefs that the program was impacting communities and that community policing concepts were indeed viable as a policing strategy in Chicago.

The National Institute of Justice funded a collaborative research project in 1997 to measure the impact of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services Accelerated Hiring, Education, and Deployment (COPS AHEAD) program in Philadelphia (see Greene et al. 1999). These officers were the principal component of the department's shift to a community policing orientation. A survey was administered to a sample of 389 officers, and analysis focused on the differences between COPS AHEAD rookie and veteran officers, motorized

rookie and veteran officers, and officers fulfilling other community policing roles. The evaluation provided an opportunity to see how differences in assignment and preparation affect the adoption of a community and/or problem-oriented role among the police.

The Philadelphia study revealed that rookie COPS AHEAD officers may have been better prepared to do community policing, as evidenced by their higher scores on academy training scales for problem solving and dealing with diversity and conflict. The five types of officers did not differ significantly with regard to their use of official data, but rookie COPS AHEAD officers and the comparison group of community policing officers reported using unofficial data (e.g., information from community residents and business owners) more than the other types of officers, particularly motorized veteran officers.

The five types of officers also differed significantly with regard to their orientations toward problem solving and community policing. This finding is not unanticipated, considering that the different types of officers have been assigned to distinctly different roles. Both rookie and veteran COPS AHEAD officers and the comparison group of community policing officers reported having stronger orientations toward problem solving and community policing than their motorized counterparts. However, the five kinds of officers did not differ significantly with regard to orientations toward law enforcement.

The study revealed significant differences among the five types of officers with regard to their satisfaction with work on their present job and with coworkers, but not in their satisfaction with supervisors. Specifically, COPS AHEAD rookies appeared to be more satisfied with work on their present job, as compared with other officers. In addition, COPS AHEAD and motorized rookies were more satisfied with their coworkers, as compared with veteran officers. The five types of officers differed significantly on a combined job satisfaction scale; COPS AHEAD rookies had higher scores, compared with other officers, indicating greater overall job satisfaction.

The five types of officers differed significantly with regard to their perceptions of impact. Specifically, both rookie and veteran COPS AHEAD officers reported feeling that they have a greater impact on their beats, as compared with their motorized counterparts and comparison group of community policing officers.

Collectively, police officer affective attachments to and understanding of the community have been enhanced in certain cities, as have officer role definitions, as a result of police and community programs. These findings are indeed encouraging in that they suggest police attitudes can be shaped toward the values and practices envisioned in community and problem-oriented policing.

Community Policing: Where Do We Go From Here?

Changes in the market, structure, and function of policing are radically altering how we conceptualize policing and how it is implemented in communities across the country. This essay has attempted to review and discuss the road to and the consequences of community policing. In comparison to previous models of policing, those focused on the community and on problem solving appear to be gaining acceptance and producing measurable results, such that they are becoming the orthodoxy of the American police. Moreover, this orthodoxy is becoming clearer and has begun to produce more credible assessments of results.

Collectively, the evidence on community and problem-oriented policing is mixed, yet encouraging. Community residents can perceive shifts in police officer activity and improvements in police-community interactions. There are small gains in crime reduction and reduced victimization. There is a shift in police agency strategy and structure that can be associated with adopting community and problem-oriented policing strategies, although there is not much of an impact on police work—what police actually do to solve problems. Finally, there are clearly improved role learning and role adoption by the police entering these roles, although it is not yet clear if they are due to organizational changes or the self-selection of officers to these types of activities. It is equally clear, however, that police engaged in these new styles of policing uniformly report greater attachment to their work and improved job satisfaction.

These impacts are encouraging for community and problem-oriented policing advocates, although the recent shift in police attention to zero-tolerance strategies could possibly erase gains if the limited focus of this approach moves the police back to earlier and more traditional definitions of police work. Moreover, these conclusions are indeed based on individual projects rather than on systematic and replicated study of police decisionmaking, community interaction, and police service delivery change.

Given this mixed bag of findings, it might be encouraging for those who resist community interaction and problem solving as the primary focuses of American policing to eschew these developments and call for a return to traditional efforts. Although this might be tempting, there are several external forces that continue to shape policing styles in favor of community and problem-oriented approaches. And, over the years, there has been considerable evidence to suggest that the chief obstacle to realizing community and problem-oriented policing objectives are police organizations themselves. It is to these topics that we turn our final attention.

Market pressures for community and problem-oriented policing

Although there are those who want to debate the role and function of the police, the institution of policing is being driven (and is often not doing the driving itself) toward a new paradigm. There are several forces pushing American policing toward this paradigm, forces that will likely continue to shape the police in years to come.

First, American policing has shifted from a closed- to an open-system model of organization and of organizational change, albeit at times begrudgingly. Specifically, today there is greater police agency-environment interaction in shaping the policies and priorities of the police and in assessing their effectiveness. The police are seen as one agent in a range of social institutions that affect community quality of life. Consequently, policing is becoming more influenced by those institutions external to it. This is especially the case where powerful external elites in the social, political, and economic sectors begin to endorse the rhetoric of community and problem-oriented policing. As the institutional imagery of policing continues to shift, it is likely that it will reach a tipping point from which there will be little return. This imagery is important because it helps shape the institution of policing, and it is simultaneously used by the institution of policing to shape the environment (see Crank and Langworthy 1992).

Much of the shift toward community-oriented government finds its roots in studies of organizational excellence conducted in the private sector more than a decade ago (see Peters and Waterman 1982). These studies suggested that successful organizations exhibited certain properties that afforded them the opportunity to make adjustments to changing external conditions. Among these properties were (1) maintaining close customer relations; (2) promoting a bias for action—being predisposed to do something rather than to wait; (3) increasing worker and managerial autonomy; (4) embedding a value system in the organization to guide individual behavior absent a rule; (5) sticking with what the organization does best, i.e., understanding your products first; and (6) promoting the idea that productivity comes through well-trained and well-supported personnel. These ideas have found their way into improvements in the public sector as well (see Osborne and Gaebler 1992) under the idea of reinventing government. Under such arrangements, government is becoming problem centered; the functional separation of government bureaucracies is yielding to task force and matrix organizational approaches to address discrete and visible municipal problems. The police are squarely in this environment, and their likely ability to withdraw from it is considerably curtailed.

This is not to say that the police as an institution have fully adopted this external set of relationships. In fact, in only a few American cities can it be said that the police now operate in a system of government where agencies are intimately connected to other social and organizational systems, each of which affects the level of safety, crime, disorder, and fear. In reality, this is an emerging and yet unformed aspect of a larger movement in American government to develop problem-centered government.

Nonetheless, in many other parts of the world, consultative committees composed of community leaders and other government and private-sector representatives function to help define public safety matters and to integrate services across a wide array of agencies to impact community problems. This emphasis began in policing largely through the creation of community advisory bodies (boards and other organizational arrangements) to work with the police in a more direct and supportive fashion.

Bayley (1994, 279), who has studied policing throughout the world, identifies such consultative relationships as the cornerstone of community policing in many parts of the world: "[C]onsultation, adaptation, mobilization and problem solving constitute an operational definition of community policing in practice around the world. They are what police forces do when community policing rhetoric becomes operational reality." According to Bayley, consultation involves asking the community (residential and commercial) about its safety concerns and security needs. Adaptation refers to affording local police leaders, typically captains of precincts, to adjust their resources to accommodate the needs of the community as determined through consultation. Mobilization refers to the police linking the resources and efforts of public and private agencies to focus on identified public safety issues. And, problem solving involves "remedying conditions that generate crime and insecurity. It involves conditions-focused prevention at local levels" (Bayley 1994, 279). Bayley's formula for community policing clearly reflects the movement toward organizational excellence in business and industry and the reinvention of government services that has been ongoing in the past two decades. And, in the research on community policing and problem solving, there is evidence that such processes are taking root in police departments across America.

In Houston (Wycoff 1985), crime prevention and neighborhood security programs were stimulated by community interest, and a community task force actually encouraged and succeeded in getting the police to become responsible for these efforts. In Chicago (Friedman 1994), community leaders formed a local block club to target drug activities in specific neighborhoods. In Los Angeles (Margolis 1994), the breakdown of community infrastructure led to a community coalition designed to work with several Los Angeles agencies to

achieve community stability. Such a process is now a central feature of the Los Angeles Police Department's interaction with the community (Greene 1998) and that of many other police departments. In Chicago, the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy has as its central feature "beat meetings"—regular interactions between Chicago police officers and community leaders to identify and prioritize local crime and disorder problems (Skogan 1998).

Such examples call attention to the fact that, over the past several years, police agencies throughout the country have tied themselves to larger social and governmental networks in their pursuit of community and problem-oriented policing strategies. Although these efforts have not necessarily been as effective as anticipated, the networks remain. Perhaps more importantly, the presumption that the police have to work with external entities is now a common feature of the language and planning of most police agencies. The genie is out of the bottle, and it is unlikely that the community will accept a lessor role in this process, as was typically the case under the traditional model of policing.

Policing at different levels of social intervention

The second element of the new policing is the mixing of proactive police responses with community planning and partnership building. This is not limited to proactive enforcement strategies and/or tactics because, if limited to such approaches, it would have the same problems as with zero tolerance previously discussed. Today, there is increased police proactive intervention, most particularly in crime prevention activities and victim assistance efforts (Crank 1994; Rosenbaum 1988; Rosenbaum, Lurigio, and Davis 1998; Skogan 1990). Here, the focus is on seeing the police as an intervention system that should be, but is not, primarily prevention focused. Those who argue for this position suggest that it is simply not enough to arrive at a crime scene, take a report, and tell the victim what he or she should have done differently to avoid the situation. Rather, the police are to attempt to intervene in the crime-victim-consequence causal network as early in the process as possible.

Such a conceptualization results in the specification of a chain of cause-and-effect relationships in which the police might intervene. Borrowing from the public health service, strategies to intervene in the causal networks of delinquency and crime require that prevention strategies be seen as primary, secondary, or tertiary (see Prothrow-Stith 1998, 59–61).

Police programs that seek to model behavior for youths and those that seek to involve the community in some form of self-protection or related community-building activities can be seen as primary interventions. These are viewed as primary interventions because they seek to intervene between the conditions

that spawn crime and disorder and the more proximate causes of crime and disorder, such as overt youth delinquency and deteriorated neighborhoods. Here lies much of the rhetoric and programming of community policing. Neighborhood storefronts, beat officers, expanded block watch, community councils, and the like are aimed at reinforcing the community's, not the police's, ability to resist crime. They are, and should be, community driven (Friedman 1994), because they are meant to ingrain public safety issues into the local social and community structure.

Other programs, such as D.A.R.E.® (Drug Abuse Resistance Education) and G.R.E.A.T. (Gang Resistance Education and Training),[4] seek to create alternative futures for youths so that they can more easily resist the temptation of drug use and gang membership, although the results of the research on these programs suggest that they may not have the impact once anticipated. Nevertheless, these efforts seek to foster youths' prosocial behavior as a primary crime prevention intervention.

An illustration of a primary intervention is offered in Boston through its program for high-risk youths, an attempt to identify and work with youths at risk of violence and injury (see Prothrow-Stith, Spivak, and Hausman 1987). This project, using the Violence Prevention Curriculum for Adolescents (Prothrow-Stith 1987), trained youths in Boston high schools. One evaluation of the program suggested it reduced student suspension rates and produced positive behavior changes among participating youths (Hausman, Pierce, and Briggs 1996). These findings are encouraging for the national movement to introduce violence reduction training to America's youths. To the extent that the police have a role in these programs, they constitute a primary target for police crime prevention efforts in the future.

Traditional forms of policing can be seen as secondary interventions—i.e., interventions that react to crime and delinquency and attempt to treat or respond to an immediate problem. Reactive patrols, followup criminal investigations, and most forms of crime prevention, including crime prevention through environmental design, which seek to deny opportunity rather than change motivation, illustrate this intervention point.

Although there is considerable discussion about reactive policing, it is not at all clear that the police can be completely free of such activities. The police were, after all, partly organized as an emergency response system. As certain emergencies are unlikely to be predictable, some police resources are likely to continue supporting reactive policing. Some form of split responsibility—problem solving and reaction to emergencies—is likely the long-term reality of policing (see Tien, James, and Larson 1978). In fact, this is the operational reality in

many cities, including those that are at the forefront of community and problem-oriented policing.

Creating defensible space or analyzing crime patterns for routine activities are approaches seeking to intervene between proximate causes and immediate effects as well (Felson 1986, 1987, 1995). Here, the focus is on treating crime situations and events through the response of the police, the community, or both. To be sure, there is some overlap between some police crime prevention activities. But, to the degree that the police alone cannot be expected to affect the larger forces of society and personality that shape criminal intentions and behaviors, they too are a form of social treatment to the failures of larger social, political, and economic institutions.

It might also be argued that much of problem solving falls under this secondary intervention level as well. Problem solving generally starts with analysis of historical and current behaviors and incidents to find some pattern. Once patterns are identified, strategies and programs designed to address the underlying problem are then brought to the forefront for implementation and evaluation. Although the language of prevention is associated with the problem-solving activities of the police, pragmatically these activities are perhaps better associated with differentiating treatments, or more precisely, matching treatments to problem sets.

Police efforts to ameliorate past victimizations or disputes can be seen as tertiary interventions. Such interventions can be said to be rehabilitative in their focus, i.e., attempting to redress the consequences of crime. Victim assistance and youth programs emphasizing high risk as a criterion for participation seek to intervene between the effects of crime and disorder and their consequences for individuals. Here, too, lie some of the newer community policing programs and efforts. Such efforts seek to broaden the role of the police to include supporting victims of crime and trying to reclaim youths who might have already begun minor criminal careers. Gang mediation and community dispute resolution programs have been conducted by the police either alone or in conjunction with social rehabilitative agencies, typically those rooted in social work and education. Here, the police are linking their efforts to the social rehabilitation arena to the extent that they concentrate efforts on addressing the consequences of crime and disorder, not their roots or proximate causes.

The importance of understanding the basis of intervention in any particular police program—community, problem oriented, or traditional—cannot be overstated. Knowing where in the causal chain the police are intervening provides a better understanding of the intervention program and its anticipated outcomes and effects. Better specification of the level and type of police intervention will also likely produce a broader range of police output and outcome measures.

Technology and community and problem-oriented policing

A third factor shaping policing in significant ways is the increased use of technology to address crime problems. Today, police agencies are quickly employing technology to address a range of security, communication, and problem-solving issues that assist them in becoming proactive rather than reactive. In Hartford, Connecticut, for example, the Cartographic Oriented Management Program for the Abatement of Street Sales (COMPASS) linked sophisticated computer mapping technologies with weed-and-seed forms of community and problem-oriented policing to address street narcotics sales. The city believed that these types of crime were most responsible for the declining community quality of life in several Hartford neighborhoods (see Tien and Rich 1994). The Hartford experience was evaluated as being beneficial to the city. In the small, well-defined geographic areas identified in Hartford, targeted crime information coupled with police actions against drug dealers effectively shut down these marketplaces in a month.

In recent years, technology has been employed to better understand crime dynamics—the spatial and temporal dimensions of crime. In New York City (see Silverman 1999), a program called COMPSTAT was originated to increase understanding about crime and to ensure greater accountability among command personnel for their efforts to address persistent crime problems. COMPSTAT refers to "compare stats" (Silverman 1999, 98) and employs computer mapping technology coupled with the philosophy of command personnel taking ownership for addressing crime and disorder problems.

Loosely modeled on industry sales and marketing meetings, the COMPSTAT process was meant to identify problems, ascertain how commanders planned to address those problems, and then hold them accountable (presumably through subsequent meetings) for the impacts of their actions on the identified problems. In part, this follows the general notion of problem solving.

Current analytic approaches associated with COMPSTAT may actually be degrading the idea of police performance and fixing it too closely on crime and arrest patterns. In fact, much of what passes under the rubric of COMPSTAT views performance almost exclusively through these dimensions. By plotting crime events (typically only serious crime events) and then attempting to tie police action to the interdiction of these events, the police may once again find themselves in the unenviable position of being measured on data produced by the community or through the selective use of certain police resources.

Today, there is less reliance on the police as the single line of defense in crime prevention, intervention, and social control. Although the police are seen as part of the solution to crime and disorder, we have begun to recognize that they may not be the most important part.

More importantly, by excluding other sources and kinds of information from the performance measurement system, the police may be missing a real opportunity to design and implement a system more consistent with the two central tenets of community and problem-oriented policing—namely, mobilizing communities in their own self-defense and solving persistent crime and disorder problems.

An important illustration of this rests in a comparison of the approach to crime control in New York City with that in San Diego, made by Cordner (1998). New York has laid claim to reducing crime and disorder significantly, largely through the use of COMPSTAT as a process to more finely analyze crime and, more importantly, to make commanders more accountable for their use of resources to fight crime and disorder in the city's neighborhoods and business districts (Pollard 1997; Silverman 1999). In contrast, San Diego has spent considerable time refining community and problem-oriented policing over a period of two decades (Capowich and Roehl 1994).

In comparing the two cities, Cordner suggests that zero tolerance, although perhaps effective in New York, is not necessarily the wave of the future for other police agencies. In fact, San Diego achieved comparable results, as measured by declining crime over the same period, as New York, but San Diego used quite different police methods—namely, those associated with community and problem-oriented policing. As Cordner (1998, 311) suggests: "San Diego has enjoyed almost exactly the same decrease as New York, without adding substantially more police officers."

Policing through networks and partnerships

A fourth factor shaping the future of policing is related in part to our earlier consideration of the networks and partnerships the police have been building with other agencies for the past several years. Today, there is less reliance on the police as the single line of defense in crime prevention, intervention, and social control. Although the police are seen as part of the solution to crime and disorder, we have begun to recognize that they may not be the most important part. This recognition stems from several activities that have sharpened the crime prevention lens of many local governments.

Mutual activity undertaken by many government agencies to resolve persistent neighborhood crime, disorder, and fear problems has resulted in broadening the type of stakeholders in the solutions to these problems. Greater reliance on the private sector for crime prevention and control interventions has also changed the mix of those who have a role to play in public safety (see Shearing 1992). As Bayley and Shearing (1996, 585) note:

> Policing is no longer monopolized by the public police, that is, the police created by government. Policing is now being widely offered by institutions other than the state, most importantly by private companies on a commercial basis and by communities on a voluntary basis.

For the past 15 years or so, there has been a strong privatization movement in criminal justice, much of which is focused on maintaining security over areas, and policing. This movement has resulted in a burgeoning private security industry, the creation of walled or gated communities, policing by private agents, and the creation of other quasi-public entities to oversee some security functions.

For example, business improvement districts (BIDs) have sprung up across the United States. Currently, about 1,000 of these districts exist (Hudson 1996). The central features of BIDs are that they are clean and safe—ridding the downtown area of social and physical incivility, precursors to fear of crime and crime itself. Typically, BIDs focus on integrating public and private security in commercial sections of cities. Such integration is politically and financially supported by the political and business communities; to the extent that BIDs do not take police resources from neighborhoods, they are generally accepted in the communities in which they have been implemented (see Greene and Stokes 1998).

BIDs are now creeping ever so slowly into residential neighborhoods. Because they have been seen as effective in reducing crime and disorder in the business sector of the community, communities are attempting to build similar models for residential use. Should this occur on any wide-scale basis, the structure of policing will continue to be significantly modified.

This movement toward neighborhood-based safety is further supported by a large amount of volunteerism that supports crime prevention and control in residential neighborhoods. As Bayley and Shearing (1996, 587) suggest:

> In recent years private policing has also expanded under noncommercial auspices as communities have undertaken to provide security using volunteered services and people. A generation ago community crime prevention was virtually nonexistent. Today it is everywhere—citizen automobile and

> foot patrols, neighborhood watches, crime-prevention associations and advisory councils, community newsletters, crime prevention publications and presentations, protective escort services for at-risk populations, and monitors around schools, malls and public parks. Like commercial private security, the acceptability of volunteer policing has been transformed in less than a generation.

The trend that Bayley and Shearing identify, particularly in regard to community mobilization and volunteerism, is not without significant problems. There is great selectivity in individual and community participation in government programs in general and criminal justice programs in particular (for a review, see Rosenbaum, Lurigio, and Davis 1998, 20–27). Poor and socially disorganized communities often lack the internal leadership to sustain participation over time, and language and cultural barriers inevitably influence participation as well. As Rosenbaum and his colleagues (1998, 25) suggest:

> [P]articipation appears to be much more likely in homogeneous, low-crime, middle-class neighborhoods than in heterogeneous, higher-crime, lower class neighborhoods. In the latter communities, residents generally feel less responsible for crime prevention, more suspicious of their neighbors, and more alienated from the police.

Communities in higher income and less crime-prone neighborhoods may be rather easily mobilized in the face of a dramatic crime and or perceived threat to community order. Once mobilized, however, sustaining community participation may prove difficult (see Rosenbaum 1986). The dynamics of community and individual participation in community and problem-oriented policing are only now coming to light (see Rosenbaum, Lurigio, and Davis 1998, 20–29). As they are central to the type of partnership implied in community and problem-oriented policing approaches, community participation patterns need further exploration and assessment.

Also contributing to the idea that the police are being seen less as the primary form of safety services is the increasing coordination and/or interaction between the police and the rest of the criminal justice system. For example, the Manhattan experiment in community prosecution (Boland 1998) can be seen as a justice system response to a community demand for greater public safety in neighborhoods. In this instance, the Manhattan program restructured prosecution services to address both quality-of-life issues as well as serious crime occurring in neighborhoods.

Prior to this project, smaller, less serious offenses were likely to be dropped by the justice system once the police took action. Over time, this sent a message

that prosecutors and the courts had little interest in pursuing these matters. Eventually, the police began to underenforce them, believing that they would not be accepted in the courtroom process. As a result, the community had little response from downtown to neighborhood problems. For the past several years, community courts have sprung up across America. Some are found in business districts, others are located or move about in residential settings. Each now addresses a wide variety of community problems. Such prosecution- and court-related investments in community crime and disorder likely will continue to shape the police officers and agencies working in these same neighborhoods and business areas. As the justice system itself has begun to recognize that it too must coordinate efforts for maximum output and impact, this will greatly reshape the role of the police in the years to come.

Changes associated with the justice system, as previously alluded to, are also affecting the relationships between the police and other social service agencies. Today, there is certainly increased interaction and coordination between the police and human services and social welfare services. In areas such as domestic violence and child abuse, the police are working as part of intervention teams to influence these outcomes in a positive way (Gamache, Edelson, and Schock 1988; Hirschel et al. 1999).

Like it or not, the police are in the social welfare business: They are the only 24-hours-a-day, 7-days-a-week agency open to address a wide range of social problems, such as domestic and social welfare problems. Consequently, for practical as well as philosophical reasons, the police cannot continue to see much of this work as not police business. Such shifts in partnerships with social service agencies and continued pressure for the police to respond to these community concerns will continue to shape both the definition of police work and the delivery systems by which police services and other government social services are provided. Increased police agency accountability for effort, output, and activity is also pushing the police toward more analytic and thoughtful responses and methods of measuring success—measuring effort is not enough to maintain support for the police, efforts must be linked to outputs and outputs to effects.

Each of these changes in the marketplace and environment of the police has had profound impacts on how policing is performed and evaluated. They portend a significant departure from policing as we know it. They will require considerations of jurisdiction, service delivery, the protection of constitutional rights (particularly as they are affected by private service providers), and the network of agencies and individuals who will play a role in public safety.

Policing and the bureaucratic imperative

Community policing is a difficult philosophy to implement in highly structured, authoritarian bureaucracies—such as those found in American law enforcement. The problem of change implementation focuses our attention on the institutional capacity of the police to actually effect the intended outcomes of community policing. As we have seen, American policing has made some progress toward more open and accountable administrative, organizational, and service delivery systems, yet much more needs to occur if the police are to fully embrace these new concepts.

Compartmentalizing community and problem-oriented policing

Tactical planning and the shifting of personnel to hot spots are better developed in policing today than they have been in the past. In fact, such tactical analysis has often eclipsed larger issues of police roles and accountability. Consequently, short-term tactical considerations are more apt to drive community policing programs, perhaps to the detriment of the long-term strategic issues. Additionally, at present most of these programs are treated as experiments or special areas and do not challenge the core technology of policing systemwide. Although the effects achieved in Chicago are the most documented, this program also remains an adjunct to more traditional response-driven policing.

Project after project in the community policing arena appears to seek to incrementally affect policing through time- and jurisdiction-bounded demonstration programs. Although there are both pro and con arguments to conducting demonstration projects, it is clear that much of what passes as general policing is unconnected to these projects (see Zhao 1996). If we have learned nothing from the experiments in team policing of the past (Sherman, Milton, and Kelly 1973; Schwartz and Clarren 1977), it should be clear that police bureaucracies are skilled at stifling innovation, most particularly when the change threatens the internal status quo of that agency (see Wycoff and Kelling 1978). Consequently, the limited and often oblique approach afforded community and problem-oriented policing programs at present is unlikely to materially affect the bureaucratic routines these programs seek to alter.

Related to the organizational issues raised previously, many community policing programs are presented and function as adjuncts to other police services in any given area. For example, in foot patrol programs, the officers are often placed into areas to relieve motorized patrols, or neighborhood police station officers are adjuncts to the many overlay police services in that neighborhood. Such specialization can be quite detrimental to instilling a strategy of community policing or problem solving. When such organizational specialization takes

place, we need only look at the community relations movement of past police generations and its impact on "real" patrol officers (Greene and Pelfrey 1997). The suboptimization of community-oriented policing is certainly to be avoided in setting the police agenda of the future.

Resocializing and training officers

Another set of significant implementation problems surrounds both the selection and resocialization of police participants assigned to community policing programs, activities, or functions. In regard to selection, it is not clear that what passes as a community or problem-oriented police program is not actually the result of highly motivated police officers who are either self-selected or organizationally selected into these positions. That is, in the current version of community-oriented policing programs, patrol officers are often creamed or volunteered such that we often do not know if it is the program or the individual that accounts for effects achieved, presuming we can find any.

Much of the current efforts to imbue policing with community and problem-oriented focuses remain short in duration—ranging from a few days to perhaps 1 week, not a significant timeframe to resocialize the police.

Evidence from Chicago and Joliet appears to suggest that community and problem-oriented policing can be generalized to the wider police workforce (Skogan and Hartnett 1997; Lurigio and Skogan 1998; Lurigio and Rosenbaum 1994). Still, questions remain as to what types of police officers are drawn to such programs, and how the police selection and socialization process supports or detracts from a more generalized style of policing. Zhao and his associates (1995) suggested that there was indeed more emphasis and desire for community and problem-solving training in many police agencies. This is no small technical matter, for it points to a more critical question—namely, can all or even a large number of police officers actually become community or problem oriented (Greene 1989)?

Related to the person/role fit, the questions raised regard the extent to which police participants in demonstration programs receive the resocialization they require for what are fundamentally new roles. Much of police training might be characterized as developing "acting" officers; much of the reform implied in community and problem-oriented programs will require "thinking" officers.

A cursory review of the literature on current and past community and problem-oriented programs reveals that generally less than 1 week of time is devoted for American police officers to learn and function in these new police thinking roles. Certainly, enacting roles based on such little preparation is unlikely to produce the results expected; if such results are indeed achieved, then the question of whether these results are achieved through programs and institutions or through the self-selection of individuals again arises.

Community and problem-oriented policing require that the police change, in some fundamental ways, the process they use to conduct business. All too often, these efforts have not been accompanied by effective training that might assist police officers, supervisors, and indeed those at all levels within police departments to make these shifts in philosophy, policy, and practice.

In its early inception, community and problem-oriented policing training was but a small aspect of the training the police received. More often than not, this training was short in duration, conceptual, and at times ethereal and lacked any serious connection to the realities of police work. (For a discussion of this process in Chicago, see Skogan and Hartnett 1997.) Typically, these efforts amounted to training that ranged from a few hours to perhaps an entire day. In fact, much of the current efforts to imbue policing with community and problem-oriented focuses remain short in duration—ranging from a few days to perhaps 1 week, not a significant timeframe to resocialize the police.

Beyond the issue of duration is the matter of content. What are the subject domains from which community and problem-oriented policing should be drawing? From the perspective of community policing, the generally agreed topics are effective communications, developing and conducting meetings, building consensus among community partners, action planning, and the ability to deal with conflict within interpersonal situations. These topics are generally not found in police training curriculums. Moreover, basic and advanced police training as currently construed in America may actually provide competing messages about the role of the police in society and more specifically about the importance of community and problem-oriented policing vis-a-vis more traditional approaches. What is generally lacking in American policing is the "red thread" of community and problem-oriented policing that would link the diverse topics within any basic or advanced training curriculum.

Perhaps a more pressing problem in police training as it affects community and problem-oriented policing is in the preparation of new officers for these challenging positions. Typically, training and standards commissions within each State govern police training. These commissions set the minimum standards for police training. There is often a range in training and preparation needed to become a police officer, from about 420 to 600 hours. Much of this training was

developed during the professional era of policing. That is to say, much of this training was developed to bring the police up to some standard of practice that could be used to ensure that minimal preparation would be required of all police officers, as well as to enhance the occupation's prestige as a profession. Together, the twin goals of establishing minimal criteria for policing officers and increasing the occupation's status have been the underlying justifications in much of this movement. Unfortunately, at the time of their adoption, minimal standards did not include a visible place for community and problem-oriented policing. Even today, the linking of community and problem-oriented concepts in an integrated State-mandated curriculum is not typical of the police training environment. Rather, community and problem-oriented training has become an add-on in the midst of traditionally based skills training offered and mandated by these commissions and taught in police academies across the country.

Tackling police culture

Perhaps one of the greatest obstacles to realizing community and problem-oriented policing agencies rests within the cultures of policing. Organizational cultures are "the values, beliefs, assumptions, perceptions, norms, artifacts, and patterns of behavior" that guide individual and group action (Ott 1989, 1). Cultures are powerful metaphors, for they focus our concerns on the internal symbols that channel organizational behavior (Morgan 1986).

Despite a recognition of the important role that style—or organizational culture—plays in policing, the methods for creating this organizational culture and the implications of competing cultures for police work are not clearly understood and less obviously practiced in modern-day law enforcement agencies. Values and organizational culture in policing are important beyond the issue of image or the general stylistic notions that are thought to condition police departments (Wilson 1967; Brown 1981). At the institutional level of policing, values and culture are most often associated with the corporate strategy being pursued by the organization as a whole (see Kelling and Moore 1988; Moore and Trojanowicz 1988). Current trends in policing toward the identification and publication of explicit organizational values can be viewed as illustrating the institutional connections between values, culture, and corporate strategy. And conflict between the internalized management culture of police organizations and the tactical culture of police operations, which has been identified by several researchers (Manning 1977; Brown 1981; Reuss-Ianni and Ianni 1983), can be viewed as evidence of an ongoing internal struggle for value clarification within police departments. Moreover, current efforts to shift police departments from traditional policing toward community and problem-oriented policing (Goldstein 1990) can also be viewed as explicitly addressing competing internal values within policing as portrayed in our earlier consideration of policing models.

Resocializing supervisors

Although it is generally agreed that first-line supervisors play a critical role in overseeing all activities of line officers, the shift to community and problem-oriented policing makes these roles even more critical. In New York City, for example, the role of the sergeant required several adjustments to properly oversee CPOP, previously discussed. For example, sergeants in New York supervising street officer activities needed to adjust their own and the officers' expectations about what activities were legitimate. Here, the concern was to shift the sergeants' definition of good police work to include more community contacts (see Weisburd and McElroy 1988). A second shift in supervisory practice and orientation included the need to shift sergeants from managing the workload that was being responded to toward proactive problem-solving activities that responded to community problems (in this case, street-level drug sales). Third, in the New York experience, sergeants needed to adjust their supervisory practices to ensure that, while they were encouraging police and community interaction, it remained lawful and therefore did not corrupt officer decision-making and actions taken in community settings.

Skogan and Hartnett echoed the concern for the development of sergeants' facility and agreement with community and problem-oriented policing concepts and practices. In speaking about the Chicago CAPS Program, they suggest: "It was also clear that the program could not become a reality until officers believed that their immediate supervisor really expected them to carry it out" (1997, 90).

For community and problem-oriented policing to become firmly entrenched in American policing, it will be necessary for supervisory practices to shift toward facilitating workforce achievement while holding officers accountable for problem solving. This is a major task and one requiring that we rethink the industrial supervisory model that currently undergirds policing. It is clear from research on the police that the task environment of police officers produces both opportunities for community building and problem solving while at the same time improving satisfaction for individual officers (Wycoff and Skogan 1993; Zhao, Thurman, and He 1999). Police officers seek autonomy in their daily activities, and it will be essential that police supervisors afford officers decisional latitude and autonomy while at the same time ensuring that such autonomy is used appropriately to solve community problems.

Performance measurement

Finally, perhaps one of the more significant issues confronting community and problem-oriented policing is the need to develop and implement performance standards that will reinforce the shift from traditional policing to these newer

styles and practices. Performance measurement has the effect of announcing what the organization values and then monitoring individual compliance with organizational objectives. Such systems reinforce the messages obtained through the philosophical discussion of community and problem-oriented policing by making practical the means and outcomes sought of individual police officers, work groups, and the entire organization. As noted by Skogan and Hartnett (1997, 109):

> Performance in a community policing assignment needs to be recognized; and performance measures need to be developed that enable managers to give their line workers routine feedback about how well they are doing, and to convey to the department, and to the general public, the reality of the agency's new values and expectations.

In some respects, American policing is in a catch-22 situation where it at once announces to the community and to the police that they should expect something different from the police and yet measures those things that are most associated with traditional policing, such as crime reporting and arrests. In systems where there is a disjuncture between preaching and practice, it should be expected that employees would follow the path of what is measured, rewarded, and punished.

Today, there are competing messages in the measurement of police performance at both the individual and organizational levels. Despite several efforts to shape policing toward community and problem-oriented approaches, the central measurements of police impact remain the frequency of serious crime and the number of arrests made by the police.

Innumerable discussions about the vagueness of police statistics and their ability to shed light on police performance have been advanced. Essentially, they say that police crime reports are suspect in the measurement of performance as they are more often related to community confidence in reporting victimization to the police. Also, police arrest statistics as a measure of performance are problematic as they generally are affected by the level of resources that the police can devote to a particular crime or location, rather than a measure of either efficiency or effectiveness. To date, most police agencies have not linked calls for service to performance measurement, even though these data may more accurately reflect community concerns about crime and disorder or other things that disturb the social fabric.

Problem solving as a central policing technological change should carry with it a measurement system that allows the police to know if the problem has been resolved or has diminished. Moreover, if the level of harm from the problem

has been reduced or it takes longer to recur, the police may have improved their performance even though it is not exactly reflected in their traditional measures.

Identifying and using appropriate measures of police performance, then, likely will help to reinforce police shifts toward community and problem-oriented policing. Conversely, if the police continue to use historical measures of success exclusively, the internal messages that officers receive are that business as usual is the path to individual and organizational success. Such a message complicates individual roles and institutional change in policing and does injury to the fledgling accomplishments of community and problem-oriented policing.

The author wishes to thank Dr. Dennis P. Rosenbaum, School of Criminal Justice, University at Albany, State University of New York; Dr. Alex Piquero, Department of Criminal Justice, Temple University; and the editorial board members of the Criminal Justice 2000 *project for their helpful and insightful comments on this manuscript. The manuscript has improved with their assistance, yet any interpretations, errors, and omissions remain those of the author.*

Notes

1. These include murder, aggravated assault, rape, robbery, auto theft, burglary, and arson.

2. Sir Robert Peel, the acknowledged founder of organized policing in England in the early 1800s, suggested as the first principle of policing that police agencies be judged primarily by the absence of crime.

3. Quoted on the cover of Kelling and Coles 1996.

4. D.A.R.E.® and G.R.E.A.T. are programs that have been implemented nationally to provide prosocial role models and activities for school-age children.

References

Alpert, G., and R. Dunham. 1988. *Policing multi-ethnic neighborhoods.* New York: Greenwood Press.

Alpert, G., and M. Moore. 1993. *Measuring police performance in the new paradigm of policing. In Performance measures for the criminal justice system.* Bureau of Justice Statistics—Princeton University Study Group on Criminal Justice Performance Measures. NCJ 143505. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Bayley, D.H. 1994. *Police for the future.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bayley, D.H., and C.D. Shearing. 1996. The future of policing. *Law & Society Review* 30 (3): 585–606.

Berkley, G.E. 1969. *The democratic policeman.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Bittner, E. 1970. *The functions of the police in modern society.* Chevy Chase, Maryland: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute of Mental Health.

Black, D. 1980. *The manners and customs of the police.* New York: Academic Press.

Boland, B. 1998. The Manhattan experiment: Community prosecution. In *Crime and place: Plenary papers of the 1997 conference on criminal justice research and evaluation.* Research Forum, NCJ 168618. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Boydstun, J.E., and M.E. Sherry. 1975. *San Diego community profile: Final report.* Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

Brown, L.P., and M.A. Wycoff. 1987. Policing Houston: Reducing fear and improving service. *Crime & Delinquency* 33 (January): 71–89.

Brown, M.K. 1981. *Working the street.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Capowich, G.E., and J.A. Roehl. 1994. Problem-oriented policing: Actions and effectiveness in San Diego. In *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promises,* edited by D. Rosenbaum. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Clarke, R.V. 1998. Defining police strategies: Problem solving, problem-oriented policing, and community-oriented policing. In *Problem-oriented policing: Crime-specific patterns, critical issues, and making POP work,* edited by T. O'Connor Shelly and A.C. Grant. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

———. 1995. Situational crime prevention. In *Building a safer society: Strategic approaches to crime prevention,* edited by M. Tonry and D.P. Farrington. Vol. 19 of *Crime and justice: A review of research.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cordner, G.W. 1998. Problem-oriented policing vs. zero tolerance. In *Problem-oriented policing: Crime-specific patterns, critical issues, and making POP work,* edited by T. O'Connor Shelly and A.C. Grant. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

———. 1985. The *Baltimore County Citizen Oriented Police Enforcement (COPE) Project: Final report.* New York: Florence V. Burden Foundation.

Crank, J.P. 1994. State theory, myths of policing, and responses to crime. *Law & Society Review* 28:325–351.

Crank, J.P., and R. Langworthy. 1992. An institutional perspective of policing. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 83 (2): 338–363.

Eck, J.E. 1993. Alternative futures for policing. In *Police innovation and the control of the police,* edited by D. Weisburd and C. Uchida. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Eck, J.E., and D.P. Rosenbaum. 1994. The new police order: Effectiveness, equity, and efficiency in community policing. In *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promise,* edited by D.P. Rosenbaum. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Eck, J.E., and W. Spelman. 1987. *Problem solving: Problem-oriented policing in Newport News.* Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

Edelman, M. 1977. *Political language: Words that succeed and policies that fail.* New York: Academic Press.

Etzioni, A. 1993. *The spirit of community.* New York: Crown Publishers.

Farrell, M.J. 1988. The development of the Community Patrol Officer Program: Community-oriented policing in the New York City Police Department. In *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality,* edited by J.R. Greene and S. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger.

———. 1986. The *Community Patrol Officer Program: Community-oriented policing in the New York City Police Department, interim progress report number 2.* New York: Vera Institute of Justice.

Felson, M. 1995. Those who discourage crime. In *Crime and place,* edited by J.E. Eck and D. Weisburd. Vol. 4 of *Crime prevention studies*. Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press.

———. 1987. Routine activities and crime prevention in the developing metropolis. *Criminology* 25:911–931.

———. 1986. Linking criminal choices, routine activities, informal control, and criminal outcomes. In *The reasoning criminal: Rational choice perspectives on offending*, edited by D.B. Cornish and R.V. Clarke. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Fogelson, R. 1977. *Big city police.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Friedman, W. 1994. *The community role in community policing.* In *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promise,* edited by D.P. Rosenbaum. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Gamache, D.J., J.L. Edelson, and M.D. Schock. 1988. Coordinated police, judicial, and social service response to woman battering: A multiple-baseline evaluation across three counties. In *Coping with family violence,* edited by G.T. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, and J.T. Kirkpatrick. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

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

———. 1987. Toward community-oriented policing: Potential, basic requirements, and threshold questions. *Crime & Delinquency* 33 (1): 6–30.

———. 1979. Improving policing: A problem oriented approach. *Crime & Delinquency* 25 (April): 236–258.

Gouldner, A. 1954. *Patterns of industrial bureaucracy.* New York: Free Press.

Greene, J.R. 1998. The road to community policing in Los Angeles: A case study. In *Community policing: Contemporary readings,* edited by G. Alpert and A. Piquero. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.

———. 1989. Police officer job satisfaction and community perceptions: Implications for community policing. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 26 (2) (May): 168–183.

Greene, J.R., and S.H. Decker. 1989. Police and community perceptions of the community role in policing: The Philadelphia experience. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 22 (2) (May): 105–123.

Greene, J.R., M. Hickman, K. Henderson, R. Stokes, W. Pelfrey, and A. Piquero. 1999. *Measuring what matters: Assessing community police performance in Philadelphia.* Final Report. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Greene, J.R., and C.B. Klockars. 1991. What police do. In *Thinking about police.* 2d ed. Edited by C.B. Klockars and S.D. Mastrofski. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greene, J.R., and S. Mastrofski, eds. 1988. *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality.* New York: Praeger.

Greene, J.R., and W.V. Pelfrey, Jr. 1997. Shifting the balance of power between police and community: Responsibility for crime control. In *Critical issues in policing: Contemporary readings.* 3d ed. Edited by R.G. Dunham and G.P. Alpert. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.

Greene, J.R., and R. Stokes. 1998. Policing business districts: Problem solving in a different context. In *Problem-oriented policing: Crime-specific patterns, critical issues, and making POP work,* edited by T. O'Connor Shelly and A.C. Grant. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

Greene, J.R., and R.B. Taylor. 1988. Community policing and foot patrol: Issues of theory and evaluation. In *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality,* edited by J.R. Greene and S. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger.

Guyot, D. 1979. Bending granite: Attempts to change the rank structure of American police departments. *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 7 (3): 253–284.

Hausman, A., G. Pierce, and L. Briggs. 1996. Evaluation of comprehensive violence prevention education: Effects on student behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Health* 19:104–110.

Hayslip, D., and G. Cordner. 1987. The effects of community-oriented patrols on police officer attitudes. Special issue on foot patrol and community policing. *American Journal of Police* 4 (1) (Spring): 95–119.

Hirschel, J.D., I.W. Hutchison, C.W. Dean, and A.M. Mills. 1999. The law enforcement response to spouse abuse. In *Policing perspectives: An anthology,* edited by L.K. Gaines and G.W. Cordner. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.

Hope, T. 1995. Community crime prevention. In *Building a safer society: Strategic approaches to crime prevention,* edited by M. Tonry and D.P. Farrington. Vol. 19 of *Crime and justice: A review of research.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Hudson, K. 1996. Special district governments: Examining the questions of control. *American City and County* (September): 54–71.

Judd, D.R. 1988. *The politics of American cities: Private power and public policy.* 3d ed. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Kelling, G.L. 1985. Order maintenance, the quality of urban life, and police: A line of argument. In *Police leadership in America,* edited by W.A. Geller. Chicago: American Bar Foundation; New York: Praeger.

Kelling, G.L., and W.J. Bratton. 1993. Implementing community policing: The administrative problem. *Perspectives on policing.* No. 17. NCJ 141236. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Kelling, G.L., and C.M. Coles. 1996. *Fixing broken windows.* New York: Free Press.

Kelling, G.L., and M. Moore. 1988. From political to reform to community: The evolving strategy of police. In *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality,* edited by J.R. Greene and S. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger.

Kennedy, D. 1998. Crime prevention as crime deterrence. In *What can the Federal Government do to decrease crime and revitalize communities?* Research Forum, NCJ 172210. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice and Executive Office for Weed and Seed.

Klinger, D. 1994. Demeanor or crime? An inquiry into why citizens are more likely to be arrested. *Criminology* 32:475–493.

Klockars, C.B. 1988. The rhetoric of community policing. In *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality,* edited by J.R. Greene and S. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger.

———. 1985. Order maintenance, the quality of urban life, and police: A different line of argument. In *Police leadership in America,* edited by W.A. Geller. Chicago: American Bar Foundation; New York: Praeger.

Lurigio, A.J., and D.P. Rosenbaum. 1994. The impact of community policing on police personnel: A review of the literature. In *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promises,* edited by D.P. Rosenbaum. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Lurigio, A.J., and W.G. Skogan. 1998. Community policing in Chicago: Bringing officers on board. *Police Quarterly* 1 (1):1–25.

Maguire, E.R., J.B. Kuhns, C.D. Uchida, and S.M. Cox. 1997. Patterns of community policing in non-urban America. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 34 (3): 368–394.

Manning, P.K. 1988. Community policing as a drama of control. In *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality,* edited by J.R. Greene and S. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger.

———. 1986. British policing: Continuities and changes. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice* 25 (4) (November): 261–278.

———. 1979. The reflexivity and facticity of knowledge: Criminal justice research in the 1970s. *American Behavioral Scientist* 22 (6): 697–732.

———. 1977. *Police work: The social organization of policing.* Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Margolis, S. 1994. Blythe Street team makes an impact. *Police Chief* (October): 70–73.

Mastrofski, S.D., and J.R. Greene. 1993. Community policing and the rule of law. In *Police innovation and control of the police,* edited by D. Weisburd and C. Uchida. New York: Springer- Verlag.

Mastrofski, S.D., R.E. Worden, and J.B. Snipes. 1995. Law enforcement in a time of community policing. *Criminology* 33 (4): 539–555.

McElroy, J., C.A. Cosgrove, and S.A. Sadd. 1993. *Community policing: The CPOP in New York.* Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.

Miller, W.R. 1975. Cops and bobbies, 1830–1870. *Journal of Social History* (Winter): 81–101.

Moore, M. 1994. Research synthesis and policy implications. In *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promise,* edited by D.P. Rosenbaum. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

———. 1992. Problem solving and community policing. In *Crime and justice: A review of research,* edited by M. Tonry and N. Morris. Vol. 15. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Moore, M.H., and D.W. Stephens. 1991. *Beyond command and control: The strategic management of police departments.* Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

Moore, M.H., and R.C. Trojanowicz. 1988. Corporate strategies for policing. In *Perspectives on policing.* No. 6. NCJ 114215. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Moore, M.H., R.C. Trojanowicz, and G.L. Kelling. 1988. Crime and policing. In *Perspectives on policing.* No. 2. NCJ 111460. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, and Harvard University.

Morgan, Gareth. 1986. *Images of organization.* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. 1968. *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Oettmeier, T.N., and M.A. Wycoff. 1998. Personnel performance evaluations in the community policing context. In *Problem-oriented policing: Crime-specific patterns, critical issues, and making POP work,* edited by T. O'Connor Shelly and A.C. Grant. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

Osborne, D., and T. Gaebler. 1992. *Reinventing government.* New York: Plume Publishing.

Ott, J.S. 1989. *The organizational culture perspective.* Pacific Grove, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Pelfrey, W.V., Jr. 1998. Precipitating factors of paradigmatic shift in policing: The origin of the community policing era. In *Community policing: Contemporary readings,* edited by G. Alpert and A. Piquero. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.

Peters, J.T., and R.H. Waterman. 1982. *In search of excellence.* New York: Harper & Row.

Police Foundation. 1981. *The Newark foot patrol experiment.* Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

Pollard, C. 1997. Zero tolerance: Short-term fix, long-term liability? In *Zero tolerance: Policing a free society,* edited by N. Dennis. London: Institute of Economic Affairs, Health and Welfare Unit.

Prothrow-Stith, D. 1998. Revitalizing communities: Public health strategies for violence prevention. In *What can the Federal Government do to decrease crime and revitalize communities?* Research Forum, NCJ 172210. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice and Executive Office for Weed and Seed.

———. 1987. *Violence prevention curriculum for adolescents.* Newton, Massachusetts: Education Development Center.

Prothrow-Stith, D., H. Spivak, and A.J. Hausman. 1987. The Violence Prevention Project: A public health approach. *Science, Technology, and Human Values* 12:67–69.

Reiss, A.J., Jr. 1985. *Policing a city's central district: The Oakland story.* Research Report, NCJ 96708. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Reuss-Ianni, E., and F.A.J. Ianni. 1983. Street cops and management cops: The two cultures of policing. In *Control in the police organization,* edited by M. Punch. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Roehl, J.A., R. Huitt, M.A. Wycoff, A.M. Pate, D.J. Rebovich, and K.R. Coyle. 1995. *National process evaluation of the Weed and Seed initiative, cross-site summary report.* Pacific Grove, California: Institute for Social Analysis.

Rosenbaum, D. 1988. Community crime prevention: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Justice Quarterly* 5:323–395.

Rosenbaum, D.P., ed. 1986. *Community crime prevention: Does it work?* Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Rosenbaum, D.P., A.J. Lurigio, and R.C. Davis. 1998. *The prevention of crime: Social and situational strategies.* Belmont, California: West/Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Rosenbaum, D.P., S. Yen, and D. Wilkinson. 1994. Impact of community policing on police personnel: A quasi-experimental test. *Crime & Delinquency* 40:331–353.

Sadd, S., and R. Grinc. 1993. *Issues in community policing: An evaluation of eight innovative neighborhood oriented police projects.* New York: Vera Institute of Justice.

Schwartz, A.I. and S.N. Clarren. 1977. *The Cincinnati team policing experiment: A summary report.* Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

Shearing, C.D. 1992. The relation between private and public policing. In Modern policing, edited by M. Tonry and N. Morris. Vol. 15 of *Crime and justice: A review of research.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Sherman, L., C. Milton, and T. Kelly. 1973. *Team policing.* Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

Sherman, L.W. 1995. The police. In *Crime,* edited by J.Q. Wilson and J. Petersilia. San Francisco: Institute for Contemporary Studies.

Sherman, L.W., P.R. Gartin, and M.E. Buerger. 1989. Hot spots of predatory crime: Routine activities and the criminology of place. *Criminology* 27:27–55.

Sherman, L.W., and D. Weisburd. 1995. General deterrent effects of police patrol in crime "hot spots": A randomized, controlled trial. *Justice Quarterly* 12 (4): 625–648.

Silverman, E.B. 1999. *NYPD battles crime: Innovative strategies in policing.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Skogan, W.G. 1998. Community policing in Chicago. In *Community policing: Contemporary readings,* edited by G. Alpert and A. Piquero. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.

———. 1994. The impact of community policing on neighborhood residents: A cross-site analysis. In *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promises,* edited by D.P. Rosenbaum. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

———. 1990. *Disorder and decline: Crime and the spiral of decay in American neighborhoods.* New York: Free Press.

Skogan, W.G., and S.M. Hartnett. 1997. *Community policing, Chicago style.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Skogan, W.G., S.M. Hartnett, J.H. Lovig, J. DuBois, S. Houmes, S. Davidsdottir, R. VanStedum, M. Kaiser, D. Cole, N. Gonzales, S.F. Benett, P.J. Lavrakas, A.J. Lurigio, R.L. Block, D.P. Rosenbaum, S. Althaus, D. Whelan, T.R. Jounson, and L. Higgins. 1995. *Community policing in Chicago: Year two: An interim report.* Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Skolnick, J. 1994. Justice without trial revisited. In *Police innovation and control of the police,* edited by D. Weisburd and C. Uchida. New York: Springer-Verlag.

———. 1966. *Justice without trial: Law enforcement in democratic society.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Skolnick, J., and D. Bayley. 1988. Theme and variation in community policing. In *Crime and justice: A review of research,* edited by M. Tonry and N. Morris. Vol. 10. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1986. *The new blue line.* New York: Free Press.

Sparrow, M.K., M. Moore, and D. Kennedy. 1990. *Beyond 911.* New York: Basic Books.

Stark, R. 1972. *Police riots.* Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Sykes, G. 1986. Street justice: A moral defense of order maintenance. *Justice Quarterly* 3:497–512.

Taylor, R.B. 1998. Crime and small-scale places: What we know, what we can prevent, and what else we need to know. In *Crime and place: Plenary papers of the 1997 Conference on Criminal Justice Research and Evaluation.* Research Forum, NCJ 168618. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Thompson, J.D. 1967. *Organizations in action.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Tien, J.M., W. James, and R.C. Larson. 1978. *An alternative approach to patrol: The Wilmington split-force experiment.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Tien, J.M., and T.F. Rich. 1994. The Hartford COMPASS program: Experiences with a Weed and Seed-related program. In *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promises,* edited by D. Rosenbaum. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Trojanowicz, R.T., and B. Bucqueroux. 1990. *Community policing: A contemporary perspective.* Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Company.

Van Maanen, J. 1974. Working the street: A developmental view of police behavior. In *The potential for reform in criminal justice,* edited by H. Jacob. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

———. 1973. Observations on the making of policemen. *Human Organization* 32:407–418.

Walker, S. 1983. *The police in America.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

———. 1977. *A critical history of police reform.* Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath.

Weatheritt, M. 1988. Community policing: Rhetoric or reality? In *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality,* edited by J.R. Greene and S. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger.

Weber, M. 1947. *The theory of social and economic organization.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Weisburd, D., and L. Green. 1995. Policing drug hot spots: The Jersey City drug market analysis experiment. *Justice Quarterly* 12 (4): 711–735.

Weisburd, D., and J. McElroy. 1988. Enacting the CPO role: Findings from the New York City Pilot Program in Community Policing. In *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality,* edited by J.R. Greene and S. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger.

Williams, H., and A. Pate. 1987. Returning to first principles: Reducing the fear of crime in Newark. *Crime & Delinquency* 33:53–70.

Wilson, J.Q. 1967. *Varieties of police behavior.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Wilson, J.Q., and G.L. Kelling. 1982. Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety. *Atlantic Monthly* 249 (March): 29–38.

Wycoff, M.A. 1988. The benefits of community policing: Evidence and conjecture. In *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality,* edited by J. R. Greene and S. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger.

———. 1985. *Police-community stations: The Houston field test.* Technical report. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

Wycoff, M.A., and G.L. Kelling. 1978. *The Dallas experience: Organizational reform.* Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

Wycoff, M.A., and W.G. Skogan. 1993. *Community policing in Madison: Quality from the inside out: An evaluation of implementation and impact.* Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation.

Zhao, J. 1996. *Why police organizations change: A study of community-oriented policing.* Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.

Zhao, J., Q. Thurman, and N. He. 1999. Sources of job satisfaction among police officers: A test of demographic and work environment models. *Justice Quarterly* 16 (1): 153–173.

Zhao, J., Q. Thurman, and N. Lovrich. 1995. Community-oriented policing across the U.S.: Facilitators and impediments to implementation. *American Journal of Police* 14:11–28.