

LAW ENFORCEMENT MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE

A REPORT WITH RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING
POLICE AND COMMUNITY RELATIONS



BY
EDDIE K. WILSON

WEST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

POLICE DEPARTMENT

CANYON, TEXAS

NOVEMBER 1991

224

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to take this opportunity to thank the members of the West Texas State University Police Department who have put in a tremendous amount of extra time while I pursued the LEMI program. They are truly dedicated to bringing Law Enforcement back to a caring and respectable profession.

Most important of all, I wish to thank my beautiful wife, Terri and our two children, Joe Dan and Kristen for standing by me through all the tribulations of my law enforcement career. Terri has made it all worth while and truly holds the key to my life with her constant and endless love.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Table of Contents.....	iii
I. Issues facing law enforcement versus community relations.....	1
A. Introduction.....	1
B. Law Enforcement and Community attitudes.....	3
C. Other issues.....	5
II. Review programs to resolve relation issues.....	6
A. History of Community Policing programs.....	6
B. Community Oriented Policing.....	17
C. Problem Oriented Policing.....	30
D. Other programs.....	32
III. Effective issues of programs.....	33
A. Summary.....	33
B. Future of Community-Relations/Policing.....	35
IV. End Notes.....	36
V. Selected Bibliography.....	38

I. Issues facing law enforcement versus community relations

A. Introduction

Law enforcement and community relations today are extremely strained. Even though great strides have occurred in the law enforcement arena towards professionalism and adequate compensation, some police officers in America are still overworked, undertrained, underpaid, and under educated. In many areas, police and the community seem to stand in conflict. This creates serious problems with public confidence in the police and consequently with the ability of the police to work effectively with the crime problem.

The poor attitudes of the community and lack of confidence in the police slowly builds a barrier between the community and police. Because of these barriers, police often suffer low moral, lack of incentive, lack of concern and problems with police recruiting. In order to understand the problems faced between the police and the community, we must look at an important objective of policing, that of human relations. From a police prospective, human relations is defined as police participation in any activity that seeks law observance through respect rather than enforcement.

Police-community relations have a direct bearing on the character of life in the cities and on the communities ability to maintain stability and solve its problems. At the same time, the police department capacity to handle crimes depends to a large degree upon its relationship with the

citiznery.¹

Studies have shown that the more homogeneous and stable the people and their belief in the system, the fewer the transgressions. The systems will work best where there is a trust in the police by the community therefore creating a partnership to fight crime. As with the American population, we are anything but a homogeneous bland of people, thus creating a great diversity in the wants and desires of our society.

Community attitudes toward the police are mostly the result of personal contacts rather than of a knowledge of police methods. Much of the public is not only ill informed concerning the caliber of its police in general, but lacks appreciation of the conditions under which police must operate. It is therefore of great importance to police departments to spend considerable time in public relations and build a favorable image. However, only in perfect situations would every citizen feel respect and friendliness toward the police. A certain degree of resentment on the part of the public is natural, and must be expected due to the very nature of the job.² James J. Skehan paints a work picture of the crux to the whole problem:

"A police force gains the respect of the community it serves by carrying out its functions in a spirit of toleration, human kindness, and good will toward all men. This is a difficult task, because people in every community have many standards of morality, and although they are willing to obey some of our laws, they are determined to violate others. Therefore, the policeman is never popular with all

classes of persons."³

"Today's policemen are the heirs of that frightful legacy of ill will built up over many years - the man who walks the street bitter at the police may still be harboring a grudge of forty years' standing. The policeman who embittered him then may long ago have gone to his reward, but his successors must suffer the consequences."⁴

Because of these problems, law enforcement must seek new ways to solve crime and win the public's trust. Many methods such as community oriented policing and neighborhood policing have come into existence to realign the police with the community's wishes.

B. Law enforcement and community attitudes

Law enforcement has traditionally been very slow to make changes not only in technical advances but in social behavior trends. Law enforcement has taken the attitude that we are doing the best job we can under the circumstances.

Research by police on police was virtually nonexistent. As Herman Goldstein has suggested, no agency of city government was as unaccountable as public police.⁵

Law Enforcement officers have paid very little attention as to how the public perceives them as they conduct their various law enforcement duties. More ill will can be built against a police department by inconsiderate, inhumane handling of prisoners than by any other one thing.

If officers would think of how the public perceives

them while they work, they would see that it would help to give the curious bystanders a sales job for the police department. Make your arrest with as little violence as possible. Be humane in your duties. Officers are not paid to deal out punishment, and the public knows it.⁶

Because of many "tough guy" attitudes of the police, often the communities have developed a poor perception of the police. Currently, the relationship in most communities between the police and the public is not entirely satisfactory. Because of these poor perceptions members of the public frequently do not notify the police of situations that require enforcement or preventive action. This hinders law enforcement tremendously by not knowing the actual numbers of crimes committed in the communities. This may result in directing programs of reducing crime in the wrong direction. Citizens often avoid involvement in averting or interfering with criminal conduct, and many are suspicious of the police, the criminal justice system, and the entire political process.⁷

Many police officers now view their relations with the public as poor. This attitude is reflected in surveys of police officers as well as in frequent statements by police officials. Recently a survey of police officers in a western municipal department disclosed that 70 per cent thought that the prestige of police work was fair or poor while only 29 per cent said good and 2 per cent excellent. Twenty-six per

cent of the officers believed that "relations with public" was the principal problem faced by police.⁸

Public cooperation comes when the police and the public are able to enjoy positive contacts with each other. These positive contacts do not occur when the policeman is issuing traffic citations or making arrests. They occur when the citizen cries out for help to the police and is immediately helped and aided by knowledgeable, sympathetic officers.⁹

One very important factor in crime analysis is the actual fear of crime. Fear on one hand may be deplorable, but it also saves lives and prevents injury by prompting caution. At the same time fear is a problem in its own right. Often exaggerated by the media as well as by word-or-mouth, it disrupts patterns of daily life, immures people, especially the elderly, in their homes, creates debilitating stress, contributes to the deterioration of neighborhoods, causes economic loss to merchants, and leaves portions of cities abandoned to the very criminals everyone fears.¹⁰

C. Other issues

The need for strengthening police relationships with the communities they serve is critical today in the Nation's Hispanic, Afro-American, and other minority groups. These groups are taking action to acquire rights and services which have been historically denied them. As the most visible representative of the society from which these groups

are demanding fair treatment and equal opportunity, law enforcement agencies are faced with unprecedented situations on the street which require that they develop policies and practices governing their actions when dealing with minority groups and other citizens.¹¹ Hostility, or even lack of confidence of a significant portion of the public, has extremely serious implications for the police. These attitudes interfere with recruiting, since able young men and women generally seek occupations which are not inordinately dangerous and which have the respect and support of their relatives and friends. Public hostility affects morale and makes police officers less enthusiastic about doing their job well. It may lead some officers to leave the force, to accept more prestigious or less demanding employment.¹²

II. Review programs to resolve relation issues

A. History of Community policing programs

The United States has gone through tremendous changes with law enforcement in the past 100 years. It has evolved from the position of a night watchman in small western towns in the early 1800s to very complicated police structures in large cities in present day.

In 1833, Philadelphia made a dramatic effort to organize an independent, competent, 24 hour a day police force. It was supported by a patron, Steven Girard, who left a large inheritance to fund police reform. Philadelphia passed a model ordinance that provided two dozen police, who should

serve both day and night, with officers appointed by the mayor's office and control of the force vested in one officer. In addition, the new law required that promotions would be based on skill and integrity.¹³

As time progressed and the westward movement proceeded, we saw citizens take law enforcement in their own hands. Vigilante groups sprang up in crime ridden communities. Citizens were tired of criminals and thugs creating fear in their communities. According to Richard M. Brown in Violence in America, vigilantism is based on three rationalizations:

1. Self preservation - citizens must be willing to kill or be killed, when the official system fails to provide adequate protection.
2. Right of revolution - the United States comes from a tradition of violent revolution. Early framers of the Constitution argued that periodic revolt might be necessary to prevent government tyranny. Part of the American psyche embraces the idea that when something fails to work properly, revolution is as valid a response as reform.
3. Economic rational - the development and maintenance of an effective criminal justice system is an expensive proposition. This position argued that frontier towns should not bear the

expense when vigilantism did the job efficiently for free.¹⁴ For the time being, hopefully we have progressed past this type of enforcement even knowing that people when wronged still have a feeling of revenge or to pay back the person that has wronged.

At the turn of the century, there were undeniable problems in law enforcement. These included the taint of corruption, shortcomings and confusion in leadership, the threat of vigilantism, and inequities in application of laws.¹⁵

Corruption also increased with passage of the Volstead Act of 1919, which made Prohibition the law of the land. This ushered in the Roaring Twenties, also called the Jazz Age or the Flapper Era. It was a time when bootleggers and owners of speakeasies openly paid off police, and many people winked at the no alcohol law. While many decried this open rebellion, a large segment of society viewed Prohibition as a laughable nuisance, and even murderous gangsters like Al Capone and Lucky Luciano were portrayed as folk heroes. The blatant disregard of Prohibition also foster widespread disrespect for the law in general and, by extension, disrespect for police.¹⁶

As time progressed, citizens as well as law enforcement administrators began to see problems between police

departments and the communities they serve. Police reform was seen as a must and was only right around the corner in time. In the 1930's Oakland (California) Police Chief August Vollmer was credited with launching the American police reform movement. Listed below are the principles he considered vital in this reformation:

1. The corrupting influence of politics should be removed from the police organization.
2. The head of the department should be selected at large for competence, a leader, preferably a man of considerable police experience, and removable from office only after preferment of charges and a public hearing.
3. Police officers should be able to rate a "B" on the Alpha test, be able-bodied and of good character, weigh 150 lbs, measure 5 feet 9 inches tall, and be between 21 and 31 years of age.

These requirements may be disregarded by the chief for good and sufficient reason.

4. Salaries should permit decent living standards, housing should be adequate, eight hours of work per day, one day off weekly, annual vacation, fair sick leave

with pay, just accident and death benefits, when performance of duty, reasonable pension provisions on an actuarial basis.

5. Adequate training for recruits, officers, and those already on the roll should be imperative.
6. The communication system should provide for call boxes, telephones, recall system, and (in appropriate circumstances) teletype and radio.
7. Records should be complete, adequate, but as simple as possible.
8. A crime-prevention unit should be established if circumstances warrant this action and qualified women police should be engaged to handle juvenile delinquents' and women's cases.
9. State police forces should be established in state where rural protection of this character is required.
10. State bureaus of criminal investigation and information should be established in every State.¹⁷

By the 1950's, however, blemishes had begun to appear in that model of perfection. Many police departments found

themselves the target of mounting citizen complaints. Many accusations seemed relatively trivial. Perhaps the officer appeared indifferent to the caller's seemingly petty concerns such as broken streetlights or a barking dog. Sometimes the charges were serious, as when minorities accused the police of harassment or outright brutality.

While concern about the isolation of the police from their constituency had not reached crisis proportions, the increasing pressure to find a way to build bridges to the community fostered interest in Police/Community Relations (PCR) efforts. The best PCR programs were a sincere effort to reach out and address a host of community concerns. The worst were half-hearted, understaffed, and underfunded attempts to blunt public criticism without making any substantive change.

The three main components of PCR programs were efficiency, responsiveness, and representation. Targeted program areas were:

1. communication and education programs
2. programs to involve citizens in crime prevention
3. programs to improve law enforcement service to the public
4. youth programs
5. other programs, such as critical-incident programs involving police relations with

minorities

6. training programs¹⁸

Other factors setting the stage for the birth of Community Policing were:

1. the isolation of officers in police cars
2. the narrowing of the police mission to crime fighting
3. a scientific approach to management that stressed efficiency more than effectiveness
4. increased reliance on high-tech gadgetry instead of human interaction
5. insulation of police administration from community input
6. a long-standing concern about police violation of minority civil rights.

Initial attempts were made by the police to reach the community, such as PCR, Crime prevention, and team policing units.¹⁹

During the 20 years following World War II, the police became increasingly isolated from their communities. Reasons for this isolation included urbanization, rapidly changing social conditions, greater demands for police services, increased reliance by the police on motorized patrol, police efforts to professionalize, and reduced police contact with noncriminal elements of society. These factors, combined with public apathy, caused many police agencies to attempt to

combat rising crime without actively involving their communities in their efforts.

Due in large part to the widespread riots in the sixties and the report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, many police agencies reassessed their role and made changes that resulted in greater community involvement in crime control. Police agencies through out the nation significantly improved their ability to deal with crime and disorder. They also took great strides in responding to the demands of their communities for greater service involvement and responsiveness.

In less than 10 years, the nature of debate in the police service has changed. The question is no longer "Should we be involved in non-enforcement programs?" Now the question is, "How should we be involved in them?" As is usual during any time of great change, experimentation has resulted in both success and failure.²⁰

In 1967 the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice noted that: "the struggle to maintain a proper balance between effective law enforcement and fairness to individuals pervades the entire criminal justice system. It is particularly crucial and apparent in police work because...every police action can impinge directly, and perhaps hurtfully, on a citizen's freedom of action."²¹

While departments have become more sophisticated and employ new standards such as strategic planning they must also be aware of what they have learned from their history. It is important for the police to perfect techniques that allow them to deal effectively with those higher class citizens, however the lesson of history teaches that the biggest challenge the police face is finding a way to enlist the cooperation and support of average citizens in efforts to make their lives safer and more enjoyable. This should afford them the dignity and respect they deserve.

Community Policing is a reminder of the importance of balancing efforts aimed at the upper class with those that focus on the street where most people live. It also is a reminder that people are the police department's most valuable resource and should be treated as valued partners in the police process.

History also shows change takes time and that, at any given moment, the past and the future co-exist together. Even today, some departments have not fully embraced all the reforms Vollmer outlined in the 1930's, meanwhile other departments are leading the way into the future that others will follow. What we do know today is that Community Policing has now reached critical mass, so that it is now recognized as being at the cutting edge of what is new in policing.²²

By 1982, the Federal Government was eager to find out

if anything would work to improve policing. By then progressive police administrators, scholars, and even a few politicians had begun to realize that solutions to America's crime problem were unlikely to be found by using traditional methods.

These were the things found out:

1. Increasing the number of police does not necessarily reduce crime rates or raise the proportion of crimes solved. The most that could be said was that if there were no cops, there would be more crime.
2. Random motorized patrolling neither reduces crime nor improves chances of catching suspects. Moreover, it does not reassure citizens enough to affect their fear of crime, nor does it engender greater trust in the police. Regular patrols by police officers on foot, on the other hand, were shown to reduce citizens' fear of crime, although they have no demonstrable impact on the crime rate.
3. Two-person patrol cars are no more effective than one-person cars in reducing crime or catching criminals.
4. Saturation patrolling does reduce crime,

but only temporarily, largely by displacing it to other areas.

5. The kind of crimes that terrifies Americans most-mugging, robbery, burglary, rape, homicide-is rarely encountered by police on patrol.

6. Improving response time to emergency calls has no effect on the likelihood of arresting criminals or even in satisfying involved citizens. One recent and very large study showed that the chances of making an arrest on the spot drop below 10 percent if even one minute elapses from the time the crime is committed.

7. Crimes are not solved through criminal investigations conducted by police departments. Generally, crimes are solved because offenders are immediately apprehended or someone identifies them specifically by a name, an address, a license plate number. The studies show that if neither of these things happen, the chances fall to less than one in ten that any crime will be solved.²³

Even when some tactics had dramatic payoffs - foot patrol, for example, with its impact on fear reduction,

citizen attitudes, and officer satisfaction - it was unclear just what those findings meant in relation to crime reduction.²⁴

This revolutionary movement broadens the police mandate beyond a narrow focus on fighting crime. It now includes efforts that also address fear of crime, social and physical disorder, and neighborhood decay. Police must form a partnership with people in the community.

As Professor David Carter has said, "Community Policing is at the 'cutting edge' of what is happening in policing today, which means that no single book can hope to capture all the creative ways in which it is and will be applied."²⁵

In 1984 research results from the Flint experiment convinced the C.S. Mott Foundation of Flint to fund the National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center at Michigan State University's School of Criminal Justice. This new approach was so revolutionary in the Flint experiment, no one knew what to call it. As time progressed, many new names continued to crop up - Community - Oriented Policing, Neighborhood Policing, Neighborhood-Oriented Policing. Finally, in 1988, the center changed its name to the National Center for Community Policing.²⁶

B. Community-Oriented policing

One definition of community relations is "the management function which evaluates public attitudes, identifies the policies and procedures of an individual or an organization

with the public interest, and executes a program of action to earn public understanding and acceptance."

Community Service programs are geared to help alleviate individual and community social problems of a noncriminal nature. In other words, the basic function here is in the helping of individual citizens by individual police officers. This help is given most often in one to one, face to face situations. If the needs of the individual cannot be met by utilizing existent police resources, the person is directed to a social service agency that can help.²⁷

Based on the historical aspects of law enforcement, various programs were developed in response to the apparent lack of communication between police and the community. An outline of "Ten Principles of Community Policing" was introduced in a book by Robert Trojanowicz and Bonnie Bucqueroux entitled "A Contemporary Perspective."

1. Community Policing is both a philosophy and an organizational strategy that allows the police and community residents to work closely together in new ways to solved the problems of crime, fear of crime, physical and social disorder, and neighborhood decay. The philosophy rests on the belief that law-abiding people in the community deserve input into the police process in exchange for their

participation and support. It also rests on the belief that solutions to contemporary community problems demand freeing both people and the police to explore new and creative ways to address neighborhood concerns beyond a narrow focus on individual crime incidents.

2. Community Policing's organizational strategy first demands that everyone in the department, including both civilian and sworn personnel, must find ways to change the philosophy into practice. This requires making the subtle but sophisticated shift so that everyone in the department understands the need to focus on solving community problems in new and creative ways that can be challenging and enlisting people in the process of policing themselves.
3. To implement true Community Policing, police departments must also create and develop a new breed of line officer, the Community Police Officer (CPO), who acts as the direct link between the police and people in the community.
4. The CPO's role demands continuous,

sustained contact with the law abiding people in the community, so that together they can explore productive new solutions to local concerns involving crime, fear of crime, disorder, and decay with private citizens serving as unpaid volunteers.²⁸ As full-fledged law enforcement officers, CPO's respond to calls for service and make arrests. They also go beyond this narrow focus to develop and monitor broad-based, long term initiatives that can involve community residents in efforts to improve the overall quality of life in the area over time.

As the community's ombudsman, CPO's also link individuals and groups in the community to the public and private agencies that offer help.

5. Community Policing implies a new contract between the police and the citizens it serves. It offers the hope of overcoming widespread apathy, and at the same time restrains any impulse to vigilantism.
6. Community Policing adds a vital proactive element to the traditional reactive role

of the police, resulting in full-spectrum police service. As the only agency of social control open 24 hours a day, seven days a week, the police must maintain the ability to respond to immediate crises and crime incidents. However, Community Policing broadens the police role so that they can have a greater impact on making changes today that hold the promise of making communities safer and more attractive places to live tomorrow.

7. Community Policing stresses exploring new ways to protect and enhance the lives of those who are most vulnerable. These include juveniles, the elderly, minorities, the poor, the disabled, and the homeless.
8. Community Policing promotes the judicious use of technology, but it also relies on the belief that nothing surpasses what dedicated human beings, talking and working together, can achieve. It invests trust in those who are on the front lines together on the street. It depends on their combined judgment, wisdom, and expertise to fashion creative

new approaches to contemporary community concerns.²⁹

9. Community Policing must be a fully integrated approach that involves everyone in the department, with the CPO's as specialists in bridging the gap between the police and the people they serve. The Community Policing approach plays a crucial role internally by providing information and assistance about the community and its problems, and by enlisting broad based community support for the department's overall objectives.

10. Community Policing provides decentralized, personalized police service to the community. It recognizes that the police cannot impose order on the community from outside, but that people must be encouraged to think of the police as a resource they can use in helping to solve contemporary community concerns. It is not a tactic to be applied, then abandoned, but an entirely new way of thinking about the police role in society. It's a philosophy that

also offers a coherent and cohesive organizational plan that police departments can modify to suit their specific needs.³⁰

This new Community Policing Officer is a mini-chief in a specific beat area, a generalist who considers making arrests as only one of many options that can be used to solve problems.³¹ It shifts the focus of police work from handling random calls to solving community problems. The goal is to allow CPO's to own their beat areas. Then they can develop the rapport and trust that is vital in encouraging people to become involved in efforts to address the problems in their neighborhoods.

Community Policing requires both a philosophical shift in the way that police departments think about their mission, and a commitment to the structural changes this new form of policing demands.³²

- Many police departments are surprised when community oriented programs are implemented, they experience an increase in reports. These may result due to the fact that the citizens feel more free to discuss their problems with police. Therefore, departments implementing such programs must prepare their communities for an increase crime rate which by explaining that the increase is only an increase in reporting of the actual crimes that were already occurring and not being reported.³³ Community policing is not merely

adding foot patrol to a police departments tactics.

Community policing is a philosophy that must permeate an entire department in the way they perceive policing.³⁴

Community Policing broadens the focus to solicit information from the law-abiding people, through both formal and informal contacts.

Chief Davis of the Santa Ana PD noted four points to consider when implementing a community based program.

1. Civilianizing the department to be more sympathetic to a community oriented policing philosophy.
2. Open new positions, recruit laterally across the state that have the same philosophy.
3. Reorganize the department so as to create opportunities for bright and energetic officers. When you create opportunities, people who are otherwise reluctant to join may join because they see a possibility of personal gain within the department.
4. Those who remain recalcitrant go unrewarded.³⁵

The traditional police approach offers only limited opportunities for officers to tap the information that law abiding people posses.³⁶ Many times the only contact that motor patrol officers have with law abiding people is

a formal effort to gather information from victims or possible witnesses shortly after a crime has been committed. Another difficulty lies in the fact that an armed, uniformed officer who is a stranger can seem intimidating. This is an image that many traditional officers strive to cultivate.³⁷

One way to reduce the abrasive contacts by police is to use civilians or volunteers in various aspects of police duties. Volunteers can be used to contact complainants to retrieve additional information. In departments that employ a true victim assistance program, civilians recontact victims to obtain additional information and to determine any needs the victim may have as a result of the crime committed against them. Chief Gary Leonard of the Alexandria, Virginia Police Department has made tremendous use of volunteers. Included are two retired colonels who help analyze intelligence and a statistician who spends four hours each week providing sophisticated crime analysis. Leonard also uses volunteers to make callbacks to property crime victims whose cases are not assigned for further investigation. Those calls often reveal that the "crime" has been "solved", that the stolen bicycle or lawn mower was actually borrowed by a friend.

In the Flint experiment, an enterprising CPO convinced the teenagers who had been terrorizing park visitors that they should instead accept the responsibility for maintaining

the park and protecting both the young and the old who wanted to use the facility. The CPO's ability to convert these young people from being the problem to being the solution shows how Community-Policing can enhance the quality of community life without relying on the threat of arrest as the primary means to effect positive change.³⁸

Community Policing sets forth the premise that police officers must do more than concentrate only on specific crime incidents. They must look for pressure points in the underlying dynamics that might lend themselves to providing new solutions. Community Policing also means that the police must accept new responsibilities in dealing with fear of crime, disorder, and quality of life issues in addition to a narrow focus on crime.³⁹

As research shows, most of the calls the police receive have nothing to do with a crime in progress. The bulk of calls involve other problems. Often they are a physical or social disorder, a loud party, an abandoned car, uncollected garbage stacking up, a group of rowdy teens on the corner, or drunks who have taken over a neighborhood park. The traditional police mind-set that visualizes officers as law enforcement officers and not peace officers consider such calls a nuisance. They interfere with the real business of policing, which is "catching the bad guys."⁴⁰ Many people think if the police would crack down on criminals, the crime problem would be solved. Several issues mentioned that may

contradict this theory are indicated below:

1. Rebellion - Many people, especially the juveniles who commit the majority of crimes, respond to aggression with rebellion. If the police limit their approach to getting tough, they risk alienating the law abiding people who cross their path. They also risk abetting the transformation of petty miscreants into hard-core offenders.
2. Limitations - Another obvious obstacle in the get tough approach is that there is not enough jail and prison space to lock up all the offenders. The reality in many areas today is that there is scarcely enough room to keep the most serious offenders behind bars.
Many of them will commit new crimes again if they are released.
3. Scope of service - The third reality ignored in a narrow, get tough approach is that approximately four of every five calls for service to any police department do not involve a crime in progress. The romantic vision of the officer as crime fighter, tracking down

vicious killers and clever jewel thieves, bears little relationship to the way most police officers spend their days and nights.⁴¹

Many departments have implemented various programs directed towards community policing. One such department is the Houston Police department led by Chief Lee Brown. The evolution in the Houston Police department did not come from one particular person, but it evolved from police leaders challenging the assumptions they have held for several decades. Policing has developed a number of identifying characteristics through the years.

1. The police are reactive to incidents.

The organization is driven by calls for police service.

2. Information from and about the community is limited. Planning efforts focus on internally generated police data.

3. Planning is narrow in its focus and centers on internal operations such as policies, procedures, rules, and regulations.

4. Recruitment focuses on the spirit of adventure rather than the spirit of service.

5. Patrol officers are restrained in their

- role. They are not encouraged or expected to be creative in addressing problems and are not rewarded for undertaking innovative approaches.
6. Training is geared toward the law enforcement role of the police even though officers spend only fifteen to twenty percent of their time on such activities.
 7. Management uses an authoritative style and adheres to the military model of command and control.
 8. Supervision is control-oriented as it reflects and reinforces the organization's management style.
 9. Rewards are associated with participating in daring events rather than conducting service activities.
 10. Performance evaluations are based not on outcomes but on activities. The number of arrests made and the number of citations issued are of paramount importance.
 11. Agency effectiveness is based on data, particularly crime and clearance rates from the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports.

12. Police departments operate as entities unto themselves, with few collaborative links to the community.⁴²

One problem agencies have faced is how to measure the effectiveness of a community relations program. One way to measure community oriented programs is by taking note of the number of complaints a department receives prior to the implementation of the program. After the program has been in effect for 12 months, compare the number of complaints now received. A tremendous decrease should occur if the proper targets have been determined.⁴³

C. Problem-Oriented policing

Another very popular program implemented is Problem-Oriented Policing/Problem-Solving Policing. Confusion also surrounds the relationship between Community Policing and Problem-Oriented Policing (also called Problem-Solving Policing), which are different but compatible concepts. Essentially, Problem-Oriented Policing asks line officers to think rationally and objectively and to look for the underlying dynamics behind a series of incidents, rather than to focus on the individual occurrences as isolated events. The confusion arises because Community Policing urges CPO's to use Problem-Solving techniques. It also demands that police departments make substantive structural changes, so that CPO's can act as the department's specialists in identifying, carrying out, and monitoring

long-term solutions.

Noted proponents of Problem-Oriented Policing, such as Herman Goldstein of the University of Wisconsin School of Law and the leadership of the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), recognize the benefits of involving officers directly in the community. However the definition of Problem-Oriented Policing does not expressly demand this commitment to restructuring departments to promote continuous community involvement.⁴⁴ Problem-Oriented policing instead suggests that the technique like crime mapping or crime analysis would indicate to the department of the persistent problems at various locations. Again, not everyone who is victimized reports the crime to the police, so a department without Community-Policing or Problem-oriented policing might never know whether by utilizing problem oriented policing one can anticipate and identify problems, tailor solutions to local needs, and provide sustained, street-level evaluation and follow-up. To be successful in their respective communities police must find new ways to promote cooperation between citizens.⁴⁵ Lee Brown New York City Chief of Police and former Houston Chief of Police stated that to implement any type of program, you must have a written plan of action. To turn the police organization towards neighborhood-oriented policing, you must meet some minimal guidelines.

1. Must make it possible for citizens to work with police to control crime.

2. Set top priority as crime prevention.
3. Police resources should be used in ways that reinforce the concept of community and the actual neighborhoods themselves.
4. The last step is to translate these values into action.

To reduce the fear citizens face, Lee Brown implemented a Fear Reduction project. Houston observes in 1983 that while crime rates were going down, fear of crime was going up. He implemented a victim recontact program in which a Victim assistance coordinator recontacted victims and asked them if there was anything they could do for the victims or make referrals. Victims were also asked if they had any additional information. Sometimes they learned the crime had been solved but no one had told the police department. Also introduced was a Community Organizing Response Team (CORT) where officers were taught how to organize a community to help address quality of life issues.⁴⁶

D. Other programs

Houston implemented a program called DART which stands for Directed Area Responsibility Team. Essentially DART is a team policing based on decentralized management and emphasizing community involvement. Not only are districts to operate as integrated teams under DART, involving all the specialist of the department, but patrol officers on each shift and beat are to formulate plans that fit the needs of

their area.

The self-directing team concept is designed to produce "structured" or "directed" patrol rather than the random patrolling whereby officers cruise aimlessly until sent somewhere by the radio dispatcher.⁴⁷

III. Effective issues of programs

A. Summary

In brief, problem-oriented policing does not seek to deal with the underlying causes of deviance, disorder or crime, but rather, it is concerned with those constellations of mediating factors that can be practically controlling. A problem requires recognition, study, analysis, a planned strategy of attacking it, the securing of cooperation from various sources and, most importantly, the mobilization of trust and support in the affected community.⁴⁸

As police departments progress towards some type of community oriented policing, they will find themselves involved increasingly in dispute resolution situations. The Complainant may not wish to prosecute an individual that has wrong them but merely may want restitution or their property returned to them. Police will find that without the support of the complainant, there can be great difficulty in prosecuting cases successfully. Police departments may find themselves solving the problem buy making an agreement with the two parties thus solving the problem before it goes to a prosecution level. Certainly prosecutors and courts will

favor this for minor crimes to reduce the back logs in our court rooms and over crowded jails. This will also reduce the time an investigator will spend on a case because once an agreement is made, he/she must no longer try to gather all the necessary evidence to prove the case. Departments may develop forms requesting a "level of action taken" preference from victims, filled out at the time the original incident report is taken. Once the victim has made the request in writing, the department takes only the action requested by the victim unless certain situations develop where criminal charges are the most appropriate actions taken.

In a democracy, the police use of coercion must be legitimate in the sense that it is accepted as proper and fitting by the major portion of the citizenry as consistent with the concepts of the community in regard to acceptable police behavior. Ultimately, the effective use of coercion depends on the limitation of applications to what mores the community will support as proper. When applications exceed these limits, coercion breeds resistance which in turn breeds additional coercion.⁴⁹

Role conflicts have been among the costs of the proliferation of duties imposed on police agencies. The police have had to impose irritating restrictions on persons who see themselves as law-abiding citizens. Diligent enforcement of such regulations erodes police efficiency in two ways.

Unpopularity of the regulations is transferred to the enforcement agents to impair public support of police. Expansion of work-load without additions to the police staff stretches thin the personnel resources for crime suppression.⁵⁰

Public cooperation comes when the police and the public are able to enjoy positive contacts with each other. These positive contacts do not occur when the policeman is issuing traffic citations or making arrests. They occur when the citizen cries out for help to the police and is immediately helped and aided by knowledgeable, sympathetic officers.

B. Future of Community-Relations/Policing

The future of Community-Relations/Policing rest with law enforcement administrators and the communities themselves. These programs rely on trust and bonding between the police department and the community. Should either side distrust the other, it is very unlikely these type programs will succeed. Administrators from the individual police departments must set the tone for policing in the 1990's and on into the 21st century. As we have seen, police departments have very little impact on crime reduction. The only apparent way of solving our crime problem is to form a tighter bond then ever with our communities. We must live up to our motto, "To protect and serve" now more than ever.

End Notes

¹Alan Coffee, Edward Eldefonso, Walter Hartinger, Human Relations: Law Enforcement in a Changing Community (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: 1971), p. 1-48.

²J.J. Skehan, Modern Police Work (New York: 1951), Francis M. Basuino, pp 8-9.

³Ibid., 8-9.

⁴E. Adlow, Policemen and People (Boston: 1947), William J. Rockfort, p. 17.

⁵Robert Trojanowicz, & Bonnie Bucqueroux. Community Policing, A Contemporary Perspective. (Ohio: 1990) p. v.

⁶Robert M. Platt. Improving the Police Image. (Kennedale, Texas, pp 28.

⁷Ibid., 32.

⁸Paul F. Crommwell, George Keefer. Police-Community Relations. (Minn: 1973) p. 2.

⁹Ibid. p. 7.

¹⁰Jerome H. Skolnick & David H. Bayley. New Blue Line-Police Innovation in six American Cities. (New York 1986 p. 2.

¹¹Paul F. Crommwell, George Keefer. Police-Community Relations. (Minn: 1973) p. 1.

¹²Ibid., 2.

¹³Robert Trojanowicz, Bonnie Bucqueroux. Community Policing, A Contemporary Perspective. (Ohio: 1990) p. 47.

¹⁴Ibid., p. 51.

¹⁵Ibid., p. 52.

¹⁶Ibid., p. 54

¹⁷Ibid., p. 55

¹⁸Ibid., p. 62

¹⁹Ibid., p. 67

²⁰Robert M. Platt. Improving the Police Image. (Kennedale, Texas, pp 32.

²¹Jerome H. Skolnick & David H. Bayley. New Blue Line-Police Innovation in six American Cities. (New York 1986) p. 4.

²²Robert Trojanowicz, Bonnie Bucqueroux. Community Policing, A Contemporary Perspective. (Ohio: 1990) p. 71.

²³Jerome H. Skolnick & David H. Bayley. New Blue Line-Police Innovation in six American Cities. (New York 1986) p. 4.

²⁴Robert Trojanowicz, Bonnie Bucqueroux. Community Policing, A Contemporary Perspective. (Ohio: 1990) p. viii.

²⁵Ibid., p. ix

²⁶Ibid., p. 7

²⁷Paul F. Crommwell, George Keefer. Police-Community Relations. (Minn: 1973) p. 8.

²⁸Robert Trojanowicz, Bonnie Bucqueroux. Community Policing, A Contemporary Perspective. (Ohio: 1990) p. xiii.

²⁹Ibid., p. xix

- ³⁰Ibid., p. xx
³¹Ibid., p. 3
³²Ibid., p. 5
³³Jerome H. Skolnick & David H. Bayley. New Blue Line-Police Innovation in six American Cities. (New York 1986) p. 48.
³⁴Robert Trojanowicz, Bonnie Bucqueroux. Community Policing, A Contemporary Perspective. (Ohio: 1990) p. 7.
³⁵Jerome H. Skolnick & David H. Bayley. New Blue Line-Police Innovation in six American Cities. (New York 1986) p. 49.
³⁶Robert Trojanowicz, Bonnie Bucqueroux. Community Policing, A Contemporary Perspective. (Ohio: 1990) p. 10.
³⁷Ibid., p. 12
³⁸Ibid., p. 13
³⁹Ibid., p. 14
⁴⁰Ibid., p. 15
⁴¹Ibid., p. 28
⁴²Lee P. Brown. The NarcOfficer., A practical guide for police officials. (November 1990) p. 21.
⁴³Jerome H. Skolnick & David H. Bayley. New Blue Line-Police Innovation in six American Cities. (New York 1986) p. 48.
⁴⁴Robert Trojanowicz, Bonnie Bucqueroux. Community Policing, A Contemporary Perspective. (Ohio: 1990) p. 8.
⁴⁵Ibid., p. 11
⁴⁶Lee Brown. American Journal of Police., Neighborhood Oriented Policing. Vol 9, no. 3, (1990) pp 38.
⁴⁷Jerome H. Skolnick & David H. Bayley. New Blue Line-Police Innovation in six American Cities. (New York 1986) p. 93-94.
⁴⁸Egon Bittner. American Journal of Police., Some Reflections on staffing. Vol 9, no. 3, (1990) pp 189-196
⁴⁹Paul F. Cromwell, George Keefer. Police-Community Relations. (Minn: 1973) p. 27.
⁵⁰Ibid., p. 26

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alpert, Geoffrey P. & Dunham, Roger G. Policing Urban America. Waveland Press, 1988.
- Armstrong, Terry R. Power and Authority in Law Enforcement. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1976.
- Berkly, George E. The Democratic Policeman. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.
- Bittner, Egon. "Some Reflections on staffing Problem - Oriented Policing," American Journal of Police. Vol 9, no. 3, (1990):pp 189-196.
- Bristow, Allen P. Effective Police Manpower Utilization. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1969.
- Brown, Lee P., "Community Policing: A Practical Guide for Police Officials," The NarcOfficer (November 1990): pp 21-29.
- Brown, Lee. "Neighborhood - Oriented Policing," American Journal of Police. Vol 9, no. 3, (1990):pp 201-208.
- Caldwell, Harry. Basic Law Enforcement. Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear Pub. Co., 1972.
- Coffey, Alan, Eldefonso, Edward, Hartinger, Walter. Human Relations: Law Enforcement in a Changing Community. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Cromwell,Jr., Paul F., Keefer, George. Police-Community Relations. St. Paul, Minn.: West Publishing Co., 1973.
- Cromwell Jr., Paul F. & Keefer, George. Police-Community relations: Selected readings. St. Paul, Minn., West Pub. Co., c1978, 2nd ed.
- Earle, H., Police-Community Relations: Crisis in our Time. Springfield Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1967.
- Eldefonso, Edward. Principles of law Enforcement - An overview of the Justice System. New York: Wiley, c1982.
- Fennelly, Lawrence J., Tyska, Louis A. Security in the Year 2000 and Beyond. Palm Springs, Calif.: ETC Publications, 1987.

- Fink, Joseph. The Community and the Police - Conflict or Cooperation? New York: Wiley, 1975.
- Geary, David P. Community Relations and the Administration of Justice. New York: Wiley, 1975.
- Gourley, Gerald Douglas. The effective Municipal Police Organization. Beverly Hill, Calif.: Glencoe Press, 1970.
- Greene, Jack R. & Mastrofski, Stephen D. Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. Praeger, 1988.
- Kennedy, Daniel B. Applied Sociology for Police. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1972.
- Mastrofski, Stephen D. "The Prospects of Change in Police Patrol: A decade in review." American Journal of Police. Vol 9, no. 3, (1990): 49-75.
- McDonald, Lynn. The Sociology of Law and Order. Montreal Book Center, Boulder Colo.: Westview Press, 1976.
- Platt, Robert M. Improving the Police Image. Kennedale, Texas, Criminal Justice Press, 1974.
- Rubinstein, Jonathan. City Police. New York: Rarrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1973.
- Skolnick, Jerome H. & Bayley, David H. New Blue Line-Police Innovation in six Amercian cities. New York: Free Press; London: Collier Macmillian Publishers, c1986.
- Sutherland, Jon N. Comparative Concepts of Law and Order. Glenview, Ill.: Scott, Foresman, 1971.
- Toch, Hans. & Grant, J. Douglas. & Galvan, Ramond T. Foreward by Gain, Charles R. Agents of Change-A Study in police reform. New York: Halsted Press Division, Wiley, 1974 c1975.
- Trojanowicz, Robert & Bucqueroux, Bonnie. Community Policing, A Contemporary Perspective. Cincinnati, Ohio.: Anderson Publishing Co., 1990.
- Vetter, Harold J. Introduction to Criminology. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1974.
- Woods, Arthur. Crime Prevention. New York: Arno Press and The New York Times, 1971.

Yarrington, Roger. Community Relations Handbook. New York:
Longman, c1983.