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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Problem Statement

In parallel with the apparent ineffectiveness of the police agencies against rising crime rates, community policing emerged as an alternative to traditional policing starting in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Although it suffered from apparent problems with its identity, community policing has become the popular style of policing on a national scale (Maguire & Mastrofski, 2000). Popularity of community policing spread nationwide when President Clinton signed “the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement act of 1994” on September 13, 1994.

Today there is a wide acceptance of community policing even though there is not a consensus over the concept of community policing (Trojanowicz et al., 1998). According to the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office, almost 86% of United States’ community is served under the rubrics of community policing in varying degrees (Hickman & Reaves, 2001). Kerley and Scheb’s (1998) survey of police chiefs, on the other hand, claim that merely half of these police agencies report implementing community policing activities in a comprehensive way.

Hickman and Reaves (2001) note that “In 2000, nearly all municipal (95%) and county (94%) police departments had sworn personnel designated as full time community policing officers...” (p.5). However, this number might also be misleading considering the fact that most departments have assigned only a relatively small portion of its officers
to community policing activities while keeping the majority in traditional patrol duties (Pelfrey, 2004). Klockars (1988) even claims that what police simply do under the umbrella of community policing is nothing more than an effort to legitimize itself without making any essential changes.

Community policing has not only attracted the police departments but also has drawn the attention of scholars and there is an immense literature with many published articles and books about various aspects of it. Literature has primarily focused on the effect of community policing on crime rates, citizen fear of crime, public satisfaction, people's perceptions of the police, social development of neighborhoods, structure of police agencies, departmental resources, job satisfaction of personnel, and training of police officers (Zhao, Lovrich, and Robinson, 2001; Bayley and Shearing, 1996; Kessler, 1999; Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls, 1997; Skogan, 2004). Actually a considerably large group of academic world and police authorities seem to like making big claims about the potential of community policing against all its negative effects, the confusion it creates, and problems in measuring its success (Fielding, 1995, p.26). In addition to the topics above, there are also countless other areas which scholars have researched.

However, anyone curious about community policing literature will notice that most of the studies see community policing as an independent variable that affects its dependent variables either positively or negatively (Trojanowicz, et al., 1998; Wilson, & Bennett, 1994; Forman, 2004; Skogan and Hartnett, 1997). This approach is one-sided and fails to reflect the other side of the coin. Can community policing be dependent upon other factors? Is there any variation across police agencies nationwide in their
implementation of community policing? If any, what are the determinants of this variance?

Using contingency theory which assumes that philosophy and structure of an organization are influenced by a variety of internal and external environmental dynamics, this study will explore the effects of contingent factors at individual, organizational, and social levels on community policing activities of police departments. Mainly, it is hypothesized that community policing is contingent upon a set of individual, departmental, and societal factors.

The primary concern of such a structural contingency model is diagnosing the problem rather than treating an unknown problem. If the assumptions of contingency theory are correct and when there is no best way to organize, then the question becomes whether or not community policing should be the ultimate strategy for police departments. For instance, community policing may be working better in homogenous societies where informal controls are strong whereas it might fail in complex urban communities. In this study, I intend to find out empirically the level of variation in community policing activities of police departments by systematically comparing them and to establish the determinants of such variation.

This research study differs from previous studies in two major ways. First of all, the current study conducts a national level research in order to have a broader perspective unlike most of its preceding examples that usually explore only one police agency. Such an initiative in an environment with little nationwide empirical evidence will help us understand whether community policing entails real reform features or is merely the same
old-style of policing (Bayley, 1988). Second, this study identifies the conditions that promote or hinder community policing activities by identifying community policing as a dependent variable that varies with the internal and external constraints of its environment contrary to many studies that place community policing in the independent variable category.

**Dissertation Plan**

This dissertation is divided into six chapters. The first chapter is the introductory part to the dissertation. It starts with a problem statement, consists of a section as to how the proposed study differs from previous research, and concludes with a brief plan of the dissertation.

The second chapter provides an overview of the historical context of community policing in the United States. It explores the emergence of community policing as an alternative to traditional policing. This chapter examines the existing body of knowledge on community policing by separating it into its sub-fields; a) individual, b) organizational, and c) community level studies. The chapter offers an insight on the manner by which community policing has been studied to date, the variables that have been used to study it, and some of the findings of the research.

Chapter three introduces contingency theory and discusses its key components. This chapter serves as an introduction to why contingency theory might offer a better alternative to current studies in community policing. In an effort to strengthen the thesis of the dissertation, this chapter also includes a review of studies conducted on community policing that benefit the elements of contingency theory. Studies examining the reason
for the emergence of community policing, its effective or ineffective implementation are discussed.

Chapter four lays out the dissertation’s research design. In the chapter I present general information about the Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS) and specifically focus on the community policing section of the survey. Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) and CENSUS 2000 data will also be examined. In this chapter I test the causal model where community policing is hypothesized to be contingent upon a set of individual, departmental, and societal factors. Chapter four lays out the research design.

Chapter five explores the findings of the statistical analysis.

Finally, chapter six includes a discussion of the findings, its implications for policies related to the community policing practices and suggestions for future research in terms of the contingencies of community policing.
CHAPTER 2: COMMUNITY POLICING

Introduction

Professional policing and the community policing are two dominant philosophies in contemporary policing (Trojanowicz et al., 1998). Toch (1997) states that most police departments find a place somewhere in between these two philosophies. However, beginning with 1980s, community policing is seen as an alternative to the traditional model. What is community policing? What do police departments and actually police officers understand from this term? How is community policing applied to real situations by police departments? Do the agencies use common criteria? Can we deploy any of the police officers in community policing activities or should we rather train them first? None of these questions have conclusive and certain answers. This causes a dilemma in defining, understanding and applying community policing.

Definitional Problems

Even though there are countless definitions for community policing in the literature, there is not one that academicians agree upon. The uncertainty and diversity over the definition of community policing together with the lack of a clearly defined set of characteristics result in local police agencies interpreting its meaning and how it should be implemented differently (Maguire & Mastrofski, 2000).

Along with the problems of defining community policing, some critics claim the
possibility that police departments may not actually embrace the tenets of community policing (Breci & Erickson, 1998). For instance, Wycoff (1994) finds in her nationwide survey that almost half of the police chiefs do not have an explicit understanding of the meaning of community policing. In the words of a police chief “a large percentage of law enforcement agencies who say they're doing community policing aren't doing it because they're not really sure what it means” (Weber, 1999). There is also a disagreement between community policing as envisaged and theorized by academics and community policing as perceived and practiced by police agencies (Ziembo-Vogl and Woods, 1996 in Xu, Fiedler, and Flaming (2005). Rahtz (2001, p.2) critiques the theorists and states that community policing is “a model of policing that flies in the face of what most of us have learned about police work. A lot of the background of COP comes from academia, where it's easy to sit in a classroom and pontificate about what police ought to do.” To Cordner in Dunham and Alpert (2005), disagreement is a result of complexity of community policing as a program, its multiple effects, variation in program scope, and research design limitations which make the determination of community policing effectiveness extremely difficult.

**Community Policing: What Is It Really?**

A better way to lessen the confusion surrounding the term community policing might be to start with thinking in terms of its components. Community policing is both a law enforcement and crime prevention strategy whereby some community residents work with local law enforcement agencies to manage community crime through detection and investigation, identification of possible perpetrators, and expansion of communication
and dialogue with neighborhood police officers (Champion & Rush, 1997). The desire to adopt community policing can be understood as a new and more democratic paradigm of law enforcement (Buono, 1997). Proponents of community policing claim that traditional policing has simply failed to deliver the goods and that community policing is the evolutionary response (Brogden, 1999).

In many respects, community policing came forward as a response to the “professional,” scientific, reactive, and unsystematic patrol-based model. Its major aim is to decrease social distance between the police and their communities (Manning, 1998). Since its beginning in the late 1970’s, community policing today has matured from its earlier image of public and officials’ trial and error exercise to becoming the leading model of law enforcement organizations at local and community levels (Yates et al., 1997). Community policing should be viewed as an extension of initiatives to build and enhance cooperative relations between the police officers and members of the public (Lab, 2003).

Parallel to this fact, community policing came out as an acceptable alternative solution. According to this philosophy, the police cannot successfully prevent or investigate crime without the willing participation of the public. Community policing highlights the beginning of working partnerships between police and communities to diminish crime and enhance security (Moore, 1992). So, police departments have set up special units within the organization to act as public relations agents in the general community (Smith & Hawkins, 1973). Community-based policing has come into sight as
the expression of a police reform movement that addressed a central problem confronting
police in the 1960s – the problem of legitimacy (Crank, 1994).

In the framework of community policing, it is particularly sought after that
officers have the choice, except when a serious offense is committed, to decide not to
enforce the law if an additional alternative emerges as more efficient (Goldstein, 1987).
Community policing includes changing police organization, rewards, and assessment;
their commands; how police and community are anticipated to communicate; and
anticipations of the police (Manning, 1998). The movement to community policing asks
for a fundamental change in the role and responsibilities of police departments and how
and responsibilities in community policing are altered from a focus on regular patrol to
giving more importance to direct communication with citizens and to prevention rather
than reaction to crime activity, and it also envisages an environmental focus in which
officers are more liable to a neighborhood rather than merely performing police duties.

The sociological literature, therefore, has focused considerable attention on how
well people like their local police and as part of their focus, scholars have studied topics
such as police-community relations, citizens’ perceptions of the police, and police-citizen
interactions (Parker et al., 1995). There is furthermore a great deal of consensus about
treating the community as customers and about assessing performance by surveys of
community satisfaction rather than completely by the figures of crime and arrest rates
(Bayley & Shearing, 1996).
Community policing is a widely accepted philosophy based on the idea that “Police departments develop a new relationship with citizens in the community, allowing them the power to set local police priorities and involving them in efforts to improve the overall quality of life in their neighborhoods” (Trojanowicz, et al., 1998). As a proactive approach, community policing tries to increase police presence in neighborhoods, to find the root cause of crimes, to solve disputes among citizens, and to catch criminals (US Department of Justice, 1992). Bohm et al. (2000) write that community policing represents mutual trust and shared responsibility in the creation of peaceful community. Apart from its focus in communities, it targets not only disorder but also crime, and it gives a value to both departmental and community-level feedback in evaluating police (Xu, Fiedler, & Flaming, 2005).

One of the best definitions that describe community policing is Thurman, Zhao, and Giacomazzi’s (2001). They define community policing as “the guiding philosophy for the delivery of police services that relies upon positive interactions among police, other public servants, and community representatives to serve local needs regarding crime control, crime prevention, and crime-related quality-of-life issues” (Thurman et al., 2001, p.10). Taken as a whole, community policing is an overall policing strategy which is bigger than the sum of all its components. It is a perceptional revolution and enlightenment in understanding the core problems traditional policing has suffered for centuries.

To provide a clearer contextual understanding of community policing the following section explores the historical emergence of community policing as an
alternative to traditional policing in the 1980s and its rise to eminence as a project when President Clinton signed “the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement act of 1994” on September 13, 1994.

The Construction of Community Policing

A historical view with a focus on the 1994 Crime Act

The form of policing has changed several times since the modern concept of police was born in London in 1829. The history of policing in the United States for instance can be divided into three main periods: the political era, the reform era, and the community policing era (Kelling and Moore, 1988). While such periods represent a simplified version of a very complex history of policing in which “slavery, segregation, discrimination, and racism” took part and affected the quality and development of policing (Williams and Murphy, 1990), it nevertheless provides a basic typology.

There have been extensive social changes in the 1960’s such as the civil rights movement, the women’s movement, and the crime boom. However, police departments in the United States could not adapt themselves to these changes largely due to an increasing public mistrust of the police following the incidents such as the killings of Black Panther leaders by the Chicago police and the Knapp Commission Report on police corruption in New York City (Crank, 1994). Violence between police and minorities, as well as between police and students, began to convince the academic community that the police are crucial social factors (Bayley, 1971). Therefore, policing in the United States required an alternative strategy. In such an environment, community policing as a strategy to fight against crime turned out to be a common concern for policy
makers.

The 1980s was the period when police departments began to question their capabilities to fight against crime (Bayley & Shearing, 1996). This questioning was primarily forced by the evident rise in crime and especially during the course of the 1990s more and more departments accepted community policing as a tool to deal with the causes of crime instead of focusing on its effects (Thomas, 1994). Following its fifteen year emergence, community policing today has become the leading model of law enforcement strategy and effort at the local and community level (Yates et al., 1997).

Crank (1994) notes that community policing as a policy issue which was circulated among the political actors of the United States from the early 1980s to the present was an institutional process intended to reinstate legitimacy to the police. Police departments noticed their inability to fight against crime without the support of community members and hence police agencies, in an effort to restructure themselves, needed to check their objectives, strategies, management, and public accountability measures (Bayley & Shearing, 1996).

Crank (1994) argues that the “professionalized” organizational structure was a fundamental separation of police from community. Community policing emerged particularly in response to the increasing doubts about the effectiveness of traditional policing strategy. The apparent reason as to why bureaucratic style of policing is not appropriate was linked to three contingency factors: rise in crime, rise in fear of crime, and poor police-community relations (Thurman, Zhao, & Giacomazzi, 2001). Today there is a wide acceptance of community policing even though there is not a consensus
over the concept of community policing (Trojanowicz et al., 1998). According to Carter (2000, p.3) “Crime—and the need to prevent it—has consistently received substantial attention from politicians simply because it is of major concern to citizens.” It is also a topic that is easy for politicians to take a stand on since people do not want crime. Increasingly, many politicians perceive community policing as a way not only to deal with crime but also to better serve the community (Carter, 2000).

To this end, in an effort to prevent crime and make the streets safer President Clinton signed “the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 on September 13, 1994. According to COPS Office Report (2000, p.9) “The legislation passed Congress with strong bipartisan support and the endorsement of every major law enforcement group in the country.” Title I of the act is also known as “the Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act of 1994” and contains “…provisions for billions of dollars in grants…with the purpose of increasing the hiring and deployment of community policing officers and to advance community policing nationwide” (COPS Office, 2000, p. 9). Title 1 also

…provides additional and more effective training to law enforcement officers,...encourages the development and implementation of innovative programs to permit members of the community to assist…law enforcement agencies,...and encourages the development of new technologies to assist…law enforcement agencies in reorienting the emphasis of their activities from reacting to crime to preventing crime (Crime Act, 1994).

Finally, “The Public Safety Partnership and Community Policing Act of 1994” (Title 1) also authorizes the Attorney General to make public safety and community policing grants (Crime Act, 1994).

The nationwide acceptance of community policing today resulted from research
and innovations in methods of policing in order to give better police services to the communities (Bennett, 1990). Community-based policing is becoming the accepted model for policing and is being applied by many police departments across the United States. However, community policing is still at the developmental stage. Like every other new initiative, community policing is also “politically fragile because if no “successes” can be demonstrated, then support will dwindle” (Carter, 2000, p. 5).

Until now a historical perspective was used to shed light on the factors that led to signing of Title 1 of the 1994 Crime Act on public safety and community policing. However, none of the policies on policing happens in a vacuum. There is always some combination of social, economic, and/or political reason/s behind it. The public has a serious interest in crime because of its multitude and effect on people in the United States. That establishes a natural connection between the public and policy makers. And, as the statistical figures of the early 1990s showed there was a rising trend in crime rates. There has not been a solution to eradicate it. Community policing was seen in such an environment as an important tool to lessen crime rate in the US. That is actually where the politicians in the early 1990s came into the scene which entailed an environment where no former policy worked and a new one, namely community policing, was waiting for its turn. Since politicians are responsible to their constituencies they have the tendency to have an interest in anything new. In today’s world, community policing is seen by many politicians as a promising way to fight against crime (Carter, 2000).

The following section examines the policy environment under which community policing thrived in the United States.
The Policy Environment

In this section of the chapter I explore the policy environment leading to the signing of “Title I-The COPS Bill” of the “Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994” on September 13, 1994.

Being a highly salient but not very complex issue, Title I fits in the “hearing room politics” where politicians dictate the rules of the game keeping their potential reelection in their mind constantly (Gormley, 1986).

Title I generally aimed to increase the number of officers in the communities, to advance problem solving and interaction with communities by police officers, to support innovation in policing, and to develop new technologies for assisting officers in reducing crime (US Department of Justice, 2000). I think the most important factor behind the strong bipartisan support and law enforcement groups’ approval of Title I is that the Act became somehow a hybrid law in its final form which includes sections not only on toughness on crime like death penalty and gun ban but also on societal solutions to crime like community policing. As a matter of fact, the 1994 Crime Act was originally the Bush Administration’s crime bill that had been somewhat changed in the early period of the Clinton administration (Bright, 1995). One reason to why the Act sustained its presence in different Presidencies might be the fact that the police departments involved in implementation of crime control have their own agendas that overpower Congress’ authority (Gest, 2001).

Title I of 1994 Crime Act on community policing had a huge support in Congress particularly because of the ineffectiveness of the traditional way of policing in dealing
with crime. Some said the act would pass just because it had the “Crime Bill” label (Kennely, Congressional Record, 1994). However, it was not free of critics. Kennely, for instance, critiqued the Clinton administration and especially Attorney General Janet Reno because of their misperceptions that favored criminals and assumed everybody as equally good (Congressional Record, 1994). To other critics, Title 1 was an umbrella protecting the criminals. These critics, however, may have just been motivated by politics. Although research shows that punishment is not a deterrent (Paternoster and Piquero, 1995; Cullen and Agnew, 2003), politicians are still advocating pork barrel politics on harsher punishments partly due to their expectations to be re-elected.

After the passage of the law in 1994, there have been some serious efforts by the new Republican majorities in the House and Senate to re-write the Act (Dayton Law Review, 557.). However, "crime in America has dropped for the past seven years -- the longest decline on record, thanks to a national consensus we helped to forge on community police…” (Clinton, 2000) The numbers indicate that this was a period of the lowest crime rates in a generation (FBI Uniform Crime Reports 1998, 1999).

Consequently, it is clear that there are lots of actors in the passage of a policy and bargaining is an important tool in reaching a consensus between the parties. Title I of the 1994 Crime Act has been a balanced bill at the end that was supported by both Republicans and Democrats following several modifications.

Kingdon’s (2003) book helps us understand the causal linkages in the passage of the Title I of the 1994 Crime Act in several aspects. Kingdon (2003) takes the “Garbage Can Model” developed by Cohen, March, and Olsen (1972) and revises their model. To
Kingdon (2003) three major streams of processes (problems, policies, and politics) develop and operate largely independent of one another. “But at some critical junctures the three streams are joined, and the greatest policy changes grow out of that coupling of problems, policy proposals, and politics” (Kingdon, 2003, p. 19). “A problem is recognized, a solution is available, the political climate makes the time right for change and the constraints do not prohibit action” (Kingdon, 2003, p.88). In our example of community policing, the problem was the intolerable crime rates (Steffensmeier, 1999). Indicators (crime figures, statistics) like Uniform Crime Reports help us recognize that there is a problem in fighting against crime. To Kingdon (2003) “windows are opened by events in either the problems or political streams” (p. 203). As part of a political stream, the changes in administrations and members of Congress also cause agendas to change (Kingdon, 2003). Rising crime rates and the change in Presidents assisted to the coupling of the problem and political stream together and consequently Title I of the 1994 Crime Act was offered as a solution.

**The Literature Focus Elements on Community Policing**

With community policing emerging as a full force model in policing came an emerging literature both from academia and other research organizations. To date a great amount of the community policing literature tends to focus on three major layers; a) studies focusing on its effect on individuals (police personnel), b) essential organizational or managerial changes, c) the need for a support for its functioning. I would like to lay out the varying views of the authors under the above mentioned subheadings.
Individual Determinants

One of the key factors for the success of community policing is the acceptance and the approval of police officials for the change in policing. For most of these officers, what community policing will offer them is an unknown territory. Therefore, a considerable amount of literature examines the relationship between community policing and its presumable effect on police personnel.

Generally speaking community policing differs from traditional law enforcement since it allows police officers the independence to expand the scope of their jobs. Additionally, community policing calls for police officers to learn a multitude of new skills (Birzer, 2003; Cardozo, 2004). Several studies have revealed the positive effects of community policing on job satisfaction among officers deployed with these activities by increasing their positive contacts with citizens (Wilson, & Bennett, 1994; Brody, DeMarco, & Lovrich, 2002; Pelfrey, 2004). In general, officers felt more freedom and control over their duties and they perceived their job as less frustrating and more significant, exciting and satisfying (Wycoff, 1988). Studies also revealed that “officers working in areas where community policing had been implemented received significantly fewer complaints than officers working in other areas” (Kessler, 1999). Above all, community policing allows police officers an encounter with the good people of their neighborhoods (McElroy, Cosgrove, and Sadd, 1993). This side of community policing is extremely important for some officers who might develop a tendency of seeing everyone in the society as equally bad. Actually, the probability of community policing having an effect on police agencies is questionable without even bearing these behavioral
determinants in mind (Breen, 1997).

While all these are benefits of community policing, there is certainly a large deal of resistance to adopt the model. This opposition of police personnel to community policing can best be explained by the tenets of sociological institutionalism. Sociological institutionalism is concerned with “how the member of the institutions interprets data from the environment” (Peters, 1999, p.103). Isomorphism helps us understand the institutions as the “systems of meaning and that their behavior and the behavior of individuals within them depend upon the meanings incorporated and the symbols manipulated” (Peters, 1999, pp. 102-103). In sociological literature, the relationship between individuals and institutions rely heavily on the shaping effect of institutions of individuals through making habits to norms and values (Peters, 1999, p. 107). The hesitancy of police officers may stem from the failure of police departments in creating the symbols and values that can shape a positive outlook on community policing. The following section identifies an important factor in helping to create the positive outlook towards community policing and hence shape the institutional values and norms in this direction. This is namely police training.

Training personnel

Training and educating police officers have a key role in their acceptance of community policing practices. Training is especially important for police agencies to harmonize their community policing activities with the perceptions of new recruits. Indeed, it has been a critical determinant in overcoming the resistance of traditional masculinist police culture. Therefore this section informs the significance of training on
individual police officials.

Birzer (2003) notes that “police-training is an important tool in the process of facilitating change within police organizations.” With the further implementation of community policing strategies in US police agencies, training becomes a critical centerpiece.” The training requirements to be a police officer have been ignored for a long time (Cox, 1996, p.122). Eighty three percent of the police agencies admit that the current training attempts are inadequate and there is a necessity for training in community policing (Travis, 1995). An officer’s standards and descriptions of how to carry out police duties are primarily learned at training academies (Champion & Rush, 1997, p.120). Even though the things taught in training academies are vital, there is frequently a significant difference between what is taught and what really happens on the streets (Cox, 1996, p.125). Traditionally, the police training curriculum has dedicated minimum interest to communication skills (Birzer, 1999). Typical interview comments from the public regarding police performance include: “they don’t know what they’re doing” and “they don’t know how to talk to people” (Fielding, 1984). One of the major purposes of future police training should be to make better communicators of the public servants responsible for maintaining order (Cox, 1996, p.236). Haarr (2001) says, “more than 90% of basic academy training is spent on task-oriented training that instructs police recruits in the basic repetitive skills and conditioned responses associated with the reactive nature of the traditional model of policing.” The total time spent on relations with the community is not more than 10% in any of the training academies, while a huge amount of a police officer’s time is filled with tasks requiring skills in these areas (Cox, 1996, p.
Police-community relations are often the result of misunderstanding of the day-to-day relationships and attitudes that exist between the police and the residents of poor neighborhoods (Parker et al., 1995). It is not possible to sufficiently serve the community without initial understanding of its needs and demands. This objective can be best achieved by means of comprehensive, integrated training in community policing (Glenn et al., 2003, p.116). One of the most important aims of future police training should become to make much better communicators of police officers in charge of sustaining order (Cox, 1996, p.236). This training will better equip police officers to “gain effective approaches to dealing with citizens, and thus gain the support and trust of the public” (Gül, 2003, p.2). For the success of community policing, police officers must be independent; when they find out a problem, they must resolve it working with members of the community (Birzer, 1999). Birzer (2003) emphasizes that “this self-directed culture should be initiated within the context of training.”

There have been extensive efforts lately made by police managers, police training experts, and criminal justice academics to develop police training programs around community policing (Haarr, 2001). Standards for recruiting and training police officers are mutually increased and changed in community policing. Community policing is much more reliant on the incentive and creativity of individual officers than is the recent strategy that presumes all patrol officers as employees who must be constantly supervised. The strategies’ success depends on the officer’s awareness of his local community (Moore, 1992).
As policing advances into community-oriented strategies, police academies should comprise more than the mechanical features of policing in their core curriculum (Birzer, 1999). To attain the level of support from police recruits that is crucial to move community policing beyond theory to real practice and effecting significant change, it is said that essential changes are required to be made to present training programs, at all levels of the police organization (Haarr, 2001). Thurman, Zhao, and Giacomazzi (2001) claim that law enforcement agencies must be more planned in attracting, recruiting, and training candidates who will work at community policing activities even though the same qualities of great cops two decades ago are required in safeguarding the people.

Effective community policing requires training for both police personnel and community members (Glenn et al., 2003, p. 103). Even though there is consensus that police training is essential and a very important component in making change in police departments, there is a lack of agreement related to what training is supposed to cover and how the efficiency of such training should be measured (Quinet et al., 2003).

Although the list of community policing courses varied, the most common courses were designed to inform recruits about community policing philosophies and concepts, problem-solving techniques, dealing with special populations, how to build police-community relations, team building and leadership, communication skills and tactics, and patrol techniques and beat profiling (Haarr, 2001).

Several initiatives for training the community members as in the example of “citizen police academies” are good examples. What is being taught in these academies? Almost everything that will help them become aware of the daily activities of a police department (Weiss & Davis, 2004; Cohn, 1996). The goals remain the same; to give citizens a better understanding and appreciation of police work through education, to
encourage greater cooperation between residents and the police, and to acquaint citizens with law enforcement’s role in the criminal justice system (Weiss & Davis, 2004).

Zhao, Thurman, and Lovrich (1995) in Alpert and Piquero (1998) find the positive relationship between the training and community policing activities and they note that the training and education of line officers especially in heterogeneous communities is vital for the success of community policing. To Weiss and Davis (2004), primary vital benefit of this kind of community policing training activities is that it humanizes officers. Thanks to increased ability and confidence due to received training officers might spend more time with performing community policing activities (Robinson, 2003).

Consequently, training plays a key role in shaping the values and norms of police personnel at the individual level. A training program specifically designed for community policing activities is vital not only for the success of community policing in a police agency but also to break the deeply-rooted police cultural barriers. In the following section, the focus will shift from individuals to police organizations and I will examine the relationship between community policing and police departments.

**Organizational Arguments**

A transition from traditional model to community policing will, of course, affect both individuals and police organizations. Traditional para-militaristic organizational structure will not work under community policing model. This section lays out the several issues in the literature about the modifications and changes community policing will require at the departmental level.
During the 1980s, police all over the developed democratic world have more and more questioned their role, operating strategies, organization, and management tactics which are attributable to mounting doubts about the effectiveness of their traditional methods in protecting the public from crime (Bayley & Shearing, 1996). Community-based policing has come into sight as the expression of a police reform movement that addressed a central problem confronting police in the 1960s – the problem of legitimacy (Crank, 1994). The desire to adopt community policing can be understood as a new and more democratic paradigm of law enforcement (Buono, 1997). In many respects, community policing came forward as a response to the “professional,” scientific, reactive, and unsystematic patrol-based model (Manning, 1998).

Community policing envisages changing “ineffective, reactive, quasi-military bureaucracies” with up to date police departments receptive to not only the needs of their personnel but also the demands of the citizens they serve (Rosenbaum, Yeh, & Wilkinson, 1994). Community policing includes changing police organization, rewards, and assessment; their commands; how police and community are anticipated to communicate; and anticipations of the police (Manning, 1998). The movement to community policing asks for a fundamental change in the role and responsibilities of police departments and how they work (Morash & Ford, 2002, p.126). Community policing literature highlights three principal elements regarding organizational change: responding to public expectations, setting up of new preferences in police work, and establishing ties between activities and organizational priorities (Zhao, He, & Lovrich, 2003). With the appropriate structure and design, internal resistance to change may
become non-problematic in the transition period (Williams, 2003).

Wide acceptance of community policing resulted from research and innovations in methods of policing in order to give better police services to the communities (Bennett, 1990). Some of the research studies include preventive patrol, differential police response, patrol deployment, one versus two-officer patrol, team policing, specialized patrol, directed patrol, low-visibility patrol, high-visibility patrol and management of demand (Friedmann, 1992). Community policing provides police agencies the flexibility that will enable them to adjust their operations to the changing social conditions (Williams, 2003).

However, in terms of the effectiveness or efficiency of the policy, neither police departments nor police officers are fully convinced to apply community policing techniques to police work. The resistance of police agencies might partially be explained with path dependency in historical institutionalism. As Peters (1999) elaborates, “when a government program or organization embarks upon a path, there is an inertial tendency for those initial policy choices to persist. That path may be altered, but it requires a good deal of political pressure to produce that change” (63).

**Societal Arguments**

“Without the community input, it is hard to define what constitute good police work, and the performance evaluation is less objective and meaningful as it is solely at the discretion of police agencies” (Xu, Fiedler, & Flaming, 2005). Applications of community policing are usually accepted by citizens. Results indicate that people who see police efforts in community policing state higher safety and vice versa (Reisig &
Parks, 2004; Schafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2003). Thurman and Reisig’s (1996) study reveals that “the community is highly supportive of the concept but waiting for the police department to take a leadership role in its delivery”. Voluntary contacts of the citizens with the police seem to boost confidence in the police (Hawdon & Ryan, 2003; Ren, Cao, Lovrich, & Gaffney, 2005). Three crucial features separating community policing from traditional or professional policing are prevention, increased officer discretion, and shared responsibility (Adams, Rohe, & Arcury, 2002). One of the themes of community policing is that the police have to be accountable to the community in addition to the current police hierarchy (Weisheit, Wells, & Falcone, 1994).

Community policing gives neighborhood residents the chance to convey their concerns, needs, and complaints against police whereas it gives police the opportunity to inform citizens about local crime problems (Forman, 2004). “The results suggest that models of community policing that focus on creating community partnerships have the potential to reduce tension between the police and the public” (Kessler, 1999). It also gives the citizens the moral and emotional commitments to obey the law by using techniques which foster trust and promote reciprocal cooperation (Kahan, 2002).

Skogan and Hartnett (1997) express that community policing initiatives can actually improve quality of life in neighborhoods. For instance, Thurman, Giacomazzi, and Bogen’s (1993) study shows that interacting with youths from poor neighborhoods under the umbrella of community policing yields better ties between the police agencies and the communities they serve even though this type of initiative is costly. Supporters of community policing usually stress the development in police-community relations and
reductions in crime and residents’ fear of crime as key benefits of community policing (Wilson & Bennett, 1994). Community policing emphasizes the significance of the public’s support in police efforts so “the police need to maximize positive voluntary contacts with the public and minimize negative interactions” (Schafer, Huebner, & Bynum, 2003). In order to create good relations and to improve its quality, police visibility via foot patrol is claimed to be an important factor (Salmi, Voeten, & Keskinen, 2000).

“Community policing’s emphasis on the new role of the community as partner and co-producer of neighborhood safety is a key element distinguishing it from traditional or professional policing” (Grinc, 1994). Community policing assists to combine police preferences with the needs of community residents more consistently (Meares, 2002). By making itself more accessible to citizens, it seems that the police have the capacity to produce solidarity, confidence, and effectiveness within their respected communities (Scott, 2002).
CHAPTER 3: CONTINGENCY THEORY

Introduction

Contingency based approaches first appeared in the 1960s. Contingency theory gained its popularity relying on the fact that a large fraction of organizational life is situational (Longenecker and Pringle, 1978). For example, bureaucracy might work well for some organizations and not for others. As a matter of fact, not so many organizations can successfully adapt themselves to changing environmental conditions while effectively managing internal interdependencies at the same time (Miles & Snow, 1978). Hence, scholars studying this theory seek to draw a parallel between the structure of an organization and its environment. Shepard and Hougland (1978) claim that studies working on several aspects of the contingencies came out as a result of initiatives to overcome the complicated conditions encountered by organizations.

Contingency theory as a term was first formulated and hence has been primarily associated with the work of Lawrence and Lorsch (Miner, 2002). They claim that “outside contingencies can be treated as both constraints and opportunities that influence the internal structure and processes” of organizations (1969a, p. 186). Among the numerous factors they include “member needs” as a contingency for the internal condition and functioning of the organization (Lorsch & Lawrence, 1970). Citing Woodward’s study (1953) in their book, they (1969a) note that “there can be no one best
way of organizing a business” (p.191)... and “different environmental settings demand different organizational structures.” In other studies on organizations from the private sector, Lawrence and Lorsch (1969b) argue about the necessity of match-ups between the organizational unit and its environment. The “Organization-environment mismatches” as mentioned in their (1969b) book informs my study in terms of the problems that may occur as a result of the mismatches between environmental conditions and police departments’ activities to fight against crime.

Contingency Theory explains that the existence of organizations does not occur in a vacuum but in the framework of a social environment which affects characteristics and operations of organizations (Blau & Schoenherr, 1971). Unlike studies that treat organizations as if they exist in a glass cage (Blau & Schoenherr, 1971), contingency theory aims to “understand the interrelationships within and among subsystems as well as between the organization and its environment...and attempts to understand how organizations operate under varying conditions and in specific circumstances” (Kast and Rosenzweig, 1973, p. 313). In its simplistic form, contingency theory claims that, in order to be successful in their decisions, organizations and/or their leaders must consider every aspect of their surroundings and then should act accordingly. As a result, “different environmental conditions and different types of relationships with outside parties will require different types of organizational structural accommodation for a high level of performance to be achieved” (Child, 1972; Scott, 1994). In the literature, contingency theory is also known as the “it depends” approach.
Contingency theories came out as a response to the classical theories such as Max Weber’s who looked for ways to best organize the structures. Fiedler (1964), for instance, argued that there is no best way to manage an organization and also claimed that a strategy which works fine for an organization may not necessarily go well with another. In other words when the structure of an organization does not fit its environment, it won’t fulfill its functions well and will likely fail (Pfeffer, 1982). The primary reason for this variability is the fact that organizations are contingent upon several external and internal factors which are the organization’s structure, its technology, its size, and the constraints of its environment (Donaldson, 2001; Clegg, Hardy, & Nord, 1996). In their diagram, Weill and Olson (1989) classify contingent variables as strategy, structure, size, environment, technology, task, and individual.

Strategy, according to Ginsberg and Venkatraman (1985), is by definition, contingency-based. At the core of contingency theory lies the assumption that “there is no one best way to organize, and that any one way of organizing is not equally effective under all conditions” (Galbraith, 1973 in Ginsberg and Venkatraman, 1985). In order to be as effective as possible, organizations must be structured in a way that is compatible with the environmental conditions and the nature of the work carried out (Shoonhoven, 1981). Longenecker and Pringle (1978) in Luthans and Stewart (1978) assert that “there is a dependent relationship between the organizations and their environment or that the environment operates on the organization.” So an effective organization should have strategies that are flexible to change and adapt to the varying conditions in its environment.
Since a fit to contingencies promotes to high performance, organizations are motivated to attain it (Donaldson, 2001). However, uncertainties that are brought by the environment cause challenges to organizations which are expected to be rational (Thompson, 1967). Contingency theory allows open-system organizations an orientation and an acceptable level of certainty to structure themselves and to plan their strategies (Hanson, 2003). Thompson (1967) claims that “those organizations with similar technological and environmental problems should exhibit similar behavior; patterns should appear…we should also find that patterned variations” (p.2). Our study expects to find this type of similarities and differences across police departments in implementing their duties related with community policing.

**Why Contingencies are Significant: Problems with Excluding Contingencies**

To Xu, Fiedler, and Flaming (2005), excluding contingencies in community policing is problematic “because of many factors such as social inequality, there may be a significant variation from neighborhood to neighborhood in terms of the social, structural, and ecological characteristics.” However, Ritti and Mastrofski (2002) assert that a shift from professional model to community policing is non-critically accepted in the USA across police departments in a standardized way today. Contingency theory, however, emphasizes that different approaches may be needed for different neighborhoods and other structural conditions (Kast & Rosenzweig, 1973). Additionally, “police organizations exist in certain contexts—they have different histories and traditions, they come in a variety of sizes, they approach the job of policing in different ways, and they are located in different environments.” (Maguire, 2003, p.5) Hence, managing the
campus police department in Kent State University, for instance, is different from managing the Kent City Police Department given the variation in the population, in the life styles of students versus multi-generational communities, the schedules of the community and the students, and so on. This variation is not limited to outside factors for Police in the U.S, but also Police in the US has a decentralized and localized structure and these structures are independent with their unique organizational forms, cultures, and procedures, and are under autonomous authority, and are created by thousands of different local governments (Maguire, 2003). And these internal structural variations may very well be related to social factors that are beyond managerial control (Langworthy, 1986 in Maguire, 2003).

In his intriguing study on organizational structure in police departments across U.S., Maguire (2003) focuses the readers’ attention to the variability of police agencies not only in numbers and size, but also in terms of their organizational formation. To Maguire (2003), one of the primary contextual determinants of this variation is the environmental pressures on police agencies.

The focus on the importance of contingency theory in policing is not agreed upon. There are some authors who have found it as having no redeeming value for understanding police department structures. For example, He, Zhao, and Lovrich (2005) find no satisfying evidence for contingency theory in understanding the organizational change in police agencies in U.S. They claim that funding takes up an important part in police agencies’ community policing activities. Similarly, Worrall and Zhao (2003) note that environmental pressures or contingencies may not necessarily explain the community
policing activities of police agencies. Using the tenets of resource dependency theory which explains organizational change with the availability of external resources, authors (2003) claim that Community-Oriented Policing Services (COPS) grants play a relatively significant role in the implementation of community policing activities.

Critiques of contingency theory in policing literature are not compelling in several aspects. Wilson (2006), for instance, finds that although COP funding increases COP activities, it is not a major factor and money alone is not the key to COP strategies. Unlike He, Zhao, and Lovrich (2005) and Worrall and Zhao’s (2003) findings, Wilson (2006, p.102) finds that “although increased COP funding enhances COP implementation, the amount of COP funding per employee had the smallest influence among those variables with a significant effect.” Another counter argument is that funding does not necessarily explain change in police departments. To this end, Maguire and Katz (2002) claim that police agencies make false claims about their community policing practices in order to get funding whereas they do not actually implement community policing. And even though the assumption that funding is an important component of community policing is true to an extent since it is an expensive strategy that relies on labor, funding alone cannot explain change in other policing styles especially when there is no funding available or required. Above all, contingency theory does not refute resource dependency theory. Both external resources and environmental conditions might well be explaining community policing implementation.
Focus of Literature

According to Bayley and Shearing (1996) “Community policing faces substantial obstacles and will not be easy to achieve.” The obstacles facing community policing can be identified through several contingencies that affect its functioning. These contingencies will be examined in the following section under three main headings: Individual factors and police culture, organizational hurdles, and societal obstacles.

Individual Factors and Police Culture

Rohe (2001) argues that “The transition from traditional to community policing involves major changes in the missions, policies, and practices of police departments, as well as in the behavior of police officers.” Officers who will attend to any type of community policing activities need to be prepared for drastically new roles and contrary to reactive traditional approaches, they are encouraged to work with the public (Lord, 1996). Officers’ interest and perceptions toward community oriented strategies are vital in accomplishing change from traditional to community policing (Rosenbaum & Lurigio, 1994; Yates & Pillai, 1996). Some police officers may adapt themselves to the ideas of community policing and the changing roles necessary for successful implementation whereas others may not familiarize themselves and may resist significantly and conflict with the ideas of community policing (Ford, Weissbein & Daniel, 2003; Rohe, 2001).

Most likely the major barrier facing anybody who would put into practice a new approach of policing is the complexity of changing the current culture of policing (Moore, 1992). As a result of working in an isolated environment, the police have a tendency to group together and reject strangers which ultimately makes the transition
within police departments exceptionally complicated (Allen, 2002). Police officers develop different orientations toward their work as well as toward the people in their communities, i.e. distinctive police personality (Champion & Rush, 1997, p.121). Most police are as a matter of fact still not convinced it is required, and research so far is ambiguous about its accomplishment (Bayley & Shearing, 1996).

Many officers for instance are not especially interested in getting involved in problems not related with crime and are eager to do instead the traditional side of their job which they call “real police work.” This pattern encourages police to create an image of “us” –police officers- against “them” –the citizens in the community (Brunschat, 2003). Davis, Henderson, and Merrick (2003, p.298) note that “Police officials at the lower levels are likely to be antagonistic toward a style of policing that contrasts with their training and experience in authoritarian regimes.” According to Jesilow and Parsons (2000, p.171) this is the case because “Too many of them joined the force for the excitement of the job; they want to catch the bad guy and put him in jail.” This pattern of “Many years of working under a quasi-military, bureaucratic structure made officers unable to accept a more decentralized departmental structure” (Allen, 2002, p.514).

Actually, most officers resist accepting this new set of roles that are entailed in community policing because of their belief that police organizations are not the right place for community building (Grinc, 1994). Many officers are not especially interested in getting involved in problems not related with crime and stuck instead to traditional view of their job. To them, it does not look much like “real police work” (Novak, Alarid, & Lucas, 2003). As a matter of fact, Miller (1998) argues that the traditional obsession
with masculinity in policing degrades any activity that appears to be tied with femininity and weakness (Miller, 1998). She (1998, p.161) asks that “how can policing be transformed to honor the values of care, connection, empathy, and informality (the female voice) within the paramilitary masculinist police organization?” Hunt (1984) claims that gender is the most crucial barrier to police transformation. Even though police agencies declare that they implement community policing, they still follow the tenets of professional/masculinist model (Herbert, 2001).

The patrolmen on the street, for instance, feel that these community officers do the police-community relations whereas they do police work (Smith & Hawkins, 1973). The idea that police should adapt to the community creates confusion and anger, and most unexpectedly is resisted by patrolmen (Manning, 1998; Novak, Alarid, & Lucas, 2003). It is also mentioned by police officers that community policing is being implemented erratically across department divisions (Maguire, Kuhns, Uchida, & Cox, 1997; Glenn et al., 2003, p. 101). Currently present factors that lead to stress, such as “role conflict, role ambiguity, and responsibility for people” may increase for the officers working at community-based policing and supplementary stress may also occur between these officers and those employed at the traditional roles of law enforcement (Lord, 1996). Yates and Pillai (1996, p.205) find that “officers expressing less administrative and local government support for their community policing efforts were found to exhibit more strain while police expressing more administrative and local government support for their efforts were found to exhibit less strain.”

Likewise, many officers believe that they are misinterpreted by the community
and mistrusted in poor and minority areas. Each community has different problems and demands unique solutions (Jobes, 2003). Existing conditions and contextual factors may lead to officers’ unwillingness to interact with the community which then leads to failures in community policing programs (Wilson & Bennett, 1994). In their observation, cooperation with the community may work in districts where inhabitants already got along with the police, but not where they were needed most (Skogan et al., 1999, p.120). Actually having closer relations in problematic districts as part of community policing activities may place officers as candidates “to be killed in the line of duty” (Springer, 1994).

Discretion as a result of decentralization is an essential contingency in community policing. Meares (2002, p.1600) argues that “Community policing in its various incarnations embraces the decentralization of command and celebrates the discretion of street-level officers, especially when they deal with community-nominated problems”. However, discretion may increase “possibility of police corruption and the unnecessary intrusion of law enforcement officers into the lives of community residents” (Adams, Rohe, & Arcury, 2002, p.400). Kessler (1999, p.334), states that “Increases in the discretionary power of field officers may also result in increases in abuses of citizens.

**Organizational Hurdles**

Putting community policing into action has many difficulties in practice. Traditional roles of police organizations is a major obstacle to any new and different model of policing, and particularly, to the existing endeavor into community policing (Yates & Pillai, 1996). Some of the organizational obstacles to community policing are
“lack of knowledge and skill in new functions, a police culture that is negative and resistant to change, and bureaucratic structures/policies that discourage both problem solving and the development of police-community partnerships” (Rosenbaum, Yeh, & Wilkinson, 1994, p.348-349). The drastic changes and the implementation of practices related with community policing usually bring in uncertainty and discomfort in police agencies (Brody, DeMarco, & Lovrich, 2002). Police agencies are somewhat reluctant to acknowledge and try new ideas (Allen, 2002). Allen (2002, p.511) states that “with the advent of reengineering, rightsizing, reorganizing and reinventing government, one of the greatest challenges facing public organizations is the process of change.” This process encounters new ideas with the old ones and if failures are followed with the new strategies, there may be a tendency for the police agencies to return to old tactics.

As a matter of fact, it seems that the essential priorities of policing in the US remain mostly in line with the principles of the professional model (Zhao, & Thurman, 1997; Zhao, He, & Lovrich, 2003). Defenders of the professional model also argue that using limited police resources in order to implement community policing activities is practically undermining the actual problems that neighborhoods are encountering (Jesilow & Parsons, 2000). Since police agencies are unable to include communities in their projects, the failure rate of the shift to community policing is also pretty high (Grinc, 1994).

It is important to emphasize that much of the failure is due to having community policing initiatives be attempted without first constructing the organizational environment to maintain them on a consistent basis (Rosenbaum, Yeh, & Wilkinson, 1994). The most
frequently mentioned cause is disregarding of the organization’s culture (Morash & Ford, 2002, p.7). The uniqueness of culture given with “the history and nature of both the city and the department” become a concern in terms of generalizing the findings of a case study to other agencies because of the issues with external validity (Pelfrey, 2004). Therefore “best practices” are problematic due to contextual factors and what works for some departments may not work for others (Langworthy, 1986 in Crank, 2003).

Robinson (2003) notes that differences across police organizations in their community policing implementation indicates the significance of organizational factors in community policing performances and behavioral outcomes of police officers. For this reason, departments spend a considerable amount of time in doing some type of community policing (Herbert, 2001). However, commitment to implementing community policing is not merely enough and they usually do not create an environment that fits with the internalization of the community policing elements (Magers, 2004). Because “…guidelines for changing police agencies remain incomplete and sketchy. This leaves many administrators searching for ways to make COP fit their departments and communities” (Breci & Erickson, 1998, p.21). Indeed, Maguire’s (1997) in Herbert (2001) survey of police departments finds that an actual organizational reform among police agencies which claim to be engaged in community policing activities happened only in a relatively small portion of them. Because, “there are still no systematically explicated, empirically-grounded theoretical models to predict which community variables should be most influential in shaping the kinds of policing organizations and practices in a community” (Wells, Falcone, & Rabe-Hemp, 2003, p.567). In other words,
no matter what we would like to believe that “community policing is the dominant police administrative, operational paradigm of policing, in actuality what dominates policing is a combination of community policing and the more traditional aspects of the rational-legal bureaucratic model” (Magers, 2004, p.72).

**Societal Obstacles**

Even though police efforts that aim to bridge the gap with the society are approved by most community members, such programs fail primarily due to the reluctance of the public. Most people do not want to take responsibility to maintain social control by having closer relations with the police (Grinc, 1994; Rosenbaum & Lurigio, 1994; Thacher, 2001). Grinc, (1994, p.465) explains the public’s hesitation to keep closer relations with the police as follows,

> The reasons for this include high levels of fear, skepticism that community policing will be anything but another short-lived police program, the heterogeneous populations and disorganization that often characterize communities, intragroup conflict among community leaders and residents, and the poor relationship between the police and residents in poor, minority communities that historically have borne the brunt of police abuses.

Community policing is communications policing. Police power mobilizes community and in doing so “generates a field of knowledge previously unavailable to police. Their participation within the policing body gives police access to the intimate, private spaces of everyday life” (Saunders, 1999, p.139). In this respect, community policing is extremely interventionist and aims at accessing public resources using communications technology and the mobilization of others (Punch, 1999). Brunson and
Miller (2006), for instance, find that “young men’s negative views about the police stemmed largely from proactive policing strategies such as frequent pedestrian and vehicle stops.” Indeed, police priorities might not be in alignment with the community’s and can even conflict in detrimental ways (Thacher, 2001).

Community policing may actually mislead us from addressing inherent social inequalities which are at the heart of tension between the police and minority communities (Perrott, 1999). There is always a probability that interactions with the police can also damage police image (Hawdon & Ryan, 2003). The problem lies in the difficulty to decide what actually good relations are (Lynes, 1996). Another impediment to the community policing activities is people’s demands for stricter laws and programs to curb crime (Jesilow & Parsons, 2000).

In fact, societal factors play a critical role in people’s belief against crime and police practices. Schafer, Huebner, and Bynum (2003), for instance, argue that “overall, persons who had positive views of community cultures and their neighborhoods and did not perceive major crime as a problem were more likely to express positive perceptions of community-policing services.” Citizens living in urban areas with larger population, for example, are more likely to think that police role should be limited to enforcing laws (Flanagan, 1985 in Weisheit, Wells, & Falcone, 1994).

Therefore, environmental conditions come up as an important determinant (contingency) in community policing. Policing strategies are subject to varying environmental circumstances and pressures that influence traditional and community policing practices (Depew, 1992). Actually, organizations incline to structure themselves
in varying ways depending on the stability and predictability of their environment and prevailing conditions (Hanson, 2003). Davis, Henderson and Merrick (2003), for instance, find in their study which focuses on different countries that “there is no single uniform model of community policing” and the success of each community policing program is shaped and influenced by the local context and history.

Awareness of the residents of their police agency’s community policing activities is another determinant for the success of these practices in integrating community and for getting support from the citizens (Adams, Rohe, & Arcury, 2005). Yet police departments erroneously presume that people will assist them in their community policing actions once they are invited (Rosenbaum and Lurigio, 1994). Rosenbaum and Lurigio (1994) claim that this assumption is not correct especially in urban minority communities where police relations with residents are at its minimum. For that reason community policing may be undermining the extremely well-established social inequities that are at the center of tension between minorities and the police (Leighton, 1991 in Perrott, 1999). Actually, it is not easy to create and sustain district, neighborhood and even block groups (Buerger, 1994).

What happens in practice is a free-riding problem as argued by Olson (1968). People do not take part in police-related activities unless there is an incentive to do so. Attendance is high when the police organize a picnic or party but not when a neighborhood meeting is held (Grinc, 1994). Herbert (2005, p.862) states that residents “correspondingly see the state as uniquely responsible for ensuring security and preserving equality; communities cannot exert coercive force as the police do, and they
cannot oversee the redistribution of wealth.” In addition to that, since police training mainly consists of responding to crime and not essentially dealing with community-level factors like collective efficacy, most of the community policing practices do not actually take into account societal factors or processes that affect their success (Nolan, Conti, & McDevitt, 2004). Indeed, findings reveal that neighborhood environment together with the personal experiences seem to matter more than race on attitudes toward the police (Smith, 2005).

Police’ interaction with the community takes place not in a vacuum but within an environment that consist of several complex emotional and behavioral components of society (Scott, 2002). Thurman, Zhao, and Giacomazzi (2001, p.99) state that “social scientists refer to the environment as an independent variable that functions to influence organizational structure, which is referred to as a dependent variable.” Findings in the literature support their thesis. Community policing has been successfully implemented to some extent in the districts where the general pattern of the social structure was homogenous and informal controls were strong (Smith&Hawkins, 1973; Hawdon & Ryan, 2003).

However, there is always the risk that community policing strategies will merely reflect the interests of the more influential and eloquent groups in a neighborhood (Fyfe, 1995). In fact, Brunson and Miller (2006) note that police practices in disadvantaged urban neighborhoods are different than the ones in middle- or upper-class communities. The literature suggests that community policing works best in places that are already-organized and where it is the least needed (Buerger, 1994), confirming the tenets of
contingency theory. Consequently, community policing is practiced much less in low-income, heterogeneous, deteriorated, disadvantaged, renting, and high-crime communities (Grinc, 1994; Skogan, 1988 in Buerger, 1994; Reisig & Parks, 2004).

This sort of disparate practices appears to be an important explanatory factor of the consistent findings of scholars of minority mistrust and dissatisfaction with the police forces (Brunson & Miller, 2006). Communities such as poor or minority neighborhoods and disorganized communities that mistrust the police may be hesitant to cooperate with police departments (Jesilow & Parsons, 2000; Hawdon & Ryan, 2003). In these disorganized communities, “the informal networks of social control are lacking thereby forcing the police to use more traditional styles of policing” (Hawdon & Ryan, 2003). Actually since local communities change in terms of income, age, deprivation level, number and type of crime and victimization, police clearance rates, and attitudes toward the police, Ashby (2005, p.421) claims that “policing strategies and assessment measures should ultimately reflect the needs of the local community. Those who are involved in the provision of services to the community are likely to understand these differences and customize service delivery accordingly.” In the words of former President Clinton (1996), “…you've got to have a partnership. There is no Government program to solve this. You've got to have grassroots citizens involved in it; otherwise, there is no way to get it done...government programs fail...because there's no structure underneath…”

Other Contingencies

Crime

Proactive policing in general and community policing practices in specific are
criticized because they do not target crime directly but rather deal with societal conditions and other sources of crime (Xu, Fiedler, & Flaming, 2005). However crime still exists and the public expects police to do something to fight it. Therefore, in most cases crime itself is a more important part of the police job than crime prevention especially in areas with higher crime rates. There is inconclusive evidence regarding the effectiveness of community policing on crime reduction. Research findings which show that community policing reduces crime in areas where it is practiced may also be misleading. Edwin and Carrico (1990), for instance, reexamined the Flint program and claimed that while crime rates fell about 8 percent in foot-patrol areas, crime rose by 10 percent in the rest of the Flint where community policing is not practiced. Similarly, “critics charge that Greenberg's programs merely force criminals out of the city into the suburbs, without reducing total crime. Whether this is true is questionable; crime has increased in nearby North Charleston [as well]” (Edwin & Carrico, 1990, p.26).

**Terrorism**

“Like police organizations, the causal environments in which they are immersed are also changing rapidly...the massive influence of the 11 September terrorist incidents is exerting a profound influence on police organizations” (Maguire, et.al, 2003, p.272). Therefore the developments following 9/11 terrorist attacks seem to be critical for the future of community policing. Murray (2005) is worried about the fact that there appears to be a return from community policing and its principles to the traditional policing rationalized by the war against terrorism in the post September 11 era. De Guzman (2002, p.11) claims that “in the context of war against terror, some tenets of community policing
appear to be inconsistent with the implementation of these new police roles...” parallel to the “…fact that community policing in its present form would be unable to meet the demands introduced by the threat of terrorism.”

Oliver (2004) defines the shift from community policing to a new style as the new era in policing, namely Homeland Security. Oliver (2004) supports his argument relying on the fact that COPS funding have been radically cut while the Homeland Security budget has constantly continued to increase and he states that this is due to a not partial but a larger environmental change in police agencies. Oliver (2004) finally claims that even though Homeland Security was seen as part of community policing in the awakening of 9/11, it will turn into a distinct policy and a new paradigm shift in policing. Murray (2005, p.349), on the other hand, argues that such a model “will be counterproductive since it takes away the critical facility of prevention and community cooperation which are inherent in community policing.” He offers the coexistence of both policing philosophies under the tenets of community policing since its principles which rely on trust and reciprocal respect consist of much more reasonable and efficient methods in the war against terrorism by providing early warnings with reference to terrorist acts.

**Funding**

Federal funding takes up an important part in police agencies’ community policing activities. For example, many authors argue that police departments make false claims about their community policing actions so that they can qualify for federal funding (Maguire et al., 1998 in Worrall & Zhao, 2003; MacDonald, 2002; Maguire & Katz,
In some places these images of community policing are all too accurate. Somebody writes a grant or comes back from a conference, and all of a sudden the powers that be are hot to do community policing. The departments grab the grant, sets up a few days of training on the "Community Policing Model," a few cops are designated community officers, the chief holds a press conference, and nothing really changes (Rahtz, 2001, p.1).

All of these findings refer to the fact that police organizations may be in community policing for the money (Worrall & Zhao, 2003). Indeed, He, Zhao & Lovrich (2005, p.302) find that “receiving COPS Office grants is positively associated with the implementation of community policing.” Then the question is; what happens when COPS office stops funding? Its being an expensive strategy due to its requirement on expansion of police resources makes things more complicated and jeopardizes its future once the funding is ceased (Edwin & Carrico, 1990). Actually with the new administration, COPS funding is zeroed out, departments have no longer the extra personnel for community policing activities, and even the most dedicated police agencies are faced with abandoning their programs (Wallace-Wells, 2003). Therefore, Rosenbaum in Brodeur (1998, p.20) warns that “local municipalities must be prepared to absorb the long-term cost of these additional resources once the COPS money has been phased out.”

Unlike these findings, Wilson (2006) claims that although COP funding increases COP activities, it is not a major factor and money alone is not the key to COP strategies. “One police chief reportedly refers to the program as ‘the gift that keeps on taking.’ Under the proposed grants, communities would have to show how they would keep the new officers on the force once federal funding lapsed” (Holly, 1994, p.603). Interesting enough, the hiring and deployment of community policing officers thanks to the
additional federal funding makes people more dependent on police and might reduce residents involvement in COP activities (Black, 1980 in McDonald edited in Weisburd, Uchida, and Green, 1993, p. 161).

**Federal Intervention**

Worrall and Zhao (2003, p.68) claim that “the influence of the federal government on local law enforcement organizations has had direct impact on innovations in contemporary policing.” Practical examples to federal intervention that had huge impact on local police agencies would be 1994 Crime Act and most recently the establishment of Homeland Security.

Donovan, Mooney, and Smith (forthcoming 2007) employ a historical institutional perspective in order to study the relationship between federal system and states and to emphasize the increasing power of the federal government in this equation. They (forthcoming 2007) claim that crises like the Great Depression, World War II, and the attacks of 9/11 have been the primary determinant in the power shift from states to federal government. This situation (changes in the inertial tendency and path dependency) can be explained with “punctuated equilibrium” presented in historical institutionalism. To the authors, one primary reason to this flexibility in power change is the fact that the authority of the federal and state government is ill and ambiguously defined in the Constitution. Another cause is presented as politicians’ enacting laws at the federal level in order to be reelected (government failure inherent in representative government). The interaction and diffusion between states and federal government can be
seen in the history of community policing that started with experiments at the state level in late 1970s and then extended to the federal milieu with the 1994 Crime Act.

In this chapter, I mentioned various contingencies of community policing at individual, departmental, and societal level. Briefly, at individual level, I examined the effects of masculinist police culture on officers’ rejection of “soft policing” and on their resistance to change. I also laid out why most police are not still convinced and do not perceive community building as part of their job description due to the fact that community policing contrasts with their training and experience. At the organizational level, I listed police departments’ para-militaristic bureaucratic structure, their limited resources, their lack of knowledge and skills for a new model, their uncertainty and discomfort in accepting change, and their hesitancy for investing limited police resources to enforce law with such a new way as the primary obstacles to the implementation of community policing.

At the societal level, the public’s hesitation to get involved with the police due to fear and other distrust issues historically, interfering nature of community policing to people’s lives, conflict between police and community in priorities and demands, and its lack of practice in disadvantaged neighborhoods were listed as main hurdles to community policing. Finally, lack of evidence that community policing has reduced crime, cuts in community policing budget, general thinking in “war on terror” requires more traditional model policing, and federal intervention were also listed as other factors that hinder community policing activities.
**Hypotheses**

In view of the literature both in contingency and community policing, the effect of individual, departmental, and societal factors on the level of community policing activities are explored. As shown in Figure 1, crime rates (violent and property) are added as an intervening variable between individual, departmental, and societal factors and the degree of community policing activities.

The aim of placing such an intervening variable is to see whether or not contingency factors at the individual, departmental, and societal levels affect both directly and indirectly, via crime rate variable, the level of community policing activities a police agency implements.

*Hypothesis 1 (Effect of Contingencies on Community Policing):*

*Individual Level:*

*Hypothesis 1-a:* Police agencies with more female officers employ more community policing activities.

*Hypothesis 1-b:* Police departments consisting of more personnel from races other than White (racially diverse) use more community policing activities.

*Hypothesis 1-c:* Police agencies admitting more educated people as police officers implement more community policing activities.

*Hypothesis 1-d:* As the income of police personnel increases, so does the implementation of community policing activities.
Figure 1: Causal Diagram for the Effects of Contingency Factors on Community Policing
Hypothesis 1-f: Police agencies that have bigger budgets implement more community policing activities.

Societal Level:

Hypothesis 1-g: As the population increases, the level of implementation of community policing activities decreases.

Hypothesis 1-h: Societies that are more heterogeneous will have fewer community policing activities.

Hypothesis 1-i: As the unemployment rate of a community increases, community policing activities diminishes.

Hypothesis 1-j: Communities with more income inequality have less community policing implementation.

Hypothesis 2 (Effect of Contingencies on Crime Rates):

Individual Level:

Hypothesis 2-a: Police agencies with more female officers have lower crime rates.

Hypothesis 2-b: Police departments that are more heterogeneous in terms of race have less crime.

Hypothesis 2-c: As the police agencies recruit more educated personnel the crime rate decreases.

Hypothesis 2-d: As the income of police personnel increases the crime rate decreases.
Departmental Level:

Hypothesis 2-e: Police departments which are larger in size have higher crime rates.

Hypothesis 2-f: Police agencies with bigger budgets have more crime.

Societal Level:

Hypothesis 2-g: As the population increases, so does the crime rate.

Hypothesis 2-h: Societies that are more heterogeneous in terms of race have higher crime.

Hypothesis 2-i: As the unemployment rate of a community increases the crime rate increases.

Hypothesis 2-j: Communities with less income and more income inequality have more crime.

Hypothesis 3: As the crime rate increases, community policing activities lessens.
CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY

Data Sources

The units of analysis are city police departments nationwide. In order to test the hypotheses, the data for this study were drawn from three sources. This study uses Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS): 2000 Sample Survey of Law Enforcement Agencies; Federal Bureau of Investigation’s (FBI) Uniform Crime Reports (UCR); and United States Census 2000. Each data source provides some of the required variables and will therefore be merged into a single data set to conduct appropriate analysis.

LEMAS

LEMAS is a national-level survey conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics in different years and presents a broad level of information about the organizational characteristics of law enforcement agencies in the United States. These characteristics include but are not limited to “personnel, expenditures and pay, operations, community policing initiatives, equipment, computers and information systems, and written policies” (Hickman & Reaves, 2002). LEMAS 2000 is the sixth survey of its series and includes a section with a wide set of questions about the community policing activities of police departments. This section will be used in my study to create an index variable to measure the variance across these departments. The index variable will serve as a dependent
variable. This dataset will also be used to obtain information at the individual and departmental levels. The questionnaire of the 2000 LEMAS survey was sent to all self-representing agencies including local police departments, sheriffs’ offices, and state law enforcement agencies and was also mailed to a nationally representative stratified random sample of nonself-representing agencies with fewer than 100 sworn personnel. Total number of agencies responded to the questionnaire is 2,985 and this number equals to 97.4% response rate. As a result, final data included 1,975 local police departments, 961 sheriffs’ offices, and the 49 primary State police departments (Hickman and Reaves, 2002).

**UCR**

UCR was initiated in 1929 in an effort to gather the crime statistics at different geographic levels and to best portray the actual crime rates. The FBI collects voluntary data from participating law enforcement agencies in two major crime categories. Part I offenses include criminal homicide, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor-vehicle theft, and arson. Part II offenses include all other reportable crimes. This research will benefit 2000 UCR data in the operationalization of the “crime rate” variable. When comparing crime rates among police jurisdictions, however, “factors such as population density, degree of urbanization, demographic composition of the population…and economic conditions” will be taken into consideration as suggested by the FBI (Reaves & Hickman, 2002).
CENSUS

The twenty-second of its series, also known as Census 2000 data which is provided by U.S. Census Bureau gives extensive information about not only the population but also the socio-economic characteristics of the United States’ residents. Census Bureau uses one short and a long form. While the short form is sent to every household, the long form is only sent to the limited (approximately 1/6) number of households (Sevetson, 2002). The short form gathers general information like name, gender, age, race, and homeownership while the long version asks detailed questions on social characteristics such as marital status, place of birth, and education; and on economic characteristics like employment status and income (Sevetson, 2002). Some part of this data will be extracted from the Census Bureau’s web page at the place level (cities, towns, villages, etc.) to be used in obtaining information about societal characteristics of law enforcement agencies.

Data Limitations

Aside from the limitations of each dataset, a general problem arose in combining three datasets which ultimately caused losing some cases. The primary reason for such a problem in merging data was the LEMAS and UCR’s incompatibility with CENSUS data. Since the CENSUS data was at place level, no exact match was found for some cases and therefore the cases including the state and tribal police departments were deleted. Merged dataset consisted of 2571 cases and was merely a sample of municipal, sheriff, and county police agencies.

Since the unit of analysis is police departments due to data restrictions, I also can
not run analyses at the neighborhood level. This is problematic because, Skogan and Harnett (1997) in Scott (2002, p.149) claim that “the interactions between police and residents within cities vary substantially across neighborhoods.”

For LEMAS data; first of all, even though LEMAS 2000 asks police departments about their community policing activities in a detailed section and an index is created to measure overall community policing performance of the agencies, “unfortunately, I am unable to document the extent (or intensity) to which each individual COP program was implemented in a particular police agency” (He, Zhao, & Lovrich, 2005, p.310).

Secondly, LEMAS is given to and filled by the Chief Executive Officer of a police agency (Weisburd & Lum, 2005). Since one person completes the survey, honesty and objectivity of the respondent are questionable and personal bias in most cases is inevitable (O’Shea & Nicholls, 2003).

Finally, in addition to the possible response and processing errors, the data is also subject to sampling error since it does not include the whole population of the departments with less than 100 sworn personnel (Reaves & Hickman, 2002).

The FBI’s Uniform Crime Reports are also criticized in several aspects. Since the UCR is voluntary in nature, the “FBI has no control over the reliability, accuracy, consistency, timeliness, or completeness of the data they receive” (Maltz & Targonski, 2002, p.299). This together with the dark figure of crime make nonreporting, underreporting, and double-counting often-encountered errors in UCR data.
Variable Operationalization

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable used in this study is "level of community policing activities" and it will be derived from 2000 LEMAS. In its questionnaire, LEMAS has a section on community policing that acquires information about different community policing implementations of police departments. The questions asked in this section are primarily "yes" "no" questions. These questions will be merged and turned into an index variable to create a ratio level variable which measures the level of community policing activities of a certain police agency. Creating an index variable will help overcome problems encountered in previous studies with coding community policing as a binary variable which ultimately results in biased outcomes about the level of community policing activities. Because binary coding does not exactly tell us to what extent a police agency implements community policing. In binary coding, you will have only two scores. ‘0’s will represent ‘no community policing activity’ and ‘1’s will stand for ‘perfect community policing activity’. Such a coding would not tell you anything about the police departments that implements community policing to an extent, somewhere between 0 (no activity) and 1 (100% activity). This study also meets to a great extent the standards offered by Wilson (2006) to improve the measurement of COP implementation. These standards are listed by Wilson (2006, p.11) as successful when COP;

- is measured on an interval level scale
- accounts for varying levels of implementation
- accounts for multiple types of COP-related activities
- allows the empirical comparison of police organizations implementing COP in various forms
-empirically gauges the extent to which COP implementation varies for police organizations across time or place.

Another drawback with the former studies is, when creating an index variable, not including the measures showing different aspects of community policing which ultimately causes the lower correlations. To Wells, Falcone, and Rabe-Hemp (2003, p.584), “this means that other measures of COP, e.g., that tap other philosophical or programmatic aspects of the COP perspective or that incorporate a more diverse assortment of items, might well show a different, or at least a stronger, pattern of effects or influences.” Using LEMAS survey that measures community policing under six main categories, this study creates a more complicated index variable with values varying between 0 (no community policing activity) and 34 (complete COP activity).

The first question asks whether or not the agency has a community policing plan. In our data, as part of an index variable, this question was turned into a dummy variable and recoded in which ‘0’ stands for ‘no community policing plan’ and ‘1’ represents a ‘formally or informally written community policing plan.’

The second question measures the community policing training practices of agencies and asks “During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2000, what proportion of agency personnel received at least eight hours of community policing training (problem solving, SARA, community partnerships, etc.)?” Agency personnel here refer to the new officer recruits, in-service sworn personnel, and civilian personnel. In order to create an index variable, these ordinally-coded variables were turned into a dummy variable where ‘0’ means ‘no community policing training' and ‘1’ indicates ‘community policing training of all, half or more, or less than half personnel.’
The third set of questions examines the community policing practices of police departments and is listed under this main question: “During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2000, which of the following did your agency do?” The list consists of whether or not the agency a) actively encouraged patrol officers to engage in SARA-type problem-solving projects on their beats, b) assigned detectives to cases based on geographic areas/beat, c) conducted a citizen police academy, d) formed problem-solving partnerships with community groups, public agencies, or others through specialized contracts or written agreements, e) gave patrol officers responsibility for specific geographic areas/beats, f) included collaborative problem-solving projects in the evaluation criteria of patrol officers, g) trained citizens in community policing (e.g., community mobilization, problem solving), and h) upgraded technology to support community policing activities. These activities were asked in yes-no format and therefore were coded as dummy variables where ‘0’ means ‘no activity’ and ‘1’ refers to the ‘practice of that certain activity.’

The fourth question set inquires about the interaction between police agencies and the community groups and lists several related activities under following major question: “During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2000, which of the following groups did your agency meet with regularly (at least once every 3 months) to address crime-related problems?” The groups include advocacy groups, business groups, domestic violence groups, local public agencies, neighborhood associations, religious groups, school groups, senior citizen groups, tenants’ associations, and youth service organizations. Meeting with each of these groups gets a score of ‘1’ and no meeting is scored as ‘0’.
The fifth question asks whether or not public opinion is taken into consideration through surveys. The main question is: “During the 12-month period ending June 30, 2000, did your agency conduct or sponsor a survey of citizens on any of the following topics?” These topics consist of public satisfaction with police services, public perceptions of crime/disorder problems, personal crime experiences of citizens, reporting of crimes to law enforcement by citizens, and any other survey. Since these questions were asked in yes-no format, each was coded as dummy variable where ‘0’ means ‘no opinion survey’ and ‘1’ stands for ‘conducting survey in that specific topic.’

The final question asks for which community policing purposes the results of the above-mentioned surveys were used. These purposes are listed as agency used survey info a) for allocating resources to targeted neighborhoods, b) for evaluating program effectiveness, c) for formulating agency policy and procedures, d) for prioritizing crime/disorder problems, e) for providing information to patrol officers, f) for redistricting beat/reporting areas, g) for training development, and h) for other purposes. These purposes were asked in yes-no format and therefore were coded as dummy variables where ‘0’ means ‘no specific purpose’ and ‘1’ refers to the ‘use of information about the purposes.’

All of these sub-activities, when combined together, make up an index variable that measures the level of community policing activities of a certain police agency. Descriptive statistics (Appendix Table-1) are in appendix. Cronbach’s alpha, coefficient of consistency, was also used to see whether the variables are measuring the same underlying construct “level of community policing activities.” Cronbach’s alpha score for
reliability analysis is very high (.924) and therefore I may say that I am measuring the same concept with each one of these index variables.

One thing that needs to be mentioned here, however, is that the community policing activities noted in the LEMAS survey might mean different things to different respondents (Bayley, 1998). To Bayley (1998, p.140) “…a generic test of community policing is unlikely to be constructed. Any test will be partially useful only for a particular program in a particular place…the evaluation results to date have been mixed, partly for these reasons.” Similarly, Xu, Fiedler, and Flaming (2005) note the difficulties with measuring the effectiveness of community policing practices. Therefore, Kenneth and Veitch (1997) mention the need for developing new ways to measure the effectiveness and efficiency that will explain this new style of proactive policing.

**Independent Variables**

There are three sets of independent variables which explore the individual, departmental, and societal effects.

**Individual level**

Variables measuring individual effects are ‘race’, ‘gender’, ‘education’, and ‘income’ of police personnel.

**Race.** Several findings in the literature reveal the significance of race on community policing. Lurigio and Skogan (1994) find that minority officers (especially African Americans) have more positive attitudes and feel more optimistic toward community policing than their white colleagues in Chicago. Similarly, Novak, Alarid,
and Lucas (2003) found that non-White officers were more likely to support community policing concepts. As a result of his analysis, O’Shea (1999, p.74) also notes that “black officers in Chicago were less resistant to change than non-blacks, were more willing to work with the community to solve problems, and showed less cynicism about the community.” One argument in the literature is to harmonize police forces with the communities they serve in order to reduce the conflict between the two (Lynes, 1996). One way to lessen the tension may be to recruit new officers in order to reflect the racial heterogeneity of the neighborhoods. However, Perrott (1999, p.350) argues the “...racial prejudice and discrimination, both from police departments and society at large, as the most significant obstacles to minority recruitment.”

In light of these findings, the "race" variable is derived from the second section of the LEMAS 2000 which asks questions about personnel. In one of the questions in personnel section, the departments are asked to “enter the number of full-time sworn personnel with general arrest powers by race for the pay period that included June 30, 2000.” Race categories are ‘White, not of Hispanic origin’, ‘Black or African American, not of Hispanic origin’, ‘Hispanic or Latino’, ‘American Indian or Alaska Native’, ‘Asian’, ‘Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander’, and ‘some other race’. These race groups are used to create a racial diversity variable (see appendices for the formula). The idea of using such a variable was inspired by the study of Hill and Leighley (1999) that used racial composition of voters in order to find out the effect of state institutions on political behavior. What racial diversity basically stands for is that it shows how heterogeneous a population is in terms of the racial composition. And the racial diversity
value refers to the probability that two randomly chosen persons from a given population do not belong to the same racial category. Racial diversity index takes a value between 0 and 1, and the higher the value, the bigger the diversity is.

However, since such a measure does not allow us to determine whether specific racial groups respond differently, above mentioned race categories will also be used as dummy variables in running analyses in order to find out whether it is racial diversity that matters or is it the experiences of certain racial groups that makes the difference.

**Gender.** Gender is among the most debated topics in policing. Much of the literature suggests that “a community policing model calls for certain characteristics that are more typically thought of as feminine in nature...in other words, the ideal or superior traits for community policing officers to possess are those qualities often referred to as feminine” (Sims, Scarborough, & Ahmad, 2003, p.280). Hale and Wyland (1999) suggest that female officers may better communicate with citizens. O’Shea (1999) reports that female police are also less resistant to change. However, Miller (1999, p. 216-217) notes the fact that even in community policing traditional masculinity of policing has a place and it actually was used in criminally active areas with high crime rates that needs aggressive policing styles. Actually, some residents may prefer more traditional methods of policing and therefore may be disturbed by the existence of female officers in their neighborhoods (Skolnick & Bayley, 1988). At the organizational level, community policing is also resisted primarily by male officers who would prefer catching criminals instead of attending neighborhood meetings (Herbert, 2001).

As the ‘race’ variable, ‘gender’ is also derived from the second section of the
LEMAS 2000 that asks police agencies to “enter the number of full-time sworn personnel with general arrest powers by gender for the pay period that included June 30, 2000.” The number and the percentage of male and female personnel were calculated by adding each race group together according to their gender.

*Education.* College-graduate police personnel believe that they don’t have enough discretion in their assignments and do carry negative attitudes toward the police organization (O’Shea, 1999). As such in this study I assume that the more educated officers will be more open to change and receptive to new strategies like community policing that in turn gives them more discretion and authority.

The ‘education’ variable is also operationalized by using LEMAS 2000 survey’s second section about personnel. In this survey, the departments are asked to ‘indicate their minimum education requirement which new (non-lateral) officer recruits must have within two years of hiring.’ The options under this questions are ‘four-year college degree required’, ‘two-year college degree required’, ‘some college but no degree required’, ‘high school diploma or equivalent required’, or ‘no formal education requirement.’ These values were recoded in order to create an ordinal level variable and ‘0’ was coded as ‘no educational requirement’ and ‘4’ as ‘four-year college degree required.’ Even though this variable doesn’t directly reflect the educational level of police, it might still give us a clue about a department’s recruitment policy in terms of the educational attainment of the candidates. Not coding the level of education of police officers is a weakness in LEMAS data. LEMAS 2000 data offer us no alternative about police officers’ educational backgrounds other than asking the departments’ minimum
education requirements in hiring new officers. Such a measure does not tell us anything about the educational attainment of officers especially when older officers recruited long before these requirements existed are taken into account. Further LEMAS questionnaires should include either the number or the percentages of personnel in each education category.

*Income.* Similar to the previous individual level variables, ‘income’ will be measured with the operationalization of the question that requests agencies to ‘enter the salary schedule for full-time sworn personnel positions.’ For the income variable this study uses the minimum (starting) salary of an entry-level officer or deputy.

**Departmental level**

Departmental variables, on the other hand, consist of "size" and "budget" of police agencies.

*Size.* Size of a police department is a fairly often argued variable in the literature. Jackson (1991, p.56) claims that “size is a very significant variable that managers need to take into account when designing organization structures.” To Wells, Falcone, and Rabe-Hemp (2003), for instance, among all organizational factors departmental size alone is the strongest determinant of a law enforcement style. Since community policing requires more manpower compared to traditional policing, it is easier for bigger departments to use community policing methods (Sharp, 2006). Indeed, Maguire, Kuhns, Uchida, and Cox (1997) find that bigger agencies practice a broader range of community policing related strategies. Another argument is that since larger departments have more
differentiated and specialized structures, there is always a room for community policing activities (Blau, 1970). However, “given the close social ties between police and the community, it should be expected that rural officers will use policing styles that are responsive to citizens in their area and...rural policing presents an ideal type example of community policing” (Weisheit, Wells, & Falcone, 1994, p.553). O’Shea’s (1999) study supports this thesis and finds that officers working in smaller districts are more willing to work with the citizens and has more positive attitudes toward community policing. Unfortunately though, small departments may not have enough capacity and the luxury to deploy their officers as community policing officers (Skogan, 2004).

‘Size’ variable can be obtained both from LEMAS 2000 and CSLLEA datasets and here refers to the actual number of ‘authorized full-time sworn personnel with general arrest powers paid agency positions on June 30, 2000’. In this study, both the ‘total size’ and the ‘size of police per 1,000 population’ will be used. ‘Size of police per 1,000 population’ is calculated by first dividing the ‘total size’ to the ‘population of the jurisdiction served’ and then multiplying it by 1,000.

*Budget.* It is generally agreed that departments with more monetary power will have more possibilities to apply different techniques and strategies including community policing activities in order to fight against crime. Like the ‘size’ variable, ‘budget’ can be obtained both from LEMAS 2000 and CSLLEA datasets and here refers to the ‘total operation budget for the 12-month period that includes June 30, 2000’. This study uses both the ‘total budget’ and the ‘budget per 1,000 population’. ‘Budget per 1,000
population’ is calculated by first dividing the ‘total budget’ to the ‘population of the jurisdiction served’ and then multiplying it (per capita budget) by 1,000.

Societal level

Finally, societal variables consist of ‘racial composition’, ‘population’, ‘unemployment rate’, and ‘income’ and will be extracted from Census 2000.

*Racial composition.* Race is not an issue that is only limited to the police but still remains a volatile problem for policing because of the following reasons;

- the alarming rates of victimization many minority groups endure;
- the disproportionate number of minorities arrested and incarcerated;
- the debate about how best to promote minority hiring and promotion in police departments;
- the role of race as a common factor in police brutality;
- the concern that racially motivated incidents and attacks are on the rise; and
- the worrisome emergence and growth of new militant groups, such as the skinheads, who openly advocate violence against minorities. (Trojanowicz, Kappeler, Gaines, & Bucqueroux, 1998, p. 253)

Even though most community policing projects target multiple deprivation and racially heterogeneous areas (Fielding, 1995, p. 127), it is extremely difficult for the police to address and respond to opposing community demands equally (Gottlieb 1993). Greenberg and Rohe (1986) in Grinc (1994, p.458) note that “there is an absence of shared norms regarding the definition of social order in heterogeneous, lower-income neighborhoods.” Such a communal structure makes the implementation of community policing almost impossible due to the reluctance of residents with working cooperatively with police in solving crime or neighborhood problems in order to improve neighborhood conditions (Schuck & Rosenbaum, 2005). For example, “the rosy picture of the English
constable was shattered by the events in Brixton Liverpool, Manchester, and other cities” due to “the deep-seated hatred and resentment of police by ethnic minorities and the police abuse of minorities” (Fairchild, 1993, p. 87). Actually, racial diversity is believed to be an important factor in decision making. Hero and Tolbert (1996), for instance, claim that race/ethnicity play a critical role in state politics and policy outcomes. Their hypothesis is inspired by Key’s (1949) theoretical assumption which states that the driving force behind politics in areas with large minority population is the maintenance of control by Whites. Strangely enough, Perrott (1999) finds that due to racial prejudice and discrimination of both police departments and society in general, minority applicants to the police departments claim that they face serious obstacles in recruitment process.

In light of these findings, "racial diversity" variable is derived from Census 2000. Race categories in the Census are ‘White’, ‘African American’, ‘Native American’, ‘Asian’, ‘Pacific’, and ‘other race’. These race groups are used to create a racial diversity variable. As stated before, racial diversity shows how heterogeneous a population is in terms of the racial composition. The racial diversity index takes a value between 0 and 1, and the higher the value, the bigger the diversity is. However, since such a measure does not allow us to determine whether specific racial groups respond differently, above mentioned race categories will also be used as dummy variables in running analyses in order to find out whether it is racial diversity that matters or is it the experiences of certain racial groups that makes the difference.

Income. Involvement of citizens in community policing activities in poor neighborhoods can be surprisingly difficult (Skogan, 2004). Studies reveal that
community policing works best in middle-class neighborhoods and traditional policing remains the dominant way of policing for poor and uneducated people (Skolnick & Bayley, 1988). Income is measured in two ways in this study. One is income and is measured with median household income and the other is income inequality which shows up as a better measure to see the disparity among different income groups. In their study Liska and Chamlin (1984) find that income inequality is a good predictor for both property and violent crimes. Although there are several ways to measure income inequality, our research will use the GINI index that are available in Census data at county level. The GINI Index is “based on the cumulative distribution function of households’ income, and various percentile indexes, which compare the portion of total income received by the top fraction with the portion received by a bottom fraction” (Cowell, 1998 in Lopez, 2004, p.2411) GINI coefficients take values between 0 and 1 and ‘0’ stands for ‘complete equality’ while ‘1’ represents ‘complete inequality’.

*Population density.* The majority of the population arguments focuses on the relation between population density and communal structures. Population density is among the major structural constraints that limit the collective efficacy of the communities (Nolan, Conti, & McDevitt, 2004). Greene and Mastrofski (1988) claim that it is really hard to identify communities in big cities in the first place. The 19th Century British Prime Minister Disraeli puts such an idea well when he notes that “in great cities men are brought together by the desire of gain. They are not in a state of cooperation, but of isolation, as to the making of fortunes; and for all the rest they are careless of neighbors…” (Quoted in Thurman, Zhao, & Giacomazzi, 2001, p.48) Population density
here means the density per square mile of land area.

*Unemployment rate.* Being one of the significant social conditions, unemployment rate is among the important predictors of variation in crime rates. Unemployment rate is deducted from the Census 2000 data and refers to the percentage of unemployed population in a given jurisdiction.

Other factors

In order to better reflect the effects of environmental conditions on community policing, this study also uses societal variables such as home ownership, percentage of people living in urban, educational attainment, etc. In their path breaking study, Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997) find residential stability as an important factor that increases collective efficacy of the neighborhoods. Because “when you have a home that is rented, or is bought and sold four or five times within a period of three or four years…that affects a lot of the block watches and citizens on patrol, because they are designed to get to know your neighbor” (Carlile, 1996). Indeed, home ownership can reflect people’s attachment to the community (Correia, 2000). Reisig and Parks (2004, p.163) show that “Whites, the better educated, older residents, homeowners, and those who have lived for a longer duration in their current residence all rate citizen partnerships with the police significantly more favorably.”

*Control Variables.* The first control variable is "crime rates" and is used to control for the effects of independent variables. Residential stability together with poverty, the level of informal control and the social and organizational features of
neighborhoods are also strong indicators that explain crime rates (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997; Martin, 2002). Other determinants of crime rates may be listed as city-level structural factors such as population density, percentage of young people, household and population composition, and income inequality (MacDonald, 2002). MacDonald (2002, p.611) confirms previous research and notes that “structural indicators of disadvantage are important and powerful predictors of urban violence.” Since crime control is the first priority of police departments, Zhao, Lovrich, and Robinson (2001, p.373) claim that “core functional priorities of American policing largely remain closely modeled after the professional model.” Skogan (2004) also argues that community policing has tended to work best in low-crime areas. Hence one of the main assumptions of this study is that crime rates are affected by social and organizational factors and crime rate is determined by the strategy used by the police agencies.

In order to measure this variable, UCR data is used. Part 1 offenses in this dataset will be categorized into two categories: "violent" and "property" crimes using FBI classification and they will be fixed to per 1,000 population. Violent crimes are murder, rape, aggravated assault, and robbery while the property crimes are burglary, larceny-theft, and motor-vehicle theft. Since UCR data are gathered monthly, annual crime rate is calculated by adding the number of monthly crime rates. Then these numbers are added together to find total violent and property crime rates. The "crime rates" variable will be used as an intervening variable in the second main hypothesis.

The second control variable is number of community policing officers. It is supposed that the more an agency has assigned community policing officers, the more
community policing activities they will have. The related question in the LEMAS survey is that ‘of the total number of full-time sworn personnel with general arrest powers, how many served as community policing officers, community resource officers, community relations officers, or other sworn personnel specifically designated to regularly engage in community policing activities?’ The number of community policing officers is divided into the total number of full-time sworn personnel with general arrest powers and then multiplied by 100 in order to find the percentage of community policing officers.

**Statistical Method**

There are two main paths in this study. Each path uses the same statistical method in order to measure the effects of independent variables on dependent variable. For the first path that examines the impact of the main independent variables at individual, organizational, and societal level on level of crime rates dependent variable, multivariate ordinary least squares (OLS) regression techniques were used. Multivariate OLS regression was used to test here because of the fact that our dependent variable is a ratio level variable and our independent variables are a combination of ordinal and ratio level variables.

Table 1 shows all the variables with the coding information.
**TABLE 1: VARIABLES AND CODING INFORMATION (Valid N = 2371)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coding (mean and standard deviation in parentheses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Com.Pol.</td>
<td>An index variable to measure the level of implementation of community policing across police agencies using community policing section of the LEMAS 2000 data. In numbers ranging between 0 and 34 (11.207; 7.893)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level Race</td>
<td>Measured with a racial diversity index offered by Hill and Leighley (1999). In numbers ranging between 0 and 1 where 1 represents perfect diversity (0.17; 0.184)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Percentage of female sworn personnel in an agency (0.076; 0.081)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Minimum education requirement requested by police departments in application process. ‘0’ was recoded as ‘no educational requirement’ and ‘4’ as ‘four-year college degree required’ (1.258; 0.679)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Average of minimum and maximum salary of an entry-level officer or deputy (31459; 9565)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Level Size</td>
<td>authorized full-time sworn personnel with general arrest powers paid agency positions on June 30, 2000. Here calculated for per 1,000 population. (2.068; 2.844)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget</td>
<td>total operation budget for the 12-month period that includes June 30, 2000’. Here calculated as the ‘budget per 1,000 population.’ (157842; 249164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Level Race</td>
<td>Measured with a racial diversity index offered by Hill and Leighley (1999). In numbers ranging between 0 and 1 where 1 represents perfect diversity (0.283; 0.193)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Here refers to income that is measured with median household income and the income inequality measured with GINI index. Values in parantheses belong to GINI (0.439; 0.037)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Even though both population and population density is present, here refers to population density which means the density per square mile of land area. (2498; 3028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>the percentage of unemployed population in a given jurisdiction (3.878; 2.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Rates</td>
<td>categorized into two under &quot;violent&quot; and &quot;property&quot; crimes using FBI classification and they will be fixed to per 1,000 population. Violent (11.800; 19.813), Property (28.123; 46.303)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Community Policing Officers</td>
<td>Here means community policing officers, community resource officers, community relations officers, or other sworn personnel specifically designated to regularly engage in community policing activities and calculated as percentage (22.057; 33.748)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall model that examines the impact of the main independent variables at individual, organizational, and societal level and the property and violent crime rates on level of community policing activities dependent variable, used path analysis. Path analysis was used here because of the fact that crime rates are seen as an intervening variable between the independent variables at individual, organizational, and societal level and the dependent variable (level of community policing activities). In order to test this path model, multivariate OLS regression was used again since our dependent variables (both the crime rates in the first path and the community policing in the second) are ratio level variables and our independent variables are a combination of ordinal and ratio level variables. The first path examined the impact of the main independent variables at individual, organizational, and societal level on the crime rates dependent variable. And the second path examined the impact of the crime rates variable and the main independent variables at individual, organizational, and societal level on the level of community policing activities dependent variable.

**Equations for the model**

**Violent Crime**

\[
Y_{\text{violentcrime}} = \beta_0 + \beta_{11}X_{\text{gender}} + \beta_{12}X_{\text{race}} + \beta_{13}X_{\text{education}} + \beta_{14}X_{\text{income}} + \beta_{15}X_{\text{size}} + \beta_{16}X_{\text{budget}} + \beta_{17}X_{\text{race(society)}} + \beta_{18}X_{\text{unemployment}} + \beta_{19}X_{\text{median income}} + \beta_{10}X_{\text{gini}} + \beta_{11}X_{\text{population density}} + \beta_{12}X_{\text{urban}} + \beta_{13}X_{\text{poverty}} + \beta_{14}X_{\text{single}} + \beta_{15}X_{\text{renters}} + \beta_{16}X_{\text{education}} + \beta_{17}X_{\text{diversity}} + \beta_{18}X_{\text{comm.pol.officer}} + e_1
\]
Property Crime

\[ Y_{(property\,crime)} = \beta_0 + \beta_{21} X_{(gender)} + \beta_{22} X_{(race)} + \beta_{23} X_{(education)} + \beta_{24} X_{(income)} + \beta_{25} X_{(size)} + \]
\[ \beta_{26} X_{(budget)} + \beta_{27} X_{(socio\,e\,y)} + \beta_{28} X_{(unemployment)} + \beta_{29} X_{(median\,income)} + \beta_{210} X_{(gini)} + \]
\[ \beta_{211} X_{(population\,density)} + \beta_{212} X_{(urban)} + \beta_{213} X_{(poverty)} + \beta_{214} X_{(singles)} + \beta_{215} X_{(renters)} + \]
\[ \beta_{216} X_{(education)} + \beta_{217} X_{(diversity)} + \beta_{218} X_{(comm\,pol\,officer)} + \varepsilon_2 \]

Effect of Contingencies on Community Policing

\[ Y_{(Community\,-\,policing)} = \beta_0 + \beta_{31} Y_{(violent\,crime)} + \beta_{32} Y_{(property\,crime)} + \beta_{33} X_{(gender)} + \beta_{34} X_{(race)} + \]
\[ \beta_{35} X_{(education)} + \beta_{36} X_{(income)} + \beta_{37} X_{(size)} + \beta_{38} X_{(budget)} + \beta_{39} X_{(socio\,e\,y)} + \beta_{310} X_{(unemployment)} + \]
\[ \beta_{311} X_{(median\,income)} + \beta_{312} X_{(gini)} + \beta_{313} X_{(population\,density)} + \beta_{314} X_{(urban)} + \beta_{315} X_{(poverty)} + \]
\[ \beta_{316} X_{(singles)} + \beta_{317} X_{(renters)} + \beta_{318} X_{(education)} + \beta_{319} X_{(diversity)} + \beta_{320} X_{(comm\,pol\,officer)} + \varepsilon_3 \]
CHAPTER 5: ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This chapter examines the impact of individual, organizational, and societal level factors on level of community policing activities of the police agencies. Crime rates (violent and property) are added as an intervening variable between individual, departmental, and societal factors and the degree of community policing activities in order to find out whether or not contingency factors at those three levels affect both directly and indirectly, via the crime rates variable, the level of community policing activities a police agency implements. The research hypotheses detailed at the end of chapter three regarding the contingencies of community policing are addressed. Findings regarding each hypothesis are laid out and further analyzed.

As seen in Tables 2 and 3, since both crime rates variables (violent and property) revealed similar results, the findings of both variables will be presented together. Table-2 presents the model examining the impact of the contingencies on the violent crime rates. Table-3 shows the model examining the impact of the contingencies on the property crime rates. Table-4 presents the model examining the direct and indirect impact of the contingencies on the level of community policing activities via violent crime rates. Results were checked for multicollinearity and heteroskedasticity. Multicollinearity was checked in SPSS using collinearity diagnostics. Multicollinearity was a problem when ‘population’ and ‘percent of people between ages 15 and 24’ variables were entered into equation at the same time. Hence ‘percent of people between ages 15 and 24’ variable
was taken out of the analysis. Multicollinearity was also a problem when ‘size’ and ‘budget’ variables were entered into equation at the same time. Hence ‘size’ and ‘budget’ variables were entered into equation separately.

In order to check for heteroskedasticity, all variables were first transferred to STATA and Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity was run. Heteroskedasticity exists if the variance of $\varepsilon$ is greater for some values of X than for others. When heteroskedasticity exists, the OLS estimates of beta and alpha are no longer Best Linear Unbiased Estimates (BLUE). Heteroskedasticity means that the variance of $\varepsilon$ is changing and the mean of zresid is not constant across X. If there is a problem with heteroskedasticity in a model, b will still be unbiased estimate of beta, but b will have an over or underestimated standard error. Thus the t-tests for statistical significant of b may be incorrect and we run the risk of rejecting the null hypothesis when it is in fact true, or not rejecting the null hypothesis when it is false (Type-1 and Type-2 errors).

Since there was also a problem with heteroskedasticity ($\text{Chi}^2 = 126.40$ and Prob $> \text{Chi}^2 = 0.000$), an OLS multivariate regression with robust standard errors was employed in STATA. According to STATA’s description, robust is “a programmer's command that computes a robust variance estimator based on a varlist (list of variables) of scores and a covariance matrix. It produces estimators for ordinary data (each observation independent), clustered data (data not independent within groups, but independent across groups), and complex survey data with stratified cluster sampling.”
### TABLE 2- MULTIVARIATE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF VIOLENT CRIME RATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coef</th>
<th>(Rob.Se)</th>
<th>p &gt;</th>
<th>z</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Percentage Female)</td>
<td>4.087</td>
<td>3.823</td>
<td>.285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Racial Diversity)</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>6.224</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-14.367</td>
<td>9.713</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-10.842</td>
<td>6.662</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Attainment)</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td>.367</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>.283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Size</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (Police per 1000)</td>
<td>2.505</td>
<td>1.753</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>3.008</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>.506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget (per 1000)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Racial Diversity)</td>
<td>-4.887</td>
<td>6.176</td>
<td>.429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.082</td>
<td>1.748</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>-.304</td>
<td>.253</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (Median)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.639</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Inequality</td>
<td>-9.628</td>
<td>9.123</td>
<td>.291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Societals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Percent living in)</td>
<td>7.652</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty (below poverty line)</td>
<td>.587</td>
<td>.426</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singles (in percentages)</td>
<td>.789</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters (in percentages)</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (associate degree percent)</td>
<td>-.262</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Index (ind.div./socie.div.)</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>.936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing Officers(percent)</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-14.439</td>
<td>8.928</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Square</td>
<td>.4736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>31.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: A Merged Data including “LEMAS 2000”, “UCR 2000”, and “CENSUS 2000.” Multivariate ordinary least squares regression, unstandardized regression coefficients reported, robust standard errors in parentheses. Probabilities based on two-tailed test. Problems with multicollinearity and heteroskedasticity were corrected.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coef</th>
<th>(Rob.Se)</th>
<th>p &gt;</th>
<th>z</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Percentage Female)</td>
<td>6.314</td>
<td>8.128</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Racial Diversity)</td>
<td>18.032</td>
<td>13.306</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-27.939</td>
<td>23.708</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-14.177</td>
<td>13.439</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Attainment)</td>
<td>2.870</td>
<td>1.082</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>.097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Size</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (Police per 1000)</td>
<td>4.736</td>
<td>4.262</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>-5.97</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget (per 1000)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Racial Diversity)</td>
<td>-1.074</td>
<td>13.007</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>3.678</td>
<td>.991</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>.942</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (Median)</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.408</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Inequality</td>
<td>.777</td>
<td>19.090</td>
<td>.968</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Societals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Percent living in)</td>
<td>19.508</td>
<td>2.775</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty (below poverty line)</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.865</td>
<td>.391</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singles (in percentages)</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>1.668</td>
<td>.993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters (in percentages)</td>
<td>.330</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (associate degree percent)</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.338</td>
<td>.656</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Index (ind.div./socie.div.)</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>1.026</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing Officers(percent)</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.0269</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-23.357</td>
<td>19.478</td>
<td>.231</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Square</td>
<td>.5834</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>40.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: A Merged Data including “LEMAS 2000”, “UCR 2000”, and “CENSUS 2000.” Multivariate ordinary least squares regression, unstandardized regression coefficients reported, robust standard errors in parentheses. Probabilities based on two-tailed test. Problems with multicollinearity and heteroskedasticity were corrected.
## TABLE 4- MULTIVARIATE REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF COMMUNITY POLICING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coef</th>
<th>(Rob.Se)</th>
<th>p &gt;</th>
<th>z</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Percentage Female)</td>
<td>4.903</td>
<td>1.725</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Racial Diversity)</td>
<td>-1.635</td>
<td>1.798</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>.979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-.755</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Attainment)</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>.212</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Size</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (Police per 1000)</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget (per 1000)</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Racial Diversity)</td>
<td>9.077</td>
<td>1.319</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>.922</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>.740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (Median)</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Inequality</td>
<td>4.779</td>
<td>3.971</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Societals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Percent living in)</td>
<td>4.728</td>
<td>.518</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty (below poverty line)</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singles (in percentages)</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters (in percentages)</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (associate degree percent)</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Index (ind.div./socie.div.)</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>.0431</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing Officers(percent)</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget*Society Racial Diversity</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.424</td>
<td>2.078</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted R-Square</td>
<td>.3226</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: A Merged Data including “LEMAS 2000”, “UCR 2000”, and “CENSUS 2000.” Multivariate ordinary least squares regression, unstandardized regression coefficients reported, robust standard errors in parentheses. Probabilities based on two-tailed test. Problems with multicollinearity and heteroskedasticity were corrected.
### TABLE 5- DIRECT AND INDIRECT EFFECTS ON COMMUNITY POLICING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Direct</th>
<th>Indirect</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Percentage Female)</td>
<td>4.903</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>5.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Racial Diversity)</td>
<td>-1.635</td>
<td>.921</td>
<td>-.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>-1.122</td>
<td>-1.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-.755</td>
<td>-.722</td>
<td>-1.477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (Attainment)</td>
<td>1.281</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>1.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>8.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Size</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size (Police per 1000)</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>-.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Budget</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>2.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget (per 1000)</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Societal Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (Racial Diversity)</td>
<td>9.077</td>
<td>-.229</td>
<td>8.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (Median)</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Inequality</td>
<td>4.779</td>
<td>-.400</td>
<td>4.378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>-2.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Societals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban (Percent living in)</td>
<td>4.728</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>5.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty (below poverty line)</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singles (in percentages)</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>-.085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters (in percentages)</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (associate degree percent)</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Index (ind.div./socie.div.)</td>
<td>.795</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing Officers(percent)</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interaction Variable</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget*Society Racial Diversity</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: A Merged Data including “LEMAS 2000”, “UCR 2000”, and “CENSUS 2000.” Path analysis was used. Unstandardized regression coefficients were used for direct and indirect effects since STATA did not provide standardized coefficients with robust standard errors, which were used to correct for heteroskedasticity.
Formula for the robust standard errors is in the appendices. F-value of 35.25 tells us that our model is significant at $p < .000$ and model explains approximately 32% of the variation in level of community policing activities.

At the individual level, ‘gender’ came out as a positive and significant factor for the implementation of community policing activities even though it had no effect on violent or property crime rates. Findings suggest that controlling for violent and property crime rates, as the number of female officers increases, so does the level of community policing strategies. This finding supports our first hypothesis which states that “police agencies with more female officers employ more community policing activities” and this is also parallel to the arguments in the literature that community policing ideally calls for officers who have feminine traits (Sims, Scarborough, & Ahmad, 2003). Findings suggest that as the number of female officers increases, so does the level of community policing strategies.

The ‘racial diversity’ variable that is created to measure the level of racial composition of police departments has no significant effect on the dependent variable (level of community policing activities) controlling for both violent and property crime rates. Race dummy variables that are created to determine whether special racial groups respond differently have also no significant effect on the dependent variable. Since this result was contradictory, to the arguments in the literature, another variable with the name ‘diversity index’ was created to measure to what extent police departments racially reflect the jurisdictions they serve. ‘Diversity index’ was created by dividing the racial diversity scores of police departments to the racial diversity scores of communities. As
seen in Table 4, the ‘diversity index’ has a significant and positive effect on the level of community policing activities controlling for violent and property crime rates. The more police agencies reflect the racial heterogeneity of the neighborhoods and harmonize their forces with the communities they serve, the more there is community policing implementation.

The ‘education’ variable had a significant and positive effect on property crime rates variables and level of community policing activities. Police departments that are hiring more educated new officer recruits have higher property crime rates and are implementing community policing more than the police agencies with lower educational requirements in recruitment process. This finding can partially be explained by the desire of more educated officers for more discretion, their openness to change and receptivity to new strategies that will give them more authority.

Finally, contrary to this model’s fourth individual level hypothesis ‘income’ had no significant effect on the level of community policing activities.

At the organizational level, parallel to our hypothesis which states that “police departments which are larger in size have higher crime rates and thus employ more community policing activities”, the findings show that the size of police departments in numbers of police officers serving the community has a significant effect on the level of community policing activities. However, the direction of the relationship changes from positive to negative when ‘size of police per 1,000 population’ variable is used. It is found that smaller departments, when police size is set at per 1,000 population,
implement more community policing than the larger agencies controlling for violent and property crime rates.

Similar to the findings about the size, our hypothesis claiming that police agencies, controlling for violent and property crimes, that have bigger budgets implement more community policing activities is supported for the ‘total budget’ variable. However, even though the departments with bigger budgets use community policing strategies more than the agencies with smaller budgets, it may simply reflect that they have resources to do it and doesn’t necessarily mean that the quality of their community policing services or the population it covered are any bigger or better than the agencies with smaller budgets.

As a matter of fact, a fairly large amount of the literature focuses on the effect of social conditions on crime rates. Therefore, the model’s third group of hypotheses mainly examines the relationship between societal factors and crime rates. Some researchers argue that residential stability together with the poverty and the level of informal control and the social and organizational features of neighborhoods are strong indicators to explain crime rates (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997; Martin, 2002). Other determinants of crime rates may be listed as city-level structural factors such as population density, percentage of young people, household and population composition, and income inequality (MacDonald, 2002).

At the societal level, the results suggest that controlling for both violent and property crime rates the more a community is racially heterogeneous, the more community policing is implemented. Race dummy variables that are created to determine
whether special racial groups respond differently have, on the other hand, no significant
effect on the dependent variable. The finding with the racial diversity supports the
arguments in the literature which state that most community policing projects targets
racially heterogeneous areas (Fielding, 1995, p. 127) although its implementation does
not necessarily guarantee its success in these areas. This is a very key finding in this
study because, it shows that unlike the assumptions of contingency theory, organizations
may not necessarily act to replicate themselves according to their environment.

The ‘unemployment rate’, ‘median income’, and ‘income inequality’ variables, on
the other hand, were not significant factors for both crime rates and the level of
community policing activities.

Among other societal variables, the results show that community policing is
implemented more in urban jurisdictions which have higher violent and property crimes
and in communities with more renters that have higher violent crime rates. Finally,
paralleling the literature, the study found that both property and violent crime rates have a
positive and significant impact on the level of community policing activities. Police
departments which have higher violent and property crime rates use community policing
strategies more than the ones with lower crime rates since crime control is the first
priority of police departments.

The results also support the hypothesis that the more an agency assigns
community policing officers, the more community policing activities they will have
controlling for violent and property crime rates. Interaction variables were also created
between ‘gender’ and ‘education’; ‘education’ and ‘income’; ‘budget’ and ‘racial
diversity of people’; ‘urban’ and ‘race’; and ‘budget’ and ‘community policing officers’.

The interaction between ‘budget’ and ‘racial diversity of people’ was found to be significant. The departments with bigger budgets which serve racially more heterogeneous communities implement more community policing activities. Overall, the results suggest that in their community policing activities police agencies target the most problematic neighborhoods where they probably have the least chance to be successful.

In other words, institutional authority and discretion overcomes the necessities of environmental conditions.
CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

In the previous chapter I examined the impact of individual, organizational, and societal level factors on the level of community policing activities of the police agencies. This chapter includes a discussion of the findings, its implications for policies related to community policing practices, and suggestions for future research in terms of the contingencies of community policing.

Community policing was long argued by scholars as the promised policing model. Against all its promises, though, there are substantial hurdles hindering its achievement. In spite of the current demand for community policing, there are several issues that need to be answered. “Despite a wealth of ringing endorsement, community policing leaves unanswered many basic questions about its structure and impact” (Rosenbaum & Lurigio, 1994, p.299). One such question asks about whether community policing, even its successful implementation, decreases crime and enhances the quality of life (Cox, 1996). For many “community policing represents a slogan without action, style without substance, and rhetoric without reality” (Maguire & Katz, 2002, p.504). Some others argue that it is too early to assess community policing. They argue that community policing is still in the prior phase of progress and most police organizations apply it on a trial-and-error base (Williams, 2003). Research on community policing lacks sufficient theoretical framework and consistent results (Yates & Pillai, 1996).
However, according to the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) Office, almost 86% of United States’ community is served under the rubrics of community policing in varying degrees (Hickman & Reaves, 2001). However, this number might be misleading considering the fact that most departments have assigned only a relatively small portion of its officers to community policing activities while keeping the majority in traditional patrol duties (Pelfrey, 2004). This study examined the factors as to why community policing gained popularity against all the critics and doubts about its success. These factors were listed under individual, organizational, and societal categories. These three main factors were also used to determine the variance among police departments in the degree of their community policing activities. Overall, the findings of analyses suggest that internal contingencies (both individual and structural) play a relatively more significant role than external contingencies (societal and environmental) in police departments’ decisions to implement community policing or any other policing strategies.

**Individual Level**

The findings showed that the success of any organizational change depends basically on the individual determinants. Masculinity was found to be a substantial obstacle to the implementation of community policing. However, in today’s world where women have continuously increased their share in the labor market and police forces of more and more female officers there is a need for an alternative style to the value of masculinity in order to turn police departments into more democratic work places that respect their members and the expectations of their communities (Miller, 1999). Similar
arguments can be made for the role race plays in police departments. This study’s results suggest that a racially diverse police force that mirrors the racial composition of its jurisdiction is essential for the success of community-based strategies. The strategies’ success also depends on the officer’s awareness of his/her local community (Moore, 1992). Aside from the impact of race and gender that approximate police officers to their communities especially in disadvantaged neighborhoods, hiring officials who are more likely to live in the local community and thus be aware of the needs and interests of that particular community is another alternative (Glenn et al., 2003; Ostrom and Whitaker, 1973).

Specifically designed training programs may also be helpful for new officers in understanding the community’s needs and demands. Considering their skills and demands, COP officers or any other type of police experts may be selected during their academy training. “Police-training is an important tool in the process of facilitating change within police organizations” (Birzer, 2003, p.29). In order to lessen the effect of the work atmosphere and policing subculture in which officers develop unique police personality, this study recommends a long-term training strategy which will continue throughout policing career via in-field and in-service training. Actually, in today’s world there is a continuous demand to raise qualifications and skills in police officers’ training (Feltes, 2003). There is a need to modify academic curricula. However, since there is usually a discrepancy between the purpose and training in most cases, police departments that are determined to implement a new type of policing fails to change both the curriculum and the method training is conducted (Birzer, 2003). Last but not least, the
move toward a new style of policing will not be successful unless it is accepted by employees (Lumb & Breazeale, 2003).

**Organizational Level**

This study produced significant results for the impact of organizational factors on adopting community policing. The results show that both human and the monetary resources play key roles in police agencies’ decisions with implementing any type of policing activities. In an era where everyday a new policing concept such as intelligence-led (Maguire, 2001); evidence-based (Sherman, 1998); risk-based (Gundhus, 2005); homeland security: the fourth era of policing (Oliver, 2004); war on terror (De Guzman, 2002) and so on is offered, “one thing police departments should do is to make clear their expectations before attempting to authorize employees to start programs within their communities” (Hafner, 2003, p.9). As a matter of fact, adopting a homogeneous approach may not work well for each segment of a community. Identifying the characteristics of neighborhoods and the challenges with cooperating with the public would allow police to understand which policing style would align with what kind of communities (Huebner, Schafer, and Bynum, 2004).

What actually happens in practice is that most police departments blend less visible paramilitaristic policies into the highly publicized community policing reforms (Kraska, 2001; Magers, 2004). The data used in this study shows that, even though most police departments implement community policing activities in varying degrees, 72.7% of those departments still dispatch service calls and 50.4% of them have SWAT teams. While promising to work under the tenets of community policing, police agencies turn
into more professionalized organizations by establishing new structures such as forensic divisions, SWAT teams, cybercrime units and so on in order to keep up with the changes in social life and advancements in technology. “This division of labor among departments and the need for unified effort lead to a state of differentiation and integration within any organization” (Lawrence and Lorsch, 1969, p.8). Even the scholars are confused whether or not paramilitaristic structures should be replaced with the community policing model (see Sewell (1999) for the debate between Rasor and Greenberg).

In this dissertation I argue that policing in the future should be able to combine different policing styles in order to respond to the diverse expectations of the public and the balance among these different styles should depend on the unique circumstances of the districts and neighborhoods being policed (Innes, 2004 & 2005). Inconsistencies across different styles are inevitable and should always be taken into great consideration. However, trying to formulate just a singular, standard model of policing without considering the neighborhood circumstances and contingencies will not be appropriate and effective (Butler, Jennings, & Summers, 2002; Wells, Falcone, & Rabe-Hemp; 2003; Nolan, Conti, & McDevitt, 2004).

The present crime problem also requires the coexistence of multiple police tactics and police agencies that choose soft policing still need professional and specialized units (Thomas, 1994). Because “the failure to attend to soft problems will only exacerbate serious crime; and that an indirect attack on crime through order maintenance may be a more effective, efficient, and just means of policing in urban areas” (Rosenbaum, 1998 edited in Brodeur, p.10). “Both approaches--swift police response to incidents and
disorder and problem-oriented policing--are critical to serving communities in a balanced manner” (Walters, 1993, p.20).

Adopting a flexible model may also be less costly. The strategic changes in policing following the 9/11 terrorist incidents has once again showed that investing in a certain policing model might be a burden on governments when the former model can’t keep up with the changing conditions and once it needs to be replaced. What will happen to all those investments in community policing, for instance, with the establishment of Homeland Security? Is community policing Homeland Security capable or vice versa?

**Societal Level**

Even though the results suggest that, unlike our assumptions, police departments target problematic areas and disadvantaged neighborhoods in their community policing activities, the success of community policing is still questionable especially in these communities primarily due to the lack of evidence. This research study did not have much to offer in this regard because I am of the opinion that this is not a sole police function since “many of the problems that function as signals to people in their neighborhoods does not lie with the police” (Innes, 2005, p.165). McCarthy (1990, p.36) notes that “just because you drive a drug dealer off the street corner, do you think he's going to get a job at IBM?” To this end, Goldstein (1987, p.18) asks “what should be the outer limits of police function under the community policing concept?”

Part of the literature argues that any community policing effort that is not supported by the city agencies and the informal agencies that societies rely on in
maintaining order such as families, churches, employers, peers, neighbors, and so on can not produce effective solutions to community problems (Rosenbaum and Lurigio, 1994; Bayley and Shearing, 1996). Hence Jesilow and Parsons (2000) perceive community policing as a tool that can assist replacing the current justice system with the peacemaking criminology. Some scholars also offer different community building models. Fre (1994), in his ‘good society’ model, offers the involvement of two different focus groups to fight against crime. In his description the first group institutions (family, business, police, educators, etc.) discuss their own purposes and roles. While the second group gathers together the members of these institutions to define an overall strategy. Similarly, Hawkins (2004), in his social development model, defines several risks and protective factors for communities and underscores the significance of a comprehensive plan that includes all the accountable actors and institutions for the success of community-centered activities.

It is not argued here whether community policing or any other policing style should be implemented by police agencies or not. However, this study finds that, in order to serve their communities better, police departments should consider their internal and external contingencies before implementing a policing style.

**Limitations of the Findings and Future Research Suggestions**

As noted by Heisenberg (1962, p.201) “The existing scientific concepts cover always only a very limited part of reality, and the other part that has not yet been
understood is infinite.” As in all research findings, this study has several limitations which lead to numerous possibilities for future research.

First of all, current study can not shed light on the developments in policing following 9/11 terrorist attacks which seem to be critical for the future of community policing. Actually “The massive influence of the 11 September terrorist incidents is exerting a profound influence on police organizations” (Maguire, et.al, 2003, p.272). In order to reflect changes in community policing following 2001, further research should benefit more recent data.

Second, the current data (LEMAS 2000) unfortunately do not allow us to create a good measure of a hybrid policing style that will be able to test whether or not police agencies are indeed using mixed policing styles. There is an explicit need for data that will be able to show to what extent other policing styles such as traditional policing are used by police departments.

Finally, since the unit of analysis is police departments due to data restrictions, analyses at the neighborhood level can not be conducted. This is problematic because, Scott (2002, p.149) states that “the interactions between police and residents within cities vary substantially across neighborhoods.” Future research may yield better results when neighborhood-level data are used.
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## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: Table 1-Descriptive Statistics for the Community Policing Index

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Policing Plan</td>
<td>2531</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP Training-New Officers</td>
<td>2528</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP Training-In-Service Personnel</td>
<td>2528</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP Training-Civilian Personnel</td>
<td>2526</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Encouraged Problem-Solving Projects</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Assigned Detectives Based on Geography</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Conducted Citizen Academy</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Formed Problem-Solving Groups</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Assigned Specific Areas or Beats</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Included Problem-Solving in Evaluation Criteria</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for the Community Policing Index (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY MET W/ RELIGIOUS GROUPS</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY MET W/ SCHOOL GROUPS</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY MET W/ SENIOR CITIZEN GROUPS</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY MET W/ TENANTS ASSOCIATIONS</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY MET W/ YOUTH SERVICE ORGANIZATIONS</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY SURVEYED PUBLIC SATISFACTION</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY SURVEYED PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY SURVEYED PERSONAL CRIME EXPERIENCES</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY SURVEYED REPORTING OF CRIMES</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENCY SURVEYED OTHER</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USED INFO FOR ALLOCATING RESOURCES</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USED INFO FOR EVALUATING EFFECTIVENESS</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USED INFO FOR FORMULATING PROCEDURES</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USED INFO FOR PRIORITIZING PROBLEMS</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USED INFO PROVIDING INFORMATION</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USED INFO FOR REDISTRICTING AREAS</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USED INFO FOR TRAINING DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USED INFO FOR OTHER</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>2523</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Formulas

1) Calculating Racial Diversity for Police Personnel

\[ 1 - \left( \frac{1}{P(P-1)} \sum X_i (X_i - 1) \right), \quad \text{where} \quad P = \text{the total number of population}, \quad X_1 = \# \text{ White, not of Hispanic origin}, \quad X_2 = \# \text{ Black or African American, not of Hispanic origin}, \quad X_3 = \# \text{ Hispanic or Latino}, \quad X_4 = \# \text{ American Indian or Alaska Native}, \quad X_5 = \# \text{ Asian}, \quad X_6 = \# \text{ Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander}, \quad X_7 = \# \text{ some other race}. \]

2) Calculating Racial Diversity for Community

\[ 1 - \left( \frac{1}{P(P-1)} \sum X_i (X_i - 1) \right), \quad \text{where} \quad P = \text{the total number of population}, \quad X_1 = \# \text{ White}, \quad X_2 = \# \text{ African American}, \quad X_3 = \# \text{ Native American}, \quad X_4 = \# \text{ Asian}, \quad X_5 = \# \text{ Pacific}, \quad X_6 = \# \text{ other}. \]

3) The Formula for Heteroskedasticity-Robust OLS Standard Errors

\[ \hat{\sigma}_H^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( X_i \hat{\mu}_i - \overline{X_\hat{\mu}_i} \right)^2 \]

where \( \hat{\mu}_i \) is the \( i \)th OLS residual and \( \overline{X_\hat{\mu}_i} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \hat{\mu}_i \) (note that \( \overline{\overline{X_\hat{\mu}_i}} = 0 \) as a consequence of the definition of the OLS estimator).

Source: http://ksghome.harvard.edu/~JStock/tb/q&a_2.htm