

TENSION ON THE THIN BLUE LINE: Police Officer Resistance to Community- Oriented Policing

TODD J. DICKER†
Western Michigan University

ABSTRACT: *While over 60% of police agencies in the United States are either implementing or planning for community policing (Annan, 1995), actual implementation of community policing practices is disjointed and has produced more problems than solutions. One such problem is the resistance among officers to the philosophy itself. In a study of the orientations of non-community policing officers in the largest public safety department in the US, it is determined that elements of the organizational culture of the police agency are not significant predictors of support for the community policing philosophy. Rather, individual orientations toward citizen involvement in crime prevention and job involvement are predictors of officer support. Implications for police managers are discussed.*

INTRODUCTION

Many law enforcement agencies across the US have implemented or are currently implementing community-oriented policing (COP), the most significant paradigm to emerge in law enforcement since the team policing concept of the early 1970s. According to the Police Foundation's National Survey of Community Policing Practices funded by a National Institute of Justice grant, 61% of local law enforcement agencies in the US are either in the process of planning for or actually implementing a COP program, and an additional 17% are seriously considering such a program (Annan, 1995). This is an extraordinary rate of implementation for a philosophy that is so very young (Angell, 1971, cf. Wilson & Kelling, 1982, 1989) and unproven (Clairmont, 1991; Zhao & Thurman, 1997). The rise in prominence of COP programs has frequently been attributed to the effectiveness of these programs at reducing fear of crime in a community, the improvement and expansion of the typical services provided by police agencies, and the emphasis on police officers' accountability to both the public and the police department for which they work (Bayley, 1988; Goldstein, 1987, 1990; Pepin-

† Direct all correspondence to: Todd J. Dicker, School of Public Affairs and Administration, Western Michigan University, Walwood Hall, Kalamazoo, MI 49008. E-mail: todd.dicker@wmich.edu

sky, 1989; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990; Trojanowicz & Carter, 1988; Wilson & Kelling, 1982, 1989; Wycoff, 1988).

With so many law enforcement agencies using or considering the COP philosophy, there is a desperate need for a better understanding of the major obstacles to successful implementation — among the most significant of them being officer resistance to the philosophy. It is not at all uncommon for officers to have a negative orientation toward the COP philosophy. For example:

Community policing is total bullshit and a waste. . . We got a memo. It said that community police officers are supposed to respond to calls, generally, and engage in community policing in their zones. But they do not respond to calls. They only stay in their zones to do community policing (Dicker, 1998).

Individual officer objections to the COP philosophy are one thing. When combined with organizational resistance, however, they present an extraordinary challenge to the 78% of police chiefs who believe that COP should eventually be implemented on a department-wide basis (Annan, 1995). Such organizational resistance should not be taken at all lightly.

Police and sheriff's departments are some of the most intractable and inflexible of public bureaucracies, capable of resisting and ultimately thwarting efforts to implement change (Guyot, 1979). This resistance is traditionally attributed to the rigid, paramilitary, and bureaucratic organizational design of most police agencies and is credited with the death of team policing (Sherman, Milton & Kelly, 1973). The organizational dynamics of police agencies that are implementing the COP philosophy — such as organizational culture, resistance to organizational change, formal and informal lines of communication, peer and reference group comparisons, and bureaucratic reorganization — are woefully understudied in the literature (Greene, 1994). A vast majority of literature on COP consists of anecdotal, qualitative evaluations and case-study research or studies of the impact of COP on orientations, rather than the reverse (cf. Rosenbaum, Yeh, & Wilkinson, 1994; Wilson & Bennett, 1994). Very few nationally generalizable analyses have been performed, and none have adequately addressed the theoretical issues behind officer resistance to COP implementation at the individual level. If this resistance cannot be overcome by those seeking to change fundamental policing philosophy, it presents an ominous threat to the successful implementation of COP, which once labeled a "failed experiment," will likely go the way of team policing.

The research goals of this study are to identify the major components of police officer resistance to the COP philosophy and develop an

effective methodology for developing an informed plan for the training and education of officers that addresses these sources of resistance. Here, data are examined from a major implementation of the COP philosophy in the largest public safety department in the US. The study consists of a quantitative analysis of survey data administered to non-COP officers in the department's 15-year-old program.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The natural result of widespread implementation of COP in so many communities with very different characteristics is that the definition of COP has become substantially muddled in the literature. In many cases, COP is merely a buzzword that a police department uses to enhance its image as being responsive and community conscious (Ross, 1995; Trojanowicz, 1990). COP in these cases often amounts to little more than alternative patrol strategies (e.g., officers on horses, on bicycles, and on foot patrol). In other cases, COP is something done in order to qualify for extensive federal assistance under the Crime Bill of 1994. In such instances, COP is frequently little more than an exercise in police administrators' creativity to identify existing programs that have the appearance of innovative or community-based practices so that federal agencies might allocate grant funds to them, such as, "We have a DARE program and a Community Relations Officer, so we must be doing community policing" (Ross, 1995; Zhao & Thurman, 1997). Therefore, it is important to identify what COP is — and more important, what it is not — to effectively ignore those agencies that have implemented "community policing lite" rather than a more substantial version.

Defining COP

Since the term "community policing" refers to a wide array of formal and informal approaches to policing, criteria must be established that allow researchers to sift through the unlimited styles and approaches to separate the wheat from the chaff. A starting point for such criteria would be to require that true COP requires a combination of a focus on changing the relationship between the police and the community and changes to organizational strategies and tactics.

The Relationship Between the Community and the Police

The first element recognizes that law enforcement agencies should no longer view crime as a "police problem," but instead that police

should engage in a cooperative effort with community residents, business owners, and other members of the community while viewing crime as a "community problem" (Bayley, 1988; Brown, 1991, 1992; Goldstein, 1987, 1976; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990; Trojanowicz & Carter, 1988; Wilson & Kelling, 1982, 1989; Wycoff, 1988). This focus is ubiquitous in the law enforcement community, evidenced by a proliferation of neighborhood police officers, town meetings, increased contacts, and other efforts to involve citizens and reduce fear of crime in neighborhoods (Brown, 1992; Wilson & Kelling, 1982, 1989).

Organizational Strategies and Tactics

"Organizational strategies" refers to specific changes in the organizational structure, process, and culture that facilitate the implementation of specific program components. These changes include changing the traditional paramilitary, bureaucratic organizational structure to allow for bottom-up decision making rather than the top-down variety (Angell, 1971; Brown & Morgenthau, 1993; Goldstein, 1987; Ross, 1995; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). Initiating a COP program also involves eliminating any reactive policing style and adopting a problem-solving orientation, which requires greater line-officer autonomy in identifying, defining, and developing solutions to problems (Goldstein, 1990; Trojanowicz, 1990). The COP officer must be free to address community problems as they arise, which implies a freedom to change work schedules and maintain shift flexibility (McElroy, Cosgrove, & Sadd, 1993). Patrol techniques, including innovative modes of transportation such as horseback or bicycle or reintroducing foot patrol are also a common organizational strategy (Bayley, 1988; Trojanowicz & Carter, 1988; Wycoff, 1988). Finally, the use, dissemination and analysis of information are a critical element of the organizational strategies employed by law enforcement agencies (Burgreen & McPherson, 1992). These organizational strategies are sometimes evident in COP programs, but all too frequently they are not.

This definition has the dual characteristics of being broad enough to be able to apply to a variety of programs in very different community and organizational settings as well as eliminating those programs that are essentially public relations efforts (Ross, 1995; cf. Brown & Morgenthau, 1993). Any empirical evaluation of COP ought to carefully consider whether or not the agency being examined has, in fact, implemented the COP philosophy or whether it has simply implemented a new public relations program. This determination will help to avoid coming to an erroneous conclusion about whether the COP philosophy works by basing the evaluation only on programs that actually *are* COP.

COP Officers and Their Orientations Toward the Philosophy

Most previous studies of COP assumed general support among police officers for the philosophy (Yates & Pillai, 1996). More recently, studies have examined the impact of COP programs on officer attitudes and orientations. For example, Lurigio and Skogan (1994) found that Chicago police officers were dubious of the efficacy of COP and ambivalent about its effects, and they lacked support for many of the program components such as foot patrol. Rosenbaum et al. (1994) found that COP had a neutral effect on officer attitudes and orientations toward both the job, but some positive effects on officer attitudes toward the community and the COP philosophy. Wilson and Bennett (1994) had greater success in finding COP influences on police attitudes toward the job, but found no correlation between COP on officers' views on the effectiveness of the philosophy. Several other studies report similar results (Greene & Decker, 1989; Hayeslip & Cordner, 1987; Lurigio & Skogan, 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1992). Aside from studies of the impact of COP programs on police officers who work in the program, no empirical research has yet been conducted on non-COP officers' attitudes toward COP, an area that is critical if the philosophy is to be expanded beyond its current implementation.

Non-COP Officers and Their Orientations Toward the Philosophy

Officers who are not now in a COP assignment comprise the pool of officers from which new or expanding COP programs will need to draw their personnel. They are also part of the organizational culture of the agency in which COP is conducted. If efforts to implement new COP practices do not extend their reach beyond the basic assumption that simply teaching officers about COP will eventually engender their support — something the literature clearly does not support — police managers and agencies will operate in the absence of training and implementation tools directed at reducing non-COP officer support.

As defined, the philosophy of COP requires significant changes in the role of the police officer. These changes encompass work methods, reporting relationships, work schedules, and organizational policies and as such can be expected to encounter significant resistance by a portion of those officers (Carter, 1995; Ivancevich & Matteson, 1990; Lurigio & Skogan, 1994; McElroy, Cosgrove, & Sadd, 1993; Sadd & Grinc, 1994; Wycoff & Skogan, 1992). In addition to the difficulty of mobilizing the community and planning for the implementation of an extensive COP approach, COP must contain as an integral part of the plan the effort to

win the hearts and minds of the officers charged with policing the community (Lurigio & Skogan, 1994; Sadd & Grinc, 1994).

Organizational Change and Resistance

Such a plan must be developed with a consciousness of the forces that promote and inhibit change in an organization. This consciousness should include an understanding that individuals require a certain amount of stability and predictability in their lives and that major changes such as the implementation of a new policing philosophy in a department may threaten this basic need and increase the level of stress experienced by the officers (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1990; Kotter & Schlesinger, 1979). Understanding the stress induced by dramatic organizational change and why officers resist that change has tremendously important consequences. In the street-level environment of a police officer — characterized by limited resources to accomplish the organizational mission, physical and psychological threats, and conflicting role expectations — adaptations to organizationally imposed change can result in a variety of undesirable consequences. Officers may resort to rationing their services to the public, resulting in inadequate application of resources to resolve problems, unequal enforcement of the law, and inflexibility in responding to different challenges (Carter, 1995; Lipsky, 1980).

Adaptation to organizational change can also result in the amplification of bias in both the officers' orientation toward the public and their treatment of them by encouraging stereotyping and moral judgments (Guyot, 1991; Lipsky, 1980; Maynard-Moody, Musheno, & Palumbo, 1990; Sacks, 1978; Van Maanen, 1974, 1978; Wadman, & Ziman, 1993). Therefore, the degree to which an officer supports dramatic philosophical change within a police agency is likely to be closely related to the degree of involvement the officer has in that agency or the degree to which the officer perceives that his or her own personal cultural value system agrees with the organizational culture of the agency (Carter, 1995). Some studies have suggested that COP might be used as a tool to enhance job satisfaction and performance among police officers and in fact change the organizational values (Greene, 1994; Rosenbaum et al., 1994). Until these organizational values are changed, the individual officer who might otherwise support the COP philosophy may feel dissonance with the organization, that is, if COP is rejected by most officers in the agency or viewed as a deviant assignment that makes one different, there may be a strong impetus to reject the philosophy as aberrant as well.

The Political Environment of the Agency and Resistance

A plan to win the hearts and minds of police officers to COP must also address the environmental forces driving this change in policing philosophy. External forces driving change include the marketplace and social and political changes (Carter, 1995; Ivancevich & Matteson, 1990). The current trend in federalism toward decentralization and shifting the locus of policy control from the federal to state and local governments has resulted in a strong community-based programming movement (Zhao & Thurman, 1997). The drive for more efficient and responsive government has led to changes in the tastes of the citizenry away from professional policing and toward more responsive models. The marketplace now demands flexibility and interaction at higher levels than would be tolerated under the professional model of policing, creating a strong motivation for police departments to offer COP programs as an enhanced product for public consumption. With this substantial shift from the professional to the COP models comes the requirement that police officers have a certain level of confidence in the ability of the community to accept its increased role in crime prevention (Grinc, 1994). Some remain dubious about the likelihood of police acceptance of that increased role of the citizen. Officers have been known to have an extremely negative orientation toward citizen involvement in the crime prevention function:

Community policing won't work. I don't like it. [It assumes] the people in the neighborhoods are willing to cooperate and participate. That's wrong. They're not intelligent, they're stupid. They don't like us. They band together to fight with themselves and to fight with us. . . I don't know why they hire [community police officers], they are never over there. I see them all the time having lunch over on the east side, doesn't do a damn bit of good. You know what you gotta do is do something about the juvenile problem. Trying to get the community involved won't work. People don't want to get involved. (Dicker, 1998)

Several empirical studies in the literature identify the sources of police attitudes toward citizens. Some researchers suggest that a primary factor in the development of officer attitudes toward citizens is convenience or the need to classify citizens quickly into categories (Lipsky, 1980; Sacks, 1978). The officer, faced with the task of making quick judgments in order to sort problem individuals from the benign as accurately as possible, has developed a sixth sense that is more concretely based upon the incongruity of the individual with his surroundings or

some other identifying factor (Sacks, 1978). Further complicating the matter is the fact that police officers frequently come in contact with the most undesirable elements of society and with otherwise upstanding citizens in extremely undesirable circumstances (Wilson, 1983).

Such constant interaction with the consequences of human behavior and individuals with penchants for conflict and disorder all have their effects on the accuracy of police orientations toward citizens. Van Maanen (1978) provides a particularly descriptive analysis of police categorization of citizens based upon the officer's perception of the citizen as being either a suspicious person, an asshole, or a know-nothing. The category into which an individual citizen or group falls affects the officer's subsequent behavior in any police-citizen encounter (Van Maanen, 1978). Others have also suggested that there is a nexus between officer orientations toward citizens and officer behavior (Lipsky, 1980; Sacks, 1978; Wilson, 1983). Recent additions to this area of research include detailed examinations of the effect of citizen demeanor and behavior on officers' decision to arrest (Worden & Shepard, 1996). These linkages raise the important issue of how likely an officer who perceives citizens in an undesirable light is to embrace a philosophy that encourages greater interaction with them.

HYPOTHESES

The first step in understanding these complex issues is to empirically examine the attitudes and orientations of law enforcement officers with regard to the COP philosophy and to identify the determinants of support for the philosophy. Such an analysis is likely to yield valuable information and strategies that can be used to overcome negative orientations and the resistance to the philosophy that such orientations might create. It is hypothesized in this study that the determinants of an officer's orientation toward the COP — support or resistance — is derived from three major sources: (1) the degree to which the officer views the COP philosophy as an accepted part of the organizational culture of the agency, (2) the degree to which the officer views himself or herself as a part of that culture, and (3) the officer's orientation toward citizens and their involvement in the crime prevention function.

METHODOLOGY

These hypotheses will be tested by the administration of a survey to the officers of the Kalamazoo, Michigan Department of Public Safety (KDPS). KDPS is the largest public safety department in the US with a total of 254 sworn officers. A public safety department is different from a police department because public safety officers (PSOs) also respond

to fires as certified fire fighters. Traditionally, public safety is an organizational design suited to small communities that cannot afford full-time fire departments. Kalamazoo, however, has the distinction of bucking this trend by having consolidated police and fire departments in the early 1970s. Eleven of the personnel are full-time firefighters, and the remaining officers are PSOs with both certifications. The large size of KDPS, however, ensures that the overwhelming majority of a PSO's time is spent on law enforcement matters. Additionally, survey results with regard to job involvement and satisfaction, as well as extensive qualitative interviews, confirm that these PSOs view themselves as police officers, and their firefighting responsibilities are an additional component of their job, not a central one.

Background and Characteristics of the COP Program

Kalamazoo, with a 1997 population of approximately 83,000, is the anchor city of a metropolitan area in Southwest Michigan. The department has a long history of active experimentation with policing strategies and philosophies. In 1985, the department initiated its current COP program. This implementation has been strongly supported by the chief, who has devoted a great deal of time and effort to studying, implementing, and promoting the philosophy.

The KDPS community policing program is operated by the Crime Prevention Office, which consists of eight full-time neighborhood liaison officers (NLOs) supervised by a sergeant. The program takes advantage of a large federal HUD grant that created five large, full-time neighborhood organizations that are incorporated, well funded, and led by professional staff. These neighborhood organizations coordinate crime prevention activities with their assigned NLOs and provide an infrastructure for citizen participation that is unusually solid and well prepared for the task. The COP program engages in numerous community based activities in the furtherance of its goals. For example, in the last year NLOs attended 175 community meetings and presentations attended by approximately 9,900 people. NLOs gave support to 17 different neighborhood associations, organized one new neighborhood watch, and resurrected two more ailing programs. The COP program officers developed and funded a citizen police academy, served on five crime and neighborhood task forces, attended numerous community functions, and participated with other law enforcement agencies in planning their COP programs. They also delivered the community partnership message by making 17 public appearances in the media and at functions designed to raise community awareness of their opportunity and responsibility to get involved in crime prevention.

Despite extremely strong support from the KDPS chief and many of the city commission members, the anecdotal evidence suggests that the problem of resistance to the COP philosophy continues to be a challenge to the 12-year-old program. Non-COP officers have labeled the NLOs “no longer officers,” and a strong resentment has grown toward the NLOs emerging out of the perception that they have more flexible schedules and do not perform the same level or difficulty of work of “regular” PSOs. Some NLOs report that they have a great deal of difficulty gaining respect from their coworkers and acknowledgment for the successes that they generate for the department. Moreover, they are growing frustrated by their ostracism from the organizational culture of the Department.

Data Collection

A survey instrument was directed to all PSOs that were of the rank of lieutenant or below who were not assigned to the COP program, resulting in a target population of 224. The instrument was distributed to the PSOs’ mailboxes with a cover letter from one of their fellow officers requesting their cooperation. Of the 224 valid surveys that were distributed, 118 were returned for a 53% response rate, which was rather encouraging given the single-wave mailbox distribution. Respondents’ background characteristics were not statistically different from known departmental characteristics.

The survey contained 65 questions divided into sections that probe the officers’ orientations toward the department (e.g., organizational trust, pride, or prestige in working for the department); orientations toward fellow workers (e.g., supervisor trust); orientations toward the job (e.g., perceived level of control over the work environment, job involvement); orientations toward both the community-oriented policing philosophy; and orientations toward citizen involvement in crime prevention. All questions except for the sociodemographic background variables asked the respondents to indicate their level of agreement with a statement and were scored on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). To ensure honest responses, statements were worded in both positive and negative tones that required the respondent to alternate between agreeing and disagreeing with various statements on the same dimension and necessitated reverse-coding for many of the items during the analysis of the data.

Creation of Indexes

Individual questions were combined into indexes (see Table 1 for index construction) to form multiple indicators. Such an index was used as the measure that would serve as the dependent variable resist (overall resistance to the COP philosophy, $\alpha = .87$). For the measures that address the first part of the hypothesis — the organizational culture and the degree to which the officer views the COP philosophy as an accepted part of that culture — the measures ORGTRUST (level of organizational trust, $\alpha = .85$), DIFFER (the degree to which NLOs are viewed as being different from regular officers, $\alpha = .70$), PRIDE (the level of pride the officer feels in being a part of the department, $\alpha = .88$), JOBINVOL (the level of job involvement the officer has, $\alpha = .76$), and SUPTRUST (the level of supervisor trust, $\alpha = .93$) serve as independent variables. Finally, the measure of the officer's orientation toward citizens and their involvement in the crime prevention function is CITIZEN ($\alpha = .82$), another independent variable. The individual measure of CONTROL (the level of perceived control over the work environment) also is used. All indexes were tested utilizing confirmatory factor analysis and fine-tuned by using Chronbach's alpha (α) as a measure of index reliability. The dependent variables are examined against the independent variables using bivariate correlation analysis to determine which factors are associated with one another. Then, ordinary least squares linear regression is used to estimate the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Univariate Analysis

Table 2 provides frequency distributions for each of the dependent and independent variables in the analysis. Several trends of import emerge from the data:

The General Level of Support for the COP Philosophy

Most respondents expressed some support for COP. For example, 58% of respondents indicated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, "I support the community policing philosophy," and 56% disagreed with the statement, "Community policing doesn't work." However, many of the respondents also displayed suspicions that COP is sometimes put to other, less obvious purposes. For example, 32% agreed that COP is just a fad that will go away and 39% agreed that COP is just another way to get grant dollars. A total of 54% agreed that most new programs are really just public relations efforts.

TABLE 1
Construction of Indexes (Multiple Indicators)

RESIST: Resistance to the Community Policing Philosophy ($\alpha = .87$)

1. Community policing is a fad that will eventually go away.
2. Community policing won't improve police officers' image.
3. Community policing doesn't do much for the officers involved.
4. Community policing is just a way of getting federal dollars.
5. Most new programs are nothing more than public relations efforts.
6. Community policing officers are basically social workers with badges.
7. Community policing doesn't work.
8. I support the community policing philosophy.*

ORGTRUST: Level of Organizational Trust ($\alpha = .85$)

1. This department's and my values are similar.
2. This department would lie to you if it was in its best interest.*
3. In this department you know where you stand.
4. This is a department you can depend on to do it right.
5. This is a department that is "good on its word."

DIFFER: View that NLOs are Negatively Different from "Street Officers" ($\alpha = .70$)

1. Community policing officers aren't like street officers.*
2. Community policing officers don't work as hard as patrol officers.*

PRIDE: Level of Pride in Department ($\alpha = .88$).

1. This department is a good place to work.
2. I am proud to tell others I am part of this department.

JOBINVOL: Level of Job Involvement ($\alpha = .76$)

1. I am very much personally involved in my job.
2. Most of my interests are centered around my job.
3. I consider my job to be very central to my existence.
4. I like the law enforcement profession too well to give it up.
5. Law enforcement is the ideal profession for me.

SUPTRUST: Level of Trust in Supervisors ($\alpha = .93$)

1. My supervisor is technically competent.
2. My supervisor usually makes the right decisions.
3. My supervisor usually follows through on assignments.

CITIZEN: Support Citizen Involvement in the Crime Prevention Function ($\alpha = .82$)

1. Law enforcement is easier to do when good citizens get involved.
2. Patrol officers should participate in community programs and meetings.
3. I can be more effective if I simply respond to calls.*
4. For the most part, citizens create more problems than they solve.*
5. I can do just about everything I need to do on this job without citizens' help.*

***NOTE:** These items are reverse-coded.

TABLE 2
Frequency Distributions for Individual Items in Indexes

	Strongly				ITEM DESCRIPTION
	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Disagree	
6.7	25.7	16.2	42.9	8.6	RESIST: Resistance to the Community Policing Philosophy
1.0	15.2	21.0	46.7	16.2	Community policing is a fad that will eventually go away.
1.0	13.3	26.7	49.5	9.5	Community policing won't improve police officers' image.
11.4	27.6	25.7	33.3	1.9	Community policing doesn't do much for the officers involved.
11.4	42.9	20.0	25.7	0.0	Community policing is just a way of getting federal dollars.
4.8	17.1	22.9	50.5	4.8	Most new programs are nothing more than public relations efforts.
4.8	12.4	26.7	42.9	13.3	Community policing officers are basically social workers with badges.
12.4	45.7	29.5	9.5	2.9	Community policing doesn't work.
					I support the community policing philosophy.
					ORGTRUST: Level of Organizational Trust
3.8	25.5	27.4	28.3	15.1	This department's and my values are similar.
41.5	37.7	14.2	5.7	0.9	This department would lie to you if it was in its best interest.
0.0	9.5	34.3	39.0	17.1	In this department you know where you stand.
0.0	10.4	26.4	32.1	31.1	This is a department you can depend on to do it right.
0.0	4.7	29.2	40.6	25.5	This is a department that is "good on its word."
					DIFFER: View that NLOs are Negatively Different from "Street Officers"
10.5	40.0	15.2	29.5	4.8	Community policing officers aren't like street officers.
14.3	26.7	20.0	34.3	4.8	Community policing officers don't work as hard as patrol officers.

TABLE 2 (CON'T)

Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	ITEM DESCRIPTION
					PRIDE: Level of Pride in Department
17.0	57.5	10.4	8.5	6.6	This department is a good place to work.
13.2	40.6	24.5	11.3	10.4	I am proud to tell others I am part of this department.
					JOBINVOL: Level of Job Involvement
19.8	42.5	17.9	13.2	6.6	I am very much personally involved in my job.
1.9	13.2	24.5	43.4	17.0	Most of my interests are centered around my job.
3.8	16.0	15.1	40.6	24.5	I consider my job to be very central to my existence.
14.2	34.9	29.2	17.9	3.8	I like the law enforcement profession too well to give it up.
16.0	40.6	34.9	6.6	1.9	Law enforcement is the ideal profession for me.
					SUPTRUST: Level of Trust in Supervisors
12.3	50.0	19.8	10.4	7.5	My supervisor is technically competent.
9.4	58.5	17.0	12.3	2.8	My supervisor usually makes the right decisions.
11.3	56.6	17.9	12.3	1.9	My supervisor usually follows through on assignments.
					CITIZEN: Support Citizen Involvement in the Crime Prevention Function
27.6	49.5	15.2	7.6	0.0	Law enforcement is easier to do when good citizens get involved.
9.5	53.3	26.7	9.5	1.0	Patrol officers should participate in community programs and meetings.
1.0	17.1	17.1	51.4	13.3	I can be more effective if I simply respond to calls.
3.8	29.5	27.6	33.3	5.7	For the most part, citizens create more problems than they solve.
1.0	14.3	9.5	59.0	16.2	I can do just about everything I need to do without citizens' help.
					CONTROL Amount of Control Over the Work Environment
1.9	31.1	20.8	34.0	12.3	I am satisfied with the control I have over my work environment.

Organizational Trust

The overall level of organizational trust in this department is somewhat low. Strong evidence for this conclusion includes the finding that 79% of respondents agreed that commanders of the department would lie to them if it was in its best interest, and 66% did not think the department was “good on its word.” This mistrust may very well be the result of the history of the department over the past six years. While the level of trust is low, it is interesting to note that these responses are in direct conflict with the high level of responses on the PRIDE measure, to be discussed.

COP Officers Are Different from Regular Officers

There was strong agreement with the idea that COP officers are different and that they work less than regular police officers. Some 50% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that COP officers are not like street officers, while 41% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they do not work as hard as patrol officers.

Pride in the Department

Contrary to the organizational trust measure, 75% of respondents felt that KDPS was a good place to work, and 54% were proud to tell others that they were a part of this department. These results may be surprising considering the lack of organizational trust. One interpretation of this apparent conflict is that the level of pride that an officer has in working for this department is not associated with whether or not he or she trusts the department, which leads to interesting questions for further exploration.

Job Involvement

Similarly, most respondents reported high levels of job involvement, e.g., 72% agreed or strongly agreed with the statement, “I am very much personally involved in my job. Also, 56.6% of officers felt that law enforcement was the ideal profession for them.

Supervisor Trust

Supervisors in this department enjoy a high level of trust from their subordinates. A total of 62% of respondents rated their supervisors as technically competent, 68% rated them as usually making the right decisions, and 68% rated them as following through on assignments.

Control over the Work Environment

There appears to be some dissension on the issue of whether or not officers are satisfied with their level of control over the work environment. Respondents generally either felt they had too little control (46%) or were satisfied with the level of control (33%) over the work environment. Very few were neutral on this question.

Support for Citizen Involvement in Crime Prevention

Finally, there was consistent support for the premise that citizens ought to get involved in crime prevention. Perhaps surprisingly, 63% indicated that officers ought to participate in community meetings and events.

Bivariate Correlations

In the bivariate analysis, background variables were entered into a correlation matrix with the dependent variable to determine if any factors had an association with resistance to COP (see Table 3). Only one of the background variables, RANK (coded 1 for patrol officer and 2 for all higher ranks), was significantly correlated ($r = -.215, p = .028$). This is an indication that lower ranked officers have a greater level of resistance to the COP philosophy.

Further examination of the bivariate correlations in Table 3 indicates that for all of the variables associated with the organizational culture and the degree to which the officer feels a part of that culture, there is a significant negative correlation with resistance. There is a moderate negative association between RESIST and organizational trust ($r = -.376, p = .000$), PRIDE in being a member of the department ($r = -.384, p = .000$), and a somewhat stronger association between job involvement and RESIST ($r = -.506, p = .000$). There are additional weaker but still significant negative associations between RESIST and supervisor trust ($r = -.223, p = .027$) and satisfaction with the amount of CONTROL over the work environment ($r = -.238, p = .014$). All of these associations indicate that those officers who have higher orientations with regard to feeling a part of the organization, in control of their work environment, and personally involved in the job tend to exhibit less resistance toward the COP philosophy.

TABLE 3
Pearson Product Moment Correlations (Pearson's R)

Item	Resistance to COP Philosophy	Significance
<i>Background Characteristics</i>		
Length of time in law enforcement	-.005	.960
Age	.038	.709
Gender	.014	.892
Rank	-.215*	.028
Ethnicity	-.139	.158
Educational Attainment	.130	.187
<i>Orientations Toward Department and Citizens</i>		
Organizational Trust	-.376***	.000
Pride in Department	-.384**	.000
Job Involvement	-.506**	.000
Supervisor Trust	-.223*	.023
Satisfied with Control over Work Environment	-.238**	.014
Community Policing Officers Are Different	.489***	.000
Support for Citizen Involvement in Crime Prevention	-.722***	.000

* $P \leq .05$, ** $P \leq .01$, *** $P \leq .001$

NOTE: Listwise deletion of missing values, $n = 101$

The only positive correlation is a moderate to strong relationship between RESIST and the belief that COP officers are different from "regular" officers ($r = .489$, $p = .000$). This is an indicator of an orientation in which those who support COP more tend to view NLOs as being less different from other officers in the department. Finally, there is a very strong correlation between RESIST and support for citizen involvement ($r = -.734$, $p = .000$). This relationship is to be expected and tends to confirm the internal reliability of the measure for resistance to COP by indicating that those who believe in more citizen involvement in the crime prevention effort also tend to view COP positively, and vice versa.

Multivariate Analysis

Finally, utilizing ordinary least squares linear regression (OLS), all the independent variables were regressed against the dependent variable to determine if the correlation relationships revealed in the bivariate analysis had a direct effect on the dependent variables. As a precautionary measure against multicollinearity — many of the independent variables were correlated with one another — stepwise regression with a minimum significance of F for entry into the model of $p = .05$ was used to identify only those independent variables that made significant contributions to the regression model. The results of the regression analysis, shown in Table 4, indicate a very strong regression model (r -square = .679, $df = 8$, $F = 25.118$). The regression analysis, however, revealed that several of the independent variables did not bear a predictive relationship with the dependent variable, despite the fact that they were correlated with it.

TABLE 4
Regression Analysis on Resistance to the
Community-Oriented Policing Philosophy

Variable	B	SE B	β	Description
RANK	.341	.734	.029	Rank (patrol versus sergeant or above)
ORGTRUST	.128	.136	.084	Level of organizational trust
DIFFER	.825	.183	.283***	Views community officers as negatively different from "regular" officers
PRIDE	.293	.267	.106	Pride in being a part of the department
JOBINVOL	-.384	.115	-.245***	Level of job involvement
SUPTRUST	.016	.145	.008	Level of supervisor trust
CONTROL	.533	.373	.098	Satisfied with the amount of control officer has over work environment
CITIZEN	-.906	.112	-.542***	Support for citizen involvement in crime prevention

$R^2 = .679$, $SEE = 3.45$, $df = 8$, $F = 25.118$ ***

* $P \leq .05$, ** $P \leq .01$, *** $P \leq .001$

The standardized regression coefficients (β) revealed that the strongest predictor of resistance to the COP philosophy is CITIZEN (support for citizen involvement in crime prevention) with a β of $-.542$ ($p \leq .001$). Among the organizational culture independent variables,

DIFFER (the belief that COP officers are different from regular officers) was a significant predictor of resistance ($\beta = .283, p \leq .001$), as was JOBINVOL (job involvement, $\beta = .245, p \leq .001$). No other independent variables were significant predictors of COP resistance.

The inverse relationship between CITIZEN and RESIST is rational and expected. The greater is one's support for involving citizens in crime prevention, the lesser is one's resistance to the philosophy. The other two significant predictors of the dependent variable, DIFFER and JOBINVOL, also have a logical connection to support for COP.

The desire of officers to fit into the organizational culture of the agency is similar to that of any member of a group, though it is likely enhanced by the understanding that an officer's life sometimes depends on the competence and alertness of fellow officers. The level of confidence in fellow officers required by the street environment makes officers sensitive to the potential weaknesses or predictors of an officer's inability to perform in a crisis. This central element of the police culture means that factors that make officers seem different from the norm may be interpreted as signs of potential unreliability. If one views COP officers as different, and perhaps as even lazy as a result of the flexible schedule or the fact that COP officers must sometimes remove themselves from the possibility of responding to calls for service, one might view such differences as undesirable. Any job assignment, including that of COP, that makes an officer different from the norm would create resistance to the assignment in the mind of the officer. Conversely, those who do not view COP officers as being negatively different from other officers would not have as great a level of resistance.

The third predictor of support, the level of job involvement felt by the officer, carries with it several possible interpretations. First, an officer who is more personally involved in his or her job might be predisposed to support innovative and community-oriented programming. This predisposition may come from a realization that the professional model of policing does not achieve the desired outcomes and from a personal commitment to try in its place anything that works. Those officers who feel comfortable with the impersonal, bureaucratic role of being a cog in the great machine of law enforcement (which results from the professional model) would not necessarily experience the same level of job involvement or commitment to try COP. Second, officers with higher job involvement might support programs they feel to be of a higher caliber of service to the community and thus feel more capable of achieving the organizational mission to which they feel a higher degree of personal dedication. Finally, officers who feel greater job involvement may be more disposed to support *any* department pro-

gram. Therefore, they may score higher on the measure for support for COP than other officers simply because they are more supportive in general of all departmental policies and initiatives. Further analysis of this relationship through the examination of other departments may reveal which of these interpretations is the most valid.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

These data suggest that law enforcement officials, city and county managers, or elected officials interested in increasing the likelihood of successfully implementing COP in their communities should focus their attention on the following areas.

Recruitment

Officers that are personally involved in the law enforcement profession should be sought. Personal involvement includes thinking that law enforcement is ideally suited to their life goals. Applicants who are entering the field for reasons of convenience, such as discharged military personnel looking for a place to work while they seek other career goals or those who enter the field knowing that they are only interested in being police officers for a limited time, are less likely to be committed to COP than those who are fulfilling a personal calling to the job. Also, job applicants should be examined for the characteristic of a high regard for citizen involvement in crime prevention. Questions on the job application or during the interview process can help to identify those who have such opinions. Further, previous behavior of an applicant that indicates a personal willingness to get involved as a citizen can highlight this orientation. Such evidence might include participation in neighborhood watch or crime prevention organizations. Other important indicators include volunteering in community organizations, involvement with human service organizations, or even the type of course work or major selected in college.

Training

It is important to emphasize to street officers that COP officers are “real” police officers. When COP officers make notable arrests or have similar successes, the other officers should hear about them. Incorporating COP in the field training of new officers will show them what COP officers do and thus remove the mystery behind their assignments. Appointing one or more of the COP officers as a field training officer (FTO) would ensure that new recruits receive training from COP officers during their initial exposure to the department. This field training period provides recruits with exposure to the philosophy and activities

of COP during a time in which they are open-minded, impressionable, and eager to emulate their superior officers.

Management

The idea that COP officers are real police officers should be reinforced through departmental policies. Although COP requires flexible schedules for the officers assigned to the unit, it does not preclude them from participating in roll call or performing significant patrol functions. Requiring COP officers to respond to calls whenever possible will increase their interaction with other officers and give them opportunities to establish credibility. COP officers should understand the importance of maintaining a proper appearance to their fellow officers and behave accordingly. Some jurisdictions require COP officers to respond to every call within their assigned neighborhood, a practice strongly supported by this study. Department policy should require COP officers to place backup high on their list of priorities. A common complaint heard about COP officers is that they are not available to provide backup for other officers or relief from heavy numbers of calls. Non-COP officers, however, should be reminded that COP ultimately reduces the number of calls and that it is in their best interest to have COP officers on the job.

CONCLUSION

The fact that positive orientations toward the COP philosophy are the result of orientations toward citizen involvement, job involvement, and whether community police officers are like other officers is interesting. However, even more interesting are which variables *do not* predict support for COP. Neither rank, organizational trust, level of pride in the department, supervisor trust, nor satisfaction with the amount of control over the work environment predicted support for COP. All of these variables have in common the fact that they are measures of commitment and involvement in the organizational culture of the department.

Those variables that significantly predicted support for COP also have something in common — they are all more personal orientations, that is, they are more internal orientations rather than orientations regarding the external environment or the department. The implications for overcoming officer resistance to COP in future implementations of the philosophy must include the realization that — in developing a plan to win over the hearts and minds of police officers to the philosophy — special care must be given to understanding that organizational culture is not necessarily a strong predictor of rejection of the philosophy. It is

those officers with lower morale or job involvement that are most likely to resist the change in philosophy. Attempts to introduce COP to a department must address the feelings of the officers who will ultimately determine the success or failure of the effort.

REFERENCES

- Angell, J. E. (1971). Toward an alternative to the classic police organizational arrangements: A democratic model. *Criminology*, 9, 185-206.
- Annan, S. O. (1995). *National survey of community policing strategies, 1992-1993*. Washington, DC: The Police Foundation (distributed by the Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research, Ann Arbor, MI).
- Bayley, D. H. (1988). Community policing: A report from the devil's advocate. In J. Greene & S. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality* (pp. 225-238). New York: Praeger.
- Brown, L. P. (1991). Community policing: Its time has come. *The Police Chief*, 58, 6.
- Brown, L. P. (1992). Community policing: A partnership with promise. *The Police Chief*, 59, 45-47.
- Brown, L. P., & Morgenthau, R. M. (1993). Is community policing the best answer to the nation's crime problem? *CQ Researcher*, 3, 113-123.
- Burgreen, B., & McPherson, N. (1992). Neighborhood policing without a budget increase. *The Police Chief*, 59, 31-33.
- Carter, D. L. (1995, Spring). Politics and community: Variables of change in the political environment. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 6-25.
- Clairmont, D. (1991). Community-based policing: Implementation and impact. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 33, 469-484.
- Dicker, T. J. (1998, May). Heros, wimps and cops: Putting the policing back into community oriented policing. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Society for Public Administration, Seattle, WA.
- Goldstein, H. (1976). Toward a redefinition of the police function. In A. Cohen & E. Viano (Eds.), *Police, community relations, images, roles, realities* (pp. 125-139). Philadelphia: Lippincott.
- Goldstein, H. (1987). Toward community-oriented policing: Potential, basic requirements, and threshold questions. *Crime and Delinquency*, 33, 6-30.
- Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented policing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Greene, J. R. (1994). Police officer job satisfaction and community perceptions: Implications for community-oriented policing. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 26, 168-183.
- Greene, J. R., & Decker, S. H. (1989). Policy and community perceptions of the community role in policing: The Philadelphia experience. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 28, 105-123.
- Grinc, R. M. (1994). Angels in marble: Problems in stimulating community involvement in community policing. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40, 437-468.
- Guyot, D. (1991). *Policing as though people matter*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Hayeslip, D., & Cordner, D. (1987). The effects of community oriented patrol on police officer attitudes. *American Journal of Police*, 1, 95-119.

- Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1990). *Organizational behavior and management*. Homewood, IL: BPI Irwin.
- Kotter, J., & Schlesinger, L. (1979). Choosing strategies for change. *Harvard Business Review*, 102-121.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Lurigio, A. J., & Skogan, W. G. (1994). Winning the hearts and minds of police officers: An assessment of staff perceptions of community policing in Chicago. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40, 315-330.
- Maynard-Moody, S., Musheno, M., & Palumbo, D. (1990). Street-wise social policy: Resolving the dilemma of street-level influence and successful implementation. *Western Political Science Quarterly*, 43, 831-848.
- McElroy, J. E., Cosgrove, C. A., & Sadd, S. (1993). *Community policing: The CPOP in New York*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Pepinsky, H. (1989). Issues of citizen involvement in policing. *Crime and Delinquency*, 35, 458-470.
- Rosenbaum, D. P., Yeh, S., & Wilkinson, D. L. (1994). Impact of community policing on police personnel: A quasi-experimental test. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40, 331-353.
- Ross, J. I. (1995). Confronting community policing: Minimizing community policing as public relations. In P. C. Kratcoski & D. Dukes (Eds.), *Issues in community policing* (pp. 243-259). Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Sacks, H. (1978). Notes on police assessment of moral character. In P. K. Manning & J. Van Maanen (Eds.), *Policing: A view from the street* (pp. 187-201). Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- Sadd, S., & Grinc, R. (1994). Innovative neighborhood oriented policing: An evaluation of community policing programs in eight cities. In D. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *Community policing: Testing the promises* (pp. 27-52). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Sherman, L. W., Milton, C. H., & Kelly, T. V. (1973). *Team policing: Seven case studies*. Washington, DC: The Police Foundation.
- Trojanowicz, R. C. (1990). Community policing is not police-community relations. *The FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 59, 6-11.
- Trojanowicz, R., & Bucqueroux, B. (1990). *Community policing: A contemporary perspective*. Cincinnati: Anderson.
- Trojanowicz, R., & Carter, D. (1988). *The philosophy and role of community policing*. East Lansing: Michigan State University.
- Van Maanen, J. (1978). The asshole. In P. K. Manning & J. Van Maanen (Eds.), *Policing: A view from the street* (pp. 221-238). Santa Monica, CA: Goodyear.
- Van Maanen, J. (1974). Working the street: A developmental view of police behavior. In H. Jacob (Ed.), *The potential for reform of criminal justice* (pp. 83-130). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Wadman, R. C., & Ziman, S. M. (1993). Courtesy and police authority. *The FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin*, 62, 23-27.
- Wilson, D. G., & Bennett, S. F. (1994). Officers' response to community policing: Variations on a theme. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40, 354-370.
- Wilson, J. Q. (1983). *Thinking about crime*. New York: Vintage.
- Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1989, February). Making neighborhoods safe: Sometimes "fixing broken windows" does more to reduce crime than conventional "incident-oriented" policing. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 46-52.

- Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982, March). Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 29-38.
- Worden, R. E., & Shepard, R. L. (1996). Demeanor, crime, and police behavior: A reexamination of the police services study data. *Criminology*, 34, 83-105.
- Wycoff, M. A. (1988). The benefits of community policing: Evidence and conjecture. In J. Greene & S. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality* (pp. 103-121). New York: Praeger.
- Wycoff, M. A., & Skogan, W. G. (1992). *Quality policing in Madison: An evaluation of its implementation and impact*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Yates, D. L., & Pillai, V. K. (1996). Attitudes toward community policing: A causal analysis. *Social Science Journal*, 33, 193-209.
- Zhao, J., & Thurman, Q. C. (1997). Community policing: Where are we now? *Crime and Delinquency*, 43, 345-358.