

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING

By Ian Mirsky¹

“Community policing exists as a philosophy, a set of tactics, and an organizational phenomenon” (Thomas & Burns 2005:74). Researchers in the 1970’s wanted to improve upon the professional model limitations. The limitations included inefficiencies in random patrol and investigations. After experimentation with concepts like team policing and problem oriented policing the best elements created community oriented policing. (Thomas & Burns 2005:74)

Community policing is the connection between police and citizenry, who work together on safety involving the public in the community. The design of community policing is to entail a more open relationship between the police and the public which gives the police a more proactive role in the community (Thomas & Burns 2005). Community policing involves new and old tactics. The tactics include foot and bike patrol, beat meetings, mini-stations and many other citizen and police partnerships (Thomas & Burns 2005). Community oriented policing involves organizational changes as well as external changes. For example a department may require a geographic organization or community squad division (Thomas & Burns 2005).

Community oriented policing aims to increase the relations between the police and the community. For example Newark, New Jersey, Boston, and Flint Michigan all had foot patrol demanded by the citizens (Peak & Glensor 1996). An evaluation in Newark found that citizen’s level of satisfaction with police increased due to foot patrol. Community Policing may vary, however it is often the same in certain areas of the country. For example in 1984 when the New York police department instituted community oriented policing, officers were held accountable for knowing the merchants, residents, and service providers in the beat area in which they worked. In addition officers were responsible in identifying the principal crime and order maintenance problems that confronted the people in their beat. Lastly the officers had to devise strategies for dealing with the problems that were identified (Peak & Glensor 1996). The New York program was similar to the foot patrol program in Flint Michigan.

“Historically a tenuous relationship existed between police and minorities” (Thomas & Burns 2005:72). Throughout history ethnic and racial minorities have experienced discriminatory practices from law enforcement officials (Thomas & Burns 2005). Community oriented policing

¹ Student at Buffalo State, State University of New York.

came about due to the tenuous relationship between police and minorities. Latinos and African Americans usually encounter excessive force from police, in addition to racial profiling in jurisdictions with a sizeable minority population. People of African American decent and Latinos hold more negative views of police than do whites (Thomas & Burns 2005). Latino's perception may be shifting according to a latest study. The study suggests that Latino's perception of police is increasing and that they have a more favorable view than do African Americans (Thomas & Burns 2005).

A survey conducted in 1999 concluded that more than one-third of United States citizens held positive attitudes toward their local police department. However 85% of whites felt favorable toward the police and only 58% of African Americans felt the same way. Community oriented policing originated from this problem or need. Police departments across the country employed community policing strategies as a way to significantly enhance the relations between the police and the community they serve. Community oriented policing was initiated after the 1967 Presidential Commission on Law Enforcement (Thomas and Burns 2005). The commission made several recommendations one of them being the use of community oriented policing to reduce the tensions between minorities and police agencies (Thomas & Burns 2005).

The problems that led to the policy of community oriented policing started in the late 1960's. During this time tensions between the public and the police were strained, especially in the minority community. Studies conducted at the time reveal that an overwhelming number of minorities particularly African Americans, had negative perceptions of the police. A movement that began in Michigan during the late 1960's wanted to bring the community and police closer together (Peak & Glensor 1996). A man named Louis Radelet was responsible for bringing attention to community oriented policing as a solution to the problems between the community and the police (Peak & Glensor 1996). He was very influential in finding the problems between the police and the community. Furthermore he helped mediate problems that led to tensions between the police and community. Louis founded (NIPCR) or the National Institute on Police and Community Relations at Michigan State University (Peak & Glensor 1996). During the 15 years of the institute's existence conferences were held for five days during May every year. The purpose was to bring police officers and community leaders together to discuss common problems among each other (Peak & Glensor 1996).

The reasons regarding the initiation of community oriented policing are many and unique. The first reason was the rising crime rate and the ineffectiveness of conventional police methods during the late 1960's (Gianakis, & Davis 1998). The police were confronted with concerns about racial conflicts, riots, civil rights demonstrations, political protests, and crime (Gianakis, & Davis 1998). Police administrators during this time were more willing to open the door to researchers. The willingness of the administrators led to the development of the most important policing research organizations, The Police Foundation and (PERF) known as the Police Executive Research Forum (Gianakis, & Davis 1998).

Increase of fear overwhelmed the public. Americans abandoned churches, parks, public transportation, shopping centers, and neighborhoods (Gianakis, & Davis 1998). The level of fear and crime did not always correspond. For example in areas with low crime, a level of fear was

www.internetjournalofcriminology.com

high. The minority population protested not only mistreatment by law enforcement, but a lack of respect and treatment from the police (Gianakis, & Davis 1998).

The antiwar movement should not be overlooked when discussing problems that confronted police departments around the country. Students who resisted police questioned their legitimacy and minorities rioted against them for what they represented (Peak & Glensor 1996). During this time the public questioned police tactics due to the brutalizing of citizens by police. In addition the police lost a significant portion of their financial support due to the erosion of public support (Peak & Glensor 1996). Minorities and women insisted that law enforcement agencies represent them if the agencies were to be considered legitimate (Peak & Glensor 1996). Police work continued to be routine and petty rules governed officer's behavior thus lead to the rise of militant unionism (Peak & Glensor 1996). Social changes of the 1960's and 1970s affected policing in America. However the civil rights movements, antiwar movements, crime, and riots were not the only impact in making the policy of community oriented policing (Peak & Glensor 1996).

A number of Supreme Court decisions curtailed practices by law enforcement that infringed on the rights of citizens (Peak & Glensor 1996). For example; *Miranda v. Arizona* 384 U.S. 436 (1966), the Supreme Court ruled that the defendant's 5th amendment right was violated. (Peak & Glensor 1996). This ruling relates to community oriented policing due to the tensions between law enforcement and the citizens of America. Another Supreme Court ruling that has made an impact is the case of *Mapp v. Ohio* 367 U.S. 643 (1961) this case extended the tensions between the public and law enforcement by creating uproar between the tough on crime crowd v. the civil liberties crowd (Peak & Glensor 1996). In this case the government violated Mapp's 4th amendment right.

The rulings of the Supreme Court during the 1960's relates to the activism of lawyers and citizens for social justice. Policy makers faced the task of making policies that would help rebuild relations between the community and law enforcement (Peak & Glensor 1996). Law enforcement administrators were desperate for solutions in resolving crime and relations between their department and the community (Peak & Glensor 1996). Furthermore law enforcement had battles within the department and with politicians.

Street v. New York 394 U.S. 576 (1969) relates closely to community oriented policing due to fixing relations with war protestors. The Supreme Court ruled that a New York state law banning flag burning is unconstitutional (Peak & Glensor 1996). The reasons include the 14th amendment and the 1st amendment. The 14th applies the constitution to the states and the 1st freedom of speech.

Another Supreme Court case that involves community oriented policing is *Robinson v. Florida* 378 U.S. 153 (1964) the court ruled that it was unconstitutional to arrest black and white citizens trying to eat at a restaurant. (Peak & Glensor 1996). This ruling could have influenced the atmosphere facing the minority side of why and how community oriented policing came about (Peak & Glensor 1996).

While community oriented policing originated out of police minority relations, the policy addressed concerns of not only racial minorities but whites as well.

The effects of community oriented policing had been more positive for whites and less for blacks. The idea of community policing had a positive influence on Caucasians perceptions (Perrott, 1999). Decreased police presence can influence the way Latinos and whites view police, if the police presence was weak than Latinos and whites had a less favorable view of police (Perrott, 1999). Voluntary contact with the neighborhood police officer did not change the perceptions of whites, blacks, and Latinos (Perrott, 1999). Whites, blacks, and Latinos regard police more highly when they believe that community oriented policing existed in their community (Perrott, 1999).

Perceptions of serious crime lower the satisfaction rate of police for African Americans and whites. African American and white perception of police vary according to the city in which they reside; however Latinos perception is not affected by the city (Perrott, 1999).

Compared to the way cities view community oriented policing whites, blacks, and Latinos have a less influential attitude (Perrott, 1999). Community policing is more effective for blacks, whites, and Latinos compared to other groups. Despite the implementation of community oriented policing being to improve police minority relations, whites perceptions are higher than Latinos and blacks (Perrott, 1999).

While the implementation of community oriented policing leads to an increase in patrol presence and contact with citizens whether voluntary or not, residents in minority neighborhoods usually will see police presence as a crackdown on their community even if it is due to community policing (Perrott, 1999). Community policing saturates neighborhoods with more police which leads to more contact with the public. This in turn would lead to a less favorable opinion of the police by minorities (Perrott, 1999).

Community policing is different in every state and the federal government may support programs with funding. The way in which each state runs there community oriented policing program varies according to how young the city is and if there is a sense of community. Community oriented policing has been most effective among homeowners, middle income families, and whites (Peak & Glensor 1996). According to Samuel Walker the communities that need community policing the most are the ones that are unable or unwilling to take advantage of it (Peak & Glensor 1996).

Community oriented policing is implemented based on the philosophy that crime can be associated with macro social conditions (Wilson & Petersilia 2004). Macro social conditions are problems such as lack of education, racial and ethnic oppression, economic disparities, and health resources (Wilson & Petersilia 2004). Community oriented policing philosophy believes that macro social conditions effect micro social relations in a community (Wilson & Petersilia 2004). Neighborhoods with more activities and involvement with other residents had less crime than those who did not have activities or involvement with residents (Wilson & Petersilia 2004).

Community oriented policing may increase the number of lawsuits filed against police agencies. Current research cannot claim that an increase is due to community oriented policing however more research is needed (Worrall & Gutierrez 1999). In addition officers under the umbrella of community oriented policing are more likely experience increase risk of civil liability due to the high level of interaction with the public (Worrall & Gutierrez 1999). Civil liability seems to be growing however most police administrators do not believe that it has grown to the point of an epidemic (Worrall & Gutierrez 1999).

Implementation of community oriented policing vary from state to state and city to city. In Atlanta a mini station was created on the grounds of public housing complexes. Thus helping repair the relationship between the residents of the complex and police (Peak & Glensor 1996). For example lines by drug sellers were hung across escape routes they used, police and the staff of the complex worked to remove the improperly strung lines (Peak & Glensor 1996). Philadelphia police performed an environmental survey on public housing to learn about hot spots and drug related features of the area (Peak & Glensor 1996). Tulsa assigned officers to housing complexes to develop programs such as social events, and athletic activities (Peak & Glensor 1996). In addition they developed programs to help provide role models for the youths and to assist the community in finding employment (Peak & Glensor 1996). In San Diego the sale of illegal drugs became a problem. Police patrolled on foot and automobile through areas of high drug activity and the used aggressive enforcement to tackle the problem (Peak & Glensor 1996). A survey was used to figure out which areas had problems related to drugs and crime (Peak & Glensor 1996). Once police fixed up one area they would move to the next. Several areas were identified as hot spots which required police attention (Peak & Glensor 1996).

Theories can help explain why policies were created and implemented. There are several theories that can explain why community oriented policing was implemented. The theories give reason to policies and their implementation.

Routine Activity theory states that an individual will commit a crime given three factors. The first is a motivated offender, a person who is prepared and willing to commit a criminal act (Bennett, 1991). The second factor is a suitable target such as an unlocked car in a dark alley. The last factor is the absence of a capable guardian (Bennett, 1991). A capable guardian is a person or persons willing and able to prevent such a crime (Bennett, 1991).

Community oriented policing relates to Routine Activity theory due to the patrol that is done in the community and repairing relations so that community members act as a capable guardian (Bennett, 1991). Furthermore community oriented policing stops the motivated offender by taking away the means and will of the offender. For example community oriented policing works with the community to stop illegal gun sales and drug use thus preventing a motivated offender. The creating of a capable guardian is implemented in many ways. The first is the patrol that a local police department performs (Bennett, 1991). The patrol may include bike, foot, and car while tackling hot areas. In addition to the patrols community oriented policing involves the citizens of the community (Bennett, 1991). For example if a citizen witnesses someone breaking into a car that person is more likely to call the police if they have a favorable view of the police. Considering that community oriented policing is designed to repair relations

between the police and the citizens of the community in which they serve this helps create a capable guardian (Bennett, 1991).

Another theory that helps explain the policy of community oriented policing is called Social Bond Theory or Social Control Theory (Vowell, 2007). This theory was written in 1969 by a man named Travis Hirschi (Vowell, 2007). The theory states that a person will refrain from delinquency if they have some bond with other persons in society (Vowell, 2007). Four bonds are required if the delinquent will engage in pro-social behavior. Attachment is a type of bond where a child identifies with parents, teachers, and friends (Vowell, 2007). Commitment is the extent in which the child obeys authority such as parents and teachers (Vowell, 2007). Involvement is the extent that the child is busy doing pro-social activities such as playing sports or homework (Vowell, 2007). Belief is the bond that the child wants to obey the law and support pro-legitimate activities (Vowell, 2007).

Social control theory relates to community oriented policing due to the involvement of the police in the community. The bond of attachment is related when the police work with schools to help children identify with authority figures. For example school resource officers and DARE programs. Community oriented policing helps with the commitment bond by creating a sense of pride for students to obey authority by creating rewards for doing so. Community oriented policing helps with involvement by creating after school programs with the community and working with the community to help delinquents stay out of trouble with programs geared toward pro-social activities (Vowell, P., R. 2007). Community oriented policing helps with the belief by repairing the relations between the police and communities thus having delinquents believe that police are good and wanting to obey the law (Vowell, P., R. 2007).

Community oriented policing is lacking empirical support. Studies have not found a community level effort that has been empirically effective. However other studies show that community oriented policing that works with schools and involves police intervention along with community efforts has reduced crime (Wilson & Petersilia 2004). The impact of community oriented policing varies directly with the way in which relations between the community and police are constructed and managed. Furthermore the collaboration between community members and the police depend on how successful the policy of community oriented policing is implemented (Wilson & Petersilia 2004).

Despite one of the goals of community-oriented policing to improve police-minority relations, community policing has a more positive effect on whites rather than minorities (Thomas & Burns 2005). According to the community in which the police are located, the social concerns may vary. For example African Americans regard social disorder differently than whites. Furthermore African American attitudes toward the police may vary based on social disorder (Thomas & Burns 2005). The effects of community policing regarding a community depend on the perceptions of the police. For example residents who voluntarily interact with the police either through street interaction or service calls are more likely to hold favorable opinions of the police (Thomas & Burns 2005).

One alternative to community-oriented policing is called problem-oriented policing. This particular type of policing consists of the police looking for long-term solutions to any given

www.internetjournalofcriminology.com

problem. Furthermore problem-oriented policing involves a strategy for solving a variety of problems (Peak & Glensor 1996). Additionally community groups, outside agencies, and government agencies coordinate with police to solve problems.

Another type of policing alternative to community oriented policing is called team policing. Team policing became a popular reform effort in the late 1960's. However team policing eventually failed (Peak & Glensor 1996). I shall explore why team policing failed later on in this paper. Team policing assigned officers to a particular neighborhood and those officers were responsible for police services in the area of assignment (Peak & Glensor 1996). The goals of team policing were various and plentiful and included police department restructuring, improving community and police relations, enhancing morale among the officers, and promoting change within the police organization (Peak & Glensor 1996).

Team policing had several reasons for failure. The experiments were hastily implemented and poorly planned which resulted in street level officers not understanding what their responsibility was (Peak & Glensor 1996). Furthermore team policing failed due to many problems which can be used to advance the practices of community-oriented policing. On the management level, mid-level staff was intimidated by team policing and sabotaged the experiment. In addition many concept elements were never clearly stated (Peak & Glensor 1996). For example the policy never made it clear how citizen's concerns in police policymaking should be addressed. Lastly it involved changes in police organization but not in police services.

The alternatives to community-oriented policing are at best equal to or worse than the policy. Problem-oriented policing cannot survive without the aspect of community policing involved. Community oriented policing works best when combined with the knowledge of team policing and problem oriented policing.

The negative effects of community-oriented policing are many. One of the effects to examine is liability lawsuits. Considering that community oriented policing calls for changes in the interaction between citizens and police, public managers should be aware of the consequences associated with change in the way officers do their jobs (Worrall & Gutierrez 1999). The performance of officers or police administrators can depend on whether a liability lawsuit is filed against a police agency. Furthermore a lawsuit against a police agency may become more likely due to the ambiguous legal requirement of the color of the law (Worrall & Gutierrez 1999). The reason why the color of the law may become a problem is it contrasts with traditional policing in traditional policing definitions were laid out as to what an officer could do or could not do under the standard operating procedures (Worrall & Gutierrez 1999). Researchers have found that risk taking leads to more litigations and community-oriented policing involves risk taking due to the modern management that is involved in community oriented policing (Worrall & Gutierrez 1999). Prior research has found that only nine percent of police officers interviewed had substantial fear of civil litigation. Furthermore a study conducted in 1996 found that thirty one percent of state police agencies feared some form of civil liability (Worrall & Gutierrez 1999). Police administrators do not view liability lawsuits as a problem and believe that it can be used as a deterrent to misconduct by officers (Worrall & Gutierrez 1999).

The nature and extent of the civil liability problem can only be speculated due to the fundamental limitations of available data (Worrall & Gutierrez 1999). However lawsuits against police agencies have increased since the 1960's with an estimated 30,000 civil actions filed against police annually (Worrall & Gutierrez 1999). Furthermore future research is needed to confirm the relationship between liability lawsuits and community oriented policing (Worrall & Gutierrez 1999).

The argument of whether police should define or shape a community's norm has come to the forefront of issues concerning community oriented policing. Writers argue that enforcing norms and enforcing the law takes away the political neutrality of the police (Goetz, 1996). Furthermore political entanglements may occur when police are asked to take sides in battles between neighbors or racial bigots (Goetz, 1996). In addition opponents of community oriented policing argues that citizens will gain control over the police. For example principles such as community relations, creative problem solving, and crime prevention are the greatest threat to neutrality. Thus helping influential citizens have more control of the police in their community (Goetz, 1996). Considering police must focus on the symptoms and the problems of crime, this makes them politically involved in agencies around or located in the community (Goetz, 1996). Furthermore the concern of police advising how certain grants and funds are allocated along with powers of patronage are often used by opponents to argue against community policing (Goetz, 1996).

The community organizing role of police in any given community shows that a viable community is there to organize (Peak & Glensor 1996). The police under community policing must create a feeling of community or middle class values in a community that does not share the same sense of value. For example community policing was more effective among the middle class, homeowners, and Caucasians rather than the poor, renters, and racial minorities (Peak & Glensor 1996). Disorganized communities that may have powerless citizens do not have the same competence to work with the police as organized communities in middle class neighborhoods possess (Peak & Glensor 1996). There is no single community, therefore no single way to conduct community policing. To illustrate this concept, opponents argue that some groups do not want a continued police presence. Wealthier households use the police more often for less serious crimes. However low-income households use the police for more violent crimes (Peak & Glensor 1996).

Officer discretion has become an issue in community-oriented policing. Direct and constant contact with the public can lead to abuses by officers (Weisburd, & Eck 2004). Officers could be encouraged by the public to use methods outside of their training to handle the problems that the public faces (Weisburd, & Eck 2004). Furthermore community policing places a high value on the responsiveness by police to the community. Arguments from opponents state that community policing will weaken the rule of law by the expanded use of discretion that may come from the implementation of community policing (Weisburd, & Eck 2004).

The demands of community-oriented policing may be too much for police officers. Authors have speculated whether law enforcement personnel can fulfill the demands of community policing (Weisburd, & Eck 2004). Officers will have to mitigate problems according to the needs of the community. Furthermore certain skills are required such as problem

conceptualization, program evaluation, synthesis and analysis of information, and action plans along with many others (Weisburd, & Eck 2004). In addition several studies have shown that these skills are enhanced by a college degree (Weisburd, & Eck 2004). The argument asserts that the selection criteria of officers should be changed or community policing should not be implemented (Weisburd, & Eck 2004).

Several skeptics argue that community policing is not a proper role for police. The argument is based on the notion that each and every community is different (Peak & Glensor 1996). They believe that not all people want the same law enforcement service or visibility. Several skeptics believe that community oriented policing is useless due to the policy of problem oriented policing. They want police to deal with problems and identify them while offering solutions (Peak & Glensor 1996).

Evaluations of community oriented policing are mixed. Problems with evaluation are common and frustrating to researchers (Peak & Glensor 1996). One of the problems is the purpose of the intervention that's going to be evaluated is not always specified. Furthermore certain results are not measurable such as quality of life. Surveys were conducted to understand if the public understanding of crime and fear of crime met law enforcement expectations (Peak & Glensor 1996). Results showed that the way in which they acted depended on the physical environment where citizens were located. (Peak & Glensor 1996). Research had mixed results with some showing positive effects of community oriented policing and others showing negative according to the city and implementation.

Future implications for community oriented policing looks promising. However many experiments based on great philosophy failed over time (Peak & Glensor 1996). The commitment to prognosticate the forthcoming of policing and civilization at large should not be restrained in design (Peak & Glensor 1996). We must focus on three primary subjects: 1. police administrations and supervisors with regard to their attitude and behavior toward community oriented policing; 2. the average police officer; 3. information systems and technology used for solving problems (Peak & Glensor 1996). The three primary subjects are paramount if the continuation of community oriented policing is to exist.

In post 20th century society police administrators need to prepare their departments for continual innovation. Lamentably there is no enchiridion or prescript for police administrators to pursue that will assure the accomplishment of their contemporary transcendent endeavors (Peak & Glensor 1996). Furthermore continual change of organizational formation and adjustable management attitude is imperative if they are to prosper. Although there is no instruction on how to implement a successful administrative policy, research has revealed information that can help in the success of the administrator's policy (Peak & Glensor 1996). In addition research itself cannot help with all of the complex problems police face, however it offers guidance to assist in their endeavors (Peak & Glensor 1996).

Robust leadership is an essential element in regard to the future success of policing (Peak & Glensor 1996). Police administrators will need to encourage police officers to be innovative and grant them the liberty to make decisions on predicaments that arrive. Once administrators grant

liberty to their officers so they can resolve problems and become innovative the officers will be more prepared dealing with a complex and mercurial future (Peak & Glensor 1996).

An increasing number of police administrators are beginning to question whether the current bureaucracy will be able to operate in the future (Peak & Glensor 1996). Furthermore in the 1970's advisors of law enforcement organizations contend that the military bureaucratic system impeded the development of a professional police system (Peak & Glensor 1996). Disenchantment exists within the usual structure of police confederation. However the structure continues to work for several police administrators.

Few officers have the skills needed to meet the demands of modern day policing. For example analysts are needed and demand will likely increase in the future (Peak & Glensor 1996). Additionally the majority of police officers don't have the necessary skills and technological history to shift into expert analysts. Furthermore problems with analysts start with employment considering that opportunities are easier to find outside of police departments rather than inside (Peak & Glensor 1996).

The past two decades of policing in America has been ingenious. Despite a reputation of police being resistant to change, officers were open to progressive ideas (Peak & Glensor 1996). However the more a police department changes the more it stays the same. For example most departments still embrace a paramilitary organization with unionization and civil service protection (Peak & Glensor 1996). The causes of such problems come from within the organization and it's resistance to innovation and any mercurial nature within the police department. Furthermore the police vs. society fallacy encourage resistance to change and stir a negative attitude toward any kind of openness (Peak & Glensor 1996). The future of community oriented policing will depend on the will of community leaders, politicians, and the police. In addition cooperation between all groups should be a top priority if success is abreast (Peak & Glensor 1996).

When concluding an analysis of community oriented policing race is important subject to consider in the conclusion. When police agencies are fully aware of the needs and inventiveness of a community they can use this knowledge to shape the rules of the police department (Burns, & Thomas 2005). Due to various ethnic groups having different reactions with certain features of community oriented policing the police should utilize the features that would improve citizen's outlook of the police in their community (Burns, & Thomas 2005). The unity between police and the community shall continue if police pursue a policy which corresponds with the needs of such community (Burns, Thomas 2005). Thus fully integrated models of community oriented policing can only exist if the community has trust in the police (Burns, & Thomas 2005).

Grants play a major role when making considerations in community oriented policing. The electoral tension placed on mayors increases the prospect of them applying for short-term grants. Most mayors are focused on short term political gain rather than city managers in reformed cities (Choi, Turner, & Volden 2002). Mayors applied for grants at the same rate during elections and after elections. However some grant request depended on the mayor's term length and the electoral cycle (Choi, Turner, & Volden 2002).

National political considerations play a dramatic role in the response that the federal government gave when grants for community policing were requested by cities (Choi, Turner, & Volden 2002). Immediately prior to the 1996 election grant requests and grant awards increased. However after the election year community oriented policing grants fell dramatically (Choi, Turner, & Volden 2002). Democrats who were connected to the Clinton administration were more likely to receive an increase in community oriented policing funds. Additionally these funds were used to address policy goals and community needs (Choi, Turner, & Volden 2002). High crime towns and cities along with communities with limited resources in their police departments are more likely to request grants. Towns and cities that were successful in the past were more likely to request grants in the future (Choi, Turner, & Volden 2002).

A disappointing result is that cities with high minority populations are less likely to request grants and awarded fewer police officers in response to any modest request (Choi, Turner, & Volden 2002). Further research is needed to determine if minority pressures is the reason behind the lack of funding and requests or if it stems from a total disregard to protect minorities (Choi, Turner, & Volden 2002). With information known about grants, we as an intelligent society need to explore local and national considerations relating to community oriented policing grants (Choi, Turner, & Volden 2002).

Research suggests that local governments were more likely commit to the needs of the community than did federal officials. Furthermore federal officials reacted toward cities based on ideology rather than need (Choi, Turner, & Volden 2002). Whenever an election was needed in a city which had a mayor-council, grants were requested in the short term due to the beneficial impacts that they often have (Choi, Turner, & Volden 2002).

Research regarding lawsuits related to community oriented policing lacks the results to prove that community oriented policing is responsible for lawsuits. However results show that there should be a careful implementation of community oriented policing to prevent police agencies from receiving lawsuits (Worrall, & Gutierrez 2009). The understanding of civil liability is paramount if law enforcement agencies wish to avoid civil liability suits. Furthermore police agencies need to understand the community and help participate in activities that the community engages in (Worrall, & Gutierrez 2009).

Has community oriented policing worked? Community oriented policing has not received continuous or rigorous examination. Without continuous or rigorous examination community oriented policing cannot prove that it solely is the solution to police community relations (Peak, & Glensor 1996). Using surveys of the community and respecting the physical environment can help in the implementation of community oriented policing. Critics argue that methods in which researchers used are not enough to evaluate community oriented policing. For example measuring crime rates, clearance rates, and response time should not be the only method of community oriented policing research (Peak, & Glensor 1996).

Activities that police engage in everyday can affect community oriented policing therefore this reflection will end with the research findings of police activities. Research demonstrates that automotive patrol and criminal related incidences consumed one third of community officer's activities (Smith, Novak, & Frank 2001). Theorist of community oriented policing believe that www.internetjournalofcriminology.com

officers would perform problem solving and community based services rather than an aggressive encounter (Smith, Novak, & Frank 2001). However officers make choices about how they work and will perform duties that will help maximize job satisfaction (Smith, Novak, & Frank 2001). Community police have major roles which could conflict with relations of the public. For example community police are officers and they still must enforce the laws such as arresting and controlling people (Smith, Novak, & Frank 2001). When it comes to fellow officers community officers may engage in traditional police activities to satisfy their peers. Additionally research has shown that a subculture which embraces group solidarity among the police can lead to violations of community oriented policing practices (Smith, Novak, & Frank 2001).

Research has shown that officers rely on policing for various reasons one in which is the social activities. As a result of social bonding police are more likely to be persuaded by peers to engage in traditional police methods rather community oriented methods (Smith, Novak, & Frank 2001). Furthermore community police officers respond to calls voluntarily in their district to prove legitimate among peers and have a since pride in doing “police work” (Smith, Novak, & Frank 2001).

Middle management can always be a cause in the destruction of community oriented policing. Line officers and supervisors are in positions to inexplicitly sabotage any form of community oriented policing. Management officers may view community policing as a threat and therefore seek the failure of such policy (Smith, Novak, & Frank 2001). However if community police administrators encouraged officers to participate in community policing morale increased.

REFERENCES

- Bennett, R., R. 1991. "Routine Activities: A Cross National Assessment of a Criminological Perspective". *The University of North Carolina press* 70(1): 147-163
- Burns, P. F., & Thomas M., O. 2005. "Repairing the Divide: An Investigation of Community Policing and Citizen Attitudes Toward the Police by Race and Ethnicity." *Journal of Ethnicity in Criminal Justice* 3(1/2): 71-85
- Choi, C., Turner C. C., & Volden C. 2002. "Means, Motive, and Opportunity: Politics, Community Needs, and Community Oriented Policing Services Grants." *American Politics research* 4: 423-455.
- Das, D., K. 2005. "From the Editor-in-Chief". *Police Practice & Research* 6(4): 325-328
- Dixon, B. 2004. "Community Policing: "Cherry Pie" or Melktert". *Society in transition* 35(2): 251-272
- Giacomazzi, A., L. & Brody, D., C. 2004. "The effectiveness of external assessments in facilitating organizational change in law enforcement". *Policing* 27(1): 37-55
- Gianakis, G., A. & Davis J., G. 1998. "Reinventing or repackaging public services: The Case of Community-Oriented Policing." *Public Administration Review* 58(6): 485-498
- Goetz, E., G. 1996. "The US War on Drugs as Urban Policy." *International Journal of Urban & Regional Research* 20(3): 539-549
- Hickman, M., J. 2008. "On The Context of Police Cynicism and Problem Behavior." *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice* 4(1): 1-44
- Innes, M. 2005. "What's Your Problem? Signal Crimes And Citizen-Focused Problem Solving." *Criminology & Public Policy* 4(2): 187-200
- Marenin, O. 2004. "Police Training for Democracy 1." *Police practice & Research* 5(2): 107-123
- Peak, K. J., & Glensor, R. W. (1996). *Community Policing and Problem Solving*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc. Simon & Schuster.
- Perrott, S., B. 1999. "Visible Minority applicant concerns and assessment of occupational role in the era of community-based policing". *Journal of Community & Applied Social psychology* 9(5) 339-353

- Ray, L. & Smith, D. 2004. "Racist Offending, Policing and Community Conflict". *Sociology* 38(4): 681-699
- Schnebly, S., M. 2008. "The Influence of Community-Oriented Policing on Crime-Reporting Behavior." *Justice Quarterly* 25(2): 224-25
- Smith, B., W., Novak K. J., & Frank J. 2001. "Community Policing and the Work Routines of Street-Level Officers." *Criminal Justice Review* 26:17-37
- Vowell, P., R. 2007. "A partial test of an Integrative Control Model: Neighborhood Context, Social Control, Self-Control, and Youth Violent Behavior". *Western criminology Review* 8(2): 1-15
- Weisburd, D. & Eck, J., E. 2004. "What Can Police Do to Reduce Crime, Disorder, and Fear"? *Annals of the American Academy of Political & Social Science* 593: 42-65
- Wilson, J. Q. & Petersilia, J. (2004). *Crime: Public policies for crime control*. Oakland, CA: Institute for Contemporary Studies.
- Worrall, J. L., & Gutierrez R. S. 2009. "Review of Public Personnel Administration." *Ebsco Electronic Journals Service* 1:61-68. Retrieved February 13, 2009 (<http://rop.sagepub.com>).