Old Dominion University

ODU Digital Commons

Sociology & Criminal Justice Theses & Dissertations

Sociology & Criminal Justice

Fall 1998

Assessing Levels of Cooperation Between PACE and Patrol Officers in the City of Norfolk Virginia Police Department

Michael G. Goldsmith
Old Dominion University

ASSESSING LEVELS OF COOPERATION BETWEEN PACE AND PATROL

OFFICERS IN THE CITY OF NORFOLK, VIRGINIA POLICE

DEPARTMENT

by

Michael G. Goldsmith
B.A. December 1988, Old Dominion University

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculties of
Old Dominion University and Norfolk State University
in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirement for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

APPLIED SOCIOLOGY

OLD DOMINION AND NORFOLK STATE UNIVERSITY
DECEMBER 1998

Approved by:

_____
Garland H. White (Director)

_____
Brian Payne (Member)

_____
James Nolan (Member)

ABSTRACT

ASSESSING LEVELS OF COOPERATION BETWEEN PACE AND PATROL
OFFICERS IN THE CITY OF NORFOLK, VIRGINIA POLICE
DEPARTMENT.

Michael G. Goldsmith
Old Dominion and Norfolk State University, 1998
Director: Dr. Garland H. White

The purpose of this study is to evaluate two facets of
the Norfolk Police Department's Police Assisted Community
Enforcement, or PACE, program. While there has been much
research on how community policing affects officer and
citizen attitudes, there has been very little that focuses
on organizational aspects of implementing this philosophy.
This research uses a survey instrument to examine how
Norfolk's structuring of their community policing program
may have an impact on the way the officers involved
cooperate with one another. Levels of cooperation and
training are measured, as well as the effects that years on
the department and education have on these variables. The
analyses reveal that while most of the officers believe
that community policing is a worthwhile program, Norfolk's
structuring of may have resulted in low levels of
cooperation between the PACE and Patrol officers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Community policing is a paradigm that many police
departments in the United States are using to restructure
how their departments do business. This new philosophy
allows officers to be more responsive to community needs.
It also allows the community to define the problems that
need the most attention, rather than the police. In
community policing, the neighborhood and the police become
partners working toward common goals. This is in contrast
to more traditional relationships where the police are the
"experts" and the residents are forced to receive whatever
treatment deemed necessary.

Several studies have examined community policing.
Some have focused on how community policing affects
officer attitudes toward the program and the neighborhoods
(e. g. Greene 1989, Lurigio and Skogan 1994, Rosenbaum,
Yeh, and Wilkinson 1994). Others have focused on
structural problems with community policing (e. g. Murphy
1992, Kelling and Bratton 1993). No study has examined
what happens when a specialized unit is set up within a

This thesis follows the model set by the journal *American
Sociological Review (ASR)*.

department to do just community policing. The Norfolk, Virginia Police Department has this type of setup. In their Police Assisted Community Enforcement (PACE) program, they have officers designated only to do community policing to the exclusion of any other work. It is believed, from a review of the literature, that this setup could have an impact on how well the patrol officers work with the community policing, also called PACE, officers.

This study will examine whether removing the bulk of the community policing effort from the patrol officers, and placing it in a specialized unit with the PACE officers, has an impact on the levels of cooperation between the two. It will also examine whether the two units will report differing levels of training, since the Norfolk Police Department's philosophy is that all officers are in essence, community policing officers.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Rising crime rates (Kelling and Moore 1988), increased fear among citizens (Liou and Savage 1996), and increased fear among officers (Toch 1980), point to inadequacies with our present system of policing. Couple these with the growing dissatisfaction that many communities have with police services, which also adds to tensions between citizens and the police (Lovrich 1976), and departments everywhere are searching for techniques to get their officers back into the neighborhoods to which they are responsible. Police agencies all over the country are examining the concept of community policing and how to best implement this ideal in their respective jurisdictions. When properly implemented, community policing is a technique that has been successful in making police agencies more customer oriented. Effects such as reduced fear of crime and better police-community relations have been documented to result from sound programs (Liou and Savage 1996). Unfortunately, it has been a dismal failure when administrators neglected to consider several organizational issues, such as employee participation, before starting a program.

Community policing is an evolving paradigm with roots that stretch back to the earlier eras of policing in America. This chapter will examine the history and implementation of community policing, as well as research on officers' attitudes toward community policing.

HISTORY OF COMMUNITY POLICING

Kelling and Moore (1988) break the history of American policing into 3 eras based on such concepts as organizational strategies, technology, police function, sources of authority and focus during each period. They are quick to point out that these eras are not hard and fast time lines, but generally provide a framework for discussing the general changes in policing over time. The three eras that the researchers use are: the political era, the reform era, and the era of problem solving and community involvement (Kelling and Moore 1988).

The Political Era

In the political era, the researchers describe police departments as adjuncts to the political machines that ran most localities (Kelling and Moore 1988). Departments were decentralized and came under the control of the local politicians. Many times each precinct commander was treated as if he were the manager of his station, being

responsible for the hiring as well as other duties that may be assigned by the local ward representative. This became a somewhat reciprocal relationship with the local politicians recruiting for the police and the police helping the politicians stay in power.

This relationship with the local politicians manifested itself in different ways. According to Kelling and Moore (1988), the police provided many services to the public at the direction of the local government. These services included social work functions as well as law enforcement duties. As stated before, these helped cement politicians' relationships with their constituencies.

Another manifestation of the relationship can be observed in its effect on the structure of the department as a whole. Police departments were supposed to be centrally organized under one leader or command. In fact, many departments acted as decentralized units due to the influence of the local political machine (Kelling and Moore 1988).

There are several other characteristics that define the political era of policing. According to Kelling and Moore (1988) the dominant technology or method of policing was the use of foot patrols. It was so dominant that when new technology came along, such as the police car, it was used to expand the range of the foot patrol officer

(Kelling and Moore 1988). In other words, the context of services did not change with technology in the political era.

The strengths of the political era came from the closeness of the police to the communities that they served. In fact, in many jurisdictions it was a requirement that the officer live in the neighborhood or district that they patrolled (Kelling and Moore 1988). According to Kelling and Moore (1988) other strengths included the integration of the police into the community, where they enjoyed support from its members. Also, the police provided needed social services to the community which in turn provided social control.

If familiarity between the police and the neighborhood was the strength of the political era, it was also its weakness. The closeness between the police, neighborhood, and politicians bred corruption in many places (Kelling and Moore 1988). It also led to discrimination against strangers who did not reside or work in the patrolled neighborhoods. This included discrimination against blacks and other minorities (Kelling and Moore 1988). Finally, the practiced decentralization under the political bosses led to disorganization in the departments.

The Reform Era

The reform era was the reaction to the weaknesses and corruption of the political era. The movement was led by August Vollmer and his protege O. W. Wilson. During this era an emphasis was placed on professionalism and crime fighting as the major tools of policing (Kelling and Moore 1988).

This was a very important development for policing. According to Kelling and Moore (1988:4), "20th century attempts at reform, originating from both internal and external forces, shaped contemporary policing as we know it through the 1970s."

In accomplishing this reform, Vollmer, Wilson, and others followed the path taken by J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation. That is, they set out to sell the police as a professional organization where the citizens were the recipients of police services rather than partners (Kelling and Moore 1988). According to Kelling and Moore (1988), where the politicians and community had given the police legitimacy in the political era, it was criminal law and police professionalism that provided legitimacy in the reform era. This had the result of causing law enforcement to focus on arrests and crime control.

As the reforms took effect, the focus changed, and the reformers became adept at selling their new outlook, the police became identified with the criminal justice system (Kelling and Moore 1988). The new professional police officers began to look on the tasks that they performed in the political era as social work. In Kelling and Moore's (1988:6) words, "a generation of police officers was raised with the idea that they merely enforced the law...."

During this era, citizens were not encouraged to take part in policing themselves. This became an era of rapid response times, investigations, and an attitude that police work should be left to the professionals and not the untrained citizen (Kelling and Moore 1988). Officers began to be judged by their arrest records rather than any other substantive work that had been done. This was much different than the focus and strategy of the political era.

Another difference between the two eras had to do with the use of new technology. As stated before, the political era used new technology to advance an already successful product, the foot patrol. In the reform era, technology was used to replace foot patrol with preventive patrol (Kelling and Moore 1988). According to Kelling and Moore (1988), this was a logical assumption for the time. In actuality, this focus served to further alienate the police from the public that they were supposed to be serving.

Where the foot patrol officer had intimate contact with the community, the police car served to insulate the officer from citizen contact. It was a physical barrier that eventually became a psychological barrier as well.

The Era of Problem Solving and Community Involvement

In the late 1960s and through the 1970s, the reform movement began to break down (Kelling and Moore 1988). While there are several reasons for this, three in particular stand out in relation to Community Policing. First was the rise of crime and, more importantly, fear of crime, during this time period. Despite increases in budgets, technology, and the number of officers, crime rates continued to increase (Kelling and Moore 1988). This contradicted the promised results of the earlier promotions by the reformers. A reduction in the fear of crime is one of the variables that seems to show great improvement when a good community policing program is instituted (Liou and Savage 1996).

Second, when the reformers began to talk about and move towards professional status, they only applied this to the upper echelons of their departments. The front line officers were not given access to the education and status that the administration enjoyed (Kelling and Moore 1988). Further, they were not managed as professionals. This is

the result of the classical organizational strategy that the reformers adopted for their departments. The result being that it was extremely difficult to sell these new reforms to line officers who had no stake in seeing them work (Kelling and Moore 1988).

Finally, one other reason for the failure of the reform movement had to do with the unequal delivery of police services. Despite the move to professionalization and the use of new technology to expand preventive patrol, neighborhoods did not receive equal coverage by the police (Kelling and Moore 1988). Minority communities did not benefit from the new allocation of resources. This, coupled with police mistreatment, led to mistrust and resentment of the police in minority neighborhoods.

According to Kelling and Moore (1988), the reform era of policing is presently coming to an end. In its place, police departments are now moving into the era of problem solving and community involvement. In this era, police departments are resurrecting some of the methods that worked in the political era while avoiding the undesirable side effects such as corruption. Techniques like foot patrols are now used because they have been found to reduce the citizen's perceptions and fears of crime (Kelling and Moore 1988; Liou and Savage 1996). They also foster a

close relationship between the police and the community, a relationship that had been lost during the reform era.

This present era also emphasizes the need for decentralization of services without allowing the disorganization of the political era (Kelling and Moore 1988). By decentralizing, the departments are better able to address the problems of each community. This allows a problem oriented approach to handling the crime difficulties of a particular neighborhood (Goldstein 1990).

A Critique of Kelling and Moore's History

There are those who disagree with Kelling and Moore's synthesis. Williams and Murphy (1990) believe that no accounting of police history can be complete without including the minority view and the changing relationship between minorities and the police. They believe that Kelling and Moore's treatment is incomplete because they do not address these issues.

According to Williams and Murphy (1990) police organizations are not autonomous, as Kelling and Moore seem to assume. Williams and Murphy believe that they are conditioned by broad social forces and attitudes, which include racism. They go on to state that police organizations are "barometers of the society in which they operate" (Williams and Murphy 1990:2).

The researchers suggest several deficiencies in Kelling and Moore's structure. First, they believe that traditional policing in the South has a basis in the fear of black uprisings (Williams and Murphy 1990). They believe that police patrols could have their beginnings in the slave patrols that were used to pick up runaway slaves. They go on to state that the privileged class in places such as Charleston, Savannah, and Richmond used the patrols to keep blacks from congregating and to "repress attacks on the status quo" (Williams and Murphy 1990:3). The researchers argue that many police departments arose from the need to regulate social discord in the major cities of the North.

Willams and Murphy (1990) also point out the lack of attention given to the laws against minorities in Kelling and Moore's work. They argue that the laws affecting minorities in the 1800s and early 1900s also affected the police due to their responsibility to carry out the law. According to the researchers, blacks had no say in either the policing or judicial system during the political era (Williams and Murphy 1990). They could not exert any power over the system during this time.

They also believe that the reform era must be viewed in the light of racism. For example, to Williams and Murphy (1990), the Plessy v. Ferguson ruling had the result

of lowering the number of black police officers. Although
the reform movement tried to professionalize the police,
those who had little stake in it, namely minorities, saw
little change (Williams and Murphy 1990).

During the community policing era the researchers
argue that the first programs were started in neighborhoods
that were already organized and had strong business
associations (Williams and Murphy 1990). This again
excluded minorities since their poverty stricken
neighborhoods were not as strongly organized. Williams and
Murphy (1990) state that in this new era, police agencies
must be careful to not repeat the sins of the past. In
other words, when empowering communities, the least
empowered and organized must be included as well.

Williams and Murphy (1990) provide a needed addition
to Kelling and Moore's (1988) framework. As stated before,
they provide a view of the history of community policing
from the perspective of racial minorities. Rather than
making Kelling and Murphy's (1988) historical analysis
obsolete, it adds a needed minority perspective, making it
more complete.

In examining this brief history of policing, we can
see that by the time the last stage of Kelling and Moore's
framework is reached, policing has come almost full circle.
In this most recent era, society is again trying to get the

officers back into the neighborhoods. As in the political
era, the desire is to have the members of the community
know the officers who help protect them. The emphasis has
now turned again to enlisting the citizen's help in
policing themselves, a technique that was common in the
political era.

DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY POLICING

The ideas that eventually developed into what is
commonly referred to as community policing originated in
the 1970s with several works documenting a new approach to
policing. The best known of these works is probably Herman
Goldstein's 1979 article outlining what he referred to as
"problem oriented policing." In this article, Goldstein
described the "means over ends" syndrome that seemed to
plague modern police departments. Departments had become
more interested in improving their organization and
operating methods without regard to the substantive product
of their work (Goldstein 1979). In other words, the police
were so busy improving themselves and becoming more
professional and more technological, that they seemed to
forget that their real purpose was to serve and protect the
public that hired them. Goldstein also pointed out that
the police were too ambiguous when they set out to define a
problem. He believed that problems must be carefully

analyzed and precisely defined before the police can begin to find a solution (Goldstein 1979). This is an important part of implementing both community and problem oriented policing.

While Goldstein's work was one of the early studies that is closely related to community policing, there were several studies dealing with the police and community relations that came out of the unrest of the late 1960s. Many of these concentrated on the efforts of police community relations training, with an emphasis on how these programs could improve the public's image of the police.

One example was a study done by Decker, Smith, and Uhlman (1977) that examined departments that had a community relations program and a citizen complaint board, both concepts being early attempts to get closer to citizens. According to these researchers, police agencies that had adopted these types of strategies had a better image in minority neighborhoods. This is an indication of the importance of community policing in predominantly minority neighborhoods. The majority of police-citizen contacts take place in the low income areas of a community. This is supported by the research done by Decker et al.(1977), that found the existence of these programs had no effect on the image of the police in predominantly white neighborhoods.

Percy (1978) points out another factor important to community policing. He states that the community is regarded as a co-producer of the services that are usually assigned to the police and not just a client. This points to the importance of citizen involvement in policing themselves.

SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATIONS OF COMMUNITY POLICING

While this review will examine several of the stumbling blocks that impede the execution of an effective community policing philosophy, there are examples of successful programs. Now, we will examine two departments that appear to have surmounted most of the problems that can cripple a community policing program. The Madison, Wisconsin Police Department and its Experimental Police District (EPD) and the West Palm Beach Police Department's Community Oriented Policing (COP) program are examples of successful community policing programs.

According to Skogan and Wycoff (1993), the Madison police started its change by first changing itself. Its concept of Quality Policing had one main goal, to change the structure of the department internally so that services would be better provided externally (Skogan and Wycoff 1993). Their idea was to change the managerial system prior to implementing community policing. According to the

authors (1993), job satisfaction was linked to an officer's receptivity to change. They also did away with the traditional top-down management style of the typical police agency. They instituted the principles of "Quality Leadership" that allowed supervisors more flexibility in dealing with their officers (Skogan and Wycoff 1993). They also adopted a philosophy that it was acceptable for an officer to make an honest mistake. However, mistakes born out of negligence or brutality were not tolerated (Skogan and Wycoff 1993). This philosophy allows officers to be innovative when approaching a problem solving task. Fear of reprisal for making a mistake was not a concern for these officers, unlike those in traditional departments.

The Madison police went as far as designing a facility that fostered team building and interaction among the officers (Skogan and Wycoff 1993). Instead of the regular roll call set up of rows of chairs facing a podium, these officers had a meeting table with conference chairs arranged around it. The room itself was situated such that every member of the station, including the Commanding Officer, had to walk through it, thus forcing interaction with the other officers. According to Skogan and Wycoff (1993), the structure of the physical plant facilitated community policing and team building.

These changes are examples of how an administration can avoid problems with careful planning. Skogan and Wycoff (1993) found that these internal changes had external benefits for the community. The success of the program is the result of the success in restructuring the department.

Liou and Savage (1996) studied the Community Oriented Policing (COP) program in West Palm Beach, Florida. After reiterating the failure of traditional policing methods to address crime problems, they point out the lack of knowledge concerning the implementation or measuring of community policing programs due to the lack of research in this area.

The researchers argue that police organizations must change from a "centralized and bureaucratic model to a decentralized and open model" (Liou and Savage 1996:2). This again points out the need to allow the line officer to be an independent problem solver, unhampered by constant supervision. They contend that community policing is a philosophy and not a tactic; it represents a paradigm shift for policing.

One of the keys to the success of the COP program was that they limited their initial commitment of the program to three communities. This allowed the researchers involved to properly track the effectiveness of the

program. This approach also allowed the administrators of the program the luxury of making adjustments prior to making the jump to a full scale effort that would involve the rest of the city.

To measure the impact of the program, Liou and Savage used questionnaires to measure the perceptions of the communities before and after the beginning of the program. The independent variables were race, community, and age. The dependent variables were perception of police work, perception of local crime, perception of neighborhood improvement, and perception of police-community relationships (Liou and Savage 1996). In all cases the researchers were able to demonstrate a significant favorable change in the perceptions of the community after six months into the program. In other words, the perception of local crime went down, while the perceptions about police work, police-community relations, and neighborhood improvement all increased (Liou and Savage 1996).

Liou and Savage point out other benefits reaped from programs like the one in West Palm Beach. Many cities are currently attempting to institute some form of the Total Quality Management program, based somewhat on the practices of Edward Deming. In this system, more attention is given to allowing the workers more input into job practices.

Community policing, with its emphasis on customer service, communication, and information gathering blends well with these efforts. The positive feelings generated by community policing can spill over to positive feelings for municipal government in general.

PROBLEMS WITH IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING

From this brief review of some of the literature that preceded the community policing philosophy that is being implemented today, we can see the importance of the organization of police departments on the success of their implementation of community policing policies. Community policing is a very effective way for police agencies to get back in touch with the very communities that need their services the most. However, there are several stumbling blocks to executing a successful program. These are problems that can be avoided without much difficulty if the leadership of the department is foresighted enough to take several factors into account before beginning any ambitious program. The most salient problems are discussed in the following pages.

Structural Problems

Most of the problems with achieving a good community policing program have to do with the inherent tension

between police administrators, middle management, and line officers. Problems can also arise when specialized units are set up to accomplish community policing tasks. The problems are compounded when these units are separated from the normal chain of command in a department. There are also problems with trying to implement this type of a program within a traditional, centralized police management structure. Two other important factors that can hinder a community policing effort are the traditional police culture exhibited by patrol officers and a lack of communication between the administration and the workers responsible for carrying out the program. Somewhat surprisingly, in reviewing the literature on community policing to see how these problems can be addressed, it was found that the communities involved were not the major cause of a program failing, but rather the police agencies involved, both officers and administration (e. g. Brown 1989; Gaffigan 1994; Kelling and Bratton 1993). The major problem seems to be with the rigid paramilitary structure of most police departments where programs and directives are handed down from the top to be implemented by the bottom without any real input from those responsible for the success of the program.

A good portion of this structure is a holdover from the days of corruption in the last century as well as the

early part of this century. Many departments became more centralized in their authority and deployed their officers in such a way that corruption would be minimized. The price for this change was high, however, according to Kelling and Wilson (1989). This created a situation that they term "stranger policing" where communities no longer knew the officers that patrolled their neighborhoods. Compare this to the situation that existed during the political era of policing, where the officer and the community were one and the same. The idea of "stranger policing" is antithetical to the idea of community policing.

This concept of stranger policing is echoed by Murphy (1992:117) when he states, "in many cities, those who live or work in a neighborhood do not know the police officers responsible for protecting them." He also believes that this condition leads to anger and frustration on both sides, with the public upset at the apparent aloofness of the police and the police "suspicious and cynical towards strangers" (Murphy 1992:117). This goes against the idea of policing in a democracy, where the individuals being protected know the individuals who are doing the protecting (Murphy 1992).

A more radical view of how stranger policing came about is given by Robinson (1978). He believes that the

separation of the police from the people was a deliberate undertaking by the upper class. According to Robinson (1978), the police and the people had to be alienated in order to get the police to fulfill their function of protecting owners from laborers and supporting them in disputes. Under this concept, community policing is a way to reunite a police and public that were manipulated away from one another.

Managerial Problems with Community Policing

In any case, it seems that improper managerial processes can spell doom for a community policing program. Several researchers and police administrators have written about this problem. They document how departments can either minimize or maximize the risk of failure for their programs.

Kelling and Bratton (1993) examined three departments where the community policing program had been attempted and failed. According to the authors, an administration must give ownership of the program and problems to the officers who must carry out the objectives of the program (Kelling and Bratton 1993). The Dallas police chief's community policing effort is an especially good example of how detectives, a strong union, and building a program in secrecy can lead to its ultimate failure. According to the

researchers, the police administration put together the entire community policing program without consulting their officers or investigators. When they began to implement the program, they met widespread and organized resistance from the people that were going to be tasked with carrying out the new paradigm. This eventually led to the death of the program (Kelling and Bratton 1993). They also show how this same type of thinking sabotaged the community policing efforts in Cincinnati and Kansas City (Kelling and Bratton 1993).

Brown (1989) also points out how traditional police managerial styles are not conducive to a smooth or lasting community policing program. He believes that departments have to take community policing as a philosophy, not just a program to be executed by the officers (Brown 1989). Failure to do so may lead to the demise of any program started (Brown 1989).

One managerial style that hampers community policing efforts is that of centralized authority. According to most researchers, a police department must achieve some form of decentralization to ensure a successful program. In other words, the street officer must be given more autonomy to make decisions about the handling of the area he or she patrols. Brown (1989) points out the importance of this factor by stating:

> The decentralization of authority and structure is another component of community policing. Roles are changed as the authority to participate in the decision making process expands significantly. The expansion of such authority in turn makes it necessary to alter organizational functions throughout the department. (5)

This point is also supported by a Bureau of Justice Assistance monograph on implementing community policing. This document indicates that broad shifts in power have to be made when patrol officers begin to make managerial type decisions about the problems on their beat (Gaffigan 1994). The anticipated result of this decentralization will be a flatter, more efficient agency that allows more innovation among its officers.

This same monograph also stresses that part of this change has to involve giving patrol officers long term commitments to the neighborhoods they patrol (Gaffigan 1994). In other words, administrators can not pull and move their officers from one beat to another to keep the officer from forming bonds with the community in fear that corruption will follow. A close collaboration between line officers and supervisors is also emphasized. However, they warn that this supervision should be consistent, not constant as is the case with most traditional police agencies (Gaffigan 1994). This is a throwback to the reform era with its classical style of management. In this style officers are treated as parts of a machine rather

than the independent problem solvers that are required by community policing programs.

Some of Goldstein's (1990) work also points out the advantages of decentralization by making a reference to some Japanese police practices. He examines the use of community surveys, police sponsorship of activities, and the use of group decision making by Japanese administrators. According to Goldstein (1990) it is this use of beat officers as an integral part of the decision process that, in part, makes Japanese community policing successful. American police administrators rarely consult their line officers when formulating policy. Toch (1980:493) has written about this lack of input from the rank and file and states that as long as their opinions are not sought, then there is no justification for complaining when line officers refuse to take part in prescribed programs given by outsiders. Failure to consult the bodies that represent these officers can also have a disastrous effect on a community policing program. A good example is the union based demise of the Dallas community policing effort. This program was derailed when the chief failed to consult the union before implementing his sweeping program (Kelling and Bratton 1993).

Another managerial policy that hampers community policing efforts is the emphasis of arrest over the

alternative solutions that community policing requires.
This reliance on statistics to justify manpower and budget
requests can lead to a self-perpetuating system where the
statistics may be manipulated in order to fulfill some
other, more political goal of the department (McCleary,
Nienstedt, and Ervin, 1994). Still, many departments
believe that the true measure of an officer is the number
of arrests he or she makes. This is a holdover from the
reform era when crime reporting became a central focus.
While community policing is not soft on crime, it does
mandate that problems may have to be solved with means
other than arrest.

There are problems with relying solely on statistics.
Crime rates seem to go up when community policing is
started. Many traditionalists might be tempted to say that
this is an indication that community policing does not
work. However, this curiosity has been documented in the
literature. Lovrich (1976) states that crime reporting
trends upward when the public becomes less wary of the
police. This indicates that an initial upward trend in
crime reporting may be due to better citizen-police
communication.

Related to this is how a traditional reward system can
be another hindrance in implementing community policing.
Traditionally officers are rewarded for the number of

arrests they make. According to Gaffigan (1994), rewarding behaviors that enhance the quality of life in a neighborhood may be more appropriate and encourage officers to engage in more community based activities.

A good example of how a fledgling program was forced into more traditional methods can be seen with the Seattle, Washington police department. When their community policing effort began, they formed a precinct anti-crime team (DeWitt 1992). Charged with finding ways to fight narcotics dealing in South Seattle this team used non-traditional methods to disrupt the drug trade. Despite community support and early successes this program was restructured to fall in line with department policy and more emphasis was placed on arrest (DeWitt 1992). This caused the program to fall into disfavor with the public and had little effect on other crimes that respond to problem solving techniques, such as burglary, panhandling, and code violations, in the area. These are the types of crimes that most people list when asked what bothers them most about their neighborhood. It is important to note however, that Seattle now has a functioning community policing program with the South Seattle Crime Prevention Council (SSCPC). This was achieved by allowing the community to have more input into what the police targeted in their neighborhood (DeWitt 1992).

This brings up another point that recurs in the literature about community policing: the importance of communication. It is very important that communication be open and two way when implementing these programs. Input must be received from the neighborhood and from the officers that patrol those areas. Cronin (1994), in article for the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, outlines the Norfolk, Virginia police department's Police Assisted Community Enforcement (PACE) program. In this program several interagency teams have been established to better communications between the different service agencies involved (Cronin 1994). For example, the Neighborhood Environmental Assessment Team (NEAT) is responsible for environmental concerns in the targeted neighborhoods. Comprised of members from such agencies as Public Health, Building Codes and Enforcement, and Public Works, information that is received from the community about these matters is sure to get to the proper city agency (Cronin 1994).

Line Officers and Problems with Community Policing

One final impediment to setting up a community policing strategy is the selling of the program to the line officer, and the breaking through of the police culture that binds his or her mind to traditional ways of policing.

Lee P. Brown of the Houston Police addresses this problem
with several strategies. According to Brown (1989),
several things must be accomplished if a department is to
be successful at community policing: it must break down the
barriers to change, educate supervisors and rank and file
to the merits of community policing, demonstrate a
willingness to experiment with new ideas, and provide a
training ground for community policing and strategies,
among other things. In other words, the administration
must work hard at educating their street officers and
provide them the support needed to work under this new
strategy.

Gaffigan (1994) also addresses selling the program to
patrol officers. They advise that the new program can not
appear to be "soft" on crime or appear to be social work.
It is also important to include middle managers in any
formulation of a plan. According to Gaffigan (1994), this
may avert any perceived threats from the greater autonomy
of the patrol officers. This also looks back to the idea
of open communication for a department undergoing change.

The West Palm Beach Police Department's COP program,
discussed earlier, implemented several strategies that
ensured its success. The first was in its selection
process for the officers involved. Each had to demonstrate
not only a commitment to community activities and

involvement, but also a commitment to non-traditional policing strategies (Liou and Savage 1996). Next, they were given 40 hours of training in problem solving techniques that also included other city agencies. They also placed the officers in each community on a full time basis. This allowed the officers to look at long term solutions to any problems encountered thereby avoiding the reform era trap of reactive policing. The officers employed proven techniques such as foot and bike patrols, and used vehicles only as transportation to and from their areas of responsibility.

Much research has been done on officers' attitudes and attitude changes in regard to Community Policing (Wycoff and Skogan 1994; Wilson and Bennett 1994; Rosenbaum, et al. 1994; Greene 1989; Lurigio and Skogan 1994). Most of this research examines how attitudes change in relation to work, satisfaction with work, community policing, or management structure. These studies look at the large issues of organizational change, structure, and training, and how these changes affect the officer.

Wycoff and Skogan (1994) in a study of the previously mentioned Madison, Wisconsin project surveyed all sworn personnel in the Madison Police Department. Two surveys were sent, the first in 1987 and the second in 1989. The purpose of the survey was to determine whether the

officers, after the implementation of Edward Deming style management practices, believed that the department was practicing a participatory management style (Wycoff and Skogan 1994). While the entire department was trained in this management style, it was only emphasized as a practice in the Experimental Police District.

The researchers found positive and significant relationships between belief of participatory management and satisfaction with work, the organization, supervision, and job growth potential (Wycoff and Skogan 1994). There were increased perceptions of significance of work, task identity, and work autonomy (Wycoff and Skogan 1994). The research only looked at the relationships between management and officers and officers and citizens. It did not examine the relationship between officers in the Experimental Police District and the rest of the department.

Wilson and Bennett (1994) attempted to look at officers' perceptions of Community Policing in the Louisville, Kentucky police department. They used a self administered questionnaire in four police districts to determine changes in attitudes towards community policing. They found positive and negative relationships and attributed this to the wide variation in implementing community policing within the department (Wilson and

Bennett 1994). They also requested that the officers place the last four digits of their social security number on the questionnaires. They believed that this may have invalidated the study since it raised a confidentiality issue among the officers (Wilson and Bennett 1994).

Rosenbaum, et al.(1994) examined a well funded Community Policing program in Joliet, Illinois. They tracked officers' perceptions and behaviors over a 2 year period following the implementation of the program by using three waves of surveys. While the study showed no changes in attitudes towards management practices or job satisfaction, it did document positive changes in attitudes and knowledge towards Community Policing as well as positive changes in some street level behaviors (Rosenbaum, et al. 1994). They went on to argue that while short term demonstration projects worked well, the organization had not changed sufficiently to sustain a long term effort This study was primarily concerned with how organizational change affects officer's attitudes in reference to Community Policing. It also examined how these changes affected their skills and knowledge with regard to Community Policing.

HYPOTHESES

In reviewing the literature, many studies were found that addressed issues involving officers' perceptions and attitudes concerning management structure, community policing, citizens, and the effect that instituting a community policing program has on them. No study was found that examined what happens if a specialized unit is set up to do only Community Policing, separate from any other function.

Based on the previous studies (Wycoff and Skogan 1994; Liou and Savage 1996; Rosenbaum, et al. 1994) that have shown increased levels of officer satisfaction with successful community policing programs, this study will hypothesize that officers assigned to specialized community policing units will exhibit these increases. That is, they will feel more rewarded, will perceive their work as important, and since community policing is important to police departments (Kelling and Bratton 1993), they will receive more resources for their tasks. Further, these factors will lead to conflict and reduced cooperation between community policing officers and line officers that do not have the same access to the benefits of community policing. Also, since community policing is only approximately 10 years old, there will be variations in

perceived amounts of training between officers with 10 or more years as compared to officers with less than 10 years.

This study will be performed on the Norfolk, Virginia Police Department. This department has a community policing program known as Police Assisted Community Enforcement (PACE). The philosophy behind this program is that the police must work to keep neighborhoods safe by forming partnerships with the community and other city services. The idea being that the neighborhood will define what is important to them in the way of crime, and the police will assist them by providing resources through which they can regain control of where they live. While under the Norfolk plan every officer is considered a PACE (community policing) officer, they have formed a small group of officers (PACE officers) who devote full time services to the neighborhoods they work. These officers are not responsible for calls for service. They perform their community policing duties full time within the areas they are assigned. While this program has been commended as a success by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, the dynamics between the patrol and PACE officers was not studied. The hypotheses that will explore the relationships in this department are as follows:

1) Line officers will perceive that they are rewarded less than Community Policing officers.

2) Line officers will report low levels of cooperation with the community policing unit.

3) Due to the high profile of community policing projects, line officers will perceive that their work is regarded as less important than that of community policing officers by police administrators.

4) Since Community Policing officers are not responsible for handling calls for service to the same extent that line officers are, line officers will perceive themselves as having the greater workload.

5) Officers with more than 10 years of experience will have less accurate definitions of community policing.

6) A higher proportion of officers with more than 10 or more years of experience will report inadequate perceptions of training than officers with less than 10 years of experience.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

SAMPLE

For this study, a survey was administered to members of the Norfolk, Virginia Police Department. As of November 1997, the department consisted of 721 sworn personnel. Of these 721 members, 689 were permanent officers while 32 had been hired under federal grants. The rank structure of the department starts with chief, then moves down through assistant chief, captain, lieutenant, sergeant, corporal, patrol officer II, and patrol officer I (this is a probationary rank held by officers in their first year; the promotion to POII is automatic at the end of this period). The study population consisted of all patrol officers and patrol supervisors assigned to the First and Second Patrol Divisions, along with the patrol officers assigned to the Police Assisted Community Enforcement (PACE) units within each patrol division. In addition, Community Resource Officers (CROs) are assigned to do community policing in the public housing communities. For this analysis, PACE officers refer to both PACE unit officers and CROs. Patrol supervisors are those sworn personnel that have attained the rank of corporal or sergeant. The First Patrol Division consists of 156 patrol officers, 11 sergeants, and 13

corporals. The First Patrol PACE Unit consists of 10 patrol

officers. The Second Patrol Division has 147 patrol

officers, 11 sergeants, and 13 corporals. The Second Patrol

PACE Unit consists of 9 patrol officers. There are 9 CROs.

The chain of command for the patrol divisions starts

with the division commander, a captain. Next in line is the

executive officer, a lieutenant. The three sector

lieutenants report to the executive officer. There are

three platoons in each division, each of which has three

sergeants (one for each sector), and 2 corporals. The

corporals report to the sergeants and the sergeants report

to the lieutenants. The patrol officers report to the

corporals and sergeants. The PACE officers are in a unique

situation in that they bypass the sergeants and corporals

and report directly to the sector lieutenants. Since the

entire population of these units were sampled, from the rank

of sergeant down, no special sampling strategy was needed.

The survey was administered during roll calls over a

period of two days. Since the officers work rotating days

off as well as rotating shifts, surveys were left with the

patrol supervisors for those officers that were not present

during those days. No attempt was made to survey officers

who were on sick leave or annual vacation during the period

of the survey.

Human Subjects approval for this survey was granted by Old Dominion University in October of 1997 (reference ALHSR 97-009). The survey was anonymous and subjects were instructed to not place their names on the questionnaire (see appendix). There were no questions on the survey that would have caused embarrassment, either on a personal or professional level.

MEASUREMENT OF THE VARIABLES

The survey was designed to measure feelings of rewards, levels of cooperation between PACE and Patrol officers, importance of work, perceived workload, definitions of community policing, and perceptions of levels of training in community policing. Separate surveys were developed for the patrol divisions and the PACE units (see appendices). Both surveys are identical with the exception of the attitudinal questions. The attitudinal questions differ in that they are asked from each unit's perspective.

The attitudinal section of the survey was designed to measure how well the units cooperate with each other as well as to determine the source of any friction or animosity between them. These statements addressed specific issues raised by the hypotheses. The respondents were asked to indicate whether they strongly disagreed, disagreed, agreed, or strongly agreed with each statement.

The next three statements determined whether there was a difference in perceptions of rewards between the two groups as well as examined perceived workload and work importance: 1) The work I do as a PACE/Patrol officer often goes unnoticed due to the work in the Patrol division/PACE unit; 2) The work that both the PACE units and Patrol divisions perform are equally important in the eyes of the administration; and 3) In comparison to the PACE/patrol division officers I am well rewarded for my effort. In addition, the officers were asked to rate their workload as compared to the other group.

The following two statements were used to determine how well the units cooperate with one another: 1) I often consult with the PACE/Patrol officers in regard to problem solving strategies that could be used in my district; and 2) The PACE units and Patrol divisions fully cooperate with one another.

The next question determined whether the officers felt that PACE is a help or a drain to the department: 1) PACE is a useful policing philosophy.

In addition to these questions, the patrol division survey contained one additional statement designed to measure the officers' perceptions on how well the PACE unit responded to their concerns: The PACE unit responds quickly to problems that I have pointed out in my district.

This question was asked to determine if the department needs to make the PACE officers more responsive to the patrol division. It should also be noted that for ease of analysis, the four response categories for these statements were compressed to two, agree or disagree.

To measure perceived training level, the officers were asked to check a statement that best reflected their training level. The statements were: I did not need any training, I did not need as much training as I got, I got just the right amount of training, I could have used just a little more training, and I could have used a lot more training. These categories were collapsed into two categories, feel adequately trained and needs more training.

There are also three questions on the patrol division survey just for the patrol supervisors. These questions were designed to ascertain whether the supervisors feel that PACE is a help or hindrance to their duties, and whether PACE represents a drain of needed manpower. The questions, which have yes or no responses, are as follows: 1) Do you feel that you are adequately staffed at this time? 2) Have you ever had to deny leave to a member of your platoon due to a shortage of officers? 3) Do you feel that PACE is a help to your duties as a sector supervisor?

The independent variable for this study is current duty assignment (patrol division or PACE unit). The control

variables are, number of years as a Norfolk police officer (0 to 2, 3 to 5, 6 to 10, 11 to 15, 16 to 20, and over 20), and educational level (High school diploma or GED, vocational-technical certificate, one or more semesters of college, associate's degree, bachelor's degree, and attended or completed graduate school). The variable for years as a Norfolk police officer will be compressed from six categories to two, 10 years and less and more than ten years. Since the PACE program has only been in existence since 1989 any variation should be evident between these two groups. The educational variable was also collapsed into two categories, no college degree for the first three categories and college degree for the last three.

Descriptive and inferential statistics were run using the student version of SPSS for windows. The independent variables were crosstabulated with the responses to the attitudinal statements. Chi-squares were calculated to assess significant relationships.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The student version of SPSS for Windows was used to perform the analysis of the survey data. Inferential and descriptive statistics were obtained and will be given in this chapter. The nature of this study dictates that the majority of the findings will be descriptive.

SAMPLE DESCRIPTION

The sample consisted of Norfolk Police officers assigned to the patrol divisions, PACE and Community Resource Officer units. At the end of the collection period, 200 surveys were received. Copies of the surveys are in the appendix. Of the surveys, 175 were from patrol officers (88.4 percent of the sample, 49.9 percent of the total patrol division) and 23 were from the community policing officers (11.6 percent of the sample, 82.1 percent of the total community policing population). Two respondents declined to give their duty assignment and were eliminated from the bivariate and multivariate analyses. Table 1 gives the demographic breakdown of the officers. Table 2 contains the same information split by duty assignment. In this sample, 56.8 percent (n=113) of the officers had 0 to 10 years of law enforcement experience,

Table 1. Sample Description

Variable Categories	n	valid % total=200
Years as a law enforcement officer.		
0 to 2 years	43	21.6
3 to 5 years	37	18.5
6 to 10 years	33	16.6
11 to 15 years	32	16.1
16 to 20 years	24	12.1
over 20 years	30	15.1
missing	1	
Years as a Norfolk Police officer		
0 to 2 years	59	29.6
3 to 5 years	26	13.1
6 to 10 years	31	15.6
11 to 15 years	35	17.6
16 to 20 years	22	11.1
over 20 years	26	13.1
missing	1	
Highest level of education attained		
high school diploma	36	18.0
vocational-technical certificate	5	2.5
one or more semesters of college	85	42.5
Associates degree	32	16.0
Bachelor's degree	36	18.0
attended or completed graduate school	6	3.0
missing	0	
Age		
under 30	55	27.8
30 to 39	88	44.4
40 and over	55	27.8
missing	2	
Duty assignment		
patrol division	175	88.4
PACE unit	23	11.6
missing	2	
Time in assignment		
0 to 2 years	102	51.5
3 to 5 years	46	23.2
6 to 10 years	26	13.1
11 to 15 years	15	7.6
16 to 20 years	4	2.0
over 20 years	5	2.5
missing	2	

Table 2. Sample Description by Duty Assignment

Variable Categories	Patrol n	%	PACE n	%
Years as a law enforcement officer.				
0 to 2 years	43	24.6	0	0
3 to 5 years	36	20.6	1	4.3
6 to 10 years	25	14.3	8	34.8
11 to 15 years	25	14.3	7	30.4
16 to 20 years	21	12.0	3	13.0
over 20 years	25	14.3	4	17.4
missing		1		
Years as a Norfolk Police officer				
0 to 2 years	59	33.7	0	0
3 to 5 years	25	14.3	1	4.3
6 to 10 years	23	13.1	8	34.8
11 to 15 years	27	15.4	8	34.8
16 to 20 years	20	11.4	2	8.7
over 20 years	21	12.0	4	17.4
missing		1		
Highest level of education attained				
high school diploma	31	17.7	5	21.7
vocational-technical certificate	5	2.9	0	0
one or more semesters of college	73	41.7	12	52.2
Associates degree	28	16.0	4	17.4
Bachelor's degree	33	18.9	2	8.7
attended or completed graduate school	5	2.9	0	0
missing		0		
Age				
under 30	54	31.0	1	4.3
30 to 39	72	41.4	16	69.6
40 and over	48	27.6	6	26.1
missing		3		
Time in assignment				
0 to 2 years	90	51.4	12	54.5
3 to 5 years	40	22.9	6	27.3
6 to 10 years	23	13.1	3	13.6
11 to 15 years	14	8.0	1	4.5
16 to 20 years	4	2.3	0	0
over 20 years	4	2.3	0	0
missing		2		

while 43.3 percent (n=86) had 11 to over 20 years
experience. One respondent declined to answer to this
question and was also eliminated from the analyses.

The next question asked how long the officer had been
in his/her current duty assignment. Of those responding,
51.5 percent (n=102) had been in their assignment for two
years or less, 23.2 percent (n=46) had been there for three
to five years, 13.1 percent (n=26) had been in there
assignment for six to 10 years, 7.6 percent (n=15) for 11
to 15 years, two percent (n=4) for 16 to 20 years, and 2.5
percent (n=5) for more than 20 years.

Age and educational level were also asked. In the
overall sample, 27.8 percent (n=55) of the officers are
under 30, 44.4 percent (n=88) are 30 to 39, while 27.8
percent (n=55) are 40 and over. The education variable was
collapsed from six categories to two in order to make the
analysis easier and to bring out any stronger
relationships. The original six categories were high
school diploma, vocational-technical certificate, one or
more semesters of college, associate's degree, bachelor's
degree, and attended or completed graduate school. These
were collapsed into no college degree and college degree.
Under this condition, 63 percent (n=126) of the officers
have no degree while 37 percent (n=74) have a college
degree.

Since this project dealt with the Norfolk Police
department specifically, as well as examining training
issues, it was important to take into account the training
done within the department. The Norfolk Police department
has been training its officers in community policing since
1989. Originally the variable years as a Norfolk Police
officer had 6 categories: 0 to two years, 3 to 5 years, 6
to 10 years, 11 to 15 years, 16 to 20 years, and over 20
years. This was collapsed into 2 categories, 0 to 10 years
with the Norfolk Police and over 10 years with the Norfolk
Police. This division was based on the year that community
policing training was started in earnest. At the time of
the survey 58.3 percent (n=116) of the officers had been
with the department 10 years or less and 41.8 percent
(n=83) had been with the department more than 10 years.
Again one respondent did not answer this question and was
eliminated from the analyses.

HYPOTHESES

Table 3 gives the percent of officers agreeing to
questions that reference the first three hypotheses by duty
assignment. These questions were Likert scale items with
the responses strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly
disagree. These categories were collapsed from the
original four to two, agree and disagree.

Table 3. **Percent Agreeing with Each Item by Duty Assignment**

Item	Patrol %	PACE %	p
Hypothesis 1			
I am rewarded as well as PACE/Patrol officers for my effort.	20.2	65.2	*
Hypothesis 2			
I often consult with PACE/Patrol officers in regard to problem solving strategies that could be used in my district.	31.6	60.9	*
The PACE units and Patrol Divisions fully cooperate with one another.	28.2	52.2	*
Hypothesis 3			
My work often goes unnoticed due to high profile PACE/Patrol projects.	56.4	60.9	
The work that both the PACE units and Patrol Divisions perform are equally important in the eyes of the police administration.	39.2	78.3	*

* significant at the .01 level

The statement "I am rewarded as well as PACE/Patrol officers for my effort" dealt with feelings of rewards for both groups and served to test the first hypothesis. Only 20.2 percent of the patrol officers felt they were as well rewarded as the PACE officers. Alternatively, 65.2 percent of the PACE officers felt they were as well rewarded as their patrol counterparts.

For hypothesis two, only 31.6 percent of the patrol officers agreed with the statement "I often consult with PACE/Patrol officers in regard to problem solving strategies that could be used in my district." Conversely, 60.9 percent of the PACE officers agreed with this statement. The second statement used to test the second hypothesis referred to cooperation between the two groups. The statement "The PACE units and the Patrol Divisions fully cooperate with one another" drew a 28.2 percent agreement from the patrol officers. This same statement drew a significantly different 52.2 percent agreement from the PACE officers.

The statement, "My work often goes unnoticed due to high profile PACE/Patrol projects" was used to test hypothesis three. This item drew 56.4 percent agreement from the patrol officers and a 60.9 percent agreement from the PACE units, but the difference was not statistically significant. The next statement used to test hypothesis

three was "The work that both the PACE units and Patrol Divisions perform are equally important in the eyes of the police administration." This item elicited significantly different responses from the two groups. The patrol officers had a 39.2 percent agreement rate while 78.3 percent of the PACE officers agreed with the statement.

Table 4 illustrates the results of the crosstabulations run to test the first three hypotheses while controlling for years with the Norfolk Police. Among the officers with less than 10 years of experience, 26.5 percent (n=27) of the patrol officers agreed with the reward item, while 55.6 (n=5) of the PACE officers agreed with the reward statement. Among the officers with more than 10 years on the department, 10.6 percent (n=7) of the patrol officers agreed with the reward item while 71.4 percent of the PACE officers agreed.

Hypothesis two examines the cooperation between the units. In regard to the first item, 32.1 percent (n=34) of the officers with less than 10 years on the department agreed with the consulting statement. This is in comparison to 44.4 percent (n=4) agreement of the PACE officers. Among the officers with more than 10 years on the department, 30.9 percent (n=21) of the patrol group agreed while 57.1 percent (n=8) of the PACE officers with more than 10 years agreed. For the second statement, which

Table 4. Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3, Percent Agreeing with Each Item by Duty Assignment Controlling for Years with Norfolk Police

Hypothesis Statement	Years at Norfolk Police					
	10 years or less			More than 10 years		
	Patrol n %	PACE n %	p	Patrol n %	PACE n %	p
Hypothesis 1						
I am rewarded as well as PACE/Patrol officers for my effort.	27 26.5	5 55.6		7 10.6	10 71.4	*
Hypothesis 2						
I often consult with PACE/Patrol officers in regard to problem solving strategies that could be used in my district.	34 32.1	4 44.4		21 30.9	10 71.4	*
The PACE units and Patrol Divisions fully cooperate with one another.	39 37.9	4 44.4		9 13.4	8 57.1	*
Hypothesis 3						
My work often goes unnoticed due to high profile PACE/Patrol projects.	48 46.2	6 66.7		49 72.1	8 57.1	
The work that both the PACE units and Patrol Divisions perform are equally important in the eyes of the police administration.	53 50.5	8 88.9	**	14 21.2	10 71.4	*

 * significant at the .01 level
** significant at the .05 level

referred directly to cooperation, 37.9 percent (n=39) of the patrol officers with 10 years or less on the department agreed while 44.4 percent (n=4) of the PACE officers with 10 years or less agreed. For those officers with more than 10 years on the department, 13.4 percent (n=9) of the patrol group agreed while 57.1 percent (n=8) of the PACE group agreed.

For hypothesis three, two items were also used. The first was the statement concerning whether or not the officers felt that their work went unnoticed in lieu of high profile projects in the other unit. Under the control condition, 46.2 percent (n=48) of the patrol officers with 10 years or less on the department agreed while 66.6 percent (n=6) of the PACE officers with 10 years or less agreed. Among the patrol officers with more than 10 years on the department, 72.1 percent (n=49) agreed while 57.1 percent of the PACE officers with more than 10 years on agreed. The second statement asked whether they felt that their work was judged as equally important as the other group by the police administration. Among those officers with 10 years or less on the department, 50.5 percent (n=53) of the patrol officers agreed with the statement, while 88.9 percent (n=8) of the PACE officers agreed. For those officers with more than 10 years on the department, 21.2 percent (n=14) of the patrol officers agreed while

71.4 percent (n=10) of the PACE officers agreed. Compared
to Table 3, the differences that appeared to support
hypotheses one and two hold only among those with 10 or
more years with the Norfolk Police. Among those who joined
the Norfolk Police after community policing began, no
significant differences in perceived reward or degree of
cooperation were found.

Table 5 gives the results of the crosstabulations for
the first three hypotheses controlling for education. With
this control added, 19.0 (n=20) percent of the patrol
officers with no college degree agreed with the reward
statement while 58.8 percent (n=10) of the PACE officers
with no degree agreed. Among those officers with college
degrees, 22.2 percent (n=14) agreed with the reward item
while 83.3 percent (n=5) of the PACE officers agreed.

For hypothesis two, 35.2 percent (n=38) of the patrol
officers with no college degree agreed with the consult
statement while 58.8 percent (n=10) of the non-degreed PACE
officers agreed. For the cooperation statement, 31.8
percent (n=34) of the patrol officers with no degree agreed
while 41.2 percent (n=7) of the PACE officers with no
degree agreed with that item. Among those officers with
college degrees, 25.8 percent (n=17) of the patrol officers
agreed with the consult statement while 66.7 percent (n=4)
of the PACE officers agreed.

Table 5. Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3, Percent Agreeing with Each Item by Duty Assignment Controlling for Education

	Education					
	No college degree			College degree		
Hypothesis Statement	Patrol	PACE		Patrol	PACE	
	n	n		n	n	
	%	%	p	%	%	p
Hypothesis 1						
I am rewarded as well as	20	10		14	5	
PACE/Patrol officers for	19.0	58.8	*	22.2	83.3	*
my effort.						
Hypothesis 2						
I often consult with	38	10		17	4	
PACE/Patrol officers in	35.2	58.8		25.8	66.7	**
regard to problem solving						
strategies that could be						
used in my district.						
The PACE units and Patrol	34	7		14	5	
Divisions fully cooperate	31.8	41.2		22.2	83.3	*
with one another.						
Hypothesis 3						
My work often goes	64	11		33	3	
unnoticed due to high	59.3	64.7		51.6	50.0	
profile PACE/Patrol projects.						
The work that both the PACE	49	14		18	4	
units and Patrol Divisions	45.0	82.2	*	29.0	66.7	*
perform are equally important						
in the eyes of the police						
administration.						

* significant at the .01 level
** significant at the .05 level

The work unnoticed statement for hypothesis three got a 59.3 percent (n=64) agreement rate from the patrol respondents with no degree while 64.7 percent (n=11) of the non-degreed PACE officers agreed with the statement. Among those officers with a college degree, 51.6 percent (n=33) agreed with the work unnoticed item while 50.0 percent (n=3) of the PACE officers agreed.

The work importance statement for hypothesis three elicited a 45.0 percent (n=49) response from the patrol officers with no college degree and an 82.4 percent (n=14) agreement rate from the PACE officers with no degree. For those officers with a college degree, 29.0 percent (n=18) of the patrol group agreed with the item while 66.7 percent (n=4) of the PACE group agreed. Compared to Table 3, the significant differences between the Patrol and PACE officers appear to hold with the exception of hypothesis two. No significant differences were found in degree of cooperation among officers with no college degree.

Table 6 deals with hypothesis four and gives the perceived workload by duty assignment crosstabulations. According to this table, 75.4 percent (n=126) of the patrol officers feel that they have more work than the PACE officers. Conversely, 60.9 percent (n=14) of the PACE officers feel that they have more work than their patrol counterparts. For the second workload item, 19.8 percent

Table 6. Hypothesis 4-Perceived Workload by Duty
Assignment

Category	Patrol n %	PACE n %
How does your overall workload compare to that of those in the PACE unit/Patrol Division?		
I have more work.	126 75.4	14 60.9
I have about the same amount of work.	33 19.8	7 30.4
I have less work	8 4.8	2 8.7

not significant at the .05 level

(n=33) of the patrol officers and 30.4 percent (n=7) of the PACE officers feel that both groups have the same amount of work. For the last item, only 4.8 percent (n=8) of the patrol officers believe that they have less work than the PACE officers. This is compared to the 8.7 percent (n=2) of the PACE respondents that believe they have less work than the patrol officers.

Table 7 also deals with hypothesis four. This table gives the same crosstabulations as table 6 but includes the control variable for years with Norfolk Police. Of the patrol officers that had been with the department 10 years or less (at the time of the survey) 68.0 percent (n=70) said that they worked harder than their PACE counterparts, 26.2 percent (n=27) believed they had the same amount of work, and 5.8 percent (n=6) said they had less work. Of the PACE officers with the same control, 44.4 percent (n=4) stated that they had more work than the patrol group, another 44.4 percent (n=4) stated they the workload was equal, and one respondent said that he/she had less work.

Of those patrol officers with more than 10 years on the department, 87.5 percent (n=56) believe that they work harder than the PACE group, 9.4 percent (n=6) believe the workloads are the same, and two respondents say they have less work. Of the PACE officers with more than 10 years on the Norfolk Police department, 71.4 percent (n=10) state

Table 7. Hypothesis 4-Perceived Workload by Duty Assignment Controlling for Years with Norfolk Police

	Years at Norfolk Police			
	10 years or less		More than 10 years	
Categories	Patrol	PACE	Patrol	PACE
	n	n	n	n
	%	%	%	%
I have more work.	70	4	56	10
	68.0	44.4	87.5	71.4
I have about the same amount of work.	27	4	6	3
	26.2	44.4	9.4	21.4
I have less work	6	1	2	1
	5.8	11.1	3.1	7.1

no significant differences at the .05 level

that they have the greater workload, 21.4 percent (n=3) say they workloads are equal, while one respondent said the workload was less for the PACE unit.

Table 8 gives the perceived workload by duty assignment crosstabulations while controlling for education. In this table 71.4 percent (n=75) of the patrol group with no college degree believes they work harder than the PACE officers. In comparison, 64.7 percent (n=11) of the non-degreed PACE officers claim to have a greater workload than the patrol group. Among those patrol officers with no degree, 21.9 percent (n=23) stated that they had the same amount of work as their PACE counterparts. In the PACE group, 23.5 percent (n=4) of the officers with no degree believed that the workloads were equal. For the last category, 6.7 percent (n=7) of the non-degreed patrol officers felt they had less work than the PACE officers while 11.8 percent (n=2) of the non-degreed PACE officers said they worked less than the patrol group.

Of those patrol officers with a college degree, 82.3 percent (n=51) believe they have the greater workload, 16.1 percent (n=10) believed that the groups had the same amount of work, while 1.6 percent (n=1) said they had less work. Of the college educated PACE officers, 50.0 percent (n=3) stated that they had more work, 50.0 percent said that the

Table 8. Hypothesis 4-Perceived Workload by Duty Assignment Controlling for Education

Categories	Education			
	No college degree		College degree	
	Patrol	PACE	Patrol	PACE
	n	n	n	n
	%	%	%	%
I have more work.	75	11	51	3
	71.4	64.7	82.3	50.0
I have about the same amount of work.	23	4	10	3
	21.9	23.5	16.1	50.0
I have less work	7	2	1	0
	6.7	11.8	1.6	0.0

no significant differences at the .05 level

workloads were the same, and none believed that they had
less work. Although there were differences in perceived
workload shown in Tables six, seven, and eight, none of the
differences were statistically significant.

Table 9 deals with information gathered for hypothesis
five. This hypothesis examines differences in community
policing definitions between officers with 10 years or less
experience on the department and those with more than 10
years. It did this by asking officers to rate how
important several statements were to the success of a
community policing program. Two statements were designed
to get at the importance of the philosophy of community
policing: 1) The community should be an integral part of
the decision making process, 2) Allowing the community to
define their problems. The rest of the statements dealt
with community policing techniques: 1) Techniques such as
foot patrols, 2) Techniques such as bike patrols,
3) Working with community organizations.

According to the table, of those officers with 10
years or less on the department, 7.0 percent (n=8) rated
the community as decision makers statement as not
important, 67.5 percent (n=77) rated it as important, and
25.4 (n=29) rated it as very important. For officers with
more than 10 years, 13.4 percent (n=11) rated the statement
as not important, 64.6 percent (n=53) rated it as

Table 9. Hypothesis 5-Ratings of Community Policing Statements by Years with Norfolk Police

	TEN YEARS OR LESS			MORE THAN 10 YEARS		
	not important	important	very important	not important	important	very important
Statements	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %
The community should be an integral part of the decision making process.	8 7.0	77 67.5	29 25.4	11 13.4	53 64.6	18 22.0
Techniques such as foot patrols.	14 12.2	78 67.8	23 20.0	11 13.3	57 68.7	15 18.1
Techniques such as bike patrols.	2 1.7	60 52.2	53 46.1	8 9.6	55 66.3	20 24.1
Working with community organizations.	1 .9	70 60.9	44 38.3	3 3.6	54 65.1	26 31.3
Allowing the community to define their problems.	2 1.7	70 60.9	43 37.4	7 8.4	49 59.0	27 32.5

no significant differences at the .05 level

important, and 22.0 percent (n=18) rated it as very important.

The next statement rated the importance of foot patrols to community policing. Of those officers with 10 years or less with the department, 12.2 percent (n=14) rated them as not important, 67.8 percent (n=78) rated them as important, and 20.0 percent (n=23) rated them as very important. Among the officers with more than 10 years, 13.3 percent (n=11) rated the foot patrols as not important, 68.7 percent (n=57) rated them as important, and 18.1 percent (n=15) rated them as very important.

The importance of bike patrols was rated next. Of the officers with 10 years or less, 2 respondents rated them as not important, 52.2 percent (n=60) rated them as important, and 46.1 percent (n=53) rated them as very important. Of the officers with more than 10 years on the department, 9.6 percent (n=8) rated the bike patrols as not important, 66.3 percent (n=55) rated them as important, and 24.1 percent (n=20) rated the bikes as very important.

The next statement rated the importance of working with community organizations. Among the officers with 10 years or less, one respondent rated it as not important, 60.9 percent (n=70) rated it as important, and 38.3 percent (n=44) rated it as very important. Of the officers with 10 or more years on the department, 3.6 percent (n=3) rated

this as not important, 65.1 percent (n=54) rated it as important, and 31.3 percent (n=26) rated this as very important.

The last statement dealt with the community being allowed to define their own problems. Of the officers with 10 years or less, 1.7 percent (n=2) rated this item as not important, 60.9 percent (n=70) rated it as important, and 37.4 percent (n=43) rated it as very important. Of the officers with more than 10 years on the department, 8.4 percent (n=7) rated it not important, 59.0 percent (n=49) rated it as important, and 32.5 percent rated it as very important.

Table 10 crosstabulates the data from table 9 and controls for not having a college degree (education). An examination of this table shows that the percentages hold constant for those officers with less than 10 years experience and no college degree. The percentages differ slightly but not significantly for non-college educated officers with more than 10 years on the department. These differences may be due to the small sample size, which becomes even smaller when controlling for education.

Table 11 also uses the data from table 9 but controls for having a college degree (education). Again, small but not significant changes are seen in the answers from college educated officers with 10 years or less on the

Table 10. **Hypothesis 5-Ratings of Community Policing Statements by Years with Norfolk Police Controlling for No College Degree (Education)**

| Statements | TEN YEARS OR LESS | | | MORE THAN 10 YEARS | | |
	not important n %	important n %	very important n %	not important n %	important n %	very important n %
The community should be an integral part of the decision making process.	6 8.6	45 64.3	19 27.1	7 13.0	36 66.7	11 20.4
Techniques such as foot patrols.	10 14.1	47 66.2	14 19.7	7 13.0	38 70.4	9 16.7
Techniques such as bike patrols.	1 1.4	34 47.9	36 50.7	4 7.4	37 68.5	13 24.1
Working with community organizations.	1 .8	44 62.0	26 36.6	2 3.7	35 64.8	17 31.5
Allowing the community to define their problems.	2 1.6	44 62.0	25 35.2	2 3.7	34 63.0	18 33.3

no significant differences at the .05 level

Table 11. Hypothesis 5-Ratings of Community Policing Statements by Years with Norfolk Police Controlling for College Degree (Education)

	TEN YEARS OR LESS			MORE THAN 10 YEARS		
	not important	important	very important	not important	important	very important
Statements	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %	n %
The community should be an integral part of the decision making process.	2 4.5	32 65.3	10 22.7	4 14.3	17 60.7	7 25.0
Techniques such as foot patrols.	4 9.1	31 70.5	9 20.5	4 13.8	19 65.5	6 20.7
Techniques such as bike patrols.	1 1.4	26 59.1	17 38.6	4 13.8	18 62.1	7 24.1
Working with community organizations.	0 0.0	26 59.1	18 40.9	1 3.4	19 65.5	9 31.0
Allowing the community to define their problems.	0 0.0	26 59.1	18 40.9	5 17.2	15 51.7	9 31.0

no significant differences at the .05 level

department. The same holds true for college educated officers with more than 10 years. As with the data in table 10, these differences may be due to the small sample size.

Table 12 illustrates the results of the crosstabulations for hypothesis six. In this hypothesis perception of training was crosstabulated with years on the Norfolk Police department. The original training amount variable consisted of five statements, from which the officers were to select the one that best reflected the amount of community policing training they received. For ease of analysis these five statements were collapsed into two categories, feels adequately trained and need more training.

According to table 12, 60.9 (n=70) percent of the officers with 10 years or less with the department feel adequately trained while 39.1 percent (n=45) feel that they need more training. Of the officers with more than 10 years of experience, 45.8 percent (n=38) feel that they are adequately trained while 54.2 percent (n=45) feel that they need more training.

Table 13 examines the information from table 12 while controlling for education. For officers with 10 years or less on the department and no college degree, 56.3 percent (n=40) feel they are adequately trained while 43.7 percent

Table 12. Hypothesis 6-Perception of Training Received by Years with Norfolk Police

Categories	10 years or less			more than 10 years		
	n	%	p	n	%	p
Feel adequately trained.	70	60.9		38	45.8	
			**			**
Need more training.	45	39.1		45	54.2	

** significant at the .05 level

Table 13. Hypothesis 6-Perception of Training Received by Years with Norfolk Police Controlling for Education

| | No college degree | | | College degree | | |
Categories	10 years or less n %	more than 10 years n %	p	10 years or less n %	more than 10 years n %	p
Feel adequately trained.	40 56.3	25 46.3		30 68.2	13 44.8	
						**
Need more training.	31 43.7	29 53.7		14 31.8	16 55.2	

** significant at the .05 level

(n=31) feel they need more training. Of the non-college educated officers with more than 10 years experience, 46.3 percent (n=25) feel that they are adequately trained while 53.7 percent (n=29) state that they need more training. This relationship is not significant under this control.

For those officers with a college degree, 68.2 percent (n=30) of those with 10 years or less on the department feel adequately trained. Of those officers with a degree and more than 10 years on the department, 44.8 percent (n=13) feel adequately trained. This table demonstrates that the relationships hold steady even for those officers with a college degree. A significant portion of the officers with more than 10 years experience and a college degree report feelings of inadequate training. The next chapter will further examine the hypotheses and recommendations based on the results.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

In this chapter the results of the study will be discussed and limitations addressed. Recommendations will be given based on these findings. The purpose of this chapter will be to provide a summary for the thesis in order to conclude the study and provide possible strategies for any needed changes in the relationship between the two units.

HYPOTHESES TESTS

The first hypothesis was that line officers would perceive that they are less rewarded than the community policing officers. Only 20.2 percent of the line officers agreed with the reward statement on the survey. This is compared to 65.2 percent of the PACE group who agreed that they felt as well rewarded as the patrol officers. This difference was significant at the .01 level. When the controls for years with the department and education were introduced, significance between PACE and Patrol officers remained except for those with 10 years or less on the department. It should be noted however, that when controlling for having less than 10 years with the Norfolk Police, the percentage of patrol officers agreeing with the

reward statement still remained a low 26.5 percent.

Compared to 55.6 percent of the PACE officers. In light of these findings, the first hypothesis was supported.

Hypothesis two postulated that the line officers would report low levels of cooperation with the community policing officers, due to the separation between the two groups. According to the survey, only 31.6 percent of the patrol officers agreed with the consult statement as opposed to 60.9 percent of the PACE officers. Also, 28.2 percent of the patrol officers agreed with the cooperation statement. Conversely, 52.2 percent of the community policing officers reported full cooperation. These relationships were significant at the .01 level. When the controls for education and age were introduced some of the relationships lost significance. Controlling for 10 years or less with the department and having no college degree were examples of this situation. On the other hand, for those officers with more than 10 years on the department and those with a college degree, the relationships for the cooperation statement were significant at the .01 level. For the consult statement, controlling for officers with more than 10 years on the department also yielded a significant relationship.

In examining the findings for this hypothesis, the first reaction is to assume that the control variables are

exerting an effect on the original relationship. While they may have some effect, it is more likely that the small sample size of the community policing officers are causing the loss of significance. For example, when controlling for more than 10 years on the department, 9 patrol officers agreed with the cooperation statement while 8 community policing officers agreed. This relationship is significant only due to the small size of the community policing group.

Another possible explanation exists. In examining the first two hypotheses, significant variation occurs when controlling for more than 10 years on the department and for having a college degree. It seems that as the officers increase in time on the department and education, the less rewarded they feel as patrol officers. They also are less likely to cooperate with the community policing officers. Conversely, the community policing officers under these same conditions report feeling more rewarded and more likely to cooperate.

As officers stay in the patrol division for more than 10 years, they may begin to feel that their experience does not count for much. The officers may begin to feel stifled due to the hierarchical organizational structure of the department and the nature of patrol work. A similar mechanism may be taking place for those officers who are college educated. As a result, these officers may feel

entitled to rewards that they perceive as commensurate with
their experience and education.

On the other hand, the community policing officers
under these same conditions may feel that they are being
more rewarded due to the nature of their work. They are
allowed time to use their experience and education to deal
with the problems that they encounter. They can observe a
visible result when they are successful in a neighborhood.
This may account for the disparity when these officers are
asked to compare themselves to the other division or unit.
With these concepts in mind, hypothesis two is supported.

Hypothesis three states that due to the high profile
of community policing projects, line officers will perceive
that their work is regarded as less important than that of
the community policing officers by police administrators.
As stated in the previous chapter two statements were used
to test this hypothesis. One statement dealt with whether
or not the officers felt that their work was considered
important by police administrators while the other
addressed whether they felt that their work went unnoticed
due to the work in the other group.

For the work unnoticed statement, 56.4 percent of the
patrol officers agreed that their work went unnoticed due
to community policing projects. In the community policing
group 60.9 percent of the officers felt that their work

went unnoticed due to projects in the patrol division. This relationship was not statistically significant. When controlling for education and years on the department the relationships remained not significant.

With regard to the work importance statement, for the entire sample only 39.2 percent of the patrol officers agreed that their work was viewed as just as important as the community policing group by police administrators. On the other hand, 78.3 percent of the community policing officers agreed with this item. This relationship was significant at the .01 level. As the control variables were introduced the relationships stayed significant with the exception of the college degreed group. In this group, 18 out of 66 patrol officers with degrees agreed with the item (29.0%), while 4 out of 6 (66.7%) of the community policing officers with degrees agreed. While this relationship is not statistically significant, it does illustrate the problem of introducing control variables with a small sample. It also points out that the trend in the percentages is the same. A higher proportion of the community policing officers are agreeing with the item in question than the patrol officers.

In looking at this hypothesis, it should be noted that 50 percent or over of both groups indicated that their work went unnoticed. This factor held true throughout the

controls. This may be due to a structural or organizational problem with regard to giving officers recognition for their work. Further research is indicated on this matter, perhaps focusing on upper echelon and street supervisors' techniques for recognition and reward of those officers deserving it. Based on these circumstances, and the relationships noted for the work importance statement, hypothesis three is supported.

The fourth hypothesis stated that since community policing officers are not responsible for calls for service, the line officers would perceive themselves as having the greater workload. The crosstabulation for this question on the survey shows that 75.6 percent of the patrol officers feel that they have more work than the community policing officers. Similarly, 60.9 percent of the community policing officers feel that they are the ones with more work. This relationship was not statistically significant. Controlling for years on the department and education yielded similar results. It seems that both groups perceive themselves as working harder than one another. In this case, the fourth hypothesis was not supported.

Hypothesis five postulates that officers with more than 10 years of experience will have less accurate definitions than officers with less than 10 years of

experience. To evaluate this hypothesis the officers were asked to rank five statements as to their importance to a successful community policing program. Two of the statements reflected the philosophy of community policing while three dealt with some techniques used to implement the philosophy. The idea behind this was that the officers who had a better handle on community policing would rate the philosophy statements higher in importance than the techniques. In examining the results, there were no clear distinctions in the ratings. The majority of the officers rated all the items as either important or very important (with the exception of the dreaded foot patrol). Rather than postulating that all the officers were incorrect, it seems that this represents a problem in the design of the question. Further research in this area should examine better methods to get at a proper definition of community policing. In any case, due to the structural problem with the question, hypothesis five was not supported.

Hypothesis six stated that a higher proportion of officers with more than 10 years of experience will report inadequate perceptions of training than officers with less than 10 years of experience. For the entire sample 60.9 percent of the officers with 10 years or less on the department felt that they were adequately trained. Of the officers that had more than 10 years of experience 45.8

percent reported that they felt adequately trained. This relationship was significant at the .05 level. Controlling for having a college degree also yielded a result significant at this level. Controlling for not having a degree showed no significant relationship. However, with 56.3 percent of the officers with 10 years or less on the department reporting adequate training, and 46.3 percent of the officers with more than 10 years experience, it can be argued that the trend is the same. Therefore hypothesis six is supported by the data.

LIMITATIONS

The most obvious limitation of this study is the small size of the community policing sample. The analysis started with only 23 community policing officers. As a result, when the controls for education and years with the Norfolk Police were introduced, some of the cells in the Chi-square tables became exceedingly small. Thus, any statistics from these tables lose some importance and can only be viewed as to whether they follow the same pattern as the uncontrolled tests. This limitation was unavoidable due to the small size of Norfolk's community policing unit.

Another limitation deals with the generalizability of these results. Since this study only examined the Norfolk Police and its implementation of community policing, then

obviously the results are not applicable to any other department. It is hoped, however, that this study will aid Norfolk in further adjustments to its program as well as lead to similar inquiries in other departments and areas of policing. One possible application that comes to mind is the study of how the different divisions, such as detectives or K9, relate to one another.

One last possible limitation deals with a training initiative within the department. At this time, the Norfolk Police is sending its officers through a community policing problem solving school. Eventually, every officer in the department will have to attend this school. At the time of the survey, approximately 200 officers from various divisions had completed the school. It is unknown what effect, if any, that this training may have had on the survey responses.

In summary, with regard to the limitations just addressed, this study found that hypotheses one, two, three and six were supported by the data. Hypotheses four and five were not. The study also found that controlling for years with the Norfolk department and education may have an effect on some of the results.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In examining the results from this study, it is apparent that the community policing units and the patrol divisions are not working together as well as they should. This situation keeps the PACE program from working at an optimal level. While the good news is that the majority of the officers believe that PACE is a useful policing philosophy, the bad news is that they are not implementing it to the fullest due to structural problems. The main consequence of this inefficiency is that the community does not receive the highest level of services. Patrol officers have the greatest number of contacts with the citizens of Norfolk. Unfortunately, most of these contacts are in the context of a call for service. This means that the contacts are brief and somewhat superficial. In other words, the patrol officer does not have the time to address the citizen's problem in any real depth. This level of service is left to the community policing officer. However, if the two groups are not consulting or cooperating with one another, some of these problems may not come to the attention of the proper authorities. This delays action on these problems which hampers service to the community.

It is also apparent that the patrol supervisors are the most unhappy with the structure of the program. In

reviewing the comments section from their surveys most complained about two problems: 1) They never knew what the PACE officers were supposed to be doing while they were working, and 2) they could never call on them to help with problems in their district. What is most disturbing about this is that of the 40 patrol supervisors that responded to the survey, 67 percent stated that PACE was not a help to their duties as a sector supervisor. At the least, it can be argued that if the supervisors do not see PACE as an aid they will be less inclined to provide willing cooperation to the PACE units when it is needed.

Underlying this tension with the community policing unit is the fact that 90 percent of the patrol supervisors feel that they are understaffed. It is difficult for a supervisor to give up officers to community policing projects when he/she already feels that there are not enough officers to handle calls for service, the bread and butter of patrol work. Couple this with the previously stated feelings about the benefit of the PACE program and it becomes clear that the patrol supervisors have reasons to resist cooperating with the PACE units.

There are several possible strategies to deal with these conflicts. First it is not feasible to place the PACE units and CROs back into the precincts and chain of command. There are advantages to leaving them separate.

Removing the officers from the chain of command frees them from the bureaucracy of the department. This allows them to innovate and act on problems with the freedom that community policing requires. Second, these officers can devote their full energies to community policing projects without being tied to the radio. Much in the same way that it is unreasonable to expect patrol officers to have the time and resources to do effective community policing, it is unreasonable to believe that PACE officers can be effective while doing patrol work.

One of the problems seems to be in the communication link between the patrol supervisors and the PACE unit. This could possibly be remedied by establishing a liaison officer between the PACE units and the patrol supervisors. This liaison officer would be able to keep the supervisors informed as to what projects and which neighborhoods the PACE officers were working. He/she would also provide a link to allow the supervisors to request help from the unit when needed. Establishing this position would accomplish several goals. First, it would make the PACE unit more accountable while keeping it out of the normal chain of command. Second, it would open lines of communication between the patrol divisions and the PACE unit, the two units most needed to make this program a continued success. Finally, by opening these lines, the patrol supervisors may

see PACE as an aid to their duties. This would reduce conflict and may make the supervisors more inclined to cooperate. As the leader changes his/her attitude, so will many of the patrol officers.

Another option is to place a street supervisor in charge of the PACE unit. This is not as attractive an option for three reasons. First, this move would place them back in the chain of command, which may affect their ability to innovate and address problems directly. Second, patrol supervisors are subject to transfers according to the needs of the department. This may create a situation where each new supervisor takes the unit in a different direction, which again may impact the effectiveness of the unit. Finally, placing the unit under a street supervisor would most probably entail creating new supervisor spots. Under current budget restraints this is not a feasible option. This also brings the unit one step closer to being a stand alone entity, with all the encumbering bureaucracy that follows.

One other possible solution is to make the PACE and CRO assignments mandatory rather than voluntary, as they are now. A staggered rotation could be used to replace officers in the unit every two to three years. The staggered rotation would keep continuity within the unit. By rotating officers, everyone would get an idea of what

the other's responsibilities, operating procedures, and resources are for the job. An added bonus is that as officers rotate back into the patrol division, they carry the community policing knowledge gained with them. This serves as a resource to the others in the platoon. One major drawback to this solution is that most citizens like to see the same officers working in their neighborhoods. The residents may object to the switching of officers, especially if they have become attached to one officer in particular.

CONCLUSION

This study has pointed out that while Norfolk has a successful community policing program, it is not working at the best possible level. For the reasons already iterated several suggestions were made to address problems with cooperation and communication. The study has also indicated several areas where further research might be directed: an understandable definition of community policing, an examination of the reward and recognition system within the department, and the extension of this study into the relationships between other divisions within the department. In any case, it is hoped that this study will aid in some way any policy decisions made in reference to the subject matter.

References

Brown, Lee P. 1989. "Community Policing: A Practical Guide for Police Officials." *Perspectives on Policing*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Cronin, Roberta C. 1994. *Innovative Community Partnerships: Working Together to Change*. Wasington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.

Decker, Scott H., Russell L. Smith, and Thomas M. Uhlman. 1977. "Does Anything Work? An Evaluation of Urban Police Innovations." Pp. 43-54 in *Evaluating Alternative Law Enforcement Strategies*, edited by R. Baker and F. Myer Jr. Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

DeWitt, Charles B. 1992. *Community Policing in Seattle: A Model Partnership Between Citizens and Police*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Gaffigan, Stephen J. 1994. *Understanding Community Policing*. Washington, D.C.: Bureau of Justice Assistance.

Goldstein, Herman. 1979. "Improving Policing: A Problem Oriented Approach." *Crime and Delinquency* (April): 236-258.

_____. 1990. *Problem-Oriented Policing*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company.

Green, Jack R. 1989. "Police Officer Job Satisfaction and Community Perceptions: Implications for Community-Oriented Policing. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*. 26(2): 168-183.

Kelling, George L. and William J. Bratton. 1993. "Implementing Community Policing: The Administrative Problem." *Perspectives on Policing*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Kelling, George L. and Mark H. Moore. 1988. "The Evolving Strategy of Policing." *Perspectives on Policing*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Kelling, George L. and James Q. Wilson. 1989. "Making Neighborhoods Safe." *Atlantic Monthly* (February): 46-52.

Lovrich Jr., Nicholas P. 1976. "Police Community Outreach and the Reduction of Crime: Evidence of Police-Community Relations Training and Affirmative Action from a Study of 161 U.S. Cities." Pp. 135-148 in *Evaluating Alternative Law Enforcement Strategies*, edited by R. Baker and F. Myer Jr.

Liou, Kuotsai Tom, and Eugene G. Savage. 1996. "Citizen Perception of Community Policing Impact." *Public Administration and Management.* 1(1): [Online]. Available: http://www.hbg.psu.edu:80/faculty/jxr11/liou1.html [1997, March 16].

Lurigio, Arthur J. and Wesley G. Skogan. 1994. "Winning the Hearts and Minds of Police Officers: An Assessment of Staff Perceptions of Community Policing in Chicago." *Crime & Delinquency* 40(3):315-330.

McCleary, Richard, Barbara C. Nienstedt and James M. Erven. 1994. "Uniform Crime Reports as Organizational Outcomes: Three Time Series Experiments." Pp. 335-349 in *The Administration and Management of Criminal Justice Organizations*, 2nd ed., edited by S. Stojkovic, J. Klofas and D. Kalinich. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press Incorporated.

Murphy, Patrick V. 1992. "Organizing for Community Policing." Pp. 113-128 in *Issues in Policing: New Perspectives*, edited by J. W. Bizzack. Lexington, KY: Autumn House Publishing.

Percy, Stephen L. 1978. "Citizen Coproduction of Community Safety." Pp. 125-134 in *Evaluating Alternative Law Enforcement Strategies,* edited by R. Baker and F. Myer Jr. Massachusetts: Lexington Books.

Robinson, C. D. 1978. "The Deradicalization of the Policeman: An Historical Analysis." *Crime & Delinquency* (April): 129-151.

Rosenbaum, Dennis P., Sandy Yeh and Deanna L. Wilkinson. 1994. "Impact of Community Policing on Police Personnel: A Quasi-Experimental Test." *Crime & Delinquency* 40(3): 331-353.

Skogan, Wesley G. and Mary Ann Wycoff. 1993. *Community Policing in Madison: Quality from the Inside Out.* Wasington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Toch, Hans. 1980. "Mobilizing Police Expertise." Pp. 493-502 in *The Administration and Management of Criminal Justice Organizations,* 2nd ed., edited by S. Stojkovic, J. Klofas and D. Kalinich. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press Incorporated.

Williams, Hubert and Patrick V. Murphy. 1990. "The Evolving Strategy of Police: A Minority View." *Perspectives on Policing.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Wilson, Deborah G. and Susan F. Bennett. 1994. "Officers' Response to Community Policing: Variations on a Theme." *Crime & Delinquency* 40(3): 354-370.

Wycoff, Mary Ann and Wesley G. Skogan. 1994. "The Effect of a Community Policing Management Style on Officers' Attitudes." *Crime & Delinquency* 40(3): 371-383.

APPENDIX A

PATROL OFFICER SURVEY

Community Policing Survey

Section I:

1) **With regard to the department's community policing program (PACE), how much training have you received?**
   - ☐ 0 to 7 hours
   - ☐ 8 to 16 hours
   - ☐ 17 to 25 hours
   - ☐ 26 to 34 hours
   - ☐ over 34 hours

2) **Where did you receive your training in community policing? (check all that apply)**
   - ☐ Norfolk police department
   - ☐ another police department
   - ☐ trade school
   - ☐ college or university
   - ☐ other, please specify _____

3) **Which of the statements best reflects what you think about the amount of community policing training you received?**
   - ☐ I did not need any training.
   - ☐ I did not need as much training as I got.
   - ☐ I got just the right amount of training.
   - ☐ I could have used just a little more training.
   - ☐ I could have used a lot more training.

4) **Do you feel that you are performing community policing in your daily activities as a police officer?**
   - ☐ yes
   - ☐ no

5) **How would you rate yourself as a community policing officer?**
   - ☐ Excellent
   - ☐ Very good
   - ☐ Good
   - ☐ Fair
   - ☐ Poor

6) **How does your overall workload compare to that of those in the PACE unit?**
   ☐ I have more work
   ☐ I have less work
   ☐ I have about the same amount of work

How often do you use the following skills in your work?

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always
7) Problem solving	☐	☐	☐	☐
8) Analytical skills	☐	☐	☐	☐
9) Crisis intervention	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree or strongly disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
10) I often consult with the PACE officers in regard to problem solving strategies that could be used in my district.	☐	☐	☐	☐
11) My work often goes unnoticed due to high profile PACE projects.	☐	☐	☐	☐
12) PACE is a useful policing philosophy.	☐	☐	☐	☐
13) The PACE units and Patrol Divisions fully cooperate with one another.	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
14) The work that both the PACE units and Patrol Divisions perform are equally important in the eyes of the police administration.	☐	☐	☐	☐
15) Manpower concerns in the Patrol Divisions have been adequately addressed.	☐	☐	☐	☐
16) I am rewarded as well as PACE officers for my effort.	☐	☐	☐	☐.
17) The PACE Unit responds quickly to problems that I have pointed out in my district.	☐	☐	☐	☐

18) **Are there any special considerations or qualifications for selection to the PACE unit?**
☐ yes
☐ no
☐ don't know

19) **If yes, please give a short list of those factors considered in selection (e.g. special training, education, etc.):**

**Please rate how important the following items are to a
successful community policing program:**

	not important	important	very important
20) The community should be an integral part of the decision making process.	□	□	□
21) Techniques such as foot patrols.	□	□	□
22) Techniques such as bike patrols.	□	□	□
23) Working with community organizations.	□	□	□
24) Allowing the community to define their problems.	□	□	□

25) **How many years have you been a law enforcement
officer?**
□ 0 to 2 years   □ 11 to 15 years
□ 3 to 5 years   □ 16 to 20 years
□ 6 to 10 years   □ over 20 years

26) **How many years have you been a Norfolk Police Officer?**
□ 0 to 2 years   □ 11 to 15 years
□ 3 to 5 years   □ 16 to 20 years
□ 6 to 10 years   □ over 20 years

27) **What is your current duty assignment?**
□ First Patrol
□ Second Patrol

28) **How long have you been in this assignment?**
□ 0 to 2 years   □ 11 to 15 years
□ 3 to 5 years   □ 16 to 20 years
□ 6 to 10 years   □ over 20 years

29) **What is your age?**
□ Under 30
□ 30 to 39
□ 40 and over

30) **Check the highest level of education you have completed:**
   ☐ High school diploma or GED
   ☐ Vocational-technical certificate
   ☐ One or more semesters of college
   ☐ Associate's degree
   ☐ Bachelor's degree
   ☐ Attended or completed graduate school

Section II:

───

This section is to be answered by Patrol Supervisors only.

───

31) **Do you feel that you are adequately staffed at this time?**
   ☐ yes
   ☐ no

32) **Have you ever had to deny leave to a member of your platoon due to a shortage of officers.**
   ☐ yes
   ☐ no

33) **Do you feel that PACE is a help to your duties as a sector supervisor?**
   ☐ yes
   ☐ no

Please use this space to add any comments that you feel may be helpful to this project. Add any issues or concerns here.

APPENDIX B

PACE OFFICER SURVEY

Community Policing Survey

Section I:

1) **With regard to the department's community policing program (PACE), how much training have you received?**

   ☐ 0 to 7 hours
   ☐ 8 to 16 hours
   ☐ 17 to 25 hours
   ☐ 26 to 34 hours
   ☐ over 34 hours

2) **Where did you receive your training in community policing? (check all that apply)**
   ☐ Norfolk police department
   ☐ another police department
   ☐ trade school
   ☐ college or university
   ☐ other, please specify _____

3) **Which of the statements best reflects what you think about the amount of community policing training you received?**
   ☐ I did not need any training.
   ☐ I did not need as much training as I got.
   ☐ I got just the right amount of training.
   ☐ I could have used just a little more training.
   ☐ I could have used a lot more training.

4) **Do you feel that you are performing community policing in your daily activities as a police officer?**
   ☐ yes
   ☐ no

5) **How would you rate yourself as a community policing officer?**
   ☐ Excellent
   ☐ Very good
   ☐ Good
   ☐ Fair
   ☐ Poor

6) **How does your overall workload compare to that of those in the Patrol divisions?**
   ☐ I have more work
   ☐ I have less work
   ☐ I have about the same amount of work

How often do you use the following skills in your work?

	Never	Seldom	Often	Always
7) Problem solving	☐	☐	☐	☐
8) Analytical skills	☐	☐	☐	☐
9) Crisis intervention	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please indicate whether you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
10) I often consult with the Patrol division officers in regard to problem solving strategies that could be used in my district.	☐	☐	☐	☐
11) The work I do as a PACE officer often goes unnoticed due to the work in the Patrol Division.	☐	☐	☐	☐
12) PACE is a useful policing philosophy.	☐	☐	☐	☐
13) The PACE units and Patrol Divisions fully cooperate with one another.	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
14) The work that both the PACE units and Patrol Divisions perform are equally important in the eyes of the police administration.	☐	☐	☐	☐
15) Manpower concerns in the Patrol Divisions have been adequately addressed.	☐	☐	☐	☐
16) I am rewarded as well as Patrol Division officers for my efforts.	☐	☐	☐	☐

17) **Were there any special considerations of your qualifications in your selection for the PACE unit?**
☐ yes
☐ no
☐ don't know

18) **If yes, please give a short list of those factors considered in your selection (e.g. special training, education, etc.):**

Please rate how important the following items are to a successful community policing program:

	not important	important	very important
19) The community should be an integral part of the decision making process.	☐	☐	☐
20) Techniques such as foot patrols.	☐	☐	☐
21) Techniques such as bike patrols.	☐	☐	☐
22) Working with community organizations.	☐	☐	☐
23) Allowing the community to define their problems.	☐	☐	☐

24) **How many years have you been a law enforcement officer?**

☐ 0 to 2 years   ☐ 11 to 15 years
☐ 3 to 5 years   ☐ 16 to 20 years
☐ 6 to 10 years   ☐ over 20 years

25) **How many years have you been a Norfolk Police Officer?**

☐ 0 to 2 years   ☐ 11 to 15 years
☐ 3 to 5 years   ☐ 16 to 20 years
☐ 6 to 10 years   ☐ over 20 years

26) **What is your current duty assignment?**

☐ First Patrol PACE Unit
☐ Second Patrol PACE Unit
☐ Community Resource Officer

27) **How long have you been in this assignment?**

☐ 0 to 2 years   ☐ 11 to 15 years
☐ 3 to 5 years   ☐ 16 to 20 years
☐ 6 to 10 years   ☐ over 20 years

28) **What is your age?**

☐ Under 30
☐ 30 to 39
☐ 40 and over

29) **Check the highest level of education you have completed:**

☐ High school diploma or GED
☐ Vocational-technical certificate
☐ One or more semesters of college
☐ Associate's degree
☐ Bachelor's degree
☐ Attended or completed graduate school

Please use this space to add any comments that you feel may be helpful to this project. Add any concerns or suggestions here:

VITA

Michael G. Goldsmith

Old Dominion University, Department of Sociology and
Criminal Justice, Norfolk, VA 23529 (757) 683-3791

Education:
   M.A. Applied Sociology (emphasis in Criminal Justice),
   December 1998; Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA

   B.A. Sociology (emphasis in Anthropology), December
   1988; Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA

Related Experience:
   Police Corporal, Norfolk Police Department, Special
   Enforcement Division/K9 Unit, Norfolk, VA, August
   1995-Present.

   Police Officer II, Norfolk Police Department, Special
   Enforcement Division/Metro Tactical Unit, Norfolk, VA,
   July 1991-August 1995.

   Police Officer II, Norfolk Police Department, Ocean
   View Neighborhood Patrol, Norfolk, VA, July 1990-July
   1991.

   Police Officer I, Norfolk Police Department, Second
   Patrol Division, Norfolk, VA, June 1989-July 1990.

   Police Recruit, Norfolk Police Academy, February 1989-
   June 1989.

Activities and Awards:
   Honor Graduate (first in class) Norfolk Police
   Academy, 43rd Session, June 1989.
   "Kit" Hurst Award recipient, Norfolk Police Academy,
   43rd Session, June 1989.
   Special Weapons and Tactics Training, May 1991.
   Drug Enforcement for Uniformed Patrol Officers, March
   1991.
   Uniformed Patrol Interdiction Techniques, February
   1993.
   Virginia Police Work Dog Association Accredited K9
   Handler, December 1995.
   Law Enforcement Leadership School, Module I, May 1996.
   General Instructor Development School, July 1998.