

**Community Policing Activities:
The Ohio Task Analysis Project, Final Report**

A report submitted to the
National Institute of Justice

by:

Lawrence F. Travis, III, Ph.D.
University of Cincinnati

Beth A. Sanders, Ph.D.
Kent State University

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....1

Problem Statement.....2

Methods.....4

 1981-82 Ohio Peace Officer Task Analysis.....4

 1996 Ohio Peace Officer Task Analysis.....5

 Agency Survey.....5

 Comparative Analysis.....6

Findings.....6

 Description of the samples.....6

 Community Policing and Police Officer Tasks.....8

 Has the Advent of C.O.P. changed Policing?.....9

 Agency Adoption of Community Policing and
 Officers' Tasks.....12

 Agency Commitment to Community Policing and
 Officers' Tasks.....14

 Does Assignment as a Community Oriented Policing
 Officer Matter?.....17

 What Accounts for Differences in Reported
 Frequency of Tasks?.....19

 Identification of Demographic Differences.....19

 Identification of Activity Differences.....21

Discussion.....23

Conclusion.....28

References.....30

INTRODUCTION

The dominant framework in American policing in the last decade has been community policing (Greene and Mastrofski 1988; Greene 1993; Thurman, Bogen, and Giacomazzi 1993; Rosenbaum and Lurigio 1994). According to Grinc (1994), community policing is the "new orthodoxy" of policing in this country. Community policing has become so prevalent in policing that it has been called the "quiet revolution" (Kelling 1988). Not only is community policing immensely popular with police administrators and the public, it has become a cornerstone of crime control policy nationwide (Rosenbaum and Lurigio 1994).

While much has been written on the concept and emergence of community policing (c.f. Goldstein 1987; Kelling and Moore 1988; Mastrofski 1988), we know little of how departments translate these concepts into practice (Greene 1993). Although there are numerous descriptive studies regarding the nature of COP (see Farrell 1988; Wycoff and Skogan 1994), there is a dearth of scientific study regarding community policing's concrete effects on police departments and police officers (Mastrofski 1992; Thurman et al. 1993).

Although the concept of community policing focuses on community involvement in law enforcement and police involvement in "quality of life" issues, little has been done to translate

these somewhat ambiguous concepts into specific police officer tasks. It is of particular importance to know what tasks police officers perform because, "when taken in concert, their individual actions add up to agency behavior" (Lipsky 1980:13). If community oriented policing is indeed revolutionary, one should expect the behavior of police officers to change.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

"Although interest in community policing has grown rapidly in the last decade, we know remarkably little about what it means to the work of the street-level officer" (Mastrofski 1992:23). According to Mastrofski, most research on community policing fails to explain what effect community policing will have for the daily tasks of police officers (1992). Granados (1997) argues that often what is called community policing represents the traditional compliance-based model of policing. Citing Buerger (1994), Melchers (1993), Silver (1990) and others, he argues that all too often community policing initiatives have not resulted in any fundamental change in police philosophy or practice.

Early supporters of COP such as Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990) describe it as an overall organizational philosophy where the police and the community work together to combat crime as well as fear of crime, disorder, and other social problems. Community policing demands that police officers translate that organizational philosophy into practice (Trojanowicz and

Bucqueroux 1990). If community policing entails that policing be decentralized, solve community problems, make officers proactive and creative, and involve community members, then in what specific tasks are community police officers engaged?

Mastrofski (1992) suggests nine COP officer tasks such as operating neighborhood substations, meeting with community groups, analyzing and solving neighborhood problems, working with citizens on crime prevention programs, conducting door-to-door surveys of residents, talking with students in school, meeting with local merchants, making security checks of businesses, and dealing with disorderly people (1992:24). Similarly, the Flint Foot Patrol study found that foot patrol officers performed more self-initiated tasks than other officers (Trojanowicz 1992).

Cordner (1995) noted that little is currently known about what kinds of work community police officers presently do, or about how community policing may change officer behavior. He identified a number of expected changes in officer behavior that should result from agency implementation of community oriented policing. In community policing, Cordner suggests that officers should spend less time on random patrol and more time solving problems and interacting with citizens. Similarly, community policing officers should be expected to devote more of their time and energy to crime prevention activities.

This project was an attempt to determine if the work

activities of community policing officers differs from the work activities of "traditional" police officers. Specifically, it compared the self-reported job tasks of police officers to determine if those tasks have changed over time, differ between officers in departments pursuing community policing, or differ between officers assigned as "community policing" officers and those having more traditional assignments.

METHODS

In order to determine if the advent of community policing has changed the activities of line-level police officers, we employed three sources of data. First, a sample of Ohio police departments were surveyed to determine if they have a community policing program. Second, both the 1981 and the 1996 Ohio Peace Officer Task Analysis Surveys were examined in order to measure police officer tasks.

1981-82 Ohio Peace Officer Task Analysis

The police officer task data were originally collected as part of the Ohio Peace Officer Task Analysis project. These data are the result of survey research which was conducted from 1981-1982. Over three hundred Ohio police agencies participated and the final sample included responses from 1,989 police officers.

The 1981-82 survey contained groups of specific task statements categorized into subsections such as administration; arrest, search and seizure; patrol; community relations and crime

prevention; and traffic. In order to determine what tasks police officers performed, the original questionnaire listed the task statements and asked police officers to tell how often they performed each task. Officers could respond from 0 (never) to 5 (daily).

1996 Ohio Peace Officer Task Analysis

Recognizing that the job of policing and the training needs of peace officers have changed over the past fifteen years, in 1996 the Ohio Office of Criminal Justice Services again conducted a task analysis survey of a sample of police officers throughout the state. The survey instrument was changed from that of the 1981-82 survey to better assess needed knowledge, skills and abilities for police officers. Nonetheless, the survey instrument included 23 items taken directly from the earlier survey. These items (See Appendix A) form the basis of the comparisons reported here. A total of 1689 officers from 229 police departments responded to this survey.

Agency Survey

While the 1996 Peace Officer Task Analysis survey was in the field, the local police agencies included in the task analysis survey sample were asked to complete a separate instrument. This instrument, based on the work of Greene (1993), identified departments that reported having a community oriented policing program, described the components of the program, and determined

the level of departmental commitment to community oriented policing. A total of 180 departments returned responses to this agency survey.

Comparative Analysis

We used these data to determine if police officer reported tasks have undergone change since the advent of community policing. We also examined whether the reported tasks of officers working in agencies that reported adopting community oriented policing were different from those in agencies not adopting community policing. Finally, we tested the effect of job assignment on officers' reported tasks in agencies that have adopted community policing.

FINDINGS

Description of the samples

Table 1 reports the demographic and attitudinal characteristics of officers from each sample, 1981 and 1996.

Table 1 here

This table examines officers' age, race, sex, and attitudes on job satisfaction. In the 1981 sample, over half of the officers were under the age of 30, and almost 90 percent of the officers were under age 40. In the 1996 sample, however, the age

distribution was more normal. Forty-one percent of the officers were in their thirties, while 32 percent of the officers were between 40 and 49 years old.

The distribution of race in each sample was quite similar. In both groups there were approximately 88 percent white officers and 12 percent non-white officers. Also, the percentage of males and females included in both samples was similar. Although the overwhelming majority of officers responding to both surveys were male, the percentage of females increased between 1981 and 1996.¹ As for attitudinal variables, in both survey administrations, officers were asked how interesting they found the job, and how well the job utilized their natural talents. In both samples, officers ranked their interest in the job quite high with over 80 percent of officers in both samples rating the job as "interesting" or "very interesting." Officers in both the 1981 sample and 1996 sample were somewhat less enthusiastic in their reporting of how well the job utilized their natural talents, with officers responding to the 1996 survey being more satisfied with how well their natural talents were utilized as police officers. Finally, in the 1981 survey 96% of officers listed their primary assignment as patrol officers while in the 1996 sample, only 61 percent of officers had the primary duty of

¹ Since officers were supposed to be randomly selected after departments were sampled, it is likely that the slight increase in the percentage of females included in the 1996 sample reflects an increase in female officers in Ohio.

patrol.² Table 2 presents a comparison of mean differences in demographic and attitudinal characteristics of officers in the two samples.

Table 2 Here

COMMUNITY POLICING AND POLICE OFFICER TASKS

The analysis reported here occurred in three phases. In the first phase the frequencies of task performance reported by officers in the 1981 task analysis were compared to those responding to the 1996 survey. In the second phase, frequencies of task performance reported in the 1996 survey were compared controlling for departmental implementation of community policing, departmental commitment to community policing, and officer assignment to community policing. These analyses sought to determine if officer tasks varied by agency implementation and commitment to community policing, or by officer assignment.

The final phase of the analysis involved multivariate tests for differences between the four conditions; sample (1981 or 1996), adoption of community policing, commitment to community policing, and officer assignment. These multivariate tests sought to determine how well the observed differences in the

² This is likely to be related to the frequencies reported for each task, however, in the 1981 sample, many officers reported patrol as well as several other primary responsibilities.

frequency of task performance could predict the "group" to which officers belonged.

If community policing represents a revolution in police practice, officers working in agencies implementing or committed to community policing should engage in a different set of tasks than those in agencies not adopting community policing. Within agencies adopting community policing, officers with specific community policing assignments should report frequency of task performance that differs from those with traditional patrol assignments.

Has the Advent of C.O.P changed Policing?

The first phase of the analysis sought to determine how the advent of community policing may have affected the tasks performed by police officers in general. When the first sample of officers was questioned in 1981, community policing had not yet begun to enjoy the popularity it now experiences. By comparing the tasks of officers from 1981 with those reported in 1996, one might expect to discover changes in the frequencies of tasks which would be associated with community policing.

Table 3 presents the differences in the job tasks of Ohio police officers from the 1980s to the 1990s.

Table 3 here

The table reveals that 19 of the 23 tasks analyzed had frequencies which were significantly different from one administration of the survey to the other. Of the 19 significant differences, only five values were negative, meaning officers in 1981 reported higher frequencies. For most of the differences in tasks, officers in 1996 reported higher frequencies.

The five tasks for which the 1981 sample reported higher frequencies were: impound property, give street directions, mediate family disputes, talk with people on the beat to establish rapport, and warn offenders in lieu of citation/arrest. All of these tasks except for impound property might be considered typical of community policing activities. Thus, one would have expected that officers in 1981 would be reporting higher frequencies of law enforcement activities and lower frequencies of activities indicating involvement with citizens.

Officers in the 1996 sample reported higher frequencies of several community policing tasks. There was a large difference in means for the task, "respond to general information requests." The tasks of crime analysis, represent department, and provide information to those in ride-along program also had large differences.

Additionally, officers in the 1996 sample reported they secured search warrants more often, and officers in 1996 reported

more frequent involvement in crime prevention activities including marking valuables, school visits, organizing neighborhood watch groups, distribution of printed materials and making social service referrals. There was no significant difference in the frequency with which officers engaged in foot patrol between 1981 and 1996.

In sum, the data indicate that the routine activities of Ohio police officers changed in the period between 1981 and 1996 in ways that would be expected from the advent of community policing programs. Officers responding to the 1996 task analysis reported higher frequencies of performance of tasks that involve crime prevention and community interaction. However, the finding officers responding to the 1981 survey reported higher frequencies of talking with citizens to establish rapport and giving street directions is counter-intuitive. So too is the fact that officers in the 1981 sample were more frequently involved in mediating domestic disputes and issuing warnings in lieu of citation or arrest.

Other changes in criminal justice policy may help account for these differences. The increased seriousness with which some offenses, such as driving under the influence and domestic violence, are now viewed may account for lower frequencies of mediation or warnings by officers responding to the 1996 survey. The higher frequency of officers talking with citizens and giving

street directions in the 1981 sample may also be a product of the advent of community policing, depending upon how community policing programs were implemented.

Agency Adoption of Community Policing And Officers' Tasks

The first analysis conducted in this phase was to determine the effect that a community policing program would have on officer's job tasks. In order to do this, departments were surveyed and asked if they had community policing or community-oriented policing.³

For the 1996 sample, there were 229 departments which responded to the survey. Of those departments, 67.2 percent reported they had community policing, while 32.8 percent of departments reported that they did not.⁴ Of the 1689 officers in the sample, 1,326 (84.9 percent) were from departments with community policing. Fifteen percent (235 officers) were from departments without community oriented policing programs.⁵

Table 4 displays the mean frequencies of officers' tasks and compares officers from two groups: departments which reported having community policing, and departments reporting that they

³ This information was available for only the 1996 sample.

⁴ Forty-nine departments did not respond. Additionally, several departments related that they had "always practiced community policing," though there was no formal program.

⁵ Because 49 departments did not respond, this information was missing for 128 officers. A large percentage of officers in the sample were from departments with COP because of sampling - larger departments, (i.e. Cleveland, Cincinnati) had many of their officers in the sample.

did not have community policing.

Table 4 here

The data reveal significant differences between mean ratings for nine of the twenty-three officer tasks. For eight of these, officers from departments without community oriented policing programs reported higher frequencies. These eight tasks are: impound property, patrol on foot, give street directions, warn in lieu of arrest/citation, talk with people to establish rapport, school visits, respond to information requests from the public, and hold property for safekeeping. The ninth difference concerned officer participation in raids. For this task, officers in departments having community policing programs reported a higher frequency of participation in raids than those from departments without community policing.

What is notable is that most of these differences run counter to what would be expected from the adoption of community oriented policing. One would expect that officers in departments adopting a community oriented approach would do more foot patrol and talk with people on the beat more often than officers in departments without community oriented policing. Similarly, one

would not necessarily expect officers in an agency adopting community oriented policing to participate in raids more frequently than those in more traditional organizations.

It may be that those departments reporting that they had not adopted a community oriented approach to policing serve smaller municipalities where officers naturally have a closer relationship with citizens than do officers in larger cities. So too, given the recent emphasis on drug enforcement, it would seem reasonable to hypothesize that the link between having adopted community oriented policing and officer participation in raids is a product of jurisdiction size.

Agency Commitment to Community Policing and Officers' Tasks

To further explore differences in tasks between officers working in departments adopting community policing and those in departments not adopting community policing, the next step in the analysis examined only officers from those 154 departments reporting adoption of community policing (N=1326 officers). Because many departments claim to have a community orientation yet do not display much commitment to the principles of community oriented policing (Greene 1993), officers were categorized as to the level of commitment to C.O.P their agency displayed.

Officers were characterized by agency commitment to community policing using a measure loosely based on the work of Greene (1993). In the agency survey on community policing

departments were first asked, Does your agency have community oriented policing? If yes, respondents were asked to answer several other questions. Four of those questions were used to determine a commitment score as follows:

1. What is the date of implementation of C.O.P. in your agency?

2. Is there a full-time C.O.P. supervisor?

3. Do C.O.P. officers receive supplemental training in community-oriented policing?, and,

4. Does your department have a mission statement which emphasizes community involvement?

If an agency had an implementation date, they were given one point. A full-time supervisor counted as one point, etc.. Table 5 shows how officers were distributed across those four categories. Of the 1,326 officers, only five were from departments scoring zero on commitment. Similarly, very few officers were from departments scoring only one. Just over 13 percent of officers were from departments with a commitment score of two, and 24.7 percent of officers were from departments with a score of three. The majority of officers (58.7 percent) were from departments scoring the maximum of four.

Table 5 here

Since department scores were skewed towards the high end, officers were assigned into one of two groups based on the community policing commitment score calculated for their agency. Officers with scores of 0-3 comprise the low group while those with a score of 4 made up the high commitment group. With this categorization, 58.7 percent of officers are in the high group, with slightly over 40 percent in the low commitment group.

After the groups were divided, each job task was examined to determine if the officers' agency commitment was related to task frequency ratings. Table 6 illustrates the differences in tasks of officers from departments with low commitment to C.O.P. versus officers from departments with a higher commitment level.

Table 6 here

The data reveal differences in task frequency ratings given by officers for ten tasks. Officers working in agencies with lower commitment scores reported a higher frequency of performing the tasks: impound property, give street directions, mediate family disputes, talk with people to establish rapport, warn offenders in lieu of arrest/citation, hold property for safekeeping, and respond to information requests from public.

Officers in the high commitment group reported higher

frequencies of performing three tasks: provide information to those in ride-along program, explain recruitment policies, and participate in raids.

Again, that officers in departments with lower commitment to community oriented policing more frequently engage in activities involving interaction with citizens (e.g., respond to information requests, talk to people to establish rapport) is counter-intuitive. However, that officers in agencies with higher commitment to community policing more frequently deal with citizens in ride-along programs or explain recruitment policies would be expected.

Does Assignment as a Community Oriented Policing Officer Matter?

A third and final part of this analysis of the 1996 sample of officers was to determine if officers who were assigned to community policing would report different frequencies of task performance than those having other primary assignments. In order to determine if assignment affected the frequency ratings, officers were divided into two groups. In the 1996 survey, officers were asked, Currently are you assigned as a community police officer, yes or no? There were 299 officers (19.8 percent) who replied yes, while 80.2 percent (1,211) replied no.⁶

Table 7 displays the differences in task frequency between officers whose assignment is community policing and officers who

⁶ 179 officers did not respond.

did not report a community policing assignment.

Table 7 here

The difference in reported frequency of performing tasks between officers with a community assignment and other officers is pronounced. Table 7 reveals that the two groups reported significantly different frequencies of performing 18 of the twenty-three tasks. The five tasks for which no significant differences were found tended to be tasks that are infrequently performed, such as impounding property and securing search warrants.

Officers with community policing assignments reported higher frequencies of performing all the tasks except for participation in raids, reversing the finding that participation in raids is more common among officers in agencies adopting community policing and in agencies with higher levels of commitment to community policing. What is also notable is that not only did community policing officers report higher frequencies of community policing service tasks such as social service referrals and school visits, they also reported higher frequencies for the tasks handcuff suspects and conduct field search of arrested

persons. This finding suggests that community policing officers were also more likely to engage in law enforcement tasks than officers with other assignments.

What Accounts for Differences in Reported Frequency of Tasks?

The final phase of the analysis represented an attempt to specify the relationships observed between officer characteristics and differences in frequency of task performance. The first component of this analysis was a comparison of the different groups of officers in terms of demographic and attitudinal factors. These comparisons identified possible explanations for observed differences in task frequency that could be attributed to individual officer characteristics.

The second component of this analysis involved a series of discriminant function analyses. These analyses sought to classify officers into relevant groups based on frequencies of reported task performance. The discriminant function analyses allow an assessment of the relative importance of different job activities which might be attributable to community policing "condition." That is, are differences in some things officers do more important than others in predicting, for example, whether an officer responded to the 1981 or 1996 survey?

Identification of Demographic Differences

Tables 8 and 9 describe the correlations between officer characteristics and reported frequency of task performance for

the 1996 and 1981 samples, respectively. Officers responding to the 1996 survey were older, more likely to be female, and reported that they felt their jobs more fully utilized their natural talents. Tables 8 and 9 reveal that the correlations between officer characteristics and reported frequency of performance of job tasks were virtually identical across samples. That is, the same characteristics were significantly correlated with the same tasks in the same directions.

Tables 8 & 9 Here

The differences between the two samples in terms of reported task performance are generally larger than what would be expected from the demographic correlates alone, and often reverse the direction of the demographic correlation. For example, in both samples, older officers are less likely to engage in talking with people to establish rapport and more likely to analyze crime and accident statistics. It could be then, that differences in task performance frequency between the 1981 and 1996 samples merely reflect changes in the demographic characteristics of police officers over time.

To explore the possibility that differences in reported frequency of officer performance of activities is a function of differences in officer characteristics, two logistical regression equations were computed. In the first, those tasks for which

significant differences in frequency of performance were found between the 1981 and 1996 surveys and officer age and sex were used to predict whether the officers were responding to the 1981 or 1996 survey. This regression revealed that when task frequency differences were included, officer age and sex did not help distinguish between the two surveys.

The second regression predicted whether the officers reported having an assignment as a community policing officer in the 1996 survey. Here officer sex was found to be a predictor of officer assignment. However, while female officers comprised less than 10% of the total 1996 survey respondents, females accounted for about 14 percent of officers with community policing assignments. This suggests that the greater likelihood of community policing officers being female explains observed task frequency differences rather than that the sex of the officer alone explains task frequency differences.

Identification of Activity Differences

The second component of this analysis involved the identification of task activity differences among the groups of officers. Discriminant function models were generated seeking to classify officers into sample (1981 versus 1996), and within the 1996 sample, into groups based on departmental adoption of community policing, departmental commitment to community policing, and officer assignment to community policing. Table 10

presents the results of those classifications.

Table 10 here

The most difficult classification task involved distinguishing between officers in departments with high commitment to community policing and those in departments with low commitment. Only 65% of cases were correctly classified based on differences in five tasks. Officers in departments with low commitment to community policing more frequently warned offenders in lieu of arrest, talked with people on the beat to establish rapport, held property for safekeeping, and responded to general information requests. They were also less likely to participate in raids.

The discriminant function could correctly classify 76% of cases into 1996 and 1981 samples. Officers in the 1996 sample more frequently responded to general information requests, provided information to those in ride-along programs, analyzed crime and accident statistics and represented the department to various organizations.

It was possible to correctly classify 82.6% of cases into those with a community policing assignment and those without such an assignment. Officers with community policing assignments were found to be more frequently engaged in organizing neighborhood

watch groups, distributing printed materials for public relations, patrolling on foot, talking with people to establish rapport, making school visits, giving street directions, representing the department to various organizations, and warning offenders in lieu of arrest.

Finally, the most accurate of the discriminant functions was able to correctly classify 84% of grouped cases in terms of whether or not their department had adopted community policing. Officers in departments which had not adopted community policing were more likely to engage in warning offenders in lieu of arrest, talking with people to establish rapport, and impounding property. They were less likely to participate in raids.

DISCUSSION

The advent of community policing appears to be associated with some changes in the day-to-day activities of police officers. These changes, however, are complex and suggest that there is no simple relationship between the emergence of the community policing paradigm and alterations in police officer tasks. It seems that much may depend upon how community policing is implemented.

The measures of police officer tasks used here were reported frequencies of performance. The relatively low frequency of performance for many tasks, coupled with the large sample sizes may have resulted in an exaggeration of the differences in

activities of officers in some cases. The discriminant function analyses served to identify those differences that best distinguished between the groups of interest.

The cross sectional analysis of respondents to the 1981 and 1996 surveys indicates that, in general, police officers in 1981 reported lower frequencies for most of the tasks studied. Other changes in law enforcement, such as mandatory arrest policies for domestic violence, the increased attention to drug crimes, and changes in the handling of d.u.i. offenders may also account for some of the differences between 1981 and 1996.

Since the dependent variables here are the mean frequency of performance, it is possible that task differentiation among officers, more than changes in the types of activities in which officers are engaged may explain observed differences in frequency of task performance. Fully 96 percent of officers responding to the 1981 survey reported their primary job assignment to be patrol, while fewer than two thirds of those in the 1996 survey had that assignment. Increased task specialization among officers between 1981 and 1996 then may explain higher mean frequencies for many tasks. Some officers with specialized assignments (e.g., traffic) may engage in certain activities much more frequently than others, so that the overall mean for that activity, when counted across all officers, is higher than when every officer engages in a task on an

infrequent basis.

Departmental commitment to community policing, at least as measured here, does not appear to be a very powerful predictor of officer activity. Rather, whether or not a police agency adopts community policing seems more strongly associated with differences in the frequency with which certain tasks are performed. In general, officers in agencies adopting community policing were less likely to report performance of most tasks involving crime prevention and interactions with the public.

Assignment as a community policing officer does appear to change the frequency with which officers engage in crime prevention and community interaction activities. Officers reporting a primary assignment as community police officers generally reported higher frequencies of performance of all tasks, and significantly more likely to engage in crime prevention and other activities involving interactions with citizens. The tasks which best identified officers having community police assignments were those one would expect; foot patrol, working with neighborhood watch, attending community meetings, talking with citizens, and the like. This suggests that implementation of community policing as a specialized task involving specific officers identified as having community police officer functions may explain many of the unexpected findings.

In agencies that have not adopted community policing, all

officers may engage, to some degree, in crime prevention and community interaction efforts. When aggregated across all officers, since every officer does these things at least some time, there are relatively high mean frequencies of performance reported for these types of activities. Thus, officers in 1981 (before the advent of community policing) and those in agencies not adopting community policing report higher mean frequencies for such things as talking with members of the public to build rapport.

In agencies that do adopt community policing, the effect of community policing on overall officer activities may depend upon how community policing is implemented. If only certain officers are assigned to community policing tasks, and their assignment frees other officers from responsibility for performing crime prevention and community interaction tasks, the result may be a decrease in the average frequency with which those tasks are performed. That is, a few specialized officers perform the bulk of crime prevention and community relations work while other officers become increasingly reactive and separated from citizens. If someone has the specific assignment of community police officer, it may mean that officers without such assignments see community policing as "not my job."

Our data indicate that this may be the case. Absent the adoption of community policing by an agency, all officers report

engaging in what were here defined as community policing tasks at a relatively low rate of frequency. With the adoption of community policing, and particularly, the assignment of specific officers to community policing, some officers report quite frequent performance of community policing tasks while the remainder almost never perform those tasks.

In summary, the comparison of police officer task performance in Ohio between 1981 and 1996 indicates that the kinds of activities in which officers routinely engage have changed. Officers report greater specialization in job assignments in 1996 as compared to the earlier survey. Additionally, the adoption of community policing by an agency seems to explain a lower rate of "community policing" activities performed by most officers. Specific assignment as a community policing officer, however, is associated with higher frequencies of performance of almost all tasks, especially those related to crime prevention and community interaction. If this increased activity on the part of community policing officers replaces time previously spent on random patrol, then Cordner's (1995) hypothesis that these officers will spend more time on crime prevention and community interaction and less time on routine patrol is supported.

Additional research is needed to further investigate the influence of officer characteristics on police officer activity,

and to test for effects of agency characteristics such as size, specialization, organizational height, etc., on the distribution of officer tasks. Also, further research is needed to better define agency commitment to community policing and test for relationships between commitment and task performance.

Finally, additional research is needed to assess the impact of special assignments on the total "amount" of community policing that is accomplished. The question that remains is whether it is more effective to have a few officers engaged in frequent interactions with the public, or to have all officers engaged in less frequent interactions. This research should develop measures of total community policing activity (numbers of citizens contacted, numbers of problems identified and/or solved) and outcomes (citizen fear of crime, attitudes towards the police, involvement in crime prevention activities, etc.) and then determine relationships between implementation strategy for community policing and these measures of activity and outcome.

CONCLUSION

Consistent with Cordner's (1995) expectations, police officers having assignments as community police officers in Ohio in 1996 report higher frequencies of involvement in a range of community policing activities than do other officers responding to the 1996 survey, or those officers who responded to the 1981 survey. The data indicate that assigning officers to specialize

in community policing results in those officers doing different things than officers not so assigned. Officers with community policing assignments more frequently engage in interactions with the public and in crime prevention efforts.

The data also suggest that specialist assignments to community policing may have the effect of reducing the overall level of involvement in crime prevention and citizen interaction by officers in the agency. Those seeking to implement or improve community policing efforts in police agencies should consider alternative strategies. Using specialist officers can insure that community policing functions are performed, but at a cost to average officer involvement with the community. Implementing community policing as a department-wide strategy may lead to increased involvement with the community across all officers, but not allow any officers to develop expertise. What seems clear is that the way in which community policing efforts are implemented has implications for the day-to-day work of police officers.

REFERENCES

- Buerger, Michael E. (1994) "The tale of two targets: Limitations of community anticrime efforts," Crime and Delinquency 40(3):411-436.
- Cordner, Gary W. (1995) "Community policing: Elements and effects," Police Forum 5(3):1-8.
- Farrell, Michael J. (1988) "The Development of the Community Patrol Officer Program: Community-Oriented Policing in the New York City Police Department." In J. Greene and S. Mastrofski (eds.) Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?, New York: Praeger, pp.73-88.
- Granados, William D. (1997) "Nightsticks to knighthood: A case for articulation of community policing's divergent themes." Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management 20(2):374-391.
- Greene, Jack R. and Stephen D. Mastrofski (1988) Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?. New York: Praeger.
- Greene, Helen Taylor (1993) "Community-Oriented Policing in Florida." American Journal of Police 12(4):141-156.
- Goldstein, Herman (1987) "Toward Community-Oriented Policing: Potential Basic Requirements and Threshold Questions." Crime and Delinquency 33:6-30.
- Grinc, Randolph M. (1994) "'Angels in Marble': Problems in Stimulating Community Involvement in Community Policing." Crime and Delinquency 40(3):437-468.
- Kelling, George L. and Mark H. Moore (1988) "From Political Reform to Community: The Evolving Strategy of Police." In J. Greene and S. Mastrofski (eds.) Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?, New York: Praeger, pp.3-26.
- Kelling, George L. (1988) "Community Policing: The Quiet Revolution." Perspectives on Policing, No. 1 (June). Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Kennedy, Daniel M. (1993) The Strategic Management of Police Resources. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, Perspectives on Policing 14:1-11.
- Lipsky, Michael (1980) Street-Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services. New York: Russell Sage.

Mastrofski, Stephen (1988) "Community Policing as Reform: A Cautionary Tale." In J. Greene and S. Mastrofski (eds.) Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?, New York: Praeger, pp.47-68.

Mastrofski, Stephen (1992) "What Does Community Policing Mean for Daily Police Work?" National Institute of Justice Journal, Issue No. 225. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Mastrofski, Stephen D. (1993) "Eyeing the Doughnut: Community Policing and Progressive Reform." American Journal of Policing 12(4):1-7.

Melchers, R. (1993) "A Commentary on a Vision of the Future of Policing in Canada," Canadian Journal of Criminology 35(1):47-58.

Rosenbaum, Dennis and Arthur J. Lurigio (1994) "An Inside Look at Community Policing Reform: Definitions, Organizational Changes, and Evaluation Findings." Crime and Delinquency 40(3):299-314.

Thurman, Quint, Bogen, Phil, and Andrew Giacomazzi (1993) "Program Monitoring and Community Policing: A Process Evaluation of Community Policing in Spokane, Washington." American Journal of Police 12(4):89-114.

Trojanowicz, Robert (1982) An Evaluation of the Neighborhood Foot Patrol in Flint, Michigan. East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Trojanowicz, Robert and Bonnie Bucqueroux (1990) Community Policing; A Contemporary Perspective. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.

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

Table 1 Characteristics of officers by sample year

	1981	1996
Age		
18-29	54.5	18.9
30-39	39.9	41.6
40-49	4.6	32.5
50+	1.0	7.0
Race		
white	88.1	87.9
non-white	11.9	12.1
Sex		
male	92.4	90.2
female	7.6	9.8
Interest in Job		
Very dull	.2	1.2
Dull	.8	1.3
So-so	9.2	10.0
Interesting	47.8	43.3
Very interesting	42.0	44.2
Utilize Talent		
Not at all	.7	1.5
Very little	8.2	6.4
Fairly well	36.8	28.5
Quite well	36.6	39.2
Very well	17.7	24.5

Table 2 Mean Differences in demographic characteristics of the two samples of officers

	1981	1996	Difference
Age	1.52	2.29	.77*
Race	.88	.88	.01
Sex	.08	.10	.05*
Interest	4.31	4.28	.02
Talent	3.63	3.79	.16*

Table 3 Difference in tasks from 1981 to 1996

Task	Mean frequency		Difference
	1981	1996	
Analyze crime and accident statistics	.62	1.19	.58*
Reprint department in various organizations	.80	1.42	.62*
Conduct field search of arrested person	3.44	3.36	.08
Handcuff suspects	3.66	3.58	.08*
Impound property	3.21	2.77	-.44*
Participate in raid	1.26	1.28	.02
Request bystanders to assist in apprehension	.33	.42	.08*
Secure search warrants	.67	.99	.33*
Patrol on foot	2.07	2.08	.01
Give street directions	3.86	3.65	-.21*
Mediate family disputes	3.63	3.42	-.21*
Social service referrals	2.88	3.20	.32*
Talk with people to establish rapport	3.99	3.56	-.43*
Warn offenders in lieu of arrest or citation	4.10	3.68	-.42*
Distribute printed material for public relations	.78	1.13	.35*
Explain recruitment policies	.98	.97	.01
Hold property for safekeeping	1.13	1.31	.18*
Mark valuables	.57	.67	.10*
Organize neighborhood watch groups	.14	.28	.14*
Provide information to those in ride-along program	.70	1.35	.65*
Request publicity from media	.29	.54	.25*
Respond to information requests from public	2.61	3.69	1.08*
School visits	.73	1.09	.36*

* p<.05

Table 4 Differences in tasks among officers from departments reporting they have C.O.P. and departments reporting no C.O.P program

	no ^a	yes ^b	Difference
Analyze crime and accident statistics	1.13	1.20	.07
Represent department in various organizations	1.47	1.39	-.08
Conduct field search of arrested person	3.37	3.36	-.01
Handcuff suspects	3.68	3.57	-.11
Impound property	3.07	2.70	-.37*
Participate in raid	1.04	1.33	.29*
Request bystanders to assist in apprehension	.35	.44	.09
Secure search warrants	.98	1.00	-.02
Patrol on foot	2.31	2.02	-.29*
Give street directions	3.91	3.59	-.32*
Mediate family disputes	3.50	3.39	-.11
Social service referrals	3.15	3.22	.07
Talk with people to establish rapport	3.93	3.45	-.48*
Warn offenders in lieu of arrest or citation	4.12	3.58	-.54*
Distribute printed material for public relations	1.11	1.12	.01
Explain recruitment policies	1.03	.95	-.08
Hold property for safekeeping	1.50	1.26	-.24*
Mark valuables	.59	.70	.11
Organize neighborhood watch groups	.25	.29	.04
Provide information to those in ride-along program	1.26	1.39	.13
Request publicity from media	.56	.53	-.03
Respond to information requests from public	3.89	3.64	-.25*
School visits	1.29	1.03	-.26*

^a no N=226-234

^b yes N=1264-1313

* p<.05

Table 5 Commitment to Community Policing

Commitment Score	Percent of Officers	N
0	.4	(5)
1	2.7	(36)
2	13.6	(180)
3	24.7	(327)
4	58.7	(778)

N=1326, nearly 300 officers were from non-C.O.P departments

Table 6 Difference in Means between High and Low Commitment Departments

	Low	High	Difference
Analyze crime and accident statistics	1.16	1.23	.06
Represent department in various organizations	1.42	1.38	-.04
Conduct field search of arrested person	3.38	3.34	-.04
Handcuff suspects	3.59	3.55	-.04
Impound property	2.81	2.62	-.19*
Participate in raid	1.18	1.44	.26*
Request bystanders to assist in apprehension	.39	.47	.08
Secure search warrants	.94	1.04	.10
Patrol on foot	2.03	2.01	-.02
Give street directions	3.69	3.53	-.16*
Mediate family disputes	3.53	3.29	-.24*
Social service referrals	3.25	3.20	-.05
Talk with people to establish rapport	3.67	3.30	-.37*
Warn offenders in lieu of arrest or citation	3.82	3.41	-.41*
Distribute printed material for public relations	1.20	1.06	-.14
Explain recruitment policies	.87	1.00	.13*
Hold property for safekeeping	1.46	1.13	-.33*
Mark valuables	.70	.70	.00
Organize neighborhood watch groups	.24	.33	.09
Provide information to those in ride-along program	1.31	1.45	.14*
Request publicity from media	.53	.52	-.01
Respond to information requests from public	3.80	3.52	-.28*
School visits	1.09	.99	-.10

1981 and 1996

Table 7 Mean difference in tasks between Community Police officers and officers not having a community policing assignment

	Not Assigned	Assigned	Difference
Analyze crime and accident statistics	1.16	1.29	.12
Represent department in various organizations	1.33	1.76	.43*
Conduct field search of arrested person	3.30	3.50	.20*
Handcuff suspects	3.53	3.71	.18*
Impound property	2.75	2.81	.06
Participate in raids	1.28	1.12	-.16*
Request bystanders to assist in apprehension	.39	.48	.09
Secure search warrants	.98	.88	-.10
Patrol on foot	1.87	2.77	.89*
Give street directions	3.57	4.02	.46*
Mediate family disputes	3.34	3.70	.36*
Social service referrals	3.15	3.38	.23*
Talk with people to establish rapport	3.39	4.27	.88*
Warn offenders in lieu of arrest or citation	3.56	4.13	.57*
Distribute printed material for public relations	.96	1.77	.81*
Explain recruitment policies	.93	1.17	.24*
Hold property for safekeeping	1.28	1.42	.13
Mark valuables	.62	.77	.15*
Organize neighborhood watch groups	.18	.61	.43*
Provide information to those in ride-along program	1.29	1.52	.23*
Request publicity from media	.50	.66	.16*
Respond to information requests from public	3.68	3.91	.23*
School visits	.95	1.59	.64*

N assigned 287-295
 N not assigned 1165-1202

Table 8 Correlations between officer characteristics and task performance frequency, 1996

Task	Age	Race	Sex	Interest	Talent
Analyze crime	.07*	.01	-.01	.06	.06
Represent department	.17*	.05	.04	.04	.14*
Conduct field search	-.37*	.04	-.10*	.15*	-.03
Handcuff suspects	-.37*	.01	-.09*	.17*	-.02
Impound property	-.35*	.03	-.10*	.08*	.02
Participate in raid	.02	-.01	-.09*	.07*	.07*
Request assistance	-.02	-.15*	-.04	.01	.05
Search warrant	.09*	-.03	-.07*	.10*	.04
Patrol on foot	-.23*	.01	-.04	.04	.01
Give directions	-.14*	.02	-.02	.03	.02
Family disputes	-.38*	.02	-.03	.07*	-.06*
Social service referral	-.17*	-.04	.08*	.07*	-.01
Talk to people on beat	-.26*	.01	-.05*	.14*	-.04
Warn offenders	-.35*	-.06*	-.10*	.08*	-.04
Distribute materials	.06*	.04	.03	.04	.08*
Explain recruitment	.05	-.07*	-.02	.02	.08*
Hold property	.08*	.04	-.05	.10*	-.02
Mark valuables	.06*	-.08*	.01	.05	-.02
Neighborhood watch	.05	-.04	.05	.02	.03
Provide information	-.13*	.01	-.03	.08*	.01
Request publicity	.21*	.03	.01	.01	.10*
Information requests	-.04	.14*	.05	.01	.01
School visits	.07*	-.05	.04	.04	.09*

*p<.05

Table 9 Correlations between officer characteristics and task performance frequency, 1981

Task	Age	Race	Sex	Interest	Talent
Analyze crime	.05*	.01	.01	.03	.09*
Represent department	.08*	.05*	-.06*	.07*	.08*
Conduct field search	-.09*	-.01	-.07*	.04	.08*
Handcuff suspects	-.10*	-.09*	-.02	.07*	.09*
Impound property	-.09*	-.05*	-.03	.06*	.05*
Participate in raid	-.01	-.09*	-.06*	.03	.07*
Request assistance	.03	.07*	.06*	.02	.02
Search warrant	.06*	-.01	-.09*	.02	.11*
Patrol on foot	-.02	.03	-.09*	.06*	.08*
Give directions	.04	-.03	.00	.01	.09*
Family disputes	-.13*	-.07*	.03	.02	.04
Social service referral	-.05*	-.08*	.08*	.01	.09*
Talk to people on beat	-.05*	-.01	-.02	.10*	.08*
Warn offenders	-.09*	.08*	-.04	.01	.04
Distribute materials	.03	.05*	-.01	.09*	.07*
Explain recruitment	-.05*	-.07*	.02	.04	.07*
Hold property	.02	.05*	-.05*	.04	.01
Mark valuables	.06*	-.06*	-.04	.04	.02
Neighborhood watch	.08*	-.08*	-.03	.07*	.04
Provide information	-.04*	.03	.00	.06*	.03
Request publicity	.09*	.07*	-.06*	.05	.01
Information requests	-.04	.05*	.04	.01	.06*
School visits	.15*	-.03	-.04	.07*	.05

*p<.05

Table 10 Discriminant functions for year, department adoption of COP, commitment to Cop, and officer assignment

Criterion	Discriminant Function	Cases Correctly Classified
Year		
1981	.57708	
1996	.79298	75.99%
Dept. Adoption of COP		
No	.65820	
Yes	-.11994	84.43%
Dept. Commitment to Cop		
High	-.37082	
Low	.38304	65.17%
Officer COP Assignment		
No	-.20001	
Yes	.83179	82.62%

Appendix

A. 1996 Task Analysis Instrument

B. Ohio COP survey

Community Policing in Ohio

Please take a few minutes to answer these questions about Community-Oriented Policing / Community Policing. This project is conducted by the University of Cincinnati. Our thanks to the Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Services (OCJS) for information which made this study possible.

1. Name/Address of Police Dept. _____

2. Does your agency have Community-Oriented Policing (COP)? Yes _____
No _____ IF NO, GO TO #9.

3. What is the date of Implementation of COP in your agency? _____
Month \ Year

4. Is there a Full-time COP supervisor? Yes _____ No _____

5. Are officers who perform Community Policing in a separate unit within your agency?
Yes _____ No _____

6. What Division of your agency is the COP program located in? _____

7. How many Officers are regularly assigned to Community Policing? _____

8. Do COP officers receive Supplemental Training in Community-Oriented Policing?
Yes _____ No _____

9. Which of the following Strategies does your department currently use:

- Foot patrol
- Security Surveys
- Neighborhood Substations
- Problem-Oriented Policing or Problem-solving
- Neighborhood Watch Meetings
- Volunteer Citizens
- Bicycle Patrol
- Horse Patrol
- Newsletter to citizens
- Crime Analysis
- Permanent Assignment of COP Officers to beats

Other _____

10. Does your Department have a Mission Statement which Emphasizes Community Involvement?

Yes ____ No ____

If Yes, what Year was the Mission Statement Updated / Adopted?

12. In your Department, how many Employees are:

Full-time Officers _____

Part-time Officers _____

Civilians _____

13. What is the department's starting salary for a Patrol Officer?

14. What is the minimum Educational requirement for new officers?

15. Including patrol officer, how many Ranks does your department have?

COMMENTS: _____

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Your responses are very important in helping us determine the extent of COP in Ohio.

* If you would like a copy of the results sent to your agency, please give us your name and mailing address.

Name _____

Dept. _____

Address _____
