

The author(s) shown below used Federal funds provided by the U.S. Department of Justice and prepared the following final report:

**Document Title: Process Evaluation of an Effort to Engage
Police in Alternative Responses to
Neighborhood Drug Problems**

**Author(s): Douglas Young, Catherine Stayton, Emily
Rosenzweig, and Laura Wycoff**

Document No.: 209265

Date Received: March 2005

Award Number: 96-IJ-CX-0064

This report has not been published by the U.S. Department of Justice. To provide better customer service, NCJRS has made this Federally-funded grant final report available electronically in addition to traditional paper copies.

**Opinions or points of view expressed are those
of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect
the official position or policies of the U.S.
Department of Justice.**

Process Evaluation of an Effort to Engage Police in Alternative Responses to Neighborhood Drug Problems

Douglas Young, Catherine Stayton, Emily Rosenzweig, and Laura Wycoff

Final report to the National Institute of Justice
Grant #96-IJ-CX-0064

Principal Investigator and Corresponding Author:

Douglas Young
Senior Faculty Research Associate
Bureau of Governmental Research
University of Maryland, College Park
4511 Knox Rd, Suite 301
College Park, MD 20740
Phone: 301-403-8334
Fax: 301-403-4404

Contents	Page
1. Introduction	1
2. Review of Relevant Literature	3
A. Police-Community Partnerships Aimed at Reducing Demand for Drugs	3
B. Broader View of Demand Reduction: The Public Health Model	5
C. Barriers to Community Policing	6
D. Factors Underlying Police and Resident Responses to Drug Use and Crime	10
3. Description of La Bodega de la Familia	12
A. Bodega's Neighborhood	12
B. Program Description	13
C. Plans for Working with Police	14
4. Research Goals and Methods	16
A. Research Goals and Questions	16
B. Overview of Methodology	17
C. Quantitative and Qualitative Data from La Bodega Sources	18
D. Police, Residents, and Bodega Clients	18
5. Results	22
A. Police Referrals to Bodega	22
B. Bodega's Strategies to Engage Police	25
C. Fostering Police-Community Relations	29
D. Attitudes and Beliefs about Drug Users and their Families in the Bodega Community	31
E. Beliefs about Drug Crime in the Bodega Community, and the Role of Police and Residents in Responding to Community Drug Problems	39

6. Summary and Discussion	46
A. The Challenge of Establishing New Police Responses to Community Drug Problems	46
B. Bodega's Strategic Approach	50
C. Opportunities for Change: Attitudes and Beliefs of Police	53
D. Recommendations and Future Efforts	54
7. References	57
Appendix	64

Abstract

Process Evaluation of an Effort to Engage Police in Alternative Responses to Neighborhood Drug Problems

Despite two decades of progress in community-oriented policing, efforts to link police and citizens in antidrug initiatives have remained focused on enforcement. This report presents findings from a process evaluation of efforts by a program in New York City, La Bodega de la Familia, to work with local police on alternative responses to neighborhood drug use and crime. In conjunction with the program's core service, family case management, Bodega sought to engage police and other formal criminal justice agencies in referring drug users and their family members to Bodega services. This exploratory research sought to assess Bodega's evolving work with police, while also exploring factors that may mediate police responses, including the beliefs of officers and local residents toward drug users and their families. Both qualitative and quantitative methods were used in the research; given the small numbers of study participants and data limitations, study conclusions must be regarded as tentative. Findings showed little use of the program by police during the 28-month study period. Forty-one of the 647 referrals to Bodega during this period came from police, and just nine came from patrol officers. The program was disproportionately used by specialized officers working in domestic violence and public housing, and parole and probation agents made many more referrals than police. These findings were anticipated by our observations and discussions with Bodega staff and administrators, and data obtained in extensive interviews and focus groups with police, residents, and Bodega clients. Police responses suggested that they hold distinct occupational roles and belief structures that are in accordance with those roles. Patrol officers saw drug users as "junkies" who "do not have families"; also, they were too busy dealing with service calls to make program referrals. Domestic violence and housing officers had more nuanced views of drug users and saw value in treatment, prevention, and Bodega. Additionally, while Bodega built extraordinary relationships with senior police administrators, efforts by the program to engage precinct officers and their supervisors in making referrals were incomplete. Future efforts of this kind should include explicit directives to officers from superiors

about making program referrals, accompanied by manuals and trainings involving sample cases, with guided role playing and rehearsal. More broadly, the study findings suggest that attempts to change or develop new police responses would benefit from an assessment of the personal attitudes and beliefs that inform those responses.

Executive Summary

Process Evaluation of an Effort to Engage Police in Alternative Responses to Neighborhood Drug Problems

Douglas Young, Catherine Stayton, Emily Rosenzweig, and Laura Wycoff

Background

Despite two decades of progress in community-oriented policing, efforts to link police and citizens in antidrug initiatives have remained focused on enforcement. Attempts by police to engage residents in solving drug-related problems typically involve them either serving as citizen deputies who help patrol the community or acting as the eyes and ears of police in neighborhood watch campaigns (Davis and Lurigio, 1996; Skolnick and Bayley, 1988; McElroy, Cosgrove and Sadd, 1993). This has been true in spite of concerted efforts to focus police on reducing demand for drugs and the acknowledgement of many police officials that a second prong of attack, used alongside traditional enforcement efforts aimed at reducing drug supply, is needed to break the cycle of drugs and crime (BJA, 1993; Rosenbaum, 1993; Drug Strategies, 1996).

This report presents findings from a process evaluation of efforts by La Bodega de la Familia to engage local police in using the program as a response to neighborhood drug use and crime. Bodega's efforts with police were an outgrowth of the program's family case management services, which were designed to build support around drug users with the intent of keeping them in treatment and out of jail or prison. In addition to describing and assessing Bodega's evolving work with police, this research explored factors that may mediate police responses, including the beliefs of officers and local residents toward drug users and their families, and their respective roles in dealing with community drug problems.

Bodega's planners targeted several entities within the criminal justice system as potential partners in their efforts to forge new responses to drug use and related crime. However, compared to justice actors such as judges or probation officers, local police have a uniquely close, constant presence in the lives of local residents (Goldstein, 1979 and 1990; Eck and Spelman, 1987; Trojanowicz, 1983). Police have wide discretion in responding to disorder and can fashion preventive solutions that include brokering needed services for residents, and assisting community institutions like family and social agencies (Bureau of

Justice Assistance, 1994; Uchida and Forst, 1994; Greene and McLaughlin, 1993). Bodega planners hoped eventually to engage police in a public health approach where officers would respond to drug use as a health problem, not a crime problem (Goetz, 1996; Goetz and Mitchell, 1998).

The research record underscores the challenge faced by Bodega in achieving these goals. Research done earlier at the Vera Institute, where Bodega originated, on the national Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing (INOP) initiative documented the difficulties police face in developing new strategies to tackle drug problems, and the tendency to fall back on enforcement (Grinc, 1994; Sadd and Grinc, 1993). The emphasis on enforcement in police demand reduction initiatives is consistent with most officers' views about their role in the community. Police organizational culture teaches officers to emphasize their role as crime fighters (McElroy et al., 1993; Brown, 1981; Muir, 1977).

La Bodega de la Familia

Operating out of a storefront on Manhattan's Lower East Side, Bodega's core service, family case management (FCM), included assessment, treatment planning, program referral and monitoring, advocacy, counseling, and 24-hour crisis intervention. A separate impact evaluation of Bodega's FCM service has been conducted by Vera investigators (Sullivan et al., 2002). Bodega's work with police were part of a larger effort to seek referrals from numerous criminal justice agencies. Bodega sought to enlist local officers to contact and refer families as part of their response to a routine complaint call, or refer people making inquiries at the precinct following the apprehension or arrest of a family member. Police were encouraged to refer persons who were repeatedly involved in drug-related domestic incidents, or family members victimized by the user. More diffuse Bodega goals included improving relationships between police and residents, and sensitizing police to offenders families' needs for treatment and other services.

Research Goals and Methods

The first goal of the research was to describe and assess Bodega's efforts to enlist the police in formulating new responses to community drug problems. A second goal was to identify and explore factors that underlie responses of police officers and local residents to drug users and drug crime. We employed a multi-method approach focusing primarily on qualitative data. The process research tracked quantitative data from Bodega's

computerized information system on client referrals and participation in Bodega services, We also conducted surveys of Bodega program records, held quarterly (or more frequent) meetings and extensive, ongoing discussions with Bodega's director and staff, and observed formal and informal interactions between Bodega staff and police. To address the study's second goal we conducted structured interviews and focus groups with local police officers, neighborhood residents, and Bodega clients, focusing on beliefs and perceptions that may influence responses to community drug problems. We conducted a total of five focus groups, two with police (N=15), two with local residents (N=26), and one with Bodega clients (N=8); we held ten interviews with police and six with clients.

Responses in the focus groups and interviews were analyzed qualitatively; we sought to identify major categories, such as the roles and responsibilities of different officers, that helped explain the results (Ely, 1991). Our purpose in using this approach is described by Maxwell (2001, p. 17): "Qualitative researchers typically study a relatively small number of individuals or situations and preserve the individuality of each of these in their analyses, rather than collecting data from large samples and aggregating the data across individuals or situations. Thus, they are able to understand how events, actions, and meanings are shaped by the unique circumstances in which these occur." This approach also fit with the exploratory intent of the research; Bodega's efforts and strategies with police were always evolving, and a rigorous study of their impacts was premature. Nonetheless, given the small number of study participants and limited data gathered in the research, conclusions drawn here must be regarded as tentative and requiring further study.

Results: Police Referrals to Bodega

Bodega received 41 police referrals during the 28-month study period, more than two-thirds of which came from a few officers assigned to domestic violence and public housing units. Precinct police serving in sector cars or on foot patrol – officers who comprise the largest group in any NYPD precinct – made just nine referrals, and these dropped from seven during the first half of the study period to two during the second half. These findings contrast with Bodega's success in obtaining referrals from other sources, which totaled 647 (including 164 walk-in clients) during this same period. Among criminal justice referral sources, police ranked third behind the local parole and probation agencies; parole officers referred more than twice as many families as police.

The rates at which officers referred families to Bodega were anticipated by the results of our interviews and focus groups, which suggested that police in different occupational roles hold belief structures that are in accordance with those roles. The low number of referrals from sector and patrol officers could also be traced to institutional and structural barriers. An alternative explanation of the results is that Bodega made incomplete efforts to engage police line staff and their immediate supervisors in making program referrals. These interpretations and their implications for future efforts with police, are considered below.

In focus groups and interviews, sector and patrol officers articulated the limits of their role: “It’s rare for patrol officers to make referrals. You just don’t have time when you’re on patrol.” Another added, “You’re a slave to the radio. You can’t be a counselor because you don’t have the time.” These structural barriers were compounded by an institutional resistance to making social service referrals, which were reported to be the purview of police working in special areas such as domestic violence and crime prevention. Focus group discussions suggested that sector and patrol officers were acculturated to be dismissive of program referrals. Other barriers apparent at Bodega have been documented in previous studies on efforts to promote new policing strategies, including steady turnover in sector and foot patrol officers, and a police incentive structure that does not encourage program referrals.

Bodega did become a favored program among officers assigned to deal with domestic violence, who made 19 referrals over the last 20 months of the study period. Bodega was a natural fit with these officers, who were frequently exposed to incidents involving families and substance abuse. Many of these were not easily resolved through an arrest and officers sought out programs for these cases. Based on interview and focus group data, we expected more referrals from other specialized officers who generally agreed with a more service-oriented approach. Housing, youth, and community affairs officers expressed support for Bodega, but these officers were not practiced in making program referrals and appeared hesitant to do so.

Bodega had its greatest success engaging other criminal justice agencies as sources for program referral. This is worth noting because it is consistent with the pattern we observed within the police force. Like individual police officers, criminal justice agencies such as

parole or probation, which are less focused on enforcement and incorporate social services in their repertoire of responses, are more likely to make use of La Bodega.

Bodega's Strategic Approach

Top-Down and Bottom-Up Strategies. Bodega had minimal success engaging local precinct officers in the program, even though Bodega's director had extraordinary success enlisting the police commissioner (and even the mayor) to attend Bodega events and voice support for the program. This support helped Bodega cement relations with local precinct and housing police commanders, but it appeared to have virtually no impact on referrals by precinct police or these officers' further involvement with Bodega.

Bodega used precinct roll calls, when officers change shifts, as a forum for making 15-minute presentations about the program. While roll call was a convenient way to reach several officers at once, Bodega field staff later concluded that these didactic presentations were ineffective. Many officers were not attentive in these sessions and staff thought many of them came to view Bodega as just another program—a flavor-of-the-week that would soon be relegated to the pile of neighborhood programs with good intentions but little relevance to daily policing duties. Over time, staff made fewer roll call presentations and gravitated to specialized officers, devoting their time and attention to this more receptive audience.

Ambivalence Toward Police Involvement in the Program. An atmosphere of ambivalence complicated Bodega's work with the police. Community residents, Bodega clients, and even Bodega staff seemed uncertain about the role of local police in the program. The clinical staff seemed to take their cue from local residents and especially clients. These case managers no doubt heard the same things we did in our interviews with residents and clients—a pervasive sense of distrust toward the police, frustration and anger over their perceived unresponsiveness. Staff at times mirrored the conflicted view expressed by their clients: Police could be very useful in certain crisis situations, and some individual officers were responsive and helpful, but, as a rule, it was safest to avoid them.

Opportunities for Change: Attitudes and Beliefs of Police

Sector and patrol officers' attitudes toward drug addicts also likely motivated them to ignore, and perhaps even resist, Bodega's message. There is nowhere to ground such a message if, as these officers reported, there is no such thing as a functional drug user, all

addicts are hopelessly predatory “dope fiends” and “junkies don’t have families.” Given their attitudes, these officers saw little value in treatment or prevention: “I refer people to services and they don’t want to go. They don’t care about the services offered to them.” Several of these officers went further, expressing a broader cynicism about responding to drugs. Arrests were almost as pointless as treatment: “Arresting people doesn’t make a difference. I picked up the same girl shoplifting five times. She’s hooked on drugs, she gets into rehab, drops out.... It’s a never ending cycle. How do you help someone like that?”

In contrast, attitudes expressed by specialized officers, especially housing and domestic violence police, suggested there was potential in enlisting these officers in Bodega’s mission. Compared to sector and patrol police, specialized officers held more textured views of users and addicts. They knew of functional users in the community and expressed concern for adolescents drawn to the dealer lifestyle; a few even showed sympathy for adults struggling in recovery. These attitudes were internally consistent with their beliefs about enforcement and alternative approaches to drug demand reduction. These officers were focused on the role of drugs in domestic incidents and youth crime. Domestic violence officers already used social service programs. Housing officers said they return to check on families after an incident, and spoke about the value of developing lasting relationships with residents of public housing.

A fruitful area of future research would be to consider the origins of specialized officers’ more open attitude toward drug users and their families. These police may have held these views before joining the department. Alternatively, their responsibilities may afford them more opportunity to observe and interact with families; exposure alone may engender the development of more refined views of addicts and the recognition that drug demand reduction can involve treatment and prevention, and not just enforcement.

Implications and Recommendations

It was difficult to judge the effects of sector and patrol officers’ belief systems on their use of Bodega because of shortfalls in the program’s efforts to engage this group. We cannot say whether sector and patrol officers would use the program if they were recruited to make program referrals through a well-planned training effort. Future efforts should target the gap between top-down and bottom-up strategies for reaching these officers. Patrol officers need explicit directives from superiors about making family referrals, followed by

training that extends beyond a 15-minute introduction to the program. A manual that illustrated familiar situations and specific families that benefited from program involvement, along with guided role playing and rehearsal, might generate more concrete action from precinct police.

More broadly, the study findings suggest that any attempt to change or develop new police responses would benefit from an assessment of the personal attitudes and beliefs that inform those responses. Police officers have diverse belief structures and, at least based on this exploratory study, their attitudes and beliefs about addicts and drug use vary according to their formal work roles. Paying attention to these differences should lead to more efficient, effective policing strategies. It is important to note, however, that attitudes alone did not lead certain officers to make referrals to the program. In fact, a comparison of domestic violence and housing police suggest that prior practice in making service referrals, and the acceptance of referrals as a routine part of their job, prevailed over belief structures in making use of Bodega. The use of multiple strategies to engage, train, and reinforce police will be needed if they are to expand their responses to neighborhood drug use and crime.

Process Evaluation of an Effort to Engage Police in Alternative Responses to Neighborhood Drug Problems

Douglas Young, Catherine Stayton, Emily Rosenzweig, and Laura Wycoff

1. Introduction

Despite two decades of progress in community-oriented policing, efforts to link police and citizens in antidrug initiatives have remained focused on enforcement. Attempts by police to engage residents in solving drug-related problems typically involve them either serving as citizen deputies who help patrol the community or acting as the eyes and ears of police in neighborhood watch campaigns (Davis and Lurigio, 1996; Skolnick and Bayley, 1988; McElroy, Cosgrove and Sadd, 1993). This has been true in spite of concerted efforts to focus police on reducing demand for drugs and the acknowledgement of many police officials that a second prong of attack, used alongside traditional enforcement efforts aimed at reducing drug supply, is needed to break the cycle of drugs and crime (BJA, 1993; Rosenbaum, 1993; Drug Strategies, 1996).

Research on the national Innovative Neighborhood Policy (INOP) project documented the struggles police experience in trying to develop new strategies to tackle drug problems, and their tendency to fall back on enforcement (Grinc, 1994; Sadd and Grinc, 1993). The INOP research and other studies have also shown that efforts to build partnerships between police and residents tend to be least effective in poor, disenfranchised communities where there is a history of distrust and antagonism between these groups (e.g., Skogan, 1988). Community organizations in such neighborhoods, and particularly those comprised of Hispanics and African-Americans, tend to focus on improving service delivery to individuals rather than communitywide improvements, and are thus least likely to engage in community policing efforts (Skogan and Hartnett, 1997). In these neighborhoods, collaborations between police and citizens are often limited to a small group of activists who are perennial police supporters. When these efforts are singularly focused on enforcement, they can have an insidious effect in these communities—where the line between

victim and offender is often blurred—dividing the community between the good guys and the bad guys (McKenzie, 1994).

A growing body of clinical and research literature on the unintended consequences of incarceration suggests that the drawbacks of focusing solely on enforcement in drug-related community policing efforts may be felt most by families of drug abusers (Sampson, 1992; Bloom, 1993; Hagan, 1996). These families, already victimized by the abuser, may become more vulnerable when that person is removed from the family and sent to jail or prison. Families living in public housing face the risk of eviction when a relative who was living with them is arrested for drug use. Family members may experience a profound sense of shame that divides them from their community.

Seeking to work with these families and to help police and other agencies diversify their responses to drug users, La Bodega de la Familia opened its doors in late 1996. The program was a demonstration effort of the Vera Institute developed for the City of New York with funding from the Mayor's Office of the Criminal Justice Coordinator, the city's Department of Health, the New York City Council, and various private donations. Operating in a small but densely populated 4x6-block area on Manhattan's Lower East Side, Bodega developed a set of services directed at building support around the drug user, with the intent of keeping the user in treatment and out of jail or prison.¹ The program's core service, family case management (FCM), also aimed to prevent family dissolution and problems such as drug use and delinquency among non-using family members. An evaluation of the impacts of Bodega FCM on families and individual participants was previously issued by Vera researchers (Sullivan et al., 2002).

The research reported here is a separate, exploratory study on the program's efforts to encourage criminal justice enforcement agents—police, probation and parole agencies, prosecutors, and the courts—to develop new, family-centered strategies for dealing with drug-involved offenders. The purpose of this process research, which began just a few months after the program opened in 1996, was to examine Bodega evolving strategies to work with police in particular, describe their implementation, and assess their success. Detailed below, the study methods, which were primarily qualitative, included interviews and focus groups with police,

¹ In January 1999, after data collection for the present project was completed, Bodega expanded the program's catchment area.

residents, and Bodega participants; reviews of Bodega file data; and observations of Bodega's activities. To provide the context needed to interpret evaluation findings, the interviews and focus groups examined factors that could mediate police response to Bodega's efforts. We asked officers about their views of drug users and their families; of drug crime and criminals in the neighborhood; and of the roles that families, residents, and police can play in dealing with drug use and crime. For comparison purposes, we also queried local residents and Bodega participants on these topics.

The study's focus on Bodega's work with police does not reflect any particular priority of the program. La Bodega's emphasis on its core FCM services, in fact, is signified by the more rigorous (and much more costly) quasi-experimental research reported previously (Sullivan et al., 2002). Still, this exploratory investigation of Bodega's work with police yielded several lessons that should be useful for others seeking to develop criminal justice responses to drug problems that do not rely solely on enforcement and punitive sanctions. Conducted during the early stages of the program's development, this was truly action research, both informing and informed by ongoing discussions with Bodega staff.

2. Review of Relevant Literature

Bodega's plans for working with police were based more on the prior experience of project planners and their knowledge of the principles of community-oriented policing than on reviews of specific research findings. Policing literature provides, however, a useful context for the current study. In this section we consider past efforts by police to reduce the demand for drugs and an evolving public health view of the police role that is consistent with Bodega's approach. Studies that have looked at how police and residents view their roles in responding to drug use and drug crime in the community are also reviewed.

2.A. Police-Community Partnerships Aimed at Reducing Demand for Drugs

Bodega's planners targeted several entities within the criminal justice system as potential partners in their demonstration. Compared to other justice agents, such as probation and parole officers, judges, and prosecutors, local police are potentially the program's most valuable ally. No other public agency has the kind of close, constant presence in the lives of local residents. With the push towards more proactive models of community policing and problem oriented

policing, where officers can adopt a wider range of resources to prevent and reduce crime and disorder, the police made an excellent fit as partners for the Bodega program. In tacit agreement with Goldstein (1979 and 1990) and other architects of problem-oriented policing (Eck and Spelman, 1987; Trojanowicz, 1983), Bodega planners recognized that police are best positioned to detect disorder in early stages and to identify factors that contribute to crime. Police have wide discretion in responding to disorder and can fashion preventive solutions that include brokering needed services for residents, assisting community institutions like family and social agencies (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994; Uchida and Forst, 1994), and generally providing “the enabling environment within which such community-social service interaction can take place in furtherance of community integration and stabilization” (Greene and McLaughlin, 1993, p. 144). By approaching the police as partners, Bodega planners hoped they would use their program as a tool to assist in alleviating drug-related crime and its effects in the surrounding community, which would fit neatly into the increasingly proactive policing model.

Overall, evaluations have shown that community policing by itself holds little promise in reducing crime. However, there is evidence that fear of crime decreases when communication between the police and the community increases (Skogan and Frydl, 2004). Research does support practices such as building partnerships that focus on specific problems in the community, better known as problem-oriented policing, which is often an element of community policing (Skogan and Frydl, 2004).

There is some evidence of success in addressing drug and disorder problems at specific places through the creation of community partnerships. Weisburd and Green (1995) conducted a randomized experiment of 56 drug hot spots examining problem-oriented policing techniques which involved partnerships between citizens and business owners aimed at crime control. Experimental areas that employed problem-oriented partnerships improved in signs of disorder but not on violent crime. Mazerolle and her colleagues (2000) found favorable outcomes with the Beat Health Program, which focused on underlying problems at specific locales and intervened in the spiral of decay brought on by drugs and disorder. Implemented by the Oakland Police Department, police stepped out of their normal roles by employing civil remedies and seeking the assistance of ‘third parties’ to control drug and disorder problems. Through the use of civil remedies, including the use of nuisance and drug abatement statutes, police were able to

pressure place managers and community members, including property owners, landlords, and even parents, to help solve drug and disorder problems (Mazerolle et al., 2000).

2.B. A Broader View of Demand Reduction: The Public Health Model.

There is also growing support in the literature for police-partnerships which focus on drug abuse and drug crime as public health problems. Research done earlier at the Vera Institute highlighted one of eight BJA-funded INOP sites that stood apart from the others in efforts to broaden its focus on drug crime. The Portland, Oregon program, situated in four community housing developments, aimed to improve quality of life through both enforcement and social service delivery. Enforcement, in the form of “stabilizing occupant patterns,” was viewed as a critical prelude to delivering social services (Sadd & Grinc, 1996). Once the enforcement component was in place, the program employed an on-site public health nurse and eight human service agencies to meet the myriad needs of residents. On-site programs included job placement, parenting education classes, nutritional programs, and activities for youth. In addition to providing direct service on-site, the nurse acted as a referral source.

Barry Goetz and colleagues (Goetz, 1996; Goetz and Mitchell, 1998) have described something akin to the Portland model as a public health approach to community policing. Echoing other investigators (Skolnick, 1992; Sadd and Grinc, 1996)—and the beliefs of Bodega’s planners—they have argued that most policing strategies that go under the guise of demand reduction may fail to achieve their goals of crime prevention because they do not address the social and economic contexts of drug abuse and the problems of the drug user. Invoking a public health framework, Goetz offers an ambitious, alternative vision where police are “available to persons engaging in substance abuse and their families, and act as information exchange links, partnership facilitators and public supporters of community-based public health and harm reduction resources and programs” (Goetz, 1996, p. 11). In this view, police respond to drug use as a health problem, not a crime problem, even referring known users suspected of minor offenses to treatment programs as a form of pre-arrest diversion.

Bodega planners shared similar views, but, as detailed below, were pragmatic in their message to police, emphasizing the program as a resource for families of users more than for the users themselves. Officers from the local precincts were encouraged to refer family members who were repeatedly involved in drug-related domestic incidents, or parents or spouses who

were victimized by the user. Police were told that Bodega could help the family stay together, reduce the harms experienced by the family, and prevent nonusing family members from getting involved in drug use or delinquency. The stabilized family could also support the user in a treatment program, and reduce the user's chances of relapse into drugs and crime. The same ideas—that police should be aware of drug-related harms experienced by families, that support and treatment could help the family and the user, and that residents should view police as helpful to them in accessing needed services—underlay Bodega's general goal of fostering relations between police and residents over drug issues.

2.C. Barriers to Community Policing

In the community policing tradition, police agencies have begun to see the importance of partnering with citizens, community organizations, and business owners to assist in crime prevention and reduction. In this context police have also begun to partner with victims and victim service organization; however, these partnerships may not be as plentiful as one would think. Herman and Weisburd (2002) explain:

While community policing has from the outset emphasized the importance of citizens and the broader community in defining and reacting to community problems, typically partnerships and problem solving do not involve victims of crime or victim's organizations...victims are not generally viewed as potential resources or potential partners in crime control and order maintenance. Similarly, victims' organizations have not looked to police departments as partners in reducing victimization or in strengthening the role of victims in the investigation of crime, crime prevention, and community safety. (p.90)

Some of this hesitation may lie in the differing orientation by victims and police to the actual crime encounter. Ready et al. (2002) explain that a criminal event has different implications for police and victims, which may make continued collaboration difficult. In a national survey of police departments and victims service organizations, Ready and colleagues (2002) report that their findings suggest that “while a majority of police executives believe there are benefits to involving victims in community policing, most also report that it is more useful for officers to interact with community member without special attention to who has been a crime victim when it comes to problem solving and crime prevention” (p. 192). By not seeking

and reinforcing partnerships with victims, police may be missing out on an important resource. Herman and Weisburd (2002) suggest that victims may be unique in their knowledge of crime in their neighborhood, and have invested interest in participating in crime prevention. If police can overcome the barriers to working with victims, victim service organizations may offer a resource for success in their community policing efforts.

Focus on Enforcement. Even in police-community partnerships organized to address drug crime, this innovative role for police has taken a back seat to more traditional enforcement-oriented responses. In the terminology of a ubiquitous national program that is targeted at neighborhoods like Bodega's, these efforts are more "weed" (removing drug-related activity) than "seed" (providing prevention, treatment, and other community-building resources) (Rosenbaum, 1993; Buerger, 1994). Dunsworth and Mills (1999) describe the seeding process as broader and more complex than the weeding process. Evidence of this can be found in a typology of community anti-drug efforts developed from a comprehensive review of 171 active or recent programs (Weingart, 1993). Of the four types of programs identified, law enforcement enhancement (block watches, community patrols) and civil justice (eviction and order maintenance) involved police-citizen cooperation. But police had no role in the other two types of programs that were identified—community building, and treatment and prevention.

The research done on the INOP sites underscored the narrow, enforcement focus of police practice, even when it seeks to implement strategies designed to reduce drug demand (Sadd and Grinc, 1993).² The Houston police department, one of eight BJA- INOP sites that were the subject of the study, is a case in point. In spite of this department's long-standing commitment to problem-solving policing, Houston's drug demand reduction strategy, Operation Siege, emphasized such enforcement techniques as undercover operations and buy-and-bust patrols (Sadd et al., 1991). In this view, demand reduction takes on a limited, literal meaning: Enhanced enforcement can reduce users' access to markets and thus inhibit their progression to addiction. Sadd and Grinc (1996) were not persuaded by this narrow view, concluding that such enforcement, however well-intended, cannot produce lasting effects.

² Discussions of drug policy typically distinguish between efforts aimed at reducing drug supply—interdiction and enforcement activities—and efforts aimed at reducing drug demand, which are typically associated with prevention and treatment.

The emphasis on enforcement in police demand reduction initiatives is consistent with most officers' views about their role in the community. Police organizational culture teaches officers to emphasize their role as crime fighters (McElroy et al., 1993; Brown, 1981; Muir, 1977). Even when performing a designated community policing role, officers involved in drug control tend to see themselves as assistants to specialized narcotics enforcers, mobilizing the community to feed information to narcotics police (Baker, 1985). Research has also shown that many officers are dismissive of community policing as "social work" and has documented their aversion to that role (Skogan and Hartnett, 1997; Sadd and Grinc, 1996; Rosenbaum, 1993). Police tend to see themselves as enforcers within the criminal justice system, and not as front-end referral sources for other systems (health, education, housing, social services) that contribute to solving the problems that are brought to the attention of police (McElroy et al., 1993; Goldstein, 1990).

These views present a notable counterpoint to those voiced by police administrators in surveys about drugs and crime policy. Perceiving enforcement as providing little more than a revolving door for people involved in the drug trade, the majority of police chiefs and sheriffs consistently cite treatment and prevention efforts as strategies that will be most effective in the long run (Drug Strategies, 1996). The police culture may accept a more tolerant, reflective role for senior policy officials and line officers, when given the chance, may even agree with this view. Most, however, can not see their way out of a narrowly defined role in the justice system.

Limited Involvement by Residents in Police-Community Partnerships. We have already noted that community residents have played a limited role in police efforts to control drug demand; when involved, they usually serve as informers or patrol agents. The INOP research further found that those who became active in police partnerships were community leaders already active in neighborhood organizations. Generally, awareness of community-oriented policing programs increases with the status level of the citizen (Sadd and Grinc, 1993). Not surprisingly, efforts to build partnerships most often take root in suburban, middle-class communities, while they fail in poor urban neighborhoods, and especially those populated by minorities with a history of concerns about police mistreatment (Meares, 1998; Grinc, 1994;

Block, 1971).³ In Chicago, Skogan et al. (2000) found that Blacks were more involved in community policing than Whites; however, the more recently established Hispanic communities did not show the same benefits. Davis and Miller (2002) found that residents in more established ethnic communities were more likely to be aware of and involved in community policing activities compared to residents of recently established communities, particularly recently established Hispanic communities. Neighborhood context has been identified as a crucial factor in influencing attitudes toward law and crime, and negative attitudes toward police are more common in economically disadvantaged communities (Sampson and Bartusch, 1999).

When asked about citizens' lack of participation in community policing efforts, officers in the INOP research attributed this in part to residents' apathy (Grinc, 1994). One officer observed, for example, that "one of the untested assumptions about community policing...is that the community wants to be involved in this project, in this grand idea" (Grinc, 1994, p. 446). Police may find this lack of cooperation frustrating; one study of a Philadelphia-based community policing program that failed to engage residents found that officers came away with more negative attitudes toward residents than those held before the program began (Greene and Decker, 1989).

While officers in the INOP study often identified the failure of residents to get involved as apathy, they were unable to articulate the basis of this disinterest, or how it might vary among different types of residents. Grinc (1994) states his view of the matter:

It is often an explicit or implicit assumption that, in those communities where organization does not exist, community policing should take an active role in organizing them. The experience of the INOP projects, however, suggests that such assumptions largely ignore or grossly underestimate the level of hostility that has existed between the police and members of poor and minority communities who have

³ Recent comprehensive community policing efforts, such as Chicago's CAPS (Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy) program, have made some inroads in these areas, gaining resident involvement in high-crime areas and among African-Americans. Still, this program's record remains mixed: Latinos have had little involvement in the program; awareness of CAPS is greatest among people with higher socioeconomic status; and community organizations in poor neighborhoods were least likely to mesh with the structure or goals of CAPS (Skogan and Hartnett, 1997; Hartnett and Skogan, 1999).

often borne the brunt of police abuses....Why should community members be willing to involve themselves in community policing? (p. 446).

It is worth noting that, by seeking engagement of residents in identifying and solving community disorder and crime, police departments are reversing a 50-year policy of “professionalism” that views citizens as bystanders, or even as detractors in the battle against crime. Analysts have identified a number of additional challenges to citizen involvement in community-oriented policing. Mastrofski (1988) has pointed to the differing visions held by residents and police on quality of life and what constitutes a community. Skogan and Hartnett (1997) indicate that residents often do not perceive problems of social disorder as appropriate for the police. Echoing the findings from the Violent Juvenile Offender program (Fagan, 1987), others have argued that the residents facing the most crime are also struggling with more pressing concerns and demands on their time—food, housing, and health care. (Currie, 1993; Des Jarlais, 1995; Skogan, 1996).

2.D. Factors Underlying Police and Resident Responses to Drug Use and Crime

Police Beliefs and Attitudes Toward Drug Users and Their Families. In addition to perceptions of their role in controlling drugs, officers’ views about drug users and their families likely affect their involvement in a broader, public health approach to demand reduction. Bodega staff tried to appeal to what they hoped were officers’ sympathetic views of families as victims of abusers who needed the program’s assistance. One part of this message was that such families needed help in preventing drug problems among adolescent family members who were at risk for these problems.

We could not find any previous research that assessed whether police beliefs and attitudes were consistent with Bodega’s objectives; this was the most exploratory aspect of our research. Even without regard to subgroups of citizens (such as drug users), there is surprisingly little research that addresses how police officers view the people they serve. Studies of community policing, such as Vera’s early work on New York’s Community Patrol Officer Program (CPOP), have used general measures of police attitudes toward citizens. In this research, officers evinced more favorable views toward citizens after experience in CPOP, and they also came to believe that citizens’ attitudes toward them had improved. The authors cite this as a central finding, indicating the importance of changing roles in order to change attitudes (McElroy et al., 1993).

We were also interested in the link between attitudes, roles, and responses specifically regarding drug problems. We asked officers if they were exposed to families of drug users and were sensitive to their plight. The research also sought to examine officers' beliefs and attitudes about the risks faced by adolescent family members, the family's ability to rein in and heal drug-using family members with Bodega's support, and the potential value of treatment for drug users. Responses to these questions were interpreted in light of the officer's formal role in the precinct (e.g., sector, foot patrol, or specialized officer).

The Role of Family in Reducing Drug Use. There is support in the literature for the notion that families, given adequate resources and support, may provide the most effective and reliable means of minimizing the harmful effects of drug use (including drug crime) by a loved one. Many treatment programs (e.g., Johnson, 1986, Szapocznick et al., 1988) recognize family members as critical players in engaging the substance user in treatment. Families can operate as a check on the adoption or maintenance of negative health behaviors (Umberson, 1987) such as substance abuse. They can also buffer the harmful effects of substance abuse on the rest of the family (Farrell et al., 1995).

A family's ability to mitigate the harmful effects of substance abuse, however, is conditional on the support and resources they can access. Families struggling with addiction frequently contend with an array of concomitant problems such as intrafamilial violence, physical and mental health problems, and unemployment (Rivara et al., 1997; Goldberg, 1995; Pribor and Dinwiddie, 1992). Findings from the federal Violent Juvenile Offender Research and Development program attest to the challenge of marshalling families in poor, inner-city neighborhoods like Bodega's (Fagan, 1987). While successful in other areas (mobilizing residents to increase youth supervision and providing young people with opportunities for skills development), involving the families of youths in the project was so uniformly difficult that this component of the program was eventually abandoned: "It was difficult to motivate families to participate....when they were faced with more immediate, concrete issues: housing, clothing, food, and child care. Some families criticized the concept [of the family support network] for its insensitivity to the day-to-day realities that inner-city families face" (Fagan, 1987, p. 60).

Still, the need to develop new, effective strategies for engaging families in non-punitive demand and harm reduction is increasingly evident. The price of reliance on enforcement-

oriented approaches is documented in the growing literature on the unintended, negative impacts of arrest and incarceration on offenders' families (Hagan, 1996; Moore, 1996; Smith and Elstein, 1994; Wine, 1992). Families of arrested and incarcerated drug users are faced with financial hardships and social stigmatization (Fishman, 1990). The loss of a relative to the criminal justice system often precipitates painful familial turmoil, as children rebel in the absence of their parent, spouses struggle with living alone, and grandparents have children foisted upon them.

3. Description of La Bodega de la Familia

3.A. Bodega's Neighborhood

The myriad harms that accompany substance abuse are evident in Bodega's service catchment area and the surrounding neighborhood known as Loisaida. High rates of unemployment and poverty, and significant consumption of criminal justice resources (calls for service, drug-related arrests, probation and parole caseloads), are indicators of these harms.⁴ In selecting a location for the program, Bodega's planners sought a community that had an evident need for the program's services, yet provided an infrastructure of agencies and neighborhood groups that could support Bodega in its efforts and serve as links with its case management service. The capacity for local social and community agencies to provide that support was also evident in Loisaida.

Manhattan's Lower East Side has a long and infamous relationship with substance abuse, from the days when parts of it were known as the Bowery to more recent, highly publicized clashes between police and squatters purportedly involved in the local drug trade, who occupied and barricaded buildings to keep out police. Loisaida was the site of the NYPD's first comprehensive drug sweep, Operation Pressure Point, which occurred in the late 1980s. Consisting of massive sweeps through the neighborhood, the police made more than 2,000 arrests in the first month of the operation. Like similar efforts, Pressure Point was criticized for simply moving the problem elsewhere and having temporary effects. One observer concluded

⁴ In reviewing possible locations for Bodega, planners gathered data from the U.S. Census, U.S. Public Health Service, New York Housing Authority, New York City Police Department, New York State Division of Parole, and local emergency room records.

that Pressure Point had a greater impact on drug users than dealers, and changed the composition of buyers in the neighborhood by driving out transient white buyers and the “bridge and tunnel traffic.” This left local residents with the stark realization that it was their own neighbors who comprised the drug problem. In this analysis, Pressure Point managed to turn the Lower East Side drug problem into an ethnic, minority matter (Zimmer, 1990).

3.B. Program Description

Bodega had an ambitious set of goals that centered around its core service, family case management (FCM). The program’s most specific objectives concerned the substance-abusing offender; FCM aims to *improve the offender’s retention in drug treatment* and to *reduce returns to jail or prison*. For family members, it aims to *reduce the intrafamilial harms caused by substance abuse*. The latter goals are prevention oriented, such as reducing the risk of delinquency in young family members or maintaining family functioning and stability.

Most of Bodega’s work with the criminal justice system flowed from these FCM-related objectives. Relationships with probation and parole agencies, for example, were important in encouraging referrals to Bodega and in coordinating the management of cases within the community, thereby keeping the drug users in court-mandated treatment and responding to a relapse in therapeutic, nonpunitive ways. Bodega’s work with police also derived principally from FCM goals, and emphasized the police role as referral agents for families and individual users. Bodega also sought to engage police in a broader, more diffuse set of goals that emphasized neighborhood improvement and “shifting the dialogue” about drug use and crime. These broader goals included attempts to build a sense of community among residents of the service catchment area; reduce the stigmatization of drug use by residents; encourage criminal justice agencies to view drug use as a public health problem and not a crime; and turn the focus from the individual offender to families.

Family Case Management. Families were required to meet three eligibility criteria before engaging in FCM. The family had to have at least one identified substance user (or ISU, in Bodega’s terms) involved with the criminal justice system, at least one member residing in the catchment area (this person does not have to be the ISU), and one or more family members (using the term broadly) willing to attend FCM sessions.

Traditionally a prototype of treatment with the chronically mentally ill, case management has also become a widely accepted approach for treating substance abuse. Family case management at Bodega amplifies the traditional view of brokering services. Envisioned as an assertive, comprehensive mix of activities including assessment, treatment planning, linkage, referrals, monitoring, advocacy, counseling, and structural and instrumental social support, case management provides a viable framework for tending to the multiple needs of substance abusers and their families (Weil et al., 1985; Anthony et al., 1988; Martin et al., 1993; Shwartz et al., 1997; Siegal et al., 1996).

Field Case Management and Walk-in Services. One element that distinguished Bodega's case management was the program's field unit, which worked to extend this service to clients' homes and the Bodega community. Field staff were responsible for developing and maintaining relationships with local police and field and line staff of other agencies, ranging from probation and parole to local schools and community health centers. Field counselors provided 24-hour crisis intervention services to case management clients. They also tried to connect with family members after a crisis intervention.

Bodega's walk-in services further reflected the program's communitywide focus. Open to any resident in the catchment area, these included on-site programming, workshops, trainings, support groups, and related activities that emphasize issues associated with addiction. Bodega also offered informal walk-in services for the larger community, hosting events for representatives of criminal justice agencies, schools, local service providers and community organizations, and families. For instance, holiday parties, mural paintings, and a photography show of participants' work sought to promote dialogue among community members.

3.C. Plans for Working with Police

As part of a larger commitment to connecting Bodega to criminal justice agencies, Bodega's director, Carol Shapiro, incorporated police (along with probation, parole, and court offices) into her planning before the program began. The director went on patrol car ride-alongs with local precinct police in Bodega's neighborhood (Bodega's site had been determined earlier), conducted informal focus groups with officers of the local precinct, and held meetings with officials at both precinct and NYPD headquarters during the spring and summer of 1996. The program opened in October of that year. By the time this research started at the end of 1996,

Bodega had plans for working with police that included general and specific goals, and strategies to achieve them. These were tentative plans; Bodega's director and staff fully expected them to evolve over the course of the demonstration project.

Goals. At the broadest level, Bodega hoped to change the way that criminal justice officials and line staff responded to drug users and their families—to recognize that low-level crime driven by drug addiction is best treated as a health disorder, and to view offenders in the context of their families and loved ones. Bodega planners recognized that, compared to such agencies as probation or parole, police represented their greatest challenge in realizing this goal, given their traditional focus on enforcement and the individual offender. At the same time, Bodega planners knew that police could be an important partner because of their localized precinct structure and constant presence in the community. Police could refer large numbers of residents to the program and represent Bodega's best criminal justice collaborator in achieving the goals of community-building. Toward this end, Bodega sought to improve the dialogue between local residents and police over drugs and drug crime.⁵

Bodega's most clearly stated, specific goal concerning police was to enlist local officers in referring to the program families who were experiencing the harms of drug abuse. It was expected that officers would contact and refer families as part of their response to a routine complaint call, especially in responding to addresses that were the subject of repeated calls for service. Examples here include domestic incidents and situations where a spouse, parent, or child had been victimized repeatedly by an addicted family member. Referrals might also be made to people making inquiries at the precinct following the apprehension or arrest of a family member. Referrals of individual offenders—either in lieu of arrest or after an arrest—was an objective that Carol Shapiro identified in numerous discussions with staff (and researchers) but rarely raised to the attention of police. Although the notion of a Bodega referral as pre-arrest diversion was attractive to Ms. Shapiro and other Bodega staff, they judged this practice to be inconsistent with the current arrest policies of the NYPD and made the pragmatic decision to set aside this objective soon after the program opened.

⁵ Bodega planners were well aware of the history of tensions between residents and police in Loisaida. These appeared to center around complaints of bias, abuse, and ineffective, heavy-handed enforcement by residents, and complaints of a lack of support and assistance by officers.

Bodega's other objectives regarding police can only be stated in broad terms. Throughout the research, the director worked to gain and maintain the support of top NYPD officials, beginning with the commissioner. While this was partly a strategic move (see below), it served an instrumental purpose in educating these senior police officials about a new way to conceptualize drug demand reduction and the potential value of offenders' families. Specific objectives flowing from Bodega's commitment to shift the dialogue between residents and local police were perhaps least articulated. Through a series of activities with local police and residents, such as a neighborhood youth art project or the publication of a cookbook of local ethnic recipes, the program hoped to improve relationships between these two groups.

4. Research Goals and Methods

4.A. Research Goals and Questions

The research was organized around two goals. The first was to describe and assess Bodega's efforts to enlist the police in formulating new responses to community drug problems and to improve relations between residents and police over drug issues.⁶ This process evaluation component sought to answer:

- What are Bodega's objectives in working with police? What strategies do they pursue to achieve those objectives and what is their rationale?
- How effective are these strategies and how do they evolve over time?
- What does Bodega's experience say about similar, future initiatives with local police?

A second goal was to identify and explore factors that underlie responses of police officers and local residents to drug users and drug crime. Specifically, we aimed to address several related research questions about these two groups and a third group, families participating in Bodega:

- What attitudes and beliefs do police, residents, and family members of drug users hold toward drug users and to drug use and crime?

⁶ The goals of the research were intentionally focused on process issues and not outcome. This was in part dictated by the very limited resources available for the study, however, it was also thought that outcome research on Bodega's policing-related goals would have been premature at the time the study was undertaken. A formal impact study involving Bodega program participants was begun some time after the present research was started.

- What interactions do these groups have with drug users that may affect these beliefs?
- What are their views about the role of police, residents, and family members in responding to drug use and drug crime?

4.B. Overview of Methodology

We employed a multi-method approach focusing primarily on qualitative data. The process research tracked Bodega's implementation of efforts to work with police. It involved analyzing quantitative data from Bodega's computerized information system on client referrals and participation in Bodega services, surveys of Bodega program records, including field and case management notes, reviews of program planning and operational documents, and scheduled meetings as well as extensive, ongoing discussions with Bodega's director and staff. We also observed meetings between Bodega staff and police, and conducted semi-structured interviews of local police administrators and officers.

In the second part of our research, which focused on beliefs and perceptions influencing responses to community drug problems, we conducted structured interviews and focus groups with local police officers, residents, and Bodega clients. Structured interviews typically yield data that highlight people's experiences and the meanings assigned to those experiences. The dynamics of focus groups provide information that one-on-one interviews cannot. While interviews elicit more detailed information, focus groups can clarify ambiguous aspects of interview data. The combined uses of these qualitative approaches give full voice to the subjects of investigation.

The quantitative file data and these qualitative methods were employed in a complementary fashion to triangulate findings from the information system and case files, document reviews, and interviews and focus groups. Findings on referrals, for example, suggested hypotheses that were explored in in-depth interviews with program staff, clients, local residents, and police. By comparing one source of information against each of these other data sources, we assessed the validity of inferences and themes that emerged from any single source (Maxwell, 1998; Merriam, 1988). Blending methods in this way also allowed permitted "complementary articulation" of the process findings obtained from various data sources (Smith, 2004).

4.C. Quantitative and Qualitative Data from La Bodega Sources

We tracked police referrals to Bodega through the program's operational database, identifying the type of officer who made each referrals (patrol or sector officer, detective, domestic violence officer, or housing police) and the actual service the individual or family received at Bodega (a single contact and referral for service in the community, walk-in support, or family case management). Bodega field personnel were polled by research staff at least every three months about their encounters with police while on crisis intervention calls; clinical staff were further queried about families referred by police or about any occasions where police were identified in case management sessions as playing some significant role in the lives of the client family. We directly observed La Bodega's efforts to engage local precinct officers on six occasions, including attending three topic-specific meetings held between Bodega staff and precinct supervisors and line officers, two community events attended by police and program staff, and one presentation made by Bodega staff to officers during a precinct roll call. We also informally observed interactions with police on several occasions while visiting Bodega's storefront offices.

Although this research began formally in November 1996 with support from the National Institute of Justice, research project staff had been involved in discussions with Bodega's director and other project planning staff for approximately three months prior to the program's opening in October 1996. Ongoing discussions and reviews of program documents, such as monthly operational reports, continued throughout the project's data collection period, which ended in January 1999. More extensive, directed meetings were held at least quarterly with field staff and the director to review recent efforts, assess progress, and identify new and evolving strategies or objectives.

4.D. Police, Residents, and Bodega Clients

We held two focus groups with local precinct police and conducted ten semi-structured interviews with officers and senior precinct personnel. Two focus groups were held with local residents, the first with nine and the second with eight participants. We also held one focus group with eight Bodega participants and conducted individual, in-depth interviews with six program participants. Holding multiple interviews and focus groups helped protect against the risk that any single interview or focus group was atypical (Babbie, 1998).

We employed purposive sampling techniques for the focus groups and interviews. Police officers were recruited from diverse positions with the assistance of precinct supervisors and Bodega field staff. Focus groups and interviews were held on weekdays in the afternoon and early evening, primarily with police working on day and evening shifts (who potentially had the most interaction with the program). The first police focus group was scheduled after Bodega's core operations had stabilized, about nine months after the program had opened. The second group was scheduled near the end of the data collection period, in part to assess any changes in police response or involvement with Bodega. Police interviews were held over a 20-month period between May 1997 and December 1998. Six officers participated in the first focus group, held in mid-1997. Two were sector officers (assigned to cars), two were patrol officers (who walked assigned areas or "beats" and were thus also known as beat officers) and two served in specialized units, such as crime prevention, youth, community affairs, or domestic violence.⁷ The second police focus group was conducted in the first months of 1999 with nine officers. Six were sector or foot patrol officers, and three were assigned to specialized posts. Over the course of the study we also conducted nine semi-structured interviews with police officers, which included housing police and specialized officers working in domestic violence, youth, and community affairs. One interview was also held with a detective and a precinct commander.

In interviewing community residents, we used purposive sampling techniques as well, again seeking to obtain a group that was representative of the area. We conducted two resident focus groups, the first with nine participants, the second with eight participants. Both were held in the early evening, after the work day was over. Bodega staff familiar with the neighborhood assembled the first group, held in July 1997. Researchers recruited members for the second focus group in the summer of 1998, primarily seeking volunteers at community institutions such as the local library, a recreation center, and a clinic across the street from Bodega. Many of the residents had lived in the community for years and could testify to the changes in drug use, drug crime, and the police response. A focus group was also conducted with eight program participants who were regular attendees of Bodega's "Monday Night Group," composed of family members of incarcerated drug addicts. Most of these participants had lived many years in

⁷ The dates of these groups and the positions of police officers participating in them are stated in nonspecific terms to protect their identity.

the community. In-depth, semi-structured interviews with six Bodega participants were conducted between December 1997 and March 1998. We asked clinical and field managers to identify members of their active caseload who had recent or past involvement with the police, and who varied in their length of involvement with Bodega.

Consent. An informed consent protocol was employed with all potential participants. We communicated the voluntary nature of participation, and we insured complete confidentiality throughout the research process, in accordance with federal regulations concerning human subjects' protections. Community residents and Bodega participants received a stipend of roughly ten dollars per hour for their participation in the interviews. Police officers were not paid for their participation.

Content of Interviews and Focus Groups. Police interviews and focus groups were structured around a structured set of questions involving attitudes and beliefs about substance use and addiction, and possible responses to drug-related crime, including the use of Bodega and other social services. These questions addressed attitudes toward drug users and their familial contexts; experience with families in drug-related incidents and families' and officers' role in dealing with drug problems; beliefs about drug use and drug crime in Bodega's neighborhood; beliefs about the community's perception of the police and police handling of drug-related crime; beliefs about police policy and the role of police and residents in responding to drug problems and drug-related crime. Police participating in interviews and in the focus groups were also asked about Bodega and its efforts to encourage police referrals and assist families and offenders with drug problems. Similar questions were directed at community residents and Bodega participants. Inquiries of these study participants addressed attitudes toward drug users and family contexts that range from victimization to support; the stigma of substance abuse and its cultural aspects; beliefs about drug use and drug crime in the Bodega neighborhood; beliefs about the role of police and residents in responding to drug problems; exposure to and interaction with police; the role of economic and cultural barriers to police-community partnership; and the role of Bodega and other organizations in bridging police-community relations. The questions that were used in focus groups and interviews are shown in the Appendix.

Analysis. Simple tabular and descriptive analysis was done with the quantitative information obtained from Bodega's information system on police referrals and referral outcomes. Patterns and trends emerged from simple counts of displayed data collected over the 28-month study period (even when collected into four equal seventh-month periods, the observations were too few to subject to formal statistical analysis). Analysis of these data were also informed by a timeline and a narrative, chronological description we compiled of the efforts by Bodega's director to develop and implement strategies for engaging with police (see section 5.B.).

Analysis of responses in interviews, focus groups, field notes, and program documents involved "get[ting] a sense of the whole" (Tesch, 1990, p. 142) through in-depth reviews of these data. Through repeated reading and structuring of these data, we first sought to organize them into the "broadest categories imaginable" (Wolcott, 1990, p. 33). Categorization facilitates synthesis and comprehension. As Maxwell (2001) explains, "Qualitative researchers typically study a relatively small number of individuals or situations and preserve the individuality of each of these in their analyses, rather than collecting data from large samples and aggregating the data across individuals or situations. Thus, they are able to understand how events, actions, and meanings are shaped by the unique circumstances in which these occur" (p. 17).

Following Ely and colleagues (1991), we sought to create categories that could be formed into a conceptual scheme that fit the data. Categories established in our analysis grew out of the roles the study subjects occupied. Police interview and focus group responses regarding attitudes and experiences around drugs and crime were found to be patterned around police occupational roles. The utility of these categories was reinforced by analysis of responses from community residents and Bodega clients, which also showed variation based on officers' roles and responsibilities. Another set of conceptually useful categories that emerged from assessments of the qualitative data concerned differences between substance users, addicts, and their family members. Further review of the data showed that, within this framework, responses could be distinguished in regard to their attribution of individuals' and families' drug-related problems to environmental or internal, personal causes.

Caveats. Funded with a small budget spread over two and half years, this research was limited in several respects. From the beginning, this was conceptualized as an exploratory study

aimed at examining an evolving set of efforts by La Bodega to engage police. A conventional process evaluation of Bodega’s success was constrained by the fact that the only “hard” data available to assess program performance in this area (police referrals and their outcomes) had a very limited distribution. Methodologically, the study was further limited because the program’s objectives and strategies about police “engagement” changed over the course of the research. Rigorously structured, scheduled, and repetitious data collection procedures were not suited to the goal of describing and assessing the outcomes of these developing strategies. Such procedures (e.g., repeated administrations of attitude surveys) were also deemed premature given the lack of prior research on the kinds of nuanced beliefs that were examined in this study (e.g., about different types of drug users and their families, unconventional police and community response to drug use and crime, etc.). For these reasons, findings and especially conclusions drawn from this research must be regarded as tentative and requiring further research and confirmation.

5. Results

5.A. Police Referrals to Bodega

As shown in Table 1, Bodega received a low number of police referrals during the 28-month period that extended from the program’s inception in October 1996 through the close of data collection in January 1999. Following a six- to seven-month start-up period, the rate of police referrals was consistent, averaging just under 12 every six months, or about two per month.

We broke these down into type of referral and type of officer making the referral. Referral type is whether the person involved was the substance user with criminal justice involvement (the ISU or identified substance user) or a member of the substance user’s family. Consistent with Bodega’s message and staff expectations, they were much more likely to refer family

Table 1: Police Referrals to Bodega				
			Type of Police Referral	Type of Officer

Period	Total Referrals*	Referrals from Police	Family	ISU	Sector and Patrol	Detective	Housing	Domestic Violence
Oct. '96 – April '97	197	6	5	1	3	3	-	-
May '97 -Nov. '97	183	13	11	2	4	-	4	5
Dec. '97 -June '98	134	11	8	3	1	-	2	8
July '98 -Jan. '99	174	11	10	1	1	-	4	6
TOTALS	688	41	34	7	9	3	10	19

*Includes 164 walk-in participants who were self-referred.

Table 2: Outcome of Police Referrals			
Period of Operation	Entered FCM	Attended Other Bodega Service	Ineligible or Referred Out
Oct. '96 - April '97	2	-	4
May '97 - Nov. '97	3	1	9
Dec. '97 - June '98	3	2	6
July '98 - Jan. '99	2	2	7
TOTALS	10	5	26

members than substance users, with family members accounting for 83 percent of the 41 referrals. Two-thirds of the referrals came from specialized police, and the local precinct's domestic violence officers accounted for almost half of all Bodega police referrals. Viewed over the two-year period, the trend of decreasing referrals from sector and foot patrol officers and

increases among specialized officers roughly paralleled Bodega's evolving efforts with these groups of police (see below). Closer inspection of the available data indicated that relatively few officers were responsible for most referrals. For instance, one detective was responsible for all three referrals, and once he left the precinct they received no more referrals from detectives.

Table 2 shows that 15 (37 percent) of the 41 police referrals actually participated in Bodega services, including ten (24 percent) who entered family case management (FCM). These results are generally consistent with the program's overall results, as 31 percent of all people who come to Bodega for services (including walk-ins and those referred from various sources) participate in FCM or another Bodega service. Those who do not end up participating in the program are usually ineligible, most commonly because they are unable to recruit a family member to join them in FCM or they live outside the catchment area. One interesting finding, discussed further below, is that although the domestic violence officers made the largest number of referrals, these officers account for the largest number of ineligible referrals.

Both the referral numbers and the subsequent rate of participation in FCM from police officers are lower than those seen from other criminal justice sources. Probation officers refer at a slightly higher rate than police, and the state parole agency refers more than twice as many people to Bodega as the police do. These results are consistent with expectations, as parole and probation officers tend to view service referrals as standard practice with offenders under their supervision. The higher participation rate, particularly among parolees, is likely due to the fact that the field officers are typically more directive than police in referring the substance user (who is nearly always the person under their supervision) and the family simultaneously. Additionally, parole (and, to a lesser extent, probation) officers have become more involved than police in the program over time and have had more opportunities to learn about Bodega and evaluate the appropriateness of candidates for the program.

5.B. Bodega's Strategies to Engage Police

Bodega's Top-Down and Bottom-Up Strategies. Bodega's efforts to engage police were advanced simultaneously at NYPD headquarters and the local precinct with both commanders and line officers. Before planning Bodega, the program's director, Carol Shapiro, and other Vera planners had established relationships with senior police officials, and understood the value of involving these individuals early. NYPD officials were consulted in the process of selecting the program's neighborhood and helped the director establish relations with the local precinct captain.

Employing the same top-down strategy at the local level, Carol Shapiro held planning meetings with the captain, discussing nascent plans for the project and soliciting input about her desire to create a central role for local police. She explained that police could uniquely serve as early identifiers of drug-fueled problems in families. When officers encounter a situation where drug use is involved—particularly where arrest or other police actions have been ineffective in stemming a recurring problem—both the user and his or her family members might best be served by engagement in Bodega. From the beginning, Bodega's message to the police (and to other criminal justice agencies) centered on taking into account the family, not just the individual offender.

Bodega's emphasis on gaining early, symbolic support from the police was exemplified in their choice of location for the storefront. Bodega's director first learned of the site when she was touring the area with local precinct police. The vacant storefront, centrally located in the target neighborhood, was once the site of a *bodega*—the Spanish term for small, locally operated grocery stores that are ubiquitous in New York's Latino communities—which had been shut down by police following a drug-related shootout. Keith Prunty, a police officer who was paralyzed from injuries sustained during the shooting, became the guest of honor at Bodega's opening in October 1996. Bodega's efforts to gain the interest and support of police administrators were awarded with the appearance of Mayor Rudolph Giuliani and Police Commissioner Howard Safir at the opening. Mayor Giuliani expressed his backing for Bodega's family-focused approach to drug treatment in his remarks at the gala event. He commented, "While antidrug abuse efforts often focus on the drug abuser only, La Bodega de la Familia will widen the focus to include help for the entire family."

Commissioner Safir continued to actively support Bodega after its opening. He signed letters endorsing research on Bodega and granted permission for the local precinct captain to serve on Bodega's local community advisory committee. In June 1997, Commissioner Safir attended a fundraiser for Bodega and addressed the attendees, who were largely drawn from the business community. While asserting the role of police in short-term problem solving, Safir underscored the importance of Bodega and similar programs in providing long-term solutions to drug problems. He praised the department's partnership with Bodega.

The department's support extended to its Office of Community Affairs. A senior official from the office contacted Ms. Shapiro in early 1997 to discuss joint projects with Bodega focusing on young people. After this initial meeting, some of the commissioner's staff came to Bodega for a site visit. Ongoing discussion ensued, but no formal plan of action transpired. These discussions were waylaid, in part, because attention was shifted to the Office of Community Affairs' Model Block initiative for Third Street, discussed below.

Building Relations with the Local Precinct. Support from headquarters helped pave the way for Bodega's director and staff to build relations with police personnel in the local precinct. The program's staff began by announcing Bodega's presence in the community and offering Bodega as a resource for the police. Bodega hoped that once the police understood the program's services, they would refer local residents.

Ms. Shapiro reported that she developed a good rapport with the precinct commander soon after the program opened. The captain attended meetings of Bodega's community advisory board every two to three months and Ms. Shapiro briefed him in regular phone conversations about the program's progress and police referrals. The captain accepted her invitation to join a group of local practitioners to discuss issues of restorative justice and to attend a national, invitation-only conference on the topic sponsored by the Justice Department. Ms. Shapiro described the captain as an active partner, often brainstorming with her about ways to involve police in the program.

Structural and institutional barriers to police involvement emerged as topics at these discussions between Bodega's director and the precinct captain. They noted, for example, that the traditional incentive structure of the department offered little reward for service referrals or involvement with offenders' families. In response, Bodega staff suggested and the captain

endorsed the idea to present certificates of merit from Bodega at the precinct's annual public ceremony honoring officers for "Heroism and Humanity." On the premise that some patrol officers were more comfortable making program referrals than others, the captain also discussed with Ms. Shapiro ways to deploy officers who volunteered specifically to patrol Bodega's precinct area.

These plans and discussions, however, did not yield tangible results. Patrol officers expressed little interest in volunteering for these patrols. And the captain was promoted and left the precinct before he could instill interest in a broadened incentive structure. In fact, when the captain left in late 1997 it was not clear that officers in the precinct had ever been instructed by any senior police officials to make referrals to the program.

The process of cultivating relations began again with the new captain. Ms. Shapiro and field staff met with him on at least two occasions, repeating much of their earlier message about the program and its potential value to the precinct. The new captain did not engage in the same level of discourse as the previous captain, but publicly endorsed the program. At a meeting with police and local residents in March 1999, for example, he asserted that, "La Bodega was doing really great work down on Third Street." Again, however, this support did not translate into more police referrals to Bodega.

Soliciting Referrals from the Bottom Up. From the beginning, Bodega's bottom-up strategies took the form of educating all the officers of the local precinct about the mission and services of the program, with an emphasis on family work. On six occasions between July 1997 and March 1998, field staff attended police roll calls, meetings at which patrol officers gather to change shifts. With about 15 officers in attendance at each roll call, Bodega targeted different tours in order to reach a maximum number of officers. At these meetings, Bodega field staff took 15 minutes to communicate very basic information about Bodega—its location and services, and how the program could be a resource for the police. Bodega stopped presenting at the roll calls because, according to the program's field director, they had reached all the precinct line staff through the cycle of six sessions that ended in March 1998. Subsequent interviews with field staff also suggested, however, that they had some doubt about the receptiveness of these officers and the effectiveness of approaching them while their attention was focused on the

upcoming shift and assignments; this may also have played a role in curtailing direct appeals to patrol and sector officers.

Whenever they had the opportunity, field staff distributed specially made Bodega referral cards for officers to pass along to community residents when the occasion presented itself. The cards included the program's name, address, and telephone number. In addition to the cards, Bodega created and distributed perforated pages designed for easy insertion into officers' memo books. The field staff hoped that patrol officers would tear out these pages and distribute them to community residents. These, too, provided basic contact information about Bodega.

Bodega used similar efforts to inform detectives of their services. For example, field staff gave a presentation to detectives during their roll call. Informal contact characterized subsequent work with detectives, as a member of Bodega's field staff had both personal and professional ties to the lieutenant heading up the detective unit.

Other specialized precinct police, especially domestic violence, youth, and community affairs officers, were specifically targeted in early plans for the local precinct. In meetings held with them during the planning phase, it appeared these officers more readily understood how Bodega might assist them with ongoing as well as new cases. Predictably, the domestic violence officers seemed especially attuned to Bodega's message; since they routinely addressed the needs of victims, these officers welcomed information on new programs or resources for them. Bodega field staff met with these officers on multiple occasions in early and mid-1997 to discuss the program's services and cases they were handling. By late 1997 it was evident that domestic violence officers were so eager to use Bodega that they had referred a number of families who were not appropriate for the program, either because the family lived outside the catchment area or substance abuse was not present.

Seeking Referrals from Housing Police. Bodega's efforts with the housing police were also advanced top-down and bottom-up. The director of Bodega met with the deputy of the Housing Bureau before the storefront opened. Again, the message centered on taking into account the family, not just the individual offender. Over the first year of operations it became evident that a large majority of Bodega's clients were residents of public housing. In 1997, Ms. Shapiro reached out to the regional office of the housing police to encourage them to make referrals to Bodega. In her first meeting with the local housing police commander, Ms. Shapiro

was reminded of the value of following formal NYPD channels, as she was met with skepticism and defensiveness about police involvement in the program. This initial resistance prompted her to contact a senior official, the chief of the Housing Bureau, who quickly gained the cooperation of the local commander in Bodega's efforts to work with housing officers. Over time, a member of Bodega's field staff cultivated a relationship with the commander and held monthly meetings with him.

The commander proposed assigning two housing officers to work with Bodega field staff; these officers patrolled the portion of the massive Lillian Wald housing project located in Bodega's catchment area. Consistent with our research interview data, housing police officials thought that their officers' repeated visits to certain families would yield Bodega referrals. In fact, these housing officials described family scenarios that Bodega could help with, such as calls from a mother to the police about her substance-abusing son. Bodega field staff began to meet with the housing officers to discuss the program and its family services. Bodega staff attended roll calls and distributed cards. In the end, however, these efforts were stymied by turnover in the housing officers assigned to Lillian Wald.

5.C. Fostering Police-Community Relations

Involvement in Police Efforts to Build Community Relations. Bodega's efforts to pursue its aim of "shifting the dialogue between police and community"—admittedly a vague program objective—were limited. At the precinct level, field staff regularly attended police-sponsored community activities. They attended periodic community council meetings at which they made presentations describing Bodega as a resource for both the police and the community. These meetings were a forum for dialogue between up to one hundred community residents and as many as ten officers. In addition, two Bodega staff members (one case manager and one field worker) attended a 16-week civilian training program of the Police Academy. The training was designed to increase awareness in community members and community service providers about the challenges of being a police officer.

Carol Shapiro's success in gaining high-level support from NYPD headquarters also led to her involvement in a police Model Block initiative in 1998. The department's Model Block Program worked to reclaim neighborhoods from the ravages of drug activity. Typically, these

initiatives had three stages. In the first stage, police conducted enforcement efforts to eradicate drug activity. Next, the police maintained a visible presence on the block, creating barriers to any resurgence of drug activity. The final phase required community organizations to sustain the gains of enforcement. In this phase, police sought to work with community groups and residents to identify quality of life issues, such as vacant lots or graffiti, and strategize about solutions.

In the early summer of 1998, the block in which Bodega was located, Third Street between Avenues C and B, was targeted for a possible model block initiative. Early in the planning, the community affairs commissioner consulted with Ms. Shapiro and ensured that Bodega would be involved. This contact provided Bodega's director an opportunity to voice her views about the enforcement aspects of the campaign. Specifically, she requested that the barricades that signal the police have imposed controls over the block be placed beyond Bodega's front door. In the end, the police department chose to implement a model block initiative on Third Street that had a less overt enforcement component than had been used in other locations, focusing on undercover activities and providing structural improvements to deter crime, such as repairing and replacing street lighting.

A New Objective: Serving as Police-Client Liaison. Over time, Bodega staff learned that they could play a useful role as a liaison between the program's participants and the police. In part, this role grew out of requests by participants for help in dealing with the police. Bodega staff intervened on several occasions when the police were described as "rough" with program clients during investigative home visits. One field worker related that when warrant officers came to search the home of a Bodega participant who had absconded from his place of employment, they used aggressive tactics. Upon learning of the encounter at his family home, the participant called Bodega for help. His case manager met with the warrant officers on at least two occasions, suggesting that if they toned down their tactics, the participant would cooperate. Ultimately, the participant surrendered peacefully. The police thus achieved their enforcement objective without harm to the Bodega client.

Field staff described a similar occurrence of working with detectives who wanted to "squeeze" a Bodega participant for information during a home visit. The participant turned to her Bodega field worker for help. This staff person, a former police officer himself, understood the tactics the detectives were likely to use during the home visit. He contacted the detectives,

explaining that a rough home visit could rattle the participant and disrupt her recovery. Encouraged by her Bodega contact, the participant bargained with the detectives to conduct meetings with her at the precinct. The detectives came to trust her and met with her on future occasions at the precinct house rather than her home. In suggesting the precinct meetings, the field worker felt he was ensuring that detectives would not use force in soliciting information her.

Bodega staff also functioned as a liaison in moments of crisis. During a supervised visit between a parent and children in foster care, the parent, who was a Bodega participant, threatened the supervising social worker and swung a bat at her. Anger and frustration were at the root of this threats. Because the social worker had requested to end the visit early, the parent had been denied time he was legally granted to spend with his children. Moreover, the father had dealt with this constraint on numerous supervised visits in the past. The social worker called the police, and while the police were en route the father called Bodega. The Bodega field worker rushed to the scene and worked to diffuse the situation. He spoke to all three parties involved—the social worker, the father, and the police. He warned the father that using a baseball bat was no way to handle his frustration; he urged the social worker to drop the charges; and he explained to the sergeant on the scene that this father had been working diligently with Bodega to regain custody of his children. He urged the sergeant not to arrest the father. The sergeant was amenable to the request, especially after learning the Bodega staff person had been a police officer. The duty captain insisted on arrest, however, due to the severity of the social worker's formal complaint.

The police fostered this liaison role as well. When the police learn that someone arrested is involved with Bodega, they began to take note. When a participant was in police custody, a precinct officer called Bodega for assistance, as the participant needed some medication. The Bodega case manager brought the medication to the precinct soon after the officer called. The outcome for this arrested person was surprising—he was released on his own recognizance. While the case manager did not advocate for this outcome, he speculated that the person's relationship with Bodega might have influenced this decision.

5.D. Attitudes and Beliefs about Drug Users and their Families in the Bodega Community

Sector and Foot Patrol Officers: “Junkies Don’t Have Families.” Attitudes toward drug users and their families varied depending upon the police officer’s position in the precinct and the department. Officers serving in sector cars or on foot patrol comprised the largest group of officers in any NYPD precinct. These officers were responsible for responding to calls for service and patrolling, sometimes conducting observations that were then reported to specialized enforcement units. There was no clear distinction between the attitudes of sector and foot patrol officers in responses to our questions and we have grouped them together throughout this section.

These officers’ views on adult addicts were straightforward: they were “junkies” and “dope fiends.” In their view, the lives of addicts are consumed by drugs; they are desperately seeking to obtain drugs, they are under the influence of drugs, and/or their minds and bodies have been damaged by a lifetime of drug use. They are predators who commit low-level crimes frequently and without compunction in order to support their habit. They are not particularly effective criminals, however, as was evident in the officers’ stories of addicts who had bungled burglaries or told inconsistent cover stories.

For the most part, these officers made few distinctions among people who used and abused drugs. When we asked about drug users, their responses were about addicts—people whose lives were dominated by habitual, chronic drug use. When we explicitly asked members of one police focus group about drug users, as opposed to addicts, they had little to say, and no real opinions about who these people were or how numerous they were in the community. Officers from the other group took a slightly more open view, distinguishing hard-core addicts from youthful drug users—mostly marijuana and beer-drinking adolescents, who had the capacity to change. These officers expressed concern about the dearth of services for young users and abusers, and the parental rejection they faced.

Sector and patrol police agreed with one officer’s observation that “junkies don’t have families.” They have either been disowned by their families or came from ones that were dysfunctional and often marked by intergenerational substance abuse. Officers readily spoke about responding to service calls where a grandmother or other family member had been victimized repeatedly by an addicted relative. In this scenario the victimized family member is typically relieved that the addict has been or will be arrested and put away so he or she cannot

return to the household. When asked directly if they could imagine a situation where the drug user plays a functional role in the family, sector officers were dubious and talked about how junkies are manipulative and untrustworthy.

When asked to talk about the addicts in the Bodega community, some officers described the homeless men and women they find strung out on Houston Street. In one focus group, this description prompted comments about deinstitutionalized mentally ill people they come in contact with—apparently drug users are closely linked with the mentally ill in these officers' minds. In the second focus group officers reminisced, somewhat affectionately, about mentally ill drug users who were a constant presence in the community. The other image of addicts described by some of these officers were the squatters who are noisy and aggressive occupants of tenements in the northern end of Bodega's neighborhood. Notably, none of these pictures included the drug sellers who could sometimes be found on corners near the storefront—the officers tended to view these as businessmen, albeit violent ones.

Domestic Violence Officers: Junkies and Drugs Make it Hard on Families. Other police officers in the local precinct whom we interviewed (some of whom also participated in the two focus groups) included one detective and several officers with specialized assignments in areas of domestic violence, youth, community affairs, and crime prevention. We also interviewed housing officers who patrolled the large public housing project near Bodega. It was evident that the specialized officers—in particular, the domestic violence and housing officers—had much greater exposure to drugs within families, and had different attitudes and perceptions about drug problems than other officers.

The domestic violence officers and detective regarded drug use and addiction as such prevalent problems in their daily work that they had a hard time estimating the proportion of their cases that had drug problems. One officer estimated that in eighty percent of the domestic violence incidents she responded to, at least one family member is using alcohol or drugs or is a former addict. These officers had much more textured pictures of drug use than the sector and foot patrol officers. They stated that there were many functional users in the community, although they insisted they could tell when someone was using and clearly believed that drug use had harmful effects on the user. These officers were sensitive to the rise in drug use among young people, and told stories of “[grade] A students” who turn to drugs and drug sales out of

boredom, lured by dealers who know “these kids won’t really do time” if they’re caught running drugs. At the same time, these officers had pejorative views of addicts that were similar to those noted above, sprinkling their answers with references to “junkies” and telling stories of addicts who were manipulative and violent.

Domestic violence officers viewed substance abuse within a social and familial context. Drugs lead to push-pull relationships among families and partners: “Families are conflicted. They won’t let the user live at home, but they’ll let him come home for dinner. Or maybe not even that—they’ll just give him a plate of food through the door.” These images of drug use appear to grow out of a crisis orientation that is likely common to police work on domestic incidents. Domestic violence officers described couples and families who are isolated from the community and repeatedly rely on police intervention to temporarily halt recurring cycles of drugs and violence.

Most of their stories of addicts in the Bodega community involved adults, although they also talked about “teenagers who come home and beat up their parents or grandparents when they are high” and “grandparents who are the junkies and [who have] their grandkids going out and scoring hits for them.” In relating their experiences with adult partners, the officers focused on the female addict who manipulates orders of protection to rid herself of an unwanted mate. One said drugs “make it hard on families. You’re not always talking about the ‘right’ parent. A father hits a junkie mother to get her to straighten up. The mother calls the police who take the father away and leave the six-year-old daughter with the strung-out mom.”

Housing Officers: Drug Use and Recovery One Day at a Time. Of all police respondents, housing officers had probably the most nuanced view of drug users. These officers tended to distinguish younger users who moved in and out of addiction from older, chronic, less functional addicts. They had relatively little to say about this latter group who, in their view, did not live in the housing projects to which the officers were assigned, and mostly just came to the projects to buy heroin and go to the rooftops to shoot up.

Drug use in the projects was, for these officers, very much a function of the environment. One gave this account of life in these massive housing projects, “There’s nothing else for people besides drugs.... You’re bored, you’re on welfare, the government feeds you.... After sex, then what?” Children are lured into the drug world by “the hot shot dealers.” One officer explained,

“Dealers have young kids sell because they’ll work for sneakers.... The teens are in it for the money, the status, the clothes. The teenage girls, they just use marijuana. Kids sell other drugs just to buy marijuana.”

The views of these housing police were tinged with sympathy. These were the only officers who said they knew of recovering addicts in the community and their struggle to stay clean. Drug use is “is a tattoo for life. You can be clean for two years, then use again.... Drugs are a lifetime addiction; you have to take it one day at a time.” One officer told the story of an addict who “got clean and then his wife started using. He [has been] clean for a year now, and his wife [has begun] using. They’ve got four kids, what do you think they’re going to be? People are better off when they move out of the city, upstate, or to Florida.” These officers did not talk about users or addicts as amoral, predatory criminals who would readily admit to addiction in hopes that the police would go easy on them. Nor were these officers certain that they could always distinguish users from nonusers. “People don’t want to tell you they’re on drugs. You just can’t be sure. People don’t want to tell you because they’re embarrassed.”

Community Residents: “I’m Going to Hide My Pocketbook, But I’ll Love You.” In our focus groups, residents of the Bodega community expressed varied and often conflicting views of drug users and addicts. Virtually all of them perceived drugs and drug use as endemic to their neighborhood, as part of the local landscape. They talked of drug users in their midst—brothers and sisters, children, parents, single adults who live in the same buildings, on the same streets as our respondents. Still, most residents held a view of the drug addict that was only slightly more sympathetic than that of the sector and patrol police. Perhaps the starkest distinction between user and addict came from one respondent, John, who admitted, “I’ve used every drug there is to use. But none of them made me a dope fiend.” Most agreed with John’s view that, “A dope fiend will steal from anybody to get his drugs. Let’s be real about that. He’ll just take whatever’s necessary.” Others explained: “Drug addicts rob themselves. They rip each other off.” “There are robberies. Addicts look for victims, ‘This guy looks like a chump’. Addicts know who’s not from the community, who is ‘fresh meat’.” Some respondents noted that Asians, in particular, were prime victims of addicts in the Bodega neighborhood, in part because they “don’t go to the police.”

While virtually everyone knew of these “junkies” and “dope fiends,” some residents observed variations in addicts, and a few maintained that they knew of addicts with a “moral code.” Two respondents insisted that addicts would not steal from you if you “give them your trust and [they] know you’re there for them.” Carmen runs a small shop near the local needle exchange: “I see a lot of clients [from the needle exchange], people who come back to me. They ask me for money, twenty-five cents, or a dollar, or fifty cents and believe me, they pay me back.... I haven’t lent a person a penny—somebody that I know used drugs—that hasn’t tried to pay me back.” Carmen concluded:

I get a little dizzy because I found out there’s nothing really black and white. There is so many variations in between... I think you’re gonna find very bad people who use drugs and very good people who use drugs and bad or good I believe it’s all like we all are. We are sad some days, we are happy some days, we have the same feelings...we want to be loved, we hate.

Like the specialized police with whom we spoke, community residents were cognizant of the pain and harm drug use causes families and were concerned about drug problems among adolescents. There was disagreement among respondents about the acceptability of drug use in the community; a few residents thought that the image of drug use and the high-living drug dealer was no longer attractive, while others disagreed. Most perceived a reduction in overt drug peddling in the area, but one mother was concerned that her children are still solicited by dealers. Residents related stories of children made susceptible by drug-using parents and of parents who were victimized by addicted offspring—for example, one respondent’s seventy-year-old mother-in-law who is forced to sleep on the floor of her one-room apartment by her thieving, addicted son.

These members of the Bodega community understood the conflicted responses that families have towards a loved one with drug problems. When we asked if parents were aware of kids using, one resident said:

Yeah, they don’t want to know, but when they go home and their TV isn’t there, they start to wake up. There’s some that deal with it by saying, “You get the hell out of my house,” and they throw them out. There’s other ones that say, “I’ll love

you anyway, 'cause you're mine. I'm still going to hide my pocketbook when you're home, but I'll love you, and if you're hungry, I'm going to feed you."

On the one hand, these residents believed that the sign of a true "dope fiend" is that he or she steals from family members. But everyone in these focus groups had experienced drug use and addiction up close; everyone seemed to know people who had stopped using or, in a few cases, had stopped themselves. Many in the group nodded in sympathy when a woman tearfully related the story of her brother:

Everybody was like, "No, we don't want him around," and I was always like, "Why?" you know. I was there for him and to this day he still looks back at me and says "Thank you." Well, he's my brother and I have kids of my own and would never want my kids...[she stops to cry]...in that position [of having their father taken away from them]... He himself will never close the door to his own kids. He will be there for them. And I really wish that everybody would...[more tears]...love him because people can change. A lot of people stress and it brings them down. Sometimes they try.... One time is all it takes.... But without the love and support of the family, it will just make them worse. It will just take them to their grave.

Bodega Clients: "There is More Pain Every Time it Happens." Bodega's clients had the most heterogeneous views of drug use and drug users. They very rarely used the word "junkie" (and never said "dope fiend") in our focus group or interviews, and had a maternal (most respondents were women), fatalistic view of addicts that was clearly informed by their own experiences. Like their peers in our local resident groups and interviews, Bodega clients saw drug use as pervasive in the neighborhood. Users did not fit any stereotypes, according to one respondent: "[I've seen] every type of person using every type of drug. There are no typicals." People from outside the neighborhood come there to buy and use because "it has become internationally famous" as a drug center, "drawing in the rich and the poor."

Most of these respondents had benign views of addicts. There was some disagreement as to whether drug-related violence had decreased in recent years, but most Bodega clients did not see drug addicts or users committing violent crimes—only buying and selling drugs. A few

clients expressed concern about the random violence associated with the drug trade, and several related fears about what can happen to their own children when they get drawn into addiction; one respondent lives with the fear that her daughter “might get killed for not being able to pay for drugs.”

Having spent much of their lives with grown children or partners who had cycled in and out of drug problems, these respondents were not fearful of addicts, but of addiction itself—of its power to “suck in” children and grandchildren. One woman’s son had just been released from jail where he had stopped using, but she “worries and constantly asks him if he’s okay. I am never convinced that everything is fine.” She is fearful “he will be sucked into drugs again, especially since he has now been diagnosed as HIV positive.” She wishes she could retire and take her grandchildren away from the area because she cannot count on her son to raise them drug free.

These Bodega clients were clearly committed to helping the user in their family and dealing with the harms caused by drug use. But they were weary of the battle, spent of emotional energy—from efforts to keep the family together, the grandchildren in school, the user alive and off the streets. These people had seen it all. They were pushed and pulled by spiraling, uncontrolled forces of love and addiction, angered by police treatment, and frustrated by the lack of support from the community and their lack of options in dealing with a loved one who could slip into oblivion. Perhaps typical of these clients’ experiences was a mother, Gloria, who had recently made her daughter, Marta, move out of their home. Just a few months earlier, Marta had returned home from a three-year prison stint. Marta was abstinent during her prison stay, where she served a sentence for an arrest triggered by Gloria, who had seen Marta fall to the depths of addiction. Gloria had turned her daughter in because she felt Marta was “safer in jail than in a cemetery.” And, indeed, Marta thanked her mother once she returned from prison for giving her this opportunity to get off drugs. But now that Marta was using again, Gloria feared having to call the police and repeat the cycle: “There is more pain every time it happens to someone you care so much about.” Like most of the clients we interviewed, Gloria spoke passionately about the help she was getting from Bodega—help she had never received during past years of pain.

5.E. Beliefs About Drug Crime in the Bodega Community, and the Role of Police and Residents in Responding to Community Drug Problems

Sector and Foot Patrol Officers: “You Can’t be a Counselor ’Cause You Don’t Have the Time.” Drug-related crime was pervasive on the Lower East Side, according to these officers. The most common police calls were for drug sales, and most other crime “stems from drugs. Drugs are a big issue for this community because they contribute to other crime—prostitution, shoplifting. Drugs are the root of it all.” Officers reported that they frequently encountered family disputes that may also be alcohol- and drug-related. Complaint calls for drug sales and family disputes were commonly linked to the eastern end of the police precincts, known as Alphabet City (Avenues A, B, C, and D). Large housing projects were on the eastern end of the community, as were densely populated tenements largely occupied by Latinos and, to a lesser extent, African-Americans and other people of color. Officers saw the western side of their service area—marked by trendy restaurants and bars and more costly housing populated by younger, white residents—as a source of calls for “quality of life issues...disorderly persons, late night car alarms.” This was “the most diverse precinct,” according to one officer, “you’ve got affluence to the poorest of the poor.”

Drugs remained “a big issue.” However, “things are much better than they used to be,” according to most officers. “In 1992, Avenue B and C were full of drugs. There were lines around the block to buy from dealers. Now that’s gone.” But as the conversation continued, it was evident most officers believed the change was at least partially a matter of appearances: “The demand is still high, but the sales aren’t as visible.... It’s just going inside, into the stores” and the projects and apartment buildings. For the changes that did occur, these officers credited Mayor Giuliani’s zero tolerance position on drugs and a change in deployment: “They took the foot soldiers out when OCCB [Organized Crime Control Bureau] and SNEU [Specialized Narcotics Enforcement Unit] came in. They put in plainclothes cops, got a more sophisticated system. OCCB and SNEU are the ones getting the felony collars.”

The role of these sector and foot patrol officers involved gathering information, through observation and conversation with community members, which was passed on to plainclothes specialists: “Every block has a mayor. The mayor talks to the [foot patrol officers who] fill out an intelligence report that goes to SNEU or OCCB.” The types of enforcement actions

mentioned by these officers were indirect: “If you think someone is using, you pick them up for a quality of life crime like drinking beer...or criminal trespassing...or loitering.... Then if he has drugs, you arrest him.”

Sector and foot patrol officers were cynical about the value of arresting addicts: “Arresting people doesn’t make a difference. I picked up the same girl shoplifting five times. She’s hooked on drugs, she gets into rehab, drops out.... It’s a never ending cycle. How do you help someone like that?” Another respondent continued, “You can’t give them all time in jail—there’s no room for them. There’s a lot of drug-related petty crime.” A third added, “If you bring that sort of stuff to a judge they laugh at you.... An offender really has to offend a judge to get put away for a petty crime.”

Although dubious about the value of arrests, these officers were just as negative about alternative means of dealing with drug crime. They held little hope for treatment: “I refer people to services and they don’t want to go. They don’t care about the services offered to them. You can see on their faces that these people just want to get out of going to jail.” Another officer remarked, “they just look right past you” when you try to offer them services. When they do talk about going to a program it is little more than “a junkie trying to cop a story”: “[Addicts] usually offer information about rehab. They tell you because they think you’ll give them a break.” One officer made this derisive comment about the local needle exchange: “Users sell needles, then when you arrest them for selling drug paraphernalia, they’ll pull out a needle exchange card like it’s a get-out-of-jail-free card. You arrest them anyway and the needle exchange people get mad at you.”

In a series of telling statements about role perceptions, these officers explained that specialized police—youth and domestic violence officers—were the ones to make referrals. “It’s rare for patrol officers to make referrals. You just don’t have time when you’re on patrol.” Another added, “You’re a slave to the radio. You can’t be a counselor because you don’t have the time.” This man and his partner brought in a user and his father to Bodega but never found out what happened because they “don’t have the time to follow up.” Another officer grudgingly admitted, “I’ve referred a couple people who are doing okay now. You get to see one or two out of the hundreds you talk to that end up doing okay.”

These beliefs extended to both users and their families. “People talk about getting services for their families, but these family members have to volunteer. You can talk to someone ’til they’re blue in the face and they won’t change unless they want to.” In considering referrals to Bodega, focus group respondents nodded in agreement to this response: “Cops can’t get emotionally attached to these situations. You don’t follow up because you don’t want to get attached. You have to know where to draw the line.” Consistent with Bodega’s decision to not push for referrals of users who were suspected of crimes (such as drug possession or sales), these officers insisted they had little discretion; a referral in this case was against department policy.⁸

When we asked these officers if they worked cooperatively with other community agencies one responded simply, “Patrol cops don’t really interact with community organizations,” and most nodded in agreement. Another asserted that, “Churches are helpful. They try to counsel people.... The church links to other services, clinics, centers; they all pitch in.” But in their answers to nearly all our questions about ways to deal with drug crime, these officers showed their cynicism. Getting residents involved—apparently other than the occasional “local mayor”—was also hopeless. “Neighborhood residents are more concerned with petty crime, with loud stereos, car alarms.” At meetings between the police and community, there are only “five or six people when the meeting is on the east side” of the precinct. “As you move further east, residents stop caring. They got a ‘it doesn’t concern me’ attitude.”

Specialized Officers: Following Up on Families. In our interviews with domestic violence and housing police, there was little said about the kind of drug crime that is salient to other officers in the Bodega community—narcotics sales and possession. For both the domestic violence and housing officers, conversation on this topic was limited to concerns about dealers involving adolescents in the drug trade. Apparently, they rarely made trafficking arrests nor did they serve as informants to SNEU or OCCB with any frequency. Instead, in our discussions these officers focused on the role of drugs and alcohol in domestic incidents.

⁸ Some officers noted that their discretion is limited to acknowledging or not acknowledging an event that is not yet public: “if I don’t see it, it didn’t happen” (and presumably the officer could refer instead of arrest). But once the officer “sees” the crime, he or she must make the arrest.

For them, enforcement for drug-related crimes was the difficult question of whether to make an arrest in a domestic dispute often complicated by substance abuse. Frequently, arrest was not even an option, as the offender had left the scene by the time the police arrive. Both the DV and housing police were knowledgeable about NYPD policies regarding arrests in these incidents, noting that they made mandatory arrests if an explicit complaint was made or certain other evidence was present (a weapon or bruises). Some officers expressed some concern that these arrest rules could lead them to charge “the wrong person” (leaving the children with the least capable parent, for example), but they seemed to accept the protocols as necessary.

As a matter of course, domestic violence officers talked about getting to the root cause of domestic disputes and about making calls to service agencies. They were critical of child welfare agencies that did not pursue substance abuse problems even if abuse or neglect was a product of the parent’s addiction. They said that they “will work with almost any agency that approaches them,” and they were “constantly giving out their cards at social service agencies, shelters, hospitals and clinics.” These officers’ main complaint was about agencies that did not return their calls or keep them abreast of the progress of a case. In this regard, they spoke favorably about Bodega, but expressed some frustration about Bodega’s eligibility criteria (regarding out-of-catchment cases and when Bodega staff judged there was no substance abuse involved).

Like domestic violence police, housing officers described developing relationships with people and families involved in service calls: “You find out about people over time. You come back and visit families, knock on their door and check if things are okay—especially after fights.” Housing officers felt they were in a better position to respond to residents than sector or foot police: “Precinct cops don’t really have any contact with community residents. Housing cops are always on their own out there, but when the precinct has to go into a project they’re afraid. They won’t go in without three or four men.” They also believed that residents noted the difference: “Residents like housing cops more than precinct cops, who just do what they gotta do and get out. Housing cops have to talk to residents.”

Housing officers believed that residents were ambivalent about drug crime and the police role: “Some people are happy to see you. When they have a relative that’s using or dealing, they’re not so happy.... People complain at tenant meetings about drugs but then they go out and

help the dealers.” Another stated, “Old folks and kids love us, and teens hate us.” Housing police were the only officers we spoke with who expressed concern about alienating young people from police, and the only ones who reported taking pains to not appear overly aggressive.

Residents and Bodega Clients: Safe But Trapped. Neighborhood residents gauged drug crime by the type and frequency of encounters with dealers plying their trade on local street corners. Nearly all agreed that the aggressiveness and volume of drug crime had declined in recent years, although concern remained over the continued hawking of drugs to adolescents and even younger children. These local residents were aware of drug-related crime, but did not describe themselves as its victims. Most agreed with one man’s assessment that, “If you mind your own business, they won’t bother you.” Instead, addicts “rip each other off” or they look for people who are “fresh meat”—who are not from the community or are otherwise vulnerable.

Bodega client families were even more explicit in feeling safe from drug crime and some denied that drugs users are ever involved in violent crime. Mostly, these were parents who, as one mother expressed it, “never feel unsafe” even though they live among drugs. Instead, their greatest fear was losing their children to the lure of addiction and the violence spawned within the circle of users and dealers.

Residents expressed conflicting attitudes toward police enforcement in the community. Nearly all—some begrudgingly—credited police (and Mayor Giuliani’s enforcement policies in particular) with reducing drug crime in the neighborhood. Most distinguished between the relatively unresponsive precinct police and the more effective narcotics units. Regarding sector and foot patrol officers, they agreed with the comment that, “If you saw a shoot-out and there are guns, they show up just like that. But when it comes to drugs or anything else, they’re going to take their sweet time about it and by the time they get there a lot of things have taken place. The deal has been made and they left already or they switched dealers.” Despite this cynicism, residents reported that they all still made calls to the police to report observed crime.

Families of Bodega clients were split on police enforcement, though most agreed that specialized narcotics squads were ubiquitous and had effectively curtailed overt trafficking. Some clients had specific complaints about police enforcement, questioning whether police “were arresting the right people” during narcotics sweeps. Another echoed the view that police “will only arrest the small fish and are unwilling to go after the bigger fish,” implying that

substance-abusing family members had been targeted while serious traffickers were ignored. Some clients spoke with bitterness about police ineffectiveness, appearing to hold them partially accountable for not stopping the flow of drugs to their loved ones. Mirroring their attitudes about familial drug use, these clients seemed to feel trapped by their fate: Police were not helpful and couldn't be trusted, but they were the only people they could turn to when their child's addiction had hit bottom. When absolutely necessary, police could be called to take their children away to the safety of Rikers Island.

With regard to abusive behavior by the police, residents and clients agreed there were "good cops" but in both interviews and focus groups, accounts of negative interactions far outnumbered positive ones. Virtually everyone we talked with had observed abusive behavior firsthand (or been its victim) and their stories suggested that, in their eyes, occasional police misbehavior was a historical fact of life in Loisaida. Reports of abuse most commonly involved police hassling respondents for identification (for no apparent reason), or observations of police being overly aggressive with apparent suspects—encounters that often escalated because a local bystander (in some cases our respondent) commented to the police about their mistreatment of the individuals. There was some disagreement among our respondents over whether police abuse was justified, with a few residents and one recovering Bodega client claiming abuse was an inevitable and acceptable byproduct of drug enforcement: "If I saw drug activity and saw a cop—especially if I was with some kids 'cause I don't want them to see dealing—I would tell the cop. And then if I saw the cop put a foot up his ass, it'd be okay with me."

Residents' ambivalence toward police was evident when they were asked about working constructively with them. One man who had recounted multiple stories of police abuse admitted that he had successfully petitioned police, along with local Asian residents, to make street lighting improvements in order to deter robberies. But this cooperative venture did little to ease this man's sense of distrust and victimization. Focus group respondents concurred with a woman who said, "Every time I've gone to the police they were willing to help, but [they] were also looking me up and down, kinda checking me out, to see if I'm crazy or something. Like I'm suspicious."

When asked how police could be more responsive and effective in fighting crime, one woman described how "in the old days they used to have a cop on every single block so that

residents could get to know him, like a mailman.” Another recalled: “When I was a kid, nine or ten, living on 125th [Street], there was a cop, a big guy. He was the one that used to bring me to the door of my house when I was playing hooky or breaking bottles. You used to know cops. He used to come in and sit down and drink coffee with my mother.” Related suggestions were to “keep the same police officers around” and to require officers to undergo “sensitivity training.”

One respondent reported that, “there was a time two to three years ago where cops were out here walking around. But that disappeared.” Others told stories that suggested an institutional resistance to less traditional enforcement. A Bodega client recalled “one very nice cop who walked around and talked with the community members” in her housing project, and encouraged them to solicit him with crime-fighting information and ideas. But after about a year, the officer was gone from the precinct; when she ran into the officer later, he told her his superiors thought he “was getting too close” and too familiar with people in the community. Those who were most angered by what they regarded as past police abuses talked abstractly about the community gaining some kind of control over police and police actions in the neighborhood, though they held virtually no hope for this happening in the foreseeable future.

Local residents had mixed views about the community’s role in responding to drug crime. Some residents and Bodega clients said they and their neighbors were afraid to attend community meetings and reach out to police for fear of retaliation from drug dealers. Only a few residents commented about taking actions against dealers, and they seemed to be dubious about the effectiveness of any community response. One man talked about becoming involved in block associations, but was concerned about the exclusion of young people—those most susceptible to overt drug sales—from community action. Another described aggressively chasing addicts away from a local park, but failing to get help from local police to make it stick. A local businesswoman remarked that dealers on street corners were “very bad for business” and argued that,

If you fight strongly, they’ll move on to the next corner and if the next corner refuses to have them there, they’re gonna be forced to keep on moving until, you know. Obviously they are gonna get the picture, “We are not wanted here.” But the problem is that us in the community, the people, we don’t stick together.

On the other hand, there did seem to be a consensus that community attitudes had turned some kind of corner against drugs—that dealers and the drug business were less accepted than they once were. Job opportunities and recreational programs for youth were most frequently mentioned as useful, alternative responses to drug problems.

Bodega clients were more likely than residents to report current or past involvement in community efforts to help addicts or combat drug crime. Most clients had been involved in one or more kinds of treatment services, as an addict themselves or in support of an addicted family member. Nearly everyone was thankful in this regard for the healing power of Bodega. Some of these clients described repeated, unsuccessful attempts to work with police to make trafficking arrests but held out hope that, in addition to Bodega’s therapeutic value, the program could help them build positive connections with local police.

6. Summary and Discussion

During the 28-month data collection period, Bodega received 41 police referrals, more than two-thirds of which came from a few officers assigned to domestic violence and public housing units. Perhaps the most disappointing finding was that sector and foot patrol officers made just nine referrals, and that these dropped from seven during the first half of the study period to two during the second half. These findings contrast with Bodega’s success obtaining referrals from other criminal justice sources, particularly the local parole agency. Interviews and focus groups with local police suggested that the low number of police referrals could be traced in part to institutional and structural barriers. Attitudes and beliefs about drug users and drug crime among police officers also likely affected their use of Bodega. Another, quite different explanation of the results is that Bodega made incomplete efforts to engage police line staff and their immediate supervisors in making program referrals. These various interpretations, and their implications for future efforts with police, are considered below.

6.A. The Challenges of Establishing New Police Responses to Community Drug Problems

Foot Patrol and Sector Police and Barriers to Program Referrals. Officers in our focus groups clearly articulated the limits of their role: While “there is the perception that the cops have to be everything from police to clergy,” the fact is that patrol officers are “slaves to their

radios.” Most officers report that they have little exposure to offenders’ families. And, as acknowledged by one Bodega field worker, at the moment of arrest police are focused on the immediate: “staying safe, getting in, and getting out. [Referral of family members] is really the last thing police would be thinking of at the moment of arrest...and it is just not realistic” to expect Bodega to modify police behavior on these occasions.

These structural barriers are compounded by an institutional resistance to making social service referrals, which officers may view as the purview of police working in special areas such as domestic violence or crime prevention. In one of our focus groups, sector and patrol officers seemed dismissive of program referrals; in some cases, acculturation and sheer peer pressure can create walls that any program would find hard to crack.

Bodega ran up against other structural and institutional barriers that have often been cited in previous efforts to promote policing strategies that do not focus on enforcement (e.g., Sadd and Grinc, 1993; Skogan, 1996). The most prevalent of these for Bodega were the steady turnover in sector and foot patrol officers, and the routine practice of assigning sector or patrol police to special duties outside of the community (such as visits to the city by visiting dignitaries or large parades or protest marches). Referrals from housing police were also probably affected by a high turnover of officers. These changes in line staff conspired against the notion that officers would come to know families who were repeatedly troubled by drug abuse and look to Bodega as part of the solution.

The conventional police incentive structure, while not a barrier to Bodega use, did nothing to encourage officers to make program referrals (Alpert and Moore, 2001). Bestowing annual awards on officers as a means of supplementing the routine reward system was a plausible, even creative, strategy—though perhaps of insufficient magnitude to change ingrained behavior. One focus group participant commented that, “If you really want cops to [use the program], give the one with the most referrals a new car” and another suggested a Caribbean vacation would provide the needed incentive.

Some Success with Specialized Officers. Bodega did become a favored program among officers assigned to deal with domestic violence. These officers expressed support for the program when it was first described to them, and they followed through with 19 referrals to the

program over the last 20 months of the study period.⁹ Bodega was a natural fit with domestic violence police. Compared to other police, these officers were exposed to more incidents involving families and substance abuse; moreover, these encounters were less easily resolved through an arrest. Domestic violence officers talked about multiple, repeat calls to the same households, and about situations where they were uncertain whether a crime was committed and who was at fault. They sought out programs for these cases and the availability of services reduced the frustration they often felt in dealing with repeat callers. These officers expressed a sense of relief when Bodega was opened and making referrals to Bodega and other programs gave them a sense of accomplishment. In interviews, the domestic violence officers expressed particular affinity for Bodega over some other community services because the program tries, within the limits of confidentiality, to keep the officers informed about the outcomes of their referrals.

The different reactions of domestic violence officers and sector and patrol officers to Bodega appeared to illustrate the different styles of policing described by Michael Brown (1981) in his ethnographic study of police in southern California. There was consensus among all these officers that domestic violence police employed, in Brown's terms, a "service style" in which referrals were a legitimate tool in responding to domestic incidents. Both the attitudes and behavior of sector and patrol officers were consistent with a contrasting police style that emphasized enforcement and arrest as the prime response to crime.

Based on interview and focus group data, we expected more referrals from other specialized officers who expressed agreement with a service-oriented approach to policing. Housing, youth, and community affairs officers expressed support for Bodega, and housing police in particular could describe situations in the past when a Bodega referral would have been appropriate. Behind domestic violence police, housing officers did have the highest number of referrals (ten). But several factors led to fewer referrals than anticipated. According to the local

⁹ In fact, it is likely that the domestic violence officers would have made more referrals if Bodega did not enforce their catchment area policy, which made people residing outside a designated 4x6 block area ineligible for family case management or walk-in services. This catchment area did not neatly coincide with the boundaries of the local precinct, and domestic violence officers were frustrated, particularly early on, when they referred people to Bodega who were then sent elsewhere when staff learned they did not meet the residence criteria. Bodega largely resolved this issue, which proved problematic for several other referral sources as well, by expanding its catchment area in January 1999.

housing police commander, drug-related problems were centered in the public housing unit just north of Bodega's catchment area, while problems within Bodega's area were less extensive. And turnover of officers who seemed to understand Bodega and acknowledge its utility reduced the referral rate.

It also appears that, while housing officers could readily imagine situations where a Bodega referral would be appropriate, they were not practiced in making program referrals and were hesitant to do so. Like patrol officers, housing police emphasized that their discretion was very limited in situations involving drugs. Housing officers were willing to distribute Bodega's cards, and they were willing to provide Bodega field staff with names of families who might need assistance. The onus was then on Bodega to reach out to the families and offer services. Bodega followed up, but field staff described this as "cold-canvassing." None of these families became engaged in the program.

The lack of referrals from youth and community affairs officers was also probably due to the fact that these police rarely made referrals in their ordinary course of duty. These officers expressed support for Bodega's purpose and mission in the community, and became well known to Bodega staff as visitors and supporters of the program. These officers participated alongside Bodega staff in community-building activities (such as school or neighborhood festivals and meetings). However, they apparently had little occasion to make referrals and Bodega's presence did nothing to change this.

Involving Other Criminal Justice Agencies. Bodega had its greatest success engaging other criminal justice agencies, and the New York State Division of Parole in particular, as sources for program referral. This is worth noting because it is consistent with the pattern we observed within the police force; like individual police officers, criminal justice agencies that are less focused on enforcement and incorporate social services in their repertoire of responses were more likely to make use of La Bodega.

Just after the research came to a close, Bodega developed an agreement with NYS Parole to work with all newly released parolees in their catchment area. The agreement called for Bodega staff to conduct family assessments before parole candidates are released from prison, and to continue to work with the family and field officer during the first six months of parole supervision. While some field officers (and their superiors) initially expressed reservations

about the program, most approached Bodega with an open mind, and like specialized officers, could identify occurrences where Bodega family case management and other support services are helpful. Under the parole agreement, Bodega family counseling was incorporated as part of a series of graduated interventions for parolees who are at risk of being violated for parole infractions.

While both are law enforcement agents, police officers and parole (or probation) agents play roles that differ in ways that help explain Bodega's relative success with each agency. Police are primarily responsible for responding to calls-for-service. Parole officers supervise ex-offenders who presumably have stopped committing crimes. Rather than solving crimes, parole officers are charged with *preventing* crime and holding parolees accountable to the conditions of their release. Just as with domestic violence officers, service programs are a natural source of assistance to parole officers, while they are a foreign, extraneous option for most of the police force.

Shifting the Dialogue, One Word at a Time. Bodega's other success with police officers, while modest in magnitude, was to diffuse potentially problematic situations involving police and Bodega family clients and to build working relationships among these individuals. With each individual success, Bodega's director and field staff came to believe they were achieving their objective of fostering police-community relations "one incident at a time." Bodega staff reported that their experience and perspective—field staff included a former police officer and parole agent—bought them credibility with the police in individual circumstances. This credibility, combined with a sensitivity to the needs of program clients, put them in a position to serve as liaisons in situations typically marked by adversarial and possibly explosive encounters that could be damaging to program clients.

6.B. Bodega's Strategic Approach

Closing the Gap between Top-Down and Bottom-Up. Bodega had minimal success engaging local precinct officers in the program, even though it had received public, high-level endorsements from NYPD headquarters. Bodega's director had extraordinary success enlisting the police commissioner (and even Mayor Giuliani) to make public appearances for Bodega and to voice interest in and support for the program. This support helped Bodega gain some level of support from both local precinct captains and the regional housing police commander. It also led

the department's Office of Community Affairs to seek the input of Bodega's director in the community model block initiative.

It appeared, however, that the approval of NYPD headquarters had virtually no impact on referrals by precinct police or these officers' further involvement with Bodega. In fact, the commissioner's office was never asked by Bodega to make such an appeal to the precinct or to line officers. The role of local police in referring families to the program was not a topic of discussion with headquarters, but relegated to conversations with the precinct commander and presentations to line staff. Conceding to realism, Bodega's director and staff also chose never to broach the topic of diverting suspected low-level drug offenders to the program in light of the department's prevailing enforcement-oriented approach to drug crime—a strategy that had generally received favorable reviews by the media and the public during the period of this research and was typified, during this time, by a major initiative to arrest even low-level dealers of marijuana (Silverman, 1999).

Bodega's approach was to gain central office support for a program that emphasized a broad brush of services for families of drug-involved offenders. It was Bodega's plan to gain nonspecific high-level support and then to follow up with an action plan at the local level. The director's decisions to hire a former police officer as Bodega's field director, and to include another staff member with extensive experience in the Division of Parole, were clearly advantageous to building these local relationships.

But again, these relationships did not translate into referrals. Line officers were not particularly receptive to Bodega's message at precinct roll calls. While roll call was a convenient way for field staff to reach several officers at once, it may have been the wrong time to have them consider new approaches to families and offenders. Even though Bodega staff gave short, simple explanations of their program services, they sensed the officers' attention was focused on the upcoming shift and assignments.

Nothing further was done directly with the line officers to provide them with specifics, such as an opportunity to role-play a situation where a Bodega referral would be made, or to discuss past cases that were or were not appropriate for the program. In part, this reflected the staff's concern that they would be forever discredited by local officers if Bodega staff presented

themselves as experts on police handling of difficult drug-related situations. Building credibility logically superseded any effort to develop more specific training or work plans with the police.

In hindsight, Bodega's relationships with headquarters and the local precinct commanders may have presented the best opportunity to bridge their top-down/bottom-up strategies to encourage family referrals. Brown (1981) emphasizes the role played by police administrators in the "organizational socialization" of policing styles and the influential position of the local supervising officer is often underscored in analyses of the implementation of community policing (Cordner, 2001; Goldstein, 1990; McElroy et al., 1993). While Bodega's efforts to gain support from senior officials within the NYPD offered some symbolic value, this support had no tangible effects on police referrals.

Ambivalence Toward Police Involvement in the Program. An atmosphere of ambivalence complicated Bodega's work with the police. Community residents, Bodega clients, and even Bodega staff seemed uncertain about the role of local police in the program. The clinical staff seemed to take their cue from local residents and especially clients. In all probability, these case managers heard the same things we did in our interviews with these individuals—a pervasive sense of distrust toward the police, frustration and anger over their perceived unresponsiveness, and, to some extent, abusive treatment of citizens. Staff at times mirrored the conflicted view expressed by their clients: Police could be very useful in certain crisis situations, and some individual officers were responsive and helpful, but, as a rule, it was safest to avoid them.

This underlying, rarely explicit dissonance surrounding police was most evident when uniformed officers were present at the Bodega storefront. Bodega's director and field staff were inclined to invite officers to visit Bodega and become familiar with the staff and program services. However, many clients (and, to some extent case, managers) were uncomfortable with officers present inside the small program site. Over time, staff became more judicious in their invitations to police, and tried to conduct business with police at the precinct station or other neighborhood locations. When police did visit the storefront, Bodega staff moved them to offices or the rear meeting room of the site, making their presence less evident to clients or those coming for services.

Field staff who were responsible for developing and maintaining police relations and who brought valuable personal experience to this task were attuned to the potentially positive aspects

of police involvement. But they too were cognizant of the limits of engaging police and were aware of clients' and case managers' ambivalent attitudes. The same staff person who helped deliver presentations at police roll calls later questioned if this was the right time and place to get officers to focus on a new program and a new response. Field staff also seemed to anticipate that sector and patrol officers would view Bodega as just another program—a flavor-of-the-week that would soon be relegated to the pile of neighborhood programs that had good intentions but little relevance to daily policing duties. In the end, field staff chose to stop presenting at roll calls after all officers had heard the 15-minute presentation about Bodega. They and other Bodega staff gravitated to the specialized officers and devoted much more time to this more receptive and engaged audience.

It is not clear how Bodega's day-to-day interactions with police were affected by the ambivalence among staff and clients. Bodega staff were discreet in their interactions with officers, and police who sought out the program probably felt comfortable and welcome at the storefront. But in the absence of discussions and directives about referrals from their precinct supervisors, the rank and file may have picked up the message that Bodega was, indeed, just another program. And, in the air of ambivalence about the police role, Bodega field staff were quite willing to limit efforts at engaging these officers, while focusing their energies on specialized officers and parole agents who sought the program and their input.

6.C. Opportunities for Change: Attitudes and Beliefs of Police

Sector and patrol officers' attitudes toward drug addicts also likely motivated them to ignore, or perhaps even resist, Bodega's message. There is nowhere to ground such a message if there is no such thing as a functional drug user, if addicts are hopelessly predatory "dope fiends" and, probably most important, if "junkies don't have families." Not surprisingly, these officers saw little value in treatment or prevention, and were happy to leave tasks like program referrals and developing relationships with families of offenders to other specialized officers who "have the time to follow up." It was interesting that several of these officers expressed a larger sense of impotence in dealing with drugs; for them, arrests were almost as pointless as treatment because, as one of our respondents opined, addiction, arrest, rehab, and release are a never ending cycle.

At the same time, the attitudes expressed by specialized officers, especially housing and domestic violence police, suggested there was potential in enlisting these officers to further Bodega's mission. Specialized police held more textured views of users and addicts and were somewhat more sympathetic to them and their families than sector and patrol officers. These attitudes were internally consistent with their beliefs about enforcement and alternative approaches to drug demand reduction. These officers were focused on the role of drugs in domestic incidents and youth crime, and spoke less about adult drug sales and possession cases. Domestic violence officers already used social service programs. Housing officers spoke about the value of developing lasting relationships with residents of public housing and reported that they would return to check on families after an incident.

We can think of at least three factors that may contribute to these different attitudes. First, these specialized officers have responsibilities that afford them more opportunity to observe and interact with families, placing substance abuse in social contexts. Exposure alone may engender the development of more refined views of addicts and the recognition that drug demand reduction can involve treatment and prevention, and not just enforcement. Second, it is possible (and quite likely in the case of domestic violence officers) that specialized police held such views before joining the department. Finally, these officers' unique responsibilities focus them more on problem solving, on getting to the root cause of crime; police who respond to radio calls focus on immediate reported activity. If the cause can be stemmed by program referrals or simply by establishing communication and relationships, then these are legitimate responses. The fact that a small number of housing officers made many more Bodega referrals than sector and patrol police suggests that this last factor may be the most important determinant in Bodega reaching its referral goals.

6.D. Recommendations and Future Efforts

Targeting the Message. Our findings suggest that any attempt to change or develop new police responses would benefit from an assessment of the personal attitudes and beliefs that inform those responses. Police officers have diverse belief structures and, at least based on this exploratory study, their attitudes and beliefs about addicts and drug use vary according to their formal work roles. Paying attention to these differences should lead to more efficient, effective

policing strategies. To simplify for purposes of illustration, police departments that seek to reduce drug demand through strategies other than enforcement might establish new policies and train officers throughout the force in their application. Another approach is to select model precincts to serve as demonstration sites to implement the new policies. Results from this research suggest a third option: to identify officers in a set of work roles who express attitudes and beliefs that are in relative accord with the new policies. The policies could be implemented within their work stratum, assessed for effectiveness, and then extended to other units within the force.

In applying this lesson to Bodega, the program could more efficiently generate police referrals by targeting their message to housing police and other specialized officers whose attitudes about drug use and responses to it are in line with Bodega's aims. It is important to note, however, that attitudes alone did not lead certain officers to connect with Bodega and make referrals to the program. In fact, a comparison of domestic violence and housing police suggest that prior practice in making service referrals and the acceptance of referrals as a routine part of their job prevailed over belief structures in their use of Bodega. While making many more Bodega referrals, domestic violence officers appeared to hold more pejorative views of addicts than housing police. Housing officers expressed more complex views of addicts and thought the program could be useful for families but they were reluctant to make direct referrals; these officers asked Bodega staff to initiate contacts with families they identified.

Developing Specific Training Plans. It was difficult to judge the effects of sector and patrol officers' belief systems on their use of Bodega because of shortfalls in the program's efforts to engage this group. While we suggest that housing and other specialized officers be targeted first in future efforts to involve police in Bodega, the sector and patrol officers should also be recruited to make program referrals through a well-planned training effort.

Future plans should target the gap between the program's top-down and bottom-up strategies for reaching these officers. Even with a strong endorsement from the NYPD commissioner and the precinct captains, Bodega was unable to encourage the core line staff to make many referrals. These officers need explicit directives from superiors about making family referrals, followed by training that extends beyond a 15-minute introduction to the program. The training should be done at a time when the officers are not distracted by other responsibilities. It

might be useful for officers to review and even rehearse mock situations and cases that could result in a Bodega referral. A brief descriptive manual that illustrated familiar situations and specific families that benefited from Bodega involvement might help generate more concrete action from precinct police. A number of resources are available in the city (including staff members at the Police Academy) that could offer assistance in planning and developing a training curriculum focused on referring families and even possibly offenders.

Staying the Course. In considering Bodega's future efforts with the police, the support shown the program by senior NYPD officials carries substantial weight. Arguably, this interest in Bodega is superficial, but a more optimistic interpretation is that even among the proponents of zero-tolerance enforcement strategies there is an awareness of the limitations of a single approach to drug problems. Echoing the opinions expressed by police chiefs and managers nationally (Drug Strategies, 1996), Bodega's supporters at police headquarters recognize the need for new responses to drugs and drug-related crime, and find Bodega's emphasis on the families of drug-involved offenders an appealing alternative. The rationale behind Bodega's initial interests in police—their role as gatekeepers of the justice system and their proximity to families and communities—remains as convincing now as it was when Bodega began. Armed with the lessons gained from this research and from more than two years of experience, a renewed effort by Bodega to engage local police in the program may yet yield powerful results.

References

- Alpert, G. P. and Moore, M.H. (2001). Measuring police performance in the new paradigm of policing. *Critical Issues in Policing: Fourth Edition*. R.G. Dunham and G.P. Alpert (Eds.). Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waverland Press, Inc.
- Anthony, W.A., Cohen, M., Cohen, B. and Farkas, M. (1988). Clinical care update: The chronically mentally ill: Case management—more than a response to a dysfunctional system. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 24 (3): 219-227.
- Applebaum, R. and Austin, C. (1990). *Long-term care case management: Design and evaluation*. New York: Springer.
- Ashery, R.S. (1992). *Case management community advocacy for substance abuse clients. Progress and issues in Case Management*. Rockville, MD: National Institute on Drug Abuse Research Monograph 127.
- Azzi-Lessing, L. and Olsen, L. (1994). Project Connect: What we've learned from serving substance abuse afflicted families. *Common Ground*, 11, 3.
- Babbie, E. (1998). *The practice of social research. 8th Edition*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co.
- Baker, M. (1985). *Cops: Their lives in their own words*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Block, R. (1971). Fear of crime and fear of the police. *Social Problems*, 19, 91-100.
- Bloom, B. (1993). Why punish the children? A reappraisal of the children of incarcerated mothers in America. *The IARCA Journal*, 6, 14-17.
- Brown, M. K. (1981). *Working the street*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Buerger, M.E. (1994). A tale of two targets: Limitations of community anticrime actions. *Journal of Crime and Delinquency*, 40 (3), 411-436.
- Bureau of Justice Assistance. (1993). *Problem-oriented drug enforcement: A community-based approach for effective policing*. Washington D.C: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Bureau of Justice Assistance. (1994). *Understanding community policing: A framework for action*. Washington D.C: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.

- Cordner, G.W. (2001). Community policing: elements and effects. In R.G. Dunham and G.P. Alpert (Eds.). *Critical Issues in Policing: Fourth Edition*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.
- Currie, E. (1993). *Drugs, the cities, and the American future*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Davis, R. C. and Miller, J. (2002). Immigration and integration: Perceptions of community policing among members of six ethnic communities in central Queens, New York City. *International Review of Victimology*, 9, 93-111.
- Davis, R.C. and Lurigio, A.J. (1996). *Fighting back: Neighborhood antidrug strategies*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Des Jarlais, D. (1995). Harm reduction: A framework for incorporating science into drug policy. *American Journal of Public Health*, 85 (1) 10-11.
- Drug Strategies (1996). *Drugs and crime across America: Police chiefs speak out*. Washington: Drug Strategies.
- Dunsworth, T. and Mills, G. (June, 1999). National evaluation of weed and seed. *National Institute of Justice: Research in Brief*.
- Eck, J.E. and Spellman, W. (1987). *Problem solving: Problem oriented policing in Newport News*. Washington D.C: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs; and Police Executive Research Forum.
- Ely, M. with Anzul M., Friedman, T., Garner, D., McCormack, A. (1991) *Doing Qualitative Research: Circles Within Circles*. New York: Falmer Press.
- Fagan, J.A. (1987). Neighborhood education, mobilization, and organization for juvenile crime prevention. In Lynn A. Curtins (Ed.) *The Annals of The American Academy of Political and Social Science*. 494:54-71.
- Farrell, M.P., Barnes, G.M., and Banerjee, S. (1995). Family cohesion as a buffer against the effects of problem-drinking fathers on psychological distress, deviant behavior and heavy drinking in adolescents. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 36, 377-385.
- Fishman, L.T. (1990). *Women at the Wall: A Study of Prisoners' Wives Doing Time on the Outside*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Goetz, B. (1996). *Community policing as an alternative drug control strategy? The promise and limits of alternative spheres of social control*. Paper presented at the 1996 American Society of Criminology Conference. New York, New York.

- Goetz, B. and Mitchell, R. (1998). *Police participation in drug demand and harm reduction strategies: Some preliminary findings*. Paper presented at the 1998 American Society of Criminology Conference. Washington D.C.
- Goldberg, M.E. (1995). Substance-abusing women: False stereotypes and real needs. *Social Work, 40*, 789-798.
- Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented policing*. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc.
- Goldstein, H. (1979). Improving community policing: A problem-oriented approach. *Crime and Delinquency, 25*, 236-258.
- Greene, J. and Decker (1989). Police and community perceptions of community role in policing: The Philadelphia experience *Howard journal of Criminal Justice, 28* (2) 105-123.
- Greene, J. and McLaughlin, E. (1993). Facilitating communities through police work: drug problem solving and neighborhood involvement in Philadelphia." *Drugs and Community. Involving Community Residents in Combating the Sale of Illegal Drugs*. R.C. Davis, A.J. Lurigio, & D.P. Rosenbaum (Eds.). Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas Publishing.
- Grinc, R. (1994). 'Angels in marble': Problems in stimulating community involvement in community policing. *Crime and Delinquency, 40*, 437-468.
- Hagan, J. (1996). *The next generation: children of prisoners*. (Vera Institute of Justice Conference Paper). New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Hartnett, S.M and Skogan, W.G. (1999). Community policing: Chicago's experience. *National Institute of Justice Journal (April)* 2-11. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Herman, S. and Weisburd, D. (2002). Introduction. *International Review of Victimology, 9*, 89-91.
- Johnson, V.E. (1986). *Intervention: How to help someone who doesn't want help*. Minneapolis: Johnson Institute Books.
- Klockars, C. (1988). The rhetoric of community policing. In Greene, J. and Matrofski, S. (Eds.) *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality*. New York: Praeger.
- MacKenzie, D.L. (1994). Drug control and system improvement: evaluating the success of public policies. In MacKenzie, D.L. and Uchida, C. (Eds.) *Drugs and Crime: Evaluating Public Policy Initiatives*. California: Sage Publications. 3-9.
- Martin, S., Isenberg, H., and Inciardi, J.A. (1993). Assertive community treatment: Integrating intensive drug treatment with aggressive case management for hard to reach populations.

- In J.A. Inciardi, F.M. Tims, and B.W. Fletcher (Eds.), *Innovative approaches in the Treatment of Drug Abuse*. Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 97-108.
- Martin, S., and Inciardi, J. (1993). Case management approaches for criminal justice clients. In J. Incardi (Ed.), *Drug Treatment and Criminal Justice*. 27:81-96. Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications.
- Mastrofski, S. (1988). Community policing reform: A cautionary tale. In Greene, J. and Matrofski, S. (Eds.) *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality*. New York: Praeger.
- Maxwell, J.A. (2001). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. *Applied Social Research Series*, 41. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.
- Maxell, J.A. (1998). Designing a qualitative study. In Bickman, L. and Rog, D.J. (Eds.) *Handbook of Applied Social Research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mazerolle, L.G., Price, J.P., Roehl, J. (2000). Civil remedies and drug control: A randomized field trial in Oakland, California. *Evaluation Review*. 24, (2), 212-241.
- McElroy, J.E., Cosgrove, C.A., Sadd, S. (1993). *Community Policing: The CPOP in New York*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Meares, T. (1998). Place and crime. *Chicago-Kent Law Review*. 73: 669.
- Merriam, Sharan B. (1988) *Case Study Research in Education*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Moore, J. (1996). *Bearing the burden: How incarceration policies weaken inner-city communities*. (Vera Institute of Justice Conference Paper). New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Muir, W.K. (1977). *Police: Streetcorner Politicians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- National Institute of Justice. (1993). *Community policing for safe neighborhoods: partnerships for the 21st century conference proceedings*. Washington D.C.: Institute for Law and Justice.
- Pribor, E.F. and Dinwiddie, S.H. (1992). Psychiatric correlates of incest in children. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 149, 52-56.
- Ready, J. Weisburd, D. and Farrell, G. (2002). The role of crime victims in American policing: Findings for a national survey of police and victim organizations. *International Review of Victimology*, 9, 175-195.

- Resnick R.B. and Resnick, E.B. (1984). Cocaine abuse and its treatment. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*, 7 (4), 713-728.
- Rivara, F.P., Mueller, B.A., Soges, G., Mendoza, C.T., Rushforth, N.B., and Kellerman, A.L. (1997). Alcohol and illicit drug abuse and the risk of violent death in the home. *JAMA*, 276 (7), 569-575.
- Rosenbaum, D.P. (1993). Civil liberties and aggressive enforcement: Balancing the rights of individuals and society in the drug war. In Davis, R.C., Lurigio, A.J., and Rosenbaum, D.P. (Eds.). *Drugs and the community: involving community residents in combating the sale of illegal drugs*. Springfield, Ill: Charles C. Springer.
- Sadd, S. and Grinc, R. (1993). *Issues in community policing: An evaluation of eight innovative neighborhood-oriented policing projects*. A report submitted to the National Institute of Justice. New York: The Vera Institute of Justice.
- Sadd, S. and Grinc, R. (1996). *Implementation challenges in community policing: Innovative neighborhood-oriented policing in eight cities*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Sampson, R. (1992). Family management and child development: Insights from social disorganization theory. *Advances in Criminological Theory*, 2, 6393.
- Sampson, R.J. and Bartusch, D.J. (1999). *Attitudes toward crime, police, and the law: individual and neighborhood differences*. National Institute of Justice Research Preview: Washington D.C: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Shapiro, C. (1998). *La Bodega de la Familia: Reaching out to the forgotten victims of substance abuse*. Bureau of Justice Assistance Bulletin. Washington D.C: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- Shapiro, C. and Stayton, C. (1998). *Family-focused drug treatment: A natural resource for the criminal justice system*. Presented to the Office of National Drug Control Policy Physician's Leadership Conference. Washington, DC.
- Shwartz, M., Baker, G., Mulvey, K.P., and Plough, A. (1997). Improving publicly funded substance abuse treatment: The value of case management. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87, 1659-1664.
- Siegal, H.A., Fisher, J.H., Rapp, R.C., Kelliher, C.A., Wagner, J.H., O'brien, W.F., and Cole, P.A. (1996). Enhancing substance abuse treatment with case management: Its impact on employment. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*, 13 (2), 93-98.
- Silverman, E.B. (1999). *NYPD Battles Crime*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

- Skogan, W. (1988). Community organizations and crime. In M. Tonry and N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, Vol. 8, 203-230. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Skogan, W. (1990). *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Cities*. New York: Free Press.
- Skogan, W. (1996). The community's role in community policing. *Communities: Mobilizing Against Crime, Making Partnerships Work. National Institute of Justice Journal (August)* 31-34. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Skogan, W. and Frydl, K. (2004). Effectiveness of Police Activity in Reducing Crime, Disorder and Fear. In Wesley Skogan and Kathleen Frydl (eds.), *Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing: The Evidence*. 217-251. National Research Council.
- Skogan, W. and Hartnett, S.M. (1997). *Community Policing, Chicago Style*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Skogan, W.G., Steiner, L., DuBois, J., Gudell, J.E., Fagan, A., Kim, J., and Block, R. (2000). Community policing in Chicago, year seven: An interim report. Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University, Chicago.
- Skolnick, J. (1992). Rethinking the drug problem. *Daedalus*, 121 (3), 133-159.
- Skolnick, J. and Bayley, D. H. (1988) Community policing: issues and practices around the world. *Issues and Practices*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice.
- Smith, R.C. (2004). Complementary articulation: matching qualitative data and quantitative methods. In C. Ragin, J. Nagel, & P. White (Eds.), *Workshop on Scientific Foundations of Qualitative Research*, 127-132. Washington, D.C.: National Science Foundation.
- Smith, B.E. and Elstein, S.G. (1994). *Children on hold: improving the response to children whose parents are arrested and incarcerated*. Washington, D.C.: American Bar Association Center on Children and the Law.
- Sullivan, E., Mino, M., Nelson, K., Pope, J. (2002). Families as a resource in recovery from substance abuse. An evaluation of La Bodega de la Familia. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.
- Szapocznik, J., Perez-Vidal, A., Brickman, A.L., Foote, F.F., Santisteban, D., Hervis, O. and Kurtines, W.M. (1988). Engaging adolescent drug abusers and their families in treatment: A strategic structural systems approach. *Journal of Consulting Clinical Psychology*, 56 (4) 552-557.

- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative Research: Analysis Types and Software Tools*. London: Falmer Press.
- Trojanowicz, R.C. (1983). *An evaluation of a neighborhood foot patrol program in Flint, Michigan*. East Lansing: Michigan State University, National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center.
- Uchida, C. and Forst, B. (1994). Controlling street-level drug trafficking: professional and community policing approaches. MacKenzie, D.L. and Uchida, C. (Eds.) (1994). *Drugs and Crime: Evaluating Public Policy Initiatives*. California: Sage Publications. 77-95.
- Umberson, D. (1987). Family status and health behaviors: Social control as a dimension of social interaction. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 28, 306-319.
- Weil, M., Karls, J.M., and Associates (1985). *Case management in human service practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Weingart, S.N. (1993). A typology of community responses to drugs. In Davis, R.C., Lurigio, A.J., and Rosenbaum, D.P. (Eds.). *Drugs and the community: involving community residents in combating the sale of illegal drugs*. Springfield, Ill: Charles C.
- Weisburd, D. , and Green, L. (1995). Policing drug hot spots: The Jersey City drug market analysis experiment. *Justice Quarterly*, 12, 711-735.
- Wermouth, L. and Scheidt, T. (1986). Enlisting family support in drug treatment. *Family Process*, 25, 25-34.
- Wine, S. (1992). *A motherhood issue: the impact of criminal justice system involvement on women and their children*. Canada: Corrections Branch, Ministry of the Solicitor General.
- Wolcott, H.F. (1990). Making a study more ethnographic. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 19, 44-72.
- Zimmer, L. (1990). Proactive policing against street-level drug trafficking. *American Journal of Police*, 9, 43-74.

Appendix

Focus Group Questions for Precinct Police

1. Introductory Question: Name and...
Years and position with the police department?
2. What kind of calls for service do you get most often?
3. What are some typical encounters you have with drug users? (use easel, probe for typology)
4. What are the different ways you respond to these different types of encounters? How do you deal with them? (use easel; probes: arrest; maintain order; mediate; refer somewhere...)
5. How do you decide how to respond? What factors come into play?
probes: family/friend involvement; addict vs. non-addicted seller; past history with case; what is the formal department policy regarding these encounters?
probes: how taught? pressure from supervisors to comply? from peers?
6. What are the attitudes of family members about police involvement/intervention?
7. How do addicts families affect their behavior?
8. What happens to families when they have a drug-using member arrested?
9. What is your view about the criminal justice system's focus on drug users?
probe: is this the best way to deal with the drug problem? what would you change?
10. What are the local residents' attitudes about drugs? About drug *crime*?
use easel; probe for variations and factions, different types of residents and views
11. How do you think neighborhood residents feel about the *police*?
use easel; probe for variations and factions, different types of residents and views
12. In what ways are community residents willing to help you do your job effectively?
probe: why? different 'types' of residents more or less willing? some make it more difficult?
13. Are there any programs or local service providers that serve as resources for you?
probe: what are the situations when you use them? why?
14. How did they go about trying to establish a working relationship with the police?
15. Are there others that have tried to work with you but have failed? Why don't you use these services/agencies?
16. Have you heard about La Bodega? What have you heard?
17. Do you know any officers who have used Bodega? Who? When? What was the situation?

Bodega client, resident interview schedule

Drug use and crime in the community and the police response

Name and years in community.

If Bodega client: How did you get involved with La Bodega?

With [other] community organizations are you involved in? Are these formal or informal affiliations/involvements?

How do you think drug use has affected this community as a whole? What are the contributing factors?

What about (drug) crime in the community? Is this a big problem? Little problem? Who commits most of it? What does it look like? Who are the victims? Do you feel safe on the streets? Why/why not?

How do you feel the police respond to drugs in the community? What makes a difference in how police respond? (type of officer, age of perpetrator, race, time of day/year, etc.) [probe for how respondents come to their conclusions]

Personal encounters with the police

Have you ever had positive encounters with the police? Explain.

If no, can you see a way for your encounters with the police to be more positive generally? What would that take?

Have you ever called the police? Why? Was this a call of last resort? What happened? Do you think this was typical?

What other kinds of personal encounters have you had with police? Was this an encounter/contact of last resort? Have these involved more than one type of officer? Have some officers been more helpful than others?

If describes negative encounters: Did these run-ins with the police have an impact on your family? What kind of impact? [probe for any relief, child custody problems, financial hardship]

Building a bridge

Are community residents involved in trying to deal with drug use and drug crime? How? [probe for formal, informal, who participates]

Do residents want to work with police in dealing with drugs? Has this been tried?

Can you imagine a way for Bodega to bring the police and the community together? Is that something you would want Bodega to try? Why/why not?

Focus Group Questions For Community Residents, Bodega Clients

1. Introductory Question: Name and...
....age [voluntary]; years in the community; ties to, roles in the community
2. What are your views about drug use in this community? [probe: is it a big problem, a little problem, an overblown problem; role of home, environmental factors]
3. How do you think families react to drug use by other family members? [probe: what is the range of responses they have or you have had?]
4. What are views about drug *crime* in this community? [probe: is this also a big or little problem; who does it, who is responsible; role of home, environ. factors]
5. What are some typical encounters between the police and drug users in this community? [probe: drug sellers? buyers? different types of police]
6. In your experience, what individual factors affect the way police respond to drug users/drug crime? [probe: ethnicity, age, gender of actors; family or community ties of actors; types of police; time of day]
7. Is this the right way for police to approach these situations? [probe: is it too enforcement oriented? what other roles can police play? distinguish types of police]
8. What happens to families when they have a drug-using member arrested?
9. How is the *community* involved in trying to deal with drug crime? [probe: formal, informal ways; who participates?]
10. Do residents want to work with the police in dealing with drug crime? Is there a way to do that now? Why or why not? [probe: any specific initiatives to do this? their success?]
11. Are there any programs that can help residents deal with drug crime? In building police-community partnerships?
12. Have you heard about la Bodega de la Familia?
13. What role can La Bodega play in helping residents and families to deal with drug use and crime?