COMMUNITY POLICING IN CHICAGO: BRINGING OFFICERS ON BOARD

ARTHUR J. LURIGIO
Loyola University Chicago

WESLEY G. SKOGAN
Northwestern University

This study examined the effects of community policing on police officers' perceptions, attitudes and behaviors in Chicago. Chicago's Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) became operational in March 1993 in five prototype districts. Prototype officers and a control group of officers in matched districts were surveyed before the program started and again two years later when the program was implemented citywide. Comparisons across the two groups showed that prototype officers in 1995 became less pessimistic about CAPS' effects on police autonomy and felt more qualified to engage in CAPS-related activities. Wave 2 comparisons between prototype and control officers showed the former were more optimistic about community policing, more positive about their relationships with citizens and more satisfied with their jobs on several dimensions.

The Chicago Police Department's (CPD's) experiment with community policing began in April 1993. Known as Chicago's Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS), the program was initially implemented in five prototype districts that were chosen to reflect the diversity of Chicago's neighborhoods. Following its first year of operations, an evaluation of CAPS indicated that the program led to positive changes in the prototype districts, including reductions in crime and disorder and improvements in citizens' assessments of the police (Skogan and Hartnett 1997; Skogan 1998). By May 1995, CAPS became operational throughout the city's twenty-five police districts. This article examines CAPS's effects on police officers' attitudes and perceptions.

POLICE QUARTERLY, Vol. 1, No. 1 1998

Background

Community policing attempts to change the ways police officers define and perform their jobs. Proponents of community policing claim that they are witnessing "a quiet revolution [that] is reshaping American policing" (Kelling 1998:3) and that community policing will produce a "new breed" of police officers by transforming police cultures, organizations, roles, management techniques, decision-making strategies, reward systems and training curricula (Kelling and Moore 1998; Moore 1992). These new reforms are designed to increase officers' knowledge and expertise in identifying and solving problems with the support and cooperation of residents.

Studies on Officers' Perceptions

As a result of these purported changes in their jobs and duties, community policing officers are expected to experience better relationships with their supervisors, be more satisfied with their jobs and more accountable for their work, and report improvements in their relationships with citizens and a greater willingness to work with them to identify and solve crimes and other neighborhood problems. What has research reported about the effects of community policing on officers' perceptions, attitudes and behaviors?

A combination of change strategies has influenced police officers' views in traditional police departments. Surveys of police have demonstrated consistently that community policing projects have favorable effects on officers, including increased job satisfaction, a perceived enlargement of the police role, improved relations with coworkers and citizens and stronger beliefs about the community's role in preventing crimes. In a review of several studies involving police officers in twelve different cities, Lurigio and Rosenbaum (1994) concluded that "on balance, these studies have shown that community policing has exerted a positive impact on the police and on citizens' views of the police" (p. 160). For example, in one of the first investigations of community policing's effects on officers, Boydston and Sherry (1977) found that community policing officers in San Diego, when compared with traditional officers, reported that their jobs were more interesting and less frustrating, that they had greater knowledge of their beats, and that they had higher levels of confidence in the community.

Hayeslip and Cordner (1987) investigated officers' job satisfaction in Baltimore County, Maryland's community policing program, known as the Citizen Oriented Police Enforcement (COPE) project. Officers in COPE were compared with a control group of police officers, and the COPE officers reported greater satisfaction with their jobs and more positive feelings about community residents. In addition, research in Cincinnati (Schwartz and Clarren 1977); Flint, Michigan (Trojanowicz 1986) and Edmonton, Canada (Cassels 1988) all suggested that officers engaging in community policing perceive that their work is less frustrating and is more important, interesting and rewarding than traditional policing.

Other evaluations have found that community policing officers report greater independence, greater control over their jobs and a stronger sense that they are part of a team, all of which are crucial determinants of job satisfaction. Furthermore, community policing officers report more comprehensive knowledge about their assigned turf and greater optimism about the impact of their work on community problems. Finally, they tend to adopt more benign and trusting views of the public than the ones they held while doing traditional policing (Lurigio and Rosenbaum 1994; Wycoff 1988).

In a study of Madison, Wisconsin's decentralized police management program, Wycoff and Skogan (1993, 1994) surveyed officers at three points in time over a two-year period. Those assigned to experimental districts eventually saw themselves as working as a team, believed their efforts were being supported by their supervisors and the department and thought the department was truly engaged in reform. They became more satisfied with their jobs and more strongly committed to the organization when compared with officers serving in other parts of the city. In addition, they were more citizen-oriented, invested more seriously in the principles of problem solving and community policing and felt they had a better relationship with the community. Officers who believed they were participating in organizational decisions were more satisfied on a wide range of outcomes measures. Department records indicated rates of absenteeism and tardiness and numbers of disciplinary actions and sick days decreased more in the experimental area than in the rest of the city.

There are also positive—but more impressionistic—indications from other cities that community policing can alter police officers' attitudes and perceptions. In New York City, for example, community policing officers reported that they were being exposed more to "the good people" of the community while doing their new jobs and that they got to know citizens as "people" and were interacting with

them in a variety of situations, not just during crises (McElroy, Cosgrove and Sadd 1993). As a result of community policing in Hayward, California, officers reported that citizens had a better understanding of police roles and more realistic expectations about what police can actually accomplish. Officers became more attuned to community problems and more receptive to neighborhood residents' complaints. Similarly, residents reported that the police had become more open to change and more willing to help them (Sadd and Grinc 1993).

Studies of community policing's effects on officers have had conceptual and methodological problems; many were conducted during the team policing era of the 1970s or the community relations era of the 1980s. Most of the programs, therefore, were not influenced by a systematic problem-solving model (e.g., Eck and Spelman 1987; Goldstein 1990; Kelling and Moore 1988) or even the presumption of community involvement in securing neighborhood safety. Moreover, the methodological quality of these studies was uneven, and in some cases, the range of measurement was quite limited.

Chicago's Change Strategy

CAPS managers mounted a multipronged attack on the problem of capturing the support of rank-and-file officers. The effort was a departure from business as usual in a department dominated by very traditional and conflict-laden, labor-management relations. Many of the top managers were skeptical of the motivations of patrol officers, reflecting the department's command-and-control management style. Nonetheless, it was clear to CAPS managers that no real change could take place in the organization unless there was a real change at the bottom (i.e., in the hearts and minds of the patrol officers).

Changing Officers' Jobs

The implementation of CAPS involved revising officers' jobs. Specifically, the force in each police district was divided into beat and rapid response teams. According to the program's design, beat officers would spend most of their time within their assigned geographical areas in which they would work with schools, merchants and residents to identify and solve problems and in which they would serve as conduits to expedite citizens' requests for city services. This new plan for "beat integrity" was implemented by freeing beat officers from responding to 911 calls, by increasing the number of officers in the prototypes by about 13 percent and by instituting a radio dispatching scheme that forwarded only select calls to beat teams.

Another important element of beat officers' jobs was attending neighborhood meetings and working with existing community organizations on a broad range of issues. Public beat meetings were held regularly to facilitate communication between residents and beat officers. Beat meetings, coupled with district-level advisory committee meetings and consultations with representatives of other municipal agencies, provided a structure that forced police to confront and accept their expanded roles.

Providing Leadership and Vision

The most visible and tangible element of CAPS' vision was the document, *Together We Can*, which outlined the policing philosophy underlying CAPS and enumerated key components of the change over to community policing (CPD 1994). Partly written and fully endorsed by the superintendent, *Together We Can* became the driving force behind the citywide implementation plan, and it set the discussion agenda for a newly formed Policy and Planning Committee. It was also listed among required readings for the sergeants' examination.

A variety of methods was employed to communicate the CAPS vision to prototype personnel as well as to receive input about the CAPS implementation process. There were regularly scheduled meetings involving district commanders, key personnel in the prototype districts, staff from the Mayor's Office of Inquiry and Information and CAPS managers. CPD's Research and Development Unit established a telephone hot line for patrol officers and their supervisors to call with questions or concerns about CAPS. Research and Development also published a newsletter to disseminate information about CAPS implementation progress and success stories. In personal interviews, many officers and supervisors commented on how they were able, for the first time, to voice their opinions to the command staff and have someone listen to them. In short, they were optimistic that their voices were being heard (Skogan et al. 1995).

Chicago's community policing program was never oversold. On many occasions, the mayor and the superintendent conceded that CAPS was not a panacea for all of the city's social ills. CAPS was never touted as an overnight fix for the city's crime problems. The mayor and superintendent publicly recognized that the prototype strategy involved new ideas and that mistakes would be made along the way. Police and citizens were often reminded that the prototype districts were test sites and that different models of community policing would evolve from experiences in those areas. The mayor and

superintendent stated the program could take as long as five years to become completely implemented citywide, and everyone would have to be patient waiting for CAPS to come to fruition.

Avoiding Specialization and the Social Work Image

CPD learned from other cities that it was risky to create special community policing units. Members of these units often become marginalized within their departments and lambasted by their peers as "empty holster guys" doing "wave and smile policing." Instead, Chicago's plan involved the entire department in the program, and eventually CAPS became a citywide community policing program, fully integrated into CPD's structures and operations. The prototype districts were not staffed by volunteers or by specially selected officers or supervisors. Officers on all three shifts constituted a beat team, not just those working the day watch. And unlike police departments in other cities, Chicago's beat officers received no special perks, such as selecting their own working hours or days off. In addition, beat work was not a permanent assignment; officers alternated between engaging in beat work and responding to 911 calls. Rotating assignments ensured that community policing was not confined to special units within the organization.

The program successfully avoided the cultivation of a social work image. Top administrators constantly repeated the message that traditional police work would continue and would be rewarded. They underscored the fact that officers would not become social workers; rather, they would become effective change agents to address neighborhood problems. CAPS managers and the command staff also underscored the importance of continuing the department's strong emphasis on arrests whenever appropriate.

The Study

Before the program started, we surveyed officers about their job satisfaction, their supervisors and their opinions regarding community policing (Lurigio and Skogan 1994). We administered questionnaires prior to the CAPS orientation training for CPD staff assigned to the prototype districts in which CAPS was pilot tested (i.e., before officers had any experience with or knowledge about CAPS). The survey found, for example, that a large percentage of officers wanted a stimulating and challenging job that allowed them to exercise independent thought and action, to be creative and imaginative and to learn new

things. However, less than half felt that they had deep personal involvement in their current assignments, and only one-quarter agreed that they had any influence over their jobs and that their supervisors sought their opinions.

Our pre-CAPS survey also demonstrated that a large number of officers thought that the public failed to understand and appreciate their work, and many officers were quite pessimistic about police-community relations in Chicago. With respect to their views on community policing, we found that officers were not enthusiastic about involving themselves in non-crime problems. Nevertheless, a majority thought citizens had important information to share about their beats and the police should be concerned about problems at the local level.

Despite indicators of general support for a few community policing concepts, officers embarking on police work in the prototype districts were wary about adopting new tactics such as foot patrol, and they were hesitant to market their new services to the public. Furthermore, the prototype officers thought CAPS would have little impact on the crime rate, their ability to make arrests or the police's relationship with Chicago's minorities. Overall, minority officers, especially African Americans, older officers (i.e., those forty-five years of age and older), women officers and officers with higher ranks were more optimistic about CAPS and more supportive of the program.

Method

Procedures

Wave 1 data collection. Wave 1 or baseline survey data were gathered from 1,169 patrol officers assigned to the five prototype districts (see Table 1). The surveys were administrated at the beginning of each orientation session held at CPD's training academy in the spring of 1993. The surveys were distributed by evaluation staff who described the purpose of the questionnaire, emphasized the confidentiality of the responses and explained the survey instructions. Questionnaires were handed individually to respondents. The cover sheet of each survey included a letter from CPD's superintendent, stating his support for the evaluation and reassuring officers of the confidentiality of their survey responses.

During the same time period, survey data were also gathered from 335 patrol officers assigned to five other districts that were closely matched to the prototypes in terms of their demographic characteristics and crime rates. These patrol officers received no CAPS

training and were not involved in the upcoming project; they served as the wave 1 control group. Control group questionnaires were distributed and collected by evaluation staff during roll call sessions at the district station houses, across all watches. The survey instructions were identical to those read to prototype officers. The control officer survey also had the superintendent's letter attached to the cover page, but the actual questionnaire was shortened to accommodate roll-call schedules and agendas.

Wave 2 data collection. Wave 2 survey data were collected during a massive round of training that took place from January to April 1995, approximately twenty months after the administration of wave 1 questionnaires. At that time, 6,586 officers from all police districts attended CAPS training and were surveyed. A total of 1,056 of the officers were serving in the prototype districts. The remainder worked in other districts and had not yet received CAPS training. The questionnaires administered at wave 2 were the same as those used with wave 1 prototype officers, with the addition of several new items that focused on officers' CAPS-related activities.

These surveys enabled us to make two kinds of comparisons examining the extent to which officers "came on board" as a result of their CAPS training and experience. The first contrasts the views of officers serving in the prototype and nonprototype districts at two points in time: before CAPS was implemented and more than one year after the program had been officially implemented across the city. The second compares, across wave 1 and wave 2, the views of the prototype and nonprototype officers within each of the two groups. We focus on these comparisons, using questions that were posed to the two groups at both wave 1 and wave 2.

The two waves of questionnaires were independently administered because it was impossible in practice to match officers across time, due to CPD's size, frequent transfers of officers from unit to unit and as we subsequently learned, officers' resistance to revealing their identities in any fashion that could be associated with their responses. Nonetheless, 72 percent of the officers serving in the prototypes in 1995 (i.e., at wave 2) were already there in the spring of 1993 and were surveyed at the initial orientation sessions (i.e., at wave 1). Therefore, comparing the views of prototype officers at wave 1 and wave 2 yields fairly strong evidence of attitude change. To strengthen the validity of our comparisons, we employed officers' background characteristics (i.e., age, race, education and gender) as statistical controls. Demographic covariates were also included in comparisons between prototype and control officers.

Table 1
Number of Police Officers in Wave 1-Wave 2 Prototype and Control Groups

	Group		
Survey	Control	Prototype	Total
Wave 1 (1993)	335	1,169	1,504
Survey			
Wave 2 (1995)	5,530	1,056	6,586
Total	5,865	2,225	8,090

Measures

The community policing measures employed in this study were adopted from Rosenbaum, Yeh and Wilkinson's (1994) evaluation of community policing in Joliet, Illinois and from Wycoff and Skogan's evaluations of community policing in Houston, Texas and in Madison, Wisconsin (e.g., Wycoff and Skogan 1993). The job dimension items were adapted from Hackman and Oldham's (1976) job characteristics model and the job satisfaction questions were drawn from the work of Dunham and his colleagues (e.g., Dunham, et al. 1989). The survey included questions that formed 23 scales measuring factors such as job satisfaction, officers' relations with peers and supervisors, their attitudes toward police work and community policing and their community policing-related activities. Table 2 presents the scale names and alphas, and Table 3 shows the means and ns for the scales.

CAPS-related scales. Seven scales were constructed to explore how police officers felt about community policing and the CAPS program:

(1) Optimistic about CAPS-traditional measured officers' perceptions concerning the likelihood that CAPS would lead to favorable changes with respect to traditional police services (on a scale from 1 [less likely] to 3 [more likely]). Examples of questions: "After CAPS is implemented, will arrests be more likely to occur, remain the same or be less likely to occur?" "After CAPS is implemented will reductions in crime be more likely to occur, remain the same or be less likely to occur?"

(2) Optimistic about CAPS-nontraditional measured officers' perceptions concerning the likelihood that CAPS would lead to favorable changes with respect to nontraditional services (on a scale from 1 [less likely] to 3 [more likely]). Examples of questions: "After CAPS is implemented, will more effective use of crime information be more

Table 2
Scale Names and Brief Descriptions

Scale Name	Description	Alpha
	CAPS-Related Scales*	
OPTTRAD	Optimism traditional improvements	.84
OPTCOM	Optimism community improvements	.82
OPTIM	Overall optimism about CAPS	.91
PESAUTO	Pessimistic CAPS' effects on autonomy	.68
CPORIENT	Orientation toward CP activities	.74
CPQUAL	Qualified to community policing	.82
COMRESC	Resources devoted to community policing	.85
	Police-Community Relations Scales*	
ALOF	Police should avoid public	.53
RELBAD	Police-public relations are bad	.63
	Job Dimensions and Satisfaction Scales*	
JOBAUTO	Job autonomy	.75
TASKID	Task identity	.72
SKILVAR	Skill variety	.65
PEERSUP	Peer/supervisor feedback	.86
FEEDBAK	Job feedback	.74
DEALOTH	Working with others	.72
PARTMAN	Share control over work	.73
INVOLE	Job involvement	.69
ROOTED	Job rootedness	.71
SATORG	Views of CPD	.82

likely to occur, remain the same or be less likely to occur?" "After CAPS is implemented, will greater resolution of neighborhood problems be more likely to occur, remain the same or be less likely to occur?"

(3) Overall optimism about CAPS combined officers' beliefs about the favorable impact of CAPS on both the traditional and non-traditional measures described above (on a scale from 1 [less likely] to 3 [more likely]).

(4) Pessimistic about CAPS measured officers' perceptions concerning the likelihood that CAPS would lead to unfavorable changes in police authority and autonomy (on a scale from 1 [less likely] to 3 [more likely]). Examples of questions: "After CAPS is implemented, will greater citizen demand on police resources be more likely to occur, remain the same or be less likely to occur?" "After CAPS is implemented, will greater burdens on police to solve all community problems be more likely to occur, remain the same or be less likely to occur?"

(5) Orientation toward community policing measured officers' opinions about community policing activities and their effectiveness

Table 3
Scale Means and Ns

Scale		Mean	N		Mean	N
Optimistic expectation about the effects of CAPS (OPTIM)	Prototype 1	4.98	1,169	Prototype 2	5.92	1,056
	Control 1	4.38	335	Control 2	5.08	5,530
	Control 1	4.38	335	Prototype 1	4.98	1,169
	Control 2	5.08	5,530	Prototype 2	5.92	1,056
Optimistic about CAPS traditional improvements (OPTTRAD)	Prototype 1	2.01	1,137	Prototype 2	2.25	1,040
	Control 1	1.98	320	Control 2	2.15	5,364
	Control 1	1.98	320	Prototype 1	2.01	1,137
	Control 2	2.15	5,364	Prototype 2	2.25	1,040
Optimistic about CAPS community improvements (OPTCOM)	Prototype 1	2.31	1,142	Prototype 2	2.43	1,042
	Control 1	2.27	324	Control 2	2.37	5,375
	Control 1	2.27	324	Prototype 1	2.31	1,142
	Control 2	2.37	5,375	Prototype 2	2.43	1,042
Pessimistic about CAPS on CPD autonomy (PESAUTO)	Prototype 1	2.56	1,137	Prototype 2	2.47	1,048
	Control 1	2.42	324	Control 2	2.52	5,399
	Prototype 1	2.56	1,137	Control 1	2.42	324
	Prototype 2	2.47	1,048	Control 2	2.52	5,399
Informal noncrime problem solving (we assisting/joint (CPORENT)	Prototype 1	3.40	1,157	Prototype 2	3.49	1,039
	Control 1	3.40	329	Control 2	3.48	5,432
	Control 1	3.40	329	Prototype 1	3.40	1,157
	Control 2	3.48	5,432	Prototype 2	3.49	1,039
Problems CPD solving (evaluate problems (CPOPPS)	Prototype 1	2.71	1,134	Prototype 2	2.84	1,040
	Control 1	2.67	318	Control 2	2.70	5,387
	Control 1	2.67	318	Prototype 1	2.71	1,134
	Control 2	2.70	5,387	Prototype 2	2.84	1,040
Resources devoted to community policing (COMRESC)	Prototype 1	2.91	1,147	Prototype 2	2.85	1,033
	Control 1	2.90	323	Control 2	2.83	5,391
	Control 1	2.90	323	Prototype 1	2.91	1,147
	Control 2	2.83	5,391	Prototype 2	2.85	1,033
Good organization treats us well (SATORG)	Prototype 1	2.78	1,155	Prototype 2	2.81	1,043
	Control 1	2.80	327	Control 2	2.67	3,431
	Control 1	2.80	327	Prototype 1	2.78	1,155
	Control 2	2.67	5,431	Prototype 2	2.81	1,043
Police distrust/should avoid public (ALOOF)	Prototype 1	2.48	1,167	Prototype 2	2.45	1,050
	Control 1	2.45	332	Control 2	2.45	5,480
	Control 1	2.45	332	Prototype 1	2.48	1,167
	Control 2	2.45	5,480	Prototype 2	2.45	1,050
Police public relations are bad (RELBAD)	Prototype 1	3.82	1,162	Prototype 2	3.71	1,048
	Control 1	3.83	332	Control 2	3.74	5,470
	Control 1	3.83	332	Prototype 1	3.82	1,162
	Control 2	3.74	5,470	Prototype 2	3.71	1,048
I have job autonomy (JOBAUTO)	Prototype 1	3.41	1,157	Prototype 2	3.54	1,051
	Control 1	Missing		Control 2	3.47	5,464
	Control 1	Missing		Prototype 1	3.41	1,157
	Control 2	3.47	5,464	Prototype 2	3.54	1,051
Control entire job (TASKID)	Prototype 1	2.88	1,161	Prototype 2	3.01	1,046
	Control 1	Missing		Control 2	3.00	5,469
	Control 1	Missing		Prototype 1	2.88	1,161
	Control 2	3.00	5,469	Prototype 2	3.01	1,046

Table 3
Scale Means and Ns
(Continued)

Scale		Mean	N		Mean	N
Job requires diverse skills (SKLVAR)	Prototype 1	3.41	1,163	Prototype 2	3.47	1,035
	Control 1	Missing		Control 2	3.34	5,517
	Control 1	Missing		Prototype 1	3.41	1,163
	Control 2	3.43	5,517	Prototype 2	3.37	1,035
Support from peers & supervisors (PEERSUP)	Prototype 1	2.95	1,164	Prototype 2	2.98	1,055
	Control 1	Missing		Control 2	2.95	5,503
	Control 1	Missing		Prototype 1	2.95	1,164
	Control 2	2.95	5,503	Prototype 2	2.98	1,055
Job itself provides performance feedback (FEEDBAK)	Prototype 1	3.39	1,164	Prototype 2	3.35	1,035
	Control 1	Missing		Control 2	3.28	5,437
	Control 1	Missing		Prototype 1	3.39	1,164
	Control 2	3.28	5,437	Prototype 2	3.35	1,035
Job requires dealing with other people (DEALOT)	Prototype 1	3.74	1,164	Prototype 2	3.69	1,027
	Control 1	Missing		Control 2	3.63	5,438
	Control 1	Missing		Prototype 1	3.74	1,164
	Control 2	3.63	5,438	Prototype 2	3.69	1,027
Share control over work (PARTMAN)	Prototype 1	2.70	1,164	Prototype 2	2.77	1,052
	Control 1	2.43	332	Control 2	2.69	5,501
	Control 1	2.43	332	Prototype 1	2.70	1,164
	Control 2	2.69	5,501	Prototype 2	2.77	1,052
Have enjoyment, satisfaction & involvement in job (INVOLVE)	Prototype 1	3.44	1,157	Prototype 2	3.30	1,051
	Control 1	Missing		Control 2	3.22	5,456
	Control 1	Missing		Prototype 1	3.44	1,157
	Control 2	3.22	5,456	Prototype 2	3.30	1,051
Not likely to leave the CPD (ROOTED)	Prototype 1	3.37	1,168	Prototype 2	3.37	1,053
	Control 1	Missing		Control 2	3.23	5,510
	Control 1	Missing		Prototype 1	3.37	1,168
	Control 2	3.23	5,510	Prototype 2	3.37	1,053
Getting/not in community policing ways (CPINFO)	Control 2	1.68	5,514	Prototype 2	1.66	1,026
Time spent on community policing activities (TIMECP)	Control 2	1.95	5,529	Prototype 2	1.99	1,024
Realism of CAPS assumptions (CPUNREAL)	Control 2	3.02	5,532	Prototype 2	2.94	1,025
Views of citizen capability (CITCPAB)	Control 2	2.75	5,546	Prototype 2	2.87	1,023

(on a scale from 1 [strongly disagree] to 5 [strongly agree]). Examples of questions: "Police officers should make frequent informal contacts with citizens on their beats." "Police officers should try to solve non-crime problems on their beat."

(6) CAPS capability measured officers' perceptions concerning their ability to perform CAPS-related activities (on a scale from 1 [very unqualified] to 4 [very qualified]). Examples of questions: "How qualified do you feel to identify community problems?" "How qualified do you feel to use the CAPS model to analyze problems?"

(7) CAPS resources measured officers' attitudes regarding allocation of police resources toward CAPS-related activities and services (on a scale from 1 [none] to 4 [a large amount]). Examples of questions: "How much of the department's resources should be committed to patrolling on foot in neighborhoods?" "How much of the department's resources should be committed to understanding problems of minority groups?" "How much of the department's resources should be committed to getting to know juveniles?"

Police-community relations. Two scales were constructed to examine police officers' feelings about citizens:

(1) Police-community aloofness measured officers' inclinations to have contact with citizens and to trust them (on a scale from 1 [strongly disagree] to 5 [strongly agree]). Examples of questions: "Police officers should avoid too much contact with citizens." "Police officers have reason to be distrustful of most citizens."

(2) Police-public relations measured police officers' perceptions about police-citizen relations and citizens' views and opinions of the police (on a scale from 1 [strongly disagree] to 5 [strongly agree]). Examples of questions: "Most people do not respect the police." "Citizens do not understand the problems of the police in this city." "Most people have no idea how difficult a police officer's job is."

Job dimensions and satisfaction. Officers responded to a series of items relating to ten scales of job dimensions and satisfaction. Participants scored all the job dimension and satisfaction items on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree), which measured how closely each item described their current job assignments or their attitudes and feelings toward work and management.

(1) Job autonomy measured the degree to which employees believed that their jobs afforded them discretion and independence. Examples of questions: "My job permits me to decide on my own how to do the job." "My job gives me considerable opportunity for independence and freedom in how I do the work."

(2) Task identity measured the extent to which work tasks had definite beginnings and endings and left employees with a sense of having completed a whole job. Examples of questions: "My job assignment involves doing a whole and identifiable piece of work." "My job gives me a chance to finish completely the pieces of work I have started."

(3) Skill variety measured the amount of variation in the skills and responsibilities that employees experienced in their daily assignments. Examples of questions: "My job assignment requires me to use a number of complex and high-level skills." "My job assignment requires me to do many different things at work, using a variety of my skills and talents."

(4) Peer and supervisor feedback measured the degree to which employees felt that their supervisors and coworkers provided them with information about their job performance. Examples of questions: "My supervisors often let me know how well I am performing." "My supervisors and coworkers almost never give me any feedback about how well I am doing my work."

(5) Job feedback measured the extent to which employees perceived that their jobs provided them with information about their performance, which is separate from peer or supervisor feedback. Examples of questions: "My job itself provides me with information about my work performance." "My job provides few clues about whether or not I am performing well."

(6) Working with others measured the degree to which employees felt that their jobs required working cooperatively with others. Examples of questions: "My present job assignment requires me to work closely with other people." "My job assignment requires a lot of cooperative work with other people."

(7) Share control over work measured employees' needs for opportunities to be creative, independent and imaginative in their work. Examples of questions: "In general I have much say and influence over what goes on in regard to my job." "I have enough discretion in my job to make effective decisions."

(8) Job involvement measured the extent to which employees felt that their jobs were enjoyable. Examples of questions: "I like the kind of work I do very much." "I am very much involved personally with my job."

(9) Job rootedness measured employees' perceptions of how difficult it would be for them to leave their jobs. Examples of questions: "It would be very hard for me to leave the department now even if I wanted to." "Right now, staying involved in the police department is as much a necessity as it is a desire."

(10) Satisfaction with the organization measured officers' views about CPD and what it was like working there. Examples of questions: "This city's police department is a good organization to work for." "This department is one of the best in the country."

CAPS' *practices*. Four scales explored police officers' CAPS-related behaviors and their views on CAPS assumptions and on citizens' capabilities to participate in CAPS-related activities:

(1) Getting information measured how often officers gathered information from community sources to solve neighborhood problems (on a scale from 1 [never] to 4 [almost always]). Examples of questions: "How frequently do citizen complaints contribute to your recognition of a problem?" "How frequently do community meetings contribute to your recognition of a problem?" "How frequently do personal observations contribute to your recognition of a problem?"

(2) Time spent measured how many hours officers spend each week in community policing activities (on a scale from 1 [none] to 5 [21 or more]). Examples of questions: "In an average week, how many hours do you spend on foot patrol?" "In an average week, how many hours do you spend inside the station or an office?"

(3) Realism of CAPS assumptions measured officers' opinions regarding the underlying assumptions and prerequisites of community policing (on a scale from 1 [strongly disagree] to 5 [strongly agree]). Examples of questions: "Citizens will never trust police enough to work together effectively." "It is very unrealistic to expect citizens to continually attend local beat meetings."

(4) Citizen capability measured officers' views of citizens' willingness and capacity to participate in CAPS-related activities (on a scale from 1 [strongly disagree] to 5 [strongly agree]). Examples of questions: "Citizens will be able to analyze local problems and the underlying patterns that connect them." "Citizens will be able to prevent crimes before they occur."

Results

Changes Among Officers: 1993-1995

Respondents changed on several of the scales included in wave 1 (1993) and wave 2 (1995) surveys (see Tables 4 and 5). On the CAPS-related scales, prototype officers became less pessimistic over time about community policing's effect on police autonomy whereas control officers became more pessimistic. In 1995, prototype officers also felt more qualified to engage in CAPS-related tasks and expressed more favorable views about police-citizen relations. In contrast, control officers exhibited no changes on these scales from 1993 to 1995. However, prototype officers at wave 2 wanted fewer resources devoted to CAPS-related activities.

Table 4
Multiple Regression Results

Scale	Comparison	T Beta	Statistic	Significance
Optimistic expectation about the effects of CAPS (OPTIM)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	.103	4.84	.000
	Control 1/Control 2	.041	2.98	.003
	Control 1/Prototype 1	.077	2.89	.004
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.083	6.44	.000
Optimistic about CAPS traditional improvements (OPTTRAD)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	.216	10.40	.000
	Control 1/Control 2	.031	6.03	.000
	Control 1/Prototype 1	.045	1.70	.089
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.085	6.61	.000
Optimistic about CAPS community improvements (OPTCOM)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	.120	5.58	.000
	Control 1/Control 2	.050	3.61	.000
	Control 1/Prototype 1	.040	1.49	.138
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.054	4.11	.000
Pessimistic about CAPS on CPD autonomy (PESAUTO)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	-.089	-4.16	.000
	Control 1/Control 2	.044	3.19	.001
	Control 1/Prototype 1	.107	4.01	.000
	Control 2/Prototype 2	-.043	-3.31	.001
Informal noncrime foot solving face assisting joint (CPORENT)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	.071	3.38	.001
	Control 1/Control 2	.028	2.06	.040
	Control 1/Prototype 1	.018	.69	.491
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.025	1.96	.050
Problems CAPS solving evaluate problems (CPCAPAB)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	.126	5.80	.000
	Control 1/Control 2	.021	1.50	.135
	Control 1/Prototype 1	.041	1.52	.129
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.100	7.66	.000
Resources devoted to community policing (COMRESO)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	-.062	-2.93	.003
	Control 1/Control 2	-.017	-1.24	.216
	Control 1/Prototype 1	.040	1.52	.129
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.017	1.36	.177
Good organization treats us well best open promoted (SATORG)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	.018	.85	.398
	Control 1/Control 2	-.031	-2.22	.026
	Control 1/Prototype 1	-1.210	-.00	.996
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.063	4.82	.000
Police distrust/should avoid public (ALOOF)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	.002	.09	.926
	Control 1/Control 2	-1.670	.00	.999
	Control 1/Prototype 1	-.008	-.29	.771
	Control 2/Prototype 2	-.006	-.43	.667
Police public relations are bad (RELBAD)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	-.078	-3.59	.000
	Control 1/Control 2	-.019	-1.33	.184
	Control 1/Prototype 1	-.004	-.16	.875
	Control 2/Prototype 2	-.032	-2.43	.015
I have job autonomy (JOBAUTO)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	.076	3.49	.001
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.028	2.12	.034
Control entire job (TASKID)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	.078	3.69	.000
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.015	1.13	.260
Job requires diverse skills	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	-.022	-1.02	.308
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.016	1.21	.228

Table 4
Multiple Regression Results
(Continued)

Scale	Comparison	T Beta	Statistic	Significance
Support from peers & supervisors (PEERSUP)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	.013	.60	.546
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.031	1.03	.305
Job itself provides performance feedback (FEEDBAK)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	-.025	-1.16	.248
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.032	2.41	.016
Job requires dealing with other people (DEALOTH)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	-.027	-1.22	.223
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.029	2.19	.029
Share control over work (PARTMAN)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	.042	1.93	.054
	Control 1/Control 2	.064	4.59	.000
	Control 1/Prototype 1	.138	5.15	.000
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.042	3.22	.001
Have enjoyment, satisfaction & involvement in job (INVOLVE)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	-.109	-5.02	.000
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.036	2.70	.007
Not likely to leave the CPD (ROOTED)	Prototype 1/Prototype 2	.011	.49	.624
	Control 2/Prototype 2	.047	3.62	.000
Getting information in CP-type activities (CPINFO)	Control 2/Prototype 2	.054	4.25	.000
Time spent on CP activities (TIMECP)	Control 2/Prototype 2	.037	2.93	.004
Realism of CAPS assumptions (CPUNREAL)	Control 2/Prototype 2	.043	-3.39	.001
Citizen capable of CAPS (CITCAPAB)	Control 2/Prototype 2	.054	4.15	.000

Note: For all analyses, age, gender, race, and education were covariates. For Prototype 2/Control 2 comparisons, WAVE 1 scores were also covariates.

With respect to the job dimension and job satisfaction scales, prototype officers scored higher on job autonomy and task identity. Between 1993 and 1995, prototype officers showed no changes on their satisfaction with CPD whereas control officers reported being less satisfied with CPD. Inconsistent with these findings, however, prototype officers' scores on the job involvement scale decreased from wave 1 to wave 2. Both prototype and control officers became more optimistic about CAPS effects overall and more optimistic about CAPS effects on community policing–and traditional policing-related outcomes. Officers in both groups also became more positively inclined toward community policing activities.

Table 5
Views of Officers in the Prototype and Control Districts

	Changes Among Officers 1993-1995	Comparisons Prototype-Control 1995
CAPS-Related Scales		
Optimistic Overall About CAPS	no difference (both up)	prototype officers more optimistic
Optimistic-Traditional Improvements	no difference (both up)	prototype officers more optimistic
Optimistic-Community Improvements	no difference (both up)	prototype officers more optimistic
Pessimistic About Autonomy	prototype less pessimistic	prototype less pessimistic
Orientation Toward CAPS Activities	no difference (both up)	no difference
Qualified To Do Community Policing	prototype improved	prototype higher
Resources Devoted to Community Policing	prototype improved	prototype higher
Police-Community Scales		
Police Should Avoid Public	no difference	no difference
Police Public Relations Bad	prototype improved	prototype more positive
Job Dimensions/Satisfaction Scales		
Job Autonomy	prototype improved	prototype higher
Task Identity	prototype improved	no difference
Skill Variety	no difference	no difference
Peer/Supervisor Feedback	no difference	no difference
Job Feedback	no difference	prototype higher
Working With Others	no difference	prototype higher
Sharing Control With Others	no difference (both improved)	prototype higher
Satisfaction With Organization	control less satisfied	prototype more satisfied
Job Involvement	prototype down	prototype higher

Table 5
Views of Officers in the Prototype and Control Districts
(Continued)

	Changes Among Officers 1993-1995	Comparisons Prototype-Control 1995
Rooted in Department	no difference	prototype
CAPS Practice Scales		
Getting Information In CAPS Ways	-	prototype higher
Time Spent on CAPS Activities	-	prototype higher
Realism of Assumptions	-	prototype more positive
Citizen Capability	-	prototype higher

Comparing CAPS and Control Officers: 1995

CAPS officers in 1995, compared with control officers, were significantly different on several of the scales. Prototype officers were more optimistic and less pessimistic about CAPS, their views of citizens were more positive, and their responses were more favorable on seven of the ten job satisfaction scales. On the 1995 CAPS practices scales, prototype officers were more likely to gather information from community sources. They spent more time in community policing tasks; they thought that CAPS assumptions were more realistic; and they believed that citizens were more capable of engaging in CAPS-related activities.

Discussion and Conclusions

Major Findings

During the first two years of CAPS operations, CPD undertook a variety of initiatives to move rank-and-file officers closer to the community policing model. Officers were trained in community policing strategies and their jobs were changed, requiring them to spend more time on their beats, learn more about community problems and collaborate more closely with citizens. First-line supervisors became fully engaged in the program and involved in team building activities and allowed their staff more latitude in decision making. In developing the program, upper management worked directly with the police union to address union concerns about CAPS and confronted the "social

work" perception head-on; consequently, neither union nor "soft-on-crime" complaints ever became problematic.

The current findings suggest that CPD was moderately successful in bringing officers on board with CAPS. Many of the officers' attitudes toward the program changed over time. Prototype and nonprototype officers became more optimistic regarding CAPS's impact on traditional police functions, such as reducing crime, allocating police resources and responding to calls for services and on community policing functions, such as resolving neighborhood problems and using crime information for problem solving purposes. Both groups also became more optimistic about CAPS overall and more willing to engage in community policing pursuits.

There were differences between prototype and nonprototype officers on several of the study's measures. Specifically, prototype officers became less concerned about losing their autonomy because of community policing whereas nonprototype officers became more concerned about a loss of autonomy. Compared with nonprototype officers, prototype officers reported more positive changes in their relationships with citizens and in their perceptions of citizens' views of the police. In addition, prototype officers were more likely than nonprototype officers to report that they could better identify and analyze neighborhood problems and were more confident in their abilities to solve those problems. Nonetheless, they reported wanting fewer resources devoted to CAPS.

Prototype officers changed positively on three of the job dimension and satisfaction scales. Compared with their 1993 responses, prototype officers in 1995 reported that they exercised more discretion, were more independent and experienced more control when doing their jobs. They also reported that they could see how the various aspects of their work fit together into a coherent whole. In addition, from 1993 to 1995, nonprototype officers became less satisfied with CPD as an organization. No such change occurred among prototype officers though they did report that they enjoyed their jobs less in 1995.

Prototype officers' responses to the CAPS practices scales, measured in 1995 only, were all in the expected directions. They were more likely than nonprototype officers to report that they employed the CAPS model to collect information about crime and community problems, spent more time in CAPS-related activities (e.g., contact with citizens, joint problem solving) and had more confidence in citizens' abilities to join the police in reducing neighborhood crime and other problems.

Despite these positive results, prototype officers wanted fewer resources devoted to CAPS and liked their jobs less. With regard to wanting fewer resources devoted to CAPS, officers might have been reacting to the tremendous efforts that had been undertaken to implement the program in a relatively short period of time. CAPS is the nation's largest community policing program and represents one of the most ambitious attempts at urban police reform in history. CPD, the mayor's office and other city agencies launched an impressive, all-out campaign to make the program successful. After two years of a steady diet of CAPS policies, procedures and public service advertisements, perhaps officers became glutted with information about the program and felt completely overwhelmed by CAPS. In this all-consuming environment, calling for fewer CAPS resources might have been the officers' way of communicating their dissatisfaction with the massive attention being directed at the program.

Problem solving was challenging for officers, and it is somewhat surprising that they felt undaunted by this component of CAPS. Skogan and Hartnett (1997) present a variety of CAPS case studies that illustrate the labor-intensive and often frustrating nature of the program's problem-solving endeavors. There were many impediments to effective problem solving in CAPS, including differences between the types of solutions proposed by police and citizens, police and citizens' failures to discuss problem-solving activities at beat meetings, the limited repertoire of solutions available to beat officers and barriers to mobilizing and consolidating residents' resources (Skogan and Hartnett 1997).

Finally, prototype officers liking their jobs less could have been a consequence of the absence of measures to monitor and evaluate individual and team performance in the program. Officers who used CAPS diligently as blueprint for policing but were not being rewarded for such efforts would obviously be disappointed. Although CPD staff recognized the need for a CAPS-sensitive performance evaluation, they have yet to institute a new system for recognizing the achievements of officers under the community policing model (Skogan and Hartnett 1997).

Officer Change and Community Policing: General Comments

The implementation of community policing is a battle for the

hearts and minds of police officers (Lurigio and Skogan 1994). Police departments are centralized, low-technology, human services organizations in which the motivations and skills of operational staff are paramount. Community policing calls for significant changes in the delivery of police services at the street level as well as sweeping revisions in departments' philosophies, structures, policies, procedures and deployment strategies. These demands can often lead to a struggle; typically, police officers are dubious about so-called innovative programs and policing reforms. By failing to alter officers' basic perceptions and attitudes and neglecting to prepare them fully for the unique rigors and demands of community policing, police departments risk "program failure due to apathy, frustration, resentment, perceived inequality, fear of change and other factors that militate against the successful implementation of community policing." (Lurigio and Rosenbaum 1994:147)

In the final analysis, police officers on the street are the key to successful community policing programs. However, many of the directives of community policing are beyond officers' current capacities and roles; they were initially selected and trained to perform only basic law enforcement activities: patrolling in cars, conducting investigations, making arrests and writing reports. Community policing requires police officers to do many of their old jobs in novel ways and to engage in unfamiliar and challenging tasks that may have been missing from the police academy curriculum. They are expected to identify and solve a broad range of problems, reach out to elements of the community that were previously outside their orbit and put their careers in jeopardy by taking on unfamiliar and challenging responsibilities.

Police officers can be quite resistant to change. They would rather do "what they signed up for," usually a combination of fighting crime and delivering emergency services. In many instances, their first response to community policing is to repudiate it scornfully as "social work" or to view it as "not real police work." Commenting on police officers' reactions to community policing in Houston, former Houston police chief Betsy Watson lamented that: "they [police officers] somehow have equated neighborhood-oriented policing with social work rather than tough law enforcement–and they've missed the point." (*Law Enforcement News*:14).

Most personnel in police departments are content with the status quo because it allows them to draw on predictable rules and expectations of how to serve their superiors and their constituents (i.e., the public). Community policing forces officers to develop new relationships within their agencies and with the community-at-large–an undertaking that is time-consuming and uncertain. Community policing demands creativity: officers who are accustomed to "going by the book" will be hard pressed to devise responses that are specific to neighborhood problems and needs. Community policing requires officers to accept greater levels of authority and responsibility for identifying and solving community problems with the input and cooperation of citizens. Finally, community policing requires officers to attain the skills necessary to use a broad range of resources and to communicate effectively with other city and government agencies (Ward et al. 1995). In essence, advocates of community policing have high expectations for police personnel, and some of these expectations may be unreasonable under present conditions with present personnel. Nonetheless, with proper training, support from upper-level police management and other city agencies, an understanding that the transition to community policing takes considerable time and effort and a willingness to work closely with citizens, police officers can successfully adjust to the community policing model.

NOTE

This research was supported in part by Award IJ-CX.0446 from the National Institute of Justice, Office of Justice programs, U.S. Department of Justice. Points of view in the document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position of the U.S. Department of Justice.

REFERENCES

Boydstun, J.E. and M.E. Sherry. 1975. *San Diego Community Profile: Final Report*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Cassels, D. 1988. *The Edmonton Police Department Neighborhood Foot Patrol Project: Preliminary Report*. Edmonton, Alberta: Edmonton Police Department.

Chicago Police Department. 1994. *Together We Can*. Chicago, IL: Author.

Dunham, R.B.; J. Grube; D.G. Gardner and J. Pierce. 1989. "The Development of an Attitude Toward Change Instrument." Paper presented to the Forty-Ninth Annual Meeting of the Academy of Management, Washington, DC.

Eck, J.E. and W. Spelman. 1987. *Problem Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Goldstein, H. 1990. *Problem-Oriented Policing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hackman, J.R. and G.R. Oldham. 1976. "Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory." *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance* 16:250-79.

Hayeslip, D.W. and G.W. Cordner. 1987. "The Effects of Community-Oriented Patrol on Police Officer Attitudes." *American Journal of Police* 4:95-119.

Kelling, G.L. 1988. *Police and Communities: The Quiet Revolution*. (Perspectives on Policing, No. 1). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Harvard University.

Kelling, G.L. and M.H. Moore. 1988. *The Evolving Strategy of Policing*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Harvard University.

Lurigio, A.J. and D.P. Rosenbaum. 1994. "The Impact of Community Policing on Police Personnel." Pp. 147-163 in *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises*, edited by D.P. Rosenbaum. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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

McElroy, J.E.; C.A. Cosgrove and S. Sadd. 1993. *Community Policing: The CPOP in New York*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Moore, M.H. 1992. "Problem-Solving and Community Policing." Pp. 99-158 in *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research: Vol. 15*, edited by M. Tonry and N. Morris. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rosenbaum, D.P.; S. Yen and D.L. Wilkinson. 1994. "Impact of Community Policing on Police Personnel: A Quasi-Experimental Test." *Crime and Delinquency* 40:331-353.

Saad, S. and R. Grinc. 1993. *Issues in Community Policing: An Evaluation of Eight Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing Projects (Final Technical Report)*. New York: Vera Institute.

Schwartz, A.I. and S.N. Clarren. 1977. *The Cincinnati Team Policing Experiment: A Summary Report*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute and Police Foundation.

Skogan, W.G. 1998. "Community Policing in Chicago." Pp. 159-174 in *Community Policing: Contemporary Readings*, edited by G.P. Alpert and A. Piquero. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Skogan, W.G. and S.M. Hartnett. 1997. *Community Policing, Chicago Style*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Skogan, W.G.; S.M. Hartnett; J.H. Lovig; J. DuBois; S. Houmes; S. Davidsdottir; R. VanStedum; M. Kaiser; D. Cole; N. Gonzalez; S. F. Bennett; P.J. Lavrakas; A.J. Lurigio; R.L. Block; D.P. Rosenbaum; S. Althaus; D. Whelan; T.R. Johnson and L. Higgins. 1995. *Community Policing in Chicago, Year Two: An Interim Report*. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Trojanowicz, R.C. 1986. "Evaluating a Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program: The Flint, Michigan Project." Pp. 157-78 in *Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work?* edited by D. P. Rosenbaum. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Ward, R.H., N.J. Taylor and P. Fanning. 1995. *Community Policing for Law Enforcement Managers*. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Wycoff, M. 1988. "The Benefits of Community Policing: Evidence and Conjecture." Pp. 103-121 in *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?*, edited by J.R. Greene and S.M. Mastrofski. New York: Praeger.

Wycoff, M. and W.G. Skogan 1993a. *Community Policing in Madison: Quality from the Inside Out*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

_____. 1993b. *Quality Policing in Madison: An Evaluation of Its Implementation and Impact*. (Final Technical Report). Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

_____.1994. "The Effect of a Community Policing Management Style on Officers' Attitudes." *Crime and Delinquency* 40:371-383.