Job Satisfaction: A Comparison of Foot Patrol Versus Motor Patrol Officers

Robert C. Trojanowicz
Dennis W. Banas

National Center for Community Policing
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University

MSU is an affirmative-action, equal opportunity institution.

(#'s) coincide with endnotes at end of article

Introduction

The extent to which police officers find satisfaction in their work is a prickly issue. On the surface, law enforcement and job satisfaction appear to be mutually exclusive. It is hard to imagine officers deriving a sense of achievement and accomplishment from being witness to avarice, violence, brutality, and perfidy. In reality "...what may appear shocking, horrifying, or revolting to a lay person may be only technical problems to the police officer." The repulsive incidents "...apparent to a lay person's eye are less important to police officers due to their organizational membership and consequent perception of these events as an everyday aspect of their job."(1)

The organizational identity of police officers distills their collective experiences, making them palatable and casting them in positive terms. There is some evidence that officers "...take deep pride in contributing to the

quality of life." Despite frequent horrors, they ". . see themselves as a bulwark against fear and crime. Accordingly, their work increases the fundamental freedom of society." They find fulfillment in "...helping people on an individual level and protecting society at large."(2) The concept of public service seems to be policing's imperative, from which officers derive both job dissonance and satisfaction.

Beyond public service, there are many other dimensions of job satisfaction within policing. These dimensions could probably be placed into two categories: external influences job satisfaction as it is experienced in the course of dealing with particular communities, the public at large, and government; and internal variables--those elements within police organizations which promote or prohibit a sense of fulfillment and purpose. Externally, job satisfaction is not "clear cut" because police officers are often subject to conflicting, and sometimes contradictory, mandates which inhibit job satisfaction. "As one delves more deeply into the various factors that shape police functioning, one finds that laws, public expectations, and the realities of the tasks in which police are engaged require all kinds of compromises and often place the police in a no-win situation."(3) Specifically, ". . there is the basic pervasive conflict between crime-fighting and constitutional due process which is inherent in the police function in a free society."(4)

Social schizophrenia aside, the degree to which police are integrated into or alienated from the communities they serve is an important element of job satisfaction. The police officer "... is frequently in an adversary relationship with his public. Unlike firemen,...the policeman in the routine case is often (though not always) dealing with his clientele as an antagonist; he issues summonses, makes arrests, conducts inquiries, searches homes, stops cars, testifies in court, and keeps a jail."(5) The ease with which an officer executes these responsibilities is dependent upon the level of community support for and involvement in the police function. If communities perceive police as entirely alien beings, uninitiated into the secrets of normative behavior and territoriality, the exercising of the law enforcement role becomes difficult and onerous.(6)

If officers perceive the external environment--constitutions and communities--as being beyond their influence, job satisfaction tends to become defined mainly in terms of the internal process of police organizations. In one of the most comprehensive and intense empirical studies of job satisfaction, Caplan surveyed more than 2,000 people in 23 occupations, including law enforcement. He found that job dissatisfaction was most strongly influenced by underutilization of skills and abilities, simple and repetitive work, low participation in making decisions which affect the work environment, job insecurity, limited mobility, and poor social support from immediate superiors and colleagues.(7)

Although highly useful, Caplan's research method and design, which used numerical calculations of scores on various measures of satisfaction, did not focus directly on the dynamic quality of leadership, perhaps the most significant internal element of job satisfaction within police organizations. "How subordinates view their leaders is important in a police agency, for it has a major influence upon morale."(8) In one study after another, the administration, management, and supervision of police agencies have emerged as critical variables contributing to the overall level of satisfaction.(9) One researcher found that officers, otherwise content with and comfortable in their role, bitterly accused "... the police leadership ... of being unfair, rigid, and archaic."(10)

Police managers and supervisors are in a unique position. Theoretically, they have an opportunity to articulate clear, coherent organizational objectives with commensurate reward systems. In so doing, they can minimize the demoralizing impact that contradictory external expectations may have on officers. It is their responsibility to pioneer and evaluate methods of patrol which have a potential for synchronizing community needs and police activity in such a way as to reduce the isolation officers experience in the conduct of their duties. It is also their function to recognize and encourage the appropriate use of discretion and autonomy in police work, particularly since the more draconian forms of managerial monitoring are notoriously counterproductive and disruptive within law enforcement agencies. (11)

Community Policing: The Flint Experiment

The present research will compare measures of job satisfaction between foot and motorized patrol officers in the city of Flint, Michigan. The Flint Police Department operated solely with motorized or preventive patrols until January 1979, at which point the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation provided funding for the implementation of experimental community-based foot patrols.

Flint's Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program was unique in a variety of ways. It emerged from an initiative which integrated citizens into the planning and implementation process through city-wide neighborhood meetings in 1977 and 1978. It attempted to ameliorate three distinct problems: (1) the absence of comprehensive neighborhood organizations and services; (2) the lack of citizen involvement in crime prevention; and (3) the depersonalization of interactions between officers and residents. The program began in 1979 with 22 foot patrol officers assigned to 14 experimental areas which included about 20 percent of the city's population. The activity and efforts of the foot officers addressed seven basic goals:(12)

1. To decrease the amount of actual or perceived criminal activity.
2. To increase the citizen's perception of personal safety.
3. To deliver to Flint residents a type of law enforcement service consistent with the community needs and the ideals of modern police practice.
4. To create a community awareness of crime problems and methods of increasing law enforcement's ability to deal with actual or potential criminal activity effectively.
5. To develop citizen volunteer action in support of, and under the direction of, the police department, aimed at various target crimes.
6. To eliminate citizen apathy about reporting crime to police.
7. To increase protection for women, children, and the aged.

The Flint program's salient features were a radical departure from both preventive patrol and traditional foot patrol models. Flint's foot patrol officers did not limit their activities to downtown or business areas. They were based in and accessible to all types of socioeconomic neighborhoods. Their crime prevention efforts went beyond organizing neighborhood watches. They attempted to serve as *catalysts* in the formation of neighborhood associations which articulated community expectations of the police, established foot patrol priorities, and initiated community programs. Foot patrol officers also worked in partnership with community organizations and individual citizens to deliver a comprehensive set of services through referrals, interventions, and *links* to governmental social agencies.

The foot patrol officers reconciled their role with the reality of policing; they not only provided full law enforcement services, as did their motorized counterparts, but they made a conscious effort to focus on the social service aspects of their job, bringing problems to a resolution. Since they patrolled and interacted in the same areas day after day, week after week, they developed a degree of intimacy with residents which translated into an effective cooperative relationship.

The Flint Police Department's two forms of patrol operated on the basis of relatively distinct organizational objectives and managerial patterns. Foot officers mobilized citizens in order to provide a matrix within which communities could identify and deal with many of their own problems, including -- but not exclusively -- crime. With the advice, consent, and direction of citizens, foot officers targeted, addressed, and resolved specific community level concerns, juvenile alienation, victimization of the aged, neighborhood safety and security, and so on. By comparison, motor officers continued to adhere to the narrowly oriented preventive strategy of "crime control," reacting to events after they occurred.

Motor patrol officers still perceived social service as an annoying interlude between periods of "real" police activity pursuit, investigation, arrest; foot officers enjoyed a comprehensive, integrated and realistic sense of their role in their emphasis on social service as part of community-based crime control.(13) Where motor officers were subject to alternating bouts of inactivity and intense, frenzied periods, foot officers were able to

maintain a consistent level of activity. During "down" periods, motor officers did not utilize their skills on a proactive basis; foot officers not only exercised their proactive skills continuously, but they developed and nurtured new talents in their community organizer, linkage and catalyst capacity.

Supervisory personnel within the Flint Police Department adapted their methods according to the form of patrol for which they were responsible. Motor patrol supervisors continued to measure success primarily in terms of the number of calls made and response time. They adhered to the semi-military model of authority, with some supervisors infrequently interacting with officers, either individually or collectively. Roll call remained an impersonal exercise which usually lasted approximately 10 minutes and involved all officers and sergeants on a given shift. Sergeants did not necessarily assume responsibility for a stable pool of officers because shift rotations and sector assignments changed frequently. Sergeants reviewed officers monthly. They were compelled to interact with individual officers directly only when performance seemed to be deficient.

Sergeants responsible for foot patrol officers developed a participatory mode of supervision. Supervisors met daily with the eight officers assigned to a specific sector. The 30-minute briefings were used to exchange information and to develop community-based strategies. The sergeants were familiar with the individual officers and knew their accomplishments well. When necessary, sergeants assisted and supplemented individual efforts, but did not interfere with the autonomy each officer enjoyed in defining community problems and programs. The decision-making freedom which sergeants permitted foot patrol officers was reflected in the availability of flexible or "flex" time. Although scheduled for either mornings or afternoon shifts, foot patrol officers could elect to work an evening or two instead. The only constraint on such flexibility was that the officer's alternate schedule had to be responsive to the community's needs.(14)

The supervisory and management role in foot patrol was less directed and uniform. Supervisory and command personnel served as resources and conduits for foot patrol officers and their communities. They became the repository of city-wide information, which facilitated community involvement in the crime prevention and solving process. Under ideal circumstances, the supervisors coordinated and prioritized community activities according to available resources and community needs. They did not impose cumbersome bureaucratic procedures on either foot patrol officers or on community residents.

Some of the results of the Flint experiment have been reported elsewhere.(15) Briefly, the Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program reduced crime rates by 8.7 percent. More dramatic were the reductions in calls for service, which decreased by 42 percent over the period 1979-1982. Citizens began handling minor problems themselves, or the foot officer acted as mediator on an informal basis, negating the need for a formal complaint.

Although the impact on calls for service alone was significant, additional evidence indicated that citizens felt safer, were satisfied with the program, felt that it had impacted the crime rates, and that it had improved police/community relations. There was much closer interaction between the foot officers and citizens. Over 33 percent of neighborhood residents knew their foot patrol officers by name, and 50 percent of the rest could provide accurate descriptions of foot officers. Citizens also felt that foot officers were more effective than motor officers in encouraging crime reporting, in involving citizens in neighborhood crime prevention efforts, in working with juveniles, in encouraging citizen self-protection, and in following up on complaints.(16) The foot patrol officers themselves felt well integrated into the communities they served, minimizing their sense of isolation, alienation, and fear.(17) The foot patrol experiment was so successful that the citizens of Flint passed a tax millage increase in August 1982 which extended the program to the entire city. Currently there are 64 foot beats.

Research Design and Methods

The present research is based upon interviews conducted during January and February 1984, exactly five years

after the experimental Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program began and over one year after the expansion of foot patrol to the entire city of Flint. All 64 foot officers were interviewed. Since foot officers did not patrol on the night shifts, 50 motorized officers were drawn randomly from day or afternoon shifts. Matching foot and motorized officers established a degree of control over extraneous variables (see Table I for identifying data). Thirty-three foot and 22 motorized officers worked days; 31 foot and 28 motor patrol officers worked afternoon shifts. The researchers originally hypothesized that there would be no statistically significant differences between foot and motor patrol in relation to job satisfaction.(18)

Officers ranked their responses to a series of questions on Likert-type scales. Each officer was asked to what extent he or she was (a) doing an important job in the Flint Police Department, (b) doing an important job in their patrol area, (c) keeping up with problems in their patrol area, (d) improving police/community relations, (e) doing the job the police department sees as important, and (f) working as part of a police team. The officers could choose one of three possible responses to these six (6) elements: (1) not at all, (2) to some extent, or (3) to a very great extent.

The officers were also asked to evaluate whether foot or motor officers encountered more difficulty in the following four (4) areas: (a) communicating with headquarters, (b) communicating with other police units, (c) maintaining high morale, and (d) achieving job satisfaction. The choices were: (1) foot officer, (2) motor officers, and (3) both.

Other questions were posed: (a) Did you choose your assignment? (b) Did you choose the area you walk in? (c) How will your present assignment, either foot or motor, affect your chances for career movement? (d) How enthusiastic are you today about your position in the Flint Police Department as compared to when you first entered? Possible responses for (a) and (b) were yes and no options; for (c) they were (1) good, (2) average, (3) little, or (4) none; and for (d) the alternatives were (1) more, (2) some, or (3) less.

Finally they were asked if they would reenter police work if they could start all over again. Their options were (1) definitely, (2) probably, (3) probably not, and (4) definitely not.

T-tests were used to compare foot and motor patrol officers' responses to the interviews. The data was also grouped into cells so that foot and motor patrol officers could be compared on the basis of race, age, gender, military experience, and number of years as Flint police officers. Using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) *chi* squares were run on these cells in order to test for significant differences.

Results

The Appendix contains all the results of the research in table form. The major findings will be presented in this section.

To a statistically significant degree, foot officers, more than motor officers, felt they were: (a) doing an important job in the Flint Police Department, (b) doing an important job in their patrol area, (c) keeping up with problems in their patrol area, (d) improving the police/community relations, (e) doing the job the police department sees as important, and working as part of a police team. (See Table 2 and Subtables of 2.)

Both foot and motor officers felt, to a significant degree, that while foot officers had more difficulty communicating with headquarters and other police units, motor officers had more difficulty maintaining *high morale* and achieving *job satisfaction.* (See Table 3 and Subtables of 3.)

Table 4 shows that to a significant degree foot officers felt their present assignment had good to average impact on their chances for career movement. Likewise, foot officers were more enthusiastic about their position as

compared to when they entered the police department. Foot officers, however, had more often chosen their own assignment as well as the area in which they worked.

Finally, the findings to the question, "Would you reenter police work if you could start all over again?" (Table 5), showed no statistically significant difference between the two groups.

Discussion

Job satisfaction in the present study was dependent upon the type of patrol in which officers were engaged, foot or motor, rather than the variables of age, gender, race, military experience or years of police experience. The Flint foot patrol officers clearly sustained a higher level of enthusiasm for their work than did motor officers. They exhibited less evidence of dissatisfaction or disaffection than motor officers.

There are a number of reasons why foot patrol officers experienced the higher levels of job satisfaction found in this study. The foot patrol program, as it emerged in Flint, possessed a clear set of expansive organizational objectives which officers could use to sustain momentum in their daily tasks. They were much less subject to the demoralizing bouts of inactivity, characteristic of motor patrol. They could constantly keep busy and stimulated because they were viewed as problem solvers and proactive community organizers. Many of the foot officers saw themselves as the "chief of police" of their beat areas. Their expertise ranged from helping residents install burglar alarms to conducting meetings in order to determine the priorities on which to focus crime fighting activities. Some foot officers emphasized activities and programs for the elderly, while other officers worked with juveniles or spent much of their time in public education forums. They viewed themselves as "professionals" writing articles for community newsletters, interacting with other community agency professionals, both in their uniforms and out, and making statements and presentations to the media.

The program's objectives also served to synthesize the service and law enforcement components of the police function. For foot patrol officers, fighting crime and providing social services were not dichotomous efforts. The program promoted the development of a clear role identity among foot patrol officers legitimized by both the police department and the community. It also permitted a degree of autonomy in exercising the role. Foot officers could change work schedules and operational focus depending upon the needs of their communities. They were not "locked" into swinging shifts. In fact, foot officers, to a greater degree than motor officers, chose their unit assignments and even had influence as to the neighborhoods where they worked. They consequently perceived themselves to be a part of the decision making process.

Organizationally, the foot patrol program imparted a sense of direction to officers while simultaneously integrating them into the police department through their supervisors. The internal structure of foot patrol was conducive to job satisfaction.

Foot patrol officers were not subject to internal organizational influences alone. As part of their required routine, they immersed themselves into the communities they served. By entering into a symbiotic relationship with residents, the officers derived a greater sense of safety, accomplishment and satisfaction. The foot patrol program mitigated the antagonistic and alienated relationship that often exists between the police and the policed, removing, to some extent, the contradiction between external community expectations and internal police operations.

Their supervisors supported them in their goal setting and reinforced their accomplishments with compliments and job flexibility. The foot officers began to view the community as the reference point for job enrichment and satisfaction rather than depending on the police subculture. Their sometimes cynical motor colleagues became less and less important as a necessary support group. The foot officers could be innovative and did not need to worry about bearing the brunt of criticism or ridicule from either their supervisors or community residents.

Even though motor and foot officers perceived that foot officers had more difficulty communicating with police headquarters and other police units, both groups felt that foot officers were more effective in communicating with community residents. Foot officers had difficulty communicating with the more tradition-oriented officers in the police department at both the command and line levels.

Although organizational upward mobility was still important to the foot officers, the flexibility and freedom they had in their daily activities mitigated their need to be promoted in order to feel good about themselves. Like many contemporary police departments, with decreasing budgets, there is a lack of upward mobility in the Flint Police Department. The satisfaction of having job flexibility, creativity and autonomy provided a substitute for the lack of upward mobility. It should be noted that in the most recent sergeant and lieutenant promotional tests, foot officers consistently scored higher than their police peers in other units. The most often stated reason for their success was that their supervisors helped prepare them for advancement, providing support and encouragement.

The attempt to weave foot patrol officers back into the fabric of community existence was by and large successful. However, there was one major negative aspect. Although foot officers were more satisfied than motor officers, and were stimulated by their foot patrol assignment, they, like their motor counterparts, indicated with disturbing frequency that they would not return to police work if given an opportunity to begin fresh. Thirty-nine percent of foot officers and 28 percent of motor officers said they would probably not or definitely not reenter police work. Foot officers found their work taxing and stressful. Their reticence however was different from that of motor officers. While motor officers were stressed because of the peaks and valleys presented by the variety of their calls, ranging from a high speed chase to transmitting a death message, foot officers' stress was primarily associated with their need to deliver what they promised. Because they were in the same neighborhoods day after day, week after week, residents made requests and expected results. If, for example, Mrs. Jones asked for assistance finding her late social security check, the foot officer would need to have an answer for her dilemma within a reasonable time. Motor officers, because of sporadic contact with the same citizens, did not have the same pressure to provide follow-up answers; they may never have seen the complainant again. They could thus react to Mrs. Jones' request by doing some "fancy footwork."

It could also be argued that foot patrol officers were stressed because they suffered a loss of those defense mechanisms which permitted motor officers to deal with routine requests, violence, and legal questions as technical problems. Since foot officers were expected to develop intimacy and empathy with citizens, they became incapable of adopting a technician's perspective to problems and suffering. They were, in every sense of the word, expected to be part of the solution, not part of the problem.

Many foot officers also felt that the resistance they encountered from traditional police commanders and motor officers was frustrating and discouraging; thus another reason not to reenter police work if they had it to do all over again.

Summary

Foot patrol in Flint, Michigan contains most of the elements which contribute to job satisfaction. It utilizes the unique skills and abilities of the officer; it reduces tedium and rote repetition of tasks; it involves fine officers in decision making; it provides job flexibility; and the officers receive support from their supervisors, and status and respect from their clientele.

If foot patrol is to expand nationally as a model of policing, supervisory and command personnel must be willing to administer along the lines of participatory decision making, giving line officers appropriate autonomy. Police organizations must also attempt to find alternatives that counteract the authoritarian and cynical defense mechanisms which serve to protect officers psychologically and which alienate them from the

community. Community residents will have to be viewed as valuable resources in the crime prevention and solving process. Foot officers in Flint became an integral part of the community, identified with, and responsible for, the quality of life in their neighborhoods. Their identification with a specific, manageable, geographic area reduces their feeling that crime is unmanageable and overwhelming. They see the fruits of their labors and the effects of their intense interaction with community residents.

The foot patrol model, as it has been pioneered in Flint, may also contain some lessons for motor patrol. With the resources available to law enforcement constantly dwindling, the traditional organizational avenues of job satisfaction are increasingly diminished. Job security, fringe benefits, career momentum, and salary levels are precarious. In particular, the opportunity for individual officers to "climb the ranks" is becoming severely limited. It would seem that even motor patrol could emphasize alternate sources of job satisfaction by promoting innovation, participatory management and appropriate operational autonomy. Such alternatives may motivate and captivate line officers in such a way that limited upward mobility may become less important, if not irrelevant.

APPENDIX

Table 1
Identifying Data for Motor and Foot Officers

Position	Foot Officer		Motor Officer		Total	
Rank **Patrol Officers**	(64)	56.1	(50)	43.9	(114)	100.0

Shifts Worked
  Days
  Afternoons
	(33)
	(31)
		51.6
		48.4
			(22)
			(28)
				44.0
				56.0
					(55)
					(59)
						48.2
						51.8

Gender
  Male
  Female
	(45)
	(19)
		70.3
		29.7
			(42)
			(8)
				84.0
				16.0
					(87)
					(27)
						76.3
						23.7

Race*
  Black
  White
	(23)
	(40)
		36.5
		63.5
			(10)
			(40)
				20.0
				80.0
					(33)
					(80)
						29.2
						70.8

Gender*
  Male
    Black
    White
  Female
    Black
    White
	(11)
	(34)
	
	(12)
	(6)
		17.5
		54.0
		
		19.0
		9.5
			(7)
			(35)
			
			(3)
			(5)
				14.0
				70.0
				
				6.0
				10.0
					(18)
					(69)
					
					(15)
					(11)
						15.9
						61.1
						
						13.3
						9.7

Age
  30 or less
  31-35
  36-40
  41-45
  46
	(22)
	(16)
	(17)
	(6)
	(3)
		34.4
		25.0
		26.5
		9.4
		4.7
			(33)
			(9)
			(3)
			(3)
			(2)
				66.0
				18.0
				6.0
				6.0
				4.0
					(55)
					(25)
					(20)
					(9)
					(5)
						48.2
						21.9
						17.5
						7.9
						4.4

Military Experience						
No	(43)	67.2	(39)	78.0	(82)	71.9
Yes	(21)	32.8	(11)	22.0	(32)	28.1
Number of Years as Flint Police Officer						
0-5	(12)	18.8	(21)	42.0	(33)	29.0
6-10	(31)	48.4	(20)	40.0	(51)	44.7
11-15	(13)	20.3	(4)	8.0	(17)	14.9
16+	(8)	12.5	(5)	10.0	(13)	11.4
Total	(64)	100.0	(50)	100.0	(114)	100.0

* Note: 1 Oriental officer not included.

Table 1a
Percentage Table on Number of Years as Flint Police Officer
(Race and Gender Controlled)

Race*	FOOT OFFICER		MOTOR OFFICER	
White				
Male				
0-5	(5)	7.9	(15)	30.0
6-10	(12)	19.0	(13)	26.0
11-15	(9)	14.3	(2)	4.0
16+	(8)	12.7	(5)	10.0
Female	(3)	4.8	(2)	4.0
0-5	(3)	4.8	(3)	6.0
6-10	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0
11-15	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0
16+				
Black				
Male				
0-5	(2)	3.2	(3)	6.0
6-10	(5)	7.9	(2)	4.0
11-15	(4)	6.3	(2)	4.0
16+	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0
Female	(2)	3.2	(1)	2.0
0-5	(10)	15.9	(2)	4.0
6-10	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0
11-15	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0
16+				
Total	(63)	100.0	(50)	100.0

*Note: 1 Oriental officer not included

Table 2
Comparison of 64 Foot Officers Versus 50 Motor Officers to
Determine Perceptions of Job Effectiveness

Over the last few months, to what extent have you felt you were:	Foot officers perceive higher effectiveness on the job than motor officers, at level of significance:
a. Doing an important job in the Flint Police Department	.0007
b. Doing an important job in your patrol area	.0000
c. Keeping up with problems in your patrol area	.0002
d. Improving the police community relations	.0000
e. Doing the job the police department sees as important	.0486
f. Working as part of a police team	.0164

Table 2a-1
Percentage Table on Officers' Perceptions of Job Effectiveness: Doing an Important Job in the Flint Police Department (a)

(Count) Row Pct	Perception of Effectiveness			
Position	Not At All	Some Extent	V. Great Extent	Total
Foot Officer	(2) 3.1	(38) 59.4	(24) 37.5	(64) 100.0
Motor Officer	(12) 24.0	(30) 60.0	(8) 16.0	(50) 100.0

Level of Significance: .0007

Table 2b-1
Percentage Table on Officers' Perceptions of Job Effectiveness: Doing an Important Job in Own Patrol Area (b)

(Count) Row Pct	Perception of Effectiveness			
Position	Not At All	Some Extent	V. Great Extent	Total
Foot Officer	(0) 0.0	(28) 43.8	(36) 56.3	(64) 100.0

| Motor Officer | (11) 22.0 | (26) 52.0 | (13) 26.0 | (50) 100.0 |

Level of Significance: .0000

Table 2c-1

Percentage Table on Officers' Perceptions of Job Effectiveness: Keeping up With Problems in Your Patrol Area (c)

(Count) Row Pct	Perception of Effectiveness			
Position	Not At All	Some Extent	V. Great Extent	Total
Foot Officer	(0) 0.0	(29) 45.3	(35) 54.7	(64) 100.0
Motor Officer	(9) 18.0	(29) 58.0	(12) 24.0	(50) 100.0

Level of Significance: .0002

Table 2d-1

Percentage Table on Officers' Perceptions of Job Effectiveness: Improving the Police Community Relations (d)

(Count) Row Pct	Perception of Effectiveness			
Position	Not At All	Some Extent	V. Great Extent	Total
Foot Officer	(1) 1.6	(16) 25.0	(47) 73.4	(64) 100.0
Motor Officer	(11) 22.0	(31) 62.0	(8) 16.0	(50) 100.0

Level of Significance: .0000

Table 2e-1

Percentage Table on Officers' Perceptions of Job Effectiveness: Doing the Job the Police Department Sees as Important (e)

(Count) Row Pct	Perception of Effectiveness			
Position	Not At All	Some Extent	V. Great Extent	Total
Foot Officer	(5) 7.8	(39) 60.9	(20) 31.3	(64) 100.0

Motor Officer	(12) 24.0	(27) 54.0	(11) 22.0	(50) 100.00

Level of Significance: .0486

Table 2f-1
Percentage Table on Officers' Perceptions of Job Effectiveness: Working as Part of a Police Team (f)

(Count) Row Pct	Perception of Effectiveness			
Position	**Not At All**	**Some Extent**	**V. Great Extent**	**Total**
Foot Officer	(8) 12.5	(35) 54.7	(21) 32.8	(64) 100.0
Motor Officer	(16) 32.0	(26) 52.0	(8) 16.0	(50) 100.0

Level of Significance: .0164

Table 2a-2
Percentage Table on Officers' Response To: Over Last Few Months, To What Extent Have You Felt You Were... (Race and Gender Controlled)

Cell data: (Count) Row Pct Col Pct	DOING AN IMPORTANT JOB IN THE FLINT POLICE DEPARTMENT(a)												
	BLACK						WHITE						
	Male			Female			Male			Female			
Position	Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Total
Foot Officer	(0) 0.0 0.0	(4) 6.3 36.4	(7) 11.1 100.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(6) 9.5 85.7	(6) 9.5 75.0	(2) 3.2 15.4	(25) 39.7 56.8	(7) 11.1 58.3	(0) 0.0 0.0	(2) 3.2 40.0	(4) 6.3 80.0	(63)* 99.9 55.8
Motor Officer	(0) 0.0 0.0	(7) 14.0 63.6	(0) 0.0 0.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(1) 2.0 14.3	(2) 4.0 25.0	(11) 22.0 84.6	(19) 38.0 43.2	(5) 10.0 41.7	(1) 2.0 100.0	(3) 6.0 60.0	(1) 2.0 20.0	(50) 100.0 44.2
Total	(0) 0.0 0.0	(11) 9.7 100.0	(7) 6.2 100.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(7) 6.2 100.0	(8) 7.1 100.0	(13) 11.5 100.0	(44) 38.9 100.0	(12) 10.6 100.0	(1) 0.9 100.0	(5) 4.4 100.0	(5) 4.4 100.0	(113) 100.0 100.0

*1 Oriental not included

Table 2b-2
Percentage Table on Officers' Response To: Over Last Few Months, To What Extent Have You Felt You Were... (Race and Gender Controlled)

| Cell data: (Count) Row Pct | DOING AN IMPORTANT JOB FOR YOUR PATROL AREA(b) | | | |
| | BLACK | | WHITE | |
	Male	Female	Male	Female

Col Pct Position	BLACK Male Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	BLACK Female Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	WHITE Male Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	WHITE Female Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Total
Foot Officer	(0) 0.0 0.0	(5) 7.9 50.0	(6) 9.5 75.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(5) 7.9 100.0	(7) 11.0 70.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(17) 27.0 45.9	(17) 27.0 73.9	(0) 0.0 0.0	(1) 1.6 50.0	(5) 7.9 71.4	(63)* 99.9 55.8
Motor Officer	(0) 0.0 0.0	(5) 10.0 50.0	(2) 4.0 25.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(3) 6.0 30.0	(9) 18.0 100.0	(20) 40.0 54.1	(6) 12.0 26.1	(2) 4.0 100.0	(1) 2.0 50.0	(2) 4.0 28.6	(50) 100.0 44.2
Total	(0) 0.0 0.0	(10) 8.8 100.0	(8) 7.1 100.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(5) 4.4 100.0	(10) 8.8 100.0	(9) 8.0 100.0	(37) 32.7 100.0	(23) 20.4 100.0	(2) 1.8 100.0	(2) 1.8 100.0	(7) 6.2 100.0	(113) 100.0 100.0

* 1 Oriental not included

Table 2c-2
Percentage Table on Officers' Response To:
Over Last Few Months, To What Extent Have You Felt You Were...
(Race and Gender Controlled)

Cell data: (Count) — KEEPING UP WITH PROBLEMS IN YOUR PATROL AREA (c)

Row Pct / Col Pct

Position	BLACK Male Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	BLACK Female Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	WHITE Male Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	WHITE Female Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Total
Foot Officer	(0) 0.0 0.0	(7) 11.1 53.8	(4) 6.4 80.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(7) 11.1 77.8	(5) 7.9 83.3	(0) 0.0 0.0	(14) 22.2 41.2	(20) 31.8 71.4	(0) 0.0 0.0	(1) 1.6 50.0	(5) 7.9 71.4	(63)* 100.0 55.8
Motor Officer	(0) 0.0 0.0	(6) 12.0 46.2	(1) 2.0 20.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(2) 4.0 22.2	(1) 2.0 16.7	(7) 14.0 100.0	(20) 40.0 58.8	(8) 16.0 28.6	(2) 4.0 100.0	(1) 2.0 50.0	(2) 4.0 28.6	(50) 100.0 44.2
Total	(0) 0.0 0.0	(13) 11.5 100.0	(5) 4.4 100.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(9) 7.9 100.0	(6) 5.3 100.0	(7) 6.2 100.0	(34) 30.1 100.0	(28) 24.8 100.0	(2) 1.8 100.0	(2) 1.8 100.0	(7) 6.2 100.0	(113) 100.0 100.0

* 1 Oriental not included

Table 2d-2
Percentage Table on Officers' Response To:
Over Last Few Months, To What Extent Have You Felt You Were...
(Race and Gender Controlled)

Cell data: (Count) — IMPROVING THE POLICE COMMUNITY RELATIONS(d)

Row Pct / Col Pct

Position	BLACK Male Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	BLACK Female Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	WHITE Male Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	WHITE Female Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Total
Foot Officer	(0) 0.0 0.0	(3) 4.8 33.3	(8) 12.7 88.9	(0) 0.0 0.0	(3) 4.8 60.0	(9) 14.3 90.0	(1) 1.6 9.1	(9) 14.3 32.1	(24) 38.0 80.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(1) 1.6 20.0	(5) 7.9 100.0	(63)* 100.0 55.8
Motor Officer	(0) 0.0 0.0	(6) 12.0 66.7	(1) 2.0 11.1	(0) 0.0 0.0	(2) 4.0 40.0	(1) 2.0 10.0	(10) 20.0 90.9	(19) 38.0 67.9	(6) 12.0 20.0	(1) 2.0 100.0	(4) 8.0 80.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(50) 100.0 44.2
Total	(0) 0.0 0.0	(9) 8.0 100.0	(9) 8.0 100.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(5) 4.4 100.0	(10) 8.9 100.0	(11) 9.7 100.0	(28) 24.8 100.0	(30) 26.5 100.0	(1) 0.9 100.0	(5) 4.4 100.0	(5) 4.4 100.0	(113) 100.0 100.0

Table 2e-2
Percentage Table on Officers' Response To:
Over Last Few Months, To What Extent Have You Felt You Were...
(Race and Gender Controlled)

Cell data: (Count) Row Pct Col Pct	DOING THE JOB THE POLICE DEPARTMENT SEES AS IMPORTANT (e)												
	BLACK						WHITE						
	Male			Female			Male			Female			
Position	Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Total
Foot Officer	(1) 1.6 50.0	(7) 11.1 53.8	(3) 4.3 75.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(7) 11.1 87.5	(5) 7.9 71.4	(3) 4.8 21.4	(22) 34.9 56.4	(9) 14.2 56.3	(1) 1.6 100.0	(2) 3.2 33.3	(3) 4.8 75.0	(63)* 100.0 55.8
Motor Officer	(1) 2.0 50.0	(5) 10.0 41.7	(1) 2.0 25.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(1) 2.0 12.5	(2) 4.0 28.6	(11) 22.0 78.6	(17) 34.0 43.6	(7) 14.0 43.7	(0) 0.0 0.0	(4) 8.0 66.7	(1) 2.0 25.0	(50) 100.0 44.2
Total	(2) 1.8 100.0	(12) 10.6 100.0	(4) 3.6 100.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(8) 7.1 100.0	(7) 6.2 100.0	(14) 12.4 100.0	(39) 34.5 100.0	(16) 14.2 100.0	(1) 0.9 100.0	(6) 5.3 100.0	(4) 3.5 100.0	(113) 100.0 100.0

* 1 Oriental not included

Table 2f-2
Percentage Table on Officers' Response To:
Over Last Few Months, To What Extent Have You Felt You Were...
(Race and Gender Controlled)

Cell data: (Count) Row Pct Col Pct	WORKING AS PART OF A POLICE TEAM (f)												
	BLACK						WHITE						
	Male			Female			Male			Female			
Position	Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Not At All	Some Extent	Very Great	Total
Foot Officer	(1) 1.6 33.3	(3) 4.8 37.5	(7) 11.1 100.0	(1) 1.6 100.0	(7) 11.1 100.0	(4) 6.3 57.1	(4) 6.3 23.5	(20) 31.7 54.1	(10) 15.9 66.7	(2) 3.2 66.7	(4) 6.4 50.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(63)* 100.0 55.8
Motor Officer	(2) 4.0 66.7	(5) 10.0 62.5	(0) 0.0 0.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(3) 6.0 42.9	(13) 26.0 76.5	(17) 34.0 45.9	(5) 10.0 33.3	(1) 2.0 33.3	(4) 8.0 50.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(50) 100.0 44.2
Total	(3) 2.7 100.0	(8) 7.1 100.0	(7) 6.2 100.0	(1) 0.9 100.0	(7) 6.2 100.0	(7) 6.2 100.0	(17) 15.0 100.0	(37) 32.7 100.0	(15) 13.2 100.0	(3) 2.7 100.0	(8) 7.1 100.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(113) 100.0 100.0

* 1 Oriental not included

Table 3
Percentage Table On Foot and Motor Officers' Evaluation of Level of Difficulty on the Job

Cell data: (Count) Row Pct	WHO EXPERIENCES MORE DIFFICULTY IN...												
	Communicating with Headquarters			Communicating with Other Police Units			Maintaining High Morale			Achieving Job Satisfaction			
Position	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Total
Foot Officer	(42) 65.6	(19) 29.7	(3) 4.7	(52) 81.3	(10) 15.6	(2) 3.1	(15) 23.4	(47) 73.4	(2) 3.1	(11) 17.2	(49) 76.6	(4) 6.3	(64) 56.1

Motor Officer	(32) 64.0	(10) 20.0	(8) 16.0	(35) 70.0	(9) 18.0	(6) 12.0	(10) 20.0	(34) 68.0	(6) 12.0	(12) 24.0	(30) 60.0	(8) 16.0	(50) 43.9
Level of Significance	.0921			.0369			.1810			.1170			(114) 100.0

Table 3a
Percentage Table on Foot and Motor Officers' Evaluation of Levels of Difficulty on the Job
(Race and Gender Controlled)

Cell data: (Count) Row Pct Col Pct Position	COMMUNICATION WITH HEADQUARTERS												Total
	BLACK						WHITE						
	Male			Female			Male			Female			
	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	
Foot Officer	(8) 12.7 88.9	(3) 4.8 50.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(7) 11.1 77.8	(4) 6.3 100.0	(1) 1.6 50.0	(22) 34.9 47.8	(10) 15.9 58.8	(2) 3.2 33.3	(4) 6.3 44.4	(2) 3.2 100.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(63)* 100.0 55.8
Motor Officer	(1) 2.0 11.0	(3) 6.0 50.0	(3) 6.0 100.0	(2) 4.0 22.2	(0) 0.0 0.0	(1) 2.0 50.0	(24) 48.0 52.2	(7) 14.0 41.2	(4) 8.0 66.7	(5) 10.0 55.6	(0) 0.0 0.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(50) 100.0 44.2
Total	(9) 8.0 100.0	(6) 5.3 100.0	(3) 2.6 100.0	(9) 8.0 100.0	(4) 3.5 100.0	(2) 1.8 100.0	(46) 40.7 100.0	(17) 15.0 100.0	(6) 5.3 100.0	(9) 8.0 100.0	(2) 1.8 100.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(113) 100.0 100.0

* 1 Oriental not included

Table 3b
Percentage Table on Foot and Motor Officers' Evaluation of Levels of Difficulty on the Job
(Race and Gender Controlled)

Cell data: (Count) Row Pct Col Pct Position	COMMUNICATING WITH OTHER POLICE DEPARTMENTS												Total
	BLACK						WHITE						
	Male			Female			Male			Female			
	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	
Foot Officer	(9) 14.3 75.0	(2) 3.2 66.7	(0) 0.0 0.0	(10) 15.9 83.3	(1) 1.6 100.0	(1) 1.6 50.0	(26) 41.2 50.0	(7) 11.1 46.7	(1) 1.6 50.0	(6) 9.5 60.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(63)* 100.0 55.8
Motor Officer	(3) 6.0 25.0	(1) 2.0 33.3	(3) 6.0 100.0	(2) 4.0 16.7	(0) 0.0 0.0	(1) 2.0 50.0	(26) 52.0 50.0	(8) 16.0 53.3	(1) 2.0 50.0	(4) 8.0 40.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(1) 2.0 100.0	(50) 100.0 44.2
Total	(12) 10.6 100.0	(3) 2.6 100.0	(3) 2.7 100.0	(12) 10.6 100.0	(1) 0.9 100.0	(2) 1.8 100.0	(52) 46.0 100.0	(15) 13.3 100.0	(2) 1.8 100.0	(10) 8.8 100.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(1) 0.9 100.0	(113) 100.0 100.0

* 1 Oriental not included

Table 3c
Percentage Table on Foot and Motor Officers' Evaluation of Levels of Difficulty on the Job
(Race and Gender Controlled)

Cell data: (Count) Row Pct Col Pct	MAINTAINING HIGH MORAL												
	BLACK						WHITE						
	Male			Female			Male			Female			
Position	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Total
Foot Officer	(3) 4.8 60.0	(7) 11.1 63.6	(1) 1.6 50.0	(4) 6.3 80.0	(8) 12.7 88.9	(0) 0.0 0.0	(5) 7.9 50.0	(29) 46.0 50.9	(0) 0.0 0.0	(2) 3.2 50.0	(3) 4.8 75.0	(1) 1.6 33.3	(63)* 100.0 55.8
Motor Officer	(2) 4.0 40.0	(4) 8.0 36.4	(1) 2.0 50.0	(1) 2.0 20.0	(1) 2.0 11.1	(1) 2.0 100.0	(5) 10.0 50.0	(28) 56.0 49.1	(2) 4.0 100.0	(2) 4.0 50.0	(1) 2.0 25.0	(2) 4.0 66.7	(50) 100.0 44.2
Total	(5) 4.4 100.0	(11) 9.7 100.0	(2) 1.8 100.0	(5) 4.4 100.0	(9) 8.0 100.0	(1) 0.9 100.0	(10) 8.9 100.0	(57) 50.4 100.0	(2) 1.8 100.0	(4) 3.5 100.0	(4) 3.5 100.0	(3) 2.7 100.0	(113) 100.0 100.0

* 1 Oriental not included

Table 3d
Percentage Table on Foot and Motor Officers' Evaluation of Levels of Difficulty on the Job
(Race and Gender Controlled)

Cell data: (Count) Row Pct Col Pct	ACHIEVING JOB SATISFACTION												
	BLACK						WHITE						
	Male			Female			Male			Female			
Position	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Foot Officer	Motor Officer	Both	Total
Foot Officer	(3) 4.7 60.0	(7) 11.1 70.0	(1) 1.6 33.3	(3) 4.8 100.0	(9) 14.3 81.8	(0) 0.0 0.0	(5) 7.9 38.5	(26) 41.3 53.1	(3) 4.8 42.9	(0) 0.0 0.0	(6) 9.5 75.0	(0) 0.0 0.0	(63)* 100.0 55.8
Motor Officer	(2) 4.0 40.0	(3) 6.0 30.0	(2) 4.0 66.7	(0) 0.0 0.0	(2) 4.0 18.2	(1) 2.0 100.0	(8) 16.0 61.5	(23) 46.0 46.9	(4) 8.0 57.1	(2) 4.0 100.0	(2) 4.0 25.0	(1) 2.0 100.0	(50) 100.0 44.2
Total	(5) 4.4 100.0	(10) 8.9 100.0	(3) 2.6 100.0	(3) 2.6 100.0	(11) 9.7 100.0	(1) 0.9 100.0	(13) 11.5 100.0	(49) 43.4 100.0	(7) 6.2 100.0	(2) 1.8 100.0	(8) 7.1 100.0	(1) 0.9 100.0	(113) 100.0 100.0

* 1 Oriental not included

Table 4
Percentage Table On Foot and Motor Officers' Responses

Cell data: (Count) Row Pct	OFFICER RESPONSES			
	Did you choose your own assignment?	Did you choose the area you work in?	How will your present assignment affect your chances for career movement?	How enthusiastic are you about your position now compared to first entering the department?

Position	Yes	No	Total	Yes	No	Total	Good	Average	Little	None	Total	More	Same	Less	Total
Foot Officer	(54) 84.4	(10) 15.6	(64) 100.0	(44) 68.8	(20) 31.3	(64) 100.0	(11) 17.2	(30) 46.9	(16) 25.0	(7) 10.9	(64) 100.0	(17) 26.6	(23) 35.9	(24) 37.5	(64) 100.0
Motor Officer	(32) 64.0	(18) 36.0	(50) 100.0	(17) 34.0	(33) 66.0	(50) 100.0	(4) 8.0	(13) 26.0	(14) 28.0	(19) 38.0	(50) 100.0	(3) 6.0	(14) 28.0	(33) 66.0	(50) 100.0
Level of Significance	.0221			.0050			.0060					.0026			

Table 5

Percentage Table on Whether Officers Would Re-enter Police Work

If They Could Start All Over Again

(Count) Row Pct	Re-enter Police Work				
Position	Definitely	Probably	Probably Not	Definitely Not	Total
Foot Officer	(16) 25.0	(23) 35.9	(19) 29.7	(6) 9.4	(64) 100.0
Motor Officer	(16) 32.0	(20) 40.0	(7) 14.0	(7) 14.0	(50) 100.0

Level of Significance: .2436

ENDNOTES:

1. W. Clinton Terry 111, "Police Stress: The Empirical Evidence" in Carl Klockars, ed., *Thinking About Police: Contemporary Readings* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1983), p. 441.

2. Alan F. Alcuri, "Police Pride and Self-Esteem: Indications of Future Occupational Changes," *Journal of Police Science and Administration* (Vol. 4, No. 4), p. 441.

3. Herman Goldstein, *Policing in a Free Society* (Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Co., 1977), p. 3.

4. ibid. p. 10.

5. James Q. Wilson, "The Police and Their Problems: A Theory" in Arthur Neiderhoffer and Abraham S. Blumberg, eds., *The Ambivalent Force: Perspectives on the Police* (Waltham, MA: Ginn and Company Publishers, 1970), p. 294.

6. James Q. Wilson and George L. Kelling, "Broken Windows," *The Atlantic Monthly* (March 1984), pp. 29-39.

7. Robert D. Caplan, Sidney Cobb, John French, R. Van Harrison, and S. R. Pinnau, *Job Demands and Worker Health* (Washington, D.C.: W. S. Government Printing Office, 1975), p. 202.

8. Goldstein, p. 166.

9. Alcuri, pp. 441-444; Judith Johnson Kirchoff and Roy R. Roberg, "Management Trauma in a Small City Police Department: A Case Study," *Journal of Police Science and Administration* (Vol. 9, 1981), pp. 288-290; Jeffrey S. Slovak, "Work Satisfaction and Municipal Police Officers," *Journal of Police Science and Administration* (Vol. 6, 1978), pp. 462-470.

10. Alcuri, p. 444.

11. David N. Allen and Michael Maxfield, "Judging Police Performance: Views and Behaviors of Patrol Officers" in Richard R. Bennett*, Police at Work: Policy Issues and Analysis* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983), pp. 65-86; Harry P. Harty, "Wrestling with Police Crime Control Productivity Measurement" in Joan L. Wolfe and John F. Heaphy, *Readings on Productivity in Policing* (Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, 1975), pp. 86-126; Kirchoff and Roberg, pp. 288-290.

12. Robert C. Trojanowicz, *An Evaluation of the Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program in Flint, Michigan* (East Lansing, MI: The National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center, Michigan State University, 1982),
13. For comparisons see: Robert C. Trojanowicz, *passim;* George Kelling, Tony Pate, Duane Dieckman, Charles E. Brown, *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment* (Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, 1974), *passim;* George L. Kelling, Anthony Pate, et. al., *The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment* (Washington, D.C.: The Police Foundation, 1981), *passim.*
14. The authors would like to acknowledge the help of Dennis Payne, who generously shared field notes and observations in developing these comparisons.
15. Trojanowicz, passim.
16. ibid.
17. Robert C. Trojanowicz and Dennis Banas, *Perceptions of Safety: A Comparison of Foot Patrol Versus Motor Patrol Officers,* Community Policing Series, No. 1 (East Lansing, MI: National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center, Michigan State University, 1984) passim.
18. Jesse Thompson and Hazel Harden collected data for this research. Susan Trojanowicz constructed the tables found in the Appendix.

NATIONAL NEIGHBORHOOD FOOT PATROL CENTER

Publications

Books

An Evaluation of the Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program in Flint, Michigan. A Manual for the Establishment and Operation of a Foot Patrol Program

Articles

Perceptions of Safety: A Comparison of Foot Patrol Versus Motor Patrol Officers

Job Satisfaction: A Comparison of Foot Patrol Versus Motor Patrol Officers

The Impact of Foot Patrol on Black and White Perceptions of Policing

The Foot Patrol Officer, the Community, and the School: A Coalition Against Crime

Community Policing: Defining the Officer's Role

Foot Patrol: Some Problem Areas

An Evaluation of a Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program

The Status of Contemporary Community Policing Programs

If you wish to receive a copy of a National Center publication please contact us at the address or telephone numbers given below.

National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center
School of Criminal Justice
Michigan State University
560 Baker Hall
East Lansing, Michigan 48824-1118
800-892-9051 or (517) 355-2322 in Michigan