Implementing a Community Policing Model for Work with Juveniles
An Exploratory Study

Joanne Belknap
Merry Morash
Robert Trojanowicz

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

MSU is an affirmative-action, equal opportunity institution.

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

Implementing a Community Policing Model: The Flint Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program[1]

An increasing body of criminal justice and other relevant literature has recognized that policies and programs frequently are not implemented as intended (for reviews, see Morash, 1982; Scheirer, 1981; Ellickson et al., 1983; Williams, 1981). The problem that has most often been emphasized is the staff disposition to support the program change (Bardach, 1977; Moore, 1978; Lermack, 1977; Wice, 1974; Klein, 1979; Britnall, 1979). For example, in one of the few conceptual

discussions of the relative importance of the variables that affect criminal justice policy implementation, Musheno et al. (1976:266) stressed the importance of agency staff:

> The extent to which public interest goals can be reached depends entirely on how well they serve the self-interests of those who are responsible for executing the policies in question.

Police work is characterized by a very high degree of discretion coupled with insulation from direct supervision, which makes the disposition of individual police officers particularly critical in the implementation of police programs and policies.

The Flint, Michigan Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program, from the outset, faced a difficult implementation problem, for it sought to redefine the role of the police officer in a work setting where the officer responded to multiple and potentially conflicting audiences, and was even less likely to be directly observed by the supervisor than the traditional motor patrol officer. In a radical departure from both preventive patrol and traditional foot patrol models, Flint's Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program based officers so they would be accessible to all types of socioeconomic neighborhoods, locating their officers in places such as community centers and public schools. The officers were to go beyond organizing neighborhood watches and were to serve as *catalysts* in the formation of neighborhood associations which articulated community expectations of the police and established foot patrol priorities and community programs. Foot patrol officers also were expected to work 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 were expected not only to provide full law enforcement services, as did their motorized counterparts, but also to focus on the social service aspects on their job, bringing problems to a resolution.

At the beginning of the Flint Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program, a series of community meetings and contacts were planned to define the role of a foot patrol officer. In theory, it was accepted that the community, supervisors, department administrators and foot patrol officers would have input into the development of clear role definitions.

In practice, it was recognized that the function and related role of the police officer is diverse and often contradictory: "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: (Goldstein, 1977:3). Despite the concerted effort to define the foot patrol officer's role, an evaluation of the first three years of the program revealed that "officers continually indicated that their role needed a clearer definition and that they needed additional training in crisis intervention and in interpersonal skills" (Trojanowicz, 1982:78). As a response to the evaluation findings, special training programs were developed for the patrol officers. In light of the importance and problematic nature of implementing the Flint Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program, the primary focus of the present research is on the role of foot patrol officers in the third year of program operation.

The present research specifically examines the officer's role in resolving complaints about a rowdy group of juveniles, or what we refer to as the *rowdy teenager situation.* There were several reasons for this focus. First, work with juveniles was an integral part of the foot patrol officer's job (Trojanowicz and Smyth, 1983). Foot patrol officers were expected to have preexisting relationships with adolescents in their area, and to participate in such activities as the Police Athletic League and school programs Second, although the designers and administrators of the Flint Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program considered work with juveniles to be highly important, the officers were reluctant to do this work in the early stages of the project. Many officers felt that work with juveniles was the proper task of social workers, not police officers. Furthermore, the original job description did not sufficiently emphasize the role foot patrol officers were to play in the juvenile justice system. Through training and supervision, efforts had been made to overcome the aversion to juvenile work, and it is of interest to determine how the foot patrol officers viewed their roles in juvenile work subsequent to these attempts. Finally, it would be inappropriate to expect the foot patrol officers to reveal the new aspects of their role in handling typical felony-type crimes, for of course they were expected to enforce the law in much

the same way as motor patrol officers.

Theoretical Framework

Aside from the present study's relevance to the implementation of the foot patrol policing model, there also are implications for theory development. As Sherman (1980) concluded from his review of research to predict police behavior, there has been little success in explaining most of the variance. Explanatory variables have included individual officer characteristics, situational variables (e.g., suspect and complainant *c*haracteristics), police department characteristics, community differences, and legal factors. Unlike our own study, prior research has rarely considered individual officer's role orientation, but instead has focused on the individual level variables: length of service, officer age, officer race, and officer education. It is not entirely clear why role, a theoretically important determinant of behavior (e.g., see Burke and Reitzes, 1981; Reitzes, 1980), has been neglected. Perhaps the neglect results from difficulties in operationalizing such a complex variable, the reliance on data available in police records, or a disinterest in theories that identify role as important.

Consistent with Sherman's (1980:93; also see Smith and Klein, 1984) recommendation that new theoretical models be pursued as explanations of police behavior, our research has the potential for showing police role orientation to be an important addition to the predictors that have been identified in other research. Worden and Pollitz (1984) did find that in handling domestic violence cases, officers with a crime-fighter role orientation were more likely to be affected by the victim's allegation of violence than were those with a problem-solver orientation. Unfortunately, their study was limited by the use of one item to measure role orientation: subjects were asked to indicate their agreement with the statement, "Police should not have to handle calls that involve social or personal problems where no crime is involved."

Recognizing the complex and frequently imprecise definition of the concept role, we drew on theories of role identity (McCall and Simmons, 1966) that focus on the self in a particular role, here the occupational role of police officer. In this perspective, each individual has many identities, for example as parent, child. Worker, or friend. These identities constitute for *self*, and *role identity* is the self in a particular role (Burker and Tully, 1977:883). The *ideal role identity* is the way that a person wants to be seen by various audiences—in our situation the juveniles, a complainant, and the supervisor. The *actual role identity* is the way that a person thinks she or he is seen. Barring obstacles, a person's ideal role identity should predict actual identity and actual behavior. The role identity framework suggested several areas for study. Did foot and motor patrol officers want to take on a different role in their interactions in the rowdy teenager situation? Given the widely recognized constraints imposed by the complaint situation, the law, and multiple demands on police, could the foot patrol officer fill the role as desired? If not, what factors stood in the way? [2]

Each of these theory relevant questions is pertinent to the implementation process. In order for the Flint Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program to be successfully implemented, officers should envision their ideal role identity differently than do motor patrol officers. Additionally, they should achieve a different role identity and exhibit different behavior. Finally, it would be helpful to understand the constraints that the officers feel they must overcome, or that they cannot overcome, in being the types of police that they consider ideal. An understanding of the implementation issues (i.e., undesired ideal role identity, factors inhibiting the achievement of desired role identity) can enable supervisors and program designers to identify, anticipate, and work to overcome common difficulties.

Methodology

The data were collected through a series of in-depth interviews with comparison groups of 30 foot and 29 motor patrol officers. A purposive sample was selected to provide variation not only in patrol method, but also in gender and race, two additional variables that could influence role identity (Burke and Tully, 1977:883; Turner,

1978:3). Besides the sample of Flint foot patrol officers, officers were interviewed from two other similar urban Michigan communities that relied on typical motor patrol. The use of officers from the other communities is a departure from prior research, which compared motor and foot officers within Flint during the early years of the project. By the time of the present study there were two drawbacks to using a Flint comparison group: A Flint comparison group would not be restricted to officers who had never volunteered for foot patrol, but would also include officers rotated out of foot patrol over the last five years; and the foot patrol ideal had repeatedly been discussed in the department and community, potentially influencing even motor patrol officers who had never been assigned to foot patrol.

The samples of foot and motor patrol officers were matched on gender and race (black and white). When more subjects of a certain gender or race were available in the department than were needed for the study, the individuals to be invited to participate were randomly selected from the race-gender subgroup. Sixty-five subjects were asked in writing and in a follow-up phone call to participate in the research on police work, and 59 did complete the interview. Of the 59, 30 were foot patrol officers, 28 were women and 26 were black.

Data were collected during an approximately one and one-half hour structured interview, in most cases with an interviewer matched by gender and minority status to the respondent. Interview data were tape recorded and later transcribed for analysis.

To measure role identity in the juvenile encounter situation, each officer was presented with a scenario:

> A resident in the area that you patrol complains about a group of teenagers who live in the neighborhood. The teenagers hang around late at night near the resident's house, and they drink and play loud music regularly. The resident complains that they also have caused some minor damage to cars parked in the area and to the homes in the area.

Because role identity is revealed in actual or imagined interaction with some other individuals, we questioned officers about themselves in the work situation and in relation to the officer's supervisor, the juveniles, and the complainant. The officers were asked (1) how they ideally wanted to be viewed by the complainant, teenagers, and supervisor in the situation, (2) how they actually were viewed by each of these people, and (3) in cases with a discrepancy, what constraints stood in their way of being viewed as desired. To avoid bias introduced by the order in which respondents were asked about themselves in relation to teens, complainant, and supervisor, the sequence of questions was randomly varied. Thus, some officers were first asked about role identity in relation to the supervisor, some were first asked about the complainant, and so on.

Later in the interview, the officers were asked to identify and describe their most recent handling of a similar situation, and their responses were used to indicate actual behavior. Although it is possible that some officers tried to describe an incident in which the handling of the case was consistent with ideal identity, our sense is that this is unlikely. In most cases, the officers verbally indicated they were recalling the last incident, and they seemed to focus on correct recall of the case, not on the consistency of their actions with ideal role identity.

The first step in the analysis was to identify different role identity orientations. After five identity orientations were identified through repeated readings by two researchers, the interviews were reassessed and each officer received a code value to indicate (1) no evidence of this orientation; (2) some evidence of this orientation; (3) this is the officer's predominant orientation. For each of the five orientations officers received a different code for: (1) ideal identity in relation to supervisor; (2) ideal identity in relation to complainant; (3) ideal identity in relation to teenagers; (4) actual identity in relation to supervisor; (5) actual identity in relation to complainant; (6) actual identity in relation to teenagers; and (7) actual behavior in resolving a rowdy teenager situation. Once the codes were assigned, they were verified by a second person and differences were resolved through discussion. The detailed coding scheme allowed us to capture the differences in ideal and actual identity in relation to different audiences, and to examine the relationship of ideal identity with both actual identity and actual behavior.

For officers who reported a discrepancy between ideal and actual identity, the obstacles to achieving ideal identity were organized into 23 categories: laws and policies, complainant's fears of retaliation by the teenagers, unrealistically high expectations, time/personnel limits, teenagers' arrogance or peer pressure, inability of complainant to identify the teenagers, authority and/or the "uniform," complainants see police officers as ineffectual, teenagers see police officers as ineffectual, poor parenting of the teenagers, teenagers "don't care," police officer's gender, police officer's race, police officer's physical build, police officer's age, impatience of the police officer, police officer is too soft/patient, drugs/alcohol, complainants wait too long to call the police, supervisors are never present (to effectively evaluate the situation), the police officer lacks some ability, supervisor's beliefs, and other. Then the data were reexamined and obstacles in relating to each audience were noted by indicating "yes" or "no" for every category.

In an effort to further understand officers' difficulties in acting in accord with their ideal orientations, they were asked about attempts to change police work. Responses to these questions were analyzed to identify general approaches to bringing a preferred perception of policing into line with actual police work. As was done in verifying all coding schemes, the qualitative data were subjected to repeated examination by more than one researcher.

Findings

Variations in Role Identity
The examination of the data revealed five role identity orientations: *Peacekeeper and Problem Solver, Competent Law Enforcer, Authority Figure, Friend or Peer, and Knight in Shining Armour*.

People with the *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* orientation emphasized showing concern for all parties involved in the situation, being fair and expediting negotiations between the parties, and generally resolving any sporadic or ongoing conflicts between teenagers and neighbors.

- I'm able to handle the situation at the time and follow up so it won't continue later. I say that because I'm on foot patrol; if I weren't on foot patrol, I wouldn't say that. Because, in foot patrol you have your own small area, and it is kind of like you are babysitting that area. You keep in touch with [the] same people, can go back and talk again, check before it usually happens.
- I would like my supervisor to picture me as having solved the problem, that is, having quieted the people involved and satisfied the neighbor to the best of my ability and hopefully prevented a reoccurrence, without any type of arrest or negative police enforcement.
- A problem solver, a keeper of the peace.

Officers generally wanted to convey the image of peacekeeper and problem solver to all parties-teens, the supervisor and the complainant.

In describing behavior consistent with the *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* orientation, officers stressed resolutions that would minimize conflict.

- I could have saved time by just making an arrest, but that wouldn't have solved anything. It was talking to the man, to the kids, to the parents-trying to get everybody to see where everybody was coming from.
- I talk to the teenagers, I know big boxes [tape decks] are the in thing, and I used to get into music with my friends too. But you should use earphones because not everybody likes the same music and sound travels faster at night. Tune it down when walking through residential areas. I also talked to the complainants and told them they can talk to the kids, or send them to me-they should take some steps.

Arrest was de-emphasized, and interaction and negotiation were emphasized in the behavior of *Problem Solvers and Peacekeepers.*

The second role identity orientation was the *Competent Law Enforcer*.

- I'll take care of the job, make sure there's some validity to the complaint.... Need to observe and see if there is a violation of the law. Hopefully, the sergeant would know, the boss would know that you would go out and find out what situation exists, and if there is a problem, you will take care of it and the [sergeant] ... won't have to worry that you are going to go out there and just give off a beating....
- I'll be professional, won't cuss out the kids. Handle [the situation] within the realm of the law. Efficient, won't be blasé, won't play fun games.
- I understand the problem. As a police officer I will have to obtain proper evidence to be able to make a case.
- That I understand. That I'm able to communicate and can inform them of what is right according to the law.
- Just because they're teens, doesn't make any difference to me. I'm a by-the-book officer. I believe in the laws. I'm not a threat to them [the teens] personally, but [am] acting as a liaison between the police department and the community.

The officers who wanted to be seen as *Competent Law Enforcers* by their supervisors often also wanted both the teens and the complainant to hold this view. They wanted others to recognize their focus on the law and its correct application.

Officers describing behavior consistent with the *Competent Law Enforcer* orientation emphasized a professional approach to resolving the conflict.

- The kids threw a party and I went to the party and I explained the law to them, and I took a copy of the ordinance, giving alcohol to minors, disturbing the peace-I told them what action I would be taking.
- I normally ask them to turn down their music.... I obtain names, make a report, and it is the end of that type of call. If it continues, the city attorney will have their reports and he, of course, can take action.

In describing behavior consistent with the *Competent Law Enforcer* orientation, officers emphasized that they were doing the job in the manner specified in the job description.

The *Authority Figures* wanted to put forth the image that they had the power in the situation, and thus the juveniles must obey them.

- Very authoritative. Possibly intimidating. This is all I have working for me.
- That we are the authority and we are there to protect property.
- Probably the authority image. Like, I'm there to stop them [the teens] if they do anything wrong.
- Again, there is a position of authority there. I'll listen to what they're [the teens are] going to say, but if I decide that they are going to move on, something will happen.

In some cases, the *Authority Figures* stressed that they were a "fair" authority, even "willing to listen to both sides." But the recurrent message was that the officer wanted it recognized that orders were to be followed, and that if they were not followed, every effort would be made to force the teens to obey.

A number of officers described behavior congruent with the authority orientation:

- I advised them [the teenagers] that they should leave when told, and if necessary we would show them that we were the "baddest gang" in town.

- I just talked to the kids and told them to leave and knock that shit off or I'd handle it in other ways [than politely asking them to leave]. >From the firmness in my voice I'm sure they know I would.

Authority behavior was characterized by the officer's taking control of the situation.

The third image that some officers wanted to convey, like the *Authority Figure*, was also most often directed at the teenagers. This was the image of the *Friend or Peer.*

- I go home at 3:30 every day and watch cartoons. I let them [the teens] understand I'm human with needs. I jog a lot with the kids after work.
- A police officer that they [the teens] could come to and talk to. Not the type of police that always throw 'em up against something or always takes them to jail for every little incident. I'm O.K. They can talk to me. I can come out and talk to them and I persuade them to do certain things. If there is a problem with other groups of kids, come to me first and let me try to handle it before they get into any more problems.... I won't be the kind of person that thinks that just because I have the authority they have to listen to me. I listen to them as well.

As in the last comment that is cited, it was not uncommon for police to describe the *Friend or Peer* as being an alternative to the *Authority Figure.*

Officers exhibiting behavior consistent with the *Friend or Peer* orientation stressed coming across to the teens on their own level.

- [I told them] because they represented their own neighborhood, that they should do what is best for their neighborhood.... I talked to them about my children....
- I found the head honcho, ring leader, and talked to him man to man. I don't want to talk down to him. I explained the situation he was putting me in.

A theme running through descriptions of *Friend or Peer* behavior was the officer's desire to help teenagers.

The fifth and final orientation was that of *Knight in Shining Armour*. Here the emphasis was on the fact that the officer *would* succeed in resolving any problems regardless of the feasibility of doing so.

- I'm there to save the day. "Don't worry, sir, I'll take care of it: I'll talk to the boys and if necessary the parents." [I'm] the perfect public servant because these situations are easy if kids are reasonable. They can call again if the problem recurs.
- Even if it can't [I] want the victim to feel something can be done. They start talking about how things used to be here. Before you know it, you make a friend. When you leave: "Hey, he was the greatest cop there ever was!"

In many cases, empathy with the complainant was a part of the image that the *Knight* wanted to get across to all parties in the situation. Given the unrealistic nature of *Knight* expectations, it is not surprising that no officers indicated predominant *Knight* behavior. However, 12 (20 percent) indicated behavior that was at least somewhat consistent with the *Knight* identity. These officers usually portrayed a "no nonsense" approach with the teens, implying that their delinquent behavior was going to cease, and the officers wanted to get this image across to the complainants in most cases. For example: "We told the complainant we'd talked to them [the teenagers] and they'd promised to keep the noise level down," or "I broke up the teens by advising them to disperse and find someplace else for a ball game and they couldn't throw rocks." Overall, *Knight* behavior was indicated by wanting the complainant to see that police acted effectively to resolve the problem.

As we have described the identity orientations, *Peacekeeper and Problem Solver* is most consistent with the formal objectives of many contemporary community policing programs, including the Flint Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program. A national survey revealed that officers are usually assigned to community policing programs based on their ability to communicate and interact with community residents (Trojanowicz and Harden,

1985:14), and these abilities are evidenced in the self-description given by the *Peacekeeper* and *Problem Solver*. Moreover, as noted in our introduction, foot patrol officers in Flint were to develop positive relationships with teenagers and to solve community problems.

Although the Flint foot patrol officers were expected to follow usual procedures in enforcing the law, a singular emphasis on this aspect of the job would not be consistent with the prescribed role of a foot patrol officer. Nor would a singular emphasis on being an *Authority Figure* or a *Friend or Peer* be consistent.

Subgroup Differences in Ideal Role Identity
Although similar proportions (approximately 55 percent) of both foot and motor patrol officers acknowledged that being a *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* was some part of their ideal orientation, 37 percent of the foot patrol officers, but only 7 percent of the motor patrol officers, gave it as their predominant ideal (Table IA). As indicated by the gamma, the motor patrol officers' preference for the *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* predominant identity was quite strong. Alternatively, nearly all officers included *Competent Law Enforcer* as part of their ideal, but this was the predominant ideal orientation for more of the motor patrol officers (48 percent of the motor patrol versus 27 percent of the foot patrol). The gamma reflects a moderate preference of the motor patrol officers for the *Competent Law Enforcer* orientation. There were no significant differences between patrol types for the remaining three ideal identity orientations, though there was a tendency (p>.05 but --. 10) for foot patrol officers to stress being a Friend and Peer as a part of their role and for the motor patrol officers to stress being a *Knight.*

In some cases officers described a mixture of several ideal orientations, none of them predominant. Six (20 percent) of the foot patrol officers and 8 (28 percent) of the motor patrol officers were in this *Mixed* ideal category. Of these, all but two of the officers, one foot patrol and one motor patrol, included the *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* orientation. Thus, a consideration of the *Mixed* identity category does not alter the conclusion that the foot patrol officers were more likely to consider the *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* orientation to be the predominant desired identity, and the motor patrol officers were more likely to favor the *Competent Law Enforcer* orientation as predominant.

Gender, years on the force, education, and age were unrelated to the ideal identity orientation. However, 77 percent (n=20) of the blacks but only 46 percent (n = 15) of the whites wanted to be seen as a Friend or Peer to at least some degree (X^2=8.0, p<.05).

Subgroup Differences in Actual Role Identity
Foot patrol officers are significantly more likely to feel that they have a predominant *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* role identity, and motor patrol officers are more likely to indicate that this orientation is not part of their actual identity (Table 1B). As with ideal identity orientation, the gamma shows a fairly strong relationship. Specifically, many of the motor patrol officers felt the orientation was a part of their identity (52 percent), but almost all of the foot patrol officers were in this category (90 percent). There was a trend for motor patrol officers to feel they had an *Authority* orientation more often than did the foot patrol officers (76 percent versus 53 percent).

Six (20 percent) of the foot patrol officers and fourteen (48 percent) of the motor patrol officers had mixed actual orientations, and in every case the mixture included the *Competent Law Enforcer* role.

Gender was the only demographic variable that was significantly related to actual role identity. More men had the *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* orientation (25 or 81 percent of the men versus 17 or 61 percent of the women; X^2=6.1; p<.05).

Ideal and Actual Role Identity

Consistent with theory, preferred role identity orientation is significantly related to actual orientation (Table 2), and the gammas indicate a very strong relationship for all but the *Authority* orientation, for which the relationship is moderate. In addition to there being a correspondence between ideal and actual orientations, certain ideal identity orientations seemed to preclude the possibility that an officer would have another of the actual orientations (table not included). For instance, officers who wanted to be viewed as *Authority Figures* were very unlikely to think that they were seen as *Friends or Peers*. However, officers who wanted to be viewed as *Competent Law Enforcers* were not precluded from seeing their actual roles as either *Knight* or *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper.*

Explaining Actual Behavior

As would be expected from findings of identity differences between motor and foot patrol officers, type of patrol is significantly related to officer's actual behavior (Table 3). The gammas show moderate relationships for *Problem Solver* and *Peacekeeper, Peer or Friend,* and *Authority* behaviors. All of the foot patrol officers described their handling of an actual, recent case as predominantly or partly consistent with the *Problem Solver* and *Peacekeeper* orientation, and for 53 percent this was the predominant orientation. A significantly lower but still sizable number of motor patrol officers described behavior consistent with the *Problem Solver* and *Peacekeeper* role, but this was the predominant behavior for only 30 percent. The other statistically significant difference in actual behavior was that more of the foot patrol officers described behavior that was consistent with the *Friend or Peer* orientation (18 or 60 percent versus 6 or 22 percent; X^2= 9.5; p<.05). There also was a trend (p=.08) for motor patrol officers to more often describe behavior reflecting an *Authority* orientation to at least some degree (21 or 78 percent versus 17 or 57 percent; X^2=5. 1; P<.10).

In some cases, behavior orientations were significantly related to each other (table not shown). An *Authority* orientation was commonly found with the *Competent Law Enforcer* orientation, and was unlikely to be found with the *Friend or Peer* behavior orientation.

With one exception, demographic variables were unrelated to behavior orientation (table not shown). Being on the force longer than fifteen years but less than eight was significantly related to *Knight* behavior. The percentage of officers with some *Knight* behavior orientation who were on the force a shorter time was 36 percent (n=4), and the percentage was 45 percent (n=5) for those on the force more than 15 years (X^2=6.8; p<.05). Because only 11 officers behaved as *Knights* to any degree, this finding should be interpreted with caution.

In general, identity orientation was related to actual behavior orientation (Table 4), but the gammas indicate that the relationships were not extremely strong for all but the *Friend or Peer* orientation. Because this finding held whether or not cases considered to be atypical were eliminated from the analysis, behavior in both typical (n = 41) and atypical (n = 18) cases will be included in all further analysis. Officers reporting a *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* or a *Friend or Peer* orientation were more likely than those with other orientations to describe behaviors that were consistent with identity when they recounted a recent case. However, officers with the *Knight*, *Authority*, and *Competent Law Enforcer* identity orientations did not significantly more often describe these orientations in behavior.

Specific Behavior

In describing a recent rowdy teenager case, the officers mentioned eight specific actions that they took: (1) made a referral to social services, (2) counseled the teenagers, (3) counseled the parents, (4) reassured the complainants, (5) tried to get people to empathize with each other and see each others' side, (6) gave orders, (7) made an arrest, and (8) threatened arrest. None of the demographic variables were significantly related to officers' specific actions. However, consistent with the design of the Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program, more

of the foot patrol officers said that they counseled the youth (79 percent versus 26 percent; Table 5), and the gamma indicates that this is a strong tendency.

A number of ideal and actual identity orientations were predictive of specific police behaviors, and the gammas indicate moderate to strong relationships. Counseling the teens was negatively related to the *Authority Figure* identity orientation, and it was positively related to the *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* orientation (Table 6). Similarly, officers with a *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* orientation were twice as likely to counsel the parents (24 percent versus 12 percent).

There were significant differences in ideal and actual identity orientation for officers who did and who did not encourage empathy. Only seven officers mentioned this action, but all of them saw the *Friend or Peer* identity as ideal, and six of the seven felt they had achieved the *Friend or Peer* orientation in dealing with rowdy teenagers.

Interestingly, there was a significant finding that 32 percent of the officers who thought they had a *Knight* orientation, but none of the others, threatened arrest. Officers who idealized the *Knight* orientation to at least some degree were much more likely to mention threatening arrest than others (51 percent versus 10 percent), and this finding was significant.

Fitting the Community Policing Model
Officers are on a continuum for fitting the *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* role identity orientation that would be most consistent with the full implementation of the Flint Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program, or more generally, a community policing model. At the positive extreme, some had this orientation as their desired and actual identity. In the middle, some desired this orientation as at least a part of their role, but they felt that they usually fell short of achieving it. At the negative extreme, some officers had no desire at all to act as a *Problem Solver and peacekeeper*.

Significantly more foot patrol than motor patrol officers did say that they both desired and achieved the *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* orientation, at least as a part of their identity in the context of working with teenagers (87 percent or 26 versus 48 percent or 14). More of the motor than foot patrol officers desired such an orientation, but felt they did not achieve it (14 percent versus 7 percent). Not surprisingly, a greater proportion of the motor patrol officers did not want this orientation (38 percent versus 7 percent). These differences were statistically significant ($X^2 = 10.5$; p<.01).

Age was the only other variable that was significantly related to the officer's fit with the community policing model ($X^2 = 7.7$; p<.05). Officers over 35 were more likely than younger officers to fully fit the orientation (88 percent or 21 versus 52 percent or 15), they were less likely to feel that they did not fit this orientation when it was desired (4 percent or 1 versus 14 percent or 4), and they were less likely to feel that the orientation was undesirable in the first place (8 percent or 2 versus 34 percent or 10).

Turning now to obstacles that might explain why officers did not fit the desired *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* role identity orientation, our analysis revealed very few of the obstacles identified by the officers to be significantly more common for those who did and who did not feel they actualized and behaved in accordance with their preferred role identity. When the relationships were significant, the gammas indicated weak to moderate relationships. Officers who desired and achieved a *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* identity were less likely to identify laws and policies as problem areas. They also tended not to have difficulty identifying the teens, and they less often reported that the teens viewed them as ineffectual (Table 7A). Taken together, for officers who want to act as a *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper,* a sense that this role identity is achieved seems to result from a perceived lack of legal and policy constraints and the quality of relationships with the teens.

Insofar as obstacles being related to a disjuncture between desiring a *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* role and describing behavior that is consistent with that orientation is concerned, most of the foot patrol officers preferred the role and had consistent behavior, but only about half of the motor patrol officers did. Officers who wanted to be *Problem Solvers and Peacekeepers* but did not describe behavior consistent with that orientation were more likely to find laws and policies a constraint, and more often mentioned the teens not caring as a problem than did those officers who preferred this role and had consistent behavior (Table 7B). Again, the *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* orientation was translated into actual behavior when laws and policies were not perceived as obstacles and when relations with teens were positive.

Overcoming Obstacles to Achieving Desired Role Identity

As part of the interview, subjects were asked if they had ever tried to change police work, and if yes, how they went about it. The most common response was that the officer had requested to be a foot patrol officer (12 or 40 percent of the foot patrol officers). Racial and gender subgroups were equally likely to give this response.

The foot patrol officers described three types of difficulties that their transfer helped them to overcome: (1) It allowed them more time to deal with people, (2) it allowed a preventive or proactive approach to crime fighting instead of a reactive approach, and (3) it provided a chance to really help people. Eight (67 percent), 6 (50 percent), and 3 (25 percent) of the officers gave these three reasons, respectively.

Motor patrol officers differed sharply from those on foot patrol, for they expressed a sense of futility in being able to change anything:

- Police departments are basically military in style. The only changes come from the top and all the communication is downward.
- I'm a realist. I know that I'm never going to fight the system and I'll go along with it.... I'm not going to change the system.
- I am in no situation of authority or of being able to command anybody to come over to one particular position.
- Police officers are overworked and can't do police work any more. [They] have to be reactive rather than proactive.

The motor patrol officers consistently brought up the lack of agreement with department rules and organization:

- We come off appearing like the Key Stone Cops [due to the poor organization and department rules].
- I can't change the way rules and regulations are. I just try stuff on my own.
- The calls that have nothing to do with legal action, you're just running around in circles.... The change has to be in department policies and what type of calls you will respond to.

Eleven (38 percent) of the motor patrol officers brought up organization and/or policies as problems. It appears that one effect of foot patrol is to legitimize and place value on police work that is more related to order maintenance than to crime control; and because all officers must respond to calls that require order maintenance, the foot patrol officers are more satisfied with their occupational identity.

Discussion and Conclusion

The study findings confirm that foot patrol officers' role identity orientations differ from the orientations of motor patrol officers, and that these differences are apparent in work with teenagers. As would be expected from theories of role identity, the police officers described complex orientations towards different audiences, and these orientations often combined more than one image of the self. Thus, the foot patrol officers' tendency to favor the *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* orientation was more a matter of emphasis than an absolute difference from motor patrol officers. Many of the motor patrol officers also felt that they acted as *Problem*

Solver and Peacekeeper but in comparison to foot patrol officers, this was less often their objective in policing, and it was less often reflected in their behavior.

Our finding is complemented by similar results from prior research on the Flint Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program. In a comparison of Flint motor and foot patrol officers during the first three years of the program, Trojanowicz (1982:36, 37, 38) found:

- Foot patrol officers more often felt that they improved police community relations.
- Foot patrol officers more often valued providing counsel and reassurance to residents, felt an increasing focus on accountability to the community instead of peers, and valued the protection of special classes of residents.
- Motor patrol officers more often valued aloofness or professional detachment.
- At the peak of the program, when foot patrol officers worked in relatively small districts, they placed more emphasis on helping victims and preventing crime.

Trojanowicz's findings are based on research using a different theoretical framework, methodology, comparison group, and time than did the present study, yet he also found differences in foot and motor patrol officers' desired and achieved roles.

In addition to replicating prior research results, the present study may explain the prior finding that foot patrol officers experience more job satisfaction than do motor patrol officers (Trojanowicz and Banas, 1985:11). Trojanowicz and Banas (1985: 1) described the issues surrounding job satisfaction:

> ... job satisfaction is not "clear cut" because police officers are often subject to conflicting, and sometimes contradictory, mandates which inhibit job satisfaction.

We have found, though, that on foot patrol there is less conflict between who an officer wants to be on the job and how that officer thinks she or he is seen by the various audiences in the job setting.

Although there is evidence that the Flint Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program provides a setting in which a community policing model is implemented by individual officers, there is some question about the degree of implementation and the reasons for implementation failure. First, despite the finding that foot patrol officers had generally different behavior in the rowdy teenager situation, the only specific outcome difference was that they more often counseled the teenager. They were just as likely as the motor patrol officers to threaten or make an arrest, and they were equally unlikely to make a referral to another agency. It would be useful to more fully explore the appropriateness of arrest and referral decisions to determine whether they are used by foot patrol in a way that is consistent with the program objectives.

Second, it is not known why the foot patrol officers exhibit a different role identity orientation than do the motor patrol officers. The difference may result from the process used to select officers for foot patrol, the training that foot patrol officers receive, or the ongoing supervision and peer interaction. Successful replications of the community policing approach would require a full understanding of how officers develop a certain orientation.

Third, and related to the issue of the development of alternative orientations, it is possible that foot patrol works to legitimize the *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* approach that all types of officers use in their daily interactions. By giving officers the resources of time and training, the foot patrol program might allow for a redefinition of valid police work to bring it more in line with the actual demands of the job. This dynamic would account for the increased job satisfaction of foot patrol officers.

Fourth, our efforts to discover the obstacles to enacting a *Problem Solver and Peacekeeper* role orientation were not particularly fruitful. In most cases, officers who worked in a way that was consistent with the community policing ideal described the same hindrances to accomplishing their work as did others. The only exceptions

were in the areas of laws and policies and relationships with teenagers, where the officers who acted as community police saw fewer problems. It seems that the foot patrol program provides policies and the opportunity to develop positive relationships with teenagers that enable officers to meet the community policing objectives.

Finally, by focusing on role identity and obstacles to achieving a desired role identity orientation, we do not want to imply that such things as offender characteristics, victim preference, department policies, and the immediate circumstances of the police-citizen encounter are not important in explaining police behavior. In fact, such factors are the likely influences that result in the relatively low gamma values for the relationships between ideal identity and actual behavior orientations. Yet, role identity orientation and the related department preference in defining the role of the police officer do have some explanatory value; and they should be considered in future research (the same recommendation is made by Smith and Klein, 1984).

It is of some interest that police officer gender, race, education, and years on the police force-which have frequently been included in research to explain police behavior-were not predictive of identity orientation or behavior. This is unexpected in light of theoretical work that identifies race and gender as salient identities that will permeate and affect occupational role orientations. Again, it is not known whether the process of selection into police work or police training and socialization account for the apparent unimportance of gender and race, or whether identity characteristics of different racial and gender groups are irrelevant to the police role orientations. Whatever the reason, such demographic characteristics were not important in explaining police identity or behavior.

In conclusion, the present research has provided evidence that the Flint Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program is implemented as intended by the line staff, for they have a different role identity orientation and exhibit different behavior than the motor patrol officers. These differences persist regardless of gender and race, and they seem to be supported by the policies of the community policing program and the opportunity for police to develop relationships with teenagers. Moreover, the research suggests that the role identity orientation is a useful concept in explaining police behavior, and prior neglect of this variable in research on police is not justified on empirical grounds.

Appendix

TABLE 1
Predominant Ideal Role Identity and Actual Role Identity by Type of Patrol

	Foot Patrol			Motor Patrol			N	Gamma	X^2
	No	Some	Predominant	No	Some	Predominant			
(n=15)		59		12.5*					
69.0%	06.9%		-.75						
(n=20)	(n=2)	59	.31	5.9*					
48.2%			.43						
48.3%	(n=14)	59	-.26	2.4					
(n=14)	03.4%		.30						
58.6%	(n=1)	59		2.9					
(n=17)	03.4%		-.79						
58.6%	(n=1)	59	0.00	2.5					
(n=17)	06.9%		.41						
37.9%	(n=2)		-.41						

13

(n=11)	03.4% (n=1)	59	.50	14.8*
69.0% (n=20)	27.6% (n=8)	59		0.2
	03.4% (n=1)	58		3.1
	0.0% (n=0)	59		4.2
	06.9% (n=2)	59		4.8

*p<.05

TABLE 2
Ideal Role Identity by Actual Role Identity

	No	Some	Predom-inant	N	Gamma	X^2
Ideal Problem Solver/ Peacekeeper	*Actual Problem Solver/ Peacekeeper*					
No	84.6% (n=11)	15.4% (n=2)	0.0% (n=0)			
Some	18.2% (n=6)	78.8% (n=26)	03.0% (n=1)			
Predominant	0.0% (n=0)	23.1% (n=3)	76.9% (n=10)	59	0.96	59.4*
Ideal Competent Law Enforcer	*Actual Competent Law Enforcer*					
No	100.0% (n=2)	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)			
Some	17.1% (n=6)	80.0% (n=28)	02.9% (n=1)		0.90	
Predominant	04.5% (n=1)	22.7% (n=5)	72.7% (n=16)	59		43.7*
Ideal Knight	*Actual Knight*					
No	100% (n=12)	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)			
Some	35.6% (n=16)	64.4% (n=29)	0.0% (n=0)		1.00	
Predominant	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)	100.0% (n=1)	58		74.0*
Ideal Friend/Peer	*Actual Friend/Peer*					
No	100.0% (n=24)	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)		0.94	
Some	20.7% (n=6)	79.3% (n=23)	0.0% (n=0)			
Predominant	16.7% (n=1)	33.3% (n=2)	50.0% (n=3)	59		63.5*
Ideal Authority	*Actual Authority*				0.68	
	70.6% (n=12)	29.4% (n=5)	0.0% (n=0)			

14

No	20.0% (n=8)	75.0% (n=30)	5.0% (n=2)		
Some	50.0% (n=0)	50.0% (n=2)	0.0% (n=0)		
Predominant				59	13.8*

*p<.01

TABLE 3
Actual Behavior Orientation by Type of Patrol

Actual Behavior	Foot Patrol No	Some	Predominant	Motor Patrol No	Yes	Predominant	N	Gamma	X^2
Problem Solver/Peacekeeper	0.0% (n=0)	46.7% (n=14)	53.3% (n=16)	14.8% (n=4)	55.6% (n=15)	29.6% (n=8)	57		6.6*
Competent Law Enforcer	26.7% (n=8)	63.3% (n=19)	10.0% (n=3)	22.2% (n=6)	59.3% (n=16)	18.5% (n=5)	57	-.53	0.9
Knight	73.3% (n=22)	26.7% (n=8)	0.0% (n=0)	81.5% (n=22)	18.5% (n=5)	0.0% (n=0)	57	.19 -.23	0.2
Friend/Peer	40.0% (n=12)	53.3% (n=16)	6.7% (n=2)	77.8% (n=21)	14.8% (n=4)	07.4% (n=2)	57	-.58 .50	9.5*
Authority	43.3% (n=13)	53.3% (n=16)	03.3% (n=1)	22.2% (n=6)	59.3% (n=16)	18.5% (n=5)	57		5.1**

*p<.10
**.05<p<.10

TABLE 4
Actual Behavior Orientation by Ideal Role Identity and Actual Role Identity

Actual Behavior	Ideal Identity None	Some	Predom-inant	N	Gamma	X^2	Actual Identity None	Some	Predom-inant	N	Gamma	X^2
Problem/Solver Peacekeeper *None*	75.0% (n=3)	25.0% (n=1)	0.0% (n=0)				100.0% (n=4)	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)			
Some	17.2% (n=5)	69.0% (n=20)	13.8% (n=4)	57	.42	11.9*	20.7% (n=6)	69.0% (n=20)	10.3% (n=3)		.38	16.6*
Predominant	20.8% (n=5)	41.7% (n=10)	37.5% (n=9)				29.2% (n=7)	37.5% (n=9)	33.3% (n=8)	57		
Competent Law Enforcer *None*	7.1% (n=1)	64.3% (n=9)	28.6% (n=4)				28.6% (n=4)	42.9% (n=6)	28.6% (n=4)			
	2.9% (n=1)	68.6% (n=24)	28.6% (n=10)				11.4% (n=4)	68.6% (n=24)	20.0% (n=7)			
Some	0.0% (n=0)	25.0% (n=2)	75.0% (n=6)	57	.42	7.1	12.5% (n=1)	25.0% (n=2)	62.5% (n=5)		.30	8.9
	20.5% (n=9)	77.3% (n=34)	2.3% (n=1)				53.5% (n=23)	44.2% (n=19)	2.3% (n=1)	57		

15

	Foot Patrol			N	Gamma	X²	Motor Patrol			N	Gamma	X²
Predominant	23.1% (n=3)	76.9% (n=10)	0.0% (n=0)				38.5% (n=5)	61.5% (n=8)	0.0% (n=0)			
Knight **None**	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)				0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)	0.0% (n=0)		.26	1.4
Some	57.6% (n=19)	33.3% (n=11)	9.1% (n=3)	57	-.12	0.3	72.7% (n=24)	27.3% (n=9)	0.0% (n=0)			
Predominant	25.0% (n=5)	70.0% (n=14)	5.0% (n=1)	56			35.0% (n=7)	60.0% (n=12)	5.0% (n=1)	56		
Friend/Peer **None**	0.0% (n=0)	50.0% (n=2)	50.0% (n=2)	57	.57	15.1*	0.0% (n=0)	50.0% (n=2)	50.0% (n=2)		.76	26.0*
Some	31.6% (n=6)	63.2% (n=12)	5.3% (n=1)				47.4% (n=9)	52.6% (n=10)	0.0% (n=0)			
Predominant	31.3% (n=10)	65.6% (n=21)	3.1% (n=1)				31.3% (n=10)	65.6% (n=21)	3.1% (n=1)			
Predominant	0.0% (n=0)	100.0% (n=6)	0.0% (n=0)	57			16.7% (n=1)	66.7% (n=4)	16.7% (n=1)	57		
Authority **None**				57	.19	3.3					.42	5.5
Some												
Predominant										57		

*p<.05

TABLE 5
Specific Actions By Type of Patrol

Specific Actions	Foot Patrol		Motor Patrol		N	Gamma	X²
	No	Yes	No	Yes			
Refer to Social Services	92.9% (n=26)	07.1% (n=2)	100.0% (n=27)	0.0% (n=0)	55	-1.00	0.5
Counseled Teen	21.4% (n=6)	78.6% (n=22)	74.1% (n=20)	25.9% (n=7)	55	-.83	13.2*
Counseled Parents	71.4% (n=20)	28.6% (n=8)	88.9% (n=24)	11.1% (n=3)	55	-.52	1.64
Reassured Victim	85.7% (n=24)	14.3% (n=4)	77.8% (n=21)	22.2% (n=6)	55	.26	0.2
Encouraged Empathy	85.7% (n=24)	14.3% (n=4)	88.9% (n=24)	11.1% (n=3)	55	-.14	0.0
Gave Orders	57.1% (n=16)	42.9% (n=12)	44.4% (n=12)	55.6% (n=15)	55	.25	0.4
Made Arrest	82.1% (n=23)	17.9% (n=5)	81.5% (n=22)	18.5% (n=5)	55	.02	0.0
Threatened Arrest	57.1% (n=16)	42.9% (n=12)	55.6% (n=15)	44.4% (n=12)	55	.03	0.0

*p<.01

TABLE 6
Significant Relationships Between Role Identity Orientations and Specific Actions

	No	Yes	N	Gamma	X²
Actual Friend/Peer	Encouraged	Empathy			
No	100.0% (n=23)	0.0% (n=0)			
Some	74.1% (n=20)	25.9% (n=7)			
Predominant	100.0% (n=5)	0.0% (n=0)	55	.64	8.3*
Ideal Knight	Threatened	Arrest			
No	90.0% (n=9)	10.0% (n=1)			
Some	50.0% (n=22)	50.0% (n=22)			
Predominant	0.0% (n=0)	100.0% (n=1)	55	.82	6.6*
Actual Problem Solver/Peacekeeper	Counseled	Teens			
No	70.6% (n=12)	29.4 (n=5)			
Some	42.9% (n=12)	57.1% (n=16)			
Predominant	20.0% (n=2)	80.0% (n=8)	55	.58	6.9*
Actual Problem Solver/Peacekeeper	Counseled	Parents			
No	88.2% (n=15)	11.8% (n=2)			
Some	85.7% (n=24)	14.3% (n=4)			
Predominant	50.0% (n=5)	50.0% (n=5)	55	.53	6.9*
Actual/Authority	Counseled	Teens			
No	21.1% (n=4)	78.9% (n=15)			
Some	58.8% (n=20)	41.2% (n=14)			
Predominant	100.0% (n=2)	0.0% (n=0)	55	-.73	9.3*

*p<.05

TABLE 7
Selected Relationships Between Degree of Fit With a Community Policing Model and Perceived Obstacles[a]

A. Ideal and Actual Role Identity Consistent with Community Policing.

Obstacles	Ideal & Actual	Ideal Only	Neither	N	Gamma	X^2
Law and Policies Yes	22.5% (n=9)	16.7% (n=1)	53.8% (n=7)			
No	77.5% (n=31)	83.3% (n=5)	46.2% (n=6)	59	.46	5.2**
Cannot Identify Teens Yes	7.5% (n=3)	40.0% (n=2)	0.0% (n=0)			
No	92.5% (n=37	60.0% (n=3)	100.0% (n=13)	58	0.00	7.5*
Teens See Police as Ineffectual Yes	7.5% (n=3)	16.7% (n=1)	30.8% (n=4)			
No	92.5% (n=37)	83.3% (n=5)	69.2% (n=9)	59	.60	4.6**

B. Ideal Role Identity and Behavior Consistent with Community Policing.

Obstacles	Ideal & Behavior	Ideal Only	Neither	N	Gamma	X^2
Law and Policies Yes	20.9% (n=9)	33.3% (n=1)	53.8% (n=7)			
No	79.1% (n=34)	66.7% (n=2)	46.2% (n=6)	59	.57	5.3**
Teens Don't Care Yes	16.3% (n=7)	66.7% (n=2)	15.4% (n=2)			
No	83.7% (n=36)	33.3% (n=1)	84.6% (n=11)	59	.16	4.8**

[a]Only tables where p<.10 are included
*p<.05
**.05>p<.10

___

Notes

[1]The authors would like to thank Mahendra Singh and Florence Ferguson for contributions during the early stages of this research.
[2]One additional conceptual issue that we would like to clarify pertains to the relationship of our research to the many typologies of police style that have been developed (Coates, 1972; Muir, 1977; Wilson, 1968; White,

1972; O'Neill, 1974; Broderick, 1977). These typologies attempt to summarize a constellation of police behaviors and attitudes that pervade in officer's interactions across many different law enforcement situations. We are not addressing the same issue, for our research describes common views of the self in a specific law enforcement situation. It would not be consistent with our theoretical framework to expect officers to have a stable, typical style, for we assume that officers act in relation to the immediate audiences and circumstances, both of which change. A typology of police style describes global differences within and between police departments, but cannot predict the consistent behavior and attitudes of an officer across work situations. This latter conclusion is born out by Hochstedler's (1981) finding that officers could not be empirically categorized as the types developed by the several available typologies. Thus, although there may be similarities in the types of policing identified in prior research and role identity orientations that we identify, it is important to keep in mind that different conceptual schemes are involved. Put another way, it is possible that department style of policing will influence individual role identity as a police officer, but this is not necessarily the case for all officers in all policing situations.

Bibliography

1. Bardach, E. 1977. The Implementation Game. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
2. Black, D. J. 1971. "The social organization of arrest." Stanford Law Review 23 (June):1087-1111.
3. Black, D. 1980. The Manners and Customs of the Police. New York: Academic Press.
4. Brintnall, M. A. 1979. "Federal influence and urban policy entrepreneurship in the local prosecution of economic crime." Policy Studies Journal 7 (Spring):577-592.
5. Broderick, J. J. 1977. Police in a Time of Change. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
6. Burke, P. J. and J. C. Tulley. 1977. "The measurement of role identity."Social Forces 55, 4 (June):881-897.
7. Burke, P. J. and D. C. Reitzes. 1981. "The link between identity and role performance." Social Psychology Quarterly 44 (2):83-92.
8. Coates, R. B. 1972. The Dimensions of Police-Citizen Interaction: A Social Psychological Analysis. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland.
9. Ellickson, P., J. Petersilia, M. Caggiano and S. Polin. 1983. Implementing New Ideas in Criminal Justice. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
10. Goldstein, H. 1977. Policing in a Free Society. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.
11. Hochstedler, E. 1981. "Testing types: a review and test of police types."Journal of Criminal Justice 9:451-466.
12. Klein, M. W. 1979. "Deinstitutionalization and diversion of juvenile offenders: a litany of impediments," pp. 145-202 in N. Morris and M. Tonry(eds.), Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
13. Lermack, P. 1977. "Hookers, judges, and bail forfeiters: the importance of internally generated demands on policy implementation institutions." Administration and Society 8 (February):459-468.
14. McCall, G. J. and J. J. Simmons. 1966. Identities and Interactions. New York: The Free Press.
15. Moore, M. H. 1978. "Reorganization plan #2 reviewed: problems in implementing a strategy to reduce the supply of drugs to illicit markets in the United States." Public Policy 26 (Spring):229-262.
16. Morash, M., ed. 1982. Implementing Criminal Justice Policies. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
17. Morash, M., J. Belknap, R. C. Trojanowicz and M. Singh. 1984. "Gender differences in policing: preliminary findings." A paper presented at the Annual Meetings of the American Society of Criminology, November, 1984, Cincinnati, Ohio.
18. Muir, W. K., Jr. 1977. Police: Streetcorner Politicians. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
19. Musheno, M., D. Palumbo and J. Levine. 1976. "Evaluating alternatives in criminal justice: a policy-impact model." Crime and Delinquency 22 (July):265-283.
20. O'Neill, M. W. 1974. The Role of the Police Normative Role Expectations in a Metropolitan Police Department. Ph.D. dissertation, State University of New York at Albany.
21. Reitzes, D. C. 1980. "College student identities and behaviors." Sociological Focus 13 (April): 113 -124.

22. Scheirer, M. A. 1981. Program Implementation. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
23. Sherman, L. W. 1980. "Causes of police behavior: the current state of quantitative research." Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency 17:69- 100.
24. Smith, D. A. and C. A. Vishner. 1981. "Street-level justice: situational determinants of police arrest decisions." Social Problems 29, 2 (December):167-177.
25. Smith, D. A. and J. R. Klein. 1984. "Police control of interpersonal disputes." Social Problems 31 (April):468-481.
26. Trojanowicz, R. C. and D. W. Banas. 1985. Job Satisfaction: A Comparison of Foot Patrol Versus Motor Patrol Officers. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
27. Trojanowicz, R. C. and H. A. Harden. 1985. The Status of Contemporary Community Policing Programs. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
28. Trojanowicz, R. C. and P. R. Smyth. 1983. "The foot patrol officer, the community and the school." Community Education Journal II (October):18-19.
29. Trojanowicz, R. C. et al. 1982. An Evaluation of the Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program in Flint, Michigan. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University.
30. Turner, R. 1978. "The role and the person." American Journal of Sociology 84:1-23.
31. White, S. 0. 1972. "A perspective in police professionalizations." Law and Society Review 7 (1):61-85.
32. Wice, P. B. 1974. Freedom for Sale: A National Study of Pretrial Release. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.
33. Williams, W. 1981. Implementation Issues. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
34. Wilson, J. Q. 1968. Varieties in Police Behavior. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
35. Worden, R. E. and A. A. Pollitz. 1984. "Police arrests in domestic disturbances: a further look." Law and Society Review 18 (No. 1): 105-119.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR COMMUNITY POLICING

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 Status of Contemporary Community Policing Programs
The Impact of Foot Patrol on Black and White Perceptions of Policing
Uniform Crime Reporting and Community Policing: An Historical Perspective
Performance Profiles of Foot Versus Motor Officers
Community Policing: A Taxpayer's Perspective
Implementing a Community Policing Model for Work with Juveniles: An Exploratory Study
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

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

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