This book is dedicated to the memory of

Robert C. Trojanowicz

who touched all of our lives with his vision of
community policing and his deeply appreciated
assistance to police and service agencies
around the world

THE
CHALLENGE OF
COMMUNITY POLICING

◆

Testing
the
Promises

Dennis P. Rosenbaum

EDITOR

For information address:

Contents

Research Synthesis and Policy Implications

MARK H. MOORE

SOMETHING IS CLEARLY AFOOT in the field of policing. Throughout the country (even the world), police executives are committing their organizations to something called "community" or "problem-solving" policing (Kelling, 1988). Indeed, popular enthusiasm for these ideas is so great that in a few cases in which police executives have been slow to embrace them, communities have forced the ideas upon them.

Predictably, rhetorical commitments to these ideas have outpaced the concrete achievements. Still, as one looks across the country, one finds many examples of departments that have introduced important new operational programs and administrative systems that are consistent with the spirit of the wider reforms (and are often the important first steps in changing the operational philosophy of an entire department). As Eck and Rosenbaum observe, "Community policing has become the new orthodoxy for cops"; and "community policing is the only form of policing available for anyone who seeks to improve police operations, management, or relations with the public" (Chapter 1, this volume).

The Community Policing Movement

It is not hard to understand the attraction of the new ideas about policing. They seem to recognize and respond to what have come to be seen as the limitations of the "reform model" of policing: its predominantly reactive stance toward crime control; its nearly exclusive reliance on arrests as a means of reducing crime and controlling disorder; its inability to develop and sustain close working relationships

h the community in controlling crime; and its stifling and ultimately unsuc-
sful methods of bureaucratic control (Sparrow, Moore, & Kennedy, 1990).
n contrast, the new ideas point to a new set of possibilities: the potential for
ne prevention as well as crime control; creative problem solving as an
rnative to arrest; the importance of customer service and community respon-
eness as devices for building stronger relations with local communities; and
mmissioning" street-level officers to initiate community problem-solving
orts (Sparrow et al., 1990). To many, these ideas seem more likely to
eliorate the wide variety of crime and disorder problems that are now tearing
 heart out of America's communities.
Yet beneath the enthusiasm for this wave of reform is an undercurrent of doubt
1 concern. Those influential in shaping decisions about how to police cities—
 "Big Five" alluded to by Robert Trojanowicz (the police, the community,
itical leaders, social agencies, and the media)—still hesitate to commit to the
v forms of policing (Chapter 15, this volume). They worry that the new ideas
rifice important aspects of policing's traditions (including its predominant
us on crime control and the achievement of high levels of performance in
ditional police functions such as patrol, rapid response, and criminal investi-
ion), and do so for quite uncertain gains in other less important and less
ostantial dimensions (such as fear reduction or improved community rela-
ns). They worry that policing is heading "back to the future" and that some
the important gains that the police have made in becoming less corrupt and
re professional in their key law enforcement roles will be lost.
Academic experts (who might be expected to be more consistently enthusias-
 about the reform movement) also express concerns (Bayley, 1988; Greene &
1strofski, 1988). Many of them worry that the ideas are nothing more than
pty rhetoric, embraced by police executives to curry favor with the public and
feat rather than enhance public accountability (Klockars, 1988). They also
rry that the ideas are too vague to be tested either logically or empirically and
nsequently that the welfare of America's communities is being imperiled by
 wholesale embrace of untested ideas. Finally, they worry that when properly
derstood, the ideas associated with community and problem-solving policing
uld not be implemented successfully in today's police organizations, for they
re founded and have long operated on wholly different premises.
The reason for the hesitation, of course, is that we do not know whether
mmunity policing "works." Nor do we know whether it is possible to imple-
nt community policing in the form in which it works. Indeed, it remains at
nt somewhat uncertain what community policing is and what a proper test of
ist performance would be! Until these uncertainties can be cleared up, prudence
unsels a hedged rather than whole-hearted commitment to the new ideas. As
berg (Chapter 14, this volume) observes:

Due to the potential harmful effects of misguided efforts, either intentional or unin-
tentional, community policing should be supported only *if* it is properly *defined, im-
plemented,* and *evaluated* (preferably by outside sources).

The Challenge to Police Researchers

Obviously, this situation presents a golden opportunity for police researchers.
Society needs to know whether the new directions in which police agencies are
now moving are valuable or not. In principle, police researchers are well
positioned to provide the answers.

Yet the situation holds a dangerous temptation for police researchers as well
as an important opportunity. The temptation is that the researchers will try too
early to give a definitive answer to the key question of whether community
policing "works." Alternatively, researchers might try to "rationalize" the untidy
developments now occurring in the field, and bring them under some form of
central control designed to ensure that the one best form of community policing
is tested and implemented. In doing so, there is a real risk that the search for
better ways to police America's communities might be aborted or crippled.

As the chapters of this book indicate, the concept of community policing is a
complex one. At the moment, it is more a set of challenging, general ideas
pointing to new frontiers to explore than it is an operational and administrative
blueprint for a newly-designed police department. Yet these general ideas seem
to be challenging and inspiring the field. As a result, the field is experimenting
(more or less formally) with a wide variety of particular operational and admin-
istrative ideas that might fill the void between the big, abstract, rhetorical ideas
on one hand and the concrete operations of police departments and the street-
level behavior of individual officers on the other.

Arguably, it is important both to society and to the police field that the current
binge of innovation be allowed to go forward without too much regulation. Such an
approach would ensure both the most intensive use of the field's own imagination
and experience, and the widest possible search for interesting operational and
administrative ideas. It would also ensure that the police field would continue to
"own" and feel responsible for the developments that are now occurring.

The danger associated with too heavy-handed a research intervention is that
by trying to learn too quickly and too systematically, society could actually
shrink its capacity to learn what works. In trying to answer the question of
whether community policing works before society and the field have had ample
opportunity to explore the possibilities of the complex idea, we might unwit-
tingly stop the prospecting just before we found gold. Similarly, in trying to
channel the natural experiments now occurring into a few, well-structured
experiments designed to test a small number of specific operational programs or
administrative systems that are arbitrarily defined as the "essence" of commu-
nity policing, the prospecting might be limited to areas where the real gold
cannot be found. In short, by trying to act as the arbiter of the reform movement,
the research community might end up killing it altogether.

The alternative, as Weisburd (Chapter 18, this volume) suggests, is for the
police research community to play a quite different role: to play the role of
commentator rather than arbiter. In this role, their job would not be to reach an

·ly conclusion about whether community policing works or to seize control
the direction of experimentation. Instead, it would be to keep taking stock of
velopments in the field.

As commentators, the police researchers would keep asking questions de-
;ned to clarify the concept of community policing and to unearth the particular
;umptions that were being made in establishing the plausible value of the new
proach. They would report the results of experiments undertaken by the field,
se that were observed both through the apparatus of the relatively formal
·thods of program evaluation, and through the more informal methods asso-
ted with case studies. The findings from such studies would be accumulated
they became available, and used to influence judgments about the meaning,
lue, and feasibility of community policing. But these reports would reflect the
derstanding that definitive results on the success of community policing
uld probably take a decade—perhaps a generation—to produce.

Through such work, society will ultimately learn what it needs to know about
: developments now occurring in policing. The complex idea of community
licing will gradually become clearer and the relationships among its constitu-
t parts better understood, both theoretically and empirically. We will know
tter than we do now whether the complex ideas fit together into a coherent
1ole and whether the coherent whole works to achieve goals and objectives
it society judges to be important and useful. And we will learn how hard it is
implement these ideas in the context of today's police organizations.

Yet all this will happen at a pace that allows the important experimentation
d innovation now occurring within the field to carry on at its current rapid
ce. And, most importantly, the professional field will continue to own the
velopments now taking place. Just as it took us a generation to develop and
derstand simultaneously the strengths and limitations of "professional polic-
3," it may well take us a generation to develop and understand simultaneously
: strengths and limitations of "community policing."

1e Book as a Commentary on Community Policing

I am happy to say that this book represents an important example of police
searchers, taking the role of commentator rather than arbiter of the develop-
ents now occurring in the police world. It is an extremely useful series of
apters on community policing. Inevitably, its coverage is a bit spotty—reflect-
g the uneven development of knowledge and experience in the field. Some
portant questions about community policing get some answers, but they are
it definitive (e.g., the effects of community policing programs on such meas-
es as community satisfaction with the police, fear reduction, crime prevention,
d officer satisfaction). Perhaps as important, some new questions get raised
articularly about the justifications and difficulties associated with involving
mmunities in problem definitions and solutions).

Inevitably, by reading these chapters one's judgment about whether the big
bet that is now being made on community policing is justified or not is influ-
enced. Like an investor reading an analyst's reports, one gains more or less
confidence in the enterprise in which one has invested. Somewhat unexpectedly,
I came away from reading these chapters a little more optimistic than I was
before I read them.

Yet the far more important contribution of the chapters in this book is that
they inform society and the field of policing about what is now known or
suspected and what important questions we should be asking about the develop-
ing concept of community policing. It is in this way that these chapters help light
the way forward—not necessarily to the effective implementation of a particular
concept called community policing, but to better ideas about how to police our
cities, which were initially suggested by the concept of community policing.

Let me set out in more detail what I think these studies and essays tell us about:
(a) the concept of community policing; (b) the effectiveness of community
policing; and (c) the feasibility of community policing. I will also take the liberty
of concluding with some observations on what might usefully be done simulta-
neously to accelerate the development of community policing, learn from the
accumulating experience what works and what does not, and determine the role
that police researchers could usefully play in that effort.

Developing the Concept of Community Policing

A theme that runs through these essays and reports is continuing frustration
with the problem of how to define community policing. On one hand, the writers
seem frustrated—even a bit indignant—that the idea cannot be encapsulated in
a few, well-defined operational programs or administrative systems. The con-
cept seems to encompass a wide variety of programs and managerial systems,
with no particular priority given to the individual elements.

On the other hand, the authors are also able to define community policing in
terms of a small number of fairly abstract ideas that differ importantly from the
way that policing is now being done. Bayley (Chapter 19, this volume), for
example, defines community policing in terms of four elements: consultation,
adaptation, mobilization, and problem solving.

The Utility of Ambiguity

So, it's clear that there is something to the concept. Yet it is also true that the
concept is susceptible to multiple interpretations. This may be frustrating to
those who want to work with simple concepts. But it is not at all clear that the

mbiguity of the concept is preventing it from doing useful work in stimulating
nportant innovations in the field of policing. Indeed, as Skogan (Chapter 9, this
olume) observes:

> Community policing is not a clear-cut concept, for it involves reforming decision-
> making processes and creating new cultures within police departments rather than
> being a specific tactical plan. . . . Under the rubric of community policing, American
> departments are opening small neighborhood substations, conducting surveys to
> identify local problems, organizing meetings and crime prevention seminars, pub-
> lishing newsletters, helping form neighborhood watch groups, establishing advisory
> panels to inform police commanders, organizing youth activities, conducting drug
> education projects and media campaigns, patrolling on horses and bicycles, and
> working with municipal agencies to enforce health and safety regulations.

In short, it is partly the ambiguity of the concept that is stimulating the wide
attern of experimentation we are observing. In this sense, it is important that the
oncept mean something, but not something too specific. The ambiguity is a virtue.

Operational Program, Management Style, or Overall Philosophy?

A second key issue in defining community policing is whether the concept
efers to: (a) a particular kind or set of operational programs; (b) a particular
ind or set of administrative reforms in the police department; or (c) an overall
hilosophy, or strategy, or style of policing that is meant to change the entire
epartment's operations.

Of course, there is an important relationship among these different elements.
'ommunity policing may have begun as a set of new operational programs: for
istance, the increased use of foot patrols, the development of mini police stations,
urveys of citizens to find out what problems concerned them, increased attention
o victims of crime, and so forth. Yet, to launch these efforts it was often necessary
o make important administrative changes in the department: Special units were
reated, patrol schedules were rearranged, and personnel systems were adjusted to
eflect the priority that was now being given to the new programs. Moreover, these
rogrammatic and administrative innovations often suggested the possibility of
vider strategic changes in the overall operations of the experimenting department.

Yet, both to clarify the concept and to keep accurate track of what we are learning
bout community policing, it is probably important to continue to distinguish among
hese different ideas and to understand the relationships among them. Ideally,
ommunity policing is meant to be an overall philosophy of policing that redefines
he overall mission of policing as well as its operational methods and administra-
ive form. In short, it is intended to be a strategic innovation.

In practice, no department has yet fully implemented community policing as
n overall philosophy. The closest we have come is probably a small number of

experiments with police districts or precincts that have incorporated many important
aspects of community policing (e.g., the 72nd Precinct in New York, or the
Experimental Police District in Madison) (Couper & Lobitz, 1991; Vera Institute
of Justice, 1991). This is one of the reasons we are still a long way from knowing
about whether community policing, understood as an overall strategy of policing,
works or not. We cannot know this until a whole department tries it (Moore, 1992).

Consequently, what the field is now experimenting with is not the ideal of
community policing as an overall philosophy, but instead a series of programmatic
or administrative innovations that are thought to be consistent with the overall spirit
of community policing, or important elements of the larger concept. And there are
lots of examples of these. We now have pretty good information about the effects
of foot patrol (Police Foundation, 1981; Trojanowicz, 1982) and some important
examples of what problem-solving methods can do (New York City Police Depart-
ment, 1993; Spelman & Eck, 1987) and how communities can be engaged effec-
tively in the fight against street-level drug dealing (Kennedy, 1993; Weingart et al.,
1992). We also have some important information about the effects of decentralizing
operational decisions and empowering officers (Couper & Lobitz, 1991). This is
important because this is thought to be a necessary if not sufficient administrative
change to support community problem-solving policing.

What is perhaps most important, however, is that we now know enough to
distinguish these different ideas of community policing. It is important to
understand that *administrative* changes must be made in order to make changes
in both *institutionalizing* and *widening* the effects of the new operational pro-
grams associated with community policing. Indeed, the key distinction between
a department that is experimenting with operational programs and one that is
committed to a strategy of community policing is the extent to which its
administrative and operational systems have been adapted to accommodate the
ideas of community policing (Brown, 1989): that is, the extent to which the
department relies on differential police response to ensure that patrol resources
are adequate to maintain "beat integrity" in dispatching calls and the extent to
which the organization's personnel systems have been adapted to recruit, train,
and reward officers for the kinds of behavior consistent with community polic-
ing. This represents an advance in our analytic thought about the concept of
community policing, and allows us to see more clearly what is now known about
community policing and what the challenges of implementing it will be.

The Role of Rhetoric

The field is also making progress in understanding what role the rhetoric about
community policing might play in the implementation of community policing.
It is fair to say that, at the outset, the academic community was quite skeptical
about the rhetoric of community policing. They thought it was being used
cynically to build the reputations of chiefs and departments and to obscure the

tual operations being carried out by the department. No doubt, in many cases,
eir cynicism was justified.

Yet it was also clear that, if important changes in policing were to be made
ong the lines suggested by the concept of community policing, some leadership
ould be necessary, and that one of the important tools of that leadership would
rhetoric. As Skogan (Chapter 9, this volume) observes:

Critics of community policing have been quick to claim that in reality it is just rheto-
ric. It is certainly true that it *involves* rhetoric, for community policing . . . [pro-
vides] a new vision of where departments should be heading. This calls for rhetoric,
one of the tools of leadership. Community policing also calls for rhetoric because de-
partments do not exist in a vacuum. They are dependent on the communities that
they serve for financial support, so they must have public and political support for
whatever direction they are going. Rhetoric about community policing informs the
community about a set of goals they are being asked to pay for.

In short, as I have argued elsewhere, the rhetoric of community policing helps
establish the department's external terms of accountability, and in so doing
imulates community expectations that can actually help a chief successfully
iplement the reforms that are to be undertaken (Moore, 1990).

Evaluating Community Policing

Given that we now understand that a certain amount of ambiguity about the
oncept of community policing might be helpful to the field, and that it is important
distinguish programs and administrative systems that are consistent with the
iilosophy of community policing from the overall philosophy of community
olicing, and that the rhetoric of community policing might be an important tool in
lping to implement community policing, one still wants to know what is known
out whether community policing in any of its guises works. This turns out to be
important conceptual as well as empirical question, for one of the important
sues about community policing is that it seeks to redefine the *ends* of policing as
ell as the *means*. Insofar as it does so, and insofar as the public embraces the
definition of the ends, the standards for evaluating community policing must
iange from the way that policing has been evaluated in the past.

edefining the Ends of Policing

In the past, it was relatively clear how operational innovations in policing
ould be evaluated: All one had to do was check to see whether or not they
icceeded in reducing crime (as measured by UCR reports or by victimization

surveys). That was because there was widespread agreement that the overall
objective of the police was to reduce crime.

To some degree, however, community policing seeks to redefine the overall
purposes and ends of policing. As Eck and Rosenbaum (Chapter 1, this volume)
observe, community policing increases the emphasis given to such goals as
responding to emergencies, reducing fear, mobilizing communities to take their
part in controlling crime, and enhancing security.

What remains somewhat unclear, however, is whether these new goals are to
be understood and evaluated as new ends of policing, important to achieve in
and of themselves, or whether they should be viewed as important new means
to the traditional end of crime control, important only insofar as they are also
shown to be effective methods for improving police performance in controlling
crime or apprehending offenders.

The reason this ambiguity exists is that one can make reasonable arguments
for both positions. One can make the argument that it has always been a mistake
to evaluate police departments solely in terms of their crime control effective-
ness. It has long been a part of the police mission to "serve" as well as "protect,"
and it is plausible to imagine that the value of such activities is going up in
today's cities. Moreover, reducing fear has long been associated with the goal
of enhancing security, and that has long been seen as a valuable purpose of the
police. So, it is clear that one can make an argument for the independent value
of these "new" police activities.

Yet one can also make an argument for the value of these activities as the
means of achieving more effective crime control. The argument is that it has
long been apparent that most crime control is done informally by communities.
It has also become clear that the traditional methods of policing (rapid response
to calls for service and retrospective investigation of crimes) depend for their
effectiveness on close relationships with local communities. Consequently, to
the extent that activities undertaken by the police to reduce fears, or to provide
emergency services to citizens, or to help organize a community's defenses are
successful in building informal community control and effective crime control
partnerships with the police, these activities could be justified as important
means to the ends of reducing crime in the community.

The distinction matters in evaluating community policing initiatives because
it determines how far one has to go in establishing the value of community
policing efforts. If one views service provision, fear reduction, and community
mobilization as important ends in themselves, one need go no further in evalu-
ating community policing efforts than to show that these effects occurred. If,
however, one sees these only as important means to the traditional end of crime
control, one must go further and show that these activities actually work in the
way they are theorized to do in producing these results. That is a far more
difficult and longer term evaluation task.

At the moment, it seems that the research community remains somewhat
divided on this important value question. The broader society and the individuals
who call the police, however, seem much clearer about the point. They seem to

ue police departments that produce services and fear reduction even when
y are not particularly effective in reducing criminal victimization. This may
because they are confused about these effects. If so, it may be important for
research community to point out the difference between them. But for now,
seems clear that the terms in which it is proper to evaluate police programs
ve been widened by the concept of community policing.

oven Effects

Almost nothing is certain about the effects of community policing programs.
e programs are so varied that it will be a long time before we can say
nething definitive about the whole set of programs, the individual elements
the set, and the particular features of particular programs. And it will
viously be a long time until we can say important things about the strategy of
mmunity policing as opposed to the operational programs (Moore, 1992).
Still, there are some trends that seem to be relatively robust—at least for the
ne being. It seems clear, for example, that citizens like community policing
grams. As Skogan (Chapter 9, this volume) reports:

[T]here is evidence in many evaluations that a public hungry for attention has a
great deal to tell police. When they see more police walking on foot or working out
of a local substation, they feel less fearful.

Bennett (Chapter 13, this volume) also reports community policing programs
opted in England tend to be popular among citizens.
There is slightly less strong evidence indicating that the programs can be
ccessful in reducing the fear of crime. For example, in reviewing the evidence
the effects of community policing programs in six sites, Skogan finds that
ur of crime is reduced in five of the six sites. Bennett, however, reports that
s effect is found less consistently in Britain.
There is even weaker evidence indicating that community policing programs
n be successful in mobilizing communities to deal with problems of crime and
order. Tien and Rich (Chapter 11, this volume) report on the basis of a
gram they observed in Hartford, Connecticut, that:

Weeding success [in disrupting street level drug markets] spawns community sup-
port and participation in the ensuing seeding [community development] efforts. Vis-
ible and active community involvement, in turn, increases the effectiveness of weed-
ing tactics, and is critical for long-term success in seeding.

Yet, Sadd and Grinc (Chapter 2, this volume) seem to report opposite conclu-
ons in their study of eight "Innovative Policing" sites. They observe that:

[The] forays into community policing . . . produced only minimal . . . effects on
drug-trafficking, drug-related crime, and fear of crime.

And there is almost no evidence yet indicating that community policing
programs can be successful in preventing or reducing crime and criminal vic-
timization. The strongest evidence on potentially important preventive effects
used to be the evidence indicating that the introduction of community and
problem-solving techniques could reduce calls for service in the areas in which
they are tried (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1989). But that finding, too, is now
being challenged with some studies showing that calls for service are reduced
and others showing that they are not. The only evidence that community policing
programs can be successful in reducing actual criminal victimization is pre-
sented by Wycoff and Skogan (Chapter 4, this volume), who find some such
evidence from their evaluation of Madison's experimental police district.
So, the jury is still out on the size and character of effects that community
policing programs can have on citizen perceptions of the quality of police
service, on fear, and on crime. It seems relatively clear that the programs are
popular and can reduce fear, but much less obvious that they can prevent or
reduce crime.

The Feasibility of Community Policing

An important part of the reason for the difficulties in producing consistent
operational successes may have less to do with the correctness of the theory of
community and problem-solving policing and much more to do with the diffi-
culty of implementing those theories correctly. Indeed, the authors in this book
who evaluated operational programs report universally that there were substan-
tial difficulties in implementing the community policing programs in the ways
that they were supposed to be done. Sadd and Grinc (Chapter 2, this volume),
for example, report that the eight INOP sites they examined "experienced
common implementation problems that hampered their ability to have the de-
sired impacts." Cordner (Chapter 10, this volume) reports that the particular foot
patrol experiment he evaluated "more resembled traditional policing and crack-
downs than community policing or problem-oriented policing." Capowich and
Roehl (Chapter 7, this volume) reported that two of the three problem-solving
efforts they evaluated in San Diego were based largely on traditional methods
of police work, and that these were largely ineffective.
The authors in this volume were particularly critical of the efforts that were
made to involve community participants either in the design or the actual
execution of the programs that were developed to deal with particular problems.
Sadd and Grinc (Chapter 2, this volume) observed that:

n all eight sites, the police administrators were the initiators and formulators of the community policing programs. The involvement of police officers, city agencies, and community residents in program design was generally minimal.

[T]he education and training of community residents in their roles in community po- icing is almost nonexistent. Without meaningful involvement of patrol officers in he planning process, participation by all city agencies, and true community involve- nent, community policing will fail to realize its potential.

Buerger (Chapter 17, this volume) expressed the same concerns on the basis his clinical experience.

For all the rhetoric about empowering the community, . . . when it comes down to cases the police establishment assigns to the community a role that simply enhances he police response to crime and disorder.

It is important to remember that these implementation problems are experi- ed even when leading-edge departments are trying to implement community icing programs. It should come as no surprise, then, that ordinary police partments are having difficulty implementing community policing as an erall philosophy. As Leighton (Chapter 12, this volume) candidly reports in ing up developments in Canada:

There is a growing number of police agencies that have implemented at least some of the core tactics, such as foot patrol in zones or beats, storefronts or mini-stations, and community consultative committees. Nonetheless . . . one of the main issues fac- ng Canadian police executives at this time is how to implement community policing n a systematic way and on a department-wide basis.

So, questions about effective implementation of both programs and philoso- y remain important. What is clear from reading the chapters is that this is a jor issue in efforts to further develop community policing. If we cannot iably implement community policing programs, we cannot find out whether y work, and we know in advance that any grander plans are likely to be lborn. If we cannot learn how to move from programs to an overall philoso- y through the redesign of the department's culture and administrative systems, cannot get the full benefits theoretically available from community policing. The principal work that has been done so far on the questions of implementation acerns the potential for decentralization of operational initiative in the police partment to street-level officers. That is thought to be important in the creation an organization that is capable of undertaking community problem-solving iatives. It is also thought to be important for enhancing the morale of officers erally and engaging their commitment to the changed strategy of policing. What the evidence shows on these matters is that it is both important and ssible to decentralize initiative in a police department and that the effects of

doing so on officer morale are largely positive. Wilkinson and Rosenbaum (Chapter 6, this volume) report on the basis of observations of community policing initiatives in Joliet and Aurora that:

[A] police organization that is heavily invested in the professional model of polic- ing—with a centralized, hierarchical and bureaucratized command structure—will have difficulty creating an environment that is conducive to community policing strategies and that encourages creative problem solving.

Given this finding, it is important that Wycoff and Skogan (Chapter 4, this volume) conclude on the basis of an examination of an experiment in decentrali- zation carried out in Madison that:

It is possible to change a traditional, control-oriented police organization into one in which employees become members of work teams and participants in decision-mak- ing processes.

They would also be the first to point out, however, that this change takes a great deal of sustained effort.

There is also evidence from both the Wycoff and Skogan studies and from the Lurigio and Rosenbaum work that such efforts do enhance the satisfaction of officers who are involved—once they become intensely involved. Lurigio and Rosenbaum (Chapter 8, this volume) report, for example, that:

On balance, these studies have shown that community policing has exerted a posi- tive impact on the police and on citizens' views of the police. From the police per- spective, investigators have reported increases in job satisfaction and motivation, a broadening of the police role, improvements in relationships with co-workers and citizens, and greater expectations regarding community participation in crime pre- vention efforts. (1994, 27).

This is all very encouraging, but as Leighton (Chapter 12, this volume) puts it, the challenge still remains to find means to "sustain the approach through a changed reward system, training, and other avenues." As to efforts to implement an organization-wide shift to community policing rather than simply achieve this result for some particular programs or in one particular district, Chapter 5 in this volume, by Greene, Bergman, and McLaughlin, offers a cautionary tale. Their description of a major top-down effort to implement community policing as a philosophy against entrenched, high-level opposition suggests that although progress can be made in such situations and, indeed, can accelerate, it is a very slow process.

In many respects, the question of how to implement community policing programs, and how to move from programs to an overall philosophy, and what the administrative systems of a mature community policing organization might look like, represents one of the important frontiers of research in this domain.

s raises the question of how we are likely to learn about such things. ortantly, Weisel and Eck (Chapter 3, this volume) offer a suggestion. They e that the field adopt:

A] bias for action . . . [T]he most important activity in implementing change may e simply to move forward and avoid laboriously concentrating on process vari- bles. Indeed, the single most important activity for changing the police agency and nstitutionalizing community policing may be simply to move ahead and get new eople on board.

Toward the Future of Policing

t is in that spirit that I offer the following ideas about what should be done h the powerful movement that is now occurring within the field of policing. commend that it be allowed to proceed apace. There are enough theoretical uments about the potential utility of the approach, and enough empirical dence about the accuracy of the judgments (to say nothing of enough evidence ut the limitations of our current methods) that the widespread search for roved methods of policing along the lines suggested by community policing varranted.

here are two principal problems with the way things are now developing. is simply that the field as a whole is not yet accumulating enough experi- e. The rate of programmatic and administrative innovation should be higher n it now is if the movement is not to slacken and is to provide the basis for rning what works. The rhetorical commitment must be matched by the rational commitment. The second is that police researchers are not well itioned enough now to maximize the learning that can come from the erience.

ne way to solve both problems simultaneously would be for the federal ernment to use its current commitment to increasing police presence on the et to encourage a change in the style of policing and to support efforts to rn as efficiently as we can from the field's accumulating experience. This uld involve three things: (a) an ongoing survey of the field of policing to ermine to what extent community policing is moving from rhetorical to rational levels throughout the country; (b) the establishment of a small nber of police departments that could become the nation's laboratories and ource centers in which many of the operational and administrative problems ociated with implementing community policing as an overall philosophy ld be worked out for the benefit of the field as a whole; and (c) the creation national award process that would give a cash award to any police depart- nt that developed an important operational or administrative innovation sistent with the principles and spirit of community policing. Police re-

searchers should be closely involved in these activities so that they can reliably fulfill the role of commentator that is suggested by the publication of this book. Through these devices, we can not only get on with the implementation of community policing, but discover what we ought to mean by the concept.

References

Bayley, D. H. (1988). Community policing: A report from the devil's advocate. In J. Greene & S. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality?* New York: Praeger.

Brown, L. P. (1989). *Community policing: A practical guide for police officials* (Perspectives on Policing, No. 12). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice and Harvard University.

Couper, D. C., & Lobitz, S. H. (1991). *Quality policing: The Madison experience.* Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Greene, J. R., & Mastrofski, S. (Eds.). (1988). *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality?* New York: Praeger.

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

Kennedy, D. M. (1993). *Closing the market: Controlling the drug trade in Tampa, Florida. Program focus.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Klockars, C. B. (1988). The rhetoric of community policing. In J. Greene & S. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality?* New York: Praeger.

McElroy, J. E., Cosgrove, C. A., & Sadd, S. (1990). CPOP The research: An evaluative study of the New York City Community Patrol Officer Program. New York: Vera Institute of Justice.

Moore, M. H. (1992). Problem solving and community policing. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Modern policing* (Vol. 15, pp. 99-158). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Moore, M. H. (1990). Police leadership: The impossible dream? In E. C. Hargrove & J. C. Glidewell (Eds.), *Impossible jobs in public management.* Lawrence: University Press of Kansas.

New York City Police Department. (1993a). *Problem solving annual for community police officers and supervisors: Disorderly groups.* New York: Author.

New York City Police Department. (1993b). *Problem solving annual for community police officers and supervisors: Drugs.* New York: Author.

Police Foundation. (1981). *The Newark foot patrol experiment.* Washington, DC: Author.

Sparrow, M. K., Moore, M. H., & Kennedy, D. M. (1990). *Beyond 911: A new era for policing.* New York: Basic Books.

Spelman, W., & Eck, J. E. (1987). *Problem-oriented policing. Research in brief.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Trojanowicz, R. (1982). *An evaluation of the Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program in Flint, Michigan.* East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Trojanowicz, R., & Bucqueroux, B. (1989). *Community policing: A contemporary perspective.* Cincinnati: Anderson.

Vera Institute of Justice. (1991). *72nd Precinct Model Precinct Project: Initial development and implementation.* New York: Author.

Weingart, S. N., Hartmann, F. X., & Osborne, D. (1992). *Lessons learned: Case studies of the initiation and maintenance of the community response to drugs. Report to the National Institute of Justice.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management.