

**Community Policing:
An International
Literature Review**

Jenny Coquilhat

Evaluation Team
Organisational Assurance
New Zealand Police

September 2008



New Zealand Government

First published in September 2008 by the
New Zealand Police
PO Box 3017
Wellington
New Zealand

© Crown Copyright

ISBN 978-0-477-02986-8

Acknowledgements

We would like to sincerely thank Dr Gary Cordner from Eastern Kentucky University who gave up valuable time to review this document and provided invaluable advice and suggested literature throughout the journey. The assistance you have provided has greatly contributed to this literature review.

Thank you also to the Evaluation Team at Police National Headquarters (Alison Chetwin, Lisa McCauley and Bea Makwana) for their on-going support and continuous review of the drafts versions, which helped shape this document. And finally, thank you to the Community Policing Team at Police National Headquarters (Superintendent Bill Searle, Rachael Bambery and Senior Sergeant Steve O'Connor) who have reviewed and engaged in in-depth conversation with me on the literature.

Thank you all for your assistance and support.

Jenny Coquilhat
Evaluation Officer
Organisational Assurance Group
New Zealand Police

September 2008

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Acknowledgements | 3 |
| Summary: Community Policing Elements, Benefits and Barriers | 7 |
| Elements of community policing | 7 |
| The benefits of community policing | 9 |
| Barriers to community policing | 10 |
| Introduction | 11 |
| 1. Development of Community Policing in New Zealand | 13 |
| History | 13 |
| New Zealand literature | 13 |
| Moving forward | 15 |
| 2. Understanding Community Policing | 17 |
| What is community policing? | 17 |
| The origins of community policing: urban or rural? | 18 |
| Community policing and other policing strategies | 19 |
| 3. Elements of Community Policing | 23 |
| Philosophical dimension | 23 |
| Strategic dimension | 25 |
| Tactical dimension | 26 |
| Organisational dimension | 29 |
| 4. Benefits of Community Policing | 31 |
| Measuring the effectiveness of community policing | 31 |
| Benefits of community policing | 32 |
| 5. Barriers to Community Policing | 35 |
| Implementation challenges | 35 |
| The police officer/organisation | 36 |
| The resident/community | 38 |
| Police culture | 39 |
| Specialised units | 39 |
| 6. Key Findings of Some Community Policing Evaluations | 41 |
| 7. Appendix | 45 |
| Search Strategy | 45 |
| 8. References | 47 |

Summary: Community Policing Elements, Benefits and Barriers

New Zealand Police has been implementing a refreshed model of community policing since 2006. To set these developments in international context, literature from the United States, United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand has been summarised to determine the elements of, the benefits of and barriers to community policing. The framework for the elements chapter originates from the work of Dr Gary Cordner (1999, 2007a, 2007b). The framework for the barriers chapter originates from the work of Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd (2007). While the frameworks derive from the work of Cordner and Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd, the content of each also draws on wider literature.

Elements of community policing

Philosophical dimension – The ideas and beliefs that underlie community policing

Citizen input:

- Community determine, prioritise and find solutions to problems
- Police respond to community concerns
- Police use a number of methods to engage the community

Broad function:

- Continuous sustained contact with the community
- Other public and private agencies are involved
- Police are planners, problem solvers, and community organisers
- Role includes conflict resolution, helping victims and reducing fear of crime

Personal service:

- Police adopt a customer service approach
- Police are perceived as accessible, knowing and appreciative of what the community wants and needs
- Communities deal with a specific officer
- Community policing is a philosophy rather than a programme or project
- Long term community involvement

Strategic dimension – Translates philosophies into action

Re-oriented operations:

- Tools are developed to address the underlying conditions that lead to crime
- Operational practices are interactive
- Enforcement remains a core function of Police
- Focus on long term solutions

Prevention emphasis:

- Police have a proactive and preventative focus
- Communities are encouraged to enhance safety
- Long term benefits are achieved as a consequence of collective prevention

Geographical focus:

- Officers have permanent and ongoing responsibility for specific communities; and these communities have formed naturally as opposed to being defined statistically
- Locally based officers increases accountability, responsibility and communication
- Flexibility in responding to the local context because each community has individual characteristics

Tactical dimension – translates philosophy and strategies into concrete programmes, tactics and behaviours

Positive interaction:

- Positive interactions with all parts of the community to counter the general negative nature of policing
- Enhanced through techniques such as media campaigns, shop front based officers, accessible mini-stations
- Benefits include trust, knowledge, and problem solving

Partnerships:

- Working in partnership with the community and agencies to achieve desired outcomes
- Developing collaborative and targeted responses to community issues
- Ensuring a broad range of issues are addressed
- Exchanging information is mutually beneficial to police and the community

Problem solving:

- Addresses the underlying causes of community issues
- Communities play an important role in identifying and addressing their issues
- Involves an interactive process that is essential to community policing
- Less reliance on traditional criminal justice system responses to problems

Organisational dimension – support changes to promote community policing

Structure:

- Broad organisational goals encourage a culture that supports community policing
- Employ long term strategies that support community policing
- Structures and training that promote community policing
- Requires a whole-of-police approach

Management:

- Management develop and take ownership of problem solving and solutions
- Police executives use leadership to support community policing practices
- It is important to measure organisational support and structures as well as perceptions and/or impact

Information:

- Systems are crucial in the identification and analysis of problems/issues
- Emphasises on qualitative measures rather than quantitative measures
- Information can be sourced from police appraisals, evaluations and performance indicators.

The benefits of community policing

The lack of a concrete definition for community policing and vague measures of success has contributed to the difficulties in determining effectiveness. In addition, the complex nature of community policing limits the ability to provide sufficient evidence of either success or failure. However, there are a number of benefits identified in the literature. The framework for this chapter originates from the work of Andy Mayhill (2004). These benefits include:

Improving police-community relationships and community perceptions of police:

- Opportunity to increased public accountability through participation
- A number of community policing initiatives illustrate positive results in improving community relationships and perceptions of police
- Community and police work towards shared goals

Increasing community capacity to deal with issues:

- Empowers community to respond to community concerns
- Positive attitudes in the community to interact, deal with, and solve problems
- Opportunity for community grass roots support for police

Changing police officers' attitudes and behaviours:

- Police officers increase interaction with and confidence of the community
- Police and community develop positive relationships
- Community policing is linked to increased job satisfaction

Increasing perceptions of safety and decreasing fear of crime:

- Evidence suggests that community policing can increase perceptions of safety and decrease the fear of crime

Reducing crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour:

- Evidence suggests that community policing can reduce disorder and anti-social behaviour

Barriers to community policing

Implementation barriers:

- Implementation issues that have not been identified or resolved can affect the overall success of a community policing initiative
- A range of barriers to successful implementation could impact on the potential benefits of community policing. Possible consequences of poor implementation could include:
 - Lack of control, flexibility and tailoring at neighbourhood level
 - Not recognising the historical lack of trust between police and certain communities
 - Lack of good quality information about crime provided to communities

The police officer:

- Police officers work independently of the community in identifying and solving problems
- Training in problem solving and community engagement can be neglected
- Lack of performance measures for community police officers

The resident/community:

- Communities are ambiguous with different values and expectations
- Agencies can promote conflicting values
- Ownership of problems often allocated to police rather than the whole community
- Participation can be affected by individualism and lack of social capital
- The community voice is limited to the vocal minority

Police culture:

- Resistance to community policing is attributed to the perception it is a move away from traditional law enforcement practices to a 'softer' style of policing
- The community can be disempowered when offering solutions if Police dominate as the crime and disorder experts
- Police are still reluctant to share information with the community

Specialised units:

- Isolation of officers can limit effectiveness
- Allocation of extra resources to community policing teams and special conditions of work can create internal friction

Introduction

The New Zealand Police are currently evaluating four recently introduced community policing demonstration projects. The evaluations aim to:

- Describe the intended and actual operation of the projects;
- Address the progress towards achieving objectives of community policing; and
- Examine the ways in which additional staff have contributed to the goals of a national community policing strategy¹.

In the absence of detailed research and evaluation on community policing in New Zealand, the purpose of this literature review is to discuss international research from the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand in order to identify key elements of, benefits of and barriers to community policing against which the New Zealand projects can be compared.

The literature review will consider the following themes:

- The development of community policing in New Zealand;
- Understanding community policing;
- Elements of community policing;
- Benefits and effectiveness of community policing;
- Barriers to community policing, and
- Key findings of some evaluations.

Outlined below is a summary of each chapter.

1. Development of community policing in New Zealand

The **development of community policing in New Zealand** chapter presents a brief overview of community policing in New Zealand; including a brief history of community policing in New Zealand; five key community policing documents produced for or by the New Zealand Police; and the refreshed community policing initiative. Each section aims to illustrate how community policing has developed in New Zealand.

2. Understanding community policing

The **understanding community policing** chapter provides a summary of community policing as a concept. In order to understand community policing, the first section discusses a range of definitions and meanings of community policing. The second section summarises four schools of thought around the rural/urban origins of community policing. The final section provides an overview of community policing in comparison to problem oriented policing and reassurance policing strategies, which are closely aligned to community policing. The content of this chapter draws heavily on international literature.

¹ Note the evaluation plans were developed prior to the community policing strategy being completed and distributed.

3. Elements of community policing

The **elements of community policing** chapter explores the 12 elements, as identified by Dr Gary Cordner (Cordner, 1999, 2007a). It also incorporates other literature in relation to Cordner's four dimensions of community policing: philosophical; strategic; tactical; and organisational. The first section discusses the philosophical elements: the role of citizen input; broad function; and personalised service. The next section examines the strategic elements: re-oriented operations; prevention emphasis; and geographical focus. The third section discusses the tactical elements: positive interaction; partnerships; and problem solving. The final section examines the organisational elements: structure; management; and information.

4. Benefits of community policing

The **benefits of community policing** chapter discusses literature on the perceived benefits of community policing. The benefits include: improving police-community relationships and community perceptions of police; increasing community capacity to deal with issues; changing officers' attitudes and behaviours; increasing perceptions of safety; and reducing crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour.

5. Barriers to community policing

The **barriers to community policing** chapter explores literature on the four barriers to community policing, as identified by Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd (2007). The four barriers include: the police officer; the resident/community; police culture; and specialised units.

6. Key findings of some evaluations

The **key findings of some evaluations** chapter discusses the key findings from three key initiatives: the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS); the UK National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP); and the Queensland - On the Beat evaluation.

1. Development of Community Policing in New Zealand

History

Community oriented policing began in New Zealand in the late 1980's with the introduction of the New Zealand Police *New Model of Policing: Strategy*. The strategy was based on the idea that 'local police have local responsibility' to minimise the effects of 'stranger to stranger' policing (New Zealand Police, 1989: 3). The document also promoted working in partnership with the community to solve local problems. As a result, community constables were introduced throughout the country in the late 1980's. This was followed by the opening of decentralised community policing centres and the introduction of formal community consultative committees in the early 1990's (Young and Tinsley, 1998). It was quickly discovered that the community policing model complemented the work of Neighbourhood Support Groups. Neighbourhood Support encouraged crime prevention techniques such as public surveillance; property marking; and home security. These techniques were also an important component of the work of community constables (Skolnick and Bayley, 1988).

The progress of community policing in New Zealand has not been well documented after its establishment, creating gaps in the literature. However, what is known is outlined in the following sections.

New Zealand literature

Six documents that outline community policing in the New Zealand context were identified during the literature search. These consist of three completed externally for the New Zealand Police, and three completed by the New Zealand Police. These documents help to outline the development of community policing and included:

- *The New Model of Policing Strategy* (New Zealand Police, 1989);
- *The New Zealand Police: Resource Management Review, 1989* (Strategos Consulting Ltd, 1989);
- *The Corporate Plan 90/91: Review of Community Oriented Policing* (New Zealand Police, 1991);
- *Strategic Initiative: Community Orientated Policing*² (New Zealand Police, 1993);
- *Options for the development of COP/problem solving policing in New Zealand* (Young and Tinsley, 1998); and
- *Community policing and the New Zealand Police: Correlates of attitudes toward the work world in a community-oriented national police organization* (Winfree and Newbold, 1999).

² Note *The Kapiti-Mana community policing project: some lessons for the development of community-oriented policing*, completed by Warren Young and Neil Cameron, Victoria University of Wellington. Institute of Criminology was not able to be located and so only interim findings from the *Strategic Initiative: Community Oriented Policing* (New Zealand Police, 1993) will be discussed.

The New Model of Policing: Strategy (New Zealand Police, 1989) offered strategic guidelines and outlined the development of a new community policing model. The strategy emphasised that crime and incident statistics should only be used as a partial measure for police performance, suggesting surveys as another way of measuring performance.

The strategy identified five essential elements. These elements were consistent with international literature and included:

1. Police and the community work together in partnership;
2. Development of a role that is broader than the traditional 'crime-fighting' role;
3. Decentralisation of police resources to defined geographic areas which have some identity and common characteristics;
4. Problem solving rather than reacting to incidents that are merely symptoms of a broader problem; and
5. Emphasis on flexibility with accountability.

The New Zealand Police: Resource Management Review, 1989, conducted by Strategos Consulting Ltd in 1989, aimed to assess the resource management practices of the New Zealand Police. The "Quigley Review", as it came to be known, identified that a lack of resources allocated to start up costs of community policing could limit the components of a project, but this could be alleviated through potential savings from other resources. The Quigley Review argued that in order to fully implement the process of community policing the New Zealand Police need to move away from demand driven practices and focus on an output approach with clear objectives (Strategos Consulting Ltd, 1989). The report noted that community policing was 'a step in the right direction' and should be 'pursued vigorously' (Strategos Consulting Ltd, 1989: 28).

A review of community oriented policing was conducted in 1991. *The Corporate Plan 90/91: Review of Community Oriented Policing* (New Zealand Police, 1991) identified three areas that needed to be addressed to support community policing:

1. *Organisational structure:*

Devolve financial and operational accountability and responsibility to lower more appropriate levels within a structure that supports change to ensure staff dealing with the community have the capacity to make decisions relating to their area.

2. *Consultation:*

Police and the community should work together in partnership and consultation with particular reference to the role police and the public play in resolving issues and problems.

3. *Problem solving:*

Involves an interactive process between the community and police, which aims to identify and resolve community problems.

The *Strategic Initiative: Community Orientated Policing* (New Zealand Police, 1993) discusses interim findings on the implementation of community orientated policing. The initiatives focused on three community offences - burglary; theft from cars; and wilful damage. The report concluded community policing worked when staff were committed. However, the interim findings identified the following issues:

- Training was inadequate;
- Additional resources were not made available;
- Lack of support by senior management;
- High staff turnover;
- Lack of staff consultation and involvement;
- Hostility and discontent by staff;
- Police culture - the perception that it was moving away from real police work; and
- Conflict between sectors of the community and police in regard to their involvement.

A research report titled '*Options for the development of COP/problem solving policing in New Zealand*' was completed by Young and Tinsley (1998) for the New Zealand Police. The report assessed the merits of community 'patch' officers. Staff were interviewed within the Policing 2000 Programme at Police National Headquarters and in some districts. The interviews collected a range of information to look at the structures and processes of community policing, as well as to identify potential lessons. The research found that there was considerable uncertainty and disagreement about how community policing and problem solving policing might be progressed, but there was support and willingness for change and to experiment in new ways of working (Young and Tinsley, 1998).

The journal article *Community policing and the New Zealand Police* (Winfree and Newbold, 1999) assessed a range of issues concerning police work, job satisfaction and skill requirements associated with community policing. The authors also analysed the data collected during the Policing 2000: Safer Communities Together survey completed in 1996. It also examined what was perceived to be the limited insight sworn officers held regarding the concepts of community policing. The study identified that rural and small town community policing differed from urban community policing in that a lack of support from rural communities stemmed from limited resources and a lack of an existing sense of community. Winfree and Newbold (1999) concluded that community constables felt they were not well supported in their work, and their managers did not see community policing skills as valuable. However, the study also concluded the attitudes and practices of New Zealand police officers were consistent with those of sworn officers in other democratic nations.

Moving forward

In 2006/2007 a refreshed approach to community policing commenced with the establishment of the Community Policing Group at Police National Headquarters. This refreshed approach defines community policing as:

“... both a community-centred philosophy and an approach to dealing with community-related crimes and safety problems. It involves problem solving, working with government, non-government and community groups in a co-ordinated way to reduce crime and road trauma and increase community safety and reassurance” (New Zealand Police; 2008).

This community policing initiative is in accordance with the Commissioner's strategic priority for community reassurance. Community reassurance is one of three New Zealand Police strategic priorities and aims to provide the following:

“In working with and for the community Police will focus on participation, priorities, partnerships and protection. At the heart of community reassurance is engagement. We must engage, listen and act. We want to work better with the community to set policing priorities, and be proactive to prevent crime and road trauma, therefore improving the quality of life of all people” (Strategic Plan to 2010, New Zealand Police, Sept 2006:8).

The refreshed approach is linked to the Government New Initiative (GNI) funding from the 2006 Budget, which provided 250 new community police staff over three years. It is intended that evaluations of four new community policing demonstration projects (three established during 2006/2007 and one in 2007/2008), to be completed for the Community Policing Group, will inform the subsequent roll-out of further community policing staff.

A strategy for the ‘refreshed’ community policing model is currently being developed by the newly formed Community Policing Group at Police National Headquarters. The draft strategy encourages a ‘whole-of-police’ approach to community policing, which means that community policing is integrated into policing practice and a tool used by all staff dealing with the general public. The emphasis of this approach is problem solving in a community setting. The desired outcome is to have ‘confident, safe and secure communities’. It is believed that the New Zealand Police can achieve this outcome by:

- Encouraging the community to *participate* in policing and crime prevention;
- *Prioritising* with the community;
- Supporting and enhancing problem-solving *partnerships*; and
- *Protecting* our communities.

In addition, ten principles of community policing³ have been identified which recognise elements of successful community policing. These include:

1. Communities are the focus of the New Zealand policing approach;
2. By reducing crime and road trauma community policing improves safety and reassures the community;
3. Police are visible, accessible and familiar to their community;
4. Police listen to their community, jointly prioritise concerns and keep them informed;
5. Police provide opportunities for community participation;
6. Problems are identified and responded to on a local level with the support of area, district and national, when required;
7. Police engage other government, non-government and community groups in problem solving partnerships;
8. Flexibility with accountability for achieving local community outcomes is emphasised;
9. Community policing requires an integrated intelligence-led approach; and
10. Community policing is the responsibility of all police staff irrespective of role or rank.

³ Note: It is outside the scope of this literature review to compare the 10 principles identified for the refreshed community policing approach and the elements identified in the international literature.

2. Understanding Community Policing

What is community policing?

Community policing is considered a popular contemporary policing approach responding to: the decline in public confidence in police; and growing evidence that police forces could not fight crime by themselves (Skogan, 2006; Virta, 2006; Innes, 2003; Tilley, 2003; Fridell, 2004).

What is commonly understood to be community policing is not an entirely new concept. Community policing can be traced back to the introduction of community constables, known as 'bobbies', by Sir Robert Peel in the newly created Metropolitan London Police District during the early 19th century (Patterson, 2007; Brogden and Nijhar, 2005). Sir Robert Peel rationalised that "the police are the public and the public are the police" (Braiden, 1992 - cited in Fridell, 2004: 4). Fridell (2004) believes this statement is the key principle of community policing and that "police should not be separated from, but rather joined in partnership with, the community" (p4).

Community policing as a concept was first introduced in the United States in the 1960's to increase police-community contact and reduce the fear of crime (Cordner, 1999; Innes, 2003). It became a dominant policing strategy in the United States during the 1990's with the introduction of 100,000 new community police officers (Cordner, 1999, 2007a). The deployment presented a change of focus to encourage problem solving and community engagement as opposed to reactive policing (Innes, 2003).

Weisheit et al., (1994) believe that community policing emerged as a result of a number of social trends and movements (namely victims rights and civil rights), which resulted in demands on police to be more accountable to the public by being more responsive and connected to the community. Bucqueroux (2006) argues that community policing emerged in response to two unintended consequences of a modernising policing profession. First, technology, such as the police radio and patrol vehicles, changed the relationships between the police and the community. Previously officers developed personal relationships with the community and needed the community to be willing to share information. Second, police applied scientific management to policing, which created the perception police were responsible for keeping the community safe. Previously, the community understood that ultimately the community were responsible for reaffirming the social norms that promoted public safety.

Throughout the development of community policing various definitions, meanings and practices have made the concept difficult to define (Brookes, 2006; Palmiotto, 2000; Young and Tinsley, 1998). Cordner (1999) argues that community policing is often misunderstood as a concept and recognises that community policing is:

"...not the answer to all the problems facing modern policing ... It is not anti-law enforcement or anti-crime fighting. It does not seek to turn police work into social work... [And] [t]here is no iron-clad, precise definition of community policing nor a set of specific activities that must always be included. A set of universally-applicable principles and elements can be identified, but exactly how they are implemented should

and must vary from place to place, because jurisdictions and police agencies have differing needs and circumstances” (Cordner, 2007b: 1).

In general it is agreed that community policing involves problem-solving and community engagement with an emphasis on police-community partnerships to solve the underlying problems of crime, the fear of crime, physical and social disorder, and neighbourhood decay (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990; Palmiotto, 2000). Similarly, the *Sage Dictionary of Criminology* defines community policing as:

“A philosophy of policing that promotes community-based problem solving strategies to address the underlying causes of crime and disorder and fear of crime and provides reassurance. It is a process by which crime control is shared, or co-produced with the public, and a means of developing communication with the public thus enhancing the quality of life of local communities and building police legitimacy” (Virta, 2006: p52).

The literature generally describes the primary objective of community policing as positive police-community relationships, which are achieved through community engagement, and by emphasising collaboration and prevention (Cordner and Biebel Perkins, 2005). Bucqueroux (2007) uses a medical analogy to describe community policing: patrol officers are ‘society’s emergency room physician’ responding rapidly to an occurrence, whereas, community police the ‘family physicians who have the time and opportunity to not only treat an illness but to prevent disease and promote good health’.

Fielding (2005) suggests community policing is not a single concept but could mean:

“... a *contrast* to rapid response and enforcement-oriented policing, so constables are closer to the community ... a *process* by which crime control is shared with the public ... or a *means* of developing communication with the public and interest groups” (Fielding, 1995: 25).

Internationally it is agreed that community policing needs to be a long term strategy with long term outcomes to allow for the development of decision making processes and a police culture that fosters the concept (Skogan and Hartnett, 1998). In addition, Skogan and Hartnett argue practices will vary from place to place to respond to the unique situations faced by communities.

The origins of community policing: urban or rural?

There is an abundance of research on community policing, which largely concentrates on an urban setting (Pelfrey, 2007). However, there are a range of schools of thought regarding the origins of community policing. First, community policing originated from rural policing practices. Secondly, rural communities are structured and perceive crime differently. Thirdly, community policing has been developed as a consequence of the changing nature of communities. Finally, rural and urban communities are similar.

The first school of thought argues that community policing developed its origins from a rural style of policing. Rural officers participate in a broader range of policing techniques due to the isolated nature and limited services available, where police are usually the only 24/7 service (Young and Tinsley, 1998; Weisheit et al., 1994; Pelfrey, 2007). Rural police often assume a

community-based model of policing where the officers are integrated as a member of the community and establish compatible community relationships (Scott and Jobe, 2007). In addition, rural officers have closer relationships with their community than officers in most urban settings (Pelfrey, 2007; Weisheit et al., 2004).

Critics of the second school of thought question whether a successful rural model of community policing can be adapted to urban areas because the urban population is more mobile; crimes differ, and communities are more heterogeneous, often divided by ethnicity, culture, class, age or lifestyle or otherwise poorly defined or fragmented (Weisheit et al., 1994; Young and Tinsley, 1998). Some authors' believe that rural communities are structured in a different way and perceive what is considered 'socially threatening' and crimes differently to urban communities (Scott et al., 2007).

Theorist from the third school of thought argue that the changing nature of communities is the catalyst for community policing (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004) irrespective of whether it is a rural or urban setting. Scott et al. (2007) argue that rural communities are currently experiencing 'chaotic social change' with the breakdown in traditional social roles and networks, which is characteristic of the fragmented and interpersonal relations in urban areas. Segrave and Ratcliffe (2004) argue an increasing urban sprawl and subsequent 'dormitory suburbs', which are empty during the day, has resulted in the need for community policing.

Finally, the fourth school of thought argue that rural and urban policing are similar in the sense that they are reactive in nature and primarily endorse a police professionalism ideology (Weisheit et al., 2004; Pelfrey, 2007; Scott et al., 2007).

Community policing and other policing strategies

Although the purpose of this review is to discuss community policing, it is important to understand how community policing fits with similar policing strategies. Community policing is one of a number of approaches that can be adopted as part of a modern policing strategy. The table below, developed by Dr Gary Cordner and Elizabeth Biebel Perkins (2005), outlines the primary objective, core function, distinguishing characteristics and measures of success (process and impact) of four modern policing strategies.

It is important to note the table below illustrates the difference between community policing and other commonly identified policing strategies in the United States. However, it does not include reassurance policing, a United Kingdom policing approach, which is closely aligned to community policing.

| | Reactive Policing | Proactive Policing | Community Policing | Problem-oriented Policing |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Primary objective | Rapid response to calls | Law enforcement | Positive police/ community relations | Solving recurring problems |
| Core functions | Call handling, investigations | Stops, arrests | Community engagement | Problem solving (SARA model) |
| Distinguishing characteristics | Reactive, responsive | Proactive, aggressive | Collaborative, preventative | Analytical, creative |
| Measures of success | <i>Process:</i> - response rate <i>Impact:</i> - clearance rate | <i>Process:</i> - citations - arrests <i>Impact:</i> - crime rate | <i>Process:</i> - meetings - contacts <i>Impact:</i> - public fear of crime | <i>Process:</i> - problems identified and addressed <i>Impact:</i> - problems and harms reduced |

Cordner, G. and Biebel Perkins, E. (2005) 'Problem-Oriented Policing in Practice' in *Criminology and Public Policy*, v4, i2, pp158

The following sections will briefly describe, and discuss the similarities between, community policing, problem oriented policing, and reassurance policing respectively.

Comparing problem oriented policing and community policing

Problem oriented policing, a term coined by Herman Goldstein in 1979, promotes the SARA model (scanning, analysis, response and assessment) to solve recurring problems or crimes through analytical and creative thinking (Cordner and Biebel Perkins, 2005). Problem oriented policing is commonly associated with the crime science triangle⁴ where, in order for a crime to occur, there must be an offender, a victim and a location.

The basic elements of problem oriented policing identified by Bullock and Tilley (2003) include:

- Grouping incidents as problems;
- Focusing on substantive problems as the heart of policing;
- Effectiveness as the ultimate goal;
- Systematic inquiry;
- Disaggregating and accurately labelling problems;
- Analysing multiple interests in problems;

⁴ The crime science triangle derives from the *routine activity theory* (Cohen and Felson, 1979 - cited in Harvey, 2005) and *rational choice theory* (Cornish and Clarke, 1986 - cited in Harvey, 2005). The *routine activity theory* suggests that three elements must come together in time and space for an offence to occur - a suitable target, a likely or motivated offender and the absence of a suitable guardian either protecting the target or 'handling' (discouraging) the offender (Harvey, 2005). The rational choice theory assumes that offending is purposive behaviour designed to benefit the offender and is based on assessment of the risk and benefits and thus decision-making is considered (Harvey, 2005).

- Capturing and critiquing current responses;
- Adopting a proactive stance;
- Strengthening decision making processes and increasing accountability; and
- Evaluating results of newly implemented responses.

While there are differences between community policing and problem oriented policing, many of the ideas do cross over, particularly the problem solving aspect. It is argued that problem oriented and community policing are the two most widely discussed innovations in policing, and involve police embracing social tools in a style of policing that comprises of complex programmes and organisational support (Committee on Law and Justice, 2004). Harrison Moore compares the difference between the two strategies of policing as:

“...[S]trategic concepts that seek to redefine the ends and the means of policing. Problem-solving policing focuses police attention on the problems that lie behind incidents, rather than on the incidents only. Community policing emphasizes the establishment of working partnerships between police and communities to reduce crime and enhance security.” (Harrison Moore, 1992: 99)

One of the key differences between problem oriented and community policing is the involvement of the community. Problem oriented policing addresses problems faced by the community. However, the police are able to prioritise and work independently of the community to solve the community's problems. In contrast, community policing relies on the community to define its problems or crime issues, and police and agencies work in partnership with the community to address the problems.

It is important to clearly articulate that within the New Zealand context the refreshed approach to community policing emphasises problem solving in a community engagement setting.

Comparing community reassurance and community policing

Reassurance policing has been described as the United Kingdom equivalent to community policing, which aims to involve the community to address local crime concerns and signal crimes⁵ (Smartt, 2006). Reassurance policing has been defined by Dalglish and Myhill (2004) as:

“the intended outcome of actions taken by the police and other agencies to improve perceived police effectiveness (mainly confidence in, and satisfaction with, the police) and to increase feelings and perceptions of safety (including reducing fear of crime)” (page vi).

Reassurance policing was developed in the United Kingdom and is a key priority of the *UK National Policing Plan 2005-2008*. Reassurance policing developed from increasing anxiety about crime and disorder problems, which reduced the confidence in police and increased feelings of fear and insecurity (Fleming, 2005).

⁵ Signal crimes are crimes and associated behaviours that are said to warn people about their exposure to harm, which impacts on the public's sense of security (Smartt, 2006).

Aspects of reassurance policing overlap with community policing, such as community involvement in identifying community issues, addressing public fear of crime and increasing police visibility to encourage increased trust in police (Smartt, 2006; Joyce, 2006; Virta, 2006). A similarity with community policing is evident in that the overarching aim of reassurance policing is to improve community perceptions of crime and safety. Virta (2006) argues that reassurance policing is a contemporary variation of community policing, developed from the community policing philosophy.

Fleming (2005) believes reassurance policing requires community involvement at both an individual and organisational level outside of law enforcement and beyond the public sector. This approach to reassurance policing underpins the 'refreshed' approach to community policing currently being driven by the New Zealand Police.

In recent years, UK policing has undergone a transformation, responding to the changing nature of crime and terrorism and to the rising public expectations of police, rolling reassurance policing into an 'effective and responsive local neighbourhood policing' approach (Home Office, 2008). The Home Office argues that:

“Tackling crime is the most important issue for the public and we know that the public remain unconvinced that crime has gone down and are understandably alarmed by the few, but high profile, incidences of serious crime and wider problems...Th[e] new deal must start with, and be rooted in, the local priorities set by local people. Neighbourhood policing teams, working together with local communities, will increasingly be the public face of that deal” (Home Office, 2008: 10-11).

This approach to reassurance or neighbourhood policing underpins the 'refreshed' approach to community policing currently being driven by the New Zealand Police.

3. Elements of Community Policing

As stated earlier, the purpose of this literature review is to identify key elements, benefits and barriers in international community policing practices to compare with the current practices in New Zealand. The structure of this section is based on the elements identified by Dr Gary Cordner (1999, 2007a; 2007b), as he has developed a model commonly referred to in other literature.

Cordner identified four dimensions and subsequent sub-categories (key elements), which include:

- Philosophical dimension –
 - Citizen input*
 - Broad function*
 - Personal service*

- Strategic dimension –
 - Re-oriented operations*
 - Prevention emphasis*
 - Geographical focus*

- Tactical dimension –
 - Positive interaction*
 - Partnerships*
 - Problem solving*

- Organisational dimension –
 - Structure*
 - Management*
 - Information*

Philosophical dimension

The philosophical dimension is central to the ideas and beliefs that underlie community policing, such as citizen input, broad function, and personal service. These are discussed in detail below (Cordner, 1999).

Citizen input

The rationale for citizen input is that law abiding people deserve to contribute to police processes, but in return they participate and support the idea of community policing (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990; Skogan, 2006). Community policing is not only about community engagement but involves police responsiveness to community concerns in the best way possible (Skogan, 2006). The community define their problems, which police then take seriously even if the problems they define differ from police priorities (Wycoff, 1988).

To accurately determine community needs and priorities community participation is required to identify problems, assist police to drive the solutions, and maintain community ownership of the issues (The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2007). Extensive input from the community will not only assist in identifying problems, but also in prioritising and finding solutions (Cordner, 1999; Carroll Buracker Associates Ltd, 2007; Skogan, 2006).

Cordner (1999) suggests that there are a number of mechanisms for achieving community engagement, which include systematic and periodic community surveys, fora, community meetings, and meeting with advisory groups and businesses. Skogan and Hartnett (1998) suggest that the public have a great deal to tell police, and that they are grateful for the opportunity to have their voice heard. However, Reno et al. (1998) warns that the type of neighbourhood determines whether the community is good at dealing with their own problems. For example, if the community has more social capacity then they were more likely to deal with their own problems and attend arranged meetings than those without such investment. It may be necessary to adopt a range of engagement techniques to ensure broad community involvement, such as those adopted by the National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP) in the United Kingdom. The NRPP went beyond public meetings and engaged with the community through street briefings, door knockings and 'have your say days' (Tuffin et al., 2006).

Broad function

Broad function requires the community policing role to go beyond calls for service and arrests to meet the demands of continuous sustained contact with the community. Flynn (2004) recognises community policing involves "[b]roadening the police mandate beyond narrow goals of law enforcement as an end in itself. It recognizes the importance of police in developing and maintaining the idea of 'community'" (p25). Farrell (1988) believes that community police officers have a comprehensive role as planners, problem solvers and community organisers. As planners they are required to identify principal crime and disorder problems faced by the community and prioritise, as well as analyse and develop strategies to deal with the issues. As problem solvers they are required to implement the actions and strategies to address the crime concerns. As community organisers they are required to increase the consciousness of the community and organisations to deal with problems (Farrell, 1988).

Together, police and the community can explore creative new solutions to community concerns as well as introduce individuals and groups to public and private agencies that have offered to assist (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990; Kelling and Moore, 1988). Cordner (1999) argues that community policing is about working with the community to enhance safety, so the role must include conflict resolution, helping victims, and reducing the fear of crime. Expanding the roles and duties of community police officers will enable them to think more laterally, engage proactively, follow up on activities and provide personalised service delivery (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004).

Personal service

Personal service addresses community concerns that police 'don't seem to care' about providing a quality, personalised service (Cordner, 1999). Police have recognised that they are not able to impose order on a community from outside; therefore, people must be encouraged to think of police as a resource (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux; 1990). Personalised service provides a

direct link between the police and the people within a community and enables direct face-to-face contact (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990). This is based on the idea that the community should know, contact and be able to deal directly with a specific officer, who should respond, whenever possible in a friendly, open and personal manner to satisfy the 'customers' (Cordner, 2007b). Cordner (1999, 2007a) argues that community policing works best when the officer knows the residents and can deliver a personalised service, as opposed to stranger policing.

In addition, police need to be accessible, knowing and appreciating what the community wants and needs (Mastrofski, 2006). The officer needs to identify their community and maintain an intimate relationship with the environment (Kelling and Moore, 1988; Farrell, 1988) in order to develop localised, community specific responses, which will generate a sense of accountability and responsibility (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004).

Due to the growing requirement for customer satisfaction within policing, Ferreira (1996) emphasises the importance of implementing community policing as a philosophy rather than just a programme or project. However, internationally there has been conflict between the perceived need to satisfy the community by responding quickly to calls for service verses the need to provide continued service and resources for long term community involvement (Young and Tinsley, 1998).

Strategic dimension

Key strategic operational concepts translate philosophies into actions, linking with the broad ideas and beliefs that underlie community policing (Cordner, 2007b). The strategic dimension of community policing includes re-oriented operations, emphasis on prevention, and geographical focus.

Re-oriented operations

Community policing gives police a way of addressing the underlying conditions that lead to crime, but enforcement is still a core function, so officers should continue to strongly enforce breaches of the law (Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2007). However, operational practice should look beyond traditional policing strategies, such as motorised patrol and rapid response, and replace them with more effective interactive practices e.g. handling emergency calls more efficiently to enable more time and resources to participate in community policing activities (Cordner, 1999; Cordner, 2007a; Cordner, 2007b). If community policing is about mutual support and agreement, then re-orienting practices should ensure slower response times for non-emergency calls to enable officers to develop long term solutions for community concerns (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004). They believe by re-orienting police activities the focus will shift from patrol based orientation to problem solving, crime prevention education, and building positive relationships. However, in order for this to work the community needs to address the minor concerns (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990).

Prevention emphasis

Crime prevention is central to the concept and ultimate goal of community policing (Skolnick and Bayley, 1988) and will have long term benefits (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004). Skogan (2006) suggests community capacity to prevent crime will be strengthened by encouraging communities to enhance community safety. The prevention emphasis of community policing is more proactive than traditional policing models (Cordner, 1999). However, the community do appreciate and value traditional policing, such as rapid response and reactive investigation but would prefer that victimisation be prevented in the first instance.

Police should not take sole responsibility for crime prevention but need to play a crucial role in developing strategies in partnership with local communities. Measuring the impact of crime prevention should move away from relying on crime statistics and clearance rates and complement the qualitative practice of community policing (Young and Tinsley, 1998).

Geographical focus

Organising and deploying geographically based officers to maximise identification between specific officers and their specific community should result in stronger police-community relationships, which in turn will increase mutual recognition, responsibility and accountability (Cordner, 1999, 2007a; Cordner, 2007b). The Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (2007) argues that a permanent officer must have accountability to naturally formed communities rather than communities decided by statistical boundaries. This will enable communication and partnerships to develop, and sustain relationships between the officer and their community. Cordner (1999) believes that geographically based officers develop knowledge about the community, which enables early intervention and problem identification and avoids conflict based on misperceptions or misunderstandings.

The permanency of officers is a crucial component as it builds familiarity, which in turn will develop trust, confidence and cooperation from both police and the community Cordner (1999). Equally, if a specific officer has permanent responsibility for a fixed area, then they will become more responsible for identifying and dealing with the crime problems and encourage in communication with the community (Farrell, 1988; Skogan, 2006).

There are a few challenges that confront geographically based officers. First, the mobility of the urban population, where both victims and offenders cross geographical boundaries, presents a major challenge for geographically based officers (Young and Tinsley, 1998). Secondly, crime related problems do not always develop in identifiable communities but in pockets of several communities. Thirdly, problematic communities are often fractured and difficult to engage with. To address these challenges, models of community policing need to be flexible enough to accommodate the particular character of the area.

Tactical dimension

The tactical dimension translates ideas, philosophy and strategies into concrete programmes, tactics and behaviours, which include positive interaction, partnerships, and problem solving (Cordner 2007b).

Positive interaction

The nature of the police enforcement role tends to attract a degree of negative interaction, so it is argued that police should take every opportunity to engage in positive interaction with all parts of the community (Cordner, 1999; Cordner, 2007a; Cordner, 2007b; Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd, 2007). Engaging in positive interactions, where possible, may have several other benefits such as building familiarity and trust; officers being more knowledgeable about people and conditions; and can provide specific information for crime investigations and problem solving (Cordner, 1999). Random motorised patrol and rapid response may lead to more uneasiness between the community and police. In addition, these traditional methods may not be the most effective way to deal with the community. Getting to know the community, by talking with all members, encouraging requests for non-emergency assistance, and becoming more visible, will encourage information sharing and increase appreciation of concerns (Skolnick and Bayley, 1988).

Positive community perceptions of police have been linked to low levels of crime, which was achieved through positive police-community experiences (Sherman and Eck, 2002). Techniques such as media campaigns, shop-front based officers and accessible mini-stations are believed to encourage positive interactions (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004).

Partnerships

Police need to engage with the community in partnerships to deal with crime and related problems, which includes working collaboratively with other public and private agencies (Cordner, 1999). Police and community should work in partnership not only to solve problems, but to reduce the fear of crime, physical and social disorder, and neighbourhood decay (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990; Wycoff, 1988). These relationships need to be based on trust by challenging people to accept their share of the responsibility, which in turn will enable parties to identify priorities, and develop responses to solve their own problems (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990; Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2007; Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd, 2007). Mastrofski (2006) suggests that:

“Community policing ... seek[s] to link the police more closely to the community in ‘partnership’ arrangements: joint activities to co-produce services and desired outcomes, giving the community a greater say in what the police do, or simply engaging with each other to produce a greater sense of police-community compatibility” (p 45).

Solutions developed in partnership are more likely to be appropriately targeted and therefore more effective (Young and Tinsley, 1998). Flynn (2004) argues these partnerships need to be based on trust. Community policing partnerships develop information exchange: the community provides the police with information about problem conditions and locations, crime concerns, active criminals, and stolen property, and in return police provide the community with information pertaining to community fears, problems, tactical information and advice about preventing and reducing crime (Farrell, 1988). Police are only one of the agencies responsible for addressing community problems, and other agencies need to take responsibility and respond to crime prevention and problem solving in partnership with police at all levels (Young and Tinsley, 1998; Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2007). Working in partnerships with both public and private agencies, such as schools, health, and housing, enables a broader range of issues to be addressed than if each were working in isolation

(Skogan, 2006). In addition, Young and Tinsley (1998) argue, while there are similarities in key partnerships and networks for community policing, a 'blueprint' for these partnerships at a national level is likely to have 'limited utility'.

Problem solving

Problem solving is an interactive process, involving police and communities identifying crime problems and developing appropriate solutions (Young and Tinsley, 1998). Problem solving is essential to community policing and as such, problems should not be limited to crimes, and solutions should not have to involve arrests (Weisheit et al., 1994). Police and the community should be empowered to adopt problem solving techniques and take every opportunity to address the conditions that cause incidents (Cordner, 1999, Cordner, 2007a; Cordner, 2007b; Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd, 2007).

The problem solving aspect of community policing relies more on preventing crime than traditional methods, through deterring offenders, protecting likely victims and making crime locations less conducive to identified problems (Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2007). Bucqueroux (2007) suggests that problem solving needs to be measured by asking the question 'is the problem solved?' rather than focusing on traditional methods, such as, the number of arrests.

Cordner (1999) argues that problem solving within a model of community policing has several important features. These include:

- Operates as a standard method of policing, not an occasional special project;
- Practiced by all staff throughout the ranks;
- Decisions should be made on the basis of information that is gathered systematically;
- Involves, whenever possible, collaboration between police and other agencies and institutions; and
- Incorporates, whenever possible, community input and participation, so that the community's problems are addressed (not just the police department's) and so that the community shares in the responsibility.

Cordner (1999) identifies four steps for problem solving in which community input can be incorporated. These steps include:

1. Identification of the problem;
2. Analysis of the problem;
3. A search for alternative solutions to the problem; and
4. Implementation and assessment of a response to the problem.

Problem solving techniques have already been utilised in rural and provincial districts of New Zealand but would be more successful if they were embraced and practiced by the majority of front-line police officers (Young and Tinsley, 1998). Skogan (2006) believes problem solving is more often left to specialised police units because of the specialist training required to enable officers to determine when police need to be involved, identify and analyse problems, identify root causes, and design solutions to address the causes.

Organisational dimension

Organisational elements are not part of community policing practices, per se, but do greatly affect their implementation. Therefore, an organisation needs to support changes to promote community policing (Cordner, 1999). The key elements of the organisational dimension include structure, management and information.

Structure

Police should re-examine their structures to ensure that they support and facilitate the implementation of the philosophical, strategic and tactical dimensions of community policing (Cordner, 1999; Cordner, 2007a; Cordner, 2007b). Organisational structures and training should be in place to support the concept of community policing (Skogan, 2006). In addition, the mission statement should set out the broad goals of community policing, and encourage police to develop practices that will enable those goals to be achieved (Mastrofski, 2006; Skogan and Hartnett, 1998). Mastrofski et al. (2007) conclude that community policing initiatives that have reported the greatest success in overcoming challenges are those that have been implemented for the longest. Young and Tinsley (1998) argue that changing to a community policing/problem solving model needs careful planning with a long term focus, as well as taking into account the considerable variations across Police districts.

Management

Leadership has been identified as key to the implementation of community policing (Skogan and Steiner, 2004) and plays an important role in creating positive work opportunities (Flynn, 2004). The Community Policing Consortium (1994 - cited in Fridell, 2004) report that “the role of management is not to direct the activities of the field personnel so much as to guide them and ensure that they have the resources they require to do their jobs” (p9). Police executives need to set the tone for the organisation and provide appropriate leadership to ensure each member is actively involved in community policing activities (Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd, 2007; Skogan, 2005). This includes re-examining the way people are supervised and managed (Cordner, 1999).

Reno, et al. (1998) argue that the implementation of community policing would be more successful if Commanders and Sergeants had a better understanding of community policing, and were supportive of and committed to it. Furthermore, Skogan (2005; 2002; 1996) believes organisational support and structures should be measured rather than just focusing on the officer and community perceptions of the role and/or the impact of community policing.

Information

Police information systems are crucial in providing information to assist the community and respond to their problems (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990). The utilisation of problem solving techniques has highlighted the requirement for information systems to aid the identification and analysis of problems faced by the community, including the use of Geographical Information Systems (GIS). This information traditionally has not been available (Cordner, 2007b).

Cordner (1999) suggests that information can be collected from: community police officers performance appraisals that reflect community activities; evaluating programmes for effectiveness as well as efficiency; and assessing the police's overall performance on a wider range of key indicators. Cordner emphasises the need for qualitative information to measure success rather than traditional 'bean counting' techniques; e.g. - collecting information on wider functions than enforcement and calls for service.

4. Benefits of Community Policing

To understand the benefits of community policing international literature and several key evaluations were reviewed. First, some issues around measuring the effectiveness of community policing will be discussed, followed by the benefits of community policing.

Measuring the effectiveness of community policing

Due to the complex nature of community policing evaluations have provided limited evidence of either success or failure (Cordner, 1999; Committee on Law and Justice, 2004; Segrave and Ratcliff, 2004; Ferreira, 1996; Skogan, 2006; Sarre, 2005; Mastrofski et al., 1998; Reno et al.; 1998). Patterson, (2007) suggests that evidence of effectiveness has been largely anecdotal. While measurement has tended to focus more on traditional indicators such as crime statistics even though the objectives may be more specific than to reduce crime (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004).

Many of the community policing evaluations completed in the United States have been criticised for failing to determine if practices were effective. One of the difficulties is the vague definition of success has also hindered identifying the effectiveness of community policing. In addition, the lack of a concrete definition of community policing, leaves it open to interpretation (Mastrofski, 1998). Cordner (1999:137) argues that “[b]ecause community policing is not one consistent ‘thing’, it is difficult to say whether ‘it’ works”. Likewise, Harvey (2005) suggests that there is limited evidence of effectiveness because community policing is very diverse in both intention and practice. Furthermore, effectiveness of community policing can be affected by other factors, for example organisation, operational and personality factors (Cordner, 1999; Fielding and Innes, 2006).

Although the effectiveness of community policing practices has not been clearly documented, it is widely believed that it can have a positive effect on community attitudes such as fear of crime and neighbourhood satisfaction (Cordner, 1999; Palmiotto, 2005; Vito et al., 2006). However, the community needs to own the practice of community policing for it to be effective (Skogan and Hartnett, 1998). Community ownership requires long term commitment; Harvey (2005) believes that to sustain this commitment from the community, a range of techniques need to be adopted. These include:

- Community meetings and working in partnership with local groups;
- Involving other agencies in partnerships to carry out crime prevention activities;
- Sharing problem solving; and
- Delegating responsibility for crime prevention from district commanders to individual officers.

To measure effectiveness, evaluations should look at the organisational support and the structures in place for community policing as well as police attitudes and job satisfaction. Cordner and Biebel Perkins (2005) suggest that at the very least effectiveness should be measured through meetings and contacts (process) and public fear of crime (impact).

Benefits of community policing

Essentially, community policing is a philosophy with operating principles (Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd, 2007), based on the assumption that changes today will make communities safer and more attractive tomorrow (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990), which is achieved by working together towards shared goals (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004). Community policing brings the police and community closer and offers a myriad of other benefits. Palmitto explains the benefit of community policing to be:

“... a game the Police can't lose. If coproduction through community participation leads to lower crime rates and higher arrest rates, the Police can take the credit for being foresighted agents of change. If community policing fails to increase public security, the public is hardly likely to reduce support for policing because a new gambit doesn't work out. Moreover, even if the police cannot actually deliver on the large goal of crime reduction, a heightened police presence is reassuring. Thus, community policing reduces fear of crime-and, from the perspective of political benefits to police, delivers the message that police care.” (Palmitto, 2000: 207)

The evaluation findings of three key initiatives: the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS); the UK National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP); and the Queensland: On the Beat evaluation all reported mixed findings⁶. Nonetheless, these evaluations identified some benefits, which are discussed below. The framework from this chapter originates from the synopsis of Andy Mayhill (2006). The benefits included:

- Improving police-community relationships and community perceptions of police;
- Increasing community capacity to deal with issues;
- Changing police officers' attitudes and behaviours;
- Increasing perceptions of safety; and
- Reducing crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour.

Improving police-community relationships and community perceptions of police

Community policing enables police to develop improved police-community relationships (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004). This provides the police with the opportunity to meet the community's needs (Ferreira, 1996), while increasing public accountability over police through participation (Skolnick and Bayley, 1988; Palmiotto, 2000).

A number of initiatives have showed positive improvements in police-community relationships and community perceptions of police (Skogan and Steiner, 2004; Sadd and Grinc, 1996). The CAPS and NRPP evaluations both demonstrated positive improvements in community perceptions of police.

Increasing community capacity to deal with issues

Building community capacity can mobilise and empower the community to identify and respond to concerns (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004). The benefit of an empowered community is a stronger community who want to participate in addressing issues (Mastrofski, 2006).

⁶ More detailed findings for these evaluations can be found in Chapter 7: *Key findings of some community policing evaluations*, p36.

Community policing offers the public a larger window into police activity (Skolnick and Bayley, 1988) and provides opportunities for 'grass roots' support for police (Palmiotto, 2000). However, communities with existing capacity are more likely to participate in community policing, but are less likely to benefit from it because, in general, they are already proactively addressing issues to increase community safety (Mayhill, 2006).

Neither the CAPS nor the NRPP evaluations specifically measured the social capacity dealing with issues. However, the CAPS programme demonstrated an increase in positive community's attitudes in their own ability to interact and solve problems (Ferreira, 1996). Similarly, the NRPP found improvements in public awareness of the programme (Tuffin et al., 2006). However, the NRPP aimed to increase social capacity but as a by-product of engagement (Tuffin et al., 2006). The authors concluded that community capacity is unlikely to have an impact in a programme without a specific measure for building social capacity.

Changing police officers' attitudes and behaviours

Strong anecdotal evidence suggests that community policing has positive effects on police through increased job satisfaction and improved interaction with, and confidence in, the community (Mayhill, 2006; Patterson, 2007). Mayhill (2006) argues that community policing 'embeds' officers within the community where they become more understanding of the local situations and promote a positive image of police. This provides the officers with the opportunity to make positive community-police experiences and contacts, which is said to increase morale amongst police through the encouragement of a supportive and welcoming community (Palmiotto, 2000).

The Queensland: On the Beat evaluation illustrated that community police officers felt increased job satisfaction and increased organisational support (Mazerolle et al., 2003). The CAPS evaluation demonstrated an increase in the positive attitude towards police (Skogan, 2006).

Increasing perceptions of safety/decreasing fear of crime

It is widely accepted that community policing increases the perceptions of safety and decreases the fear of crime. Skogan (2006) argues there is evidence to suggest that increasing community-police interactions are associated with lower levels in fear of crime. However, police and the community have differing levels of perceptions of safety and it has been suggested that police are more likely to perceive a reduction in the fear of crime than the community (Sadd and Grinc, 1994).

Many evaluations have illustrated positive findings in reducing the fear of crime and increasing perceptions of safety. For example, the NRPP measured specific indicators of safety which overall illustrated positive results (Tuffin, 2006). The CAPS evaluation demonstrated a significant decrease in the community's perception of crime problems (Ferreira, 1996; Skogan and Steiner, 2004). However, Skogan and Hartnett (1998) found that although the reduction in fear of crime was widespread, the impacts were inconsistent across different ethnic groups.

Reducing crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour

Community policing is beneficial as a policing approach to address a range of different crime, disorder and anti-social behaviour. For example, community policing approaches have been used to address graffiti and property damage to gang violence and organised crime (Skogan and Hartnett, 1997). More recently it has been an approach adopted to deal with anti-terrorist activities in some communities (Pickering et al., 2007). Sherman (1997) argues that community policing needs clear objectives that focus on crime risk factors.

While there is fairly strong evidence that community policing is able to reduce disorder and anti-social behaviour, overall findings are mixed about the ability to reduce crime (Mayhill, 2006).

Reducing crime, although a benefit, is not always the main focus of the community policing programmes and often the principle outcome is to reduce victimisation. The CAPS evaluation found decreases in crime and both physical and social disorder in the areas where community policing practices were active (Skogan and Hartnett, 1998). However, it is difficult to confidently conclude that the decrease in crime was due to the CAPS or other factors, for example, increases in the number of police officers (Skogan, 2006; Mayhill, 2006). Reduced crime was not a measure for the NRPP. Instead it measured changes in disorder and anti-social behaviour through self-reported victimisation surveys on the perceptions of crime and disorder (Tuffin, 2006). Overall, the NRPP illustrated positive programme effects on disorder and anti-social behaviour.

5. Barriers to Community Policing

The barriers to community policing examine a synopsis of the implementation challenges and four barriers identified by Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd (2007). It is important to note that the barriers are not insurmountable and do not apply to all police departments. The barriers include:

- Implementation challenges
- The police officer/organisation
- The resident/community
- Police culture
- Specialised units

Implementation challenges

Community policing is a popular reform, but has paid little attention to the challenges of implementation (Mastrofski et al., 2007), which is often said to be fraught with problems and challenges for a number of reasons. Patterson (2007) believes implementation is challenged by the incremental nature in which community policing is often introduced, resulting in increased resources allocated within short timeframes with little time for planning. Mastrofski et al. (2007) suggest that the traditional barriers of organisational change, scarce resources and a resistant police culture still exist and will continue to jeopardise the successful implementation of any community policing initiative.

Many authors agree that in order to achieve effective community policing, implementation issues must be addressed (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004; Sadd and Grinc 1996). Mayhill (2006: 49) summarises the barriers to successful implementation and possible 'unintended' consequences of poor implementation. The barriers to successful implementation include:

- Lack of organisational commitment and culture change;
- Community engagement seen as a one-off series of events and not 'mainstreamed';
- Lack of community ownership of the process; inequitable power relationships;
- Lack of control, flexibility and tailoring at neighbourhood level;
- Lack of status/incentives for beat officers; lack of understanding of their role;
- Performance measurement frameworks that do not reward community engagement;
- Individual officer appraisals that do not reward community engagement roles;
- Lack of training for officers on community engagement philosophy and methods;
- Police 'beats' that do not correspond to community perceptions of neighbourhoods;
- Not recognising the historical lack of trust between police and certain communities;
- Lack of capacity and collective efficacy in some communities;
- Lack of a clear definition and training for the community role in engagement;
- Lack of good quality information about crime provided to communities;
- Lack of adequate feedback to communities on action from engagement;

- Not valuing the contribution of communities and volunteers;
- Lack of co-ordinated, multi-agency approach to community engagement; and
- Lack of initial extra investment or re-profiling of resources to community work.

Many of these barriers are discussed in the following sections. The barriers to successful implementation are not isolated to the implementation phase and can affect continued community policing practices. Mayhill (2006) considers that the possible consequences of poor implementation include:

- Lack of officer understanding and buy-in leads to cynicism and lack of co-operation;
- Poorly planned engagement leads to unrealistic community expectations;
- Frustrated/disappointed communities less likely to engage in the future;
- Engagement process dominated by one group or community interest;
- Problem-solving benefits communities that least need it;
- Problem solving exacerbates divisions in communities that have differing interests; and
- Community members take inappropriate or illegal action in response to problems.

The police officer/organisation

There are a number of reasons why the police officer and the organisation pose a barrier to community policing. Community policing ‘... requires a great deal of training, close supervision, strong analytical capacity, and organization wide commitment’ (Skogan and Steiner, 2004: p155). This section discusses the barrier of the police officer/organisation in three subsections, which includes: the police officer, training, and sustained organisational commitment.

The police officer

A National Center of Community Policing study found in that three of four initiatives community policing was being conducted without the contribution of the community to identify, prioritise and solve problems (Bucqueroux, 2007). This indicates that it is possible for community police officers to work independently of the community when identifying and providing solutions to community issues.

The second barrier pertaining to the police officer is that their performance measures are based on enforcement type organisational measures rather than their aptitude to build relationships with the community, but, which results in the inability to reward an officer's good work (Skogan and Hartnett, 1998; Skolnick and Bayley, 1988; Green, 2000; Polzin, 2007).

Training

Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd (2007) suggest that most officers are not trained in the formation of partnerships; nor do they have experience in organising community involvement or empowering the community. With limited training it is unlikely that police will realise the full potential of community policing. Skogan (2006) suggests training is often ‘short-changed’ because community policing is labour intensive. Mastrofski (2006) argues that in the United States recruit training has not been substantially revised to promote community policing techniques. Greene (2000) highlights the fact that generally less than one week is devoted for

American police officers to learn and function in new police 'thinking roles' and if results can be achieved with limited training then the question of whether success comes from a programme/organisation or is due to the individual officer.

Sustaining organisational commitment

Skogan and Hartnett (1998) argue that one of the key barriers to community policing is sustaining organisational commitment. They discuss 11 experimental projects in which only one continued. Based on this one project, Skogan and Hartnett concluded that where there is sustained commitment and community ownership the result was a decline in levels of crime, social disorder and physical decay. The reasons for the remaining projects not continuing included:

- Increasing pressure to respond to surging calls for service;
- Opposition from officers and mid-level management; and
- The cessation of funding.

Young and Tinsley (1998) suggest that traditional police structures have done little to foster the acceptance of responsibility for analysing a problem and seeking a resolution. Mastrofski (2006) criticises the general lack of a 'whole-of-police' approach with community policing.

Polzin (2007) argues that Police need to employ change management strategies to successfully implement community policing. Similarly, Goldstein (1993 - cited in Flynn, 2004) indicates that:

“The initiatives associated with community policing cannot survive in a police agency managed in traditional ways. If changes are not made, the agency sets itself up for failure ... [O]fficers will not be creative ... if a high value continues to be placed on conformity. They will not be thoughtful if they are required to adhere to regulations that are thoughtless. And they will not aspire to act as mature, responsible adults if their superiors treat them like children.” (p29)

Polzin (2007) believes for community policing to be successful all barriers need to be identified during the design phase of community policing initiatives. Some of the common organisational barriers include:

- A lack of involvement by police management in the initiative's design, implementation, and monitoring;
- Disagreements about resource allocation and personnel deployment;
- Confusion or disagreement about changes in department systems and structures;
- Middle management indifference;
- Clashes between 'command-and-control' management styles and expanded decision making by line officers; and
- Preferential treatment for community police officers.

The resident/community

Community involvement and engagement are fundamental concepts to community policing. However, sustained community involvement and the different community engagement mechanisms have been identified as barriers to community policing. These are discussed below.

Sustained community involvement

The ability to sustain commitment from the community and external agencies has been identified as a barrier to community policing. Community policing is highly dependent upon community involvement but maintaining their sustainability has been an issue (Skogan and Hartnett, 1998). Residents, unlike the agencies involved, are not paid, and in order to participate must take time away from work, family, friends, daily chores, and personal interests (Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd, 2007).

Community policing often implies that individuals have common interests, values, integrity, demands and expectations but in practice communities are ambiguous (Skolnick and Bayley, 1988). Skogan (2006) argues that community involvement is not easily achieved in areas of most need and harder to reach parts of the community can become excluded in the 'community effort' because they have different interests, values, and expectations. Segrave and Ratcliffe (2004) argue that community policing serves the interests of the vocal minority and the presence of strong personalities and influential groups can dominate discussions and control the direction of an initiative.

Other factors can limit community participation in addressing issues. For example, the ethos of individualism may undercut attempts to work in partnership with police. In addition, a lack of capital investment is seen as a lack of social investment (Herbert, 2006). Herbert questions if economically and socially disparate communities are capable of generating and sustaining themselves as 'communities' under the expectations the normative ideals of community policing. The conflicting values are also a problem for agencies working together.

The lack of sustained interagency cooperation is believed to be because agencies have traditionally viewed community policing to belong to police rather than a community-wide responsibility (Skogan, 2006). Moreover, Thacher (2001) argues that working in partnership can result in conflicting values and different social values being promoted by different agencies, which create an inability to effectively work together.

Community engagement mechanisms

Community meetings have been identified as a mechanism for the community to identify and prioritise their problems, but have proven difficult to sustain. The CAPS initiative experienced difficulty in sustaining resident involvement because police often dominated the solution with enforcement-oriented approaches, limiting productive dialogue between police and residents (Skogan and Hartnett, 1998). Young and Tinsley (1998) believe in New Zealand formal community consultation committees were not successful for similar reasons: the police dominated the meetings, with the focus on either issues or concerns raised by police or on issues of which police had little knowledge or regarded as outside the scope of their work. In addition, the formal consultative meetings were unrepresentative and poorly attended.

Mastrofski et al. (2006) argues beat meetings intended to help community prioritise, participate in problem solving and discuss police services, were not successful in engaging collective self help behaviour. Instead, meetings become a place to advocate for more service delivery. However, Bucqueroux (2004) argues that communities need to be empowered and undertake training to enable them to lead in problem solving.

Mastrofski (2006) raises an interesting research question: what does the community expect from the community policing? If more was understood about community expectations then they could be incorporated into the development of initiatives.

Police culture

Traditional law enforcement and criminal justice practices create a lack of sympathy in understanding of what community policing is (Young and Tinsley, 1998). Ideas of 'solidarity' or 'brotherhood' are important in understanding the resistance to community policing. It is thought the police officers develop the need to protect one another against signs of trouble, offence or threat and perceived of danger (Skolnick and Bayley, 1988). Skogan (2006) argues there is resistance to community policing within the ranks because it is seen as soft policing or 'social work' and 'just politics' due to the involvement from public officials. Some officers do not like civilian influence on operational priorities. Scott and Jobes (2007) believe that traditionally police are 'formally trained and informally socialised' through the bureaucracy of law enforcement, which provides a counter to community policing and community engagement. However, police culture is often resistant to change towards community policing for several reasons, including: the potential loss of autonomy; there could be diversion of resources from traditional core functions; the community could impose unrealistic programmes; and police 'tough-minded' status could be demeaned (Skogan and Hartnett, 1998; Greene, 2000).

Police culture can undermine police-community relationships because police officers dominate as 'crime and disorder experts', which disadvantages the community when offering solutions. Bucqueroux (2004) believes police are doing a good job of engaging with the community for help and support but are still reluctant to share power and decision making with them. Furthermore, Herbert (2006) argues police often decide on the terms of engagement for various social problems because of the separation from the community due to their duties and powers, which disempowers the community and limits their involvement.

Specialised units

Carroll, Buracker and Associates Ltd (2007) argue that the effectiveness of community policing becomes limited when community police operate as specialised units. Specialised units can create an environment of isolation or cause friction between staff. More successful community policing initiatives have incorporated a 'whole of organisation' approach. However, the implementation of a 'whole of organisation' approach is often problematic (Cordner, 1999).

Officers work in isolation

Community police officers are likely to suffer isolation within the organisation where community policing is delivered through specialist officers (e.g. community constables) or through dedicated units (Young and Tinsley, 1998). Working in specialised units can cause difficulties establishing credibility and gaining status amongst colleagues who are still largely driven by law enforcement and criminal justice practices. The authors believe that:

“... if problem-solving and responsibility for crime prevention are assigned to specialised units without fundamental change in the rest of policing, the predominant philosophy and culture of the organisation will almost inevitably remain unchanged and crime-related problems which are identified or observed in the course of patrol or investigative work or through community contact will be only fitfully addressed” (Young and Tinsley, 1998: p10).

However, Young and Tinsley suggest this issue may be mitigated with support from management and by rewarding successful problem solving through community partnership.

Workplace friction

In some cases, specialised community policing units have caused major friction between the beat officer and the community police officer (Carroll, Buracker and Associates Ltd, 2007; Patterson, 2007). Much of this friction is because of the differences in practices: community police officers typically choose their hours, working Monday to Friday; they are provided with increased and new resources such as cars; they may have limited experience in the police; and – of more concern – there is often no job description developed (Carroll, Buracker and Associates Ltd, 2007).

6. Key Findings of Some Community Policing Evaluations

Skogan and Hartnett (1998) suggest that the lessons from the successes and failures of initiatives should be incorporated into the development of new initiatives. The findings of three key evaluations are discussed in the following sections to provide an overview of the lessons learned. The first study was included because it has been widely referred in the literature (Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy). The remaining two studies have been included due to their relevance to the New Zealand context: the National Reassurance Policing Programme, UK; and On the Beat, Queensland.

1. Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS)

The CAPS programme is widely recognised and has helped inform the literature on community policing. A city wide evaluation was conducted over a 10-year period, during which time a substantial amount of data was collected. The evaluation aimed to gauge:

- The impact of community policing on local neighbourhood problems and to determine the process of problem identification;
- How individual problems were tracked;
- How community policing policies reduced issues identified by residents as the most serious problems; and
- The extent to which the local community were involved in dealing with the neighbourhood problems and implementing tailored solutions.

The evaluation measured drug and gang problems, serious crime problems, physical decay problems, and perceived police responsiveness to the community concerns.

Overall, the programme has been described as a success in terms of the raised level of awareness achieved in joint ownership through agencies partnerships. However, there were mixed results in terms of effectiveness. The key findings included:

- “It is hard getting community policing off the ground, but it can be made to work” (Skogan and Hartnett, 1998: 246);
- The programme was effective in addressing a broad range of problems and maintaining partnerships with relevant agencies that supported a problem solving approach (Skogan and Steiner, 2004);
- 53 per cent of identified crime problems in CAPS areas showed positive changes compared to the comparison areas (Skogan; 1996). This success rate is comparative to many community policing evaluations in the United States;
- There were significant decreases in perceived crime problems, and positive attitude changes towards 1) the police and 2) the community’s own ability to interact to solve problems (Ferreira, 1996; Skogan and Steiner, 2004);

- There was a steady improvement in perceptions of police across all ethnic groups. However, views remained polarised across the ethnic groups, with a 15 to 20 per cent point gap between the perceptions of African Americans and Latino residents and White residents (Skogan and Steiner, 2004; Mayhill, 2006);
- There was a reduction in physical and social disorder, but results differed across the ethnic groups. Sharp decreases in levels of disorder were found in the predominantly African American neighbourhoods. Only modest reductions were noted in predominantly White neighbourhoods because the existing levels of disorder were low. The predominantly Latino neighbourhoods experienced serious issues but demonstrated little change (Skogan and Steiner, 2004; Mayhill, 2006);
- Although community meetings were well attended, they failed to achieve representation in many communities (Skogan and Steiner, 2004);
- Police officers noted that the actions resulting from the meetings were limited at best (Skogan and Steiner, 2004);
- Police officers also had difficulties articulating what was being discussed at the community meetings (Skogan and Steiner, 2004);
- The police department had difficulties applying problem solving tools to solve community problems because 'it requires a great deal of training, close supervision, strongly analytical capacity, and organization wide commitment' (Skogan and Steiner, 2004: 155);
- The Chicago Police Department was effective in reorganising to support community policing (Skogan and Steiner, 2004).

2. National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP)

The NRPP evaluated 16 sites across the United Kingdom. The overarching objective was to reduce crime and improve public confidence in policing by aiming to make positive changes to neighbourhoods by:

- Reducing anti-social behaviour;
- Reducing fear of crime and improving the sense of safety;
- Increasing public satisfaction and confidence in the Police; and
- Improving social capacity (Tuffin et al., 2006).

The NRPP tested the premise that negative feelings of public safety are constructed by certain cues or signals denoting social or physical disorder. The evaluation intended to answer the question: to what extent can neighbourhood interventions influence crime reduction and increase confidence in Police?

The evaluation also concluded mixed results in term of effectiveness. The key findings included:

- Overall, the NRPP made a positive change in the key outcomes over the course of a year, "[p]roviding strong evidence that local policing activity can have a positive impact on a range of outcomes" (Tuffin et al., 2006: 95);

- Results showed significant differences in the perceptions of anti-social behaviour, public confidence in police, and feelings of safety compared to the control sites (Tuffin et al., 2006);
- The NRPP was successful with community engagement, problem solving and visibility of police. However, visibility and familiarisation on its own did not lead to increased public perceptions but did so as part of a multi-pronged approach (Tuffin et al., 2006);
- Results demonstrated a significant positive change in public perceptions were sites carried out targeted problem-solving activity (Tuffin et al., 2006);
- An increase in public perceptions resulted in the improvement of community perceptions around police engagement activity (Tuffin et al., 2006);
- The programme had no effect on the calls for service or social capacity, for example, willingness of neighbours to intervene or increased voluntary activity (Tuffin et al., 2006);
- There was very little change in any of the social capacity indicators, e.g. perceptions of being a close community, trust in the local area, whether people would intervene, and would people help one another out (Tuffin et al., 2006);
- The programme had no effect on those contacting the police other than as a victim of crime (Tuffin et al.; 2006).

3. On the Beat Evaluation: Queensland

The 'On the Beat' evaluation is included in this review because it covers both neighbourhood and business based officers. The evaluation aimed to determine the effectiveness of community policing by examining the rate of reported crime in conjunction with measuring perceptions of community crime and safety. The outcome measures included:

- The rate and number of reported crimes;
- The rate and number of the types of crimes, e.g. personal, property or other;
- Perceptions of crime and safety in experimental and comparative areas;
- The frequency of incidents; and
- The effect the solution had on all parties involved.

The programme involved a number of different types of beat officers, which included: 'outer-urban neighbourhood', 'regional neighbourhood', 'shop front', and 'metropolitan shop front' officers (Mazerolle et al., 2003).

Similarly, the evaluation found mixed results in terms of effectiveness. The key findings included:

- The presence of neighbourhood beat patrols were associated with a reduction in the overall rate of reported crime, including property crime (Mazerolle et al.; 2003);
- Shop front beat patrols were effective in raising awareness and visibility of police but there was no decrease in the overall rate of reported crime (Mazerolle et al.; 2003);

- Both the neighbourhood and shop front patrols demonstrated an increase in police activity and visibility but this did not lead to a reduction in the perceptions of crime levels, an increase in personal safety or public willingness to report crime (Mazerolle et al., 2003);
- Neither neighbourhood beats nor shop front beats reduced perceptions of crime or increased perceptions of personal safety (Mazerolle et al., 2003);
- There were no reductions in the calls for service in the short term but showed some long term improvements for chronic repeat calls (Mazerolle et al.; 2003);
- The community were supportive of and made positive comments about the policing model. However, this also occurred in the comparison areas (Mazerolle et al., 2003);
- Workloads of beat officers were equal to, and in some cases better, than general duties officers (Mazerolle et al., 2003);
- Neighbourhoods with police beats would not be served the same by the police if officers were diverted towards general duties (Mazerolle et al., 2003);
- Evidence suggests that responses provided by one 'beat' officer was more cost-effective than providing general duties staff (Mazerolle et al., 2003);
- Overall beat officers felt considerable job satisfaction and organisational support (Mazerolle et al., 2003);
- The evaluation concluded that “[p]olice beats are likely to continue as an essential part of police service delivery in Queensland for the foreseeable future ... Ultimately the goal of delivering effective police services to all communities is best achieved by a commitment to police innovation, community satisfaction and program evaluation” (Mazerolle et al., 2003: 89)

7. Appendix

Search Strategy

An electronic search was conducted using the New Zealand Police Library on-line catalogue and the internet search engine 'Google'. A search of index pages from the acquired literature provided further references. Identified references were either accessed on the internet or through the RNZPC library. Articles and books were also sourced through personal communication with New Zealand Police staff at Police National Headquarters.

The literature search predominately identified research from the United States, the United Kingdom, Australia and New Zealand. Given the paucity of New Zealand research and evaluations, international elements will be compared and contrasted to community policing practices currently being evaluated.

During the search it was noted that a variety of related words were used to depict community policing. Therefore, a wider search was conducted using a combination of the key words, listed in the table below.

| Community | Policing | Elements | Barriers |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Problem-orientated | Police | Key elements | Barriers |
| Partnership | Officer | Principles | Obstacles |
| Neighbourhood | Law enforcement | Evidence based | Challenges |
| Engagement | | Effectiveness | Weaknesses |
| Beat | | Best practice | |
| Foot patrol | | | |
| Reassurance | | | |

8. References

Books and Articles

Bucqueroux, B., (2004) 'Community Policing in the Years Ahead: And Now for the Really Hard Part' in *Community Policing: The Past, Present, and Future*, eds L Fridell and M Wycoff, Police Executive Research Forum: Washington, pp 73-82

Bucqueroux, B., (2007) *What Community policing teaches us about Community Criminal Justice*
<http://www.policing.com/articles/pdf/ccj.pdf> (accessed 28/08/2007)

Bullock, K. and Tilley, N. (2003) 'Introduction - Problem-oriented policing: the concept the implementation and impact in the UK and US' in *Crime Reduction and Problem-oriented Policing*, eds K Bullock and N Tilley, Willan Publishing: Devon.

Brookes, S., (2006) 'Community Policing in Context', in *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, v8, n2, pp 104-117

Committee on Law and Justice, (2004) *Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing: The evidence*, ed. W. Skogan and K Frydl, The National Academies Press: Washington D.C.
http://books.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=10419&page=R1
(accessed 02/08/2007)

Cordner, G. (1999) 'Elements of Community Policing' in *Policing Perspectives: An Anthology*, eds L. Gaines and G. Cordner, Roxbury Publishing Company: Los Angeles, pp137-149

Cordner, G., (2007a) *The Key Elements of Oriented Community Policing*, Regional Community Policing Institute: Colorado
<http://www.dcj.state.co.us/crcpi/KeyElements.html> (accessed 10/08/2007)

Cordner, G. (2007b) *Community Policing: Principles and Elements*, Regional Community Policing Institute: Eastern Kentucky University
<http://www.kycops.org/wcp.htm> (accessed 13/08/2007)

Cordner, G. and Perkins, E., (2005) 'Problem-oriented policing in practice' in *Criminology and Public Policy*, v4, i2, pp155-180

Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd (2007) *Elements of Community Policing*, Carroll Buracker and Associates Ltd
<http://www.buracker.com/sanfran.html> (accessed 10/08/2007)

Dalglish, D., and Myhill, A., (2004) *Reassuring the public: a review of international policing interventions*, Home Office Research Study 284, Home Office: London
<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/hors284.pdf> (accessed 12/11/2007)

Eck, J.E., (2004) 'Why don't problems get solved', in *Community Policing (Can it work)*, Wadsworth: Toronto, pp185-206

Farrell, M.J., (1988) 'The development of the Community Patrol Program: Community-oriented policing in the New York City Police Department' in *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality* ed J Green and S Mastrofski, Praeger Publishers: New York, pp73-88

Fielding, N (1995) *Community Policing*, Oxford University Press: Oxford

Fielding, N. and Innes, M., (2006) 'Reassurance Policing, Community Policing and Measuring Police Performance', in *Policing and Society*, v16, n2, pp 127-145

Ferreira, B. (1996) 'The use and effectiveness of community policing in a democracy', *Policing in Central and Eastern Europe: Comparing Firsthand Knowledge with Experience from the West*, College of Police and Security Studies: Slovenia

<http://www.ncjrs.gov/policing/use139.htm> (accessed 14/05/2007)

Fleming, J., (2005) "'Working Together": Neighbourhood Watch, Reassurance Policing and the Potential Partnerships' in *Trends and Issues in crime and criminal justice*, n 303, Australian Institute of Criminology: Canberra

<http://www.aic.gov.au/publications/tandi2/tandi303.pdf> (accessed 12/11/2007)

Flynn, E (2004) 'Community Policing is Good Policing, Both Today and Tomorrow' in *Community Policing: The Past, Present, and Future*, eds L Fridell and M Wycoff, Police Executive Research Forum: Washington, pp 25-38

Forrest, S., Myhill, A., and Tilley, N., (2005) *Practical lessons for involving the community in crime and disorder problem-solving*, Home Office Development and Practice Report 43, Home Office: London

<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs05/dpr43.pdf> (accessed 12/11/07)

Fridell, L (2004) 'The Defining Characteristics of Community Policing' in *Community Policing: The Past, Present, and Future*, eds L Fridell and M Wycoff, Police Executive Research Forum: Washington, pp 3-12

Greene, J.R. (2000) 'Community Policing in America: Changing the Nature, structure, and Function of the Police' in *Criminal Justice 2000: Policies, Processes, and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System*, National Criminal Justice, v3, pp 299-370

http://www.ncjrs.gov/criminal_justice2000/vol_3/03g.pdf (accessed 15/10/2007)

Harvey, S, (2005) 'Literature Review: Police Practice in Reducing Residential Burglary' in *Research on the effectiveness of Police practice in reducing residential burglary: Report 3*, Ministry of Justice: Wellington

Herbert, S. (2006) *Citizens, Cops, and Power: Recognizing the Limits of Community*, University of Chicago Press: Chicago

Harrison Moore, M., (1992) 'Problem-solving and Community Policing', in *Crime and Justice*, v15, Modern Policing, pp99-158

Innes, M. (2003) *Understanding Social Control: Deviance, Crime and Social Order*, McGraw-Hill International: New York

- Joyce, P. (2006) *Criminal Justice: An Introduction to Crime and Criminal Justice System*, Willan Press: London
- Kelling, G.L. and Moore, M., (1988) 'From Political to Reform to Community: The Evolving Strategy of Police' in *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality* ed J Green and S Mastrofski, Praeger Publishers: New York, pp3-26
- Lilley, D., and Hinduja, S., (2006) 'Officer evaluation in the community policing context' in *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, v29, n1, pp 19-37
- Mastrofski, S., (2006) 'Critic - Community Policing: A Sceptical View' in *Police Innovation: Contemporary Perspectives*, ed. D. Weisburd and A. Braga, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp 44-73
- Mastrofski, S., Parks, R.B., and Worden, R.E (1998) *Community Policing in Action: Lessons from an observational study*, State University of New York: Albany
- Mastrofski, S., Willis, J., and Kochel, T. (2007) 'The Challenges of Implementing Community Policing in the United States' in *Policing*, 2007; i1, pp223-234
- Mayhill, A. (2007) Community engagement in Policing: Lessons from the literature
http://police.homeoffice.govt.uk/news-and-publications/community-policing/community_engagement_lit_review.pdf?view=Binary (13/08/2007)
- Mazerolle, P., Adams, K., Budz, D., Cockerill, C. and Vance, M. (2003) *On the Beat: An evaluation of beat policing in Queensland*, Crime and Misconduct Commission: Brisbane
- Morris, J. (2006) *The National Reassurance Policing Programme: a ten-site evaluation*; Home Office Research Findings 273: United Kingdom
<http://www.homeoffice.govt.uk/rds/pdfs06/r273.pdf> (accessed 07/05/2007)
- New Zealand Police (1989) *New Model of Policing: Strategy*, New Zealand Police National Headquarters: Wellington
- New Zealand Police (1991) *Corporate Plan 90/91: Review of Community Orientated Policing - Management Review Section*, New Zealand Police National Headquarters: Wellington
- New Zealand Police (1993) *Strategic Initiative: Community Orientated Policing*, New Zealand Police National Headquarters: Wellington
- New Zealand Police (2008) *Community Policing Brochure*, New Zealand Police National Headquarters: Wellington
- Palmiotto, M. (2000) *Community Policing: A Policing Strategy for the 21st Century*, Jones and Bartlett Publishers: Boston
- Patterson, J. (2007) *Community Policing: Learning the Lessons of History*, Letric Law Library
<http://www.lectlaw.com/files/cjs07.htm> (accessed 07/05/2007)

- Pelfrey, W. (2007) 'Style of policing adopted by rural police and deputies: An analysis of job satisfaction and community policing' in *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, v30, n4, 2007
- Pickering, S., Wright-Neville, D., McCulloch, J., and Lentini, P. (2007) *Counter-Terrorism Policing and Culturally Diverse Communities: Final Report 2007*, Monash University.
- Polzin, M. (2007) *A Labor-management Approach to Community Policing*, Michigan State University - School of Labor and Industrial Relations: Michigan
<http://www1.cjmsu.edu/~outreach/cp/labman.html> (accessed 25/02/2008)
- Reno, J., Marcus, D., Leary, M.L., and Travis, J. (1998) *Problem Solving in Practice: Implementing Community Policing in Chicago*, US Department of Justice: National Institute of Justice
<http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/179556.pdf> (accessed on 08/08/2007)
- Sadd, S and Grinc, R, (1996) *Implementation Challenges in Community Policing Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing in Eight Cities*
<http://www.ncjrs.gov/txtfiles/implcp.txt> (accessed on 01/05/2007)
- Sarre, R. (2005) *Community Policing - Success or Failure? Exploring Different Models of Evaluation*
<http://www.aic.gov.au/publications/proceedings/05/sarre.pdf>
(accessed on 01/05/2007)
- Scott, J., Hogg, R., Barclay, E. and Donnermeyer, J. (2007) 'Introduction: There's crime out there, but not as we know it: Rural criminology - the last frontier' in *Crime in Rural Australia*, eds. Barclay, E., Donnermeyer, J., Scott, J. and Hogg, R., The Federation Press: Sydney, pp 1-14
- Scott, J., and Jobes, P.C., (2007) 'Policing in rural Australia: The country cop as law enforcer and local resident' in *Crime in Rural Australia*, eds. Barclay, E., Donnermeyer, J., Scott, J. and Hogg, R., The Federation Press: Sydney, pp 127-137
- Segrave, M., and Ratcliffe, J. (2004) *Community Policing: A descriptive overview*, Australian Institute of Criminology
- Sherman, L.W., and Eck, J.E (2002) 'Policing for crime prevention', in Sherman, L.W., Farrington, D.P., Welsh, B.C., and MacKenzie, D.L, *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention*, Routledge: New York, pp 295-329
- Singer, L., (2004) *Reassurance Policing: an evaluation of the local management of community safety*, Home Office Research Study 288, Home Office: London
<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/hors288.pdf> (accessed 13/08/2007)
- Skogan, W. (1996) *Evaluating Problem Solving Policing: The Chicago Experience*, Institute for Policy Research: Northwestern University, Illinois
http://www.northwestern.edu/ipr/publications/policing_papers/caps17.pdf
(accessed pm 03/05/2007)

- Skogan, W. (2002) *Longitudinal Evaluation of Chicago's Community Policing Program, 1993-2001*, Institute for Policy Research: Northwestern University, Illinois
<http://webapp.icpsr.umich.edu/cocoon/NACJD/STUDY/03335.xml>
(accessed 03/05/2007)
- Skogan, W. (2005) 'Evaluating Community Policing in Chicago' in Kent R Kerley (ed.) *Policing and Program Evaluation*, Prentice Hall: New Jersey, pp. 27-41
- Skogan, W. (2006) 'Advocate - The Promise of Community Policing' in *Police Innovations: Contrasting Perspectives*, ed. D. Weisburd and A. Braga, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, pp 27-43
<http://www.ncjrs.gov/policing/use139.htm> (accessed 14/05/2007)
- Skogan, W. and Hartnett, S., (1998) *Community Policing: Chicago Style*, Oxford University Press: New York
- Skogan, W. and Roth, J., (2004) 'Introduction', in *Community Policing (Can it work)*, Wadsworth: Toronto, pp xvii
- Skogan, W. G. and Steiner, L. (2004). *Community policing in Chicago, Year ten*. Chicago: Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.
- Skolnick, J.H. and Bayley, D. (1988) *Community Policing: Issues and Practices around the World*, National Institute of Justice: Office of Communication and Research Utilization
- Smartt, U. (2006) *Criminal Justice*, Sage: London
- Strategos Consulting Ltd (1989) *New Zealand Police: Resource Management Review, 1989*, Strategos Consulting Ltd: Wellington
- Thacher, D. (2001) 'Conflicting Values in Community Policing' in *Law & Society Review*, Vol. 35, No. 4, pp. 765-798
- Tilley, N. (2003) 'Community Policing, Problem-oriented Policing and Intelligence-led Policing' in *Handbook of Policing*, ed. T Newburn, Willan Publishing: Cullompton
- Tilley, N., (2004) 'Community Policing and Problem Solving', in *Community Policing (Can it work)*, Wadsworth: Toronto, pp165-184
- Trojanowicz, R. and Bucqueroux, B., (1990) *Community Policing: A contemporary perspective*, Anderson Publishing Co: Ohio
- Tuffin, R (2006) *The National Reassurance Policing Programme: a six-site evaluation*; Home Office Research Findings 272: United Kingdom
<http://www.homeoffice.govt.uk/rds/pdfs06/r272.pdf> (accessed 07/05/07)
- Tuffin, R., Morris, J., and Poole, A. (2006) *An evaluation of the impact of the National Reassurance Policing Programme*, Home Office Research Study 296: United Kingdom
<http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs06/hors296.pdf> (accessed on 03/05/07)

Virta, S (2006) 'Community Policing' in *The Sage Dictionary of Criminology*, eds. McLaughlin, E., and Muncie, J., Sage: London

Vito, G., Maahs, J. R., and Holmes, R. (2006) *Criminology: Theory, Research and Policy* - Second edition, Jones and Bartlett Publishers: Boston, pp52-53

Waugh, A., (2005) *Review the literature on reassurance and to consider approaches which will assist New Zealand communities to feel safer*, New Zealand Police: Wellington

Weisheit, R. A., Wells, L. E., and Falcone, D. N., (1994) 'Community Policing in Small Town and Rural America', in *Crime and Delinquency*, v40, n4, pp 549-567

Winfrey, L.T. Jr., and Newbold, G. (1999) 'Community policing and the New Zealand Police: Correlates of attitudes toward the work world in a community-oriented national police organization' in *Policing. An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, v22, n4, 1999, pp589-617

Wycoff, M.A., (1988) 'The Benefits of Community Policing: Evidence and Conjecture' in *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality* ed J Green and S Mastrofski, Praeger Publishers: New York, pp103-134

Young, W., and Tinsley, Y., (1998) *Options for the development of COP/problem solving policing in New Zealand*, Victoria University of Wellington: Wellington

Internet sites

Corporation for National and Community Services: Preventing Crime with Ten Principles of Community Policing

http://www.nationalservice.org/epicenter/practices/snippet.php?action=print&p_action=view&ep_id=975 (accessed 28/08/2007)

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services: Internal Elements

<http://www.cops.usdg.gov/print.asp?Item=479> (accessed 27/08/2007)

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services: Organisational Elements

<http://www.cops.usdg.gov/print.asp?Item=477> (accessed 27/08/2007)

Office of Community Oriented Policing Services: Tactical Elements

<http://www.cops.usdg.gov/print.asp?Item=478> (accessed 27/08/2007)

Why Community Policing?

http://chandigarhpolice.nic.in?Why_Community_Poiling%201.htm (accessed 28/08/2007)

Corporation for National and Community Services: Preventing crime with ten principles of community policing

http://www.nationalservice.org/epicenter/practices/snippet.php?action=print&p_action=view&ep_id=975 (accessed 28/08/2007)