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ABSTRACT

Much of the prior literature concerning police behavior has focused on the activities and citizen interactions of officers employed by large agencies located in urban jurisdictions. Using data collected through the systematic social observation of police officers employed by twenty rural, small town, and suburban agencies in the Greater Cincinnati, OH area, the present dissertation explores issues relating to the work of police officers in smaller jurisdictions. Specifically, the activities performed by these officers are identified, and the nature and character of their interactions with citizens are described. In addition to these descriptive analyses, the present dissertation utilizes prior literature concerning the hypothesized link between community characteristics and police behavior in order to examine whether officers employed in small, but structurally diverse types of communities behave similarly in terms of officer activities and citizen interactions. Specifically, a cluster analysis was used to group these agencies and permit comparisons across community groups. Finally, these groupings were used in order to explore whether these agencies exhibited organizational “styles” consistent with those hypothesized in the prior literature.

The descriptive findings indicate that officers spent the majority of their shift time not in direct contact with citizens. The primary activities these officers performed while not in contact with citizens were motorized patrol, administrative tasks, personal/non-duty tasks, and driving to and from locations. When these officers were engaged with citizens, they primarily handled traffic-related problems, crime related problems, personal/non-duty problems, and service problems.

Comparisons across the small community types identified both similarities and
differences in terms of the way in which officers spent their time on patrol. Specifically, officers across community types tended to spend most of their time away from citizens on the four activities identified above, however, significant difference were found between the groups in terms of the percentage of time that they spent on non-task/personal activities and a number of other activities that were performed very infrequently across the community groups. In addition, differences were found in terms of the frequency with which officers encountered citizens, the percentage of time that they spent on crime related problems, and the percentage of time that they spent on service related problems. The implications of these findings are discussed.

For the most part, findings regarding the organizational “styles” exhibited by agencies within the different community types did not conform to the relationships hypothesized in prior literature. Possible factors that may have influenced these findings, as well as the limitations of the present dissertation are identified and elaborated.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

There are approximately 18,000 police departments in the United States (Walker 1999). The sheer size of the law enforcement industry and the existence of such a large number of agencies prevents convenient generalizations. However, a brief inspection furnishes at least one observation—the typical American police organization is small. Over ninety percent employ fewer than fifty sworn officers, and over three quarters of all local police agencies employ fewer than twenty five officers (Walker 1999). Some researchers have categorized departments that have less than ten officers as “atypically small,” although this definition encompasses over one-half of all American police agencies (Walker 1999; Weisheit, Wells, and Falcone 1996).

Despite these statistics, most of the research concerning police behavior has focused on large police agencies located in populous urban jurisdictions. Policing scholars have identified a clear “big-city bias” in the research concerning police organizations, officer behavior, and police-citizen interactions (Walker 1983; Maguire, Kuhns, Uchida, and Cox 1997; Reiss 1992). Smaller police agencies are often not recognized as distinct from their large urban counterparts. Notwithstanding the lack of empirically-derived data concerning the behavior of officers employed in smaller jurisdictions, many researchers have suggested that there are important differences between the behavior of officers who patrol large, urbanized areas and those who work in smaller locales. Specifically, they appear to be more intimately connected to their communities, perform a wider array of functions, and interact more informally with citizens.

Moreover, research primarily concerned with the work of “big-city cops” has often failed to recognize or explore whether officers from “small” agencies behave similarly. Instead,
smaller police organizations are often classified simply as “non-urban” or “rural,” and the workload and interactions of these officers are assumed to be analogous. These categorizations may mask substantive variations within the very large class of smaller agencies. This tendency to classify “small” police agencies in monolithic terms occurs despite the existence of a large body of literature that suggests that different types of communities are correlated with differing styles of police behavior (Wilson 1969; Duffee 1990; Langworthy and Travis 1999). For example, Wilson (1969) has suggested that police organizations tend to exhibit policing styles that are more or less reflective of the community context within which they exist, and he has subsequently classified agencies in terms of these distinct styles of behavior. Langworthy and Travis (1999), in an extension of Wilson’s (1969) ideas, hypothesize a specific link between community structures and the policing styles identified by Wilson (1969).

The apparent gap in the existing literature that has resulted from the “big city bias” highlighted above provides an opportunity to address a number of issues in a dissertation primarily concerned with the work of police in smaller agencies. First, what do police in smaller agencies do during a typical shift? While prior literature has addressed this issue in regards to urban officers, we currently have precious little empirical data regarding the workload and interactions of officers who patrol small-towns, rural places, and suburban jurisdictions. Second, is the behavior of officers different across jurisdictions that have smaller populations but that are none the less varied in terms of community structure? This issue has not been sufficiently addressed as of yet, largely due to the tendency of researchers to “group” small agencies as discussed above. The existence of variation in police behavior, if apparent, produces a third issue highlighted by the prior literature concerning the link between communities and the
police. Specifically, are differences in police behavior correlated with variations in the structural characteristics of the small communities within which these officers work? Using data collected from field observations of police officers in twenty small-town, rural, and suburban police departments in southwestern Ohio, the present study will endeavor to accomplish four main objectives:

1) to provide a description of the workload of police officers employed by rural, small-town, and suburban police agencies,

2) to provide a description of the nature and character of police-citizen interactions in rural, small-town, and suburban jurisdictions,

3) to explore whether variation exists among these agencies in terms of officer workload and police-citizen interactions, and

4) to test whether any observed variation in officer behavior is correlated with structural variations found in different types of communities as suggested in the prior literature.

The outline of the remainder of this introductory chapter is as follows. Initially, I will describe some of the methodological issues that have contributed to a limited body of empirical data concerning small-town, rural, and suburban police agencies. Subsequently, the chapter will provide a brief overview of the current state of knowledge regarding officer workload and the nature and character of officer-citizen interactions. I will then present a discussion concerning the hypothesized link between police behavior and the community. This section is followed by a description of how smaller communities may uniquely impact the police. Lastly, the chapter will describe how such a dissertation would add to our knowledge concerning the police.
SMALL POLICE AGENCIES AND METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

At present, we know very little about how policing is accomplished in smaller agencies (Cordner 1995; Langworthy and Travis 1994; Walker 1983). Although the subject has recently garnered increased attention, the methodologies most often employed in these studies, primarily anecdotal observations, open-ended interviews, self-reported task surveys, and calls for service analyses, have failed to provide systematic evidence regarding the activities and interactions of officers employed by smaller police agencies (Maquire et al. 1997; Thurman and McGarrell 1997; Weisheit, Wells, and Falcone 1994; Crank 1990).

Certain methodological barriers have partially attributed to these shortcomings. For example, small-town, rural, and suburban agencies typically employ far fewer officers than departments in more urban settings. The researcher is either forced to accept limited sample sizes from a single small jurisdiction, or is relegated to the task of gaining access to several smaller departments in order to increase sample sizes. While gaining access to any police organization for research purposes can be problematic, the culture and geographic isolation of some rural jurisdictions creates additional challenges for any prospective researcher (Weisheit, Falcone, and Wells 1996). Additionally, many smaller police agencies are not equipped to provide computerized and/or accessible records concerning calls for service data. As a result of these methodological shortcomings, the issue of what small-town, suburban, and rural police officers do is largely an unsettled empirical question.

PRIOR RESEARCH AND OFFICER WORKLOAD

While there remains a dearth of systematic data regarding the work of police in smaller agencies, prior research regarding the workload of police officers in larger jurisdictions may be
used to provide general inferences regarding the activities and interactions of small-town, rural, and suburban police. This line of research encompasses a broad range of studies that have employed a variety of methodologies and coding schemes, however, a number of conclusions have become evident regarding the workload of police officers—at least those working in the larger, more urban agencies that have typically been the focus of such studies.

First, it appears that police officers do not spend a majority of their time directly on law enforcement matters—a finding which is in direct conflict with the popular conception of police officers as primarily crime fighters (Cordner 1979; O’Neill and Bloom 1972; Webster 1970; Wilson 1968). Second, much of the police officer’s typical shift is not dedicated to responding to dispatched calls for service or directives from supervisors, but rather is devoted to filling blocks of uncommitted time (Cordner 1979; Greene and Klockers 1991; Kelling et al. 1974; O’Neill and Bloom 1972; Reiss 1971). Third, officer activities (excluding time spent dealing with citizens) appear to be dominated by routine patrol, driving en route to and from locations, administrative duties, and non-duty tasks in most cases (Whitaker 1972; Webster 1970; Parks, Mastrofski, DeJong, and Gray 1999). Finally, some of the more recent studies have focused on re-examining officer workload in the wake of the community policing movement (Frank, Brandl, and Watkins 1997; Parks et al. 1999). This research suggests that the work of officers who have been designated as “community policing specialists” appears to differ from that of more traditional beat officers. Specifically, community policing specialists engaged in a broader range of activities and were more service and problem-solving oriented.

The issue of how police officers spend their time can be more completely understood through a particular examination of how officers interact directly with citizens. Research that has involved observers to record patrol time and the nature of patrol tasks are uniquely suited to
describing the nature and characteristics of officer/citizen interactions (Cordner 1979). These studies have documented the amount of time and the number of instances during which police encounter citizens, the types of problems that are the focus of police/citizen encounters, and the role that citizens assume in such encounters (Kelling et al. 1974; Whitaker 1972; Frank et al. 1997; Parks et al. 1999). For example, these studies have found that officers spend anywhere from 91 minutes (or roughly 18%) to 190 minutes (or roughly 40%) of their shift time directly involved with citizens, and average anywhere between six and ten encounters per shift (Kelling et al. 1974; Parks et al. 1999; Whitaker 1972).

It is difficult to ascertain the focus of police/citizen encounters across these various studies because of variations in coding procedures. The Police Services Study (PSS), an observational study of officers across twenty-four agencies, found that an average of 38 percent of all police/citizen encounters involved "crime-related" matters (Whitaker 1972).\(^1\) Parks et al. (1999) found that roughly 80 percent of all police/citizen encounters involved some type of "police business," while the remainder were purely "casual" encounters with citizens. Likewise, the vast majority of citizens encountered (average of 43%) were either suspects or disputants (Parks et al. 1999). Finally, officers who are community policing specialists seem to encounter citizens more often on a casual basis (Parks et al. 1999).

While policing scholars have devoted a substantial amount of research to identifying the workload of police officers over the last thirty years—literature that has traditionally emphasized the work of officers performing in large urban jurisdictions—research regarding the correlation between community context and police behavior is somewhat limited. However, a number of researchers have suggested that community context can and does impact the activities and

\(^1\) Traffic violations were not coded as "crime-related."
interactions of police officers.

COMMUNITY AND POLICE BEHAVIOR

Theorists have attempted to philosophically establish the notion that there is an "inexorable" link between community context, the means of social control, and police behavior. For example, Banton (1964) suggested that social control is largely the function of the wider social context, including the norms of behavior and moral pressures inherent in any community. The police, as the primary purveyors of formal social control, cannot operate in isolation from the communities that they serve. These same notions are present in the work of Whyte (1943), who theorized that police enforce differing standards of behavior depending on neighborhood characteristics. Black (1976) also sought to link the context of communities with variations in social control. Black (1980) viewed the police as a "case study in the sociology of law," and his work focused on the varying quality and quantity of social control. Black specifically suggested that social structure (a facet of community context) can be used to predict the prevalent style of social control in a community. Further, Black (1976) predicted that community characteristics such as inequality or heterogeneity enhance the likelihood of more punitive styles of social control.

Wilson's (1968) classic observational study of eight police departments formed the foundation for his theoretical contributions describing how community context may impact the work of police on the street. Wilson primarily focused on the influence of two facets of community context—the political culture and population characteristics—and hypothesized an indirect relationship between community context and police behavior. Specifically, Wilson (1968) hypothesized that a community's political culture, embodied in the forms of local government and reflecting certain population characteristics, worked to influence the day-to-day
activities of officers through the selection of the police chief. The power of the political culture and local government lies in its ability to select and retain (or not retain) the chief as the head of the police agency. The chief’s prerogatives regarding how his or her officers behave on the street is thus “constrained” by the will of the wider political culture. Wilson defined this influence as the community’s “zone of indifference”—that is, the police are free to “police as they will” as long as their behavior does not violate the outer boundaries of acceptable behavior proscribed by the norms and preferences of the particular community within which they operate.

Wilson elaborated his thesis by identifying three archetypical organizational styles (legalistic, service, watchman) that could be used to describe variations in how police departments behave as a result of the hypothesized relationship between the community context, the police organization (i.e. chief), and the day-to-day activity of police officers. For example, heterogenous communities that form efficiency-minded, non-partisan (or “professional”) styles of government should tend to prefer a police organization that also values efficient law enforcement as its primary objective—or the legalistic style as defined by Wilson (1968). In contrast, police employed in more homogenous communities, communities that would tend to exhibit more consensual values among citizens without any political demand for legalistic policing, will be “freer” to engage in tasks commonly demanded by citizens in these communities. These tasks, such as providing vehicle lockouts, vacation home checks, traffic regulation, and medical assistance, define Wilson’s (1968) service style of policing.

More recent works have attempted to elaborate Wilson’s (1968) thesis describing the correlation between community context and police behavior (Duffee 1990; Langworthy and Travis 1999). Langworthy and Travis (1999) draw on Duffee’s (1990) typology of community structures to articulate a more comprehensive notion of how variations in community context...
may impact police behavior. While Wilson's thesis included certain population characteristics and forms of local government, Duffee's (1990) typology is derived from the interaction between two dimensions of community variation: 1) vertical relations, and 2) horizontal articulation. Vertical relations refer to the degree to which a locality is dependant on the larger society to deliver local governmental functions (including social control through the provision of police services). Horizontal articulation describes how communities may vary in terms of their ability to reach consensus regarding local community priorities and goals (including the style in which police services will be provisioned) (Langworthy and Travis 1999). Duffee (1990) conceptualizes four community types based on the interaction of these two dimensions (fragmented, interdependent, disorganized, and solidary). Langworthy and Travis (1999) articulate a model describing an indirect relationship between community context and police behavior that incorporates Duffee's (1990) typology of community types. According to Langworthy and Travis' (1999) model, community variations are associated with varying social control needs and, in turn, differing styles of policing.

For example, Duffee's typology defines "fragmented" communities as those that exhibit little consensus (i.e. horizontal articulation) nor significant amount of autonomy from the larger society (i.e. vertical relations). In the absence of any local consensus regarding local priorities or goals nor any high degree of local authority, the law (or larger society) provides the dominant means of social control in fragmented communities. - Langworthy and Travis (1999) elaborate on this example by demonstrating the hypothesized link between social control needs and police style:

Fragmented communities are likely to have officious law enforcers. This is so because the strong interests are extra-local and local concerns are subordinate. Police in fragmented communities will focus their enforcement energy on serving the interests of the larger society through the enforcement of the law. (This) policing style...has much in
common with Wilson's (1968) legalistic style (275).

COMMUNITY AND POLICE BEHAVIOR IN SMALLER AGENCIES

How readily does this research apply to the work of police in smaller agencies? Given the lack of systematic information on the work of small-town, rural, and suburban officers, definitive conclusions are difficult to draw. However, recent studies that have focused more exclusively on rural and small-town policing have suggested that police employed by smaller agencies can be distinguished from their counterparts in large urban jurisdictions (Maguire et al. 1997; Meager 1995; Thurman and McGarrell 1997; Weisheit, Falconi and Wells 1996; Weisheit, Wells, and Falcone 1994; Crank 1990). This literature primarily relates how the community context inherent in smaller jurisdictions may play a role in promoting a different and unique style of policing among officers employed by smaller agencies. Moreover, this literature outlines how these agencies traditionally viewed as a unitary class of “small” police departments may also vary among themselves in terms of the daily workload performed by officers (Weisheit et al. 1996).

In terms of the activities that officers engage in during a typical shift, several studies suggest that officers in small-town and rural agencies perform a wider range of activities, especially those outside the purview of law enforcement, including service functions, crime prevention, and problem solving (Benson 1995; Decker 1979; Flanagan 1985; Kratcoski and Dukes 1995; Meager 1985; Thurman and McGarrell 1997; Weisheit et al. 1994; Weisheit et al. 1996). Certain community influences, or the “dynamics” that typically exist in small-town and rural environments, may work to expand the range of activities that police officers perform in these settings. For example, smaller communities usually breed close social ties, consensus, and
a high level of familiarity (or "dense acquaintanceship networks") not only between citizens themselves, but also between citizens and police officers (Weisheit et al. 1994; Benson 1985; Marenin and Copus 1991). The bonds between the police and their communities are strengthened by the common practice of hiring locals as officers. Existing literature suggests that these close social ties work to promote the image, within smaller communities, that police officers are more than mere "crime fighters"—they are seen as integral parts of the communities they serve, and as such, expected to perform a wider array of functions during a typical shift. However, it is logical to assume variation in the degree to which smaller communities (especially small but urbanized jurisdictions and burgeoning suburban enclaves) exhibit close social ties and consensual attitudes among their citizens and between officers and citizens. This suggests that officers employed within the diverse class of "smaller" agencies may be influenced by these factors to varying degrees.

The task of systematically identifying the activities and workload of police officers in smaller jurisdictions appears to be especially relevant given the current emphasis on community oriented policing (COP). To what degree can we expect officers in small-town, rural, and suburban jurisdictions to perform activities commonly associated with COP? The unique characteristics associated with small-town and rural communities—and their hypothesized impact on the activities of small-town and rural officers—appear to highlight a logical fit between how policing is thought to be accomplished in smaller communities and the philosophical dimensions of COP (Weisheit et al. 1996; Kratcoski and Dukes 1999; Maquire et al 1997; Thurman and McGarrell 1997; Cordner and Scarborough 1997). In particular, proponents of the community policing model have identified the need to broaden the scope of police work beyond law enforcement, to actively solicit input from citizens, and to provide more personal service to
citizens (Lurigio and Skogan 1994; Cordner 1996; Kelling and Moore 1988; Skolnick and Bayley 1986). Certainly, the unique qualities associated with smaller communities seem to be tailored to meet these goals.

In sum, the existing research concerning smaller police agencies, primarily using non-systematic research methods, has identified several points by which one can distinguish the workload and activities of officers in smaller jurisdictions from their large, more urban counterparts. Specifically, this literature suggests that officers from smaller agencies perform a wider range of functions, exhibit a less legalistic style, and are faced with both facilitating and inhibiting factors related to performing activities commonly associated with COP.

The unique qualities associated with the work of police in smaller agencies can be linked to the macro-level structural characteristics typical of small-towns and rural jurisdictions. Sociological theorists have long noted the structural contrasts between smaller places and larger urban centers (Wirth 1938; Durkheim 1933; Fischer 1976). These structural differences related to the scale of places are thought to be correlated with different patterns in the exercise of social control across places of different scale. Durkheim (1933) traces these contrasts to the "great transformation"—the period of rapid urbanization that accompanied the industrial revolution of the late 19th century. The advent of modern transportation systems, communications, and population growth spawned urbanized locales which were much more heterogeneous and differentiated than the smaller, more rural communities that had been predominant prior to this period. These structural upheavals influenced different patterns in the ways in which communities typically maintained order. These new urban centers now contained populations that were more fragmented and much less consensual in terms of norms and values (Fischer 1976). Fischer (1976) portrays how these structural changes altered social interactions and the
primary means by which social order is maintained across large and small places:

Since personal means of providing order have been weakened [by differentiation and heterogeneity] other means must be used...Instead of controlling the behavior of unruly teenagers by talking to them or their parents personally, neighbors call the police (32-33).

This line of thought highlights the close social bonds that typically exist among residents of smaller places and implies that these close social bonds promote the use of more informal modes of social control. Given these considerations, a direct investigation of the nature and characteristics of officer/citizen interactions in smaller police agencies appears to be especially critical. Although the existing literature largely lacks the systematic data necessary to make firm conclusions, some observations from this line of literature are apparent. Foremost, the close social bonds typically found in these jurisdictions should not only broaden the range of activities that officers perform during a normal shift, but also influence the nature and characteristics of police/citizen interactions in several ways (Weisheit et al 1994; Benson 1995; Decker 1978; Decker 1979; Cain 1971). First, we should expect officers to engage in a large number of “casual” citizen encounters because they should be quite familiar with the citizens that they police. Second, we would expect that these officers would interact with a wide variety of citizen types (i.e. “friends” and “occupational acquaintances” rather than suspects and victims). Third, these officers may be asked, by the citizens themselves, to handle a more varied range of problems.

Another characteristic of small-town, rural, and suburban communities that may influence the character of police-citizen interactions is the lack of alternative social resources. Many of these jurisdictions lack the social service resources typically found in large, more urban jurisdictions. The fact that larger, more populous places typically provide a wider array of social services has been established in the sociological literature (see esp. Fischer 1976 for a review of
relevant early studies on the topic), and is related to the high level of functional differentiation found in urban centers. The existence of more extensive social service networks in urban rather than more rural places may best be explained by the lack of "critical mass" in the populations of smaller places (Fischer 1976:62). Put simply, smaller places do not have the number of "customers" necessary to make many specialized services viable.

In the absence of more extensive social service networks, citizens may turn to the police as their only available resource for a wide range of non-legal problems. Moreover, officers in these smaller jurisdictions often are not burdened by problems relating to "incident-driven" policing, unlike many of their urban counterparts. Lower crime levels and a decreased number of calls-for-service may allow officers more time to engage in tasks not strictly associated with law enforcement, including those commonly associated with community policing (e.g. problem solving, citizen group meetings, police-community relations activities) (Weisheit et al. 1996; Teske 1982).

Of course, there is variation in the amount of crime not only across the continuum between large and small communities, but also within the category of small communities. This fact would suggest that varying crime levels would impact the character of officer-citizen interactions in individual small jurisdictions differently.

IMPORTANCE OF STUDY

The issues addressed by this study are important for a number of reasons. First, the present study would strengthen the existing literature on small-town, rural, and suburban policing. Again, we currently know very little about how policing is accomplished in smaller agencies. Although the subject has recently garnered increased attention, the methodologies employed in these studies lack some of the advantages of systematic social observation (SSO).
Additionally, many of these studies suffer from small sample sizes, which presents difficulties in generalizing their findings to other smaller agencies. SSO would provide a more complete, systematic description of officer work routines and officer-citizen interactions. Moreover, the present study's sample would permit comparisons across a number of varied small jurisdictions, thus strengthening existing knowledge concerning varieties of police behavior among smaller agencies.

Second, the present study would augment the existing literature regarding police behavior in larger jurisdictions. Observation studies have recently been completed in several large urban agencies, including Richmond, St. Petersburg, Indianapolis, and Cincinnati. These studies have utilized systematic methods to collect data concerning officer work routines, officer-citizen interactions, and the implementation of community-oriented policing. While the findings from these studies may be used to provide general guidelines concerning the activities of officers in smaller agencies, the existing literature pertaining to police who work in small-town, rural, and suburban jurisdictions suggests that there may be important differences in officer activities between large and small departments. There have been no systematic observation studies of the work routines of officers in smaller agencies since the Police Services Study in the late 1970's. The present study would contribute a better understanding of the similarities and differences in police behavior across large and small jurisdictions.

Third, the present study would assess whether certain community characteristics are correlated with police behavior on the organizational level. The existing literature regarding the correlation between community and the police can be roughly categorized as either purely theoretical, or focusing on a limited number of specific community characteristics and their impact on individual officer decision making (e.g. land use, crime levels, community
heterogeneity, population). The present study aims to more closely tie theory and research—to explore in a more general fashion whether existing theoretical notions regarding the impact of community context can be shown to exist across a number of police agencies.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

The present study endeavors to accomplish four main objectives: 1) to provide a description of the workload of police officers employed by rural, small-town, and suburban police agencies, 2) to provide a description of the nature and character of these officers' interactions with citizens, 3) to explore whether variation exists among these agencies in terms of officer workload and police-citizen interactions, and 4) to test whether any observed variation in officer behavior is correlated with structural variations found among sampled smaller jurisdictions.

In order to provide an historical research context to these issues, the present chapter will initially review the prior research regarding officer workload—that is, what we already know about the type and frequency with which sampled police officers engage in certain activities and interaction types. This section will be primarily concerned with literature pertaining to the work of “big-city” officers because large, urban agencies have been the focus of much of the literature concerning officer workload. Differing methodologies will be described, and their relative strengths and weaknesses discussed. Subsequent to this discussion, the chapter will continue with an overview of what is known in regards to the work of police employed by smaller agencies. These discussions will provide the basis for a specific description concerning the activities and citizen interactions of the officers employed by the twenty sampled police agencies included in the present dissertation. The second half of the literature review will focus on providing a basis for addressing the final two primary goals of this dissertation, namely, to explore whether variation exists among the twenty sampled police agencies, and to test whether
any variation is correlated with certain community factors. To this end, the chapter provides a transitional discussion addressing the multi-dimensional nature of smaller communities. The chapter concludes with a review of the literature concerning what are thought to be the influences of community context on police behavior.

PRIOR RESEARCH ON OFFICER WORKLOAD

What do we know about how police spend their time during a typical shift? Prior research has attempted to answer this question in a variety of ways over the course of the last thirty years. This line of research has evolved over time, and has involved a number of methodologies including calls-for-service records (e.g. Cummings, Cummings, and Edell 1965; Wilson 1968; Bercal 1970; Webster 1970; Reiss 1971, Lilly 1978), officer activity reports and questionnaires (e.g. O’Neill and Bloom 1972; Cordner 1978), and direct observations (Wilson 1968; Kelling, Pate, Dieckman, and Brown 1974; Cordner 1978; Frank, Brandl, and Watkins 1997; Parks et al. 1999).

As Cordner (1979) notes in his review and critique of patrol workload studies, the notion that police officers spend most of their time engaged in fighting crime—a notion fueled by traditional conceptions of the police role and promulgated in the popular culture—prevailed prior to the 1960’s. A major theme of the earliest studies concerning officer workload and activities involved dispelling the popular “myth” that police spend most of their time protecting the “thin blue line” between law and order.

For example, Cummings et al. (1965), employing non-systematic observation methods and an analysis of dispatched calls-for-service in one department (801 total calls over an 82 hour period) used their findings to portray the police officer as more of a “philosopher, guide, and
friend" rather than a crime fighter. They found that over one-half of all the sampled dispatch calls involved either “service-related” issues or “order maintenance” problems and did not involve direct violations of the law. In addition to these findings, the authors used data from direct observations to describe how these sampled officers interacted with the citizens that they encountered on dispatched calls. Qualitative findings highlighted the problem-solving and supportive activities of police officers instead of those related to investigations and arrests.

Similar conclusions aimed at dispelling the crime-fighting myth were drawn by the authors of other early studies (Webster 1970; Bercal 1970; Reiss 1971). Webster also reviewed dispatch records from a city he termed as “Baywood” (population 400,000) and found that “crimes against persons” accounted for only 2.82 percent of the total number of assignments and only 2.96 percent of the total time spent on all assignments in the sample. “Crimes against property,” however, took up a more substantial portion of time (14.82%). Most of the officers dispatched time was spent on “administrative” matters (50.19%) and “social service” functions (13.70%). Likewise, Bercal (1970) concluded that most of the time spent on a typical shift is not consumed by law enforcement matters. He reviewed dispatch records over a one year period in Detroit and St. Louis. Only 16 percent of the calls could be categorized as “crime related.” The remainder of time police were asked to, “provide...ambulance service and first aid, mediate family and neighbor arguments, and to handle environmental disturbances which may or may not be crimes” (Bercal 1970: 685). Finally, Reiss (1971) concluded from his study of dispatch records in Chicago that only 3 percent of an officer’s workload (i.e. total time spent during a shift) was spent handling criminal matters. However, when “not-service-time” (personal breaks and administrative duties) were excluded from the total time spent, “criminal matters” were
found to consume 20 percent of the officer’s time (Reiss 1971).

Wilson’s (1968) seminal work *Varieties of Police Behavior*, currently most often noted for its theoretical contributions, also includes a presentation of findings from a brief (one week) review of calls-for-service data in Syracuse, New York. Similar to other early authors concerned with accounting for the time spent on a typical shift, Wilson found that only 10 percent of all dispatched calls involved “law enforcement” matters. Fully 58 percent of the sampled calls involved either “order maintenance” situations or “service” related functions. The remainder of these calls (225) involved what Wilson termed as “information gathering” situations. He concluded that the “patrolman’s role is defined more by his responsibility for maintaining order than by his responsibility for enforcing the law” (Wilson 1968:16).

These early studies did much to dispel the notion that *all* the police do is fight crime by highlighting the wide range of other types of activities the police perform on a daily basis, such as service, order maintenance, and administrative functions. Likewise, calls-for-service data provided a convenient method to delve into the issue of what the police do with their time simply because the information was (and is) relatively easy to collect and would appear to accurately measured the amount of time officers spent on dispatched calls (Cordner 1979).

However, these studies failed to provide a complete description of how officers spend their time during a typical shift primarily due to certain methodological limitations related to call-for-service data and a lack of consistency regarding the classification of officer activities (Greene and Klockers 1983; Cordner 1979). First, calls-for-service data can only account for the time officers spend actually answering dispatches. But, much of what the police do is performed outside the purview of the dispatch system. For example, officers may initiate certain activities
themselves without informing any dispatcher. Police supervisors may direct an officer to perform certain activities, thus bypassing the dispatch system altogether. So too, citizens themselves may initiate officer activities. In short, dispatch records cannot account for the time officers spend while not engaged in answering dispatched runs (Cordner 1979). Greene and Klockers (1991) concluded that up to 50 percent of officer's time was unaccounted for in these early studies.

Second, calls-for-service data are not independently obtained. Dispatch records are ultimately created only after the information has been “filtered” through both organizational arrangements and the officers who perform dispatch runs (Cordner 1979). In terms of the organizational filters, agencies may vary in terms of what calls are actually categorized as “dispatch” runs (Whitaker 1982). For example, departments may or may not record “in-service” time in the case of a traffic stop that does not result in a citation (Whitaker 1982). This situation results in an unreliable measure of how officer's spend their time across different departments. So too, officers themselves may distort the time actually spent on dispatch runs “because much of the information...is essentially self-reported by patrol officers, (and) the possibility that (dispatch records) reflect the desire of officers to be favorably evaluated must also be recognized” (Cordner 1979:51). For instance, officers may be tempted to inflate the time actually spent on one dispatched call in order to avoid being available to answer additional runs or to allow time for personal business or taking breaks.

While these methodological issues weaken the accuracy of data obtained through call-for-service analyses, the inconsistent manner in which officer patrol activities and time utilization are coded across these early studies prevents one from drawing firm conclusions.
regarding what types of activities officers are actually performing, as well as how long they are performing them. What type of activity are officers performing when they respond to a domestic argument? Wilson (1968) codes this activity as “order maintenance,” while Webster (1970) codes a response to a domestic argument as “social service.” This example is only one many as far as coding irregularities. Not only is there little agreement across studies concerning the coding of specific incident types, but there is also no agreement as to how many activity categories are most appropriate. Cordner (1979) identified 38 distinct categories that were used in these early works, and 27 of those were unique to only one of the studies.

A second method used to address the issue of what it is that officers do on a typical shift is officer activity reports. Typically, these studies utilize department designed activity logs to report what activities officers performed during their shift and how much time was spent performing these activities. The only major American activity report study covered in this chapter is one conducted by O’Neill and Bloom (1972) that sampled eighteen California police agencies (populations range from 25,000 to 100,000). The study’s finding largely echo those from the previously mentioned calls-for-service studies. They found that as little as 5 percent of self-reported patrol time was spent in “crime-related” activities. Fully 73 percent of all patrol time was taken up by random patrol. The remaining 20 percent of time officers were engaged in traffic control, non-duty activities, or administrative work.

The advantages of using officer logs as a method of describing police activities are two-fold: 1) the researcher may obtain activity logs from all officers in a department rather than just
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2 Three other major activity log studies were conducted in the UK in the late 1960s and early 1970s.
patrol officers. This would allow a glimpse into the activities of the entire department, including those officers that spend much of their shift performing administrative functions (Cordner 1979), and 2) the researcher may be able to obtain information covering an entire shift rather than information which only covers time spent responding to dispatched calls (Cordner 1979). The obvious disadvantage of this method is that the information is totally self-reported by police officers themselves. It seems reasonable to assume that sampled officers would tend to under-report activities that do not reflect positively on their performance, such as personal breaks. It might also be that some officers fail to recognize the legitimacy of certain activities they perform (e.g. service functions) and under report those activities as well. Finally, officers may tend to over estimate the time spent in law enforcement activities (Cordner 1979).

Given the methodological weaknesses apparent in both calls-for-service data and officer logs, Cordner (1979), in his critique of police patrol work load studies, identifies direct observation as the preferable method for describing what police officers do with the totality of their time during a typical shift. He provides a convenient summary of the advantages of observation data in this regard (for a more detailed description of these advantages see Methods). First, the observation method provides the most accurate and detailed information concerning officer workload. The information collected by observers is difficult or impossible to obtain through other methods, and every minute of the officer’s time can be accounted for. Second, the observer is not the subject of the study. Unlike officer logs and dispatch records, observers can provide a more unbiased record of the activities officers perform. The risk of under-reporting personal time and other non-law enforcement related duties is lessened, as well as the tendency for officers to over-report crime related activities. The information obtained through
observation is not filtered through organizational mechanisms or the police officers themselves.

Third, the observer is more aware of the research aims and can concentrate on collecting data that is most relevant to those aims.

There have been several studies that have employed direct observation as a method to document officer workload, among other issues. For example, Kelling et al. (1974) used direct observation to examine Kansas City patrol officers' use of free patrol time. Observations were part of the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment, a massive study primarily concerned with investigating the impact of randomized patrol on levels of crime, citizen attitudes, fear of crime, and officer response time across fifteen patrol beats. In terms of the observed officers' use of free patrol time, the experiment found that fully 60 percent of the officers' free patrol time was uncommitted. That is, time not spent in response to dispatched calls for service or other directed activities. 25 percent of this uncommitted time involved non-police related activities (Greene and Klockers 1991). Another 25 percent of uncommitted patrol time was spent en route to and from the police station, traveling to court, or servicing police vehicles, and another one-quarter of uncommitted patrol time was spent in "free patrol." (Kelling et al. 1974).

Whitaker (1982) provides a review of findings from the Police Services Study (PSS). The PSS represents a benchmark for subsequent research regarding police workload, because the undertaking was the most comprehensive attempt to explore officer workload through the use of direct observation to date (Whitaker 1982). The study used systematic observation methods to record the patrol activities of officers from twenty-four different police agencies and sixty neighborhoods within these jurisdictions (Whitaker 1982). The study included agencies that ranged in size from large metropolitan police departments to smaller police agencies and were
located in the metropolitan areas of Rochester, NY; St. Louis, MO, and Tampa-St. Petersburg, FL. Officers were observed for an average of 120 hours (or the equivalent of fifteen eight-hour shifts) in each study neighborhood (Whitaker 1982).

Observed officers spent an average of 352 minutes per shift (or 73% of their time) not in direct contact with citizens. Officer time spent away from citizens was dominated by three activities. First, undirected patrol dominated officer activity time, accounting for an average of 214 minutes per shift (or 3 and one-half hours). Second, observed officers spent 68 minutes per shift performing administrative duties. A similar percentage of officer time was spent on meals and/or personal business (65 minutes per shift) (Whitaker 1982). While there was wide variation among the twenty-four study sites in terms of the percentages of time spent performing these tasks, undirected patrol, administrative duties, and personal/meal time can be said to encompass the vast majority of observed officers activity time (or time spent away from citizens).

The PSS may also be used as a benchmark for investigating how much time and what type of issues officers address when they are in direct contact with citizens. Observed officers spent an average of 128 minutes per shift (or 27% of their time) encountering citizens (Whitaker 1982). The vast majority of time spent in contact with citizens (75%) was initiated through dispatched calls for service. 22.6 percent of time spent in contact with citizens was initiated by the officers themselves, and only 3.9 percent of the time spent in these encounters was citizen initiated (Whitaker 1982). PSS sampled officers averaged six encounters per shift, and the average length of these encounters was about 20 minutes. Again, five out of these six encounters were dispatch initiated (Whitaker 1982). Thus, only about one-quarter of sampled officers time was spent in direct contact with citizens, and this contact was very rarely initiated.
by citizens themselves.

PSS observers also recorded the type of problem that was the primary subject of concern in citizen encounters using four main categories (crime, disorder, service, traffic). Crime was the primary problem in 39 percent of the observed encounters. These problems included violent and non-violent crimes, morals offenses, suspicious persons or circumstances, warrants, etc... Traffic offenses accounted for 26 percent of these problems. Fully 77 percent of all traffic related encounters were initiated by the officers themselves and were not the result of dispatched runs, thus highlighting one of the advantages of direct observation in accounting for officer time. Service related issues (including medical assistance, information requests, and dependent person calls) also accounted for an additional 26 percent. Disorder problems accounted for 23 percent of all problems (Whitaker 1982).

These averages do mask, however, substantial variation in the types of problems officers dealt with across the twenty-four sampled agencies as well as across sampled neighborhoods within specific jurisdictions. For example, the percentage of problems dealing with crime across neighborhoods ranged from a high of 54 percent to a low of 22 percent recorded in a middle income suburb. Even greater variation exists in terms of traffic related problems, with percentages ranging from a low of 5 percent in two highly urbanized neighborhoods to a high of 46 percent—information that appears to highlight how community context may be correlated with variations in police workload (Whitaker 1982).

Cordner (1979) also conducted a study that utilized direct observation (as well as officer surveys) to investigate officers’ use of uncommitted time in a medium-sized Midwestern city. Similar to the findings of the Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment, Cordner (1979) found
that over one-half (55%) of all officer time was uncommitted. Like the officers sampled in Kansas City, one-quarter of this time was spent in various types of patrol (Cordner 1979). The remainder of uncommitted time was spent taking breaks (39%), performing self-initiated tasks (11%), and meeting other officers (11%).

Cordner (1979), in addressing the issue of how much time officers spend on "criminal matters," revisits a common problem that runs throughout the literature on officer workload—that is, much of what officers do during a typical shift is ambiguous and can be classified as crime-related or not crime related depending on the character of the measurement scheme. Although the direct observation method is useful in avoiding the "filtering" problems endemic to dispatch records and officer logs, comparisons across different studies using direct observation are problematic because of the lack of consistency in coding procedures within the group of studies using direct observation. Given this caveat, Cordner (1979) reports that his officers spent only 13 percent of their patrol time on crime-related matters. Much of the patrol time was spent on administrative tasks and personal breaks (44%), and Cordner (1979) simply categorized 39 percent of patrol time as "ambiguous."

More recent studies using direct observation methods have focused on investigating officer workload as a way to assess the impact of the community policing movement (COP) on officer behavior. While the primary focus of these studies is to investigate the degree to which officers engage in tasks associated with community policing, their findings provide much information relevant to examining the workload of police officers in general, and the ways in which the advent of the COP movement may be altering the activities and interactions of police officers since the 1970s and 80's.
Frank et al. (1997) utilized systematic social observation (SSO) to document the workload of both traditional beat officers and community policing specialists in the Cincinnati police department. Observers recorded the workload of 16 community policing specialists over 59 eight hour shifts and 14 traditional beat officers for 20 eight hour shifts. Similar to earlier findings, foot and vehicle patrol was clearly the dominant activity of both community policing specialists (26% of total shift time) and traditional beat officers (33% of total shift time). So too, crime-related activities were relatively infrequently performed by both groups of officers, although traditional beat officers performed these activities at a significantly higher rate (17.7%) than their community policing counterparts (5.7%).

Frank et al.'s (1997) findings can be used to buttress some of the conclusions of earlier workload studies. That is, police officers in general spend the greatest percentage of their workday simply driving around and much less time actually addressing crime-related matters. In addition to this contribution, Frank et al. (1997) expanded the literature on officer workload by suggesting that traditional beat officers and community policing specialist differ in their performance of other activities. Differences in the workload of traditional beat officers and community policing specialists were not uniform across the study neighborhoods, thus suggesting that officers may tend to engage in a broader range of activities more closely tied to the community if the freedom to do so exists. For example, traditional beat officers in Cincinnati appeared to perform many activities found to dominate patrol work in the past, while community policing specialists performed a broader range of activities designed to connect them with the community if the freedom to do so exists.

\[\text{Footnote: For a complete description of Systematic Social Observation techniques, see methods section.}\]
more closely with the community, such as service and problem solving functions (Frank et al. 1997). Interestingly, observed beat officers in Cincinnati did not perform a “single activity in the non-traditional community based service category” (Frank et al. 1997:725).

More recently, Parks et al. (1999) conducted a large scale observation project involving officers from the Indianapolis and St. Petersburg police departments. Similar to Frank et al. (1997), the project primarily aimed to provide a comparison of the daily activities and interactions of traditional beat officers and community policing specialists. The two groups of officers were strikingly similar in the activities that they performed while not in direct contact with citizens. For example, patrol accounted for 22 percent of the beat officers time and 17 percent of the community policing specialists time. Likewise, time spent on route to locations was also very similar (14% for beat officers and 13% for community policing officers). Finally, personal business accounted for 12 percent of the beat officers time and 17 percent of the community officers time (Parks et al. 1999). Traditional beat officers spent 49 percent of their time away from citizens on these three activities. These three activities accounted for 47 percent of this time for community policing specialists.4

There did appear to be, however, differences in the nature and character of police-citizen encounters between the two groups of officers. While traditional beat officers spent more time encountering citizens (25%) than did community specialists (19%), community officers were more likely to initiate encounters themselves. Moreover, community officers were more likely to engage citizens on a casual basis than beat officers (Parks et al. 1999). It may be that beat
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4 All percentages presented are derived from averaging the activities of Indianapolis and St. Petersburg officers.
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officers in the two study sites were somewhat “forced” to encounter citizens to a greater degree because of dispatch demands, however, community specialists (relieved of some directed runs) more commonly initiated “casual get-to-know-you” conversations as an avenue towards strengthening the link between the police agency and the community (Parks et al. 1999:506).

So then, what can be said in addressing the issue of what it is that police officers do during a typical shift in light of prior research on the topic? The literature discussed above provides a degree of information concerning officer activities and the nature and character of police-citizen interactions—information that has been obtained through a variety of often disparate methodologies and an array of inconsistent coding schemes. However, a distinct number of conclusions seem apparent.

First, sampled police officers do not spend the majority of their shift addressing crime-related matters (Cordner 1979; Greene and Klockers 1991). Prior literature seems to have clearly discredited the image of the police as mere crime-fighters. Second, it appears that officers across different sampled agencies exhibit a great degree of similarity as to how they spend most of their time away from citizens—their primary activity appears to be routine patrol, followed by (to varying degrees) administrative duties, driving to and from locations, and spending time on non-duty tasks or personal breaks (Cordner 1979; Greene and Klockers 1991). Third, sampled police officers enjoy a great deal of freedom to choose how it is they will spend their day because up to half their time has been found to be “uncommitted.” That is, dispatched runs and directed tasks do not constitute the vast majority of time spent on shift (Cordner 1979; Greene and Klockers 1991). Fourth, it appears that, on average, sampled police officers spend anywhere from 20 to 30 percent of their time in direct contact with citizens and average six to
ten encounters per eight hour shift. However, some studies have reported wide variations across departments in terms of time spent with citizens, ranging anywhere from 18 to 40 percent (Cordner 1979). Finally, more recent studies addressing issues related to the advent of community policing have suggested that the activities and interactions of police officers who have been designated by their departments as “community policing specialists” differ from those of the more traditional beat officer. Specifically, it appears that sampled COP specialists perform a wider variety of functions related to linking officers more closely with the community, including problem-solving, attending community meetings, and interacting with citizens on a more casual basis (Frank et al. 1997; Parks et al. 1999).

These tentative conclusions aside, there remains a wide void in the literature pertaining to officer activities and interactions. The most glaring weakness remains the fact that we have almost no systematically obtained evidence on the workload of officers from small-town, rural, and suburban jurisdictions. Do officers that police smaller jurisdictions perform activities similar to those of officers employed by large urban agencies, and if so, do they perform them at the same rate? Do officers from these agencies interact with citizens in the same manner and context as those from large urban agencies?

OFFICER WORKLOAD IN SMALLER AGENCIES

The lack of systematic evidence regarding the work routines of officers from smaller agencies aside, a limited number of studies have addressed the question of what tasks are likely to be performed by these officers (Weisheit et al. 1996; Meagher 1995; Cain 1971; Teske 1982; Flanagan 1985; Decker 1979; Marenin and Copus 1991). This line of research has primarily employed non-systematic methods in order to explore how policing is accomplished in smaller
Weisheit et al. (1996) used prior literature and a range of other methods, including focus groups, interviews with rural justice officials, and police surveys to describe the style of policing in rural places. Though the evidence is largely anecdotal, Weisheit et al. (1996) believe several factors distinguish the work of rural police agencies: 1) small agencies are more concerned with crime prevention and service activities than large agencies, 2) rural police are expected to perform a wider variety of tasks because these communities lack other social service resources, 3) police-community relations in rural places are more informal, and officers interact with citizens on a casual basis more often, and 4) the style of policing is more responsive to community concerns in rural places. These findings seem to mesh with the concepts highlighted in earlier sociological works that describe some of the core differences between urban and more rural places (Fischer 1976). Specifically, urban places are more likely to provide a wide range of specialized social services to citizens, as well as the notion that urban dwellers will interact on a more formal basis than do rural citizens.

Meagher (1985) surveyed officers from 249 municipal agencies to analyze variability in patrol styles among small departments (1-29 officers), medium sized departments (30-99 officers), and large departments (100+ officers). He found that there were certain commonalities in patrol styles among these agencies, however, there was some variability in activities related to agency size. For example, small departments performed certain crime prevention activities (checking parks, patrolling school areas, surveying parking lots) to a greater degree than both medium and large departments. Medium sized departments spent more time responding to traffic accidents than either small departments or large departments. Large departments
exhibited a more legalistic style through higher arrest rates and time spent resolving disputes. There was very little variability in terms of time spent on general patrol and offender processing (Meagher 1985).

Two qualitative observation studies also provide information specific to the activities performed by officers in smaller agencies. Cain (1971) compared the activities and interactions of English police officers from both rural and urban jurisdictions. She found that "country cops" were more "leisurely" than big-city officers and had a great deal of spare time. So too, these officers did not spend as much time on law enforcement matters and interacted with citizens on a more casual basis (Cain 1971). Police from smaller jurisdictions also appeared to have a more reciprocal relationship with the community and were more interested in enforcing community norms (Cain 1971). Teske (1982) observed officers in one small town (Huntsville, TX). He reported that these officers displayed a strong service orientation, were well-connected to the community, and interacted very frequently with both the local university police and the county sheriff department. Teske (1982) also noted the high degree of free time these officers had, and suspected that boredom was a problem with these officers because of the lack of opportunities for law enforcement.

Other research highlights the broad range of activities performed by officers employed in smaller police agencies. Flanagan (1985) used a representative national public opinion poll to explore what police duties and activities are most important to citizens. He found that community size is related to citizen's preferences for police activities and functions. Specifically, public support for a narrow, law enforcement-related police role increased with community size. People from small towns and rural areas were more likely to expect the police...
to perform a wide range activities, especially service and order maintenance functions (Flanagan 1985). Decker (1979) studied a rural county sheriff department and found that the deputies were expected to perform a wide range of services that often addressed irregular occurrences such as inspecting disputed boundary lines, checking on sick animals, and dealing with juvenile situations. Marenin and Copus (1991) provide more radical examples in their description of police units in remote Eskimo villages. It was necessary for these officers to perform services that were unique because of the geographic isolation of the communities and the lack of other social service alternatives. Officers conducted search and rescue missions, fire suppression, domestic violence awareness programs, and emergency medical services (Marenin and Copus 1991).

More recent studies have focused on the degree to which smaller police agencies have implemented community oriented policing (COP). While COP implementation is not a primary focus of the present study, these works can be used to illustrate how the COP movement may be affecting the activities and interaction of officers in small towns, rural places, and suburbs. Moreover, research concerning the implementation of COP seems to highlight the existence of close ties between smaller communities and the officers who patrol them.

Weisheit and Hawkins (1997) surveyed a national sample of rural police chiefs and county sheriffs to describe the state of COP in smaller jurisdictions. Approximately 50 percent of surveyed agencies had enacted a formal COP program, and 80 percent indicated that they commonly performed activities such as problem solving and community partnership programs. However, relatively few departments reported that their organizations included certain internal features thought to be indicative of community oriented policing, such as COP training, call
prioritizing, and COP-oriented evaluations (Weisheit and Hawkins 1997). Rather, these departments focused more clearly on COP-oriented programs that directly involved the community, including crime prevention programs and school patrols. Kratcoski and Dukes (1995) provided anecdotal accounts of COP programs in three diverse small communities. The study emphasized that community variations—even among jurisdictions that are all clearly “small”—produce different police activities designed to address the problems specific to each locale. For example, the COP programs enacted by the two departments located in small towns differed greatly from those located in a suburban jurisdiction, thus highlighting the effect of variation within the class of small agencies (Kratcoski and Dukes 1995).

Bobinsky (1994) provides a narrative account of COP programs in three Illinois small towns. While programs varied among these towns, all three departments attempted to tailor officer activities to specific community concerns, and they often included “store front” operations to better link individual officers to citizens. Cox (1992) relates how small town police administrators often take a more “hands on” approach to COP implementation because they had acquired much in the way of community knowledge and knew citizens on an informal basis. In addition, Zhao and Thurman’s (1997) survey of police chiefs in small jurisdictions (population of 40,000 or less) indicated that programs specifically designed to link the department more closely to the community were preferred over internal organizational changes. Still, many smaller police organizations appear to lack sufficient resources to implement training programs, and some small departments have resisted implementing certain COP activities (Zhao and Thurman 1997; Cordner and Scarborough 1997).

It may be that certain COP-related activities are more applicable to urban settings, or
specific implementation of COP activities will take a different form in smaller police agencies (Cordner and Scarborough 1997). Some have argued that rural and small-town police "have always done COP" or that "COP looks and sounds a great deal like rural and small town policing as it has been practiced for a long time" (Weisheit et al. 1996). We cannot know the answer to these issues without more systematic data describing the behavior of police officers across a range of rural, small town, and suburban departments.

VARIETIES OF PLACE AND THE LINK TO POLICE BEHAVIOR

While the prior literature reviewed above clearly suggests that officers who work in smaller communities will perform different activities and interact with citizens in a different manner than those who patrol in larger urban places, we do not know whether, or to what extent, officers in smaller jurisdictions behave in a like manner. Those who have characterized the state of the existing police research literature as exhibiting a clear "big-city bias" have suggested not only that officers in "small" jurisdictions behave differently than "big-city" cops, but also that there exist a wide degree of variation in the way in which policing is accomplished within the category of places typically lumped together simply as "small."

For example, Weisheit et al. (1996) identify several dimensions that can be used to distinguish rural communities from not only large urban centers, but also from relatively large small-town communities and more complex and urbanized suburban jurisdictions—places that have all formally been characterized simply as "small" in much of the existing police literature. These dimensions include demographic, economic, structural, and cultural indicators. Further, they suggest that "small" places could be distinguished and grouped in terms of three (urbanized, suburban, rural), four (rural-farm, rural-nonfarm, suburban, and urbanized), or even
more categories (rural-open country, rural-village, non-metropolitan small city, metropolitan fringe, metropolitan center, etc...). Whether it is most appropriate to use three, four, five, or more categories to distinguish small places remains in question, but the mere existence of schemes that include numerous categories suggests that small places are not the same, but rather, are very diverse in character.

The assertion that small-town, rural, and suburban officers behave differently than those in larger jurisdictions, coupled with the belief that officers performing within the wide variety of “small” places do not perform alike, begs the question as to why different places are thought to yield different patterns in the behavior of police officers. Aside from providing a description of small-town, rural, and suburban officer activities and citizen interactions, this dissertation aims to further provide an exploration of whether variations in officer behavior exist between the twenty sampled small police agencies. In light of this objective, it appears to be appropriate to review some of the literature that suggests that the structural and cultural differences that exist between places, whether they be urban centers, rural jurisdictions, small-towns, or something in between, are related to different patterns in police behavior.

COMMUNITY CONTEXT AND POLICE BEHAVIOR

When a community pays select people for its police services, it becomes a consumer. As a consumer, it has certain demands. When the service being purchased is community social control by community-sanctioned force, the relationship between consumer and service becomes intriguing, serious, and extremely volatile (Langworthy and Travis 1999:260).

In the above quotation, Langworthy and Travis (1999) delineate a relationship between communities and the people who police them that began with the advent of full-time paid police forces. The idea that communities—including all of their attendant structural variations and the
differing characteristics of the citizens who populate them—can and do contribute to variations in police behavior seems apparent. How that relationship specifically operates to influence a distinct character, or style of policing across different jurisdictions in terms of officer workload and citizen interactions remains in question.

The relationship between community level characteristics and police behavior has been empirically explored in regards to a limited number of specific issues such as the decision to use deadly force and/or excessive force (Langworthy 1986; Fyfe 1978; Fyfe 1988; Alpert and Smith 1994), and the decision to arrest (Smith 1986; Swanson 1978; Wilson and Boland 1978). In terms of the use of deadly force, various hypotheses have suggested the possibility of a relationship between rates of general violence in the community and rates of police contacts with dangerous suspects (Fyfe 1988; Sherman and Langworthy 1979; Langworthy 1986). Langworthy (1986), for example, examined the temporal relationship between community homicide rates and rates of police shootings. While cross-sectional research designs report high correlations, the correlation between community homicide rates and police shootings did not hold up when analyzed over time. In his review of the relevant literature, Fyfe (1988) concluded that situational characteristics seem to have the greatest influence on whether officers use deadly force or not, although the relationship between community factors and the use of deadly force may be indirect.

Prior literature also indicates that the decision to arrest may be correlated with certain community factors. For example, official arrest rates per reported offense have been shown to vary considerably across communities (Wilson 1968; Swanson 1978). Likewise, cities have been found to have differences in arrest rates per capita (Wilson and Boland 1978). Smith
(1986) investigated the relationship between neighborhood context and several police behaviors, including the probability of arrest, the probability that police will use coercive authority, and the probability that police will file a report subsequent to contact with an alleged victim. He found that the socioeconomic status of neighborhoods had a direct negative effect on the probability of arrest after controlling for individual and situational characteristics of police-citizen encounters. Police were also found to be more likely to exercise coercive authority in racially mixed neighborhoods. These findings suggest that police may take a more legalistic stance in heterogenous neighborhoods.

Earlier research concerned with identifying the relationship between police and community primarily offered theoretically based notions on how the relationship operates on a day-to-day basis. These works appear to be of more value in forming the basis of research designed to explore the daily workload and interactions of a typical patrol officer. For example, researchers such as Whyte (1943) and Werthman and Piliavin (1967) theorized that police develop different standards of conduct based on variations in the norms and standards of behavior found across communities. These differing standards may impact the decision to arrest or use coercive force against citizens, but also was thought to impact the more typical day-to-day interactions that officers have with all types of citizens because these “standards of conduct” could be extended to situations beyond law enforcement alone.

Likewise, other works strongly suggest that the degree of social distance between police and between citizens themselves influences differences in the way police behave towards citizens across jurisdictions. For example, Banton (1964) theorized that police provide different services to communities depending on the degree to which they are connected to that community. In
jurisdictions where there is less social distance between the police and the community, police will tend to have a greater number of informal interactions with citizens. Similarly, Bayley and Mendelson (1969) point to the impact that community heterogeneity may have in creating social distance between citizens and police. They believed that the large degree of social distance often found between poor citizens and the police resulted in more aggressive interactions. Other theorists such as Quinney (1970) and Black (1976) describe the relationship between social distance and police behavior more specifically in terms of community heterogeneity. Quinney (1970) saw law (or formal social control in the form of police) as the primary means of creating or maintaining order in heterogenous communities. Black (1976) postulated an inverse relationship between the “quantity” (or the degree of formality) of law dispensed by police and the status of community members that they encounter. For example, arrest would be a more likely outcome in cases where police were encountering low status citizens (racial minorities, poor, young, etc...). The primary purpose of this section is to provide an overview of some of the important conceptual ideas linking variations in communities specifically to different police styles. Subsequent to this discussion, I will address how this literature relates to what is known about policing in smaller communities.

James Q. Wilson’s *Varieties of Police Behavior*, published in 1968, provides a theoretical cornerstone for a discussion concerning the possible correlation between community variations and differences in how officers accomplish the task of policing across communities on a daily basis (Langworthy and Travis 1999). Wilson’s ideas arose from an exploratory study of officers from eight police departments that included both direct observation and an analysis of dispatch
The exploratory study identified certain variations in how patrol officers from these eight departments performed their daily duties, primarily the exercise of discretionary powers such as the issuance of arrests or citations. Wilson (1968) developed a typology of police agencies based on differences in what he termed the “operational style” of individual patrol officers. The three different styles of policing coined by Wilson (1968) are summarized below:

**Legalistic** - Officers from these departments intervene with citizens both frequently and formally. The legalistic style emphasizes the law enforcement function of police. Legalistic officers are likely to respond to problems and incidents in terms of how they relate to the formal law codes. These officers enforce the law through arrests and the issuance of citations. They are primarily “ministers of the law” (Langworthy and Travis 1999:163).

**Service** - Officers from these departments intervene with citizens frequently but informally. These departments stress the service-delivery function, and as such, view the public as largely a “customer” to be satisfied. While officers interact on a regular basis with citizens, they issue relatively few tickets or citations. Rather, they see their role as a solver of citizen problems. They are “government gatekeepers” who often direct citizens to other available services (Langworthy and Travis 1999:163).

**Watchman** - Officers from these departments intervene infrequently with citizens. These officers use discretion in interpreting whether a police response is necessary in certain situations, although they do respond to citizen calls of priority. The peacekeeping function is stressed, and a “don’t rock the boat” mentality prevails among officers. They may intervene formally or informally in situations requiring a police response, depending on what response the officer deems necessary to maintain public order (Langworthy and Travis 1999:164).

---

5 The eight communities were Albany (NY), Amsterdam (NY), Brighton (NY), Nassau County (NY), Newburgh (NY), Syracuse (NY), Highland Park (IL), and Oakland (CA).
What influenced different styles among police officers on patrol? While Wilson (1968) derived the above typology based on the observation of individual officers, officers from the same department appeared to perform their jobs in similar fashions. Wilson concluded that these "patterns of decision making" among officers within the same department signified a clear organizational influence on individual officer behavior (Langworthy and Travis 1999). Thus, the above mentioned "operational styles" are defined by Wilson (1968) as a set of shared expectations within any given police organization regarding how policing should be accomplished. It is a department policy promulgated by the police chief—either explicitly through formal rules and procedures or implicitly communicated through other channels—that works to shape the day-to-day activity of officers along certain dimensions (i.e. legalistic, service, or watchman) (Wilson 1968).

If police organizations influence patterns of decision-making among individual officers, then what factors impact the influence of police organizations themselves? Why does it appear that police departments, all of which have to perform certain functions to some degree or another, exhibit and promote differing expectations to its officers? It is in response to this issue that Wilson (1968) hypothesizes a relationship between community context and individual operational style through the police organization.

Wilson (1968) observed certain differences between the eight communities that were the subject of his study, and focused primarily on the impact of varying population characteristics and forms of local government. For example, five of the eight communities were industrial working class jurisdictions with declining populations and economic prospects. Four of those communities had significant minority populations. Three of the communities are described as
"well-to-do suburban" areas by Wilson (1968:90). They are predominantly white, and had experienced rapid population growth (Wilson 1968). Three of the eight departments served relatively small populations (25,000-30,000), while Oakland (CA) and Nassau County had much larger populations (367,000 and 1.3 million respectively). Additionally, the dominant form of local government in these communities varied from traditional strong mayor arrangements to more "professional" governments that employed city managers to run the day-to-day affairs of the city. These community factors, according to Wilson (1968), work to create a distinct "political culture" that "constrains" the power of the police organization (i.e. the police chief) to influence individual officer behavior. The political culture can have both a direct and indirect impact on operational style. First, the political culture may promote or discourage the existence of a particular style through the selection of a police chief. Second, the political culture may indirectly influence the operational style of the police department through what Wilson (1968) describes as the "zone of indifference." This "zone" forms the outer boundaries within which the police may act and is a reflection of the will of the wider political culture, including citizens themselves. In sum, Wilson suggests that the political culture of any given community—primarily a product of certain population characteristics and government forms—helps to produce a roughly "congruent" police style by (1) selecting and retaining a police chief who will promote a particular style of policing among the organization's officers, and (2) by collectively establishing certain boundaries of acceptable police behavior that reflect the political will of the community at large.

Specific examples from the text will serve to illustrate Wilson's (1968) thesis. Two police departments studied by Wilson fit his "service" style, Brighton (NY) and Nassau County
Both jurisdictions are described by Wilson as communities “that are not divided along class or racial lines...The middle-class character of such communities makes the suppression of illegal enterprises both easy (they are more visible) and necessary (public opinion will not tolerate them) and reduces the rate of serious crime committed by residents...the police will be freer to concentrate on managing traffic, regulating juveniles, and providing services” (Wilson 1968:200). While taking pains to recognize the differences between Brighton (which is a small community) and Nassau County, Wilson (1968) recognizes a certain “consumer-oriented” flavor to both local governments: “…besides keeping the streets clean and putting fires out, (the government) is expected to sustain a prosperous business life, provide excellent schools, hire courteous and obliging public officials...The political consumer—the voter—is thought to have high standards...” (Wilson 1968:250). Thus, the police are driven to be service oriented by a rather united, consensual populace and a local government bent on serving the demands of local constituents.

Oakland (CA) can be used to serve as an example of Wilson’s (1968) legalistic style. The community contrasts sharply with Brighton and Nassau County. Oakland had the highest crime rate among the sampled cities, a more complex and varied economy, and a large heterogenous population that included a substantial percentage of minority residents (Wilson 1968). The city is “industrial, working class...with a median family income that is below the state average” (Wilson 1968:89). Oakland had hired an outside, influential, professionally-oriented city manager to head the local government. The manager, “stood as a buffer between political pressure and police administration...(the manager) permitted (the chief) to acquire control over the department...and insulated the department from community pressures” (Wilson
1968:258). The city manager hired a police chief who favored a legalistic style, and the value-conflicted character of Oakland’s population helped to necessitate a style of policing that was, above all, "by the book" in character.

Amsterdam (NY) was one of the cities that spawned a watchman style police department. Amsterdam could be described as having a typical "rust belt" economy in the 1960's—a blue-collar town that had lost much of its industrial base and saw its downtown business district in decline (Wilson 1968). Though the population was racially homogenous (mostly white), the city’s neighborhoods formed a patchwork of small, ethnically-distinct enclaves that were home to people from varying European descent (Wilson 1968). Amsterdam’s local government "has little stable political organization...(and) is in the hands of locals—professional politicians, main street merchants, local attorneys—who operate essentially caretaker styles of government" (Wilson 1968:236). In short, the city had a low tax base, no organized political power, and few resources to spend on local services. As a result, the police, "believe the citizen wants to be left alone...(the police) are thought of as 'glorified night watchmen'—and they act accordingly" (Wilson 1968:248).

As noted in chapter one, other researchers have attempted to expand on Wilson’s (1968) ideas (Duffee 1990; Langworthy and Travis 1999). Though these more recent conceptions include more expansive descriptions of how communities vary and appear to be more elaborate in defining the intervening mechanisms that may serve to facilitate a correlation between community context and varieties of police behavior, the central point remains consistent with what Wilson (1968) argued over thirty years ago—that differences in communities will be correlated with the existence of varying police styles.
Wilson's theoretical model begins with an identification of certain factors that differentiate communities, namely, varying population characteristics and forms of local government. Duffee's (1990) work goes beyond this rather limited description regarding the ways in which communities may vary by incorporating a definition of community that recognizes the myriad of different structural configurations that communities may develop in order to serve the interests of its constituents: "(communities are) the arrangement of groups, organizations, and larger systems that provide locality-relevant functions (Duffee 1990:149). Thus, communities—and their attendant structures such as local governments, business groups, and service providers (including the police)—will be highly diverse and will be arranged in a fashion that expedites the production of certain community needs, including the need for some type of formalized social control (i.e. police) (Langworthy and Travis 1999).

Duffee (1990) identifies two main dimensions along which communities may vary and develops a typology of communities based on these two dimensions. The first dimension, vertical relations, refers to the degree to which a community is dependant on the larger society in delivering locality-relevant functions, including police services. As Langworthy and Travis (1999) note, this aspect of community variation describes the degree to which a local community is "self-reliant" (266). How is the degree to which communities vary in terms of autonomy important to the provision of formalized social control through police services? The issue goes to the question of what interests are to be served through the provision of certain community functions, including police services (Langworthy and Travis 1999). Communities that are predominantly self-reliant in this regard (or low in vertical relations) can use the provision of police services to serve local needs or customs, whereas communities who are less self-reliant
and more dependent on the larger social system (high in vertical relations) would be more apt to serve the needs of that extra-local system. In regards to the provision of formalized social control, the interests of the larger social system are proscribed in formal legal codes rather than local customs (Langworthy and Travis 1999).

Horizontal articulation is the second dimension along which communities may vary according to Duffee’s (1990) community typology. Horizontal articulation refers to the degree to which a community is able to “reach a consensus about what is proper or needed in a situation” (Langworthy and Travis 1999:264). One factor in determining the degree to which a community is able to form consensus is the amount of “cultural homogeneity” a community exhibits (Langworthy and Travis 1999:265). That is, do community members share common values and ideals in such a way as to form a common community culture? (Langworthy and Travis :264). Communities that are able to form consensus (or have a high degree of horizontal articulation) are likely to exhibit clearly defined local interests and customs, whereas in communities that are less likely to be able to form consensus (or low in horizontal articulation) these local interests and customs will be more ambiguous and less apparent. Variations in horizontal articulation have clear implications for the provision of police services. The police should be more apt to provide enforcement of local interests and customs when they are easily defined and less apt to provide enforcement when these interests or more ambiguous (Langworthy and Travis 1999).

Langworthy and Travis (1999) attempt to link these notions about community variations to the style of policing that is practiced across jurisdictional types. They review the four community types that Duffee (1990) identified based on the interplay between variations in
vertical articulation and horizontal relations, and they subsequently discuss how these community variations may promote differing styles of policing in each of these four community types. Their ideas uniquely and effectively link Dufee’s (1990) discussion concerning community variation with Wilson’s (1968) thesis describing variations in police styles. The discussion is summarized below:

**Solidary Communities** - These communities are low on vertical relations and high on horizontal articulation. They are self-reliant and homogenous. Because these communities are largely independent from the larger society and consensus is readily formed, the police should be focused on serving local interests and enforcing well-defined local customs. This type of policing most closely resembles Wilson’s (1968) service style (Langworthy and Travis 1999: 276).

**Disorganized Communities** - These communities are low on vertical relations and low on horizontal articulation. While these communities are self-reliant (isolated?), they can produce little in the way of consensus because they are heterogenous in character. Police in these communities would likely have to provide their own definitions of order. Police intervention is likely to be low in the absence of any strong local custom or consensus. This type of policing most closely resembles Wilson’s (1968) watchman style (Langworthy and Travis 1999:273).

**Interdependent Communities** - These communities are high on vertical relations and high on horizontal articulation. They are largely dependent on the larger society for the provision of locality-relevant functions, however, their ability to form consensus allows the community to “put their own spin” on the functions provided by the larger society (Langworthy and Travis 1999:273). These communities are rare according to Duffee (1999) because it would
appear to be difficult to effectively coordinate local interests, interests of the larger society, and the intermediary mechanisms needed to link the two. Since there are both strong local and extra-local interests to be served, police would likely provide a great deal of enforcement based simultaneously on law and local custom. In terms of Wilson's discussion, the policing style (if one can be defined) in such a community would be mixed (Langworthy and Travis 1999:274).

**Fragmented Communities**

These communities are high on vertical relations and low on horizontal articulation. They rely on the larger society for the provision of local functions, but they lack the capacity to form a high degree of consensus regarding what type of functions are important or in what manner they will be delivered. Since extra local interests predominate in the absence of any well articulated local customs, the dominant mode of social control in these communities would largely reflect the formalized legal codes proscribed through the larger society. This style of policing most closely resembles Wilson's (1968) legalistic style (Langworthy and Travis 1999:275).

In short, Langworthy and Travis (1999) argue that community variation is correlated with different styles of police behavior. This point is consistent with one of the central themes of the present study—that the context of smaller communities, whether they be rural places, suburban enclaves, or small towns, appears to play a role in shaping a particular and unique style of policing that is different than that found in larger urban jurisdictions. Prior literature that has focused specifically on policing smaller communities has described certain features that separate smaller communities from large urban districts, and has intimated that these unique features are correlated with the style of policing that is practiced in smaller places. While this literature is
rather broad in focus, the works primarily emphasize three factors that distinguish smaller communities: 1) a unique social climate, 2) the prevalence of racial and ethnic homogeneity, and 3) less crime.

Smaller communities have a unique social climate that is thought to impact police behavior. First, citizens in smaller communities tend to know one another on a more personal basis (Weisheit et al. 1996; Boggs 1971; Benson 1995; Cain 1971; Teske 1982). This factor is often referred to in the literature as “dense acquaintanceship networks” (see esp. Weisheit et al 1996). These networks are thought to also promote a high level of informal social control in smaller communities, primarily because people appear to be more apt to exert informal social control within a social context where they know others on a personal level (Boggs 1971). Police are also part of this tight-knit network of citizens, and are often thought of as more than simply police officers in smaller communities (Weisheit et al 1994; Weisheit et al. 1996; Benson 1995; Decker 1979; Decker 1978; Cain 1971; Teske 1982). Benson (1995) highlights the unique social position of police in smaller communities: “In a big city officers don’t have a squad car parked in the driveway, and they are not seen in uniform on the porch playing with their baby daughter” (48).

Crank (1990) suggests that community factors impact police behavior to a greater degree in smaller departments and less so in larger agencies. He used the arrest rates for four crimes (trespassing, disorderly conduct, motor vehicle offenses, and marijuana violations) as an indicator of agency style across 161 urban Illinois police agencies and 123 rural departments. Communities varied in terms of cultural and racial heterogeneity, economic conditions, and form of local government. The police agencies varied in terms of several organizational factors,
including police strength (total # of officers/population), concentration (total # of officers above rank of sergeant/total # of officers), segmentation (# of ranks in agency), and supervisory ratio. Crank’s (1990) analysis revealed “substantial differences” (175) between urban and rural agencies in terms of the impact of community characteristics on arrest rates. More specifically, the aggregate influence of environmental factors (% Hispanic, % Black, % of population speaking a foreign language, per capita income, and type of local government) on arrest rates in rural places were consistently greater than the influence of organizational variables. For example, the proportion of variance in rural arrest rates explained by environmental variables was two to three times greater than that explained by organizational variables for disorderly conduct (.20 vs. .10), motor vehicle violations (.27 vs. .08), and cannabis control (.27 vs. .09). Conversely, organizational factors explained a greater proportion of variation than environmental variables in urban departments across all crime categories included in the analysis. Crank (1990) concluded that community characteristics had a greater influence on police style in rural and small departments, while organizational factors were more predictive of agency style in larger departments (Crank 1990).

Smaller communities are also typically more racially and ethnically homogenous than large urban areas (Weisheit et al. 1996; Crank 1990). While the United States population in urban areas is roughly 66 percent white, the population is 89 percent white in more rural areas (US Bureau of Census 1990). These differences are especially pronounced in Midwestern states, but less so in the West (Weisheit et al 1996). As Wilson (1968), Duffee (1990), and Langworthy and Travis (1999) suggest, the degree of homogeneity present in a community is thought to have specific impacts on the style of policing in any given community. Specifically, homogenous
communities are thought to be more apt to form a consensus regarding what type of policing is most appropriate. The police are more likely to serve local interests and enforce local customs, and they will tend to intervene more frequently with citizens (Langworthy and Travis 1999). Wilson’s (1968) service style would seem to be the type of policing most closely associated with these traits.

Finally, smaller communities typically do not have the same amount of crime that is often present in more urban communities (Meagher 1985; Weisheit et al. 1996). The Federal Bureau of Investigations Uniform Crime Reports have consistently found that the rates of both property and violent crime are lower in more rural areas than large urban centers. Likewise, analyses based on examinations of victimizations surveys (NCS) indicate that crime rates generally increase with community size, and victimization rates go down as population size decreases from urban to suburban to rural places. These patterns hold true for both violent and property crimes, although the disparities are more pronounced for violent crimes (Laub 1981; Weisheit et al. 1996). Therefore, police who work in smaller communities should be less likely to spend time in response to law enforcement related problems. Relieved of some of the issues related to “incident-driven” policing, officers would appear to have more time to perform other tasks, such as service, problem solving, and crime prevention.

In sum, the vast majority of the prior literature concerns the activities and interactions of officers from large, urban departments. Researchers that have been more concerned with the work of officers from smaller jurisdictions have suggested, primarily through studies that have employed non-systematic or anecdotal methodologies, that there are significant differences in the ways in officers from smaller jurisdictions perform activities and interact with citizens. A
number of policing scholars have hypothesized that variations in the way in which police behave across different locales are due, at least in part, to the inherent structural and cultural differences of different community types. The following chapter will address exactly how this dissertation will address the issues of: 1) describing the activities and interactions of police from twenty sampled smaller agencies, 2) explore whether and to what extent variation exist between these agencies in terms of officer activities and citizen interactions, and 3) test the notion that variations in officer behavior across locales is correlated with the structural characteristics of communities.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

This chapter provides a description of the present study's methods. Initially, the basic research issues and hypotheses are presented. Second, a description of the twenty small-town, rural, and suburban police agencies and their jurisdictions are provided. Third, the sources of data and the measurement of variables are described. Finally, the methods of analysis used to examine both the workload and nature of officer-citizen interactions of these smaller police agencies are discussed.

DESCRIPTIVE RESEARCH ISSUES AND HYPOTHESES

The present study initially attempts to describe how patrol officers in rural, small town, and suburban agencies spend their time during a typical shift. Specifically, the study will describe police officer activities and the nature and character of officer interactions with citizens. In addition, the present study aims to explore whether police officer styles vary across smaller agencies, and if so, if this variation is correlated with certain characteristics of the communities within which these officers perform their patrol work. The following are the basic research issues and hypotheses addressed in this dissertation:

DESCRIPTIVE RESEARCH ISSUES

1. What are the daily activities of police officers in small town, rural, and suburban jurisdictions?

2. Does the proportion of time police officers in small-town, rural and suburban agencies spend on activities vary? If so, how?
3. What is the nature and character of police officer interactions with citizens in small-town, rural, and suburban departments?

4. Does the nature and character of police officer interactions with citizens in small-town, rural, and suburban jurisdictions vary? If so, how?

In addition to these descriptive research issues, this dissertation will test whether the model Langworthy and Travis (1999) conceptualized by adapting Duffee’s (1990) typology of community types to Wilson’s (1969) conceptions regarding police agency styles. The specific research hypotheses listed below are derived from Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) model:

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

H1 - Police agencies located in small communities that are highly articulated horizontally and exhibit a low degree of vertical relations will interact with citizens frequently and informally (i.e. service style).

H2 - Police agencies located in small communities that are low in their degree of horizontal articulation and exhibit a high degree of vertical relations will interact with citizens frequently and formally (i.e. legalistic style).

H3 - Police agencies located in small communities that are low in their degree of horizontal articulation and exhibit a low degree of vertical relations will interact with citizens on an infrequent basis (i.e. watchman style).

H4 - Police agencies located in small communities that are highly articulated horizontally and exhibit a high degree of vertical relations will exhibit a “mixed” style of policing.
DESCRIPTION OF STUDY SITES

The study sites for the project are twenty rural, small-town, and suburban police agencies located in Southwestern Ohio. Cincinnati, Ohio, located in Hamilton County and having a population of approximately 350,000, is the large urban center of the region. Fifteen of the study sites are located in Hamilton County, Ohio, while four study sites are located in Clermont County, Ohio. One study site (Loveland) straddles three separate counties, Hamilton, Warren, and Clermont. These 20 departments employ a total of 422 sworn officers and serve a population of 212,079. While all of these agencies can be described as “small” compared to most of the large, urban agencies that have been the subject of previous observation studies, the departments are relatively diverse in terms of both organizational characteristics and community demographics (see Table 1). The total number of sworn officers in these agencies ranges from 9 to 56 (avg.=21.10). Their populations range from 856 to 55,925. The median home values in these communities range from $33,100 to $152,400, and the median household income ranges from $19,201 to $66,415. The populations of these communities is overwhelmingly Caucasian (91.78%).

Two of the study sites (Amberley Village and Terrace Park) can be described as affluent residential suburbs. The median home value in these communities averages $152,250, and the

---

6 The project also collected data from observations of officers employed by the Clermont County Sheriff's Department. Data from the Sheriff's department observations are not included in the present study.

7 All population data from 1990 US Census

8 All community demographic data from 1989 Lemus survey.
Table 1: Structural and Organizational Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Pop. 1990</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>MHHI(S)*</th>
<th>Land Use**</th>
<th>Pop. Change (1980-90)</th>
<th># Sworn officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amberley Village</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>93.95</td>
<td>66,415</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.0360</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Village</td>
<td>1,837</td>
<td>99.34</td>
<td>28,342</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.1513</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Hts.</td>
<td>1,084</td>
<td>86.16</td>
<td>19,201</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.0793</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ash</td>
<td>11,860</td>
<td>92.48</td>
<td>46,339</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.0433</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheviot</td>
<td>9,616</td>
<td>98.31</td>
<td>26,331</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.0783</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colerain Twp.</td>
<td>56,781</td>
<td>92.24</td>
<td>36,020</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.0743</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>6,181</td>
<td>98.28</td>
<td>27,124</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.0819</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>30,250</td>
<td>98.47</td>
<td>41,276</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.0139</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>2,029</td>
<td>98.91</td>
<td>27,092</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.1000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicity</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>99.53</td>
<td>19,659</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.1799</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Park</td>
<td>18,609</td>
<td>54.35</td>
<td>37,050</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.0448</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshen</td>
<td>12,697</td>
<td>99.17</td>
<td>31,617</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.1808</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>7,518</td>
<td>99.38</td>
<td>33,866</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.2724</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockland</td>
<td>4,357</td>
<td>74.86</td>
<td>19,730</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.0957</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveland</td>
<td>9,990</td>
<td>96.83</td>
<td>38,460</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.1792</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>5,660</td>
<td>96.20</td>
<td>21,152</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.0562</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>12,038</td>
<td>97.64</td>
<td>29,647</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.0457</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharonville</td>
<td>13,153</td>
<td>96.32</td>
<td>37,128</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.0545</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace Park</td>
<td>2,133</td>
<td>99.76</td>
<td>61,419</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-.0516</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
<td>2,322</td>
<td>99.52</td>
<td>22,829</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.1391</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Median Household Income (1989)
* Percentage of land used for residential purposes
median household income is $63,917. These departments combined employ twenty-nine sworn officers and serve a population of 5,241.

Four of the study sites (Felicity, Williamsburg, Amelia, and Goshen) can be described as communities that are in the process of changing from sparsely populated, mostly rural jurisdictions to more heavily populated outlying suburbs. These agencies are all located in Clermont County, and serve small but growing populations (4,395 population avg.). These communities’ median home value ($51,000 avg.) is less than a third of that for the affluent residential suburbs, and their average household income is $25,611. The average number of sworn officers in these agencies is 13.

Three study sites (Blue Ash, Forest Park, and Sharonville) can best be described as relatively stable but fairly commercialized suburban communities. These communities lie on the periphery of the urban center, and contain core residential areas, major retailing outlets (malls and shopping centers), and limited heavy industry. These agencies appear to have more diverse demands on their time in comparison to the other study sites, largely due to an influx of both workers and consumers that significantly increases their daytime populations. The mean number of officers for these agencies is 43.

Two study sites (Loveland and Milford) can be labeled as transitional communities. Twenty years ago the sites would have likely been described as rural small-towns, but each has since undergone rapid population growth and residential home construction. The communities are now relatively wealthy, averaging a median home value of $73,233. The mean number of officers for these agencies is 13.

The communities experienced a combined 66% increase in population from 1970 to 1990.
Seven of the study sites (Arlington Hts., Lockland, Fairfax, Deer Park, Cheviot, Delhi, and Reading) are inner-ring, bedroom communities that are more blue-collar in character. These communities do vary in terms of age, median home value, and commercial mix. The average median household income for these study sites is $27,200, and the median home value is $60,657. The number of sworn officers in these departments ranges from 11 to 32. Some of these communities (e.g. Lockland and Reading) do contain industrial work sites within their boundaries. One study site, Harrison, is a true small-town. Unlike the more rural communities mentioned earlier, Harrison maintains a comparably large population base (7,518), but the community is also physically separated from other residential areas (approximately 20 minute drive from Cincinnati). The department has 21 sworn officers.

The remaining study site, Colerain Township, is difficult to categorize in relation to the other study sites. The department presides over a large geographic area with a substantial population (56,781). Likewise, the agency employs a comparatively large number of officers (24). Land use in the township varies from sparsely populated areas, residential subdivision, and retail commercial districts. The median home value is $65,700 and the median household income is $36,020.

SYSTEMATIC OBSERVATION DATA

Data on the activities and citizen interactions of suburban, rural, and small-town officers were collected during systematic observations of police officers conducted by a research team from the University of Cincinnati, Division of Criminal Justice as part of a project funded by the National Institute of Justice (Grant # 98-IJ-CX-0063); “Policing in a Community Context: An
Observational Study of Suburban, Rural, and Urban Policing.\textsuperscript{9} The data were collected over a fourteen month period between April 1, 1999 and May 27, 2000.\textsuperscript{10} Observations were conducted with 228 officers employed by these twenty-one agencies.\textsuperscript{11} A total of 602 observations were completed for a total of 5,124 hours of observation, or the equivalent of 640.50 eight-hour shifts\textsuperscript{12} (see Table 2 for a breakdown of observations by agency).

Where and Whom to Observe

The primary purpose of the observation study was to gather information important for an understanding of how policing is accomplished in suburban, rural, and small-town police agencies. To this end, it was necessary to collect data concerning the daily activities and interactions of the officers employed by the twenty-one study agencies.

Letters of inquiry regarding participation in the observation project were sent to all police agencies. Observations were randomly selected and scheduled from April 1999 through April 2000. Observations that were unable to be conducted on the scheduled date were then randomly rescheduled and conducted in May 2000. A total of 42 observations were rescheduled for May 2000. Of those, 26 observations were completed.

Identifying officer information is missing for ten of the 602 observations.

All of the participating agencies do not employ the standard eight-hour shift. Eleven of the agencies employed an eight-hour shift schedule throughout the observation period (Williamsburg, Terrace Park, Sharonville, Reading, Loveland, Fairfax, Colerain, Amberley Village, Amelia, Deer Park, and Harrison). One agency (Milford) employed an eight-hour shift schedule through December 1999, and then switched to a twelve-hour shift schedule in January 2000. Four agencies employed an eight and one-half hour shift schedule (Forest Park, Cheviot, Blue Ash, and Lockland). One agency (Delhi) employed a nine-hour shift schedule. Three agencies (Clermont Co. Sheriff, Arlington Hts., and Goshen) employed a twelve-hour shift schedule. Felicity used a varied shift schedule depending on the day-to-day preferences of the Chief (Felicity is a two person department).
Table 2: Observations by Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Observed Shifts</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Eight Hr. Shift Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amberley Village</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14,076</td>
<td>29.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Village</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15,191</td>
<td>31.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Hts.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14,321</td>
<td>29.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ash</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14,254</td>
<td>29.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheviot</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14,505</td>
<td>30.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colerain Twp.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15,775</td>
<td>32.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14,206</td>
<td>29.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16,098</td>
<td>33.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15,768</td>
<td>32.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10,043</td>
<td>20.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Park</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15,563</td>
<td>32.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshen</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10,663</td>
<td>22.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14,696</td>
<td>30.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockland</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15,356</td>
<td>31.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveland</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15,346</td>
<td>31.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15,710</td>
<td>32.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15,406</td>
<td>32.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharonville</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15,617</td>
<td>32.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace Park</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15,968</td>
<td>33.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13,865</td>
<td>28.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                        | 292,427        | 609.12  |

*Unobserved minutes and minutes spent on officer debriefing excluded.
agencies in Hamilton County, Ohio in January 1997. Sixteen Hamilton County police agencies indicated a willingness to participate in the observation project by sending letters of support to the project research team in November 1997. In response to NIJ concerns regarding the lack of more rural jurisdictions among these sixteen agencies, a subsequent letter of inquiry was sent to police agencies in adjoining Clermont County in July 1998. Five additional rural agencies agreed to also participate in the project at that time, completing the twenty-one agency sample.

The project research team and participating agency Chiefs were introduced at two separate formal meetings held at the University of Cincinnati in February and March 1999. These meetings served to both introduce the project to the participating Chiefs and provide an opportunity for the project team to gather information pertinent to the scheduling of observations. Specifically, the Chief's were presented information regarding the project's research goals, the data collection methods to be employed (including systematic social observation and subsequent police chief interviews), participating agency responsibilities (including an agreement to allow observers to accompany officers and collect observation data on selected shifts), and collaboration and assurances agreements (including assurances concerning the confidentiality of information gathered during observations). The research team also collected data from the chiefs to facilitate the scheduling of observations, including: 1) whether or not the department utilized geographic beats in their jurisdiction, 2) shift schedules, 3) and the number and type of officers who performed patrol duties in their agency.

Subsequent to these meetings, the research team decided on issues regarding the selection of officers to be observed, and the geographic location of observations (i.e. beats). Initially, the research team intended to randomly select the individual officers to be observed from each
participating agency. Ideally, this type of officer sampling method would ensure that the observed officers would be representative of all officers in each participating agency. However, information gathered from the participating chief’s, as well as the project team’s concerns regarding the viability of randomly selecting individual officers from these smaller agencies, prevented the implementation of this method. First, a number of chief’s indicated that their agencies routinely employed only one or two officers on patrol during any given shift, and that these assignments were often not scheduled more than a week in advance. Second, some chiefs indicated that patrol assignments were often more “fluid” than those typical of a large urban agency. That is, the chief’s could not assure the research team that the patrol assignments of any given officer would not change without sufficient advance notice to the research team. In light of these concerns, the research team decided to conduct observations with any available officer performing patrol on the randomly selected dates and shifts.\textsuperscript{13}

Information garnered from the chiefs in these introductory meetings also guided the research team’s decisions regarding whether or not it was viable to randomly select individual geographic beats for observation. Of the twenty-one participating agencies, only ten

\textsuperscript{13} Observation data were inspected on an ongoing basis regarding the identification of individual officers observed. Some smaller agencies employed so few officers on patrol that representativeness did not become an issue. Concerns regarding the representativeness of observed officers in the larger agencies were addressed on a case-by-case basis, and the chief’s were made aware of the need for a representative sample of individual officers. If and when it became apparent that some officers from selected departments were not being observed, the project team contacted the chief and again asked that all officers performing patrol duties be given an opportunity to be observed. These contacts generally rectified any problems, with only one officer among all participating agencies refusing to be observed. Ultimately, 228 of the 422 officers employed by these agencies were observed during at least one shift.
departments did divide their jurisdictions into geographic beats. Thus, the issue of geographic
beats did not pertain to eleven of the agencies. In terms of those agencies who did indicate that
they employed geographic beat assignments to patrol officers, two factors identified by the
chiefs effectively relegated the question of whether or not to randomly select geographic patrol
beats as a non-issue: 1) several of the agencies indicated that the utilization of patrol beats varied
from shift to shift depending on manpower availability. Thus, on any given shift, many of these
agencies in fact did not employ geographic beat assignments, and 2) where actual beat
assignments did exist, they were not used to govern where officers actually patrolled. That is,
while officers may have administratively been assigned a particular geographic area within
which to patrol, these assignments did not govern the actual location patrolled. In effect, the
chief's indicated that the existence of patrol beats in these smaller jurisdictions cannot be
equated with the strict geographic divisions typically used in large, more urban departments.
Given these facts, the research team decided that the random selection of patrol beats for
observation would not significantly enhance the geographic representativeness of the sampled
observations.

When to Observe

The next issue involved the selection of dates and shifts to be observed. The sampling
frame consisted of all seven days of the week and all available shifts (subject to the variation
among agencies in terms of the number of available shifts per day) for a thirteen month period
beginning in April 1999 and ending in April 2000. The research team decided some issues
concerning when and how often to observe based on the limitations dictated by the number of
available persons (i.e. graduate students) who indicated a willingness to become trained
observers on the project. Specifically, the research team decided to set a goal of completing the equivalent of 30 eight hour shift observations in each agency over the twelve month duration of the project, or the equivalent of 2.5 eight hour shift observations per month per agency.

The observation schedules were constructed on a monthly basis as follows: 1) The participating agencies were categorized in terms of the number of shifts available per twenty-four hour period (i.e. agencies employing eight hour shifts had three available shifts per date, agencies employing twelve hour shifts had two available shifts per date).14 2) The sixteen agencies who used shifts ranged from eight to nine hours were then divided into two equal groups of eight agencies. On any given month (rotating month to month) these agencies would be scheduled for either two or three observations, thus completing 2.5 observations per month per agency, 3) The remaining agencies who employed twelve hour shifts (or two available shifts per day) were scheduled for either one or two observations per month on a rotating basis, and 4) Observation dates and shifts for each agency were randomly selected.

What to Observe

Observed police officers were accompanied by trained observers who recorded everything that the officers did during their normal work day. These observers recorded detailed notes regarding officer activities and officer-citizen interactions into small notebooks (3"x5"). Observers were instructed to avoid taking notes while in the presence of citizens, so as to avoid citizen inquiries and/or influencing the events that were observed. If necessary, observers would record information regarding citizen encounters immediately after they occurred, or while the

---

14 Agencies that employed eight and one-half hour shifts or nine hour shifts also had three available shifts per date because their shifts overlapped.
observed officer performed routine patrol. Observers were also instructed to allow the officers access to their notes if requested by the officer themselves.

The present study utilized a framework similar to that outlined by Mastrofski, Parks, Worden, Dejong, Snipes, and Terrill (1997) in order to systematically organize and record observer's field notes into reliable, coded data. Three distinct coding instruments were developed to record information regarding the daily activities and citizen interactions of observed officers: 1) ride instrument, 2) encounter/activity instrument, and 3) citizen instrument.

One ride instrument was completed for each observation. Observers were asked to record information regarding the date and time of the observed shift, weather conditions, officer demographics (age, race, sex, level of education, length of service marital status), and the officer’s attitudes regarding having an observer present (see Appendix A for a copy of the ride instrument). Encounter/activity instruments were used to record both the daily activities and citizen interactions of the observed officers (Appendix B). Officer “activities,” as defined by Mastrofski et al. (1997), are instances where the observed officer is not in direct contact with a member of the public. Examples of officer activities include routine patrol, en route to dispatched assignments, report writing, meetings with other officers, surveillance, and personal time (see Appendix D for a complete list of activity codes).

In contrast, officer-citizen “encounters” are instances where the observed officer is engaged in some type of interaction with a member of the public.¹⁵ The present study uses

¹⁵ Unlike previous observation studies using the Mastrofski et al. (1997) framework, the present study combined the activity and encounter instruments in order to simplify coding. The instrument initially covers information common to both activities and encounters (e.g. time of incident, geographic location, number of...
Mastrofki et al's (1997) definition of encounters—any face-to-face verbal communication or physical contact with members of the public. These may include crime victims, suspects, witnesses, service recipients, disputants, non-police service providers, or friends/acquaintances of the officers themselves. Observers further classified all encounters as either “full,” “brief,” or “casual.” Full encounters include any verbal exchanges or physical contact that involves police business and take one minute or longer or involve three or more exchanges of words (e.g. officer questions a witness to a crime). Brief encounters involve police business but are less than one minute in duration or involve less than three verbal exchanges (e.g. officer gives citizens directions). Casual encounters are defined as encounters that do not involve police business (e.g. officer engages citizen concerning the weather or personal business).

In addition to the information common to both activities and encounters outlined above, each encounter-activity instrument included other information relevant to each type of incident. Additional activity information included, among other items, the type of activity performed, whether the activity involved problem solving, the type (if any) of supervision the officer received, and if any other officers were present. Encounter information also included, among other things, the problem(s) that were addressed in the encounter (see Appendix E for complete list of problem codes), whether there were others present at the encounter, and if the encounter involved any violence.

In sum, the encounter-activity instrument was used to record and explain what the officers present, etc...). The observer then is prompted to identify the incident as either an activity or an encounter. The instrument then guides the observer through the appropriate skip patterns for each type of incident.
observed officer did for the entire time of his/her shift. The primary distinction between
encounters and activities is the presence or absence of members of the public for any given time
period. All periods of time can be classified as either an activity or an encounter, the sum of
which encompasses the officer’s entire shift.

The third and final coding instrument was the citizen instrument (Appendix C). Citizen
instruments were completed for each individual encountered during the entire shift. Citizens
were classified in terms of the role they undertook during the encounter (e.g. suspect, victim,
etc...). The citizen instrument also provided information regarding the citizens demographic
characteristics, citizen demeanor, any actions taken by the citizen against the officer, information
pertaining to any offenses committed by the citizen, and any law enforcement actions of the
officer against the citizen.

In addition to these quantitative data collection instruments, observers completed a short
“narrative” regarding officer activities and citizen encounters. The primary purpose of the
narratives were two-fold: 1) to provide a check on the quantitative data included on the three
instruments, and 2) to serve as a descriptive tool in clarifying or elaborating information
concerning the officer’s activities and citizen interactions. In effect, the narrative was used to
“fill in” any gaps or unclear coded information.

*Project Personnel*

The researchers who participated in the observation of police officers were all affiliated
with the Division of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati. A total of 43 different
observers participated in the project over a 13 month period. In terms of education, twelve
observers (27.9%) were pursuing their PhD. degree, eighteen observers (41.8%) were pursuing
their Masters degree, and thirteen observers (30.2%) were undergraduate students in the Division of Criminal Justice. One of the co-principle investigators on the project, who has a doctoral degree, also conducted observations. In terms of gender, 53.4% of the observers were female.

The overwhelming majority of observers (86%) were Caucasian.

Observers were required to complete a training course prior to conducting ride-a-longs. Three separate training courses were conducted over the thirteen month length of the project.

The purposes of the training sessions were as follows: 1) provide an overview of the project and research goals, 2) describe the study sites, 3) inform the observers of the need for confidentiality regarding what occurred during the observations,16 and 4) to provide practice exercises for observers to both familiarize them with the coding instruments and the procedures for conducting ride-a-long observations. As Reiss (1971) suggests, observers viewed videotapes in order to practice coding typical police activities. In addition to these initial training sessions, observer data were reviewed and cleaned on an ongoing basis during the length of the project to ensure that all observers were following the coding standards set forth during the training sessions, thus providing a continuing check on the reliability of the observation data.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Observation Data

The primary advantage of observation data is that the method allows the researcher to obtain information that is difficult or impossible to collect through other methods. For example, dispatch records only collect information regarding calls-for-service. Officer activities are often

---

16 Observers were required to complete a form stating that they understood the meaning of confidentiality as it pertained to the project, and to sign an agreement stating that all observed activities would remain confidential.
initiated through other means, such as the officer's themselves, citizens in the officer's immediate presence, or supervisors who communicate to the officer outside of the formal dispatch system. Officer workload logs suffer from some of these same disadvantages as well.Officers may neglect to include certain activities that they feel are not "real police work" or time spent on personal activities. Using these methods, the researcher is left with an incomplete set of information regarding the actual activities of officers. So too, all types of official data (i.e. compiled by the police department itself) are "filtered" in some way. In short, the advantage of observational data is that it allows the researcher an inside perspective concerning the activities and interactions of police officers.

While observational data can be an especially effective means to garner information on activities that would otherwise be of "low visibility" to the researcher, the method does lend itself to the danger of reactivity—that an officer would change his or her behavior simply because of the presence of the observer. Reactivity, if present, would serve to undermine the validity of the data because the officer would not be performing (or not performing) the activities that he or she performs during a typical shift. Reactivity may undermine workload data by overestimating the actual activities performed by police officers (Mastrofski and Parks 1990). For example, an officer may feel the need to be especially active in the presence of the observer, or the officer may feel the need to perform certain activities in order to impress the observer (e.g. an excessive amount of vehicle stops and/or ticketing). Likewise, the presence of the observer may influence officers to not perform certain activities that they feel may not meet with the approval of supervisors (e.g. a two-hour lunch break or running personal errands), or activities that they believe may endanger the observer (e.g. avoiding domestic violence situations).
Because of these inherent dangers, the research team endeavored to minimize the likelihood of reactivity during observations, and to recognize when and if reactivity had occurred. Initially, the research team required that all observers sign a confidentiality form. The form, which serves as a promise to the observed officer that information gathered during the ride-a-long will remain confidential (other than for the express research purposes of the project), follows certain guidelines set forth by the federal government to facilitate funded research projects. Specifically, the law mandates that information obtained through observations cannot be used to identify any person “for any purpose other than the purpose for which it was obtained” (42 USCS 3789g). Further, researchers cannot convey information gathered during observations “without the consent of the persons furnishing such information” (42 USCS 3789g). The statute provides limited exemption from the normal legal process to those individuals conducting federally sponsored research, and observers cannot be subpoenaed for administrative, civil, or criminal court cases without the consent of the observed officer. These confidentiality guidelines were explained to the participating police chiefs at the project’s introductory meetings, and also detailed during all observer training sessions. Prior to conducting ride-a-longs, all observers were made aware that if they violated the confidentiality agreement they would be terminated from the project.

The research team also attempted to limit the likelihood of reactivity by encouraging a certain level of confidence and familiarity between the observers and the officers. All observers were instructed to outline the confidential nature of the information they obtained to the officer at the beginning of each shift. Observers told officers that they were free to view the observer’s notes at any time during the observation. Officers were told that no data would contain any
information that would identify them personally. Observers did not record any identifying information on citizens that the officer encountered. Finally, observers were encouraged to ride as often as possible in the same agency over time to encourage trust and familiarity.17

In order to recognize when these safeguards had failed and reactivity had occurred, the coding instruments asked the observers if they believed the police had changed their behavior because of the observers presence. Observers were asked to indicate if the observed officer was more/less inclined to get involved with citizens, arrest and/or cite citizens, or to use force during an encounter. Observers indicated that the officer had changer his or her behavior in 29 of the 15,033 officer activities recorded, and that they had changed their behavior in 9 of the 3,486 officer-citizen encounters.

MEASUREMENT OF VARIABLES

One principle objective of this dissertation is to describe how patrol officers in rural, small-town, and suburban agencies spend their time during a typical shift. Observation data used to code the time officers spend on particular tasks and encountering citizens will be used to accomplish this objective. As stated previously, every minute of observed time was recorded as either an “activity” (or time spent not in interaction with citizens) or an “encounter” (or time spent in direct interaction with citizens). In regards to activity time, observers coded each activity using one of 70 “activity codes,” including motor patrol, report writing, personal business, crime related activities, etc... (see Appendix D for a complete list of activity codes).

Observers were asked prior to conducting ride-a-longs to list preferred agencies in which to ride, and the research team attempted to match observers to certain agencies based on these preferences.
For purposes of clarity and analyzability, these 70 codes will be collapsed into seventeen more general categories. Activity time is measured as the percentage total time spent while not engaged with citizens performing a particular activity. Additional analyses will utilize a measure of the percent of total shift time (including time spent with citizens) spent performing a particular activity.

Encounter time will be used to partially describe the nature and character of officer interactions with citizens. Observers coded all encounter time in terms of the underlying “problem” the officer was engaged in while dealing with particular citizens. Observers initially chose one of 260 “problems codes” to identify the underlying issue related to each citizen encounter. This coding scheme includes instances in which there was no apparent “problem,” including situations such as casual conversations and personal business (see Appendix E for complete list of problem codes). These problem codes have been further collapsed into thirteen more general problem categories. In this way, all observed time can be measured and coded into specific activity and problem codes.

The nature and character of citizen interactions will be described beyond simply measuring time spent on specific problems. For example, all citizen encounters were categorized in terms of whether they were a: 1) full encounter, 2) brief encounter, and 3) casual encounter (see previous section in Methods defining encounter types). All citizens were coded in terms of the “role” that they had during the encounter, whether they lived in the jurisdiction being patrolled by the observed officer, and whether or not they owned property, lived, or worked at or near the location of the encounter. Likewise, observers coded the degree to which the observed officer had previous knowledge of each encountered citizen (see Appendix F.
A second primary goal of this dissertation is examine whether certain community characteristics are correlated with differences in terms of officer activities, encounters, and agency styles. As indicated by the previous narrative description of the twenty study sites, it appears that these agencies fall into certain distinct groups that appear to be similar based on a number of demographic characteristics. The heuristically apparent existence of distinct groups among the sampled communities was also indicated by the anecdotal descriptions of observers during the course of the study as well as preliminary examinations of the data using correlation matrices. Given these observations (and in light of the difficulties involved in interpreting comparisons across twenty agencies) it seemed appropriate to utilize some type of quantitatively based classification of the sampled agencies. Consequently, cluster analysis was used to group agencies in terms of the degree to which they were culturally homogenous, since cultural homogeneity is highlighted in previous literature as a factor in determining how police officers and agencies behave (Wilson 1968; Langworthy and Travis 1999; Duffee 1990). Community cultural homogeneity is measured in terms of: 1) median household income, 2) population change from 1990 to 1998, 3) percentage of land that is residential, 4) percentage of the population that is age eighteen and under, and

Initially, the four homogeneity variables were selected for four primary reasons. First, a number of these variables have commonly been employed in the macro-social criminal justice literature as key indicators of community structure. Median household income is used as a measure of the economic status of the sampled communities. Major macro-social theorists have long recognized the correlation between economically depressed areas and criminal
behavior (Shaw and McKay 1942; 1969; Merton 1938; Schuerman and Kobrin 1983; Blau and Blau 1982; Sampson and Groves 1989). Community economic status is an integral component of the dominant macro-social criminological theories (e.g. social disorganization, institutional anomie) largely because it is believed that economically deprived communities foster criminal and/or deviant behavior through processes whereby communities are unable to form consensual norms of behavior and social bonds among citizens fail to develop. The effects of community economic deprivation are thought to be accelerated when neighborhood instability and change is also present. Population change from 1990 through 1998 is a measure of community stability. Population change within communities is assumed to be a detriment to a community’s ability to realize the common goals of its residents and solve community problems (Shaw and McKay 1942; 1969; Schuerman and Kobrin 1983; Blau and Blau 1982; Sampson and Groves 1989). The percentage of land that is used for residential purposes is a measure of community land use. Researchers have documented how patterns in land use (i.e. initial residential settlement, increased residential density, and subsequent commercial and industrial development) are correlated with deteriorating structure and criminal activity (see esp. Schuerman and Kobrin 1986). Likewise, communities that exhibit a high degree of commercial and industrial land usage tend to attract more non-resident consumers and workers, thereby contributing to a higher degree of community heterogeneity.

Second, these variables were selected based on their perceived impact on police workload and the nature and character of officer interactions with citizens. The median household income of a community (as a measure of community economic status) may affect police behavior in a number of ways. The literature has suggested that police perceive a greater
social distance between themselves and persons of low socio-economic status (Whyte 1943; Bayley and Mendelson 1969). These factors should lessen the likelihood that police will engage in casually-based citizen encounters in communities of lower economic status. Likewise, research has indicated that police are more likely to use coercive force and/or arrest citizens in low socio-economic neighborhoods (Smith 1986; Bayley and Mendelson 1969). These factors would indicate that police would perform more activities directly related to law enforcement in communities of lower economic status (e.g. searching crime scenes, pursuing suspects) and handle more problems related to law enforcement (e.g. meeting complainants, interviewing witnesses, arresting suspects). Finally, the problems associated with more affluent areas should differ from those that predominate economically depressed areas. The police seem to be more likely to perform service related functions in affluent, homogenous communities and law enforcement functions in economically depressed communities (Wilson 1968; Langworthy and Travis 1999).

Population changes, as a measure of community stability, should also impact the way police behave across communities. Communities that experience rapid population changes become susceptible to social decline because this instability has a tendency to breakdown informal control mechanisms (Shaw and McKay 1942; Merton 1948; Schuerman and Kobrin 1983; Blau and Blau 1982; Sampson and Groves 1989). In the absence of informal controls, the police may be forced to provide a greater degree of formal control and resort to a legalistic style of policing in structurally unstable communities. Likewise, population changes may impact the degree to which police are familiar with local residents, thus impacting whether police encounters will tend to be coercive and/or law enforcement related (e.g. suspects, victims,
witnesses) or less so (e.g. casual and service related encounters).

Variability in community land use should primarily impact the demand for police services. For example, communities that contain large tracts of land devoted to commercial retail development will demand that police perform certain activities that are unnecessary in residential districts, such as commercial alarm responses and security checks. Similarly, police will be forced to deal with a wider range of problems associated with such development, such as traffic congestion, commercial theft, and problems related to consumer activity (e.g. bad checks and refusal to pay situations). So too, commercial and industrial land use often creates more diversified and homogenous day time populations, thus creating a greater degree of community heterogeneity. As discussed above, heterogeneity is thought to be correlated with a more legalistic style of policing.

Finally, the present study uses the percentage of the population that is aged eighteen and under as a measure of community structure. The presence of a large number of juveniles should impact police activities by creating the need to deal with a large variety of juvenile problems and offenses (e.g. truancy, runaways, underage consumption of alcohol). Likewise, the degree to which a community is comprised of adolescent citizens should impact the style of policing practiced in a community. Black (1976) argued that police would act more formally in their interactions with younger individuals. So too, the presence of such individuals in large numbers may create more law enforcement situations in general given the prevalence of young offenders in the distribution of all offenders noted in the literature (Hirschi and Gottfredson 1983; Farrington 1986; Flanagan and Maguire 1990).

Third, the relatively small sample size of twenty communities negated the
Given their importance in both the macro-social criminological literature and their perceived impact on police behavior described above, these variables were included in the cluster analysis. Cluster analysis is a generic term for a wide array procedures used to create classification systems (Alenderfer and Blashfield 1984). Clustering methods use multivariate statistical procedures to organize entities (in this case communities or jurisdictions) into relatively homogenous groups (Alenderfer and Blashfield 1984). The primary goal of clustering for the present study was to group sampled communities based on their relative homogeneity. Alenderfer and Blashfield (1984) indicate that the selection of a clustering method "must be compatible with the desired nature of the classification...and the variables used" (35). Ward’s method was selected as the most appropriate procedure to cluster the twenty sampled communities included in the present study. Ward’s method is one of several clustering methods termed "hierarchical agglomeration" methods (Alenderfer and Blashfield 1984). This method is "designed to optimize the minimum variance within clusters."(Alenderfer and Blashfield 1984:43). Ward’s method appears to be most appropriate for the goals of the present study for a number of reasons. First, Ward’s method creates non-overlapping clusters. Non-overlapping clusters were needed in order to classify each community in a single, distinct group. Second, the method tends to produce clusters that are "tight" (i.e. the distance, or differences in values for the three variables used among agencies that cluster together is relatively small)(Alenderfer and Blashfield 1984). Unlike instances where clustering is used to group a large number of entities,
one of the primary goals in clustering sampled communities was to create groups in which the clustered individual entities were very similar to those contained within each group, and as dissimilar as possible to those individual entities contained in other clusters. In this way, the method produces a classification system in which grouped entities are very similar and clusters are relatively dissimilar to each other so that meaningful comparisons can be made. Third, Ward's method tends to create cluster groups which do not contain outlying entities. It was not desirable to create a classification or grouping scheme of sampled communities that did not include the entire sample (Alenderfer and Blashfield 1984).

Langworthy and Travis (1999) have suggested that communities vary along two dimensions, and that the degree to which communities vary along these dimensions is correlated with particular styles of policing. These two community dimensions will act as independent factors in determining whether (and to what degree) community variations impact police behavior. The first dimension, vertical relations, refers to the degree to which communities are self-reliant, or independent of the larger society in supplying locally needed functions. Vertical articulation will be measured as the percentage of total funds in each jurisdiction's yearly budget (1999) that is from locally-based revenue streams (as opposed to being derived from state or federal grant programs). The second dimension, horizontal articulation, refers to the degree to which communities are able to reach consensus regarding local community priorities and goals. Langworthy and Travis (1999) suggest that "cultural homogeneity," or the degree to which a community exhibits a single culture, in part determines a community's ability to reach consensus. Community cultural homogeneity is measured in terms of: 1) median home value, 2) percentage of land that is agricultural, and 3) percentage of the population that is age eighteen
and under. These are the identical measures used to cluster the twenty sampled agencies.

The analysis will use these two dimensions to categorize the twenty sampled communities in terms of horizontal articulation and vertical relations. Specifically, agencies will be identified as either "high" or "low" along each dimension. Police behavior in each type or group of community will subsequently be measured in terms of the frequency and formality of officer-citizen interaction as described above. In this way, it will be possible to assess whether, and if so to what extent, community variations (as identified by Duffee's (1990) model) are correlated with differing police styles as defined by Wilson (1969).

STATISTICAL ANALYSES

Initial analyses will focus on providing a quantitative description concerning officer workload. First, the degree to which officers spend time not in interactions with citizens will be measured by dividing the total observed activity minutes (numerator) by the total number of observed minutes (denominator). The degree to which officers are engaged with citizens will be measured by dividing the total observed encounter minutes (numerator) by the total number of observed minutes (denominator).

Officer activities will be further measured by computing the percentage of time officers spend on selected activity categories (numerator) divided by the total amount of observed activity time (denominator). These analyses will involve two steps: 1) an analysis of the percentage of time spent across seventy activity categories (see Appendix D for complete list), and 2) an analysis of the percentage of time spent across seventeen collapsed activity categories. The first phase of analysis will involve the entire sample of communities. This analysis will serve to describe how officers from small towns, rural places, and suburbs spend their time.
during a typical shift. Subsequently, the sample of agencies will be categorized in terms of how they fall along the horizontal and vertical dimensions outlined earlier. This analysis will serve to offer a comparison of how officers from different types of communities spend their time away from citizens, as well as provide a benchmark for determining whether, and to what extent, differences in community context are correlated with differences in police activities.

Officer encounters with citizens will be measured in a number of ways. First, the nature (or focus) of officer encounters will be measured by computing the percentage of time officers spend on selected problem categories (numerator) divided by the total amount of observed encounter time for (denominator). This analysis will be conducted in two phases: 1) an analysis of the percentage of time spent addressing problems using 260 problem codes (see Appendix E for a complete list), 2) an analysis of the percentage of time spent addressing problems across thirteen problem categories. Because certain problem categories appear to naturally consume a greater percentage of officer time simply because of the nature of the problem (e.g. traffic violations), encounter descriptions will also include a measure of the frequency with which officers deal with, or encounter, certain problem types. This will be measured by dividing the total number of observed times that officers deal with selected problem types divided by the total number of standardized eight hour shifts observed. Hence, a measure of the number of times officers deal with specific problems per eight hour shift will be obtained.

The first phase of problem analysis will involve the entire sample of communities. This analysis will serve to describe how officers from small towns, rural places, and suburbs spend their time with citizens (i.e. the nature and character of police-citizen interactions). Subsequently, the sample of agencies will be categorized in terms of how they fall along the
horizontal and vertical dimensions outlined earlier. This analysis will serve to offer a comparison of how officers from different types of communities interact with citizens, as well as provide a benchmark for determining whether, and to what extent, differences in community context are correlated with differences in police-citizen interactions.

Descriptions of citizen encounters will be elaborated further. This description will include a measure of the types of citizens officers encounter by dividing the number of citizens observed in certain categorized roles (e.g. suspect, victim, witness, etc...) divided by the total number of citizens encountered for each agency. Likewise, citizen roles will be measured in terms of the percentage of all encounters that involved selected citizen types. That is, the number of citizens observed in certain categorized roles divided by the total number of encounters observed for each agency. Additional percentages will be computed concerning the officer’s observed prior knowledge of the citizen encountered, and the observed citizen’s relationship to the jurisdiction (e.g. Is the citizen from the city? Does the observed citizen work or own property at the location of the encounter, etc...).

Agency “style” (Wilson 1968) will be measured in terms of the frequency and formality of citizen interaction. Frequency of interaction will be measured by dividing the total number of encounters per agency (full, brief, casual, or combinations of these three) by the number of standardized eight hour shifts for each agency. Formality of interaction will be measured by the number of arrests and citations per standardized eight hour shifts, divided by the number of citizens encountered per standardized eight hour shifts. Likewise, style will be measured in terms of both horizontal relations and vertical articulation described in the earlier section.

Comparisons among agencies will be made using the two dimensional categorization
scheme identified by Langworthy and Travis (1999) described above. For all comparisons involving continuous variables (e.g. percentage of time spent) analysis of variance will be used to compare the cluster groups to each other and determine whether agency groups significantly differ as a whole.
CHAPTER FOUR

FINDINGS

The present chapter is organized to correspond to the research goals outlined in the methods section. The findings are presented in four primary sections: 1) A description of officer activities and citizen interactions across the entire sample of twenty smaller communities is presented. These findings specifically include a description of time spent in officer activities, problems addressed by officers in citizen encounters, citizen roles in encounters, and officer knowledge of citizens involved in encounters, 2) A summary of how the twenty sampled communities were grouped in terms of horizontal articulation and vertical relations will be presented. This section will serve as a prelude to comparing the work of officers across small community types. 3) A comparison of officer activities and citizen interactions will be presented across community types, and 4) agency groups will be measured and compared in terms of agency “style” in order to investigate whether certain community types produce distinct styles of policing as suggested by Langworthy and Travis (1999).

DESCRIBING OFFICER ACTIVITIES AND INTERACTIONS

The initial goal of the present dissertation is to describe the daily work routines of officers from the twenty sampled rural, small-town, and suburban police agencies. To this end, descriptive analyses are used to determine what activities these officers performed during their observed shifts. These descriptive analyses also include an examination of the nature and character of these officers interactions with citizens.

Prior to presenting the specific findings regarding officer activities and citizen interactions, a description of the demographic characteristics of the officers who were observed
over the thirteen month observation period is presented (see table 3).

**Table 3. Officer Demographics- Total Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Age</td>
<td>32.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Length of Service (total yrs.)</td>
<td>9.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Length of Service (current dept.)</td>
<td>7.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Male</td>
<td>86.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Caucasian</td>
<td>92.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent College Graduate</td>
<td>20.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=223

As table 3 illustrates, the mean age of all observed officers was about thirty-two years. Officers tended to have been employed within their current departments for over three fourths of their law enforcement careers. The sample was overwhelmingly male (86.10%) and Caucasian (92.40%). Walker (1999) relates that approximately eight percent of police officers nationwide are female and approximately seventeen percent of all officers are of either African-American or Hispanic origin. In this regard, observed officers were more likely to be female and more likely to be Caucasian than the entire population of police officers nationwide. Over 64 percent of the observed officers had at least some college education, and slightly over 20 percent had obtained a college degree. The sample of observed officers appears to be very comparable to the general population of police officers nationwide in regards to education. The Bureau of Justice Statistics (1993) reports that 65.2 percent of all police officers nationwide have received some college
education, and 22.6 percent of these officers have obtained a college degree.

Overview of Officer Shift Time

Observers recorded a total of 292,427 minutes of officer patrol time across the twenty sampled police agencies, or over 4,873 hours of observed officer shift time. Officers spent almost 84 percent of their total time (83.99%) performing activities while not in direct contact with citizens (245,618 minutes; 4,093 hours). The remainder of observed time (46,809 minutes; 780 hours) was spent in direct contact with citizens. In terms of the typical eight hour shift, officers spent approximately 1.5 hours in direct contact with citizens, or 16 percent of their total shift time.

Officer Activities

To assess what officers do with their time spent away from citizens, the present dissertation examines the frequency with which sampled officers performed various tasks while on patrol. This examination of officer activities is presented in two ways: 1) using 70 individual “activity” categories, and 2) using 17 collapsed “activity” categories. The 70 original activity codes were collapsed so that the present findings could be more easily compared to the broad categories often utilized in prior literature concerning descriptions of officer shift time, as well as to ensure that the present findings concerning officer activity time are not simply reflective of the particular coding scheme used for the present dissertation.

Observers coded all officer activities, or time spent while not directly encountering citizens, using one of 70 individual activity codes (see Appendix D for a complete listing of codes). These 70 individual codes account for the broad range of activities an officer may perform while not in direct contact with citizens, including (but not limited to) patrols, driving to
and from locations, enforcing traffic laws, order maintenance activities, service related tasks, and administrative work. Table 4 provides a description of the most time consuming activities performed by observed officers in terms of minutes spent on each activity and the percent of total activity time consumed by each activity (see table 4).

Table 4. Officer Activities: Most Time Consuming (Non-Collapsed) (70 categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Activity Time (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Patrol</td>
<td>89,397</td>
<td>36.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td>24,018</td>
<td>9.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals/Breaks</td>
<td>19,267</td>
<td>7.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Administrative</td>
<td>15,664</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Other Police (not official)</td>
<td>11,182</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Rt. to Location (non-dispatch)</td>
<td>11,180</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll Call</td>
<td>9,269</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Traffic Enforcement</td>
<td>8,805</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Rt. to Location (dispatch)</td>
<td>7,684</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Other Police (official)</td>
<td>7,258</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Activities (60 categories)</td>
<td>41,894</td>
<td>17.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Minutes</td>
<td>245,618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As table 4 indicates, the primary activity that officers perform is motor patrol. Observed officers spent 36.39 percent of their total activity time and almost one-third of all observed shift time (30.57%) engaged in motor patrol. In terms of the typical eight hour shift, observed officers spent close to two and one-half hours on motorized patrol. Motorized patrol accounted for over three times as much activity time as the next most time consuming activity, and more than the next six most time consuming activities combined.

The activities that consume the next highest percent of officer activity time are report writing (9.77%), time spent on meals or breaks (7.84%), general administrative tasks (6.37%), meeting other police on an unofficial basis (4.55%), and going to and from specific locations not directed by dispatch (4.55%).

Except for stationary traffic enforcement (i.e. running radar), which was among the most time consuming activities performed by observed officers (3.58% of all activity time), other law enforcement related activities consumed very little of the officers time spent away from citizens. For example, warrant and subpoena services, surveillance of particular persons, attempts to locate suspects, witnesses, or informants, and checking out suspicious circumstances combined to account for less than one percent of total activity time. Likewise, service related activities were very infrequent in the absence of citizens. General service activities, checking on or fixing road conditions, and directing traffic also consumed less than one percent of officer activity time combined. These findings reflect the fact that most criminal and service matters necessarily involve direct contact with citizens. Thus, the degree to which officers devote time to these matters while not in contact with citizens is understandably low.

The 70 original activity categories were subsequently collapsed into seventeen more
general categories in order to provide a clearer picture regarding the activities of these sampled officers and also to facilitate comparisons between my findings and those from earlier studies detailed in the literature review. The collapsed activity categories are as follows (see Appendix G for a complete listing of activity codes included within each collapsed category): 1) foot patrol, 2) motor patrol, 3) order maintenance, 4) crime related, 5) investigative, 6) traffic, 7) service, 8) community-oriented policing service, 9) administrative, 10) administrative-crime, 11) ordinance, 12) information, 13) en-route/waiting, 14) problem focused, 15) meet non-police service personnel (NPSP), 16) non-task/personal, and 17) meet other police (business related).

Table 5 presents a description of the amount of time observed officers spent performing the activities encompassed within these seventeen activity categories. All observed activity time (i.e. shift time spent while not in direct contact with citizens) is included in the seventeen collapsed activity categories. Total minutes spent on each activity are presented, as well as the percent of total activity time consumed by each activity category. As table 5 indicates, motor patrol is still the most time consuming activity (36.39%). Administrative tasks consume the next largest percentage of activity time (21.97%), followed by personal and non-task related activities (15.45%), en-route/waiting (9.36%) and traffic enforcement (4.70%).

The three most time consuming categories of activities, including motor patrol, administrative tasks, and personal tasks account for slightly less than three fourths of all officer activity time (73.81%). Once again, crime related activities consume relatively little of the sampled officers’ activity time (1.70%). Service activities also account for a small percentage of time spent away from citizens (1.30%), and activities specifically related to community-oriented
policing services (primarily including meetings with the public, civic, or business groups)

Table 5. Officer Activities: Collapsed
(17 categories)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Activity Time (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Patrol</td>
<td>89,397</td>
<td>36.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>53,975</td>
<td>21.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Task/Personal</td>
<td>37,951</td>
<td>15.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Rt./Waiting</td>
<td>22,999</td>
<td>9.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Enforcement</td>
<td>11,563</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Other Police</td>
<td>7,768</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime-Related Service</td>
<td>4,193</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>3,217</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Crime Related</td>
<td>2,824</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Maintenance</td>
<td>2,756</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Gathering</td>
<td>2,653</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet NPSP</td>
<td>2,051</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>1,817</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>1,234</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Patrol</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Service</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance Enforcement</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>245,618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

account for a minuscule percentage of activity time (0.18%). Table 5 also highlights the fact the a very large percentage of sampled officers' activity time is uncommitted (e.g. spent in random patrol or doing personal tasks).

These findings appear to indicate that the description of how sampled officers spend time away from citizens remains fairly consistent between the uncollapsed and collapsed activity category schemes. Patrol activities, specifically motorized patrol, was clearly the dominant
activity of sampled rural, small-town, and suburban officers. Outside of patrol activities, officers appear to be performing administrative tasks (primarily report writing and roll call), personal tasks, driving to and from locations, and enforcing traffic laws on a regular basis. A small percentage of activity time is consumed by law enforcement, traditional service, and order maintenance tasks.

Citizen Encounters

The second aspect of describing what it is that sampled small-town, rural, and suburban police officers do involves analyzing the nature and character of police-citizen interactions. This dissertation describes police-citizen interactions in four ways: 1) provides a description of what type of encounters citizens were involved in (i.e. full, brief, and casual), 2) provides a descriptive analysis of the underlying problems involved in police-citizen encounters, 3) describes the roles that citizens play in police-citizen encounters, and 4) describes the degree to which sampled officers are familiar with the citizens that they encounter.

Types of Citizen Encounters

As discussed previously in the methods chapter, encounters can be categorized as being: 1) full, 2) brief, or 3) casual in nature. Observed officers spent 35,522 minutes of their total encounter time (46,809) engaged in full citizen encounters, or slightly over 75% of all their encounter time. The remainder of encounter time was spent in either brief encounters with citizens (4,765 minutes; 10.17% of all encounter time) or casual citizen encounters (6,448 minutes; 13.77% of all encounter time).

Another way to analyze the type of encounters that officers engage in is to examine the number of citizens officers engage in full, brief, or casual encounters (as opposed to examining
the number of minutes spent in each encounter type). Observed officers encountered a total of 4,390 citizens over the course of the study. Of these citizens, 2,656 were engaged by police in full encounters (60.6%), 1,151 citizens were engaged in brief encounters (26.3%), and 569 citizens were engaged casually by observed officers (13%). This finding indicates that while officers spent three quarters of their encounter time engaged in full encounters, less than two-thirds of all citizens encountered were involved in full encounters.

Problems in Citizen Encounters

In regards to the identification of the nature of the underlying problem in police-citizen encounters, observers coded each citizen encounter using one of 260 problem codes (see Appendix E for a complete listing of problem codes). Table six presents a list of the ten most time consuming problems that sampled officers dealt with in their encounters with citizens. The table presents the number of minutes that were consumed by each individual problem type and the percentage of total encounter time consumed by those individual problems.

Casual conversations were the most time consuming issue addressed by sampled officers (8.36% of encounter time; 1.33% of total shift time). Casual conversations are situations where there is no apparent problem on the officer’s or citizen’s mind. These are “getting to know you” chats that officers frequently engage in as part of their professional occupational routine. In contrast, “personal business” problems are encounters where the officer clearly engages citizens for his/her own personal benefit. Officers engaged citizens in casual conversation for an average

\[ \text{information concerning encounter type was missing for seven observed citizens.} \]
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Table 6. Officer Encounters: Ten Most Time Consuming Problems (Non-Collapsed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem (260 categories)</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Encounter Time (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual Conversation</td>
<td>3,915</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Speed</td>
<td>3,839</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Accident*</td>
<td>2,595</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Business</td>
<td>2,351</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Violation</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest/Processing/Booking</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Vehicle</td>
<td>1,581</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Argument</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing/Improper Plates/Registration</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment or Inspection Lacking</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Minutes (top ten problems) 21,747

*property damage only

**The remaining 250 problem types coded by observers consumed 25,062 encounter minutes (53.54% of all encounter time).

of one-half hour per eight hour shift. Traffic enforcement problems, specifically excess speed (8.20% of encounter time) and traffic accidents involving property damage only (5.54% of encounter time) were the next most time consuming problems addressed by sampled officers.

Encounters associated with an officer's personal business (personal errands, purchasing personal
goods, spending time with family and/or friends) accounted for 5.02 percent of encounter time. The most time consuming law enforcement related problems (outside of traffic accidents and violations) were arrest and booking procedures (3.82% of all encounter time) and domestic arguments (3.02% of all encounter time). Six of the most time consuming problems specifically involved traffic accidents or enforcement. These types of problems accounted for over one quarter of all encounter time (26.2%) combined.

These ten most time consuming problems accounted for 46.45 percent of total encounter time. The remaining 250 problem types consumed 25,062 minutes of encounter time. However, the time spent on any one of these remaining problems averaged less than .005% of all encounter time.

The 260 original problem codes were collapsed into thirteen broader problem categories in order to more easily define what types of problems sampled officers handled. This categorization scheme groups problems of a similar nature into broad categories as follows (see Appendix H for a complete list of problems within each collapsed category): 1) order maintenance, 2) crime related, 3) investigative, 4) traffic, 5) service, 6) COP service, 7) administrative, 8) administrative crime related, 9) ordinance enforcement, 10) information gathering, 11) en-route/waiting problem, 12) meet non-police service providers (NPSP).

Table 7 presents a description of the amount of time observed officers spent addressing problems related to the thirteen collapsed problem categories. Total minutes spent on each problem category are presented, as well as the percentage of total encounter time consumed by each problem category. Table 7 indicates that traffic problems consumed the greatest percentage of time officers spent in direct contact with citizens (13,972 minutes; 29.84%).
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Table 7. Officer Encounter Time: Collapsed Problems
(13 categories)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Encounter Time (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>13,972</td>
<td>29.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Related</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>19.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Task/Personal</td>
<td>6,266</td>
<td>13.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>5,812</td>
<td>12.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Maintenance</td>
<td>4,018</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>3,541</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative/Crime</td>
<td>2,458</td>
<td>5.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Gathering</td>
<td>961</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP service</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative (general)</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet NPSP</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance Enforcement</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Rt./Waiting Problem</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46,808</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* one minute of encounter time spent addressing a complaint against an officer was omitted from problem re-code.

Traffic problems were followed by crime related problems with citizens (19.22%), non-task problems (13.38%), service problems (12.41%), and order maintenance problems (8.58%).

Table 7 can be used to illustrate the dichotomy between what officers spend their time on while not in direct contact with citizens and when they are in direct contact with citizens (see table 5). While performing activities (i.e. while not in direct contact with citizens), sampled officers appeared to dedicate large percentages of their time simply driving around, performing administrative functions, or conducting non-duty tasks. However, when officers are specifically
engaged with citizens they appear to spend a considerable percentage of their time on traditional
tasks such as crime, service, and order maintenance. For example, the total amount of activity
time consumed by crime related matters, service, and order maintenance functions is 6.01
percent, while the total amount of encounter time consumed by these matters is 40.21 percent.
While it is true that sampled officers spend the largest percentage of their shift not dealing with
citizens at all and performing tasks such as patrol and administrative work, these officers did
spend a considerable percentage of their time with citizens on criminal matters, service
problems, and order maintenance issues. Given that point, however, the time consumed by
officers engaging citizens concerning issues unrelated to police work (13.38% of total encounter
time) was the third most time consuming problem category.

Because certain problem categories appear to naturally consume a greater percentage of
officer time simply because of the nature of the problem (e.g. traffic violations), encounter
descriptions also include a measure of the frequency with which officers deal with, or encounter,
certain problem types. Table 8 presents a list of the twenty five most prevalent problem types
addressed by observed officers while they were in direct contact with citizens, as well as the
average number of times officers dealt with these problems in terms of the typical eight hour
shift.

Excessive speed was the most prevalent problem underlying observed officers’
encounters with citizens (340 total encounters; .558 times per eight hour shift). Observed
officers averaged at least one motor vehicle speeding problem for every two observed shifts.
The next most prevalent problems were casual conversations (289; .474), disabled vehicles (171;
.280), other automobile moving violations (160; .262), and personal business encounters (152;
Table 8 demonstrates that not only were traffic related problems the most time consuming problems handled by observed officers, but they were also the most prevalent. Five of the ten most prevalent problems handled by observed officers were traffic related.

Disabled vehicles were the most prevalent service problems (171; .280), followed by medical assistance (60; .098), general service requests (46; .075), animal problems (43; .070), and road directions (37; .060). The most prevalent crime related problems included domestic arguments (85; .139), warrant services (51; .083), and arrest/processing/booking procedures (47; .077). Officers engaged in casual conversations with citizens about once every two observed eight hour shifts (289; .474). These twenty five problems accounted for over sixty two percent of the problems identified in the 3,330 encounters observed. The remaining 235 problem types were identified in the remaining 1,206 encounters. Observed officers engaged in these other problem types slightly less than three and one half times per shift (3.48) combined. The most prevalent problems not included in Table 8 were case-related crime information, crime-tip information, harassment/stalking, discovery of missing or stolen property, and traffic accidents involving bodily injury.

Citizen Roles in Encounters

A third avenue toward understanding the character of police-citizen encounters is to examine the role that citizens play when encountering police officers. A total of 4,383 citizens were encountered by observed police officers over the thirteen month course of the project. Observers coded each citizen involved in an encounter in terms of one of eleven citizen roles. Citizens were coded as being 1) victims, or persons who are the complainant, injured, or
Table 8. Officer Encounters: Most Prevalent Problems (Non-Collapsed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th># of Encounters</th>
<th>Per 8 hr. Shift</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excess Speed</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Conversation</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Vehicle</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Violation</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Business</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Accident (p.d. only)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/Inspection Lacking</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Argument</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing/Improper Plate/Registration</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assistance</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alarm (not fire)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warrant Service</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest/Processing/Booking</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicions Person</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Service Request</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Violation</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Problem</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juvenile Problem/Disturbance</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Directions</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Vehicle Violation</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspicious Circumstances</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-Related Crime Information (citizen request)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime-Tip Information (officer request)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harassment/Stalking</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing/Stolen Property</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Problems 1,206

Total Encounters 3,330  609.12
wronged party, 2) suspects, or the apparent wrongdoer, 3) disputants, or persons whose role as suspect or victim is unclear or who may be both, 4) service recipients, 5) helpless persons, 6) third parties, or persons who desire no assistance for themselves but only for others, 7) witnesses, or persons with potential useful information, 8) quasi-police, or persons acting in an occupational capacity such as security guards, 9) non-police service providers (NPSP), or persons such as waitresses and clerks, 10) friends of the officer, and 11) occupational acquaintances, or persons the officer speaks to in the course of his or her police role.

Table 9 presents the roles that citizens played when encountering observed officers. The encounters have been divided in terms of full, brief, and casual encounters because certain types of roles appear to be associated with different types of encounters. The table presents the number of citizens encountered for each role, the percentage of those types of citizens encountered within each encounter type (full, brief, casual), and the total number of citizens encountered for each role.

As table 9 indicates, over one-half of all citizens encountered by observed officers were either victims (16%) or suspects (35%). Victims and suspects were most likely to be encountered during full encounters, as 46 percent of all citizens involved in full encounters were suspects. An additional 22 percent of all citizens involved in full encounters were victims. Sixty eight percent of all citizens involved in full encounters were either suspects or victims. Disputants were involved in six percent of all encounters, and also were most likely to be involved in full encounters (8% of all full encounters).
Table 9: Citizen Encounters: Citizen Roles by Encounter Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Brief</th>
<th>Casual**</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>577(.22)</td>
<td>129(.11)</td>
<td>5(.01)</td>
<td>711(.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspect</td>
<td>1,217(.46)</td>
<td>285(.25)</td>
<td>9(.02)</td>
<td>1,511(.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputant</td>
<td>216(.08)</td>
<td>39(.03)</td>
<td>2(.00)</td>
<td>257(.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>232(.09)</td>
<td>213(.19)</td>
<td>20(.04)</td>
<td>465(.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpless Person</td>
<td>22(.01)</td>
<td>20(.02)</td>
<td>0(.00)</td>
<td>42(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party</td>
<td>179(.07)</td>
<td>185(.16)</td>
<td>9(.02)</td>
<td>373(.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness</td>
<td>137(.05)</td>
<td>124(.11)</td>
<td>8(.02)</td>
<td>269(.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-Police</td>
<td>2(.00)</td>
<td>7(.01)</td>
<td>3(.01)</td>
<td>12(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPSP</td>
<td>25(.01)</td>
<td>61(.05)</td>
<td>155(.27)</td>
<td>241(.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>11(.00)</td>
<td>6(.01)</td>
<td>145(.26)</td>
<td>162(.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occ. Acquaintance</td>
<td>38(.01)</td>
<td>82(.07)</td>
<td>212(.37)</td>
<td>332(.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Citizens* | 2,656 (.61) | 1,151(.26) | 568(.13) | 4,375 |

* Information in regards to encounter type and citizen role is missing for seven citizens.
**Information in regards to citizen role is missing for one casually encountered citizen.

Suspects were also the most likely citizens involved in brief encounters (25% of all citizens involved in brief encounters). Service recipients were the second most prevalent type of citizens involved in brief encounters (19%), followed closely by third parties (16%) and witnesses (11%). The nature of many service related problems seems to require very little
conversation or interaction between officer and citizen, including informational problems (e.g. asking for directions) and vehicle or commercial lockouts. Casual encounters were dominated by occupational acquaintances (37% of all casually encountered citizens), NPSP’s (27% of all casually encountered citizens) and personal friends of the observed officer (26% of all casually encountered citizens).

Patterns in terms of the roles that citizens are likely to play across different encounter types (full, brief, casual) can more easily be discerned by grouping roles of a similar nature in terms of the problems likely to be addressed by officers when encountering citizens of a certain role. For example, citizens who are suspects or victims are likely to be encountered in crime related problems. Encounters involving disputants, whose role as suspect or disputant (or both) cannot be identified, typically require the officer to conduct some form of order maintenance in order to resolve the dispute. Citizens who are service recipients or helpless persons display service related roles. So too, non-police service personnel such as security guards are often engaged by officers to contribute to helping citizens with problems.

Table 10 presents results of the re-categorization of citizens roles in terms of the likely underlying problem. Victims and suspects have been combined into a crime related role category. Disputants have been identified with an order maintenance role category. Service recipients, helpless persons, and NPSP’s have been grouped into a service related role category.

Table ten clearly indicates that full encounters are most likely to involve citizens in crime related roles such as suspect or victim (68%), and also third parties or witnesses (12%).
Table 10: Citizen Encounters: Citizen Roles by Encounter Type (collapsed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Brief</th>
<th>Casual**</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime (victim/suspect)</td>
<td>1,794</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM (disputant)</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (service recipient, helpless person, NPSP)</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party/Witness</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-Police</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Occ. Acquaintance</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Citizens*</td>
<td>2,656</td>
<td>1,151</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>4,375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Information in regards to encounter type and citizen role is missing for seven citizens.  
**Information in regards to citizen role is missing for one casually encountered citizen.

The typical roles citizens play in brief encounters is more dispersed across crime related roles (36%), service roles (26%), and third party/witness roles (27%). Casual encounters are still clearly dominated by friends or occupational acquaintances of the officer (63%). However, the inclusion of NPSP’s into the service related role category considerably increases the number of “service related” citizens that encounter police casually (31% of all casually encountered
citizens). It appears that observed police were often casually acquainted with the NPSP's that they encountered during a typical shift.

**Officer Knowledge of Citizens Encountered**

A fourth way to describe the nature and character of police-citizen encounters is to examine the degree to which officers know or are familiar with the citizens that they encounter. This aspect of police-citizen interaction appears to be an especially important issue to examine in consideration of prior literature that suggests that police who work in small-town, rural, and suburban jurisdictions are more familiar with the citizens that they police (see esp. Weisheit et al. 1996). Also, the degree of familiarity that exists between officers and citizens should naturally impact the style of social control that officers are likely to adopt in citizen encounters.

Table 11 presents a description of the extent to which sampled officers knew the citizens that they encountered in terms of the type of encounter that occurred (full, brief, casual). Over 70 percent of all citizens encountered were complete strangers to the officers. In contrast, the sampled officers knew 10 percent of all citizens that they encountered "very well." Officers knew the remaining 20 percent of citizens to varying degrees (see table 11). The degree to which officers knew the citizens that they encountered appeared to remain relatively consistent across full and brief encounters. For example, strangers were encountered in 78.8 percent of the time in full encounters, and 73.8 percent of brief encounters. Officers knew the citizens that they encountered in full encounters "very well" 4.9% of the time, and they knew citizens "very well" in brief encounters 5.6 percent of the time. Officers knew citizens "very well" in almost 40 percent of all casual encounters, and had "non-detailed" knowledge of an additional 16.3 percent of casually encountered citizens. Still, over 23 percent of all casually encountered
citizens were strangers to the officers.

Table 11: Citizen Encounters: Officer Knowledge of Citizen by Encounter Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Full</th>
<th>Brief</th>
<th>Casual</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Knowledge/Stranger</td>
<td>2,080(78.8)</td>
<td>849(73.8)</td>
<td>132(23.2)</td>
<td>3,061(70.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows Citizen/Not Clear How</td>
<td>178(6.7)</td>
<td>88(7.6)</td>
<td>86(15.1)</td>
<td>352(0.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes Face/Reputation/No Detailed Knowledge</td>
<td>104(3.9)</td>
<td>63(5.5)</td>
<td>28(4.9)</td>
<td>195(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows Name and Little Knowledge/Not Detailed</td>
<td>143(5.4)</td>
<td>76(6.6)</td>
<td>93(16.3)</td>
<td>312(0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows Very Well</td>
<td>128(4.9)</td>
<td>65(5.6)</td>
<td>227(39.9)</td>
<td>420(0.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>23(0.8)</td>
<td>10(0.8)</td>
<td>3(0.5)</td>
<td>36(0.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Citizen 2,656 1,151 569 4,376

*Information in regards to encounter type is missing for seven citizens

CATEGORIZING COMMUNITIES

In addition to describing the activities and citizen interactions of sampled police officers, the present dissertation also explores whether police officer activities and interactions vary across smaller agencies. The primary aims of these comparisons are two-fold: 1) to determine whether the activities and interactions of police officers from the sample of twenty communities vary, and if so, whether these variations are correlated with community characteristics, and 2) to examine whether community variation in terms of the degree to which communities are horizontally articulated and vertically integrated is correlated with differences in police agency
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“style” as suggested by Wilson (1968). To these ends, the twenty sampled communities were classified in terms of both horizontal articulation and vertical relations. These two community dimensions will act as independent factors in determining whether (and to what degree) community variations influence police behavior.

Categorizing Communities: Horizontal Articulation and Vertical Relations

The discussion describing how these communities were categorized in terms of horizontal articulation and vertical relations is organized in the following manner. First, findings of a cluster analysis performed in order to group the twenty agencies in terms of the degree to which they are culturally homogenous is presented. As discussed in the methods section, cultural homogeneity is used in the present dissertation as a proxy measure for horizontal articulation. Each cluster of communities will be briefly described in terms of how they compare to one another. This is followed by a description of how these clusters of communities were ranked and categorized based on the degree to which they are horizontally articulated. Second, data obtained in regards to measuring the degree to which these twenty communities are vertically integrated is discussed. How the communities were ranked and categorized based on the degree to which they are vertically integrated is presented. Third, the final categorization of the communities based on Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) and Duffee’s (1990) two dimensional typology (horizontal articulation and vertical relations) is presented. Finally, comparisons in regards to officer activities, citizen interactions, and police agency “styles” based on the categorization of the sampled communities are made.

Horizontal Articulation: Cluster Analysis Solutions Based on Community Homogeneity

Horizontal articulation refers to the degree to which communities are able to reach
consensus regarding local community priorities and goals. Langworthy and Travis (1999) suggest that “cultural homogeneity,” or the degree to which a community exhibits a single culture, in part determines a community’s ability to reach consensus. As discussed in the methods section, cluster analysis was used in order to quantitatively group the twenty sampled communities in terms of four structural variables commonly used to indicate community homogeneity: 1) the percentage of land that is used for residential purposes, 2) community population change from 1980-1990, 3) median household income, and 4) the percentage of the population that is under the age of eighteen.

As indicated in the methods section, Ward’s method cluster analysis was performed in order to group the twenty sampled communities in terms of these four structural variables. Ward’s method produces a classification scheme in which grouped entities (in this case communities) are most similar to those contained within each cluster, and as dissimilar as possible to those entities (or communities) contained in other clusters. The cluster solution produced four distinct categories of agencies based on these four structural variables. Table 12 presents the twenty sampled communities in terms of their scores for these four structural variables and arranges them according to the cluster solutions. Also included is the average scores within each cluster.

Horizontal Articulation: Describing the Clusters

Cluster one is comprised of the communities of Amberley Village and Terrace Park. These two communities are the two wealthiest of the twenty sampled communities. Their average median household income is $63,917. This figure is close to sixty percent higher than the average for the next wealthiest cluster of communities, and over twice the average median
Table 12: Cluster Solutions Based on Community Homogeneity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>MHHI(S)*</th>
<th>Land Use**</th>
<th>Pop. Change (1980-90)</th>
<th>% Pop. 17 and under</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLUSTER ONE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amberley Village</td>
<td>66,415</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.0360</td>
<td>.1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrace Park</td>
<td>61,419</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-.0516</td>
<td>.2972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTER AVG.</td>
<td>63,917</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>-.0078</td>
<td>.2443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLUSTER TWO</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amelia Village</td>
<td>28,342</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.1513</td>
<td>.3097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felicity</td>
<td>19,659</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.1799</td>
<td>.3131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshen</td>
<td>31,617</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.1808</td>
<td>.3024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td>33,866</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.2724</td>
<td>.3363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveland</td>
<td>38,460</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.1792</td>
<td>.3127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
<td>22,829</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.1391</td>
<td>.2881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTER AVG.</td>
<td>29,128</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.1837</td>
<td>.3103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLUSTER THREE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Hts.</td>
<td>19,201</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.0793</td>
<td>.2454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheviot</td>
<td>26,331</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>-.0783</td>
<td>.2282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td>27,124</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>-.0819</td>
<td>.2039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td>27,092</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.1000</td>
<td>.2449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockland</td>
<td>19,730</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>-.0957</td>
<td>.2594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>29,647</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>-.0457</td>
<td>.2193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTER AVG.</td>
<td>24,854</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.0801</td>
<td>.2335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLUSTER FOUR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Park</td>
<td>37,050</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.0448</td>
<td>.2866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Ash</td>
<td>46,339</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.0433</td>
<td>.2470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colerain Twp.</td>
<td>36,020</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.0743</td>
<td>.2873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>21,152</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.0562</td>
<td>.2260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharonville</td>
<td>37,128</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.0545</td>
<td>.2209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delhi</td>
<td>41,276</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.0139</td>
<td>.2916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLUSTER AVG.</td>
<td>36,494</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.0478</td>
<td>.2599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Sample Avg.</strong></td>
<td><strong>33,534</strong></td>
<td><strong>.6785</strong></td>
<td><strong>.0446</strong></td>
<td><strong>.2655</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Median Household Income (1989)
* Percentage of land used for residential purposes
household income for the remaining two clusters. So too, cluster one communities have the
greatest average percentage of land used for residential purposes (94%). Cluster one
communities are stable in terms of population changes (-.0078), and have comparatively few
persons under the age of eighteen residing within their borders (.2443). In sum, cluster one can
be described as a well-to-do, residential group of communities having older and relatively stable
populations.

Cluster two is comprised of the communities of Amelia, Felicity, Goshen, Harrison,
Loveland, and Williamsburg. These communities seem to be distinguished by the degree to
which they are experiencing population growth and the age diversity of their residents. Cluster
two communities grew an average of over eighteen percent (18.37%) from 1980-1990, which is
the highest rate of growth among the four clusters. Close to one-third (31.03%) of the residents
in cluster two communities are aged seventeen or under, which is also the highest percentage of
young persons among the four clusters. The median household income of this cluster is
comparatively low ($29,128 avg.). The percentage of land used for residential purposes
(75.33%) places them well below the average for cluster one communities but higher than the
remaining two clusters. In sum, cluster two can be described as a group of communities that are
experiencing high rates of growth. These communities have young, but relatively less affluent
populations.

Cluster three is comprised of the communities of Arlington Hts., Cheviot, Deer Park,
Fairfax, Lockland, and Reading. These communities are the least affluent among the four
cluster groups ($24,854 avg. median household income). They also are the most industrial and
commercialized group of communities with a residential land use rate of just under sixty percent

(59.50%). All of the communities contained in cluster three have declining population rates (-8.01% average). A large percentage of remaining residents are relatively old, as less than one in four of the residents (23.35%) are aged seventeen and under. In sum, cluster three communities are relatively poor, and can be described as very diversified in terms of land use. They are older suburban communities located close to a large urban center (Cincinnati, OH) and have declining, older populations.

Cluster four is comprised of the communities of Forest Park, Blue Ash, Colerain Twp., Milford, Sharonville, and Delhi. These communities are the second wealthiest among the four clusters ($36,494 avg. median household income). Their populations are also the second most stable (4.78% growth rate). These communities do contain a significant percentage of commercial land use, however, sixty percent of land use remains residential. These communities can be described as fairly wealthy, established suburbs that have diverse economies and an average number of young residents (25.99%).

_Horizontal Articulation: Ranking the Clusters_

Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) two-dimensional typology of communities ranks communities in terms of horizontal articulation as either “high” or “low.” However, as the preceding section indicates, the cluster analysis of the twenty sampled communities based on the four structural indicators of community homogeneity identified four distinct clusters of communities in terms of cultural homogeneity. In order to typologize these communities in terms of Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) model for comparison purposes, it became necessary to collapse the four clusters into two larger groups of communities that can be identified as either “high” or “low” in terms of horizontal articulation. That is, these four clusters of communities
needed to be collapsed into two larger groups of communities in order to facilitate the “pigeon-holing” of communities to fit the two dimensional scheme.

To this end, each of the four clusters were ranked in terms of the degree to which they exhibit community homogeneity. The two most homogenous clusters were grouped together and defined as “high” on the scale of horizontal articulation, and the two least homogenous clusters were grouped together and defined as “low” on the scale of horizontal articulation. These rankings utilized a simple point system whereby each cluster was assigned anywhere from one point (least homogenous) to four points (most homogenous) depending on their average scores across the four structural variables used in the cluster analysis. Homogeneity was indicated by a greater percentage of land used for residential purposes, slower rates of change in population, lower percentages of young residents, and higher median household incomes. Table thirteen presents the results of these ranking in terms of the four structural variables and overall cluster scores.

Table 13: Cluster Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Land use</th>
<th>Pop&lt;18</th>
<th>MHHI</th>
<th>Pop. Change</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 1</td>
<td>4 (.9400)</td>
<td>3 (.2443)</td>
<td>4 (63,917)</td>
<td>4 (.0078)</td>
<td>15 (HIGH)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 2</td>
<td>3 (.7533)</td>
<td>1 (.3103)</td>
<td>2 (29,128)</td>
<td>1 (.1837)</td>
<td>7 (LOW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 3</td>
<td>1 (.5950)</td>
<td>4 (.2335)</td>
<td>1 (24,854)</td>
<td>2 (.0801)</td>
<td>8 (LOW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster 4</td>
<td>2 (.6000)</td>
<td>2 (.2599)</td>
<td>3 (36,494)</td>
<td>3 (.0478)</td>
<td>10 (HIGH)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 13 indicates, cluster one was clearly the most homogenous cluster among the
four clusters in terms of the four cluster variables. Cluster one has the highest percentage of
land used for residential purposes, the highest median household income, and the lowest
percentage of population change. Thus, cluster one will be defined as "high" in terms of
horizontal articulation. Cluster four scores the second highest in terms of homogeneity. The
cluster ranks immediately behind cluster one in terms of median household income and
percentage of population change. Cluster two is the only remaining cluster that did not score the
lowest in terms of homogeneity for at least one of the four cluster variables. Thus, cluster four
will be grouped with cluster one and will be defined as "high" in terms of horizontal articulation.
The remaining two clusters (two and three) will be defined as "low" in terms of horizontal
articulation. Both cluster two and cluster three ranked among the bottom two clusters in terms
of three of the four variables included in the cluster analysis, although different variables seem
to be driving the low degree of homogeneity for each cluster. Cluster three was highly diverse
in terms of land use and scored the lowest in terms of median household income. Cluster two
had the highest rate of growth and the highest percentage of young persons among the four
clusters.

*Vertical Relations*

As discussed previously in the methods section, vertical relations refers to the degree to
which communities are self-reliant, or independent of the larger society in supplying locally
needed functions. Vertical articulation is measured as the percentage of total funds in each
jurisdiction's yearly budget (1999) that is from locally-based revenue streams (as opposed to
being derived from state or federal grant programs). Each of the twenty sampled communities
were sent a survey in which they indicated the percentage of revenues (1999) that were derived
from local sources and extra-local sources. Langworthy and Travis' (1999) model of community types defines communities as either being "high" or "low" in terms of vertical relations. Table 14 presents the sampled communities in terms of the percentage of revenue that was derived from local sources.\footnote{Information in terms of the percentage of locally-based revenues is missing for Delhi Township. Thus, Delhi Township has not been included in the categorization of communities.}

As table 14 indicates, there appears to be a "natural break" in the data in terms of the degree to which these sampled communities rely on locally-based funds. Milford, the thirteenth ranked community, derives 78 percent of their revenues from local sources. Williamsburg, the fourteenth ranked community, derives only 67 percent of their revenues from local sources. The eleven percentage point difference is by far the largest gap between any two sampled communities except for the degree of difference between the last ranked community (Felicity .43) and the second to last ranked community (Colerain .55). Because Langworthy and Travis' (1999) two-dimensional community typology defines communities as being either "high" or "low" in terms of the degree to which they are vertically integrated, this "natural break" in the data will serve as the dividing point in determining if a sampled community is "high" or "low" in terms of vertical relations. Thus, thirteen of the sampled communities will be defined as "high" in regards to vertical relations, and the remaining six communities will be defined as "low" in terms of vertical relations.
Table 14: Percentage of Locally Based Revenues and Vertical Relations Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>% Local Revenue</th>
<th>Vertical Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Arlington Hts.</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fairfax</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Blue Ash</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Lockland</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Harrison</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Sharonville</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Forest Park</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Amberley Village</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Deer Park</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cheviot</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Terrace Park</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Loveland</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Milford</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Williamsburg</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Goshen</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Reading</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Amelia</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Colerain</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Felicity</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two-Dimensional Categorization of Communities

With the ranking of the sampled communities completed, each community can now be typologized in terms of the degree to which they appear to be horizontally articulated and vertically integrated. Table 15 presents this typology of the sampled communities along the horizontal and vertical community dimensions.
Table 15: Community Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horizontal Artication</th>
<th>(LOW)</th>
<th>Interdependent</th>
<th>(HIGH)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dependent Disconnected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fragmented)</td>
<td>Amelia</td>
<td>Colerain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Felicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(HIGH)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williamsburg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vertical Relations</th>
<th>Autonomous Non-Consensual</th>
<th>Established Suburban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(LOW)</td>
<td>(Disorganized)</td>
<td>(Solidary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arlington Hts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amberley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheviot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Terrace Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Blue Ash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharonville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrison</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forest Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loveland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Milford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The nomenclature used by Langworthy and Travis (1999) to define each community type (e.g. Fragmented, Interdependent, Disorganized, and Solidary) has been altered somewhat for the present dissertation in order to provide a more appropriate description of the smaller, less urbanized communities contained in the sample, however, the typology presented here remains consistent with the actual categorization scheme used by Langworthy and Travis (1999) in terms...
where these communities fall in regards to horizontal articulation and vertical relations.

For example, the communities termed as “Dependent Disconnected” communities above correspond to Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) “Fragmented” communities. These communities are high on vertical relations and low on horizontal articulation. They rely on the larger society for the provision of local functions, but they lack the capacity to form a high degree of consensus regarding what type of functions are important or in what manner they will be delivered (Langworthy and Travis 1999). In regards to horizontal articulation, four of these communities (Amelia, Felicity, Goshen, and Williamsburg) were included in these least homogenous cluster grouping (cluster 2), while the remaining community (Reading) belonged to the second least homogenous cluster (cluster 3). These Dependent Disconnected communities are highly reliant on the larger society for the provision of local functions, as they comprise five of the six most vertically integrated communities in the sample.

The communities termed as “Autonomous Non-Consensual” communities correspond to Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) “Disorganized” communities. These communities are low on vertical relations and low on horizontal articulation. While these communities are self-reliant (or, as Langworthy and Travis suggest “isolated”), they can produce little in the way of consensus because they are relatively heterogenous. In regards to horizontal articulation, five of these “Autonomous Non-Consensual” communities (Arlington Hts., Cheviot, Deer Park, Fairfax, and Lockland), were included in the second least homogenous cluster (cluster 3). The remaining two Autonomous Non-Consensual communities (Harrison and Loveland) were part of the least homogenous cluster (cluster 2). All of these communities were among the thirteen least vertically integrated communities in the sample.
Colerain is the only sampled community to rank high in terms of vertical relations and high in terms of horizontal articulation. Consistent with Langworthy and Travis' (1999) nomenclature, Colerain has been identified as an "Interdependent" community. While Colerain is largely dependent on the larger society for the provision of local services (35% of revenue is extra-local), the community was part of the second most homogenous cluster in the sample (cluster 4). Thus, Colerain's ability to form consensus allows it to "put its own spin" on the functions provided by the larger society (Langworthy and Travis 1999). The identification of Colerain as the sole Interdependent community in the sample should not be surprising however, as Duffee (1990) suggests that these types of communities are "rare and perhaps unstable" (quoted in Lanworthy and Travis 1999: 273).

The communities termed as "Established Suburban" communities correspond to Langworthy and Travis' (1999) "Solidary" communities. These communities are low on vertical relations and high on horizontal articulation. They are self-reliant and relatively homogenous. Two of these Established Suburban communities (Amberley Village and Terrace Park) comprised the most affluent, stable, and residentially-oriented cluster in the sample (cluster 1). The remaining Established Suburban communities (Blue Ash, Milford, Sharonville, and Forest Park) were included in the second most homogenous cluster (cluster 4), which can be characterized as relatively wealthy and stable. All six Established Suburban communities were among the thirteen least vertically integrated communities in the sample.

COMPARISONS ACROSS COMMUNITY TYPES

The present section will provide a comparison of officer activities and citizen interactions across the four types of communities outlined above. Specific comparisons will include the
following: 1) a comparison of the amount of time spent in activities versus citizen interactions across community types, 2) a comparison of the most time consuming activities performed by officers across the community types. Activities will be compared in terms of seventy activity categories, and will subsequently be compared in terms of the collapsed activity category scheme that includes seventeen activity categories, 3) a comparison of citizen involvement in different encounter types (full, brief, and casual) across community types, 4) a comparison of the most time consuming problems handled by officers across the community types. Problems will be compared in terms of 260 problem categories, and will subsequently be compared in terms of twelve collapsed problem categories, 5) a comparison concerning the roles that citizens play in different encounter types across community types, and 6) a comparison of the degree to which officers know the citizens that they encounter in different encounter types across the community types.

Comparison of Time Spent: Officer Activities vs. Citizen Encounters

Table 16 presents the percentage of time officers spent in activities and citizen encounters across the four community types. As table 16 indicates, the Interdependent community spent the largest percentage of time in interactions with citizens (21.43% of all observed time). The three remaining community types were very similar in terms of the amount of time officers spent engaging citizens. Officers from Established Suburban communities spent 15.66 percent of their time in citizen encounters, while officers from Dependent Disconnected communities and Autonomous Non-Consensual communities engaged citizens 16.36 percent of the time and 14.95 percent of time respectively. Analysis of variance (F-test) confirmed that the four groups differed significantly in terms of the percent of time they spent with and without
citizens. Clearly, officers in the Interdependent community are distinguished from the three other community types in terms of the degree to which they engage citizens.

Table 16. Community Comparisons: Total Time Spent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Established Suburban</th>
<th>Interdependent</th>
<th>Auto-Non Consensual</th>
<th>Dependent Disconnected</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>84.33 (76,901)</td>
<td>78.56 (12,394)</td>
<td>85.04 (88,615)</td>
<td>83.63 (54,505)</td>
<td>3.435*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounters</td>
<td>15.66 (14,287)</td>
<td>21.43 (3,381)</td>
<td>14.95 (15,583)</td>
<td>16.36 (10,663)</td>
<td>3.386*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>91,188</td>
<td>15,775</td>
<td>104,198</td>
<td>65,168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*05

Comparison of Officer Activities

Officer activities were originally compared across seventy categories of activities (see Appendix D for a complete list of activity codes). Table 17 presents how officers from the four community types compare in terms of the most time consuming activities performed by the entire sample of officers. Percentages presented in the table were computed in terms of the total amount of activity time for each community type.

As table 17 indicates, motor patrol was by far the most time consuming activity across all four community types. The interdependent community performed motor patrol at the highest percentage of activity time (40.45%). The three remaining community types were strikingly similar in terms of the percentage of activity time spent on motor patrol. For example, Established Suburban officers spent 35.99 percent of all activity time engaged in motor patrol.
Table 17. Community Comparisons: Most Time Consuming Activities  
(70 categories/percent of activity time only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Established Suburban</th>
<th>Interdependent</th>
<th>Auto-Non Consensual</th>
<th>Dependent Disconnected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Patrol</td>
<td>35.99</td>
<td>40.45</td>
<td>35.60</td>
<td>35.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Writing</td>
<td>9.01</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>10.55</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meals/Breaks</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gen. Admin.</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>10.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roll Call</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Rt. Location</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationary Traffic</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>2.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Police (non-official)</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Rt. Dispatched</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Police (official)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Activities</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>15.82</td>
<td>17.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autonomous Non-Consensual officers spent 35.60 percent of activity time engaged in motor patrol, and Dependent Disconnected officers spent 35.76 percent of all activity time engaged in motor patrol. Likewise, the degree to which officers spent time writing reports was very similar across the four community groups.

Established Suburban officers were distinguished in terms of the amount of time they spent in stationary traffic enforcement (4.38% of all activity time). In contrast, Interdependent officers performed stationary traffic enforcement at the lowest percentage of activity time.
(1.87%). Interdependent officers spent a larger percentage of activity time in roll call (6.14%) and en route to dispatched assignments (8.31%) than the three remaining groups. Autonomous Non-Consensual officers spent a larger percentage of time meeting unofficially with other police officers than the other three groups (5.83%). Observers often noted the degree to which officers from these communities knew each other informally and backed one another up, probably due to the close physical proximity of some of these agencies to one another (e.g. Arlington Hts., Lockland). Officers from Dependent Disconnected communities spent a greater percentage of activity time engaged in general administrative duties (10.06%). Most of these agencies have Chiefs who sometimes perform regular patrol duties and were the observed officer in ride-a-longs.

Similar to the description of the activities of the entire sample of officers, officer activities were subsequently compared in terms of seventeen collapsed activity categories across the four community types. Table 18 presents these comparisons in terms of the percentage of total activity time only and percentage of total shift time consumed by individual categories of activities.

Four categories of activities, including motor patrol, administrative, non-task/personal, and en route/waiting, were consistently the most time consuming activities across all four community types. The percentages of time consumed by motor patrol remained constant with the percentages contained in table 17 because no other activities were collapsed into the motor patrol category. The collapsing of six administratively-related activities (general administrative,
Table 18. Community Comparisons: Collapsed Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>% Activity Time</th>
<th>% Total Shift Time</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>ANC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Patrol</td>
<td>35.99</td>
<td>40.45</td>
<td>35.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>21.89</td>
<td>21.37</td>
<td>21.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Task/Pers.</td>
<td>14.21</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td>18.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En Rt/Waiting</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>9.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Enf.</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet Police</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime-Related</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm./Crime</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Maint.</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info Gather</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet NPSP</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solve</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Patrol</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Service</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report writing, automobile maintenance and refueling, officer transports, checking equipment, and roll call) into one “administrative” category revealed that officers across the four community types perform administrative duties at very much the same rates (21.89%, 21.37%, 21.32%, and...
22.77% of all activity time respectively).

Autonomous Non-Consensual officers were distinguished in the degree to which they spend time performing non-task and personal duties (18.37% of all activity time). The interdependent community spent the largest percentage of activity time driving to and from locations and waiting (13.49% of all activity time). This community (Colerain) is the largest geographically of the nineteen communities included in these comparisons. Established Suburban officers remained the highest in terms of the percentage of activity time that they spent in all types of traffic enforcement activities (stationary and mobile)(5.71% of all activity time), as well as investigative activities (2.51% of all activity time). The Interdependent community and the Established Suburban communities performed crime-related activities (2.17% and 1.41% of all activity time) at greater percentages than did Autonomous Non-Consensual Communities and Dependent Disconnected Communities, although crime related activities were performed relatively infrequently across all four groups.

Activities including ordinance enforcement, foot patrol, and meeting non-police service personnel were performed very infrequently across all four groups. Likewise, activities that usually would require some type of citizen interaction, including service functions, problem solving, information gathering, and order maintenance activities, were performed infrequently in the absence of citizens.

Analysis of variance (F-test) was performed to determine whether the four groups significantly differed in terms of the percentage of total time (including time spent with citizens) spent on individual activity categories (see right portion of table 18). The groups differed significantly (.05) in terms of the percentage of total shift time spent performing non-
task/personal activities (F=5.014), en-route/waiting activities (F=2.720), service activities (F=2.958), investigative activities (F=2.850), foot patrol (F=5.247) and problem solving (F=2.734).

An independent samples T-test confirmed that Autonomous Non-Consensual officers performed non-duty/personal tasks significantly more than did the other three groups (T=3.144). A second independent t-test was performed to investigate whether Interdependent officers significantly differed from the remaining three groups as far as time spent en-route/waiting. These results were not significant (T=2.83). It should be noted, however, that the differences in terms of percentage of total shift time consumed by this activity were less than the differences in terms of total activity time consumed by en-route/waiting because comparisons based on total shift time do not control for the time officers spent in citizen interaction (Interdependent officers spent more time in citizen interaction than the remaining three groups). It does not appear that the differences in time spent in terms of service activities, investigative activities, foot patrol, and problem solving carry much substantive weight since the time consumed by these activities across all four groups was extremely small.

**Comparison of Officer Encounters**

As outlined in the methods section, observed officer encounters were defined as being either full, brief, or casual in nature. Table 19 presents a comparison of the number of citizens involved across the different encounter types across the four community groups. As table 19 indicates, observed officers from the Interdependent community tended to engage citizens in full encounters at a higher percentage than did officers from the remaining three community groups (74.14% of all encounters). While almost three-fourths of all Interdependent encounters were
full in nature, the remaining three community groups engaged citizens in full encounters about 60 percent of the time. In terms of brief encounters, the Established Suburban communities and the Autonomous Non-Consensual communities were more likely to engage citizens briefly (28.50% and 27.03% respectively) than officers in the Interdependent community (21.18%) or the Dependent Disconnected communities (22.17%). Casual encounters were most prevalent in the Dependent Disconnected communities (16%), a finding that is somewhat contrary to what would be expected given the level of heterogeneity in these communities as defined by the variables used in the cluster analysis measuring horizontal articulation.

Table 19. Community Comparisons: Citizen Involvement in Encounter Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encounter Type</th>
<th>Established Suburban</th>
<th>Interdependent</th>
<th>Auto-Non Consensual</th>
<th>Dependent Disconnected</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>58.76(734)</td>
<td>74.14(238)</td>
<td>58.91(889)</td>
<td>61.81(641)</td>
<td>60.78(2502)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief</td>
<td>28.50(356)</td>
<td>21.18 (68)</td>
<td>27.03(408)</td>
<td>22.17(230)</td>
<td>25.80(1062)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>12.73(159)</td>
<td>4.67 (15)</td>
<td>14.04(212)</td>
<td>16.00(166)</td>
<td>13.41 (552)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Citizens</td>
<td>1249</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>1037</td>
<td>4116*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Citizens observed in Delhi rides have been omitted (260) because the department was not included in community categorization. Information concerning encounter type is missing for seven citizens.

Comparison of Problems in Citizen Encounters

Similar to the description of citizen interactions in regards to the entire sample of communities presented earlier, the four types of communities were compared to one another in
terms of the underlying problem inherent in each individual citizen encounter. This analysis
initially entails comparisons across the four community groups utilizing the 270 original
problem codes, and subsequently compares the community groups in terms of collapsed problem
categories. Table 20 presents the non-collapsed comparison of the underlying problem in citizen
encounters across the four community groups.

The top portion of table twenty 20 presents the percent of all encounter time observed
officers spent engaged in handling the ten most time consuming problems identified as most
time consuming for the entire sample of officers. The bottom portion of table 20 lists the most
time consuming remaining problems for each community group.

Table 20: Community Comparisons: Most Time Consuming Problems (non-collapsed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Established Suburban</th>
<th>Interdependent</th>
<th>Auto-Non Consensual</th>
<th>Dependent Connected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Casual Conversation</td>
<td>6.78 (969)</td>
<td>2.78 (94)</td>
<td>11.55(1,800)</td>
<td>9.23(985)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess Speed</td>
<td>9.43(1,348)</td>
<td>6.32(214)</td>
<td>7.46(1,163)</td>
<td>8.93(953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Accident (pd)</td>
<td>8.03(1,148)</td>
<td>5.59(189)</td>
<td>4.06(633)</td>
<td>3.85(411)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Business</td>
<td>5.26 (752)</td>
<td>3.54(120)</td>
<td>4.71(735)</td>
<td>6.00(640)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving Violation</td>
<td>3.72 (532)</td>
<td>2.09 (71)</td>
<td>5.13 (800)</td>
<td>4.27(456)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest/Process/Booking</td>
<td>2.77 (396)</td>
<td>2.72 (92)</td>
<td>5.36 (836)</td>
<td>1.70(182)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Vehicle</td>
<td>6.01 (859)</td>
<td>6.09(206)</td>
<td>2.02 (316)</td>
<td>1.60(171)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Argument</td>
<td>1.85 (265)</td>
<td>3.57(121)</td>
<td>2.04 (319)</td>
<td>5.63(601)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improper Plates/Regist.</td>
<td>1.66 (238)</td>
<td>0.65 (22)</td>
<td>3.48 (543)</td>
<td>3.16(337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment/No Inspection</td>
<td>2.21 (317)</td>
<td>3.49(118)</td>
<td>3.12 (487)</td>
<td>1.05(113)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The most time consuming problems handled by Established Suburban officers were speeding (9.43%), traffic accidents involving property damage only (8.03%), casual conversations (6.78%), and disabled vehicles (6.01%). These officers were the least likely among the four groups to spend time involved in domestic argument encounters (1.85%). Consistent with the other three community groups, personal business problems (5.26%), other moving violations (3.72%), and motor vehicle equipment violations (2.21%) were among their most time consuming problems. Outside the ten most time consuming problems identified for the entire sample, Established Suburban officers spent time handling other traffic related problems such as accidents involving bodily injuries (3.32%), and driving under the influence (1.84%), as well as service related problems such as medical assistance (1.87%) and first aid (1.75%).

Similar to the Established Suburban officers, officers from the Interdependent community often spent time handling speeding problems (6.32%), and traffic accidents involving property damage only (5.59%), although they did so at smaller percentages of time
than did the Established Suburban officers. Interdependent officers were the least likely among the four groups to spend time engaged in casual conversations with citizens (2.78%), or encounters related to personal business (3.54%). So too, these officers spent smaller percentages of encounter time stopping motorists for other moving violations (2.09%) and improper plates (0.65%). Outside of the ten most time consuming problems identified for the entire sample, Interdependent officers spent time encountering citizens in law enforcement and order maintenance situations such as shoplifting (3.01%), unspecified thefts (2.86%), thefts from commercial property (2.89%) and domestic fights that involved violent physical contact (2.86%).

Officers from Autonomous Non-Consensual communities were distinguished by the amount of time they spent engaging citizens in casual conversations (11.55%), a finding that again seems contrary to the “non-consensual” label applied to these communities for the present study. These officers spent greater percentages of their encounter time handling moving violations (5.13%), arrest procedures (5.36%), and stopping motorists for improper plates (3.48%) than did officers from the remaining three groups.

Officers from Dependent Disconnected communities spent a greater percentage of encounter time involved in personal business interactions (6.00%) than did the remaining three groups, and casual conversations were their most time consuming problem (9.23%). These officers spent a smaller percentage of their encounter time dealing with traffic accidents involving property damage (3.85%) and arrest procedures (1.70%) than did the remaining three groups. Dependent Disconnected officers spent more of their encounter time dealing with juvenile problems (2.91%) than did other types officers, probably due to the great percentage of
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young persons living in these jurisdictions.

Table 21 presents the most time consuming problems handled by the four groups of officers in terms of the twelve collapsed problem categories used in the previous analysis involving the entire sample of communities. Again, percentages of all encounter time and total shift time (including time spent while not in contact with citizens) spent handling problems within each category are presented, as well as the F statistic for differences among the groups.

Table 21: Community Comparisons: Most Time Consuming Problems (collapsed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Type</th>
<th>% Encounter Time</th>
<th>%Total Shift Time</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>ANC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>32.94</td>
<td>20.43</td>
<td>31.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Related</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>35.34</td>
<td>16.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Task/Pers.</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>16.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>14.78</td>
<td>11.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Maint.</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>6.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin/Crime</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Service</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adm. (general)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet NPSP</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance Enf.</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*.05
As table 21 shows, Established Suburban officers spent a greater percentage of their encounter time interacting with citizens in traffic related problems (32.94%) and service problems (16.83%) than did officers in the other three groups. The tendency of Established Suburban officers to spend more of their interaction time involved in service related problems is consistent with the homogenous label applied to these communities in the present study. These officers tended to fall in the middle of the four groups in terms of percentage of encounter time spent on crime related problems, non-task problems, order maintenance problems, investigative problems, administrative/crime problems, and information problems. Consistent with the other three groups, problems related to COP service, general administrative, meeting non-police service personnel, and ordinance enforcement consumed very small percentages of these officers’ encounter time.

Interdependent officers spent a greater percentage of encounter time involved in crime related problems (35.34%) and investigative problems (9.05%) than did officers in the other three groups, thus suggesting that these officers appear to be the most “legalistic” of the four groups in terms of the nature of the underlying problems inherent in citizen encounters. In comparison to the other three groups, Interdependent officers spent the second greatest percentage of their encounter time on order maintenance problems (9.05%). They spent a smaller percentage of their encounter involved in non-task or personal interactions (6.32%) than did officers in the remaining three groups.

Autonomous Non-Consensual officers spent a greater percentage of their encounter time among the four groups involved in non-task or personal interactions (16.26%). Interestingly, these officers spent a smaller percentage of their encounter time on crime matters (16.58%) in
comparison to the three other groups, however, they spent a larger percentage of encounter time handling administrative related crime problems (7.29%) than did officers in the remaining three groups. These officers tended to spent a greater percentage of their encounter time than other groups processing offenders and interacting in court proceedings, but they spent smaller percentages of their time actually encountering citizens who were associated with crime problems.

The collapsed problem categories presented in table twenty 21 present a different picture of Dependent Disconnected officers than does the non-collapsed category scheme presented in table twenty 20. For example, while these officers clearly spent a greater percentage of their encounter time engaged in the specific “problem” of casual conversations than did the other groups, the percentage of encounter time these officers spent in the broader non-task/personal collapsed category does not stand out as prominently (15.32%). These officers not only spent a greater percentage of their encounter time on the specific problem of domestic fights than did other groups of officers (see table 23), but also spent larger percentages of encounter time dealing with order maintenance problems in general (10.88%). They spent the second largest percentage of encounter time among the four groups on crime related problems (22.30%).

Analysis of variance (F-test) was performed to determine whether the four groups significantly differed in terms of the percentage of total time (including time spent without citizens) consumed by individual problem categories (see right portion of table 21). The groups differed significantly (.05) in terms of the percent of total time spent on crime related problems (F=9.978) and service problems (F=3.348). Officers from the Interdependent community spend more than double the amount of total shift time (7.56%) addressing crime related problems with
citizens than do officers in the other four groups. In terms of service related problems, it appears that Interdependent officers and Established Suburban officers spend significantly greater percentages of total shift time addressing these problems (3.15% and 2.61% respectively) than does Autonomous Non-Consensual and Dependent Disconnected officers (1.70% and 1.90% respectively). Independent samples T-tests confirmed that Established Suburban officers and Interdependent officers spent significantly more time with citizens handling service problems than did officers from Autonomous Non-Consensual and Dependent Disconnected communities (T=3.024).

Comparing Citizen Roles Across Community Types

The four groups of communities were further compared in terms of the roles that citizens play when they encounter observed police officers. Table 22 shows that, similar to the description of the entire sample of communities, citizens involved in full encounters predominantly take on crime related roles across all four community groups (e.g. suspects or victims). For example, approximately two-thirds of all fully encountered citizens are either suspects or victims across all four groups.

Quasi-police, friends, or occupational acquaintances rarely interacted with officers in full encounters across the four groups. Officers from the Interdependent community and the Dependent Disconnected communities tended to encounter more citizens in order maintenance related roles (10.08% and 9.20% of all fully encountered citizens respectively) than did officers from Established Suburban communities or Autonomous Non-Consensual communities (6.40% and 7.87% respectively). The four community groups seemed to fully encounter citizens in service roles at similar rates.
Table 22. Community Comparisons: Citizen Roles in Full Encounters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Roles</th>
<th>Established Suburban</th>
<th>Interdependent</th>
<th>Auto-Non Consensual</th>
<th>Dependent Disconnected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime (victim/suspect)</td>
<td>73.02 (536)</td>
<td>66.38 (158)</td>
<td>67.49 (600)</td>
<td>62.40 (400)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM (disputant)</td>
<td>6.40 (47)</td>
<td>10.08 (24)</td>
<td>7.87 (70)</td>
<td>9.20 (59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (service recipient, helpless person, NPSP)</td>
<td>9.80 (72)</td>
<td>8.40 (20)</td>
<td>11.13 (99)</td>
<td>10.76 (69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party/Witness</td>
<td>9.80 (72)</td>
<td>14.70 (35)</td>
<td>11.02 (98)</td>
<td>14.50 (93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-Police</td>
<td>0.00 (0)</td>
<td>0.42 (1)</td>
<td>0.00 (0)</td>
<td>0.15 (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Occ. Acqu.</td>
<td>0.95 (7)</td>
<td>0.00 (0)</td>
<td>2.47 (22)</td>
<td>2.96 (19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 describes citizen roles across the four community groups in regards to brief and casual encounters only. Table 23 points to the contrasting roles that citizens tend to play in brief and casual encounters in comparison to full encounters. For example, while approximately two-thirds of all fully encountered citizens took on crime related roles, only about one-fourth to one-fifth of all citizens encountered briefly or casually took on such roles across the four community groups.
Table 23. Community Comparisons: Citizen Roles in Brief & Casual Encounters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Roles</th>
<th>Established Suburban</th>
<th>Interdependent</th>
<th>Auto-Non Consensual</th>
<th>DependentDisconnected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crime (victim/suspect)</td>
<td>21.16(109)</td>
<td>22.89(19)</td>
<td>26.97(167)</td>
<td>23.23(92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OM (disputant)</td>
<td>1.94 (10)</td>
<td>2.40 (2)</td>
<td>2.42 (15)</td>
<td>2.27 (9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (service recipient, helpless person, NPSP)</td>
<td>38.44(198)</td>
<td>39.75(33)</td>
<td>23.58(146)</td>
<td>18.43(73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Party/Witness</td>
<td>17.66 (91)</td>
<td>26.50(22)</td>
<td>17.93(111)</td>
<td>18.18(72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quasi-Police</td>
<td>0.58 (3)</td>
<td>1.20 (1)</td>
<td>4.84 (3)</td>
<td>0.75 (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend/Occ. Acqu.</td>
<td>20.19(104)</td>
<td>7.22 (6)</td>
<td>28.59(177)</td>
<td>37.12(147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>619*</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The groups also appeared to encounter different types of citizens in terms of brief and casual encounters. For example, Established Suburban officers tended to encounter citizens in service related roles (38.44% of all briefly or casually encountered citizens) more so than roles such as friends or occupational acquaintances (20.19%). The opposite appears to be true for Dependent Disconnected officers. They encountered friends and occupational acquaintances in brief and casual encounters (37.12%) more so than citizens in service related roles (18.43%). Officers from Autonomous Non-Consensual communities appeared to encounter citizens in service related roles and friends/occupational acquaintance roles about equally (23.58% and
28.59% respectively). Interdependent officers were the most likely of the four groups of officers to encounter third parties and/or witnesses briefly or casually (26.50%).

**Comparing Officer Knowledge of Citizens Across Community Types**

Finally, observed officers were compared across the four community groups in terms of the degree to which they knew the citizens that they encountered. Table 24 describes the degree to which observed officers knew fully encountered citizens across the four community groups. Overall, observed officers tended to fully encounter citizens who were strangers across the four groups. For example, close to 80% of all fully encountered citizens (averaged across the four groups) were strangers. However, observed officers from Dependent Disconnected communities tended to at least recognize citizens that they fully encountered to a greater degree than officers from the remaining three groups. For example, these officers at least recognized 33.06 percent of all fully encountered citizens. The degree to which these officers at least recognized fully encountered citizens contrasts sharply with that of Interdependent officers (9.24%) and Established Suburban officers (12.52%). So too, officers from Dependent Disconnected communities knew 8.58 percent of all fully encountered citizens “very well,” more so than the remaining three groups.

Table 25 describes the degree to which observed officers knew the citizens that they encountered briefly or casually. There appears to be a wide amount of disparity between the four groups in terms of how often observed officers encountered strangers and citizens that they
Table 24. Community Comparisons: Officer Knowledge in Full Encounters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Roles</th>
<th>Established Suburban</th>
<th>Interdependent</th>
<th>Auto-Non Consensual</th>
<th>Dependent Disconnected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Knowledge/Stranger</td>
<td>87.05 (639)</td>
<td>90.33 (215)</td>
<td>76.04 (676)</td>
<td>65.99 (423)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows Citizen/Not Clear How</td>
<td>3.54 (26)</td>
<td>2.94 (7)</td>
<td>7.08 (63)</td>
<td>11.38 (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes Face/Reputation</td>
<td>2.86 (21)</td>
<td>1.26 (3)</td>
<td>4.83 (43)</td>
<td>5.30 (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows Name and Little Knowledge</td>
<td>3.95 (29)</td>
<td>2.52 (6)</td>
<td>5.17 (46)</td>
<td>7.80 (50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows Very Well</td>
<td>2.17 (16)</td>
<td>2.52 (6)</td>
<td>5.51 (49)</td>
<td>8.58 (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.40 (3)</td>
<td>0.42 (1)</td>
<td>1.34 (12)</td>
<td>0.93 (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Citizens                       | 734                  | 238           | 889                 | 641                    |

knew “very well” briefly or casually. For example, 90.36% of all citizens encountered briefly or casually by officers from the Interdependent community were strangers, while only 41.91% of all citizens briefly or casually encountered by officers from Dependent Disconnected communities were strangers. Likewise, officers from Dependent Disconnected communities knew 27.27% of all briefly or casually encountered citizens “very well,” while Interdependent officers knew only 2.40 percent of these citizens “very well.” In spite of the fact that Dependent Disconnected communities have been defined among the least consensual communities in the sample, it appears that officers from these communities know the citizens that they police (or at least come in contact with) to a greater degree than officers in the remaining three groups.
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Table 25. Community Comparisons: Officer Knowledge in Brief & Casual Encounters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizen Roles</th>
<th>Established Suburban</th>
<th>Interdependent</th>
<th>Auto-Non Consensual</th>
<th>Dependent Connected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Knowledge/Stranger</td>
<td>63.30 (326)</td>
<td>90.36 (75)</td>
<td>53.87 (334)</td>
<td>41.91 (166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows Citizen/Not Clear How</td>
<td>9.12 (47)</td>
<td>2.40 (2)</td>
<td>11.12 (69)</td>
<td>12.12 (48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizes Face/Reputation</td>
<td>3.30 (17)</td>
<td>1.20 (1)</td>
<td>6.77 (42)</td>
<td>6.81 (27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows Name and Little Knowledge</td>
<td>8.34 (43)</td>
<td>3.61 (3)</td>
<td>12.09 (75)</td>
<td>11.11 (44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knows Very Well</td>
<td>15.14 (78)</td>
<td>2.40 (2)</td>
<td>15.16 (94)</td>
<td>27.27 (108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0.77 (4)</td>
<td>0.00 (0)</td>
<td>0.96 (6)</td>
<td>0.75 (3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Citizens                     | 515                  | 83             | 620                 | 396                 |

COMPARISON OF AGENCY “STYLES”

The final aspect of comparing the four groups of communities is to investigate whether the four community types exhibit distinct “styles” of policing as suggested by Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) two-dimensional typology, which they developed from adapting Duffee’s (1990) conceptualization of community types to Wilson’s (1969) measurement of agency style (see literature review section).

The hypotheses contained in Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) typology correspond to the specific hypotheses listed in the methods section of the present dissertation. Specifically, police agencies located in small communities that are highly articulated horizontally and exhibit a low degree of vertical relations will interact with citizens frequently and informally. This group of
In order to explore to what extent these four community groups exhibit the policing styles outlined above, the community groups were measured in terms of both the frequency with which observed officers interacted with citizens and the degree to which they interacted formally with citizens.

**Frequency of Citizen Interaction**

In order to examine the frequency that officers interacted with citizens, each community group was measured in terms of the number of times that they encountered citizens per standardized eight hour shifts observed. Table 26 presents the number of citizens these four groups of agencies encountered per standardized eight hour shift across full, brief, and casual encounters respectively.
Table 26. Community Comparisons: Frequency of Citizen Interaction Per Shift

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Encounter Type</th>
<th>Established Suburban</th>
<th>Interdependent</th>
<th>Auto-Non Consensual</th>
<th>Dependent Connected</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full</td>
<td>3.05 (580)</td>
<td>5.29 (174)</td>
<td>3.26 (709)</td>
<td>3.65 (496)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief</td>
<td>1.30 (248)</td>
<td>1.27 (42)</td>
<td>1.32 (288)</td>
<td>1.09 (148)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>0.67 (129)</td>
<td>0.42 (14)</td>
<td>0.79 (172)</td>
<td>0.96 (131)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.03 (957)</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.99 (230)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.38 (1,169)</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.70 (775)</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.756</strong>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Standardized 8 hour shifts observed:
  Established Suburban= 189.94
  Interdependent=32.86
  Autonomous Non-Consensual= 217.05
  Dependent Disconnected= 135.74

As table 26 shows, officers from the Interdependent community encountered more citizens per shift (6.99) than did those from the other three groups. The difference between Interdependent officers and those from the remaining three groups is primarily due to the greater number of citizens encountered fully by Interdependent officers. While Interdependent officers fully encountered about five and one third citizens per shift (5.29), officers from the remaining three groups fully encountered anywhere from 3.05 citizens and 3.69 citizens per shift. In fact, the remaining three groups are very similar in terms of total citizen encounters per shift, with Established Suburban officers encountering 5.03 citizens per shift, Autonomous Non-Consensual officers encountering 5.29 citizens per shift, and Dependent Disconnected officers encountering 5.70 citizens per shift. Analysis of variance tests between the four groups confirmed that there are significant differences between them in terms of frequency of citizen interaction (F=3.756).
Given these considerations, it would appear that Interdependent officers could be most aptly described as “high” in relation to the remaining three groups in terms of frequency of citizen interaction. The relative similarity that is evident among the remaining three groups in regards to the frequency with which they interact with citizens seems to suggest that they should be grouped together and labeled as “low” in terms of relative frequency.

Formality of Citizen Interaction

In order to examine to what degree officers interacted formally with citizens, each community group was ascribed a “formality score.” These scores were derived by dividing the total number of citizens arrested or cited per standardized eight hour shift by the total number of citizens encountered per eight hour shift. Table 27 presents how these groups of agencies compared in terms of the formality of their interaction with citizens. As table 27 indicates, officers from the Autonomous-Non-Consensual group interacted with citizens more formally (.1953) than the remaining three groups. Established Suburban officers and Interdependent officers interacted with citizens in a very similar manner in terms of formality (.1509 and .1548 respectively). Dependent Disconnected officers interacted with citizens most informally (.1384). Analysis of variance test confirmed that there is a significant difference among the four groups in terms of formality (F=3.320).

Independent samples T tests were run in order to distinguish the four groups of agencies in terms of whether they should be classified as “high” or “low” in terms of formality of citizen interaction. These tests revealed that the degree of difference between Auto-Non Consensual officers (the most formal group) and Interdependent officers (the second most formal group) was greater (F=2.302) than the degree of difference between Dependent Disconnected officers (the
least formal group) and established Suburban officers (the second least formal group) (F=.260). The two most similar groups were Interdependent officers (1548) and Established Suburban officers (.1509). Thus, the Auto-Non Consensual group has been defined as “high” in terms of formality of interaction, and the remaining three groups have been defined as “low” in terms of formality of interaction.

Table 27. Community Comparisons: Formality of Police Citizen Interactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Established Suburban</th>
<th>Interdependent</th>
<th>Auto-Non Consensual</th>
<th>Dependent Disconnected</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrest &amp; Cites/8 hr. Shift</td>
<td>.9885</td>
<td>1.5088</td>
<td>1.3819</td>
<td>1.0642</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encs./8 hr. Shift</td>
<td>6.5481</td>
<td>9.7405</td>
<td>7.0749</td>
<td>7.6882</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formality</td>
<td>.1509</td>
<td>.1548</td>
<td>.1953</td>
<td>.1384</td>
<td>3.320*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*.05

Community Typology and Agency “Styles”

Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) model hypothesizes certain relationships between community structure, or the degree to which communities are horizontally articulated and vertically integrated, and agency “style,” or the frequency and formality with which police officers interact with citizens. These hypotheses incorporate Wilson’s (1969) terminology in describing policing styles in terms the relative frequency and formality of police citizen interactions.(see literature review for a detailed discussion).

For example, police agencies that exhibit a “legalistic” style interact with citizens both frequently and formally. The type of communities that are hypothesized to interact with citizens
both frequently and formally are those that are high on vertical relations and low on horizontal articulation, or the Dependent Disconnected communities that correspond to Langworthy and Travis' (1999) "fragmented" communities (see H2 in methods). Police agencies from the Dependent Disconnected communities, however, interacted with citizens infrequently and informally in the present dissertation. In terms of Wilson's (1969) terminology, it appears that officers from Dependent Disconnected communities exhibited something of an "informal watchman" style. Thus, the present findings tend to disconfirm the hypothesis (H2) that officers from communities that are high on vertical relations and low on horizontal articulation (i.e. Dependent Disconnected communities in the present sample) will interact with citizens both frequently and formally.

Police agencies that exhibit a "watchman" style interact with citizens infrequently. The type of communities that are hypothesized to interact with citizens infrequently are low on vertical relations and low on horizontal articulation, or the Autonomous Non-Consensual communities that correspond to Langworthy and Travis' (1999) "disorganized" communities (see H3 in methods). Police agencies from the Autonomous Non-Consensual communities did interact with citizens less frequently than the three remaining groups. In this sense, the policing style exhibited by officers from Autonomous Non-Consensual can be said to conform to those hypothesized (H3). Officers from Autonomous Non-Consensual communities, however, also interacted with citizens more formally than did officers from the remaining three groups. Given this consideration, it appears that these officers exhibited something of a "formal watchman" style. It appears that the present findings tend to confirm the hypothesis that officers from Autonomous Non-Consensual communities will interact with citizens infrequently, however, the
fact that these officers interacted with citizens more formally than the remaining three groups is not addressed or included in H3.

Police agencies that exhibit a "service" style interact with citizens frequently and informally. The type of communities that are hypothesized to interact with citizens frequently and informally are those that are low on vertical relations and high on horizontal articulation, or the Established Suburban communities that correspond to Langworthy and Travis' (1999) "solidary" communities (see H1 in methods). Police agencies from the Established Suburban communities, however, interacted with citizens infrequently and informally in the present dissertation. Similar to police from the Dependent Disconnected described above, it appears that officers from Established Suburban communities exhibited something of an "informal watchman" style. It appears that the present findings tend to confirm the hypothesis that officers from Established Suburban communities will tend to interact with citizens informally, however, these officers appeared to interact with citizens less frequently than H1 seems to suggest.

Communities that are high on vertical relations and high on horizontal articulation are hypothesized to exhibit a "mixed" policing style that simultaneously satisfies both the demands of the larger society and local custom. These communities are defined as Interdependent in both the present dissertation and Langworthy and Travis' (1999) model (see H4 in methods). Because the "mixed" style does not fall neatly into Wilson's (1969) two-dimensional style typology, it is difficult to determine precisely how this style would be explicitly defined. However, police agencies from the Interdependent community interacted with citizens frequently and informally in the present dissertation, thus indicating that these officers primarily exhibited a "service" style in terms of Wilson's two-dimensional typology. Thus, the findings regarding the
frequent citizen interaction exhibited by the officers from the Interdependent community tend to confirm H4, however, these officers' tendency to interact relatively informally with citizens appears to suggest that these officers exhibited a "service" style rather than the "mixed" style suggested in H4.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

This dissertation began by outlining what has been termed a “big-city bias” in regards to the existing empirical literature on police behavior. Most policing research has focused primarily on large, urban departments and officers who patrol metropolitan and often densely populated beats. Whether one attributes this bias to methodological barriers such as small sample sizes, the geographic isolation of more rural jurisdictions, or problems in relation to gaining access to smaller, more insular organizations, the upshot has been a shortage of empirically derived data regarding smaller, more typical police agencies and the cops who patrol small towns, rural places, and suburban jurisdictions. The thirteen month observation project that is the subject of the present dissertation began with an inclination to fill this gap in the empirical literature. What do these police officers do during their shift time? How do they interact with citizens? How do they compare to one another in regards to their activities, citizen interactions, and patrol “styles”?

The present dissertation has provided a systematic description of officer work routines and officer-citizen interactions in smaller jurisdictions. Much of the prior literature concerning police behavior in smaller jurisdictions has relied on anecdotal evidence obtained largely through focus groups and interviews with police chiefs. The systematic social observation of these officers provides a more complete, empirically based picture of what these officers do during a typical shift. This information is important because the majority of police agencies in the United States are relatively small, and the future development of comprehensive theories of police behavior demands the collection of data within these smaller jurisdictions.
In addition, prior literature concerning police behavior in smaller communities has typically suffered from small sample sizes. The present dissertation’s sample of twenty small agencies has permitted comparisons across varied types of small communities. This data provides evidence that police do, to a certain degree, behave differently within small jurisdictional settings, and thus negates the notion that police in small communities behave alike.

The present dissertation also offers cluster and descriptive analyses in order to provide a preliminary assessment of how structural community characteristics may be related to differences in police behavior. To this end, prior literature has investigated the link between community context and police behavior in a largely theoretical vein, with the except of individual officer decision-making (i.e. use of deadly force, decision to arrest). A complete understanding of police behavior necessarily includes a recognition of the impact that communities themselves will exert beyond police organizations and/or individual officers.

In order to put the present findings into some type of context, it would appear to be useful to initially discuss how these officers compare to their more-often studied big city counterparts. Next, this chapter will discuss the findings regarding the comparisons across different small community types. Third, I will discuss the findings relative to Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) model, as well as elaborate on the “styles” of policing that officers from these smaller community types appear to have exhibited. This section will identify some general limitations of the present dissertation, as well as address some issues specific to the use of the present data set to test Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) model. Finally, I will suggest some issues for further research related to the topic of policing in smaller jurisdictions.
COMPARISONS TO BIG CITY OFFICERS

The data obtained through systematically observing 228 individual small town, rural, and suburban police officers over the course of 600 shifts offers an empirically-based glimpse as to the typical routine of police employed by these smaller agencies. First, officers spent about two and one-half hours of an eight hour shift (30% of total shift time) performing routine motorized patrol, which is the predominant activity of these officers. These officers also spent approximately one and one half additional hours (18% of total shift time) per shift doing administrative work, which primarily entailed writing reports. They also spent slightly over one hour per shift (13% of total shift time) engaged in personal tasks, such as taking breaks or eating meals. Officers spent an average of thirty eight minutes per shift (about 8% of total shift time) driving two and from specific locations, either at their own discretion or at the direction of dispatchers. In total, officers spent over five and one-half hours per shift either performing motor patrol, doing administrative work, driving to and from specific locations, or engaging in personal tasks. In addition, officers spent an average of nineteen minutes per shift enforcing traffic laws through the use of mobile or stationary radar (4.0% of total shift time).

Much of the rest of the typical shift was spent in direct contact with citizens (15% of total shift time, or approximately one hour and fifteen minutes per shift). Officers typically encountered between five and six total citizens (5.77) per shift. Officers interacted with citizens for an average of twenty three minutes per shift regarding traffic violations (4.8% of total shift time). Officers spent approximately fifteen minutes encountering citizens regarding crime related matters (3.12% of total shift time), and slightly over ten minutes each per shift involved in service related citizen encounters (2.14% of total shift time) or non-task/personal citizen
encounters (2.16% of total shift time). The remaining hour of shift time was spent on a wide variety of tasks that included (but was not limited to) crime related tasks not involving citizens, investigations, order maintenance situations, and meeting other police.

Given what we know about the work of more urban police officers through prior systematic social observation research, how do these small town, rural, and suburban officers compare? Officers from smaller jurisdictions appear to practice a type of policing that is somewhere in the middle between that of traditional beat officers in big cities and COP specialists. That is, in some respects they are similar to big city traditional beat officers, while in other aspects of police work they appear to be more similar to non-traditional “community policing specialists.”

For example, officers from smaller jurisdictions perform motorized patrol (30.5% of total shift time) at about the same rate as did traditional beat officers in Cincinnati (32.9%), and more so than did Cincinnati COP specialists (23%) (Frank et al. 1997). In terms of administrative activities, officers from smaller jurisdictions (about 20% of total shift time) also appeared to be more like Cincinnati’s beat officers (18%) than COP officers (13%) (Frank et al. 1997). It may be that officers from smaller jurisdictions perform a number of additional administrative functions because of an absence of support personnel in smaller agencies. So too, a number of ride-a-longs were conducted with the chief, lieutenant, or sergeant in the sampled agencies. These are officers who often perform regular patrol duties in smaller agencies, a situation that is a rarity in larger, more urban departments.

In other ways, officers from smaller jurisdictions perform more similarly to the newer, more non-traditional “community policing specialist” now becoming common in large urban...
departments. For example, officers from smaller jurisdictions spent about the same amount of
time handling crime related matters (4.58% of total shift time) as did Cincinnati COP specialists
(5.09%). They spent much less time on crime matters than did traditional beat officers in
Cincinnati (17.67%) (Frank et al. 1997). It may be that small town officers and big city COP
specialist are more similar in this regard because both types of officers are often less burdened
by the demands of responding to a large number of dispatched calls-for-service, and hence,
perform crime related activities and handle crime related problems less frequently than does the
typical beat officer. Officers from smaller jurisdictions also appear to be similar to big city COP
specialist in another regard. They spend more time engaged in personal and non-duty tasks
(15.39% of total shift time) than did beat officers in Cincinnati (9.7%).

Officers from smaller jurisdictions also appear to be more similar to COP specialists than
traditional beat officers in terms of the nature of their interactions with citizens. For example,
officers from smaller jurisdictions spent almost 24 percent of their encounter time engaging
citizens either briefly or casually. Likewise, Indianapolis and St. Petersburg COP specialists
also spent 24 percent of their encounter time engaging citizens either briefly or casually (Parks et
al. 1999). In contrast, sampled Indianapolis beat officers tended to engage citizens in full
encounters at higher percentages of encounter time than either of these two types of officers
(86% of encounter time). Indianapolis beat officers encountered citizens either briefly or
casually only 13 percent of their total encounter time (Parks et al. 1999). In this regard, it
appears that officers from smaller jurisdictions interact more informally with citizens than do
traditional beat officers. The similarity between officers in smaller jurisdictions and big city
COP specialists in this regard also suggests, at least to some degree, that certain aspects of the
community policing “philosophy” have always been integral to how policing is accomplished in smaller places. These officers do appear to engage citizens on a relatively casual basis, thus suggesting that many small town departments may have already formed close community ties—an objective that has been at the heart of the movement towards the creation of COP units in larger urban departments.

The relatively informal nature of police-citizen interactions in these smaller jurisdictions aside, much of the anecdotal literature on small town police suggests that these officers should spend more time with citizens than does the typical urban officer (see esp. Weisheit et al. 1996). It does not appear that observed small-town, rural, and suburban officers spent more time with citizens than urban officers who have been the subject of recent observation studies. For example, observed beat officers from Indianapolis and St. Petersburg spent an average of over 24 percent of their total shift time involved in citizen encounters. Even community-oriented specialists in these cities, who were somewhat less burdened by the demands of dispatch directed calls, spent over 19 percent of their shift time in interaction with citizens (Parks et al. 1999). As discussed above, the sampled rural, small town, and suburban officers averaged about 15 percent of total shift time engaging citizens.

The smaller percentage of time spent engaging citizens may be due to two primary factors. First, it appears that the large number of dispatched calls for service handled by traditional beat officers in urban areas provides them with a greater opportunity to interact with citizens (especially in full encounters) than either “big city” COP specialists or police employed in smaller jurisdictions. Likewise, dispatched calls for service often involve time consuming crime related matters that often cannot be resolved quickly. Second, COP specialists appear to
make up for this “lost” citizen time by engaging in a broader range of non-traditional police activities such as community based service activities (e.g. community meetings) (Frank et al. 1997). Only one sampled small department (Williamsburg) required officers to periodically attend such meetings, and community based service activities consumed an extremely small percentage of officer time (0.12% of total shift time).

Even though officers from these smaller communities tended to spend less overall time with citizens than those observed most recently in urban jurisdictions, other prior literature suggests that the frequency with which these officers interacted with citizens is not unusually low. Specifically, officers from agencies included in the Police Services Study conducted in the 1970’s (see literature review chapter) averaged six encounters per shift overall, which is a number strikingly similar to that found in the present dissertation.

COMPARISONS ACROSS SMALL COMMUNITIES

One consequence of the bias toward researching large urban departments has been that smaller police agencies have commonly been referred to as a singular group of “non-urban” or “rural” departments. The workload and interactions of officers employed by these agencies has, to a large degree, been assumed to be analogous simply because they are all smaller and less urbanized than those departments that have been the subject of the bulk of research on policing. The present dissertation examines whether officers employed in small, but structurally diverse types of communities behave similarly.

In many respects, officers employed in the twenty sampled agencies do behave in like fashion regardless of structural variations. For example, certain activities predominated officer shift time across the four groups of communities. These “big four” activities were motor patrol,
administrative tasks, personal activities, and going en-route to and from locations. Notwithstanding structural differences among the twenty sampled communities, these officers consistently spent most of their shift time doing these four activities. In fact, the prior observation literature regarding the work of big city officers appears to have found much the same thing (Frank et al. 1997; Parks et al. 1999). It may be that certain tasks, such as these “big four” activities, will tend to dominate police officers’ time regardless of variations in department size, community structures, or particular patrol styles simply because these basic tasks are integral and common to accomplishing the goals of all police officers. Likewise, officers performed service activities, investigative activities, and crime related activities relatively infrequently when they were not in direct contact with citizens. These findings would appear to be another “universal” aspect of police work regardless of department size or community variation because it is difficult to perform these activities without the presence of at least one citizen.

Traffic enforcement, whether officers were engaged with citizens performing vehicle stops or simply running radar, was another time consuming activity for officers across the four community groups. It is difficult to ascertain from the more recent observation studies highlighted here whether this is true for large departments as well because these studies did not report findings specific to time engaged in traffic related activities and problems. However, findings from the PSS suggest that traffic problems consume large percentages of officer time in some communities. The PSS did indicate that there was a large degree of variation in terms of time consumed by traffic related problems across the range of large and small jurisdictions included in the PSS, but it is not clear whether these variations were specifically correlated with
community size (Whitaker 1982).

More generally, there were no significant differences among the four types of small communities in terms of a number of officer activities and problems handled, including the time they spent meeting other police, gathering information, meeting non-police service personnel, performing COP related service activities, enforcing local ordinances, and handling order maintenance problems with citizens.

There does appear to be some differences, however, across the four groups of communities. The lone Interdependent community was significantly different from the other three groups in terms of the percent of time that they spent in direct interaction with citizens. This finding may be attributed to two primary reasons. First, Langworthy and Travis (1999) suggest that there will be “lots of” social control in Interdependent communities because police officers in these jurisdictions must simultaneously emphasize law enforcement (due to the community’s reliance on the larger society to provide for local functions) and the demands of local custom (because these communities have the capacity to form consensus). Thus, Interdependent communities are the only group among the four community types included in the typology that strongly exert these dual demands on the police. As a result, police officers in Interdependent communities may be “forced” to interact more frequently with citizens in order to satisfy the social control needs of both the larger society-and the local-community.

Second, the finding that sampled Interdependent officers interact more frequently with citizens may simply be an artifact of the relatively low number of observations completed in the Interdependent agency relative to the other three groups. As discussed in the Methods section, Colerain Twp. was the only agency of the twenty sampled communities that measured high on
both vertical relations and horizontal articulation. This situation resulted in the equivalent of only 32.8 eight hour shifts that were observed and analyzed for the Interdependent community group. Given this relatively low number of observations, it is possible that a few rides that contained unusually high frequencies of citizen interactions may have artificially inflated the measure of frequency of citizen interaction for the Interdependent community. However, this does not appear to have occurred. For example, the modal number of citizens encountered per shift by interdependent officers was nine, which is greater than the average number of citizens encountered per shift in the Interdependent community (6.99). Likewise, the modal number of citizens encountered per shift for the entire sample of agencies was 7.5. Interdependent officers were involved in only four of the thirty observations that had the most number of citizens observed.

The Interdependent community also spent the greatest percentage of time going en-route to and from specific locations. This finding appears to be due to two primary reasons. First, the Interdependent community presides over a very large geographic area relative to the other sampled study sites (see description of study sites in Methods section). Logically, the Interdependent community’s dispersed geography should result in longer periods of time consumed traveling from one specific location to the next. Second, officers from the Interdependent community tended to answer more dispatched directed calls-for-service than the other three community groups. For example, 29.62 percent of all the activities and encounters that Interdependent officers experienced were the result of dispatched assignments. The remaining three groups collectively averaged 15.71 percent of all their activities and encounters responding to dispatched assignments. Clearly, the number of dispatch directed assignments an
officer receives will impact the amount of time he/she spends going to and from specific locations. Relatedly, the Interdependent community’s high number of dispatch directed assignments probably indirectly increased the frequency with which these officers interacted with citizens relative to the remaining three groups.

Officers from the Interdependent community also consumed greater percentages of time handling crime related problems with citizens relative to the other three groups (over 35% of total time spent encountering citizens). This finding appears to have had a “ripple effect” in regards to the nature and character of their interactions with citizens. For example, Interdependent officers were the most likely to engage in full encounters (rather than brief or casual) with citizens (74% of all citizens encountered), and they tended to be less familiar with the citizens that they encountered than were officers from the remaining three groups (90% of the citizens that they encountered were strangers). Across the four groups, full encounters tended to involve citizens that were not only strangers to the officers, but also citizens who played crime related roles such as “suspects” or “victims.”

There were differences among the four groups in terms of the percent of time consumed by non-task/personal activities (while not in contact with citizens). Specifically, the Autonomous Non-Consensual communities spent more time engaged in non-task/personal activities relative to the other three groups. These communities correspond to Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) “disorganized” communities. They scored low in terms of the degree to which they relied on the larger society to provide for local functions and they scored low in terms of horizontal articulation, or the degree to which they are able to form consensus. Langworthy and Travis (1999) hypothesize that the lack of extra-local social control mechanisms (resulting from
low vertical integration) coupled with the lack of local social control mechanisms (resulting from the inability to form consensus) will create a “normative void” in these communities whereby the police themselves will be enabled to practice the type of policing that fits their own definitions of order.

How can we expect the police in these communities to fill this normative void? First, we would expect that the frequency of citizen interactions would be low, with the police focusing on intervening primarily in cases of serious disorder and crime (Lanworthy and Travis 1999). Second, individual officers should tend to focus on “keeping the beat quiet,” and doing as little as possible to avoid “stirring things up” (Lanworthy and Travis 1999). This is precisely what appeared to occur in the sampled Autonomous-Non Consensual communities. These officers were the second lowest among the four groups in terms of their frequency of citizen interaction (5.38 citizens per eight hour shift), and they spent more time engaged in personal non-duty activities (i.e. “doing nothing” in terms of occupationally related tasks) relative to the remaining three groups. When these officers did interact with citizens, they did so more formally than the other groups by citing and arresting more citizens per shift relative to the number of citizens that they encountered overall.

The findings regarding differences among the four groups in terms of the percent of time spent handling service related problems with citizens indicates that officers from Established Suburban communities and the Interdependent community spent more time on these problems (2.61% and 3.15% of total shift time respectively) than did officers from either Autonomous Non-Consensual communities or Dependent Disconnected communities (1.70% and 1.90% of total shift time respectively). The Established Suburban communities and the Interdependent
community both scored high in regards to horizontal articulation, or the degree to which these community types were able to form consensus regarding the delivery of locally relevant functions. The Established Suburban communities, as well as Colerain Twp. (the Interdependent community), have all been measured as relatively affluent (avg. median household income = $43,646) and stable in terms of population change (avg. population change = .0367). These two community groups should exert greater and more collective locally-based authority over their police officers (Langworthy and Travis 1999), whereby police tend to provide more services demanded by local citizens (Langworthy and Travis 1999). In contrast, officers from Autonomous Non-Consensual communities and Dependent Disconnected communities should not be expected to spend as much time handling service related problems, because these community types score lower in the degree to which they are horizontally articulated or consensual. Instead, local interests in these communities are more diverse, and the degree to which citizens can demand that police perform service functions that are important to local residents is less unified (Langworthy and Travis 1999).

In regards to the percentage of time consumed by service problems, it should also be noted that the percent of total shift time consumed by service problems was somewhat low across all four groups. For example, the highest percentage of total shift time consumed handling service related problems was 3.15 percent (Interdependent officers). This compares to 8.2% of total shift time for observed Cincinnati COP specialists and 4.4% of total shift time for observed Cincinnati beat officers, although exact comparisons are difficult in light of variations in coding schemes (Frank et al. 1997). Even if one adds in the time consumed by service activities (without the presence of citizens), the time consumed by service related problems and
activities fails to consume even 5 percent of total shift time across the four groups. This finding is somewhat surprising given that existing prior literature concerning the work of police from smaller agencies (primarily anecdotal) suggests that service functions should be much more pronounced in rural, small town, and suburban settings. These anomalous findings may very well be due to the fact that officers did not generally interact with citizens as frequently as those who have been observed in more urban jurisdictions. Put simply, it is difficult to spend a significant percentage of time handling service problems absent frequent citizen interaction. So too, prior literature that has primarily relied on data derived from officer interviews and officer logs may have overestimated the actual amount of time officers from smaller jurisdictions devote to service because these methods do not independently account for the totality of shift time.

Differences among the four community types were also found in terms of the percent of time officers spent on investigative activities (F=2.850), problem solving activities (F=2.734), foot patrol (F=5.247), and service activities performed in the absence of citizens (F=2.958). These differences appear to carry very little substantive weight, however, because they all consumed extremely small percentages of officer shift time. For example, foot patrol activities and problem solving activities failed to account for even one percent of total shift time across the four groups.

COMMUNITY TYPOLOGY AND AGENCY “STYLES”

Many of the findings regarding the organizational “styles” exhibited by agencies within the four different community types did not conform to the relationships hypothesized in Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) model. This section will discuss some possible reasons why this
occurred, and identify some limitations specific to attempting to apply the current data set to
Langworthy and Travis' (1999) model.

First, the community typology that Langworthy and Travis (1999) incorporated into their
model describing the relationship between community structure and police styles may be more
appropriate for describing and categorizing community structures that are more often found
across a wider range of community types than are included in the present sample. Though these
small communities did vary in terms of the degree to which they were horizontally articulated
and vertically integrated, these variations were also relative to the fact that all of the sampled
communities are small. This factor limits the degree to which these communities will vary along
these two dimensions relative to a more universal set of communities. For example, the small
communities that have been labeled “Autonomous Non-Consensual” in the present dissertation
measured low on horizontal relations primarily because they were among the least wealthy
communities in the sample, and also because they have diverse land usage. But these
communities may be heterogenous only in a relative sense to the remaining sample of small
communities. Are these communities truly “disorganized” in comparison to all communities,
including those found in large, densely populated urban centers? While this issue cannot be
resolved in the present dissertation, the degree to which they are not “disorganized” relative to a
more inclusive sample of communities would clearly have implications in regards to the “style”
of policing that one would expect in these smaller communities.

The second issue relates to how community structure was measured for the present
dissertation, specifically the ways in which vertical relations and horizontal articulation were
indicated. Communities were categorized in terms of vertical relations by comparing the
percentage of revenue that was collected from local vs. extra-local sources for one year. While this measure appears to be a valid indicator of vertical relations because it does indicate to a degree how much the sampled communities tended to rely on outside sources for their local revenue, it is only one of many possible indicators of vertical relations. So too, the measure does not account for yearly fluctuations in the degree to which community revenue sources may shift between local and extra-local funds.

Communities were also categorized in terms of horizontal relations through a cluster analysis that used four structural variables to measure community homogeneity. These four variables were selected for a number of valid reasons, including the degree to which it was thought they would impact police behavior and their prevalent use in prior literature as indicators of community structure (see methods section for a more complete discussion on this topic). Despite these considerations, the use of these four variables at the exclusion of other possible indicators of community structure may not have resulted in precise categorizations in terms of horizontal articulation. Relatedly, the cluster solutions based on community homogeneity originally resulted in four groups of communities. These four groups then had to be collapsed into two in order to fit into the two dimensions of horizontal articulation (i.e. “high” and “low”) included in Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) model. This process may have blurred important distinctions that were found to be apparent among the original four groups in the cluster analysis, and may have resulted in less precise groupings based on horizontal articulation.

A specific example may serve as a case in point. The findings regarding the activities and interactions of officers from Dependent Disconnected communities often failed to conform to the relationships hypothesized in the Langworthy and Travis (1999) typology, nor to those
expected given how these communities were measured in terms of horizontal articulation. Langworthy and Travis' (1999) typology suggests that officers from Dependent Disconnected communities (labeled as “fragmented” in the model) will act as “dispassionate law enforcers” who will intervene with citizens both frequently and formally. Officers from Dependent Disconnected communities, however, were not significantly different from Established Suburban officers nor Autonomous Non-Consensual officers in terms of the frequency with which they interacted with citizens, and they interacted with citizens significantly less than did Interdependent officers. Moreover, Dependent Disconnected officers scored the lowest among the four groups in terms of formality (.1384), or the prevalence with which they gave citizens citations and/or arrested citizens. In fact, these officers engaged citizens in casual encounters more so than did the remaining three groups (16% of all citizens encountered), and they were the most likely to know citizens that they encountered “very well” (8.58% of all citizens encountered).

Officers from Dependent Disconnected communities may not have exhibited a legalistic style because the specific measures used to indicate homogeneity may not have accurately captured the overall structural condition of these communities. For example, while these communities are growing at comparatively high rates, they do remain among the smallest sampled communities in terms of total population. From an anecdotal standpoint, these communities can be described as among the most “rural” in character despite the fact that they are presently undergoing significant changes in terms of population growth and land usage. It may be (as many observers noted in the observation narratives) that these communities still exhibit the close social bonds and consensus that is often found in rural places despite more
recent movements toward structural diversity and suburbanization. If this is the case, one would not expect these communities to exhibit a primarily legalistic style, but rather one that is more consistent with communities of rural character.

The third and fourth issues regarding the application of the present data set to Langworthy and Travis' (1999) model involves the measurement of police agency “style” that was incorporated into the model directly from Wilson's (1969) original research. Put simply, is “frequency and formality of citizen interaction” an adequate way to describe the style of policing that appears to have been exhibited by these small agencies given what we have been able to discern in regards to the percent of time these officers spent on certain activities, problems, and the overall nature of their citizen interactions? For example, the policing “style” of the Interdependent community was measured as “frequent” and “informal,” thus indicating a “service” style according to Wilson’s scheme. While these officers clearly tended to perform service activities and to handle service related problems relatively frequently, they also handled more crime related problems than the remaining three groups. It does not appear that the label “service” completely captures what the overall style of Interdependent officers was beyond simply their frequency and formality of citizens interaction. Langworthy and Travis’ (1999) model suggests as much by hypothesizing that Interdependent officers will exhibit a “mixed” style. Given what is known about the actual percentages of time these officers spent on service problems and crime problems, this “mixed” label seems most appropriate, however, Wilson’s (1969) two dimensional typology does not allow for such variation.

Fourth, the labels that Wilson (1969) uses to identify “styles” based on the frequency and formality of citizens interaction do not appear to contain enough specificity regarding the range
of styles that appear to have been practiced across the groups of small agencies. For example, Wilson (1969) identifies agencies that do not interact frequently with citizens as "watchman."

To a certain degree many of these agencies do tend to exhibit "watchman" style tendencies based on their relatively infrequent citizen interaction, however, there appears to be certain distinctions in the way in which these agencies engage in the "watchman" style.

For example, Established Suburban agencies and Autonomous Non-Consensual agencies both interact with citizens relatively infrequently. When citizen interactions do occur in Established Suburban communities officers tend to be relatively informal (low number of arrests and citations per shift) and spend time in service related problems more so than Autonomous Non-Consensual officers. When citizen interactions do occur in Autonomous Non-Consensual communities officers tended to be more formal (highest number of arrests and citations). Hence, I have used the terms "informal watchmen" and "formal watchman" to describe the styles practiced by these agency types. It may be that smaller agencies in general tend to interact with citizens less frequently. If this is the case, then the use of the term "watchman" to depict the style of policing practiced in smaller places may be inadequate because the term fails to capture the essence of what is occurring beyond infrequent police-citizen interactions.

To this point, the typology contained in Langworthy and Travis' (1999) model may most appropriately be viewed as depicting four ideal types of communities. Indeed, Langworthy and Travis (1999) state that, "Communities will rarely if ever match the pure types portrayed here...Communities are more or less heterogenous, more or less unequal, more or less autonomous, never completely one thing or the other" (272). This suggests that communities cannot necessarily be defined discreetly in terms of one of the four community types, but rather,
communities should be seen as entities that vary continuously along the vertical and horizontal dimensions. If this is the case, it may be most appropriate to measure these communities individually in terms of structural characteristics, and then subsequently perform regression analysis to determine whether, and to what extent, these communities vary from one another.

Finally, there has been a considerable passage of time (30+ years) between Wilson's (1969) conceptualization of agency "styles" and the collection of data for the present dissertation. During the last three decades police organizations have undergone changes in the ways in which they train officers, the degree to which they exhibit quasi-military and highly centralized structures, and the extent to which crime control has been emphasized as the primary function of police work. In addition, the advent of community-oriented policing has altered the philosophical, strategic, and tactical aspects of police operations in many departments (Cordner 1979). The organizational and philosophical changes that have occurred in policing over the last three decades may have greatly impacted the behavior of officers beyond the community-level structural characteristics that were used to investigate differences between agencies in the present dissertation.

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

While this dissertation has attempted to provide empirically-based information in regards to the activities and interactions of police in smaller jurisdictions, there remains quite a bit that we do not know in terms of how policing is accomplished in small towns, rural places, and suburban jurisdictions. Future research, for example, could more comprehensively address issues related to policing smaller jurisdictions by incorporating a larger cross-section of small jurisdictional types to facilitate comparisons among small agencies. As Weishet et al. (1996)
aptly point out, “It is not true that “sticks is sticks.” (118). Comparisons of police agencies across large geographic regions would seem to be especially appropriate. The type of problems and people that police must deal with varies considerably from one geographic region to the next (Weisheit et al. 1996). This dissertation has exclusively explored variations in police work within the Greater Cincinnati region. Future researchers may wish to explore differences in policing within other metropolitan regions, as well as variations in small jurisdictions from differing regions of the country (i.e. western small jurisdictions vs. eastern, coastal regions vs. inland, etc...). In this way, future researchers may overcome problems related to the generalizability of the present findings, and incorporate regional variations into descriptions of police behavior in smaller jurisdictions.

Prior literature also suggests that there is a great deal of variation between small municipal agencies, rural county sheriffs’s, and rural state police departments (Cordner and Scarborough 1997; Weisheit et al. 1996). For example, the roles and jurisdictions of these three different types of agencies vary from one state to the next. In some smaller jurisdictions, rural county sheriff’s are the lone law enforcement agency charged with a wide array of duties. In other small jurisdictions these same agencies play a less significant role. So too, the duties typically performed by rural county sheriff’s (e.g. warrant services, court-related administrative duties) contrast sharply with those of either small town municipal police (general law enforcement) or state police agencies (in most instances restricted to highway patrol duties). Clearly, a complete description of policing in smaller places requires empirically-based examinations across these small agency types.

The advent of community-oriented policing has provided additional opportunities for
future research regarding police behavior in smaller jurisdictions. Specifically, future research should attempt to explore whether there are differences in the ways in which COP is practiced across jurisdictional types. This line of enquiry appears to be necessary in light of the fact that COP originated as a strategy for big city departments to reduce citizen fear of crime and temper tensions between the police and the public. These are issues that appear to have less importance in smaller jurisdictions. Tactical elements of COP, including foot patrols, directed patrols, and mini-stations appear to be much more appropriate for police in urban rather than rural or small town jurisdictions (Cordner and Scarborough 1997). For example, sampled officers in the present dissertation performed COP related service activities and problem solving techniques very rarely. Does this mean that rural, suburban, and small town officers do not engage in COP? It may simply be, as some researchers have suggested, that COP takes on a less formalized character in smaller communities (Cordner and Scarborough 1997; Weisheit et al. 1996). Future observation projects in smaller jurisdictions may need to develop coding instruments tailored to capture and describe what may be a different and unique brand of COP practiced by police in smaller agencies. So too, observational research that is more qualitative in nature may be able to undercover COP related activities that are less formalized and more difficult to capture using systematic social observation. More in-depth analysis concerning the specific content of "casual" police-citizen interactions, for example, may provide a better understanding of the degree to which officers and citizens collaborate in smaller jurisdictions.

Finally, research concerning the contrasts between urban and rural policing would seem to be a productive avenue in which to gain a greater understanding of police work in all types of agencies. Specifically, research that involves direct comparisons between urban police officers
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and those from smaller jurisdictions using systematic social observation methods that utilize a singular coding scheme would enable researchers to overcome the lack of precision and confusion resulting from the disparate measures used to catalog officer activities and interaction in prior research. In this way, researchers would be able to provide data that would be amenable to statistical tests designed to uncover significant differences across urban, suburban, rural, and small town agencies.

In a larger sense, the expanding amount of empirically-based information regarding the behavior of police officers that has been created in recent years as a result of the growing number of large-scale police observation studies may provide an avenue for policing scholars to more accurately depict the variety of ways that policing is accomplished across all types of police agencies. Policing scholars may then be able to move beyond what Wilson's (1969) groundbreaking theoretical work has provided—the categorization of police behavior as either service related, legalistic, or watchman oriented—and formulate more encompassing theories of police behavior.
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APPENDIX A

RIDE INSTRUMENT

1. Enter the five digit Ride number?
2. Enter your observer ID code?
3. Enter date of ride.
4. Official start time of observed officer's shift? (Military)
5. Enter police department code.
6. Did your observation of the assigned officer begin later than the official beginning time of this shift?
   1 no [GO TO Q-8]
   2 yes
7. Why did your observation of the assigned officer begin late?
   1 observer was not present when officer started work
   2 observer was reassigned to this officer because of split shift
   3 officer not present; on duty elsewhere (include in the building)
   4 officer not present; on personal business elsewhere
   5 officer not present; don't know what he/she was doing
   6 other
8. What was the official end time of assigned officer's shift? (Military)
9. Did your observation of the assigned officer end earlier than the official ending time of this shift?
   1 no [GO TO Q-11]
   2 yes
10. Why did your observation of the assigned officer end early?
    1 observer requested it for personal reasons
    2 officer had other official duties requiring transfer to other unit serving the assigned beat
    3 officer had permission to leave early for pers. business
    4 officer left early for personal business w/o permission
    5 officer left work early for personal business and status of permission unknown
    6 officer left work early for reasons unknown
    7 other
11. To what type of unit was the observed officer(s) assigned?
    1 beat officer
    2 community policing officer (GO TO 13)
    3 other specialist
12. Beat Number?
ENTER BEAT NUMBER

Officer #1 Information

13.  O1's ID number? (USE OFFICER BADGE NUMBER - SEE CODE SHEETS)

14.  O1's name:

15.  How long has O1 been regularly assigned to this beat/area of responsibility?

ENTER TIME—IN MONTHS.

16.  O1 level of education.
   1  Less than HS
   2  HS grad
   3  Some college or trade school
   4  College graduate
   5  Some post graduate education
   6  Advanced degree

17.  O1 sex
   1  Male
   2  Female

18.  O1's race:
   1  White
   2  Black
   3  Hispanic
   4  Asian
   5  Other or mixed race

19.  Age of O1? (YEARS)

20.  Length of service with THIS police department? (YEARS)

21.  Length of TOTAL police service? (YEARS)

22.  O1 rank:
   1  Police officer/specialist/deputy
   2  Sergeant
   3  Lieutenant
   4  Captain/Deputy Chief
   5  Chief/Sheriff
   6  Other [EXPLAIN IN NARRATIVE]

23.  Marital status of O1?
   1  Single, never married
24. At the beginning of the ride (first 1/2 hour), what was O1’s attitude about having an observer present?

1 very negative
2 negative
3 neutral
4 positive
5 very positive

25. At the end of the ride (last half hour), what was O1’s attitude about having an observer present?

1 very negative
2 negative
3 neutral
4 positive
5 very positive

Officer #2 Information

26. O2’s ID number? (USE OFFICER BADGE NUMBER - SEE CODE SHEETS)

IF THERE IS NO O2, ENTER ZERO. [GO TO Q-39]

27. O2’s name:

28. How long has O2 been regularly assigned to this beat/area of responsibility? (MONTHS)

29. Level of education of O2?

1 Less than HS
2 HS grad
3 Some college or trade school
4 College graduate
5 Some post graduate education
6 Advanced degree

30. Age of O2? (YEARS)

31. Length of service with THIS police department (YEARS)

32. Length of TOTAL police service? (YEARS)

33. O2’s sex

1 Male
2 Female

34. O2’s race:
1 White
2 Black
3 Hispanic
4 Asian
5 Other or mixed race

35. O1 rank:
1 Police officer/specialist/deputy
2 Sergeant
3 Lieutenant
4 Captain/Deputy Chief
5 Chief/Sheriff
6 Other [EXPLAIN IN NARRATIVE]

36. Marital status of 02?
1 Single, never married
2 Married
3 Divorced or separate
4 Widowed
5 Refused

37. At the beginning of the ride (first 1/2 hour), what was O2's attitude about having an observer present?
1 very negative
2 negative
3 neutral
4 positive
5 very positive

38. At the end of the ride (last half hour), what was O2's attitude about having an observer present?
1 very negative
2 negative
3 neutral
4 positive
5 very positive

39. Was there precipitation during this ride?
1 no
2 light rain
3 heavy rain
4 combination of 2 and 3
5 light snow/sleet/hail
6 heavy snow/sleet/hail
7 combination of 5 and 6

40. What was the average temperature during the ride?
41. Did the weather, in your opinion, affect how the officer(s) acted or conducted their shift?

1. No
2. Yes - it diminished their activity [EXPLAIN IN THE NARRATIVE]
3. Yes - it increased their activity [EXPLAIN IN THE NARRATIVE]

42. Did this ride take place on the date as assigned?

1. yes
2. no, officer was sick on assigned ride date
3. no, observer was sick on assigned ride date
4. no, officer was on a scheduled day off
5. no, officer was on vacation
6. no, no officer available on assigned day for assigned beat
7. no, observer did not go
8. no, inclement weather
9. no, other reason [EXPLAIN IN NARRATIVE]
APPENDIX B

ENCOUNTER / ACTIVITY INSTRUMENT

1. Ride number?
2. Observer number?
3. Activity/Encounter number?

ENTER THE NUMBER FOR THIS ACTIVITY SEQUENTIALLY FOR THIS RIDE.

4. Time activity/encounter began?
5. Time activity/encounter ended?
6. What county did this activity/encounter occur?

1 Hamilton
2 Clermont
3 Butler
4 Warren
5 Other

7. What city/township/village did this activity/encounter occur?

USE CITY CODES

8. Exact Geographic location/address [ENCOUNTERS MUST HAVE ADDRESS]

9. Brief description of activity/encounter?

10. What information source led directly to this activity/encounter being undertaken?

1 officer acted on own without apparent request, notification, or command from others
2 dispatcher
3 supervisor/administrator (include roll call)
4 other officer requested/notified
5 citizen (on-scene)
6 citizen (by telephone, other)

11. At the time this activity/encounter began, or immediately before, what higher authority in the department instructed the officer to engage in this activity?

1 no higher authority gave instructions
2 dispatcher
3 supervisor/administrator
4 both 2 and 3
5 higher authority gave instructions, but not sure who
6 no instructions from higher authority given, but officer notified higher authority of intentions to do activity

12. Who conducted this activity/encounter?
1. O1 only  
2. O2 only  
3. both O1 & O2 

13. How many police (including O1 and O2) were engaged in this activity/encounter?  
NUMBER 

14. How did officer proceed to the scene of this encounter/activity? 
1. motor vehicle: within posted speed; no lights/siren 
2. motor vehicle: within posted speed; lights/siren 
3. motor vehicle: above posted speed; no lights/siren 
4. motor vehicle: above posted speed; lights/siren 
5. foot/bike: walking/normal speed 
6. foot/bike: running/above normal speed 
7. not applicable: officer at scene at beginning of encounter 

15. Type of location in which activity/encounter occurred? 
1. Business - industrial 
2. Business - retail 
3. Residential 
4. Rural 
5. Other 

16. Nature of initial location of encounter/activity? 
1. public property, outdoors (e.g., road, sidewalk, park) 
2. public property, indoors (e.g., government building) 
3. police facility, outdoors (e.g., police parking lot) 
4. police facility, indoors (e.g., police station) 
5. private property, outdoors (e.g., yard, front porch) 
6. private property, indoors (e.g., home) 
9. other 

17. At any time during this ride did the police indicate that they had prior knowledge of this location? 
1. no 
2. yes, information from roll call 
3. yes, heard about it from department or other officers (not roll call) 
4. yes, direct knowledge from prior visits 
5. yes, police showed prior knowledge of location, but basis of knowledge not clear 

0. NO SECOND LOCATION—NOT APPLICABLE 
1. public property, outdoors (e.g., road, sidewalk, park) 
2. public property, indoors (e.g., government building) 
3. police facility, outdoors (e.g., police parking lot) 
4. police facility, indoors (e.g., police station)
For what percentage of elapsed time did this activity occur within the boundaries of this officer's jurisdiction?

What was the level of illumination when this activity/encounter began?
1. Daylight/brightly lit room: could readily distinguish facial features and hands of persons if present
2. Dim lighting: could distinguish profile or overall size of persons or objects
3. Near darkness: could distinguish movement or presence of something, but not enough light to determine size or nature of object
4. Total/virtual darkness: unable to see anything

Before the activity/encounter began, was there any indication of anticipated violence at the scene?
1. no
2. yes, from officer
3. yes, from other source
4. yes, from both officer and other source

During this encounter, did the police try to determine the nature, extent, or causes of the larger problem?
1. no
2. yes

During this encounter, did the police try to PREVENT the occurrence or recurrence of the problem?
1. no
2. yes

Did this activity involve communicating with representatives of other organizations that provide services to the public?
1. no [GO TO Q-26]
2. yes, face-to-face meeting
3. yes, telephone discussion

What type of organization was involved?

SEE AGENCY CODES

Did this encounter/activity involve a face to face interaction with a citizen?
1. no [GO TO 61]
2. yes

Start Encounter Questions: Problem Type

Problem—per dispatcher or others:
0 = not dispatched, OTHERWISE, ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

28. Problem — at beginning of encounter:
   ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

29. Problem — at end of encounter: Most Important Problem?
   ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

30. Problem — at end of encounter: Second Most Important Problem?
   0 = no 2nd problem, otherwise ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

31. Did the police indicate that the problem in this encounter is part of a larger problem than just the circumstances of this event?
   1 no [GO TO Q-33]
   2 yes

32. What was the nature of the larger problem identified by the police?
   ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

33. How many citizen forms were filled out for this encounter?
   ENTER NUMBER HERE

34. How many citizens were at this encounter which there was NO citizen form completed?

35. Was this a BRIEF/CASUAL ENCOUNTER?
   1 no
   2 yes, brief encounter [GO TO Q-76]
   3 yes, casual encounter [GO TO Q-76]

Start Full Encounter Questions

36. Was this encounter part of a long-term plan or project to deal with this problem?
   1 no [GO TO Q-38]
   2 yes, plan focused on specific people or location
   3 yes, plan focused on this kind of problem in general
   4 yes, unable to determine nature of plan

37. Who created the plan or project of which this encounter was a part?
   1 officer—or officer with others
   2 other police officers only
   3 supervisors or management
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38. Who took the decision-making lead in this encounter?

1. O1 only
2. O1 and other police shared equally
3. Other police, but not O1
4. O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
5. O2 only (2-officer unit only)
6. O2 and other police shared equally (2-officer unit only)
7. Unable to determine

39. Did O1 receive advice, guidance, or instructions during this encounter about what to do from a NON-SUPERVISOR police officer?

IF MORE THAN ONE, SELECT THE FIRST THAT OCCURRED.

1. No [GO TO Q-41]
2. Yes, take an action
3. Yes, do NOT take an action
4. Yes, other

40. Which action was O1 advised to take or not take by another NON-SUPERVISOR police officer?

1. Arrest/cite someone
2. Use force/more force on someone
3. File an official report/how to report the matter
4. Notify/summon supervisor
5. Mobilize other police/nonpolice for assistance
6. Counsel, advise, mediate w/citizen(s)
7. Give citizen other personal assistance
8. Leave scene/do as little as possible
9. Other

41. Did the officer request input from the SUPERVISOR during this encounter? INCLUDE RADIO/MDT/TELEPHONE.

1. No
2. Yes, information, advice, or instruction
3. Yes, supervisor presence
4. Yes, both 2 and 3
5. Yes, not sure which of the above

42. At any time during the ride did the police discuss this encounter with a supervisor? [INCLUDE RADIO/MDT/TELEPHONE]

1. No [GO TO Q-45]
2. Yes, before encounter only
3. Yes, during encounter only
4. Yes, after encounter only
5. Yes, before and during encounter
6 yes, before and after encounter
7 yes, during and after encounter
8 yes, before, during, and after encounter

43. HOW did the supervisor tell the officer what to do regarding THIS encounter?
IF MORE THAN ONE, SELECT THE FIRST THAT OCCURRED.
1 no [GO TO Q-45]
2 yes, offered suggestion only; take an action
3 yes, offered suggestion only; do NOT take an action
4 yes, ordered officer; take an action
5 yes, ordered officer; do NOT take an action
6 yes, could not determine which of 2-5 applies

44. What action was O1 advised/ordered to take or not take by the supervisor?
1 arrest/cite someone
2 use force/more force on someone
3 file an official report/how to report the matter
4 notify/summon supervisor
5 mobilize other police/non-police for assistance
6 counsel, advise, mediate w/citizen(s)
7 give citizen other personal assistance
8 leave scene/do as little as possible
9 other

Others Present at Scene Information

45. Was there a supervisor present to observe the officer?
1 no [GO TO Q 48]
2 yes

46. For what percentage of the encounter was a supervisor present?

47. What was the highest rank of the supervisor present at the scene?
1 Sergeant
2 Lieutenant
3 Captain/Deputy Sheriff
4 Chief/Sheriff

48. Was there another officer present to observe the officer?
1 no [GO TO Q 50]
2 yes
3 yes, this is a two officer unit

49. What percentage of the encounter was the officer observed by another officer?

50. What percentage of the activity was the officer observed by EITHER another officer or a supervisor?
51. Upon arrival at the scene, how many police officers were already present?

52. Upon arrival at the scene, how many non-sworn service personnel were already present?

53. At the beginning of the encounter, how many citizens (bystanders + participants) were present?

54. Including your assigned officer(s), what was the maximum number of officers present at any one time during the encounter?

55. What was the maximum number of non-sworn service personnel present at any one time during the encounter?

56. What was the maximum number of citizens (bystanders + participants) present at any one time during the encounter?

57. Overall, what was the demographic makeup of the citizens and bystanders?

0 No bystanders
1 Entirely white
2 Mostly white
3 Half white, half nonwhite
4 Mostly nonwhite
5 Entirely nonwhite

58. Did the police seek information from any source other than citizen participants during this encounter?

1 no [GO TO Q-60]
2 yes

59. From what source did they seek information?

ENTER AGENCY CODE.

60. Did the observed police call for more police officers to go to the scene?

1 no [GO TO Q-76]
2 yes, while enroute to the scene [GO TO Q-76]
3 yes, while at the scene [GO TO Q-76]

Start activity information (end encounter information)

61. Type of activity?

SEE ACTIVITY CODES

IF ACTIVITY = 100, 101, 102, 110, 115, 120, 800, 801, 802, 803 [GO TO Q-67]

Problem Solving

62. Was this activity part of a long-term plan or project to deal with a problem? [LONG-TERM = LONGER THAN THIS RIDE]
1 no [GO TO Q-65]
2 yes, plan focused on specific people or location
3 yes, plan focused on this kind of problem in general
4 yes, unable to determine nature of plan

63. Who created the plan or project of which this activity was a part?

1 officer—or officer with others
2 other police officers only
3 supervisors or management
4 other
5 unable to determine

64. At what problem was this activity directed?

USE PROBLEM CODE.

65. Did this activity involve a meeting with representatives of a citizen organization?

1 no [GO TO Q-67]
2 yes, neighborhood or other area-based group
3 yes, victim advocate group
4 yes, business group
5 yes, church or religious group
6 yes, school group
7 yes, other group: specify in narrative

66. How many citizens were present at this meeting?

Other Officers/Supervisors

67. Did the officer request input from the supervisor during this activity?

1 no
2 yes, information, advice, or instruction
3 yes, supervisor presence
4 yes, both 2 and 3

68. At any time during the ride did the officer discuss this activity with a supervisor? [INCLUDE RADIO/MDT/TELEPHONE]

1 no [GO TO Q-70]
2 yes, before activity only
3 yes, during activity only
4 yes, after activity only
5 yes, before and during activity
6 yes, before and after activity
7 yes, during and after activity
8 yes, before, during, and after activity
69. Did the supervisor tell the officer what to do regarding THIS activity?
   1. no
   2. yes, offered advice/suggestion only
   3. yes, ordered/instructed officer
   4. yes, could not determine whether 2 or 3

70. Was there a supervisor present to observe the officer?
   1. no [GO TO Q 72]
   2. yes

71. What percentage was a supervisor in view of this activity?

72. Was there another officer present to observe the officer?
   1. no [GO TO Q 74]
   2. yes
   3. yes, this is a two officer unit

73. What percentage of the activity was another officer present?

74. What percentage of the activity was the officer observed by EITHER another officer or a supervisor?

75. Did O1 receive advice, guidance, or instructions during this activity from a NONSUPERVISOR police officer?
   CODE YES ONLY IF COMMUNICATION WAS ABOUT THIS ACTIVITY.
   1. no
   2. yes

Resume Common Questions

76. Did the police file an official report or indicate an intention to file an official report regarding this activity/encounter?
   1. no, neither filed nor intended to file
   2. yes, filed an official report
   3. yes, intended to file an official report

77. How many times during this activity did the officer request information using the MDT (computer)?
   ENTER NUMBER

78. At any during this activity/encounter, did O1 display a weapon for safety purposes (not necessarily for coercive purposes) in which the citizen was most likely unaware of this action.
   1. no
   2. yes, O1 displayed PR-24 or flashlight or other nonlethal weapon
   3. yes, O1 displayed handgun
   4. both 2 & 3
did not observe entire activity/encounter

79. At any during this activity/encounter, did O2 display a weapon for safety purposes (not necessarily for coercive purposes) in which the citizen was most likely unaware of this action.

0  NA - no O2 present
1  no
2  yes, O2 displayed PR-24 or flashlight or other nonlethal weapon
3  yes, O2 displayed handgun
4  both 2 & 3
5  did not observe entire activity/encounter

80. What percentage of this activity/encounter did you observe O1 directly?

ENTER A NUMBER BETWEEN 0-100.

81. Was another project observer present during this activity/encounter?

1  no [GO TO Q-83]
2  yes

82. What was the identification code of the observer present?

IF MORE THAN ONE OBSERVER PRESENT, SELECT THE NUMBER OF THE FIRST ONE YOU OBSERVED]

83. Did the police change their behavior because of your or other observer presence?

1  no significant change [GO TO Q-86]
2  yes, a little change
3  yes, a substantial change

84. In what way did the police change their behavior during this encounter because of observer presence?

1  police more inclined to get involved
2  police less inclined to get involved
3  police more inclined to arrest or cite
4  police less inclined to arrest or cite
5  police more inclined to use force
6  police less inclined to use force
7  other: explain in narrative

85. What is the basis of your judgment that police changed their behavior because of observer presence?

1  police stated that their behavior changed
2  observer inferred it from behavior or manner of police
3  other: explain in narrative

86. Did you perform any police tasks during this activity?

1  no
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes, offered police information, advice, or an opinion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes, performed some physical aspect of police work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>yes, had more than casual communication with citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>yes, two or more of the above</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ENTER NUMBER HERE
APPENDIX C

CITIZEN INSTRUMENT

1. Ride number?
2. Observer number?
3. Encounter number?

ENTER THE NUMBER FOR WHICH THIS CITIZEN IS RELATED

4. Citizen number?

ENTER THE NUMBER SEQUENTIALLY FOR THIS ENCOUNTER.

5. Time encounter with this citizen began: MILITARY
6. Time encounter with this citizen ended: MILITARY

Citizen Characteristics

7. Citizen's sex?
   1. male
   2. female

8. Citizen's age?
   1. preschool (up to 5 years)
   2. child (6-12)
   3. young teen (13-17)
   4. older teen (18-20)
   5. young adult (21-29)
   6. adult (30-44)
   7. middle-aged (45-59)
   8. senior (60 and above)

9. Citizen's race/ethnicity?
   1. white
   2. black
   3. Hispanic
   4. Asian
   5. American Indian
   6. other

10. Citizen's social class?
    1. chronic poverty (homeless, no apparent means of support)
    2. low (subsistence only)
    3. middle
    4. above middle
    5. completely unsure
11. In what role did the police place this citizen when first encountering him/her?

ENTER CITIZEN ROLE CODE.

12. What was the final role placed on this citizen by police (at the end of the encounter)?

ENTER CITIZEN ROLE CODE.

ENTER SAME CITIZEN ROLE CODE AS PREVIOUS ITEM IF ROLE DID NOT CHANGE.

13. What kind of establishment was the citizen representing?

1. None
2. Business
3. Government agency
4. Church
5. Neighborhood organization
6. Other

14. What was the officer's prior knowledge of this citizen?

1. No knowledge at all. Citizen is a stranger [GO TO 16]
2. Knows citizen, but not clear how well
3. Recognizes citizen's face or knows reputation, but no detailed knowledge
4. Knows by name and a little knowledge of citizen, but not detailed
5. Knows citizen very well (personal background, address, friends, family, personal habits)

15. Does the officer perceive this citizen as a “troublemaker”?

1. No
2. Yes
3. Unsure; no indication

16. Is there any indication that this citizen lives, routinely works, or owns property at or near the encounter location (within 3 city blocks or 1/4 mile)?

SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE NUMBER.

1. No
2. Yes, works at or near location
3. Yes, owns property at or near location
4. Yes, lives at or near location
5. Unsure/can’t tell

17. Was there reason to believe this citizen resides within this city?

1. No, citizen from another city
2. Yes, citizen from city
3. Completely unsure

18. Did this citizen appear to be under the influence of alcohol or other drugs?
1. no indication
2. indication of use, but no visible effects on behavior
3. slight behavioral indications (slight speech)
4. strong behavioral indications (strong speech, difficulty standing / understanding conversation)
5. unconscious

19. Was there any reason to believe this citizen was involved with drugs (use or sale)?
   1. no
   2. yes, observer inferred
   3. yes, officer stated citizen probably uses or sells

20. Did this citizen show any signs of mental disorder?
   1. no
   2. yes

21. Did this citizen show any signs of physical injury or illness requiring immediate medical attention?
   1. no
   2. yes, minor injury or illness
   3. yes, serious injury or illness

22. Did this citizen have a weapon in his/her possession or within "jump and reach?"
    SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.
   1. no weapon evident [GO TO Q-24]
   2. incapacitating device (mace, pepper spray)
   3. blunt/martial arts instrument
   4. knifestabbing instrument
   5. other weapon
   6. firearm

23. Was this weapon concealed from the police at any time during the encounter?
   1. no
   2. yes, on citizen's person
   3. yes, not on citizen's person

24. Did the citizen threaten to assault the police?
   1. no
   2. yes, before the police attempted to arrest or physically control citizen
   3. yes, during or after police attempted to arrest or physically control citizen
   4. yes, both 2 and 3 above

25. Did the citizen physically assault the police?
1. no
2. yes, before the police attempted to arrest or physically control citizen
3. yes, during or after police attempted to arrest or physically control citizen
4. yes, both 2 and 3 above

26. Did the citizen physically assault another citizen while the police were at the scene?
1. no (GO TO Q-28)
2. yes

27. What was the citizen number who received the attack?
ENTER OTHER CITIZEN NUMBER HERE

28. Did the citizen commit any nonviolent criminal act while in the officer’s presence?
1. no (GO TO Q-30)
2. yes

29. What type of offense was committed?
ENTER OFFENSE CODE HERE

30. Did this citizen flee or attempt to flee the police?
1. no
2. yes, before the police attempted to arrest or physically control citizen
3. yes, during or after police attempted to arrest or physically control citizen
4. yes, both 2 and 3 above

31. Did this citizen summon the police to this encounter?
1. no
2. yes
3. not clear

32. Was this a BRIEF/CASUAL ENCOUNTER?
1. no
2. yes, brief encounter [GO TO Q-138]
3. yes, casual encounter [GO TO Q-138]

Citizen Requests and Officer Responses
HELP BOX

33. Did the citizen ask the police to arrest another citizen involved in this encounter, and what was the officers response? SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE
1. no [GO TO Q-35]
2. yes, ignored request without acknowledging it
3. yes, explicitly refused to comply without saying why
4. yes, declined to comply and explained why
5. yes, promised to comply at some future time
6. yes, partially complied in citizen's presence
7. yes, complied fully in citizen's presence

34. What was the relationship between these two citizens?

1. strangers
2. casually acquainted
3. well acquainted: relatives, household members
4. well acquainted: friends
5. well acquainted: neighbors
6. well acquainted: coworkers, long-term business associates
7. could not determine relationship

35. Did the citizen ask the police NOT to arrest or cite someone else, and what was the officers response? SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE

1. no
2. yes, ignored request without acknowledging it
3. yes, explicitly refused to comply without saying why
4. yes, declined to comply and explained why
5. yes, promised to comply at some future time
6. yes, partially complied in citizen's presence
7. yes, complied fully in citizen's presence

36. Did the citizen ask the police to advise or persuade another citizen (not a representative of service organization) to do something, and what was the officers response? SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE

1. no
2. yes, ignored request without acknowledging it
3. yes, explicitly refused to comply without saying why
4. yes, declined to comply and explained why
5. yes, promised to comply at some future time
6. yes, partially complied in citizen's presence
7. yes, complied fully in citizen's presence

37. Did the citizen ask the police to warn or threaten another citizen, and what was the officers response? SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE

1. no
2. yes, ignored request without acknowledging it
3. yes, explicitly refused to comply without saying why
4. yes, declined to comply and explained why
5. yes, promised to comply at some future time
6. yes, partially complied in citizen's presence
7. yes, complied fully in citizen's presence

38. Did the citizen ask the police to make another citizen leave the scene, and what was the officers response? SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE

---
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1 no
2 yes, ignored request without acknowledging it
3 yes, explicitly refused to comply without saying why
4 yes, declined to comply and explained why
5 yes, promised to comply at some future time
6 yes, partially complied in citizen's presence
7 yes, complied fully in citizen's presence

39. Did the citizen ask the police to file a report, and what was the officers response? SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE

1 no
2 yes, ignored request without acknowledging it
3 yes, explicitly refused to comply without saying why
4 yes, declined to comply and explained why
5 yes, promised to comply at some future time
6 yes, partially complied in citizen's presence
7 yes, complied fully in citizen's presence

40. Did the citizen ask police to act on the citizen's behalf with a government official/agency, or private organization, and what was the officers response? SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE

1 no
2 yes, ignored request without acknowledging it [GO TO Q 43]
3 yes, explicitly refused to comply without saying why [GO TO Q 43]
4 yes, declined to comply and explained why [GO TO Q 43]
5 yes, promised to comply at some future time
6 yes, partially complied in citizen's presence
7 yes, complied fully in citizen's presence

41. What agency/organization did police contact or promise to contact on the citizen's behalf?
ENTER AGENCY CODE.

42. What agency/organization did police contact or promise to contact on the citizen's behalf—on their OWN INITIATIVE (without citizen's request)?
ENTER AGENCY CODE.
ENTER ZERO IF POLICE DID NOT CONTACT/PROMISE CONTACT ON OWN INITIATIVE.

43. Did the citizen ask the police for physical assistance for self or others, and what was the officers response? SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE

1 no
2 yes, ignored request without acknowledging it
3 yes, explicitly refused to comply without saying why
4 yes, declined to comply and explained why
5 yes, promised to comply at some future time
6 yes, partially complied in citizen's presence
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44. Did the police provide physical assistance to this citizen on their OWN INITIATIVE (without citizen's request)?

1. no
2. yes

45. Did the citizen ask police for information on how to deal with a problem, and what was the officers response? SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE

1. no
2. yes, ignored request without acknowledging it
3. yes, explicitly refused to comply without saying why
4. yes, declined to comply and explained why
5. yes, promised to comply at some future time
6. yes, partially complied in citizen's presence
7. yes, complied fully in citizen's presence

46. Did the police provide this citizen information on how to deal with a problem on their OWN INITIATIVE (without citizen's request)?

1. no
2. yes

Police Law Enforcement Actions

47. Did the police threaten to issue a citation or ticket to this citizen?

1. no
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

48. Did the police issue a citation, ticket or summons to appear before a magistrate to this citizen?

1. no [GO TO Q-50]
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

49. For what offense was the citizen CITED? [FIRST OFFENSE]

ENTER OFFENSE CODE. DO NOT USE FELONY OR MISDEMEANOR CODES.

50. Did the police notify, promise, or threaten to notify another government agency about citizen's
wrongdoing?

1. no [GO TO Q-52]
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

51. What agency did police notify, promise, or threaten to notify about citizen's wrongdoing?

ENTER AGENCY CODE.

52. Did the police check for outstanding arrest warrants on this citizen?

1. no
2. yes

53. Did the police hold a warrant to arrest this person?

1. no
2. yes, held by officer(s) at scene
3. yes, held by other police or legal authority not at scene

54. Was there probable cause to believe this person had committed an offense

1. no (GO TO Q-56)
2. yes

55. What was the offense code of the most serious offense?

USE OFFENSE CODES

56. Did the police threaten to charge this citizen with a criminal offense?

1. no
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

57. Did the police arrest this citizen?

1. no [GO TO Q-69]
2. yes

58. What is the FIRST offense with which the citizen was charged?
ENTER OFFENSE CODE.

59. BEFORE arresting the citizen for this offense, did police observe this citizen engage in an illegal act or observe circumstantial evidence of an illegal act?
SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE

1  no
2  yes, observed circumstantial evidence of illegal behavior
3  yes, observed citizen perform illegal act
4  yes, observed both circumstantial evidence and observed the citizen perform an illegal act

60. BEFORE arresting the citizen for this offense, did the police observe physical evidence that implicated this citizen in the offense?
SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1  no
2  yes

61. BEFORE arresting the citizen for this offense, did the police hear claims from others that implicated this citizen in the offense?
SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1  no
2  yes, other citizen(s) had second-hand information implicating this citizen
3  yes, other citizen(s) observed citizen commit the offense
4  yes, this citizen fit the description of someone known to the officer as wanted by the police

62. BEFORE arresting the citizen for this offense, did the police hear this citizen confess to this offense?
SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1  no
2  yes, partial confession (admitted involvement short of committing offense)
3  yes, full confession

63. BEFORE the citizen was arrested for this offense, did the police show disrespect to this citizen?

1  no (GO TO 65)
2  yes, ignored citizen requests
3  yes, minor disrespect (unnecessary remarks)
4  yes, racial or lifestyle slurs
5  yes, swearing at the citizen
6  yes, shouting at the citizen
7  yes, combination of 6 and any other of the above

64. Who showed this disrespect?

1  O1 only
2. O1 and other police
3. other police but not O1
4. both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
5. O2 only (2-officer unit only)
6. O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

65. BEFORE being arrested, what was the citizen demeanor toward the police?

1. Very deferential
2. Merely civil
3. Passive aggressive
4. moderately hostile/disrespectful
5. highly hostile/disrespectful

66. What was the demeanor of the citizen immediately after arrest?

1. Very deferential
2. Merely civil
3. Passive aggressive
4. moderately hostile/disrespectful
5. highly hostile/disrespectful

67. What was the demeanor of the citizen at the conclusion of the encounter?

1. Very deferential
2. Merely civil
3. Passive aggressive
4. moderately hostile/disrespectful
5. highly hostile/disrespectful

68. Who showed disrespect first, this citizen or the police?

[CODE 0 IF ONLY ONE OF THE PARTIES OR NONE OF THE PARTIES WAS DISRESPECTFUL]

0. not applicable: only one/none of parties was disrespectful [GO TO Q-77]
1. citizen [GO TO Q-77]
2. police [GO TO Q-77]

69. Did police observe this citizen engage in an illegal act or observe circumstantial evidence of an illegal act? SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE

1. no
2. yes, observed circumstantial evidence of illegal behavior
3. yes, observed citizen perform illegal act
4. yes, observed both circumstantial evidence and observed the citizen perform an illegal act

70. Did the police observe physical evidence that implicated this citizen in a legal offense?

1. no
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2 yes

71. Did the police hear claims from others that implicated this citizen in a legal offense? SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.
1 no
2 yes, other citizens provided a description, but not citizen's name
3 yes, other citizens provided this citizen's name
4 yes, this citizen fit the description of someone known to the officer as wanted by the police

72. Did the police hear this citizen confess to a legal violation? SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.
1 no
2 yes, partial confession (admitted involvement short of committing crime)
3 yes, full confession

73. What was the citizen demeanor toward the police during the interaction?
1 Very deferential
2 Merely civil
3 Passive aggressive
4 moderately hostile/disrespectful
5 highly hostile/disrespectful

74. Did the police show disrespect to this citizen?
1 no (GO TO 76)
2 yes, ignored citizen requests
3 yes, minor disrespect (unnecessary remarks)
4 yes, racial or lifestyle slurs
5 yes, swearing at the citizen
6 yes, shouting at the citizen
7 yes, combination of 6 and any other of the above

75. Who showed disrespect?
1 O1 only
2 O1 and other police
3 other police but not O1
4 both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
5 O2 only (2-officer unit only)
6 O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

76. Who showed disrespect first, this citizen or the police?
(CODE 0 IF ONLY ONE OF THE PARTIES OR NONE OF THE PARTIES WAS DISRESPECTFUL)
1 citizen
77. Did the police interrogate this citizen?

1. no
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

Searches

78. Did the police hold a warrant to search for evidence on this person or his/her property?

1. no
2. yes

79. Did the police conduct a search of any of the following: the citizen, the area immediately around the citizen, his/her possessions, home, or automobile?

1. no [GO TO Q-81]
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

80. Which search was conducted before the citizen was arrested?

1. NOT APPLICABLE: Citizen was not arrested
2. the citizen's person
3. area immediately around the citizen
4. citizen's personal possessions
5. citizen's home
6. citizen's automobile
7. two or more of the above
8. search was conducted AFTER arrest

Use of Force

81. Did the police threaten to use physical force on this citizen? [INCLUDE BOTH VERBAL THREATS AND GESTURES.]

1. no
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)
82. At any during this encounter, did O1 display a weapon for safety purposes (not necessarily for coercive purposes) in which the citizen was most likely unaware of this action.

1. no
2. yes, O1 displayed PR-24 or flashlight or other nonlethal weapon
3. yes, O1 displayed handgun
4. both 2 & 3
5. did not observe entire encounter

83. At any during this encounter, did O2 display a weapon for safety purposes (not necessarily for coercive purposes) in which the citizen was most likely unaware of this action.

0. NA - no O2 present
1. no
2. yes, O2 displayed PR-24 or flashlight or other nonlethal weapon
3. yes, O2 displayed handgun
4. both 2 & 3
5. did not observe entire encounter

84. Did the police use a firm grip or non-pain restraint on this person?

1. no
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

85. Did the police frisk this person?

1. no
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

86. Did the police handcuff this person?

1. no
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

87. Did the police use pain compliance on this person (hammerlock, wristlock, finger grip, carotid control, bar arm control)?
88. Did the police use impact or incapacitation methods on this person (striking with body or weapon, mace, taser)?

1. no
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

89. Did the police draw or discharge their firearm in this citizen's presence?

1. no
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

Officer Requests and Citizen Responses

90. Did the police ask/tell the citizen to sign a formal complaint?

FIRST APPROACH

1. no [GO TO Q-93]
2. yes, suggested only
3. yes, requested only
4. yes, tried persuasion
5. yes, tried negotiation
6. yes, commanded citizen
7. yes, threatened citizen explicitly

91. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to sign a formal complaint?

2. suggested only
3. requested only
4. tried persuasion
5. tried negotiation
6. commanded citizen
7. threatened citizen explicitly

92. What was the citizen's final response to this request?
(Sign formal complaint)

1  no indication one way or the other
2  refused
3  said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4  did it in police presence

93. Did the police ask/tell the citizen NOT to sign a formal complaint? FIRST APPROACH

1  no [GO TO Q-96]
2  yes, suggested only
3  yes, requested only
4  yes, tried persuasion
5  yes, tried negotiation
6  yes, commanded citizen
7  yes, threatened citizen explicitly

94. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen NOT to sign a formal complaint?

2  suggested only
3  requested only
4  tried persuasion
5  tried negotiation
6  commanded citizen
7  threatened citizen explicitly

95. What was the citizen's final response to NOT sign formal complaint?

1  no indication one way or the other
2  refused
3  said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4  did it in police presence

96. Did the police ask/tell the citizen to use the legal process to solve their problem? FIRST APPROACH

1  no [GO TO Q-99]
2  yes, suggested only
3  yes, requested only
4  yes, tried persuasion
5  yes, tried negotiation
6  yes, commanded citizen
7  yes, threatened citizen explicitly

97. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to use the legal process?

2  suggested only
3  requested only
4  tried persuasion
5  tried negotiation
6  commanded citizen
What was the citizen's final response to use legal process?

1. no indication one way or the other
2. refused
3. said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4. did it in police presence

Did the police ask/tell the citizen to seek the help of other service agencies to solve the problem?

FIRST APPROACH

1. no [GO TO Q-103]
2. yes, suggested only
3. yes, requested only
4. yes, tried persuasion
5. yes, tried negotiation
6. yes, commanded citizen
7. yes, threatened citizen explicitly

What was the other service agency/organization police asked the citizen to use?

ENTER AGENCY CODE.

What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to seek the help of other service agencies?

1. suggested only
2. requested only
3. tried persuasion
4. tried negotiation
5. commanded citizen
6. threatened citizen explicitly

What was the citizen's final response to get help from other service agency?

1. no indication one way or the other
2. refused
3. said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4. did it in police presence

Did the police tell/ask the citizen to help another person with their problem?

FIRST APPROACH

1. no [GO TO Q-106]
2. yes, suggested only
3. yes, requested only
4. yes, tried persuasion
5. yes, tried negotiation
6. yes, commanded citizen
7. yes, threatened citizen explicitly
104. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to help another person with their problem?
   2 suggested only
   3 requested only
   4 tried persuasion
   5 tried negotiation
   6 commanded citizen
   7 threatened citizen explicitly

105. What was the citizen's final response to help another person with their problem?
   1 no indication one way or the other
   2 refused
   3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
   4 did it in police presence

106. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to seek the help of family or friends with his/her problem?
   FIRST APPROACH
   1 no [GO TO Q-109]
   2 yes, suggested only
   3 yes, requested only
   4 yes, tried persuasion
   5 yes, tried negotiation
   6 yes, commanded citizen
   7 yes, threatened citizen explicitly

107. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to seek the help of family or friends with his/her problem?
   2 suggested only
   3 requested only
   4 tried persuasion
   5 tried negotiation
   6 commanded citizen
   7 threatened citizen explicitly

108. What was the citizen's final response to seek the help of family or friends?
   1 no indication one way or the other
   2 refused
   3 said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
   4 did it in police presence

109. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to leave another person alone, stop bothering them, or leave the premises? FIRST APPROACH
   1 no [GO TO Q-112]
   2 yes, suggested only
   3 yes, requested only
4. yes, tried persuasion
5. yes, tried negotiation
6. yes, commanded citizen
7. yes, threatened citizen explicitly

110. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to leave another person alone, stop bothering them, or leave the premises?

2. suggested only
3. requested only
4. tried persuasion
5. tried negotiation
6. commanded citizen
7. threatened citizen explicitly

111. What was the citizen's final response to leave other person alone, leave premises, etc.?

1. no indication one way or the other
2. refused
3. said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4. did it in police presence

112. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to cease disorderly behavior? FIRST APPROACH

1. no [GO TO Q-115]
2. yes, suggested only
3. yes, requested only
4. yes, tried persuasion
5. yes, tried negotiation
6. yes, commanded citizen
7. yes, threatened citizen explicitly

113. What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to cease disorderly behavior?

2. suggested only
3. requested only
4. tried persuasion
5. tried negotiation
6. commanded citizen
7. threatened citizen explicitly

114. What was the citizen's final response to cease disorderly behavior?

1. no indication one way or the other
2. refused
3. said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4. did it in police presence

115. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to discontinue illegal behavior? FIRST APPROACH

1. no [GO TO Q-118]
What was the last approach police used to get the citizen to discontinue illegal behavior?

1. Yes, suggested only
2. Yes, requested only
3. Yes, tried persuasion
4. Yes, tried negotiation
5. Yes, commanded citizen
6. Yes, threatened citizen explicitly

What was the citizen's final response to discontinue illegal behavior?

1. No indication one way or the other
2. Refused
3. Said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4. Did it in police presence

Did the police tell/ask the citizen to provide information about the identity or location of a suspected wrongdoer? FIRST APPROACH

1. No [GO TO Q-121]
2. Yes, suggested only
3. Yes, requested only
4. Yes, tried persuasion
5. Yes, tried negotiation
6. Yes, commanded citizen
7. Yes, threatened citizen explicitly

What was the last approach police used to try to get the citizen to identify or locate a suspected wrongdoer?

1. Suggested only
2. Requested only
3. Tried persuasion
4. Tried negotiation
5. Commanded citizen
6. Threatened citizen explicitly

What was the citizen's final response to provide information on identity/location of wrongdoer?

1. No indication one way or the other
2. Refused
3. Said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4. Did it in police presence
121. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to control the person or animal responsible for this problem?

FIRST APPROACH

1. no [GO TO Q-124]
2. yes, suggested only
3. yes, requested only
4. yes, tried persuasion
5. yes, tried negotiation
6. yes, commanded citizen
7. yes, threatened citizen explicitly

122. What was the last approach police used to try to get the citizen to control the person or animal responsible for this problem?

2. suggested only
3. requested only
4. tried persuasion
5. tried negotiation
6. commanded citizen
7. threatened citizen explicitly

123. What was the citizen's final response to control the person/animal responsible for this problem?

1. no indication one way or the other
2. refused
3. said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4. did it in police presence

124. Did the police tell/ask the citizen to call the police if the problem occurs again?

1. no
2. yes

125. Did the police tell the citizen NOT to call the police if the problem occurs again?

1. no
2. yes

126. Did the police comfort or reassure the citizen?

1. no
2. yes, O1 only
3. yes, O1 and other police
4. yes, other police but not O1
5. yes, both O1 and O2 (2-officer unit only)
6. yes, O2 only (2-officer unit only)
7. yes, O2 and other police (2-officer unit only)

Dispute

127. Was there a dispute between at least 2 citizens on opposite sides of an issue?
1. no [GO TO Q 135]
2. yes
3. yes, domestic dispute

128. During the encounter, with what other citizen present did this citizen show conflict?

ENTER THE CITIZEN NUMBER OF THAT CITIZEN.

-9 citizen in conflict w/other person present who does not qualify as a citizen participant in this
encounter

129. What action did this citizen take toward the other citizen when the officer FIRST observed them
interact?

THIS CITIZEN'S FIRST ACTION TOWARD OTHER CITIZEN

1. no conflict behavior
2. calm verbal disagreement (no threats)
3. agitated verbal disagreement (no threats)
4. threatened to harm other citizen
5. assaulted other citizen

130. What action did the other citizen take toward this citizen when the officer FIRST observed them
interact?

OTHER CITIZEN'S FIRST ACTION TOWARD THIS CITIZEN

1. no conflict behavior
2. calm verbal disagreement (no threats)
3. agitated verbal disagreement (no threats)
4. threatened harm to this citizen
5. assaulted this citizen

131. What was the MOST intense action taken by this citizen toward the other citizen during the
encounter? THIS CITIZEN'S ACTIONS TOWARD OTHER CITIZEN: MOST INTENSE. SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1. no conflict behavior
2. calm verbal disagreement (no threats)
3. agitated verbal disagreement (no threats)
4. threatened to harm other citizen
5. assaulted other citizen

132. What was the MOST intense action taken by the other citizen toward this citizen during the
encounter? OTHER CITIZEN'S ACTIONS TOWARD THIS CITIZEN: MOST INTENSE. SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE.

1. no conflict behavior
2. calm verbal disagreement (no threats)
3. agitated verbal disagreement (no threats)
4. threatened harm to this citizen
5. assaulted this citizen
133. At the conclusion of the encounter, what was the nature of the conflict between these two citizens?

1. one or both citizens had departed the scene
2. amicably reconciled
3. calm disagreement (no threats)
4. agitated verbal disagreement (no threats)
5. threats of harm offered
6. in physical conflict

134. What was the relationship between these two citizens?

1. strangers
2. casually acquainted
3. well acquainted: relatives, household members
4. well acquainted: friends
5. well acquainted: neighbors
6. well acquainted: coworkers, long-term business associates
7. could not determine relationship

135. Was this citizen in conflict with another citizen who was NOT present during this encounter?

1. no
2. yes, strangers
3. yes, casually acquainted
4. yes, well acquainted: relatives, household members
5. yes, well acquainted: friends
6. yes, well acquainted: neighbors
7. yes, well acquainted: coworkers, long-term business associates
8. yes, could not determine relationship

136. Was this citizen encouraged to cooperate with police by another citizen present during this encounter (including bystanders)?

1. no
2. yes

137. Was this citizen encouraged NOT to cooperate with police by another citizen present during this encounter (including bystanders)?

DO NOT CODE THIS ITEM 0 UNLESS THIS WAS A BRIEF OR CASUAL ENCOUNTER

1. no [GO TO Q-143]
2. yes [GO TO Q-143]

General Brief/Casual Questions

138. What did the citizen request/demand of the police? SELECT MOST IMPORTANT

1. nothing [GO TO Q-140]
2. directions
3. information about police or other local services
| 4 | other information/assistance |
| 5 | investigate problem/situation |
| 6 | deal with people causing problem for citizen |
| 7 | greetings, casual conversation |
| 8 | other |

139. How did the police respond to the citizen's request/demand? SELECT HIGHEST NUMBER APPLICABLE

1. ignored request without acknowledging it
2. explicitly refused to comply without saying why
3. declined to comply and explained why
4. promised to comply at some future time
5. partially complied in citizen's presence
6. complied fully in citizen's presence

140. What did the police request/demand of the citizen? SELECT MOST IMPORTANT.

1. nothing [GO TO Q-143]
3. information about other suspect, crime, or disorder
4. other type of information/assistance to police
5. stop doing something disorderly, illegal, dangerous, leave scene
6. greeting, casual conversation
7. goods or services (e.g., purchases)
8. other

141. How did police communicate the request/demand?

2. suggested only
3. requested only
4. tried persuasion
5. tried negotiation
6. commanded citizen
7. threatened citizen explicitly

142. What was the citizen's final response to this request?

1. no indication one way or the other
2. refused
3. said he/she would do it, but didn't do it in presence of police
4. did it in police presence

Common Questions

143. Did the citizen change his/her behavior because of your or other project observer's presence or actions during the encounter?

1. no significant change [GO TO Q-145]
2. yes, a little change
3. yes, a substantial change
144. What is the basis of your judgment that the citizen changed his/her behavior because of your or other observer presence?

1 citizen stated that his/her behavior changed
2 observer inferred it from behavior or manner of citizen
3 other

145. At the beginning of this activity/encounter was the citizen in custody?

1 no
2 yes, had been taken into protective custody earlier by observed officer(s)
3 yes, had been taken into protective custody earlier by other than observed officers
4 yes, had been taken into police custody earlier by observed officer(s)
5 yes, had been taken into police custody earlier by other than observed officers

146. At the end of this activity/encounter was the citizen in custody?

1 no
2 yes, protective custody
3 yes, police custody

147. What best characterizes the citizen's emotional state at the beginning of the contact?

1 not elevated (calm)
2 elevated—fear or anger
3 elevated—happy
4 depressed—sadness, remorse

148. What best characterizes the citizen's emotional state at the end of the contact?

1 not elevated (calm)
2 elevated—fear or anger
3 elevated—happy
4 depressed—sadness, remorse
APPENDIX D

ACTIVITY CODES

rev February 27, 1997

100 ENROUTE TO DISPATCHED ASSIGNMENT

Use when an officer has received an order to go somewhere by the dispatcher or supervisor. This activity begins as soon as the officer begins to respond to the assignment. It ends when the officer arrives at the location of the assignment and commences another activity or an encounter.

101 ENROUTE TO LOCATION (OTHER THAN ASSIGNED DISPATCH)

This category covers time spent enroute to a specific location for situations other than 100 above. For example, the officer decides to go to a restaurant for a break, or the officer responds to a citizen's beeper/cellular phone request.

102 ENROUTE TO LOCATION - NOT DISPATCH DIRECTED

This differs from 101 in that the officer may proceed to a location where another unit has been dispatched, such as for back-up purposes. This PARTICULAR officer was not dispatched to this call.

110 GENERAL MOTORIZED PATROL/PREVENTIVE PATROL

Use this category when the officer is driving around without any special purpose other than to wait for an assignment or to see anything that might require police intervention. Do not use this category if another, more specific category applies (e.g., 131, 201, 202, etc.).

115 GENERAL BICYCLE PATROL

120 GENERAL FOOT PATROL

Same as 110, only on foot. Use this category only if the observed officers are actually on foot on the beat. Sometimes foot officers will use their motor vehicles, in which case, do not use this category.

125 WAITING

Use this code when police are waiting for the arrival of someone or something and are doing nothing else during this time period (e.g., waiting for a tow truck).
Do NOT use this code if they are performing any other activity, such as guarding a crime scene.

126 WAITING FOR ARRIVAL OF ANOTHER POLICE OFFICER

Same as above, but the person the officer is waiting for is a police officer.

130 TRAFFIC-ENFORCEMENT

Use this code if it appears that the primary motive is to enforce traffic regulations (ie, "movers")

131 Mobile

132 Stationary

140 BACK UP OTHER POLICE

Use this activity category when an officer backs up other police (on his own initiative or on assignment) but there is no encounter between the observed officer and the citizen.

150 PARADES, DEMONSTRATIONS, CROWD CONTROL

200 PROBLEM-FOCUSED ACTIVITY (SITUATIONAL)

Use this category when officer focuses activity on a particular place or person that requires or may require the officer’s immediate attention.

201 Surveillance of particular person

202 Surveillance of particular address

203 Check out suspicious circumstances

204 Residential security check; alarm response

205 Commercial/industrial security check; alarm response

206 Warrant/subpoena service

207 Attempt to locate suspect, witness, informant
208 Search of crime scene
209 Pursuit of fleeing suspect
210 Search property
211 Guard crime scene

300 ORDINANCE ENFORCEMENT
301 Parking
302 Building code
303 Health/sanitation/trash

400 SERVICE
401 Check on or fix road conditions
402 Check on or fix property or equipment
403 Escort
404 Transport person
405 Direct traffic/parade
406 Medical/health service

500 INFORMATION GATHERING
501 Police records
502 Other government records
503 Crime analysis
504 Private sector data sources
610  MEETINGS WITH OTHER POLICE—OFFICIAL BUSINESS

Use this category when the officer meets with other police to handle official police business, such as conferring on how to complete police records or how to handle a particular situation.

611  Roll call - Include time it takes to “prepare for shift”.

612  Electronic communications with other police (telephone, radio, MDT)
Use this code only if the officer was engaged in no other activity (e.g., general patrol, enroute to location) during this communication

620  MEETINGS WITH PUBLIC

The codes in this category should be used when the officer is dealing with public groups, often as a speaker or participant. Often this will be part of regularly scheduled meetings which the police are invited to attend.

621  Neighborhood/housing/group

622  Civic association (crosses neighborhood boundaries)

623  Victims' group

624  Business group

630  MEETINGS WITH OTHER NON-POLICE SERVICE PROVIDERS

Use these categories when the officer is conducting official business with other public officials or private sector service providers who are not police.

631  Government agencies/officials

632  Private sector agencies/individuals

700  ADMINISTRATIVE

This covers a variety of activities that are supportive of police service provision but do not involve direct service to the public.

701  Report writing
If the officer does some report writing (701) while he/she is engaging the public in an encounter, do not code this as an activity. It is simply part of the encounter. However, if the officer fills out a report form after the encounter is over, the time spent filling out the form should be counted as activity 701.

702 Automobile maintenance, refueling, washing
703 Transport other police
704 Transport prisoner, witness, evidence, other materials
705 Calibrate/check/check out equipment
706 Process evidence/property
707 Meet with prosecutor about a case
708 Meet with judge/magistrate about a case (not a formal proceeding)
709 Appear in court for hearing, trial, or other formal legal proceeding
710 Conduct research/inquiry on a problem

800 PERSONAL BUSINESS

Give the activity this code if it is clear that the officer is not conducting official police business. The activity itself may (or may not) have official approval. For example, meals and restroom breaks are officially expected personal activities. Sleeping, running personal errands, and just hanging out with friends are generally not approved. These are also coded as personal business.

801 Meal, snacks, restroom breaks
802 Personal errands, relaxation
803 Meetings with other police—not business-related

900 CHECK OUT SITUATION/GONE ON ARRIVAL (NO INTERACTION WITH CITIZEN)
Use this category when the officer is responding to an assignment or beeper/phone request and when he/she gets to the scene, there is no one there and the officer has no encounter but merely looks around the scene.

990 DEBRIEFING BY PROJECT OBSERVER

Use this code only if the officer was engaged in no other activity (such as general patrol, en route, surveillance) and was solely engaged in a debriefing by the observer.

999 UNOBSERVED ACTIVITY

Use this to cover activity by the observed officer when you have no knowledge as to what the officer was doing. For example, the officer may tell you to wait in the car and do something, not explaining what it is he/she was doing. Or you may take a personal restroom break and not be advised of what happened in your absence.
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PROBLEM CODES

Problems with Persons

005 MEET COMPLAINANT — Code when this is all the information that is given (e.g., "See a man, woman, person at...") or "I need the police at x location").

010 PUBLIC NUISANCE — Any person(s) or circumstances alleged to be annoying, unpleasant, or obnoxious to an individual or the public welfare (e.g., general complaint about rowdy party, firecrackers, peace disturbance). Whenever possible, use more specific codes below.

011 DRUNK — Person is inebriated or alleged to be inebriated.

012 DISORDERLY — Person is excessively loud, rowdy, annoying to others or is alleged to be disorderly by a citizen or officer.

013 VAGRANCY — No visible means of support. Do not use code 013 when Drunk; use code 011.

014 LOITERING — Person(s) lingering in public place (e.g., youths hanging out on corner). Appropriate for encounter that begins with police officer saying "move along."

015 PORNOGRAPHY — Sale, distribution, or consumption of illegal sexual-related literature, film, etc.

016 OBSCENE ACTIVITY — Lewd, unchaste, indecent activity (e.g., indecent exposure, Peeping Tom). Do not code 016 when Pornography (015) or Prostitution (023).

017 NOISE DISTURBANCE — Use when someone complains about or officer investigates a loud party or gathering where they have been disturbed by the excessive noise. (E.g., "That barking dog next door keeps me from getting my sleep." "They’re playing their stereo for the whole neighborhood-"

018 PEDDLING, BEGGING — A person selling pencils or other wares on the street without a permit or begging for money.

019 ARGUMENT, PARTICIPANTS UNSPECIFIED — Any verbal disagreement that stops short of physical contact with persons or property where type of participants is unknown.
020 **DOMESTIC ARGUMENT** — Any verbal disagreement between related family members (including couples "living together") that stops short of violent physical contact with persons or property.

021 **NON-DOMESTIC ARGUMENT** — Any verbal disagreement between non-related individuals that stops short of violent physical contact with persons or property.

022 **GAMBLING** — Any of a number of illegal gambling activities (e.g., book making, numbers, dice, etc.).

023 **PROSTITUTION/SOLICITING** — Sexual relations for pay (e.g., street walkers, call girls, illegal massage parlors). Include soliciting sex for money, whether by seller or buyer of sexual services.

024 **CURFEW VIOLATION OR TRUANCY** — Juveniles or adults out after designated hours or a pupil who stays away from school.

025 **KEEP THE PEACE - PREVENT POTENTIAL ARGUMENT** — Use this code, for example, when a woman requests police protection while picking up her clothes from her house in a situation where she is leaving her husband. The officer is requested to be present so as to prevent any problem from developing.

026 **JUVENILE PROBLEM/DISTURBANCE (Non-specific)** — Use this code for a complaint about juveniles that does not otherwise fit one of our other categories. E.g., "the boys are playing in the street again." "Those kids keep tormenting my dog."

027 **HARRASMENT/STALKING** — Conduct directed toward a victim that includes repeated or continuing impermissible contact that would cause a reasonable person to suffer emotional distress and that actually causes the victim to suffer emotional distress.

028 **FAMILY TROUBLE (unspecified)** — Use this code for a report of "family trouble" where the nature of the trouble is unspecified (We've got a family trouble at 12th and Walnut"). Do not use this code when a more specific one applies (i.e., 029, Domestic Argument, 093, Domestic Fight, etc.).

030 **INTER-GROUP CONFLICT** — Conflicts between groups of citizens, where group membership extends beyond family ties, such as neighborhood associations, clubs, gangs, or just many unrelated people who have a dispute with another group of unrelated people. Do not use this code when conflict involves fights, assaults, or other specific physical contact in the encounter.

031 **NEIGHBOR TROUBLE** — Use this code for a report of "neighbor trouble where the nature of the problem is otherwise unspecified."
032  **GANG CONFLICT**—Use this code for a report of conflict between gangs, where the nature of the conflict is otherwise unspecified.

033  **LABOR-MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS**—Conflict between labor and management in a business or government agency.

035  **GANG PROBLEM, GENERAL**—Use this code when the problem is identified as a "gang problem," but there is no specific conflict or fight involved.

040  **DRUG VIOLATIONS**—Includes sale, consumption, or possession of unspecified drugs.

041  **ALCOHOL LAW VIOLATION**—Illegal possession, or consumption of alcohol (e.g., blue law violation, after hours, speakeasy, underage drinking). Do not code 041 is driving while intoxicated (471) or drunk (011).

042  **ILlicit DRUGS (NONALCOHOL), GENERAL**—Includes any nonalcoholic illicit drugs, when the precise nature of the drugs are unknown or there are multiple types of drugs.

043  **MARIJUANA**—Includes consumption, possession, dealing of marijuana/hasish.

044  **COCAINE/CRACK**—Includes possession, consumption, dealing of cocaine or crack.

045  **OTHER NARCOTIC/ILLICIT DRUGS**—Includes possession, consumption, dealing of any other narcotic/illlicit drug or look-alike substance that is not included in codes 043 and 044 above.

046  **PARAPHERNALIA**—Includes possession, use, or dealing in illicit drug paraphernalia.

050  **CROWD CONTROL**—Control of large groups of citizens gathered in public or private spaces.

051  **PARADES/PUBLIC EVENTS**—Use for control of officially sanctioned public events.

052  **CIVIL DISORDERS (RIOTS, TERRORISM, PRISON DISORDERS)**—Violent, mass public disturbance, and the use of threats of force to intimidate or coerce.

060  **FAMILY NEGLECT/NONSUPPORT**—Use when a general reference to neglect or non-support of family members.

061  **CHILD NEGLECT**—Neglect, nonphysical abuse, or threat of for directed at a
child by a member of the family (e.g., child abandonment, locking a child in a closet, not feeding a child, etc.). Do not code 061 where there is actual physical harm involved. Instead see codes 101-103.

062 NONPAYMENT OF SUPPORT — Includes nonpayment of either child support or alimony payments.

063 CONTRIBUTING TO DELINQUENCY OF A MINOR

070 MISSING PERSON — Report of a person as missing or the description of a person reported as missing. If person provides or requests additional request for or report of information, use the 600 code first 070 second.

071 JUVENILE RUNAWAY — A call to report a juvenile runaway, by parent or guardian, or the discovery of a juvenile runaway. See above for use of 600 codes.

072 KIDNAP — To carry or attempt to carry a person away by unlawful force or by fraud and against the person’s will.

080 MEDICAL ASSISTANCE — An unspecified call for some form of medical help.

081 "MAN DOWN" - CAUSE UNKNOWN — A call that there is a person lying in a public place who may require some form of medical or emergency transport service. The person might be drunk, sick, dead, or anything else, but the call does not specify the cause.

082 EMERGENCY MEDICAL TRANSPORT NEEDED — Use for the transport of medical personnel or medical case in emergency conditions (e.g., emergency warning signals, fast driving).

083 FIRST AID, RESUSCITATION NEEDED — Use when the call indicates that the police will be expected to administer first aid or resuscitation and not just to transport someone.

084 OBSTETRIC — Use for call related to emergency treatment of woman during pregnancy or childbirth.

085 MENTAL DISORDER, INVOLUNTARY HOSPITALIZATION — Code anytime that problem is presented to the officer as someone who is mentally ill or acting irrationally. Include in this category the process of committing someone to a mental health facility that occurs in a non-emergency setting.

086 HELPING INVALID OR DISABLED PERSON — Use for moving a sick or injured
person from one room to another, helping an old or disabled person get back into bed if they've fallen out, etc. Do not use in emergency situations where 082, Emergency Medical Transport, or 083, 084, etc. apply.

**090 PHYSICAL INJURY INFlicted BY PERSONS** — Use for a general reference to some physical harm inflicted by one person on another where information is not sufficient to code in one of the categories below.

**091 THREATENED PHYSICAL INJURY** — Code when someone has threatened to harm someone else. (I'm gonna break your arm. I'm gonna beat you up.)

**092 FIGHT (PHYSICAL)** — Any disagreement that includes violent physical contact with persons or property. Use codes in this category when there is not sufficient information to select a more specific category, such as simple or aggravated assault.

**093 DOMESTIC FIGHT** — A disagreement that includes violent physical contact with persons or property between related family members (including couples "living together").

**094 NON-DOMESTIC FIGHT** — A disagreement that includes violent physical contact with persons or property between unrelated individuals.

**994 GANG FIGHT** — Use this code for a non-domestic fight involving gangs of youths or others. Do not use for all fights involving more than two participants. Rather use 994 only when it is specified by the dispatcher, the citizen complainant, or someone else as definitely a gang fight.

**095 SIMPLE ASSAULT** — The physical attack by one person upon another not accompanied by the use of a weapon.

**096 DOMESTIC ASSAULT** — The physical attack by one person upon another not accompanied by the use of a weapon when it is known that the participants are related family members (including couples living together).

**097 NON-DOMESTIC ASSAULT** — The physical attack by one person upon another not accompanied by the use of a weapon when it is known that the participants are not related family members.

**098 AGGRAVATED ASSAULT** — Physical attack by one person upon another accompanied by the use of a weapon or other means likely to produce death or serious bodily harm.
099 DOMESTIC AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Code 099 when it is known that the aggravated assault is between related family members (including couples living together).

100 NON-DOMESTIC AGGRAVATED ASSAULT - Code 100 when it is known that the aggravated assault is not between related family members.

101 CHILD ABUSE, GENERAL - Physical harm inflicted by a person on a child. See codes 60-63 for nonphysical abuse.

102 INCEST

103 NEGLECT RESULTING IN SERIOUS BODILY INJURY —

110 SUSPICIOUS PERSON - A general claim belief that there is a suspicious person in a neighborhood or a police officer stopping someone because of suspicious dress or activity. (Use this category unless officer or caller indicates with specificity what is expected, e.g., a drunk, someone using illegal drugs, etc.). For calls, "Person w/a gun" should be coded 110.

111 PROWLER - A report or officer-initiated action relating to an unidentified person in or near private property.

112 GUNSHOT - A report that someone has heard a gunshot at a particular location.

113 SCREAMS - A report that someone has heard screams at a particular location.

114 SUSPICIOUS CIRCUMSTANCES - A situation that looks like a crime or other wrongdoing is in progress, might be in progress, or that the situation lends itself to crime/wrongdoing (e.g., open window, open door, unattended car that is running). This should be used for situations where there is no suspicious person that is the focus of police or citizen attention.

115 SUSPECTED VIOLATOR - Use for general reference to a suspected violator without more specific information.

116 FLIGHT FROM POLICE/LAWFUL DETENTION - Suspect or apparent violator in flight (e.g., parole violator, prison escapee, wanted for questioning, etc.). Do not code when person is fleeing from officer at start of event unless person fleeing is previously known to be wanted (e.g., burglar running away upon police arrival see code 117 for those situations).

117 INTERFERENCE WITH POLICE - Through verbal or physical means an individual refuses to obey a command given by a police officer (e.g., refusing to stop when signalled or commanded by police, resisting arrest, harboring
a fugitive). Do not use this code if refused to comply temporarily, but does comply after a verbal exchange.

118 **WEAPONS VIOLATION** — The unlawful possession, sale, transfer, or discharge of a weapon (e.g., carrying a gun without a license, discharge of weapon in public place, possessing sawed-off shotgun or machine pistol, etc.). Does not apply to Bomb Threat, 332.

120 **ROBBERY** — Use for a generalized reference to a robbery without any further information. Note: "robbery" includes CARJACKING.

121 **ATTEMPTED ROBBERY**

122 **ROBBERY OF PRIVATE CITIZEN** — Theft directly from a person by force or threat of force. Robbery may or may not involve an actual physical attack. Threat of force is enough to place a theft from residence into this category. More force than is necessary to steal a purse must be applied to place Purse Snatch, 242 in this category.

123 **ATTEMPTED ROBBERY OF PRIVATE CITIZEN**

124 **ROBBERY OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION** — Theft from a financial institution accomplished by force or threat of force (e.g., hold up of check-cashing agency; bank robbery).

125 **ATTEMPTED ROBBERY OF FINANCIAL INSTITUTION**

126 **ROBBERY OF OTHER COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENT** — Theft from a nonfinancial institution accomplished by force or threat of force. Robbery may or may not involve an actual physical attack. Threat of force is enough to place a theft from commercial establishment into this category (e.g., hold up of grocery store, shop, bar, service station, etc.).

127 **ATTEMPTED ROBBERY OF OTHER COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENT**

130 **SEXUAL ATTACK** — Use when a generalized reference to some form of sexual attack without specific information.

131 **ATTEMPTED SEXUAL ATTACK**

132 **RAPE** — The carnal knowledge of a female through the use of force or the threat of force or of a minor (e.g., statutory rape)

133 **ATTEMPTED RAPE**

134 **CHILD MOLESTATION** — A sexual attack upon a child.
135 ATTEMPTED CHILD MOLESTATION

140 DEATH ("DEAD BODY") — Request to respond to report on sighting of dead body or suspicion of dead body (e.g., "my husband passed on in his sleep."). Use this code when no other reason for death can be specified.

141 ACCIDENTAL DEATH — Death by accident (e.g., drowning, industrial accident, but not traffic fatality which is 414).

142 SUICIDE — Killing oneself intentionally.

143 ATTEMPTED SUICIDE

144 HOMICIDE — Death of any person through the acts of another (but not traffic fatality which is 414).

145 ATTEMPTED HOMICIDE

150 CIVIL RIGHTS VIOLATION — Denying an individual their constitutional or legal rights. Do not code when police officer does not inform individual of their rights.

160 ADULT SUBJECT OF POLICE CONCERN (non-specific) — Use this code for cases where the police are concerned about an adult’s welfare, but no specific problem type applies. E.g., "I’m going to check on the old couple who live in the back apartment, we try to look in on them every couple of days."

161 JUVENILE SUBJECT OF POLICE CONCERN (non-specific) — Same as 160, except that the subject of concern is a juvenile.

170 SCHOOL SAFETY — Problems relating to the safety of persons attending or working on school property.

Problems with Property

200 DISCOVERY OF MISSING OR STOLEN PROPERTY — Code for a request for response or for a response to call of located, missing, or stolen property, or when police officer discovers such property.

201 ALARM (NOT FIRE) — Burglary, residence, bank, business. See Code 322 for fire alarm. Use this code when officers are responding to an alarm.

202 ALARM (CHRONIC FALSE) — Use this code for any security alarm problem related to repeated false alarms.
205 **MISSING OR STOLEN PROPERTY** -- Use this code for an unspecified problem with property that does not fit any of the categories below.

210 **LOST PROPERTY** -- A report that someone has lost some form of property (e.g., a lost watch, a lost wallet, etc.).

211 **RETURN OF LOST PROPERTY** -- Code when police officer returns lost property or caller reports recovery/return of lost property.

221 **THREAT TO TAKE PROPERTY** -- Someone threatens to take away the property of another person.

222 **RETURN OF STOLEN PROPERTY** -- Code when police officer returns stolen property; or when caller reports return/recovery of stolen property.

223 **BUYING, RECEIVING, OR POSSESSING STOLEN PROPERTY** -- The knowledgeable (or alleged knowledge) purchase, receipt, or possession of stolen property.

230 **THEFT, UNSPECIFIED** -- Use for a generalized reference to stolen property.

231 **ATTEMPTED THEFT, UNSPECIFIED**

232 **MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT** -- Involves stealing or unauthorized (Without owner consent) removal of an automobile, motorcycle, snowmobile, motor boat, or other powered vehicle

233 **ATTEMPTED MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT**

234 **THEFT FROM RESIDENCE** -- The successful stealing of property from a residence where no indication of unlawful entry is present. It is the crime of theft that leads only to the loss (or threatened loss) of property or cash within the confines of an individual's private dwelling unit or ancillary buildings such as a garage, shed, or barn.

235 **ATTEMPTED THEFT FROM RESIDENCE**

236 **THEFT FROM COMMERCIAL** -- The successful stealing of property from a commercial or industrial establishment where no indication of unlawful entry is present. This does not include Shoplifting, 238. For example, items may be taken from the area within a security fence or by a person remaining in the store after hours.

237 **ATTEMPTED THEFT FROM COMMERCIAL**
238 **SHOPLIFTING** — The stealing of articles from within a commercial establishment during regular store hours.

239 **ATTEMPTED SHOPLIFTING**

240 **THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE** — The stealing of articles from a motor vehicle (e.g., stolen motor vehicle parts and accessories, stolen audio equipment, etc.).

241 **ATTEMPTED THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE**

242 **PURSE SNATCHED/POCKET PICKED** — Theft of either purse or wallet where no more force than is necessary to remove the property from the individual is exhibited. If excessive force is used, code as Robbery of Private Citizen, 122.

243 **ATTEMPTED PURSE SNATCH/POCKET PICKED**

250 **BURGLARY** — Use when a generalized reference to a burglary without specific information to use one of the more detailed codes listed below.

251 **BURGLARY, RESIDENTIAL** — The successful theft that involves the unlawful entry of residence or related residential building such as a garage, shed, or bam. Thefts committed by persons that have a right to be in the property (e.g., personal guests and service workers) should be coded as Theft From Residence, 234. If an unsuccessful attempt, code as 282, Break-In, Residential.

252 **BURGLARY, COMMERCIAL** — The successful theft that involves the unlawful entry of a commercial or industrial establishment (e.g., breaking into a store after closing or breaking through a security fence and taking items) — If an unsuccessful attempt, code as 284, Break-in, Commercial.

270 **UNWANTED/UNAUTHORIZED ENTRY OR PRESENCE** — Use for general reference to an unwanted or unauthorized entry where specific information is not available to code one of the more detailed codes listed below.

271 **TRESPASSING** — To non-forcibly enter private or restricted public area without permission or right.

272 **TRESPASSING, RESIDENTIAL (PRIVATE)** — To non-forcibly enter one's private residential property without permission or right (e.g., riding or walking through a yard, a known individual [friend] walking into an unlocked house or ancillary building).
273 TRESPASSING, RESIDENTIAL (PUBLIC) – Same as 272, but pertains to public housing.

274 TRESPASSING, COMMERCIAL – To non-forcibly enter a commercial, industrial, or restricted public area without permission or right (e.g., railroad yard, jumping a fence around a school).

275 UNAUTHORIZED USE OF MOTOR VEHICLE – Use this code when a car is used without the owner’s permission, but is not considered stolen. e.g., "My Uncle took my car over to New Haven, Connecticut when I wasn’t around. I want him to bring it back right now!"

280 BREAK-IN – Use for a generalized reference to a break-in

281 ATTEMPTED BREAK-IN/INCLUDING ALARMS – Use when cannot discern whether location is commercial or residential. Also use when location is public/governmental property such as school.

282 BREAK-IN, RESIDENTIAL – The unlawful entry of a residence or related residential building where no property is removed from the premises.

283 ATTEMPTED BREAK-IN, RESIDENTIAL/INCLUDING ALARMS

284 BREAK-IN, COMMERCIAL – The unlawful entry of a commercial premise or related commercial building where no property is removed from the premise. For this category entry will almost always be by force or stealth.

285 ATTEMPTED BREAK-IN, COMMERCIAL/INCLUDING ALARMS

286 BREAK-IN, MOTOR VEHICLE – The unlawful entry of a motor vehicle such as a car, truck, or boat where no property is removed from the vehicle. This category will involve entry by force or stealth.

287 ATTEMPTED BREAK-IN, MOTOR VEHICLE/INCLUDING ALARMS

290 SUSPICIOUS PROPERTY CONDITION – General request to respond to report or sighting of property condition (excluding motor vehicle) that "does not appear right."

291 PECULIAR OR PUZZLING CIRCUMSTANCE – Request to respond to report, or sighting of extraordinary or supernatural circumstances (e.g., UFOs, unusual noise, or explosion, etc.).
292 **SUSPICIOUS MOTOR VEHICLE** — Request to respond to report or sighting of motor vehicle that "does not appear right" or "does not belong in the area."

293 **DANGEROUS SUBSTANCE** — This code should be used when the police receive a report that someone has found dynamite, blasting caps, ammunition, etc., and wants the police to investigate. See also 532, Transport dangerous substance, for cases where the request is for the police to haul such items away.

300 **DAMAGED PROPERTY** — A generalized reference to damaged property.

310 **UNINTENTIONALLY DAMAGED PROPERTY** — Code this when there is a request for response or response to call of damaged property where there is no intent (or use of force) to destroy property (e.g., tree fell on house, baseball through window, etc.).

311 **UTILITY PROBLEM** — Code this when there is a request for response or response to call about a public utility problem or dangerous situation (e.g., street lights out, gas leak, down wire, transformer sparks, water main break, open fire hydrant causing flooding).

314 **ENVIRONMENTAL HAZARD OR DISASTER** — Any call or response to call about potential or actual weather or environmental problem (e.g., oil spill, tornado touched down, hail stones, flooding condition).

320 **FIRE (GENERAL)** — Any problem associated with a specific instance of a fire, past or in-progress ongoing fire or suspected fire. See code 802 for fire prevention.

321 **FIRE IN PROGRESS** — Response to report or sighting of fire in progress.

322 **FIRE ALARM/SMOKE** — Use when there is a response to a mechanical or electronic fire alarm.

330 **INTENTIONALLY DAMAGED PROPERTY** — A general reference to property that was damaged intentionally in some manner.

331 **THREAT TO DAMAGE PROPERTY** — A threat to harm property ("I'm gonna knock this shed down.").

332 **BOMB THREAT** — Use for response to report of an explosive set to go off.

340 **VANDALISM** — The malicious damage of property. There has to be intent to damage property.

341 **VANDALISM, RESIDENTIAL** — The malicious damage (or attempted
damage) of residential property. There has to be intent to damage property. The following are acts to be coded in this category: egging, smashing mailbox, spray painting, "lawn jobs," window soaping, and felling trees. Do not code acts of minor damage when they are unintentional, such as running through flowers after a ball or breaking a tree limb by swinging on it; incidents like these can be coded as Unintentionally Damaged Property, 310.

342 VANDALISM, COMMERCIAL -- The malicious damage (or attempt to damage) of such property. There has to be intent to damage property.

343 VANDALISM, PUBLIC PROPERTY -- The malicious damage (or attempt to damage) of such property. There has to be intent to damage property.

344 VANDALISM, MOTOR VEHICLE -- The malicious damage (or attempt to damage) of a motor vehicle. As with 341, 342, and 343, there must be intent to damage or else code Unintentionally Damaged Property, 310.

345 TAMPERING WITH AN AUTO -- Use this code where there is not enough information to specify a theft or an attempted theft, or vandalism. This code would apply, for example, to a report that "there are two boys sitting in my car at ___."

350 ARSON -- The suspected or actual setting of a fire in which an intention of property damage. Do not code 350 when leaf or grass fire gets out of hand and causes damage; code as Fire in Progress, 321.

351 ATTEMPTED ARSON

352 THREATENED ARSON -- The threat to burn another's property (e.g., "I'm gonna burn your house down.").

380 PROBLEMS WITH MONEY/CREDIT/DOCUMENTS -- A generalized reference to some problem with money, credit, or documents.

381 FORGERY OR COUNTERFEITING -- To imitate a signature on a legal document or to imitate legal or exchange tender (e.g., making bogus money and making bogus entertainment tickets.)

382 FRAUD OR EMBEZZLEMENT -- Deceit or trickery with the intent of taking property or cash from another person (e.g., passing bogus money, tokens or tickets, con games, fly-by-night swindle, and altering of
financial accounts).

383  **BAD CHECK/BAD CREDIT CARD** — Offering a stolen or invalid check, draft, or credit card in a financial transaction.

384  **REFUSE TO PAY** — Refusal of an individual to give payment for goods or services that were consumed.

385  **UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICE** — Includes mislabeling, bait and switch, overcharging, failure to provide agreed services or goods, or other practices unfair to consumers.

386  **LANDLORD - TENANT DISPUTE** — Code for disagreement between landlord & tenant not involving serious argument or other disturbance. Include evictions in this category.

**Traffic Problems**

410  **TRAFFIC ACCIDENT** — A report of a motor vehicle accident where no indication of occurrence or extent of personal injury is given.

411  **TRAFFIC ACCIDENT, PROPERTY DAMAGE ONLY** — Anything from a damaged fender to a chain reaction or total wreck that has no personal injury. A collision need not have occurred if property damage results from the efforts of a driver to avoid a collision.

412  **TRAFFIC ACCIDENT, PERSONAL INJURY** — Any type of motor vehicle accident where there is bodily injury due to presence in a motor vehicle involved in an accident. An actual collision is not necessary if personal injury occurred as a result of a driver's efforts to avoid a collision.

413  **TRAFFIC ACCIDENT, PEDESTRIAN HIT** — Any type of motor vehicle accident where someone other than a rider in a motor vehicle reports bodily injury. The exception to this is a Hit and Run, 420.

414  **TRAFFIC FATALITY** — A traffic accident in which someone is killed.

420  **HIT AND RUN (person injured)** — Hitting a person with a motor vehicle, or being involved in a personal injury automobile accident, and then escaping. See 421, Leaving the scene, if no injury is involved.

421  **LEAVING THE SCENE (property damage)** — Hitting property with a motor vehicle, or being involved in a automobile accident where no personal injuries occur, and then escaping. See 420, Hit and run, if anyone is injured in the accident.
440 **ROAD BLOCK** – A police action to block moving traffic on a street, or highway.

450 **VEHICLE VIOLATION** – Use for a generalized reference to a violation related to a motor vehicle.

451 **PARKING VIOLATION** – Vehicle in violation of street parking ordinance (e.g., double parking, overtime meter, two spaces, too far from curb, wrong direction, no parking zone, etc.).

452 **ABANDONED VEHICLE** – Motor vehicle abandoned (i.e., not possible to move on own power or left for junk).

453 **EQUIPMENT OR INSPECTION LACKING** – Covers any time police officer suspects, sights, or stops a motor vehicle travelling without proper equipment or current inspection (e.g., tail or head lights out, tail pipe, or other malfunctioning equipment).

454 **MISSING OR IMPROPER LICENSE PLATE/REGISTRATION** – Covers any time police officer stops vehicle because license plate is not visible or out of date or registration is found to be missing.

455 **ROUTINE CHECK** – Covers any time police officer stops vehicle to "check it over" as a matter of routine or random check.

460 **TRAFFIC FLOW PROBLEMS** – Use for a generalized reference to a problem related to traffic flow and its regulation.

461 **TRAFFIC SIGNAL DISORDER** – Code when police officer stops to check a report of a disorder or sights a disorder (e.g., malfunctioning traffic light, broken traffic sign, etc.).

462 **TRAFFIC OBSTRUCTION OR CONGESTION** – Code when police officer proceeds to investigate or call received for traffic slowdown or stoppage (e.g., unknown tie-up). Do not use this code when a Motor Vehicle Accident is indicated.

463 **DIRECT TRAFFIC** – Use this when officer is dispatched to direct traffic or directs traffic as a result of a problem.

464 **PEDESTRIAN CONTROL/SCHOOL CROSSING GUARDS** – Use for encounters or calls that involve pedestrian control or the provision of school crossing guards.

465 **ROAD CONDITION** – Includes street depression, soft shoulders, falling rocks,
washout of road, flooded street.

470 MOVING VIOLATION — Covers any moving traffic violation for which a violator may receive a citation (with the exception of Hit and Run, 420; Driving While Intoxicated, 471; and Excess Speed, 472) (e.g., reckless driving, running stoplight or sign, not using turn signal, tailgating, open alcohol in car, etc.).

471 DRIVING UNDER THE INFLUENCE — An encounter or a call involving a suspicion, sighting, or determination of an operator to be driving while intoxicated.

472 EXCESS SPEED — An encounter or a call involving a suspicion, sighting, or determination of an operator driving faster than the legal limit.

480 ASSIST MOTORIST — general reference to the need to assist a motorist in some manner either unspecified or not related to disabled vehicle or road directions.

481 DISABLED VEHICLE — Motor vehicle temporarily broken down (e.g., engine trouble, flat, out of gas, keys locked in car, etc.).

482 ROAD DIRECTIONS — Code when cit. asks police officer "How do I get to ...."

Service Problems

505 GENERAL REQUEST FOR SERVICE — A general request for service that cannot be coded within one of the more specific categories.

506 ASSIST PERSON LOCKED IN OR OUT OF HOME, OFFICE, OTHER BUILDING — Use when the police help someone in such circumstances, or are requested to do so. Do not use for helping a person into a locked car, this is coded as 481, Disabled Vehicle.

507 EMERGENCY - NATURE UNSPECIFIED — Use when it is clear that the problem is of an emergency nature, but no details that would allow you to specify the problem further are available. E.g., "We've got an emergency down at the warehouse, get there right away!" Include 911 hangups in this category.

510 REQUEST FOR SURVEILLANCE — A request to have the police look after something in general or an unspecified request for extra patrol.

511 HOUSE/VACATION CHECK OR EXTRA RESIDENTIAL PATROL — This code applies to request for house check activities of a police officer that involve the surveillance or checking of residence such as would be requested when the occupant is on vacation or trouble has occurred there earlier. When caller reports return from vacation and/or requests termination of house check, use 620 and then 511 in that order.
512 COMMERCIAL DOOR CHECK — This code applies to the routine activities of a police officer that involve checking to see that doors are locked and windows are closed.

513 STORE OPENING OR CLOSING CALL/"ALARM SET" — This applies to phoned-in calls where a store is reporting that it is opening or closing so that police can adjust their patrol activity and to situations where police are present to watch store opening or closing.

520 ESCORT — The request for escort or provision of an officer on foot or in a vehicle to accompany an individual to some destination. Do not code this category if the officer transports an individual from one location to another—(530, 531, 730).

521 EMERGENCY ESCORT — The request or provision of a vehicle to accompany another vehicle under emergency circumstances (e.g., escort of ambulance, fire truck, or private citizen).

522 BANK/MONEY ESCORT — The request or provision of officer or police vehicle to accompany someone making a deposit of money.

523 FUNERAL/PARADE ESCORT — The request or provision of escort services related to a funeral or parade.

525 POLICE PROTECTION — Request for police to be present to protect someone from an anticipated threat (e.g., a woman wants police to stand by while she removes her personal belongings from her boyfriend’s apartment following a fight).

530 TRANSPORT — The request for, or response to a request for, taking a person in a vehicle from one location to another; nonmedical transport (e.g., prisoner transport, bringing home accident victim, transporting person with large amount of money). Use 530 when the status of the person to be transported is unknown; otherwise use 531 or 730.

531 TRANSPORT PERSON NOT IN CUSTODY — Any request, or response to request, for transport where the person to be transported is not in custody.

532 TRANSPORT DANGEROUS SUBSTANCE — Use this code when the police are requested to transport a dangerous substance from one location to another. For example, a case where someone has found blasting caps and requests the police to remove them to a safe location. See also 293 if no request to transport is made.

540 COURIER — Code when officer is dispatched (or request for courier) to carry equipment, documents, or other materials for a citizen or public official, or when he provides same (e.g., coffee run for dispatchers, legal papers to courthouse, or...
other pickup and delivery).

550 **ANIMAL PROBLEM** – This code applies to a request or response to any problem that is animal related (e.g., lost, found, dead, rabid, treed, dangerous, etc., animal). It includes violations of local code about pets (e.g., leash laws). Also includes concerns about rodents and other animals concerned with health. Do NOT include noise disturbances (e.g., barking dog) in this category. Code barking dogs as 017.

560 **POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS, OFFICER FRIENDLY, SCHOOL VISIT** – Use when an officer makes a PCR type presentation to school group or other type of group. This does not require a formal presentation, just stopping in to give crime prevention information to a block club meeting would qualify.

**Information Problems**

Note: A 600 is used as the first (or only) code when the incident is primarily information related. A 600 code used as the second problem code means that the request for or offer of info is separate from the first problem. If a second code can be found to describe the info desired or given, place this second code in second problem code slot.

610 **CITIZEN WANTS INFORMATION** – An unspecified request for information.

611 **CASE-RELATED CRIME INFORMATION** – Code this when an individual wants to know about a specific case or incident (e.g., "Where is my towed car?").

612 **CRIME PREVENTION INFORMATION** – Code this when the citizen wants information about crime prevention in general, not related to a specific incident or case.

613 **OTHER INFORMATION** – An individual wants information not included in 611 or 612 above (e.g., "How many tickets does it take to lose a license?").

614 **DIRECTIONS (NONTRAFFIC)** – Code when a citizen calls in or hails an officer and asks for general, nontraffic directions. (for traffic directions, use 482.)

620 **CITIZEN WANTS TO GIVE INFORMATION**

621 **CRIME-TIP INFORMATION** – Person wants to give information on a crime or suspected violator. This should be information that will help police solve a crime or catch a criminal/violator.

622 **NOT CRIME TIP INFORMATION** – Person wants to give information that does
not concern solving a crime or catching a criminal/violator.

630 OFFICER WANTS INFORMATION

631 CRIME-TIP INFORMATION — Officer seeks information about crime, suspects, or criminal activity from a potential informant.

632 NOT CRIME TIP INFORMATION — Officer seeks information that does not concern detecting or solving a crime or catching a criminal/violator.

640 OFFICER WANTS TO GIVE INFORMATION — Use when officer initiates contact to tell someone something the officer thinks they need to know.

650 HOSPITAL OR OTHER MEDICAL REPORT TO THE POLICE — Use for reports to the police of such items as gunshot wounds, drug overdoses, etc., where the hospital, doctor's office, or other medical facility is notifying the police without (necessarily) requesting that the police take any action.

660 REQUEST FOR A SPECIFIC POLICE UNIT, PROBLEM UNSPECIFIED — Use when a caller requests to speak with the juvenile officer, the family crisis unit, the animal control officer, etc., but does not otherwise tell the operator what the problem is that he/she wished to discuss. Calls for service coders could then follow up with a 31 response code (or perhaps an 09) and code the particular type of unit requested with the assignment code (see List of Agency and Police Unit Types).

Legal Procedures

710 PAPERS TO BE SERVED — A residual code for a general reference to the need to serve papers.

711 WARRANT TO BE SERVED — A request or response to a request for administering a writ authorizing an arrest of an individual to the individual, including traffic warrants.

712 SUBPOENA/SUMMONS TO BE SERVED — A request or response to a request about a legal document ordering a person to appear in court or other legal document such as an eviction notice or sheriff's note of closing a business establishment.

713 SEARCH WARRANT TO BE SERVED — Service of a search warrant.

720 ARREST PROCESSING/BOOKING — The process of processing (booking) an offender at police facilities. Includes fingerprinting, records checks, sobriety tests, breath/blood tests.
TRANSPORT PERSON IN CUSTODY — A request or the activity of transporting a prisoner from one facility to another. If you are coding an activity (no significant police-citizen interaction), use the appropriate activity code.

INTERROGATION — Interrogating a suspect (usually at the station after an arrest has been made).

COURT PROCEEDINGS — Any appearance before an officer of the court (judge, magistrate, prosecutor) to conduct legal process.

OBTAIN WARRANT — Officer requests or picks up a warrant for arrest/search/subpoena.

HEARING — Officer brings citizen before a judge or magistrate to file charges, set bail, or conduct other legal process.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDINGS — Officer appears before regulatory/administrative agency/official to conduct noncriminal legal proceedings.

Miscellaneous Problems

CIVIL CODE PROBLEMS/VIOLATIONS — Codes in this category include problems relating to state and local civil/regulatory codes.

BUSINESS REGULATIONS — Licensing and operation of businesses.

FIRE PREVENTION

LITTER, TRASH, REFUSE, AND PROPERTY APPEARANCE

PARKS AND RECREATION

STREETS AND PUBLIC WAYS

POLUITION, HEALTH, AND SANITATION

HOUSING

NUISANCE PROPERTY — Property that is a source of nuisances and disturbances. Use this category only if the concern is with the property and not specified people on the property.

NO PROBLEM ("ALL QUIET") — Code for a response to investigate a request made to the police officer where the officer indicates nothing is the matter (e.g., outcome of citizen asking to check on suspicious person, "Unable to locate..."
anyone*). Not to be used in coding calls for service. Use this also when citizen misinterprets a situation (e.g., what the citizen believes is a problem actually is not a problem).

811 NO CONTACT ("GONE ON ARRIVAL")

812 DON'T KNOW PROBLEM – Code when no indication is given other than to proceed to a specified location (e.g., "Proceed to 1st St. and wait until further instructions," or request for service is garbled, unintelligible, etc).

813 NO PROBLEM: Use this when the situation is no longer a problem (e.g., an encounter which appears to be a problem at the beginning of the encounter, but is no longer a problem at its conclusion)

820 COMPLAINT AGAINST A POLICE OFFICER – Note this change (see 821). This code should be used when a citizen complains about a police officer, and not about police service in general or in a particular case.

821 COMPLAINT ABOUT POLICE SERVICE – Use this code when the citizen's complaint is about police service and not about what a particular officer did (or did not do). e.g., "I've called three times already and no one has shown up yet," or "Why don't we ever see a patrol car out here."

830 INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION – Use this code for encounters that result from an officer engaging in an Internal Affairs Investigation.

840 COMPLIMENTS FOR POLICE – Code when individual has a compliment about a member of the police department (e.g., courageous police work, beyond the call of duty, courtesy, etc.).

850 CASUAL CONVERSATION – Use this code only if there is no apparent problem on the officer's or citizen's mind. Casual conversations unrelated to police work or solving problems fit into this category. Getting-to-know-you chats that have no problem focus should be included here.

851 PERSONAL BUSINESS – To be used exclusively for casual encounters where the officer is not engaged in any police business but is clearly engaged in an encounter for his/her personal benefit. This would include running personal errands, purchasing goods and services, ordering meals, spending time with family or close friends.

860 IRRATIONAL OR CRANK CALL TO POLICE – Any call for which the request/information provided by citizen literally makes no sense, is irrational, or is overtly a hoax. Do not use the code if there is any question about the authenticity of request/information or if any police
personnel indicates to you that the call is (will be found to be) groundless.

861  FALSE REPORT

870  OFFICER IN NEED OF AID/PROVIDE WEAPONS COVER — This is used where officer is dispatched to be back-up firepower in serious incident (e.g., apprehending a dangerous, armed criminal, holed-up armed robbers, sharpshooter needed).

Use this if there is a distress call to aid another officer (e.g., officer down, officer being assaulted, officer needs immediate emergency assistance)

871  BACK UP AN OFFICER - OTHERWISE UNSPECIFIED, NO EMERGENCY — Use this code where an officer is requested to back up another officer but no problem type is specified. Also there should be no mention of an emergency need for back up. If there is an emergency, need, it should be coded as 870, Officer in need of aid.

872  NEED AN OFFICER - PROBLEM NOT SPECIFIED — Use when an officer is instructed to meet another officer, but no mention of the problem to be dealt with is made.

874  ASSIST OTHER DEPARTMENT - PROBLEM NOT SPECIFIED — Use when an officer is instructed to assist another police department, but no mention of the problem to be dealt with is made.
APPENDIX F

OFFICER KNOWLEDGE OF CITIZEN

1. No knowledge at all. Citizen is a stranger.

2. Officer knows citizen, but not clear how well.

3. Officer recognizes citizen’s face or knows reputation, but no detailed knowledge.

4. Officer knows citizen by name and has a little knowledge of citizen, but not detailed

5. Officer knows citizen very well (personal background, address, friends, family, personal habits)
APPENDIX G

OFFICER ACTIVITIES BY CATEGORY
(collapsed activity categories)

1. Foot patrol
2. Motor patrol
3. Order maintenance
   - parades, demonstrations, crowd control
4. Crime related
   - warrant or subpoena service
   - attempt to locate suspect, witness, informant
   - search of crime scene
   - pursuit of fleeing suspect
   - search property
   - guard crime scene
5. Investigative
   - surveillance of person or address
   - check out situation/gone on arrival
6. Traffic
   - mobile or stationary traffic enforcement
7. Service
   - check on or fix road conditions
   - check on or fix property or equipment
   - escort
   - transport person
   - direct traffic or parade
   - medical or health service
8. Community-oriented policing service
   - public meetings
   - neighborhood/housing group meetings
   - civic association meetings
   - business group meetings
9. Administrative
   - general administrative
   - report writing
   - automobile maintenance, refueling, washing
   - transport other police
   - calibrate or check on equipment
- roll call

10. Administrative-crime
   - transport prisoner, witness, evidence
   - process evidence or property
   - meet with prosecutor about case
   - meet with judge about case
   - appear in court

11. Ordinance
    - parking
    - building codes
    - health/sanitation/trash

12. Information
    - general information gathering
    - police records search
    - other government records search
    - crime analysis
    - private sector data sources

13. En route/waiting
    - to dispatched assignment
    - to other location
    - to back-up another officer

14. Problem focused
    - situational problem focused activity
    - conduct research/inquiry into a problem

15. Meet non-police service personnel (NPSP)
    - government agency/officials
    - private sector agency/officials

16. Non-task/personal
    - personal business
    - meals, snacks, restroom breaks
    - personal errands, relaxation
    - meetings with other police-not business related

17. Meet other police (business related)
    - in person
    - by telephone or electronically
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APPENDIX H

ENCOUNTER PROBLEMS BY CATEGORY
(collapsed problems)

1. Order maintenance

public nuisance
drunk
disorderly
vagrancy
loitering
pornography
obscene activity
noise disturbance
peddling, begging
general argument
domestic argument
non-domestic argument
keep the peace
juvenile disturbance
neighbor trouble
labor-management problems
crowd control
parades/public events

2. Crime related

gambling
prostitution
harassment/stalking
family neglect/non support
child neglect
non payment of support
contributing to delinquency of a minor
juvenile runaway
search warrant to be served
officer in need of aid/Weapons cover
back up an officer
gang conflict
gang problem-general
drug violations
alcohol violation
illicit drugs-general
marijuana
cocaine/crack
other narcotics
paraphernalia
civil disorder
kidnap
physical injury inflicted by person
threatened physical injury
fight (physical)
domestic fight
non-domestic fight
gang fight
simple assault
domestic assault
non-domestic assault
aggravated assault
domestic aggravated assault
non domestic aggravated assault
suspected violator
flight from police
interference with police
weapons violation
robbery
attempted robbery
robbery of private citizen
attempted robbery of private citizen
robbery of financial institution
attempted robbery of financial institution
robbery of other commercial establishment
attempted robbery of other commercial establishment
sexual attack
attempted sexual attack
rape
attempted rape
child molestation
attempted child molestation
homicide
attempted homicide
civil rights violation
discovery of missing or stolen property
missing or stolen property
threat to take property
buying, receiving, or possessing stolen goods
motor vehicle theft
attempted motor vehicle theft
theft, unspecified
attempted theft, unspecified
theft from residence
attempted theft from residence
theft from commercial
attempted theft from commercial
shoplifting
attempted shop lifting
theft from motor vehicle
attempted theft from motor vehicle
purse snatched/pocket picked
attempted purse snatch/pocket picked
burglary
burglary residential
burglary commercial
unauthorized entry
trespassing
trespassing residential
trespassing public housing
trespassing commercial
unauthorized use of motor vehicle
break-in
attempted break-in
break-in residential
attempted break-in residential
break-in commercial
attempted break-in commercial
vandalism
vandalism residential
vandalism commercial
vandalism public property
vandalism motor vehicle
tampering with auto
arson
attempted arson
threatened arson
problems with money/credit/documents
forgery or counterfeiting
fraud or embezzlement
bad check/bad credit card
refuse to pay
unfair business practice
hit and run
leaving the scene
papers to be served
warrant to be served
subpoena/summons to be served

3. Investigative

alarm (not fire)
alarm (chronic false)
meet complainant
family trouble
suspicious person
prowler
gunshot
screams
suspicious circumstances
dead body
accidental death
suicide
attempted suicide
suspicious property condition
peculiar circumstance
suspicious motor vehicle
fire alarm
emergency-nature unspecified
interrogation
no problem “all quiet”
gone on arrival
don’t know problem—dispatch directed
situation no longer a problem
irrational or prank call to police
false report

4. Traffic

traffic accident
traffic accident—property damage only
traffic accident—personal injury
traffic fatality
road block
vehicle violation
parking violation
abandoned vehicle
equipment or inspection lacking
missing or improper plate/registration
routine vehicle check
traffic flow problems
traffic signal disorder
traffic obstruction
direct traffic
pedestrian control
road condition
moving violation
driving under the influence
excess speed

5. Service

missing person
medical assistance
“man down”
emergency medical transport
first aid
obstetric
mental disorder
invalid/disabled person
adult subject of police concern
juvenile subject of police concern
school safety
dangerous substance
damaged property
unintentionally damaged property
utility problem
environmental hazard
fire
fire in progress
fire alarm/smoke
fire in progress
landlord-tenant dispute
general request for service
lockout
request for surveillance
vacation check
commercial door check
store opening or closing call
escort
emergency escort
bank/money escort
funeral/parade escort
courier
animal problem
citizen wants information
other information (not crime related)
directions
officer wants to give information (not crime related)
return of lost or stolen property
return of stolen property
assist motorist
disabled vehicle
road directions

6. COP service

crime prevention information
fire prevention
litter, trash, property appearance
parks and recreation
streets and public ways
pollution, health, sanitation
housing
nuisance property
police-community relations

7. Administrative

administrative proceedings
internal affairs investigation

8. Administrative/crime

arrest/processing/booking
transport person in custody
court proceedings
obtain warrant
hearing
case-related crime information

9. Ordinance Enforcement

civil code violation
business regulations

10. Information gathering

crime-tip information
not crime-tip information
officer wants information
officer wants crime-tip information
officer wants non crime-tip information
general information problems

11. En route/waiting problem

12. Meet non-police service personnel problems

request for specific police unit (problem unspecified
assist other department (problem not specified)

13. Non-task/personal

casual conversation
personal business