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ABSTRACT

The trend toward community policing is currently popular among police, citizens and academics. This trend in policing involves a shift in focus from traditional reactive crime fighting toward a more proactive approach focusing on citizen concerns. Community policing involves not only a greater emphasis on citizens, but also changing the way policing is performed. Thus, it is expected that the daily activities of community police officers should differ from traditional police officers and that their activities should vary within cities depending on the unique characteristics of neighborhoods.

The present study examines the activities of both community oriented and traditional beat police officers across neighborhoods within a single city. It is an examination and comparison of the types of activities officers engage in during a typical day, whether officer activities vary across neighborhoods, and an examination of the factors that influence officer activities.

Overall, the findings from the analysis of workload are consistent with previous research on officers’ daily activities. Officers in Cincinnati appear to perform activities in similar proportions to officers in other cities studied. The comparison of community and beat officers reveal a number of significant differences between the two groups of officers.

To summarize, the typical day of a community police officer in Cincinnati looks different from the typical day of a beat officer. COP officers spend significantly more time on what are commonly considered community policing activities and significantly less of their day on some of the more traditional police activities (crime, traffic enforcement) when compared to beat officers. However, COP officers still spend a significant proportion of their day on traditional activities. The analysis of variation reveals that the sometimes explicit and always implicit assumption that community policing will vary across neighborhoods is largely unsupported by this analysis. Although some variation was detected, the extent of variation suggested by proponents of community policing is clearly not evident in Cincinnati. The multivariate models predicting the proportion of time officers spend on six different activities were somewhat surprising. The models overall are weak predictors of officer activities with few significant variables.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Community policing is the current watchword in policing and "has become, in the 1990s, the dominant strategy of policing" (Cordner, 1997:45; see also Rosenbaum and Lurigio, 1994; Eck and Rosenbaum, 1994). Kelling (1988) has suggested that there is a "quiet revolution" taking place in policing as more and more police agencies advocate the merits of community policing. This trend in policing involves a shift away from the traditional reactive crime fighting approach toward a more proactive approach focusing "on specific concerns of the community" (Webb and Katz, 1997:428; see also Mastrofski, Worden, and Snipes, 1995).

WHAT IS COMMUNITY POLICING?

Presently, there is considerable debate over what this strategy entails and how it is to be implemented (Cordner, 1997; Kratcoski and Dukes, 1995; Mastrofski et. al., 1995; Oliver and Bartgis, 1998). There are numerous theoretical pronouncements on community policing, and several common themes run throughout the various definitions. (Goldstein, 1987; Oliver and Bartgis, 1998; Seagrave, 1996; Riechers and Roberg, 1990; Rosenbaum and Lurigio, 1994). The major themes are increased interaction between police and citizens, increased citizen input, and responses tailored to specific community needs and desires (Alpert and Dunham, 1988; Alpert and Moore, 1993; Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), 1994; Cordner, 1997; Goldstein, 1987; Skogan, 1990; Webb and Katz, 1997).

Proponents of community policing suggest that it is necessary for the police to work together with citizens (BJA, 1994; Goldstein, 1987; Reiss and Tonry, 1986; Skolnick and
Bayley, 1987; Whittaker, 1980). Community policing entails not only a greater concern for citizens as the police audience, but also changing the way policing is performed. For instance, policing has historically been reactive, with police activities focused on law enforcement responses to criminal occurrences. In contrast, community policing proposes using a much broader variety of policing strategies.

Further, it is suggested that the police must tailor their services to the unique needs of the communities they serve (Alpert and Dunham, 1988, 1986; Alpert, Dunham and Piquero, 1997; Alpert and Moore, 1993; BJA, 1994; Webb and Katz, 1997; see also Cordner, 1997; Skogan, 1990), or in other words, “customize police services to the needs of each community” (BJA, 1994:51). “It [COP] promises that police will be responsive to the expressed needs of the communities they serve” (Skogan, 1990:90). As such, it is inferred that the daily activities of officers should vary depending on “unique characteristics [that] can aid the police officer in increasing his/her effectiveness in different neighborhoods” (Alpert and Dunham, 1988:121). For instance, community police officers assigned to a largely commercial, retail neighborhood may engage in frequent foot patrol to discourage the victimization (pick pockets, purse snatching) of customers moving from store to store. Whereas officers working in a predominately residential neighborhood may be more concerned with burglaries of homes.

Daily activities of community police officers might include such things as foot patrol, problem-solving activities, attending community meetings, networking, and various other activities, including traditional law enforcement. Essentially, community police officers should engage in more service and order maintenance activities than law enforcement
activities (Mastrofski, 1988; Kratcoski and Dukes, 1995; Mastrofski, Worden and Snipes, 1995; Greene and Taylor, 1988; Oliver, 1998).

POPULARITY OF COMMUNITY POLICING

The growing popularity of community policing can be seen in the number of departments implementing community policing, the requests of citizens for community policing, and the media attention focused on it by politicians and advocates (Maguire, Kuhns, Uchida, and Cox, 1997; Oliver and Bartgis, 1998; Rosenbaum and Lurigio, 1994; see also Skogan, 1990). The popularity of community policing strategies among citizens is evidenced by incidents such as in Flint, MI where citizens twice voted for a tax increase to keep foot patrol officers (Kelling, 1988). It can also be seen in Cincinnati, OH where citizens raised money to supply officers with bikes for bicycle patrol in neighborhoods. The popularity of COP among politicians is nowhere more evident than in President Clinton's anticrime policy which mandates that 100,000 new police officers funded by the 1994 crime bill must be engaged in community policing (Cordner, 1995; Rosenbaum and Lurigio, 1994).

Despite its growth and popularity we have very little information on variation in community police officer activities within jurisdictions. We do know that the activities of community police officers vary across jurisdictions, but not whether they vary within cities and what role, if any, community characteristics play in determining the specific activities engaged in by police officers. In fact, the underlying assumption that community policing varies within a city has never been subjected to empirical scrutiny, though this remains an assumption about how it should be implemented rather than how it is being implemented (see Riechers and Roberg, 1990). Indeed, despite the suggestions that community police officers
should respond to the unique characteristics of the communities they serve, we do not yet have a clear picture of the relationship between neighborhoods and the activities of community policing officers. For example, does the socioeconomic status or the land use patterns of a neighborhood influence the types of activities of community officers.

We do, however, have reason to believe that officers may not vary their activities across neighborhoods. Alpert and Dunham's (1988) research into neighborhoods and policing in Miami "indicates that police in the different neighborhoods apparently do not have different styles of policing to match the unique characteristics of the neighborhoods" (1988:120). If this is indeed the case, then a central tenet of community policing may not be being incorporated into the street level implementation of this policing strategy.

PRESENT STUDY

The present study examines the activities of both community oriented and traditional beat officers across neighborhoods within a single city. Further, it will examine the factors which influence the activities of officers during their typical work day. Thus, the present study will permit an examination and comparison of the types of activities officers engage in during a typical day. It will also allow for a determination of whether officer activities vary across neighborhoods. Further, if variation exists, it will permit an assessment of whether variation is unique to community policing or is a characteristic of traditional policing as well. Lastly, including characteristics of neighborhoods and officers will permit an assessment of the influence these factors play in determining the activities of both traditional and community police officers. Thus, it will help to determine if unique characteristics of neighborhoods are in fact influencing the activities of officers as suggested by proponents of community oriented
policing.

IMPORTANCE OF STUDY

The issues addressed by this study are important for a number of reasons. First, many departments claim to be implementing community policing, including those receiving federal funds specifically for community policing programs. If we are to assess the current status of implementation then we must address the central tenet of differential policing based on neighborhood characteristics.

Second, it is important to know how street level officers are implementing community policing. Lispsky (1980) notes that the behavior of street level bureaucrats when aggregated make up agency policy. Police administrators therefore need to know what community police officers are doing in different neighborhoods in order to evaluate the impact of community policing on citizens and neighborhoods and allow for adjustments to its implementation (see BJA, 1994). Alpert and Dunham (1988:141) suggest that feedback and adjustments are necessary in any project such as community policing. After acquiring information police administrators then need to use this information to “deal with any incongruence between the neighborhood context and police policies, strategies and styles”.

Third, examining the factors associated with officer activities will contribute towards a theory explaining the behavior of police officers. Academics need to become more knowledgeable of the activities of police officers to assist in the development of a theory explaining police behavior (Worden, 1989). Indeed, research on police behavior has focused almost exclusively on a very narrow range of police behavior. Extant research has mostly examined the outcomes of police-citizen encounters (decisions to arrest) with little focus on
the activities which precede and may in some cases precipitate an encounter with a citizen. Further, if officer activities do not vary across neighborhoods, examining the factors associated with officer activities may help to identify obstacles to differential policing across neighborhoods.

In summary, community oriented policing is extremely popular among academics, police and citizens. Despite problems with defining community policing most definitions include several major themes. Included among these major themes is the issue of variation in police officer activities based on the unique characteristics of neighborhoods. In order to fully assess the status of the implementation of community policing it is necessary to determine if officers vary their daily activities across different neighborhoods. In addition, it is important to understand the role played by both community and individual characteristics in explaining officer behavior. The present study will address both of these issues by examining officer activities across neighborhoods in a single city and by examining the influence of community and individual characteristics on officer activities.

Chapter 2 will address the issue of defining community oriented policing and review the literature on community oriented policing, giving special attention to variation in activities of police officers under this new policing strategy. Chapter 2 will also review studies which have attempted to explain the behavior of police officers. In Chapter 3 the data sources, variables, and measures used will be described.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The present study focuses on variation in community policing activities. As such, four critical substantive areas must be addressed to more fully understand the subject: 1) community oriented policing (COP), 2) COP activities, 3) variation across neighborhoods, and 4) correlates of police behavior. To cover and review these four components the following tasks will be undertaken. First, the chapter will begin by describing the development and evolution of community policing, followed by an attempt to conceptualize community policing by reviewing the literature which has tackled the task of defining this concept. Second, a discussion of the activities of community police officers as portrayed in the theoretically based literature on community policing follows, with a review of empirical studies of community police officer activities. The third section reviews the literature on variation in police behavior. Finally, since this study attempts to explain the activities of police officers the correlates of police behavior are discussed.

EVOLUTION OF COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING

A knowledge of the history and development of an idea or movement provides a firmer understanding and better orientation than simple definition (see Johnson and Wolfe, 1996). As such, in an attempt to better understand community policing as related to officer activities and variation a discussion of its development and evolution is undertaken prior to defining the concept.

Many authors have discussed the development of community oriented policing as an outgrowth of the problems encountered with traditional reform era policing. The reform or
professional era of policing began in the early 1920s and 1930s. During this time period, police reform was closely linked with the wider movement to reform local politics (Fogelson, 1977; see also Eck and Spelman, 1987). In an attempt to wrest control of the police from local political machines and increase the efficiency and effectiveness of police, reformers pushed for changes in the function and structure of police (Fogelson, 1977). Included in these changes were a narrowing of police functions to focus on the control of serious crime, increased use of technology, centralization of the organization and the professionalization of officers (Eck and Spelman, 1987; Fogelson, 1977; Kelling and Moore, 1988).

The changes in policing brought about by the reform movement resulted in what Eck and Spelman (1987) refer to as incident-driven policing (rapid response, preventive patrol and follow-up investigation). That is, policing in which police officers respond or react to incidents as they occur. For example, patrol officers are encouraged to stay in their cars and wait for radio calls and detectives are encouraged to solve individual cases and thus wait for a crime to occur and attempt to solve or clear the crime (Eck and Spelman, 1987). Kelling and Moore (1988:104) note that while the reform strategy was successful during the 1940s and 1950s, it "was unable to adjust to the changing social circumstances [i.e., urban riots, rising crime, war protests] of the 1960s and 1970s."

Problems with police-citizen relations encountered during the 1960s and the rise of social science research findings contributed to already growing skepticism concerning traditional police practices (Eck and Spelman, 1987; 1987b; see also Skogan, 1990). The social upheaval of the 1960s made apparent the problematic relations between the police and many citizens (Eck and Spelman, 1987; see also Eck and Spelman 1987b). As already noted,
incident-driven policing encouraged officers to stay in their cars, and by doing so "patrol officers lost contact with residents of their beats who were neither offenders nor victims" (Eck and Spelman, 1987). Social science research conducted on various police strategies (preventive patrol, rapid response, detectives) and rising crime rates led to the questioning of incident-driven policing's effectiveness in controlling crime (Eck and Spelman, 1987). Thus, "The limitations of the professional model of policing and its apparent inability to prevent crime led the police and citizens to consider alternatives to the police as professional crime fighters and citizens as passive recipients of police services" (Rosenbaum, 1988; 1978).

A variety of different alternatives have arisen to deal with the problems of police-citizen relations and the apparent inability of police to control crime. Public relations units, task forces, team policing and various other initiatives have been tried (Eck and Spelman, 1987). More recently, community policing and problem-solving policing have been introduced as ways to overcome the problems of traditional incident-driven policing. Community oriented policing has moved to the forefront of these alternatives to traditional incident-driven policing.

COMMUNITY ORIENTED POLICING

Defining community policing has proven to be a difficult problem for both researchers and practitioners. As already stated, while many definitions exist for community policing, there are common elements contained in most definitions and they seem to suggest that community policing involves changing the nature of the police mission (see Hoover, 1992; Oliver and Bartgis, 1998; Reisig and Giacomazzi, 1998). Despite these common elements, the various conceptualizations make defining community policing difficult.
A variety of definitions focus on community policing as a particular program, such as, foot patrol or neighborhood watch (Seagrave, 1996). Police agencies and city administrators often cite the use of specific programs or tactics as evidence of implementation of community policing (see Rosenbaum and Lurigio, 1994). In other words, many authors have portrayed COP as encompassing certain types of activities. Essentially, these authors are suggesting that these activities and programs are community oriented policing or that police agencies which look or act in a certain way are community oriented. “Rather than concretely define community policing, writers often describe it by enumerating features commonly found in community policing programs” (Police Executive Research Forum (PERF), 1996:3).

Partially as a result of these types of definitions and claims, others have suggested that the term community policing is nothing more than a rallying cry and “in many respects lacks substance” (Seagrave, 1996:8). These authors note the use of the term by police agencies to describe any program or even traditional police practices (Maguire, Kuhns, Uchida and Cox, 1997; see also Seagrave, 1996).

Still others have suggested that community policing is a philosophy rather than a strategy or organizational rearrangement (Reisig and Giacomazzi, 1998; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990). Reisig and Giacomazzi (1998:547) state that “the community policing movement represents a philosophical shift in the operational mission of policing”. In other words, community policing is a philosophy regarding the police mission which guides the police organization and determines various strategic, tactical and organizational dimensions of the organization. Seagrave (1996:5) states that philosophical definitions of community policing are the most common and that “community policing is most broadly regarded as a
philosophy". Throughout most of these theoretical pronouncements of community policing a number of recurring themes are present.

The common themes throughout most definitions of community policing include a partnership between the police and the community, citizen input, and differential policing based on characteristics of the individual neighborhoods being served (Alpert and Dunham, 1988; Alpert and Moore, 1993; Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA), 1994; Cordner, 1997; Goldstein, 1987; Skogan, 1990; Webb and Katz, 1997). The partnership between police and citizens includes increased police-citizen interaction and citizen input in setting police priorities (BJA, 1994; Cordner, 1995; Skogan, 1990; Webb and Katz, 1997). Increased interaction between police and citizens implies that citizens and the police will work together (BJA, 1994; Goldstein, 1987; Reiss and Tonry, 1986; Skolnick and Bayley, 1987). Police and citizens working together is hypothesized to lead to greater citizen input (Webb and Katz, 1997). In turn, this increased citizen input should lead the police to tailor strategies to the unique characteristics of individual neighborhoods, as "such a relationship, between the police and the public, enables the police to focus on specific concerns of the community" (Webb and Katz, 1997:8). In focusing on community concerns it is anticipated that officers will engage in activities that are intended to address the concerns of neighborhood residents. Thus, a central theme of community policing and the focus of this study is policing activities tailored to the unique characteristics of neighborhoods.

Problem Oriented Policing

A problem often encountered when defining community policing is distinguishing between community policing and problem-oriented policing. The two have similarities and
are often discussed interchangeably, yet they are distinct approaches (Hoover, 1992; Eck and Spelman, 1987; 1987b). Langworthy and Travis (1999:306) state that the "essential difference between problem-oriented policing and community-oriented policing is the role of the public". Community-policing relies on citizens to play a central role in helping the police to define problems and seek out solutions. In problem-oriented policing the police define the problems and use citizens as a resource rather than coproducers who help to define and solve problems. Langworthy and Travis (1999) classify problem-oriented policing as proactive in that the police proactively define problems, and community-policing as reactive in that the police respond to citizens' definitions of problems. Eck and Spelman state that "problem oriented policing relies on and supports community oriented policing, but it is not synonymous with community oriented policing" (1987:511).

**Problem Solving**

Police agencies involved in the implementation of community policing often encourage officers to engage in problem solving activities as well as community policing activities. It is necessary to understand the distinction between problem oriented policing and problem solving activities. Confusion arises when problem-solving is discussed within the context of community policing. For example, the Bureau of Justice Assistance (1994) places problem-solving as a core component of community policing. However,

An important distinction must be made between problem-solving and problem-oriented policing. Problem-solving is a tactic used by individuals or small teams of officers to address a specific problem, but it may or may not be encouraged and guided by the agency... Problem-oriented policing is an agency-wide strategy to encourage and guide all its members to engage in problem-solving. A primary mission of problem-oriented policing agencies is the effective handling of problems (Eck and Spelman, 1987:5; italics added).
Problem-oriented policing, therefore, can be viewed as a distinct philosophy apart from community policing, and problem-solving as a process or component of community policing (Eck and Spelman, 1987). According to the Cincinnati Police Division (CPD) community police officer position classification the Cincinnati Police Division views problem-solving as a component of community policing. As such, problem-solving will be referred to throughout this study as one component of community policing.

In sum, community policing arose from the problems encountered with traditional incident-driven policing, the research revolution in social science, and the public perception that traditional police practices were ineffective. The popularity of community policing has not resolved the conceptual problems associated with it and no clear definition currently exists. However, a number of common themes are found throughout most of the literature which attempt to define community policing and suggest that it is a philosophy. However it is defined, tailored policing based on neighborhood characteristics is a core component. As such, the activities of community police officers should vary across neighborhoods based on the characteristics of those individual neighborhoods. The next section will address community policing activities.

IMPLEMENTING COMMUNITY POLICING AT THE STREET-LEVEL

To implement community policing, officers must engage in concrete everyday activities that embody the community policing philosophy. It is important to examine the implementation of community policing by individual officers at the street-level, because how they implement it through their activities determines the content of COP in that jurisdiction (Lipsky, 1980). This section will first define police activities in order to operationalize this
construct for the present study. Second, a review of the types of activities the literature suggests community police officers should be engaged in during a typical day will be presented. In other words, following a definition of police activities, the second section will begin by examining what community police officers should do (according to advocates) versus what research suggests they actually do during a typical day.

**Police Activities**

The present study is concerned with the daily activities of police officers under community policing. Prior research concerning police activities has failed to define this concept. Studies on the daily work of officers often refer to what officers do variously as tasks and activities. Rather than define these terms they are often left to the readers' common sense notion of what these terms mean. In addition, these terms often appear interchangeably in the literature. The intent is not to criticize prior work on police tasks and activities, as this body of research has provided valuable information about what officers do during a typical day. At the same time, if the objective here is to more fully understand what it is officers do when they engage in COP and traditional policing in the era of community policing, it is necessary to properly define what is meant by police activities.

Activities can be conceptualized as a series of related groups of tasks engaged in to accomplish some underlying objective, or as groupings of individual tasks officers engage in during a day. More specifically, every act in which an officer engages can be considered a task (e.g., handcuffing a suspect, driving). Related tasks with the same underlying objective can be aggregated to make up activities. For instance, the tasks of using radar to identify speeding cars, pulling over speeding cars, and writing a traffic ticket all contribute to the
activity of traffic enforcement. In other words, a series of tasks which are related in time and achieve a singular purpose become an activity. Multiple tasks therefore can make up similar types of activities. At the same time a single task can also be an activity. For instance, an officer can radar speeding cars, never write a traffic ticket, yet still be engaged in traffic enforcement. As such, an activity may be composed of similar groups of tasks or an individual task. A police officer’s entire working day can be broken down into its individual activities or into groups of activities in order to understand what it is they do.

COP and Police Functions

Community policing at the street-level is generally described as either individual activities, such as foot patrol or attending a community meeting, or it is classified into groups of activities such as order maintenance, law enforcement, and service. Community policing is generally viewed as a reaction to the failings of incident-driven policing which focused heavily on the enforcement of laws over the delivery of services in non-legal situations and the maintenance of order (see Eck and Spelman, 1987). Oliver suggests that community policing at the street-level calls for a reorientation of the three styles of policing outlined by Wilson (1968; see Oliver, 1998).

The three functions outlined by Wilson are the delivery of service, law enforcement, and order maintenance (essentially three functions composed of groups of related activities). Service delivery includes activities such as assisting stranded motorists and giving directions, while the other two functions involve incidents directly related to law violations (Wilson, 1968; for review see Langworthy and Travis, 1999). Langworthy and Travis (1999:13) summarize Wilson’s (1968) other two functions concisely when they state, “the latter set [of
functions] includes law enforcement (when the police base their actions on the law) and order maintenance (when they do not rely on the law as the primary justification for action)."

In community policing, order maintenance and service activities should outnumber law enforcement activities of police officers (Greene and Taylor, 1988; Kratcoski and Dukes, 1995; Oliver, 1998; Mastrofski, 1988; Mastrofski, Worden and Snipes, 1995). Mastrofski, Worden and Snipes (1995:541) point out that community policing clearly "rejects law enforcement as the single core function of police." The community police officer should act not only as a crime fighter, making arrests and answering calls, but also as a community problem-solver and ombudsman (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990). If community policing involves a reorientation of Wilson's (1968) three functions, then what types of activities will community police officers perform?

Theoretical Perspectives on Community Policing Activities

Some authors have attempted to answer this question and give direction to police agencies and officers implementing community policing. These authors have listed various daily activities which embody the philosophy of community policing. In an attempt to guide police agencies in implementing community policing Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994) developed a detailed list of categories of community police officer activities (see Table 1 below). This list provides some insight into the types of activity categories which they suggest community police officers should be engaged.
Table 1. Community Police Officer Activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law Enforcement</td>
<td>Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directed Patrol</td>
<td>Visiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Involvement</td>
<td>Recruiting and Supervising Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying and Prioritizing Problems</td>
<td>Proactive Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting</td>
<td>Targeting Special Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving</td>
<td>Targeting Disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing</td>
<td>Networking with the Private Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicating</td>
<td>Networking with Non-Profit Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Resolution</td>
<td>Administrative/Professional Duties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1994.

Mastrofski (1992) also lists a variety of activities that community police officers can undertake during a typical work day. He lists surveys of residents, park-and-walk patrol, neighborhood substations, involvement with citizen groups, and problem-solving. In sum, Mastrofski's (1992) and Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux's (1994) lists support other (Greene and Taylor, 1988; Mastrofski, 1988; Mastrofski, et al., 1995; Oliver, 1998) contentions that one would expect COP officers to spend more time in order maintenance and service activities than law enforcement activities. Specifically, one would expect COP officers to spend more time on some of the activities suggested above, for example, problem-solving, foot patrol, activities involving citizens and helping activities among others, and less time on law enforcement and traffic activities.

In addition to listing activities, some have provided theoretical perspectives on COP that imply that officers will have to engage in certain activities to carry out the COP
philosophy. For example, Manning (1988) suggests that community police officers should work as a link between citizens and other governmental agencies. In order to do this officers may spend more time in activities which require engaging citizens and other government service employees. Further, authors imply that officers are expected to help organize citizens around crime and quality of life issues (Goldstein, 1987; Skolnick and Bayley, 1987). These types of objectives will also require changes in police officer activities. While these authors do not directly list the activities of community police officers, they do imply that officers will engage in different activities under community policing.

Whether authors directly list activities officers should engage in or suggest the types of objectives officers need to accomplish (which implies different activities) all of these authors are suggesting that community police officers will spend their day engaged in activities which differ from traditional police officers.

EMPIRICAL STUDIES OF COP OFFICER ACTIVITIES

Although authors have outlined the types of activities community police officers should undertake, and police agencies around the country rally behind the cry of community policing “we [still] know remarkably little about what it [community policing] means to the work of the street-level officer” (Mastrofski, 1992:23). That is, few studies have empirically examined the daily activities of community police officers (Mastrofski, 1992; see also Cordner, 1995). Still, this limited but expanding body of research has provided information on activities or what officers do when implementing COP.

It is argued that community police officers will engage in different activities than traditional beat officers (Frank, Brandl, and Watkins, 1997). However, as already suggested
we have limited information regarding the activities of community police officers. Although our knowledge is limited, there are a handful of studies specifically examining community police officer tasks and activities.

In their study of the amount of time community police officers in Cleveland, Ohio spent on various activities, Kratcoski and Dukes (1995) used six categories of activities. They divided activities up into 1) total time, 2) administrative time, 3) time spent in direct contact and communication with citizens, 4) active patrol (both foot and motor patrol), 5) amount of time spent issuing citations and towing autos, and 6) number of felony and misdemeanor arrests, traffic citations, moving misdemeanors, parking tickets, summons and radio calls. Using duty-logs, they examined the amount of time spent by community police officers on each of these different categories of activities.

"To our surprise, we found that time use by neighborhood police officers was much like that reported by many researchers for district officers during the past two decades with the notable exception that [a considerable amount of] time is dedicated to communication with citizens" (Kratcoski and Dukes, 1995:161). Community police officers in Cleveland spent approximately 21 percent of their shift in communication with citizens. The top quartile of the distribution, however, ranged from 2 to 7 ½ hours communicating with citizens. In other words, the distribution was skewed with a small number of officers accounting for a large portion of the time spent communicating with community residents. The majority of time recorded in duty-logs was spent on administrative matters. Time spent patrolling (both foot and auto patrol) accounted for approximately 19 percent of an average shift. Overall, administrative, communicating with citizens and patrolling accounted for 97 percent of
community police officers’ shifts. The remaining three percent fell into the categories of responsive law enforcement and time spent making arrests and issuing citations.

Although this study does provide some information about the daily activities of community police officers in a single city, its broad general categories may mask certain activities and it does not provide any information regarding variation across neighborhoods. By collapsing all activities into six broad categories we do not know if a small number of activities are responsible for the findings regarding a particular category. For instance, the category of law enforcement includes felony and misdemeanor arrests, traffic citations, moving misdemeanors, parking tickets, issuing and serving summons and radio calls. It is very likely that activities such as writing traffic and parking tickets will heavily outnumber felony and misdemeanor arrests and thus dominate this category. Further, the use of activity logs relies on officers’ cooperation, honesty, and interest in reporting of activities and times (Cordner, 1979). These logs are designed to allow supervisors to review the work of police officers and, as such, officers may not wish to report activities or the use of time which would reflect poorly on them to supervisors (Cordner, 1979; see also, Greene and Klockars, 1991). Thus, these logs may be biased toward activities which officers believe supervisors expect of them as community police officers.

Travis and Sanders, (1998) using surveys of police departments and task analysis surveys of both community police officers and traditional beat officers in Ohio from 1981 and 1996, examined the daily work activities of officers across departments and years. The task analysis survey was administered to police officers and asked respondents to report the frequency with which they engaged in 24 different tasks during the previous 12 months
(response options included never done, once a year/less, several times a year, monthly, weekly, and daily). They found that community police officers responding to the 1996 survey "report higher frequency of involvement in a range of community policing activities than do other officers" (Travis and Sanders, 1998:28). For instance, they found that COP officers reported a higher frequency of involvement in representing departments with other organizations, patrol on foot, giving directions, providing various types of information to citizens, and visiting schools. This study provides insight into the daily work routines of community police officers across jurisdictions in Ohio and suggests that community officers perform different activities than traditional beat officers. However, due to the nature of the data collection (surveys) the researchers were limited to examining a restricted range of activities. Further, it does not provide information on variation within departments.

Using data collected during observations of police officers in Cincinnati, Frank, Brandl, and Watkins (1997) examined the daily work activities of community police officers. They classified into thirty-five categories the daily activities of both traditional beat officers and community oriented police officers and examined the frequency with which officers engaged in these various categories of activities. They also collapsed the thirty-five categories into nine more general groupings similar to those commonly used in research examining officer activities. Thus, they avoided the problems of relying on officers for information and the use of broad categories which may mask activities.

Similar to Travis and Sanders (1998) they found that the daily activities of community police officers differed from those of traditional beat officers. They note that "the findings show that neighborhood officers engage in a broader range of non-traditional police activities
than do patrol officers” (Frank et al., 1997:725). Patrol officers performed more crime-related tasks than community officers and community officers performed more service and problem solving activities than beat officers. They concluded that the types of activities and the frequency of performance differed between community and beat officers in Cincinnati. This study, like the others reviewed here, provides some insight into the types of activities community police officers engage in during a typical day. Further, the authors suggest “that ‘community policing’ is not uniformly delivered across neighborhoods” and that this may be influenced at least in part by citizen demands and characteristics of neighborhoods (Frank et al., 1997:725). Thus, this study suggests that, in Cincinnati at least, the central theme of differential policing across neighborhoods may be being implemented.

In contrast to these three studies many other studies are valuable because they provide anecdotal evidence of what COP officers do. These project descriptions and evaluations provide a source of information concerning the daily activities of community police officers (Frank et. al., 1997).

Similar to Travis and Sanders (1998) and Frank et. al. (1997) these studies note that community police officers often engage in community-based service activities, such as, organizing block watches, giving school lectures and attending community meetings (see Brown and Wycoff, 1986; Farrell, 1988; Lasley, Vernon and Dery, 1995; Wycoff, 1988). Crime analysis (see Skogan, 1998; Babcock, 1996; Butler, 1996) and safety programs (see Kratcoski and Noonan, 1995) are also an often noted activity of community police officers. Travis and Sanders (1998) also found that community police officers in their sample reported a greater frequency of analysis of crime and accident statistics than traditional police
officers. Problem-solving is an integral part of many implementations of COP and as such many studies cite the problem-solving activities of officers (see Babcock, 1996; Barrett, 1996; Berry, 1996; Butler, 1996; Skogan, 1998; Young, 1996). Foot patrol is also an often noted activity and is discussed in case studies of Chicago, Santa Barbara, Edmonton, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, Delray Beach and Philadelphia (see Barrett, 1996; Berry, 1996; Butler, 1996; Hawkins, 1996; Lasley et. al., 1995; Skogan, 1998; Wiatrowski, 1995). In addition to the activities above there are a variety of other types of activities (directed patrol, community surveys, newsletters, bike patrol) which appear less often in the case study literature (see Babcock, 1996; Barrett, 1996; Butler, 1996; Lasley et. al., 1995; Young, 1996; Skogan, 1998). Overall, these single site studies suggest that COP officers are encouraged to perform a broad array of nontraditional activities.

These are not systematic studies of the proportion of time spent engaging in COP. Rather, they are merely descriptions of the types of activities that officers engage in when they implement COP. Unfortunately, we do not know the frequency with which they engage in these activities or if there are differences between COP officers and traditional officers. These are only used to inform, not to provide a detailed analysis such as this study undertakes.

The studies discussed in this section suggest that community police officers may engage in somewhat different activities than research has shown traditional police officers perform. In addition, Frank et al. (1997) suggest that community police officers may be engaging in different activities across neighborhoods, however this is only a tentative statement since only this one study discussed in the previous section attempted to examine this issue (see also Alpert and Dunham, 1988). There are, however, a number of studies
which examine variation in the delivery of police services across and within jurisdictions. Since the primary focus of this study is variation in community police officer activities across neighborhoods within a single jurisdiction the next section will examine the literature on variation in police behavior.

VARIATION IN THE DELIVERY OF SERVICES

As noted previously, differential policing based on neighborhood characteristics is a central theme of community policing (Alpert and Dunham, 1988; Alpert and Moore, 1993; BJA, 1994; Cordner, 1997; Goldstein, 1987; Webb and Katz, 1997). It is an assumption regarding how community policing should be implemented that has yet to be rigorously tested. Indeed, there has been only a limited quantity of research focusing on variation in community police officer behavior.

At the same time, there is some research which suggests the implementation of COP does vary across jurisdictions (see Weisel and Eck, 1994). Mastrofski (1993:74) states that there are “many ways community policing might be performed”, and Riechers and Roberg (1990:106) support this when they note, “community policing programs vary from city to city”. In fact, a recent survey of law enforcement agencies regarding community policing practices found variation in the implementation of community policing across regions (Maguire, Kuhns, Uchida, and Cox, 1997). Still, research on variation across and within jurisdictions in COP activities is still in its infancy. One source of information regarding the activities of community police officers, however, lies in single city process evaluations and case studies of community policing. The following section begins with a brief examination of some of the case studies of major implementations of community policing, followed by a
review of the research on variation in traditional police behavior.

Case Studies

Although case studies of police agencies implementing community policing do not focus specifically on the daily activities of officers they do discuss generally the activities of officers in their descriptions of single city programs. Thus, as in the previous section, case studies can provide some information regarding the types of activities engaged in by community police officers in various police agencies. By comparing the descriptions across cities these case studies can also begin to provide some insight into variation by looking for commonalities and differences.

Examining case studies it is apparent that activities such as problem-solving, foot patrol, attending community meetings, and collaborating with other agencies are common tasks for COP officers across many jurisdictions. Activities such as bike patrol, crime analysis, crime prevention, community surveys, newsletters, youth activities, and holding seminars are mentioned more sporadically in the case studies examined. For example, activities such as attending community meetings and visiting schools are noted in many case studies (see Babcock, 1996; Barrett, 1996; Berry, 1996; Brown and Wycoff, 1986; Butler, 1996; Farrell, 1988; Sadd and Grinc, 1994; Wycoff, 1988; Young, 1996). In addition, problem-solving activities are almost always listed in case studies (see Babcock, 1996; Barrett, 1996; Berry, 1996; Butler, 1996; Hawkins, 1996; Skogan, 1990, 1998; Weisel and Eck, 1994; Young, 1996). Other types of activities are listed somewhat less often, such as, crime analysis (see Skogan, 1998; Babcock, 1996; Butler, 1996), bike patrol (see Skogan, 1998; Young, 1996; Butler, 1996) and recreational and youth programs (see Skogan, 1998;
Farrell, 1988). In addition to these commonly listed activities a variety of other activities are noted in various jurisdictions. For instance, enforcement of housing code violations (Kratcoski and Noonan, 1995) and directed patrol (Barrett, 1996; Skogan, 1990) are mentioned.

Although these studies suggest variation across jurisdictions in the activities of community police officers a qualifier is needed. Researchers in these cases studies may not have enumerated all of the activities engaged in by community police officers in these cities. Since they are not systematic studies of officer activities, but rather general descriptions of the agency's implementation of COP, many activities engaged in by officers may have been left out of the descriptions. As such, these studies may only provide information on some of the activities of officers which the authors decided to include as examples of COP activities. However, the activities mentioned in case studies occurred often enough that they were reported to or observed by researchers and researchers considered them noteworthy enough to mention. As such, these studies provide some insight into the types of community policing activities across jurisdictions. However, they do not catalog all activities or the frequency of activities officers engaged in during a work day. In other words, they do not provide insight into the typical working day of a community police officer.

In sum, when reviewing descriptions of the implementation of community policing in various settings it appears that these studies, when taken together, support the contention that the types of activities of community policing officers vary across jurisdictions. However, they tell us nothing about variation within jurisdictions and are not systematic studies of variation in police officer behavior.
Variation in Traditional Police Officer Behavior

Interest in variation in police officer behavior started long before the community policing movement. Indeed, in referring to the Scottish police, Michael Banton (1964:49) noted that “one of the most striking features . . . is the great variety of tasks performed by policemen”. Supporting Banton’s statement, Goldstein (1987:15) states that “line officers have always made use of a wide range of alternatives for getting their job done”. One of the early systematic examinations of variation in police behavior was done by Wilson (1968) in which he typologized police departments based on the behavior of officers. He suggested that the style of policing varied across departments based on the political style of the local government. Since that time a variety of researchers have noted variation in police services.

While some have suggested that differences in organizational structure and practices result in variation in police behavior, others have suggested that variety in police behavior is the result of differences between individual officers (Bittner, 1967; Brown, 1981; Muir 1977; Walsh, 1985). For example, Bittner (1967) suggested that officers’ use of discretion to engage in different activities reflected a desire to maintain order, while Mastrofski, Worden, and Snipes (1995) suggest that officers essentially use discretion to do what they believe is best. Other authors have suggested that officer personalities or working styles account for variation in behavior (Brown, 1981; Mastrofski, 1981; Muir, 1977; see also Walsh, 1985).

Still others contend that it is the environment or context in which police work occurs which accounts for variation in behavior (see Bayley and Mendelsohn, 1969). “The observation that police conduct in similar situations varies by type of residential area is not new” (Miller and Bryant, 1993:136). For example, Banton (1964) noted that police behavior
varied across different neighborhoods. Ostrom, Parks, and Whittaker (1978) also noted that 
variety in service delivery reflected varying needs of communities, and in a study of officer 
discretion to arrest using vignettes Powell (1990) found that police from different regions of 
the country used their discretion differently.

Meagher (1985:37) states that “there has been a tendency to almost universally accept 
the maxim that policing is dissimilar according to agency types and jurisdictional 
characteristics”. However, he finds that there are commonalities or core tasks which all 
police officers on patrol engage in frequently. Nonetheless, Meagher himself finds support 
for the notion that policing does vary across different jurisdictions. Consistent with Meagher 
(1985), Slovak (1986) finds no reason for surprise that police work varies from place to place 
since contextual factors previously discussed all exert influences upon police work. If, as 
these authors have suggested, there is spatial variation in police behavior both across and 
within jurisdictions then what factors account for this variation?

CORRELATES OF POLICE BEHAVIOR

The section that follows reviews the literature on determinants of police officer 
behavior. Similar to the prior discussion on variation in officer behavior, research concerning 
the correlates of officer behavior has not focused on community policing officers, but instead 
on the activities of traditional police officers. More specifically, this research has focused 
primarily on officer interactions involving decisions to arrest, engage in service or order 
maintenance (see Riksheim and Chermak, 1993). The research to date has ignored the 
behavior of police officers which may precede and in some cases precipitate an encounter with 
a citizen. For example, an encounter with a citizen involving a traffic citation is most likely
preceded by the officer engaging in some sort of traffic enforcement activity, such as, using radar to detect speeding motorists. The present study explores the behavior of police officers which often leads to interactions with citizens. It attempts to explain why officers engage in, for example, traffic enforcement activities.

Although previous research has not focused on police activities or community police officers, activities are a form of police behavior, and as such, the same variables influencing officer behavior in police-citizen interactions may also influence the decisions of officers to engage in daily activities. In other words, it seems reasonable to hypothesize that the daily activity choices of police officers are influenced by the same factors which influence the choices of police officers in interactions with citizens, of course this remains an empirical question.

Two major reviews of the quantitative research concerning police behavior have been published. The first in 1980 by Sherman and the second by Riksheim and Chermak (1993). Both of these reviews of the literature examined research on service, detection, arrest, and use of force. Both reviews classified police behavior into four levels of analysis: individual, situational, organizational, and community (Riksheim and Chermak, 1993; Sherman, 1980).

Individual level variables include, among others, officer age, sex, race, attitudes, and length of service. These variables refer to the attributes of the individual officer as an explanation for behavior. Situational variables involve characteristics of the suspect, victim, or the immediate physical surroundings. For example, situational variables commonly included in analyses of police behavior are race of complainant, race of victim, number of
bystanders present, and demeanor of suspect.\textsuperscript{1} Organizational level explanations of police officer behavior use characteristics of the police agency. Characteristics of the agency can be either inter or intra-organizational (Riksheim and Chermak, 1993). Intra-organizational characteristics are characteristics specific to a single police agency and include such things as supervision, patrol strategy, and division of labor (Riksheim and Chermak, 1993). Inter-organizational characteristics are differences between organizations and include variables such as department size, bureaucratization, and professionalism (Riksheim and Chermak, 1993).\textsuperscript{2} The last category of variables are community level factors. These factors generally include characteristics of the population served and the environment, such as, income, population heterogeneity, socioeconomic status, and crime rates.

\textbf{Individual Level Characteristics}

Both Sherman (1980) and Riksheim and Chermak (1993) in reviews of the quantitative research concluded that research on individual characteristics of officers has been mixed and that significant findings generally show weak relationships. Nonetheless, there have been many studies conducted on the relationship between individual officer characteristics and behavior.

\textbf{Officer Style.} Many of the studies examining individual characteristics of officers have focused on describing different styles of police officers. In other words, they have focused on describing a style of working that characterizes how an officer does his or her job. Based

\textsuperscript{1} Although situational variables have been found to be related to police officer behavior in interactions with citizens, situational variables are beyond the scope of this study.

\textsuperscript{2} Since the present study involves only a single police agency, inter-organizational variables are beyond the scope of this study.
on field observations, Brown (1981) typologized police officers according to how aggressive they were in crime control and how selective they were in enforcing laws. He suggested that these two factors were reflective of an officer’s style and that this style influences police officer’s decisions. Similarly, Muir (1977) typologized officers according to what he termed passion and perspective. Passion refers to an officer’s willingness to use coercive force. Perspective refers to objectivity or the ability to empathize with others (see Langworthy and Travis, 1999 for an overview). An officer’s behavior is influenced by their willingness to use coercive force and their ability to empathize.³ For example, an officer without passion or perspective Muir termed an avoider. This type of officer is uncomfortable with the use of coercive force and lacks an understanding of others, as such, this type of officer prefers to do as little as possible. We might anticipate that this type of officer would spend more time engaged in routine motor patrol and avoid activities that might require interactions with citizens, for example, traffic enforcement. As already mentioned, Wilson (1968) also suggested that police officers develop a particular style which influences their decisions. These studies of officer working styles suggest that the types of activities officers engage in will be structured by the officers working style.

**Officer Race.** Sherman (1980) concluded that the results of research on officer race were mixed, while more recent research has found no relationship between race and officer behavior (Worden, 1989; Smith and Klein, 1983; see also Riksheim and Chermak, 1993 and Brooks, 1997 for reviews). For instance, Brooks (1997) points out that early research on

³ A number of empirical tests of Muir’s (1977) work have failed to support the situational and contextual consistency of his typology of operational styles (see Cox and Frank, 1992; Hochstedler, 1981; Snipes and Mastrofski, 1990).
officer race and use of deadly force found that African American officers were more likely to be involved in deadly force incidents. However, these findings have since been attributed to the assignment of black officers to high crime neighborhoods (Fyfe, 1988). Thus, it appears that race of an officer is unrelated to the types of behavior previously studied. Still, it is important to control for differences in officers while examining other variables hypothesized to influence officer activities since these studies were conducted prior to the COP era.

**Gender.** A number of studies on gender show no differences between male and female officers or that females perform their job just as well as men (Balkin, 1988; Martin, 1980; Worden, 1989). Sherman (1980) reported that the results of studies examining gender and service activities up to 1980 showed mixed results. More recent research has found differences between men and women police officers. For instance, Homant and Kennedy (1985) found that women police officers expressed a greater willingness to get involved in family disputes. Further, Horvath (1987) found that males were involved in deadly force incidents more often than female officers, although Worden (1989) found no differences between males and females in self-initiated encounters and arrests. Therefore, it appears that the behavior of male and female officers may differ depending on the type of activity. For example, Homant and Kennedy’s (1985) work suggests that female officers may be more likely to engage in activities related to family disputes.

**Length of Service.** The evidence on length of service and officer behavior is mixed (Sherman, 1980). A number of studies have found length of service to be related to detection activities, traffic stops, and arrest (Sykes and Brent, 1983; Sherman, 1980; Worden, 1989). However, a number of these studies have found contradictory findings. For example, Worden
(1989) found length of service was related to traffic stops, but found no relationship between length of service and arrests, a finding that is contrary to Sykes and Brent (1983). Further, the relationships found in detection activities noted by Sherman (1980) have since been contradicted. For example, Meyers, Heeren, Hingson and Kovenock (1987) found length of service unrelated to decisions to stop suspected drunk drivers, but significantly related to decisions regarding arrests of drunk drivers. In other words, officers with less experience were more likely to have made decisions not to arrest suspected drunk drivers. Thus, the relationship between length of service and officer behavior is unresolved. However, it does appear that length of service is related to some types of officer activities and considering the wide variety of activities expected of COP officers it is important to examine the influence of length of service.

**Attitudes Toward Community Policing.** In general, officer attitudes have not been found to be significant predictors of police officer behavior (Brooks, 1997; Riksheim and Chermak, 1993; Worden, 1989). "Overall, it seems apparent that attitudes contribute little to our understanding of police behavior" (Brooks, 1997:162). For instance, Worden (1989) and Smith and Klein (1983) both found no relationship between attitudes and arrest decisions. However, most of the research conducted on the relationship between attitudes and behavior has not been done within the context of community policing. Mastrofski, Worden, and Snipes (1995) did find that officers with pro community policing attitudes, that is those officers who held attitudes consistent with the principles of community policing, were less likely to make arrests and by implication engage in law enforcement activities. Thus, it appears that attitudes toward community policing may influence the activity choices of police officers in
departments implementing community policing.

**Education.** A tremendous amount of effort and resources have been dedicated to increasing the educational levels of police officers (Goldstein, 1977). Proponents argue that a college education will influence officers’ attitudes and thus their behavior (See Worden, 1990). Studies examining the relationship between college education and attitudes, however, show weak relationships (Worden, 1990). For example, Worden (1990) found that officers’ education was at best modestly related to only a handful of attitude measures. He suggested that “to dwell on the handful of statistically significant relationships that emerge from these analyses would be to overemphasize the impact of education on officers’ attitudes” (Worden, 1990: 584).

In regards to college education and behavior, Sherman (1980) suggested that research has shown support for the notion that college education influences the behavior of officers. For instance, Homant and Kennedy (1985) found education positively related to officers’ reported willingness to get involved in family disputes. However, other research has found education to have no impact on arrest (Smith and Klein, 1983; Worden, 1989). Further, Worden (1990) found that the effects of college education on citizen evaluations of police performance in encounters was insignificant. In other words, citizen satisfaction following encounters with police officers did not differ between college educated and non-college educated officers.

Overall, it appears that recent research does not support the contention that education influences the attitudes or the work behavior of police officers. However, advocates of community policing suggest that officers will need skills obtained through higher education
to engage in activities such as problem-solving and increased interaction with citizens. If the contentions of advocates are correct then it is likely that officers with higher levels of education will be more willing and prepared to interact with citizens in a variety of problem solving activities. As such, education may influence officer activities or how officers spend their day in a community policing department.

Neighborhood Level Characteristics

Although there is a substantial body of research delineating the relationship between neighborhood characteristics and crime (see generally Bursik, 1986; Sampson, and Groves, 1989; Shaw and McKay, 1942), research exploring the relationship between neighborhood characteristics and police behavior is somewhat limited. Those researchers which have reported a relationship suggest that community factors influence police behavior (Banton, 1964; Whyte, 1943; Wilson, 1968). For example, Wilson (1968) suggested that community characteristics were related to the style of policing an agency displayed. More specifically, homogeneous communities were more likely to receive service style policing. In other words, officers in those communities were more likely to engage in service type activities. Officers working in more heterogeneous communities were more likely to engage in law enforcement type activities.

William Whyte (1943) also suggested a relationship between community characteristics and officer activities. He put forth the idea that police have different standards of acceptable behavior in different neighborhoods and as such will act accordingly. The following sections provide an overview of the research on the relationships between community level variables and police officer behavior.
Levels of Crime. Levels of crime have been found to influence police behavior in the aggregate. For instance, reported crime has been shown to influence overall agency arrest rates (Liska and Chamlin, 1984), which implies that officers are more likely to engage in arrest activities. However, examining individual police officer decisions in encounters with citizens Smith (1987, 1984) found that neighborhood crime rates had no influence on arrest decisions or the separation of disputants in violent encounters between citizens. Thus, it appears that there is mixed evidence regarding the impact of crime rates on the law enforcement activities of police officers.

Examining police citizen encounters from the Police Services Study (PSS), Smith (1986) found that officers in high crime neighborhoods were less likely to engage in proactive investigative behaviors and less likely to file victimization reports from incidents. Thus, it appears that police officers’ behavior may be influenced by the level of crime in a neighborhood, but the impact varies depending on the type of behavior under examination (see Riksheim and Chermak, 1993). As such, it is unclear how crime rates influence the daily activities of police officers. Nonetheless, it does appear that levels of deviance in neighborhoods do influence some types of police activities.

Composition of Community. In addition to examining levels of deviance in neighborhoods researchers have also theorized and empirically examined how characteristics of neighborhood residents or the composition of communities influence the behavior of police officers. Werthman and Piliavin (1967) suggest that police categorize not only persons, but also areas in which they patrol. In other words, officers develop different expectations for different areas (see also Whyte, 1943). Relatedly, Bayley and Mendelsohn (1969) suggest
that police have certain expectations regarding interactions in minority neighborhoods. Both of these works point to a categorization of patrol areas based on characteristics of the residents in those areas. These characterizations, in turn, may influence police behavior. For instance, community police officers, given long term geographic assignments, may develop characterizations of the neighborhoods in which they work. In turn, they may engage in activities which correspond to their expectations of those areas. For example, if officers characterize a neighborhood as a high crime area with residents antagonistic to the police, then they may believe foot patrol is an inefficient and potentially dangerous form of patrol and thus engage in more motorized patrol and law enforcement activities. Additionally, in neighborhoods characterized as supportive of the police, officers may be more likely to engage citizens and work on community-based service activities, such as, block watch and community organizing.

A variety of community characteristics relating to the status of communities and their residents, commonly found in studies of the geographical distribution of crime, have also been included in studies of police behavior. Unfortunately, these studies have examined a wide range of officer behavior and by implication a wide range of activities and the findings have been mixed. The remainder of this section will review three major areas of police activities which have been examined within the context of neighborhood characteristics.

First, a limited number of studies have examined service activities of police officers. Wilson (1968) suggested that homogenous communities are more likely to receive service style policing. That is, officers are more likely to engage in service than law enforcement type activities. However, Smith (1986) found that police were more likely to engage in assistance
activities in racially heterogeneous neighborhoods. In other words, officers were more likely to spend unassigned time engaged in activities assisting citizens in neighborhoods that were racially heterogeneous. Further, Smith (1986) found that officers engaged in more assistance activities in neighborhoods with a higher proportion of single parents and were less likely to engage in assistance activities in higher status neighborhoods. Lastly, Mastrofski (1981) found that increased neighborhood violence was associated with increases in service behavior. Thus, contrary to Wilson (1968) it may be hypothesized that officers engage in more service activities in neighborhoods which are most in need of assistance.

Second, the relationship between law enforcement and order maintenance type activities and community characteristics has received much more attention than service activities. Smith (1986) examined the relationship between proactive investigations and community characteristics using PSS data. The types of activities under proactive investigations included law enforcement and order maintenance activities (police initiated contacts involving suspects or suspicious persons) during unassigned officer time. He found that of the community characteristics he examined, racial heterogeneity had the strongest impact on proactive investigative activities of officers. That is, officers in racially heterogenous neighborhoods were more likely to use unassigned time to engage in police initiated encounters with suspects and suspicious persons. Smith (1986) also found that police were less likely to engage in proactive investigative activities in neighborhoods with a high proportion of single parents. Lastly, in another study by Smith (1987) he found that the likelihood of mediation in domestic violence situations declined as the socioeconomic status of a neighborhood declined. Thus, it appears that the community characteristics of
heterogeneity, proportion single parent households and neighborhood socioeconomic status may influence law enforcement and order maintenance type activities.

Third, the area of police behavior receiving the most attention is the relationship between community characteristics and decisions to arrest and aggregate level arrest rates. Indeed, Riksheim and Chermak (1993:369) state that "arrest is the only area which has generated a substantial number of findings on the influence of community-level variables". Liska and Chamlin (1984) and Swanson (1978) found that the percent nonwhite of a community was related to increased arrest rates and Crank (1990) found that racial heterogeneity was associated with arrest rates, but only in rural police departments. Wilson (1968) suggests that the more racially heterogeneous a community, the more likely officers will engage in law enforcement behavior. The socioeconomic status of a neighborhood has also been found to be related to police arrest decisions. For example, Smith, Visher and Davidson (1984) found poverty level to be a significant predictor of arrest, and Slovak (1986) found poverty levels associated with increased likelihood of arrests for property crimes. Thus, it appears that racial heterogeneity and poverty are both associated with increased law enforcement activities.

Land Usage. A characteristic of neighborhoods not commonly examined in studies of police behavior is the usage of land. In fact, land usage has been largely ignored in the research on criminal behavior as well (Roncek and Maier, 1991). The work of Felson (1994) and Roncek and Maier (1991) suggest that commercial land use influences crime. More specifically, they suggest that "dangerous places", such as, bars and nightclubs provide increased opportunities (potential offenders and suitable targets) for crime and thus result in
increased crime in neighborhoods. In addition, these types of establishments create increased traffic flow (pedestrian and automobile) which increases opportunities for traffic law violations and predatory crime.

Further, Felson (1991) suggests that land use which increases the amount of "unassigned space" may increase crime. That is, places which have large areas of space lacking guardianship are more likely to have increased crime. For instance, shopping malls where many strangers converge are common places for drug sales (Felson, 1991). Further, entertainment districts, parks and public schools draw crowds and have large areas of "unassigned space" (parking lots, common areas, sidewalks outside the view of retail workers). These spaces provide opportunities for crime by bringing in potential targets (people and goods) and offenders in places with a lack of guardianship.

This work suggests that the commercial uses of land in largely residential neighborhoods may influence patterns of activity and thus levels of crime (see Roncek and Maier, 1991). If land use influences offenders and victims then it is likely that these same factors may also influence officer activities. There are three potential explanations for how neighborhoods with large areas of "unassigned space" may influence police officer activities.

First, many retail and entertainment businesses bring large crowds or have large areas of "unassigned space" (see Felson, 1994). Areas which contain large amounts of "unassigned space" and large crowds can be difficult for police to control. Felson (1994:67) states that dispersed property over a large space "is very difficult for police to patrol effectively". Indeed, in a neighborhood dominated by warehouses, for instance, officers may perceive little need for activities such as foot patrol, whereas in a downtown retail commercial area
neighborhood foot patrol may be deemed appropriate (see Slovak (1986) for a discussion of policing in central business districts of cities).

Second, commercial establishments may request different activities from local police officers and may influence police activities informally. For example, police in areas dominated by entertainment and retail commercial activity may be requested to deal with shoplifters or problems associated with the victimization of customers rather than daytime residential burglaries and family disputes. In addition, business owners may attempt to informally influence officer activities in a way residents cannot. For example, Felson (1994) discusses how a convenience store chain (7-Eleven) attempted to increase traffic flow at night in their stores by offering taxi drivers free coffee and restrooms. Similarly, a convenience chain in Cincinnati is known to offer police officers discounts and free coffee. This may be, in part, an attempt to influence the activities of officers by encouraging them to visit these stores more often. Whatever the intent, commercial establishments may be able to influence officer behavior in a way that residents cannot. Thus, officer behavior may differ in neighborhoods with a large proportion of commercial establishments.

Lastly, as Roncek and Maier (1991:726) state, “the presence of more people [as a result of certain types of commercial activity] can increase the anonymity of an area and result in people ignoring or less effectively performing the guardianship activities that they might undertake in less busy areas”. Thus, areas with a greater number of people and large areas of “unassigned space” (parking lots, common areas in malls) may have decreased levels of informal social control. Donald Black (1976:107) suggests that “law is stronger where other social control is weaker”. In other words, informal social control is inversely related to
formal social control. As such, it may be hypothesized that police officers (agents of formal social control) may spend more time engaged in controlling activities (order maintenance, law enforcement, traffic enforcement) in neighborhoods with more "unassigned space".

**Organizational Characteristics**

Many studies have examined inter-organizational characteristics, that is, comparing organizations and their effect on officer behavior. However, few studies have examined intra-organizational characteristics beyond organizational policies. Mastrofski (1981) when examining the size of patrol area assigned (PAA) to an officer found that increases in PAA size were related to increases in the likelihood that victims would be comforted by officers. Mastrofski (1981) also found that increased PAA size and increased neighborhood violence were related to increases in service behavior. Thus, the physical size of the area assigned to officers may have an influence on how officers behave.

**Weather Conditions**

Another variable not examined in studies of police behavior is weather or seasonality. Previous research has shown that there is a relationship between seasonality, temperature, and crime (Falk, 1952; Field, 1992; Lab and Hirsche, 1988; LeBeau, 1994; LeBeau and Langworthy, 1986). If these factors influence criminal offenders and crime rates, then it is reasonable to infer that these factors may also influence demands on the police and the daily activities of police officers. For example, it is unlikely that officers will engage in foot patrol during unusually cold weather or during heavy precipitation, and there is likely to be less law enforcement activity during times of less criminal activity. As such, it is important to control for the impact of weather conditions on officer activities during a given day.
Conclusion

The present study examines the activities of both community oriented and traditional beat officers across neighborhoods within a single city. It examines the types of activities officers engage in during a typical day and compares the activities of community and beat officers. Further, it examines the extent of variation in activities across neighborhoods. Lastly, it examines the factors which are correlated with officer activities.

This chapter began with a description of the development and evolution of community oriented policing. The purpose of which was to provide a firmer understanding and a historical context in which to discuss the definition of community policing. Next, community policing was defined by examining the literature which has attempted this difficult task.

After defining community policing the types of activities of community police officers were discussed followed by a review of the empirical literature on community police officer activities. The concept of an activity was also defined in this section. Addressing the issue of variation in activities across neighborhoods, the fourth section reviewed the literature on variation, both within and between agencies, in traditional and community police officer behavior. Finally, since the present study attempts to explain the activities of police officers the correlates of police officer behavior were reviewed. The next chapter describes the research study site, the collection of the data, and the methods of analysis used in the study.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS

This chapter provides an overview of the research study methods. First, the basic research questions and research hypotheses are presented. Second, descriptions of the city of Cincinnati and the Cincinnati Police Division are provided. Third, the sources of data and the measurement of variables are described. Finally, the methods of analysis used to examine officer activities are discussed.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The present study is a systematic attempt to specify if patterns of policing vary across neighborhoods, and to examine the factors which explain police officer activities. Prior to an examination of variation in officer activities, a description of the types of activities both traditional and community oriented police officers perform and a comparison of the activities of the two types of officers will be presented in order to gain an understanding of the two groups of officers and their daily activities. Next, the activities of officers will be examined across neighborhoods. Finally, factors which explain officer activities will be explored. The following are the basic research questions addressed by this study.

1. Do the activities of community police officers vary across neighborhoods?
2. What factors help to explain variation in the activities of community oriented officers?
3. Do the activities of traditional beat officers vary across neighborhoods?
4. What factors help to explain variation in the activities of traditional beat officers?
5. Do the activities of police officers (both community and traditional) vary across neighborhoods?

6. What factors help to explain variation in the activities of police officers?

From these broad research questions fifteen specific research hypotheses are developed based on prior research and theoretical statements discussed in the previous chapter.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

The proportion of time police officers spend on activities will:

H1- vary across neighborhoods in Cincinnati.

H2- differ according to the race of the officer.

H3- differ according to the length of time the officer has worked for the department.

H4- differ according to the education of the officer.

H5- differ according to the sex of the officer.

H6- differ according to the officer’s orientation toward community policing.

H7- differ according to officers’ perceptions of the level of citizen input into daily activities.

H8- differ according to officers’ perceptions of the level of supervisory input into daily activities.

H9- differ according to the crime rate of a neighborhood.

H10- differ according to the mobility of a neighborhoods residents.

H11- differ according to the socioeconomic status of the neighborhood.

H12- differ according to the proportion of commercial property in the neighborhood.

H13- differ according to the proportion of industrial/agricultural property in the neighborhood.

H14- differ according to the average daily temperature.
H15- differ according to the total amount of precipitation.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The site of the current research is Cincinnati, Ohio. The city of Cincinnati is located in the southwestern portion of Ohio along the Ohio river. The population of Cincinnati is approximately 364,000 persons, with 37.9 percent African-American, 53.5 percent female, and a median age of 30.9 years (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1991).

The city of Cincinnati provides for an ideal setting for the study of neighborhoods and policing. Cincinnati has always been very neighborhood oriented (Thomas, 1987). Indeed, Thomas (1987) states that Cincinnati, due to the many hills and valleys, developed as a group of villages surrounding the city, and that even as these villages were annexed they retained independent identity. Neighborhood organizations and neighborhood identity in Cincinnati have remained strong up to the present. For instance, each neighborhood is recognized by the city and has a neighborhood council which represents the neighborhood to the city. Further, as an example of citizen recognition of neighborhoods in the city the local telephone book, the Cincinnati Bell Yellow Pages, lists neighborhood names next to phone numbers and addresses. Previous researchers have also observed the appropriateness of Cincinnati for research into neighborhoods (see Percy, 1987; Thomas, 1987). Thus, even though there is much confusion over the meaning of the term neighborhood in the literature on community policing, research in Cincinnati overcomes this problem due to its historical development of independent and recognized neighborhoods.

The city of Cincinnati is divided into 53 distinct and diverse neighborhoods. These neighborhoods vary by, among other things, racial heterogeneity (95 percent African-
American to 1 percent) and the percent of residents living below the poverty level (76 percent to 1 percent). This diversity will allow for comparisons of the activities of neighborhood and traditional patrol officers in a variety of structural settings. For the aforementioned reasons, Cincinnati neighborhoods are analytically quite distinct units of analysis. The result is a study site that provides substantial variation in the study neighborhoods, and therefore an appropriate setting for a study of community policing activities which are hypothesized to vary with the demands of different communities.

CINCINNATI POLICE DIVISION

This study focuses on policing activities within the Cincinnati Police Division (CPD). CPD is the largest police agency within Hamilton County, with 985 sworn officers. It is headed by a police chief, who in turn coordinates the activities of four separate bureaus: the Patrol Bureau, the Resource Bureau, the Support Bureau and the Investigation Bureau. All officers who participated in this study were assigned to the Patrol Bureau at the time of observation. In all, approximately 500 of the 985 sworn officers are assigned to the Patrol Bureau. Of the sworn officers in the Cincinnati Police Division, 84.3 percent are male, 64.3 percent are white, 34.7 percent are African-American, and 1 percent are classified as ‘other’ (LEMAS, 1993).

The Patrol Bureau performs all primary police functions, and is divided into seven separate sections: Tactical Planning, Patrol Administration, Special Weapons and Tactics (SWAT), the Night Chief, Event Planning, the Community Policing Coordinator, and the Police Districts. The Community Policing Coordinator, typically a lieutenant, and his/her non-sworn staff, are responsible for the integration of the community oriented policing
philosophy into CPD, and report to the Special Projects Coordinator, a position directly below the Chief. Their responsibilities also include overall coordination of COP officers and department wide planning and staffing of COP.

In addition to being functionally differentiated, CPD is also spatially differentiated into five districts located throughout the city. Each district responds to calls for service and other police services in the geographic area assigned to it. Within each district, areas are further divided into beats, ranging from 3 to 6 in number per district for a total of 22 beats in the city.

In 1995, the CPD reformed all five police district boundaries so that they conform to the existing natural boundaries of the city’s 53 neighborhoods. In other words, district boundaries that passed through a neighborhood causing the neighborhood to be located in more than one district were adjusted so that all neighborhoods are now situated within only one district. Additionally, the CPD reformed beat boundaries in the same fashion. As a result, all officer assignments conform to neighborhood boundaries. Parameters for crime reporting areas were also adjusted to conform to neighborhood boundaries.

**Beat Officers**

Traditional beat patrol officers are assigned to a specific district. These officers are then assigned to a specific beat within the district to patrol and answer calls for service. Patrol officers in the Patrol Bureau typically work 8 hour shifts, and begin a work day on one of four shifts: 1st shift (beginning at 6:00 am or 7:00 am), 2nd shift (beginning at 3:00 pm, 4:00 pm or 5:00 pm), 3rd shift (beginning at 10:00 pm or 11:00 pm) and power shift (beginning at 7:00 pm or 9:00 pm). Officers working these shifts typically ‘rotate’ (or switch shifts) on an annual basis.
COP in Cincinnati

In May 1991, community oriented policing began on a limited scale in Cincinnati. Each of the five districts in the city formed a COP Team consisting of one sergeant and five to eight police officers. The five COP teams were deployed in eight of the city's neighborhoods. Over time community members across the city demanded that COP Teams be assigned to their respective neighborhoods. Due to the increased political pressure exerted by groups of citizens from various communities, the Cincinnati City Council formed a COP committee that was charged with exploring the possibility of expanding the community policing initiative.

On March 6, 1994 the Team concept was replaced with Neighborhood Officers. The intention of this change was to provide all neighborhoods in Cincinnati with COP. Due to personnel limitations, however, the police division was unable to assign all neighborhood officers to a single neighborhood. Initially, 32 officers were assigned to the city's 53 neighborhoods. In 1995, the number of neighborhood officers was increased to 45 and was increased again to 47 by the time of the present study.

COP Officers

COP officers are assigned to one of the five police districts. Each district's community policing efforts are coordinated by 1 or 2 sergeants, also located at the district level. Each district has between 9 and 12 community police officers under the command of each community policing sergeant (47 COP officers department-wide). COP officers and their sergeants report to their respective District Commanders. These officers are assigned
to a specific neighborhood, or in some cases, several neighborhoods on a long-term basis, in which to perform their COP functions. These assigned functions include:

- General duties common to all officers assigned to the Patrol Bureau within their assigned neighborhood,
- Become acquainted with citizens of their assigned neighborhood,
- Identify neighborhood problems, such as crime, fear of crime, safety, neighborhood decay and quality of life issues,
- Forge partnerships with citizens to develop solutions to neighborhood problems,
- Network with local service agencies to assist in problem solving,
- Represent the CPD at community meetings,
- Prepare and share crime statistics with citizens of the neighborhood,
- Perform crime prevention functions, such as establishing Block Watch programs and conduct security surveys, and
- Develop initiatives to improve the future of the youth of the neighborhood (Cincinnati Police Division Position Classification, 1998)

In order to facilitate the performance of their duties, COP officers are not responsible for radio runs and work flexible schedules. In other words, COP officers work varying days of the week and begin tours of duty at varying times of the day. Typically, COP officers work Monday through Friday, and begin their shifts between 7:00 am and 1:00 pm.

COP officers typically work alone, however 3 pairs of officers who are assigned to the same neighborhood work as two-person teams. Additionally, four COP officers are assigned bicycles and typically spend portions of their regular work day patrolling neighborhood streets on bicycles.

DATA SOURCES

This study uses a number of different data sources to examine the activities of police officers. The final merged data set includes three levels of data (individual, neighborhood, and ride data). This data set will provide for a much more detailed analysis of neighborhood characteristics and officer activities than has been done in previous research. For example,
previous research generally uses only census data to delineate neighborhood characteristics, however, this data set will provide details about the use of property within neighborhoods rather than simply characteristics of its residents. Further, the use of observation data, as noted by Cordner (1979:51), "should result in the most accurate and detailed information" regarding the activities of officers. The data and their sources are detailed in the sections that follow.

Systematic Observation Data

Data on the activities of both community oriented and traditional beat officers in Cincinnati 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 # 96-IJ-CX-0075). The data include observations over a thirteen month period between April 2, 1997 and April 30, 1998 with 131 different beat officers (236 observations for a total of approximately 1,888 hours observed) and 31 different community oriented police officers (206 observations for a total of approximately 1,648 hours observed).\textsuperscript{5} A total of 442 shifts were observed or

\textsuperscript{4} Observations were planned for April 2, 1997 to March 30, 1998. However, only 6 observations were conducted in the month of December. On December 6, 1997, two Cincinnati Police officers were shot and killed while attempting to serve a warrant for domestic violence. In the weeks that followed, there were numerous changes in the daily routines of officers. Specifically, all officers were assigned to 2 person units for 2 weeks following the incident and there were numerous ceremonies conducted in the city including police funerals and memorials. These ceremonies closely resembled the actions described by Crank (1998). Due to these nonroutine events, coupled with the research team's desire to avoid disturbing officers in their time of mourning, observations were suspended until January 2, 1998. In order to compensate for not conducting the scheduled observations in December, observations were conducted on randomly selected days and times through April 1998.

\textsuperscript{5} Thirty COP officers were randomly selected, however, during the course of the project some officers were promoted and/or transferred resulting in six additional officers being assigned to neighborhoods in the study.
approximately 3,536 hours.

Mastrofski et al. (1997) suggest that decisions regarding observations of police officers should be made based on the issues of whom to observe, where to observe them, when to conduct observations and what should be observed and recorded. The following section describes the research methodology used in the observation study and from which the present study's data were obtained.

**Whom and Where to Observe.** The primary purpose of the larger observation study was to document the activities of community policing officers and beat officers in one city. The project sought to observe these two different officers in their natural environment. In order to make comparisons of the behavior of officers based on assignment and context, COP and beat officers were observed in similar environmental contexts. Thus, if a COP officer for neighborhood X was observed, then the beat officer for neighborhood X was also observed.

However, the number of different individual COP and beat officers observed varies. In Cincinnati, COP officers and beat officers are assigned to neighborhoods and beats, respectively, for long periods of time. However, while each neighborhood typically has only one COP officer, there is more than one beat officer assigned to a neighborhood. Therefore, there are fewer different individual COP officers included in the study (31) than individual beat officers (131). In all, a total of 206 (46.6%) observations were conducted with COP officers and 236 (53.4%) with beat officers.

**When to Observe.** As Reiss (1971b:10) notes, “When it is difficult to locate a satisfactory sampling frame for variables under investigation, time often is a useful sampling frame.” In order to make the desired comparisons of COP and beat officers, the study
observed officers during similar times of the day, and on similar days of the week. Beat officers can be assigned to any shift on any day of the week. COP officers typically work from 10:00 am to 6:00 pm, though some COP officers begin their 8 hour shift as early 7:00 am, while others begin as late as 1:00 pm. This variation posed a problem in determining the shift on which to observe beat officers, as COP officers typically work during 1st and 2nd shifts. Therefore, in order to have the most comparable observations, beat officers were only observed on 1st and 2nd shift and not observed during 3rd or power shifts, since COP officers in Cincinnati rarely work during these time periods.

Days of the week in which COP officers work also vary slightly, however most work 5 consecutive days, Monday through Friday or Tuesday through Saturday. Therefore, observations were conducted with beat officers on Monday through Saturday. In other words, no observations occurred on Sundays.

This places obvious limitations on the generalizability of the results. Clearly, the activities and behavior of police officers working 'midnights' or 3rd shift on Friday nights will most likely not resemble 1st shift officers on Tuesdays. Though observed behavior cannot be interpreted as the manner in which policing is done in Cincinnati as a whole, the beat officer observations included in our study do represent an adequate comparison group and the findings are generalizable to COP officers in Cincinnati. Further, the present study’s focus is variation across neighborhoods and the influence of neighborhood factors on police activities, rather than variation across shifts or days of the week. As such, these issues should not hinder the present study’s examination.

**Sampling Technique.** The initial sampling frame of officers consisted of all 47 COP
officers in the city at the beginning of the project. Four of these officers were excluded because they spent portions of their work day on bicycles, and observations of these officers were not logistically feasible. Thus, the final sampling frame was 43 officers, of which 30 were randomly selected for inclusion in the study. Of the selected officers, 4 were assigned to only one neighborhood, 8 officers shared a neighborhood with another officer (i.e., a neighborhood had more than one COP officer) and 18 were assigned to more than one neighborhood. Six of these officers worked in pairs (2 person units). These 30 officers were responsible for 33 of Cincinnati’s 53 communities and 18 of the city’s 22 beats.

Having selected COP officers for inclusion in the study, the next step was to select comparable beat officers. Since beat officers are not assigned to neighborhoods, but rather work rotating shifts and beats it was not possible to select individual beat officers as comparison officers with the COP officers. In other words, selection of a single comparison beat officer for each COP officer would result in some observations occurring in beats which did not correspond to the neighborhoods included in the study or to the same shifts as COP officers work. As such, the method for obtaining comparable beat officers was as follows. Since COP officers are assigned to neighborhoods, the selection of the COP officers brought with it a beat that corresponded to the neighborhood. The beat officer assigned to the corresponding beat on the selected day and time was then observed. Thus, a sample of beats allowed for observations of beat officers in contexts and at times that are comparable to those of the COP officers selected.

With the selection of COP officers in the study and the location of beat officers to be included, dates and times for the observations were chosen. The sampling frame consisted
of valid days of the week (i.e., Monday through Saturday) and valid shifts (i.e., 1st and 2nd for beat officers only). One day per month was randomly selected for each COP officer and officers in the complimentary beat in which observations were to be conducted. Then shifts (1st or 2nd) were randomly selected for beat officers (COP officers choose their own start times). In all, 93.4 percent of the observations were completed on the assigned date.

The sample of officers from this selection process had a mean length of service of 8.5 years (range 1-27 years). Approximately 42 percent of the officers in the sample had some college education, while 34.8 percent had completed a college degree. Unfortunately, data on the entire police division does not exist for these two items. Thus, comparisons of the sample with the population of Cincinnati officers is not possible. However, information was available on the sex and race of officers in the Cincinnati Police Division. Table 2 below compares the sample with the population of officers in CPD.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male White</th>
<th>Male Nonwhite</th>
<th>Female White</th>
<th>Female Nonwhite</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPD Totals*</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55.9%)</td>
<td>(24.2%)</td>
<td>(14.1%)</td>
<td>(5.8%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45.9%)</td>
<td>(35.6%)</td>
<td>(13.4%)</td>
<td>(5.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Totals for Police Specialists and Police Officers as of December 31, 1997.

What to Observe. Trained observers accompanied police officers during the assigned times and recorded everything officers did during their normal work days. Researchers took careful notes of activities and citizen interactions with police during the ride-a-long in small booklets (3" x 5"). Observers would take notes on relevant information during the
observation, but in order to avoid citizen inquiries and thus influencing events observed, were
instructed never to complete these notes in the presence of a citizen. Opportune times for
‘catching up’ on note taking included immediately after the encounter, or while the officer
was on routine patrol or en-route to a location. If an officer requested to review the
observer’s field notes, the observer would share them with the officer.

In order to systematically structure observations and ensure reliability, the framework
described by Mastrofski et al. (1997) was adopted. Four different coding instruments were
used to record information necessary to explore the daily routine of police officers: ride
instruments, activity instruments, encounter instruments and citizen instruments. These
instruments helped to structure the recording of events during observations by riders.

A single ride instrument was completed for each observation period. On each ride
instrument information regarding the type of officer (COP or beat), officer(s) characteristics
(sex, age, race, educational attainment, rank, length of service, and marital status), and
questions about weather and precipitation during the ride are recorded. Observers were also
queried about the officer’s attitude regarding the presence of an observer during the ride, as
a check for reactivity (see Appendix 1 for a copy of the ride instrument).

Activity instruments were designed to record the daily activities of officers. During
any given observation, separate activity forms were completed for each different action taken
by an officer in which the officer was not in direct contact with a member of the public.
Specifically, activity forms were used to collect information concerning the starting and
ending time of the activity and a description of the activity, such as, routine patrol, en-route
to a location, roll call, auto maintenance, report writing, meetings with other officers,
surveillance, attempting to locate a person or place, and personal time. Twenty-three
different categories of activities that covered 70 different types of tasks were coded (see
Appendix 2 for a listing of the activity codes). These activity categories are the same as those
used in other observation studies conducted in Richmond, St. Petersburg, and Indianapolis
(see Mastrofski, Parks, Reiss, and Worden, 1994).

In addition, activity forms contained information about how the police were mobilized
to engage in the activity (on his/her own initiative, by a supervisor, by the dispatcher, or by
a citizen) and the characteristics of the location of an activity (private place, public place,
etc.). Observers recorded whether problem solving activities were engaged in by the officer,
whether other officers or supervisors were present, whether the officer requested information
from the mobile dispatch terminal (MDT, which is located in each police vehicle) and any
perceived reactivity by the officer due to the observers' presence (see Appendix 3 for a copy
of the activity form).

Encounter forms tap information about any interaction the officer has with members
of the public. Like Mastrofski et al. (1997:9), encounters were operationalized as face-to-
face verbal communications or physical contact with members of the public. The primary
difference between activities and encounters was the presence or absence of members of the
public. As such, all actions taken by officers during any given observation are the sum of all
activities and encounters. In other words, activities and encounters are mutually exclusive
and everything observed is either an activity or an encounter.

As already stated, encounters are all face-to-face contacts with citizens that include
verbal exchanges or physical contact. Each encounter is further classified as either "full",
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“brief” or “casual”.

- Full Encounters—verbal exchanges or physical contact that involve police business and take a minute or longer and involve three or more exchanges of words.
- Brief Encounters—Involve police business, but are less than one minute and involve less than three verbal exchanges between police and citizens.
- Casual Encounters—Encounters that do not involve police business or a police problem.

Examples of full encounters include an arrest or a conversation with a citizen regarding a burglary (police business) which takes more than a minute. Brief encounters also involve police business, but are typically short in duration. For example, if an officer requests a citizen to do something, but there are not “3 exchanges of information”. Casual encounters include contacts with the public which may satisfy the 3 exchange rule, however they do not involve any type of police business. An example of a casual encounter is when an officer talks to a friend about non-police business (e.g., sports, current events, other friends) and does not act on behalf of the police division.

Each encounter instrument included, among other things, information on how many other officers, supervisors, non-police service providers and citizens were present during the encounter. It also documents the reason for the encounter and the nature of the problem at different times during the encounter (see Appendix 4 for a complete list of problems). Thus, the underlying activity engaged in during the encounter can be determined from the encounter instrument (see Appendix 5 for a copy of the encounter instrument).

The final coding instrument used in the study was a citizen form. These forms were completed for each citizen with whom the observed officer had contact during the ride. Since
there may be more than one citizen present at each encounter, there may be more citizen forms than encounter forms. In other words, encounter forms are place specific, whereas citizen forms are person specific. 

Narratives

In addition to the quantitative data, ride narratives were also completed for each observation period. These narratives allowed the observer to clarify the quantitative information, allowed the research team to check information from the databases against the qualitative information provided, and provided a contextual description of the observed officer behavior.

Project Personnel

The researchers who participated in the observations of police officers were all affiliated with the Division of Criminal Justice at the University of Cincinnati. A total of 30 different observers participated in the project over the 13 month period. The observers consisted of 21 doctoral students (70.0%), 8 students completing their master of science degree (26.7%) and the principal investigator, who has a doctoral degree. The observers were primarily male (76.7%) and white (86.7%).

Prior to conducting ride-a-longs, observers were required to complete a training course over a period of several weeks. In the training course, the project and its purposes were described in great detail, and the organizational arrangement of the Cincinnati Police Division was reviewed. The majority of effort in these training sessions was devoted to
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6 Given the purposes of this study the data from citizen instruments are not used.
reviewing and discussing the four data coding instruments, and clarifying and interpreting each of the standardized questions. As suggested by Reiss (1971b), observers reviewed videotaped activities and encounters of police officers and citizens, and were asked to code the actions viewed on the videotape using the project instruments. These instruments were reviewed and discussed by the research team and observers. In addition to these training exercises, each observer was briefed on project confidentiality, and required to complete a form stating that they would not discuss activities observed while on ride-a-longs with personnel not related to the project.

The purpose of this training was to ensure the use of standard coding rules and hence increase inter-coder reliability. Over the course of the project (but especially after the first two months), the research team and the observers held meetings and debriefings in order to discuss general operations of the project. During these meetings the observers communicated coding dilemmas as a group (e.g., “I saw the officer do ____. How do I code this?”). These issues were addressed and clarified as a group, in hopes of increasing reliability.

In sum, trained observers, during 442 observations, collected information concerning the activities of officers and encounters with other persons. Every minute of time was accounted for as either an activity or an encounter. For the purposes of this study, encounters were recoded to tap the underlying activity that was engaged in by officers during the encounter. Thus, every minute of an officer’s day and the activities engaged in during that time were accounted for.

Observers collected information concerning the specific types of activities (e.g., routine patrol, attending community meetings, problem solving, personal time, administrative,
etc.), the amount of time spent on these activities, who initiated the activity, where the
activities occurred, and the contextual characteristics of each activity. Further, observers
completed daily logs which allowed for verification of the coding categories used and, if
needed, clarification of the activity.

**Advantages and Disadvantages of Observations**

There are both advantages and disadvantages to field observations. One obvious
advantage is that field observations allow the researcher to obtain information which would
otherwise be difficult or impossible to collect. Specifically, it allows the researcher to obtain
as close to an “insider’s view” into social phenomena as possible. Field observations do not
rely on official records in order to make inferences. All official records are filtered in some
way, whether by the public or the police. For example, dispatch records only provide
information on those incidents in which someone phoned the police. However, many
incidents and individuals come to the attention of the police through other mechanisms. Thus,
official records do not allow the researcher to gather information on many activities of the
police (e.g., giving a citizen directions). In contrast, field observations allow the researcher
to collect information on low visibility actions of the police; indeed, all actions of the observed
officers.

**Reactivity.** One disadvantage to field observations is reactivity. In other words, the
event observed might not have occurred but for the presence of the researcher. This is
especially problematic for observations of police officers, due to the unique occupational
subculture of police which is often leery of outsiders. Further, police work is highly
autonomous, and officers are often not used to being accompanied by anyone during their
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normal work routines. Officers may engage in behavior they perceive to be acceptable due to the fact that they are being observed, or they may want to “show the observer a good time”. For example, officers may wish to demonstrate specific police-related activities, such as running record checks on the computer or making arrests. This may result in researchers over estimating the prevalence of this phenomena (Mastrofski and Parks, 1990). Conversely, officers may choose to reduce the vigor with which they do their work because they feel responsible for the observer’s safety. In this case researchers would underestimate specific officer activities.

Minimizing Reactivity. Understanding the potential for this problem, the research team took numerous steps in order to minimize reactivity. Five safety measures were taken to reduce reactivity: 1) promising study confidentiality, 2) fully explaining the purpose of the study to the officers, 3) maintaining a long term orientation in the police districts, 4) utilizing trained student observers, and 5) including questions in the survey instruments which prompt the observer to determine whether reactivity occurred (see Mastrofski et al., 1997).

First, the research team guaranteed the police officers confidentiality. Individuals conducting research which is sponsored by the federal government have limited exemption from the normal legal process (Boruch, Reiss, Garner, Larntz and Freels, 1991). This confidentiality is mandated by Federal law, which states, that information obtained through observations can not be used to identify any person “for any purpose other than the purpose for which it was obtained” (42 USCS 3789g). In other words, the research staff can not divulge details of observations in any fashion other than data input for the project. For example, observers can not be subpoenaed for administrative, civil or criminal court cases,
“without the consent of the persons furnishing such information” (42 USCS 3789g). 7 Additionally, any identifiers which could be attributed to individual officers have been stripped from the data set, and names of citizens or other members of the public were never recorded in field notes or any other data collection instrument.

The research team conveyed the confidentiality agreement and the purpose of the study to the police department and its officers in several ways. The principal investigator attended a staff meeting of department administrators prior to beginning the study, outlining the rules of confidentiality and study purpose. Then, the principal investigator and members of the research staff attended all roll calls and met with all COP officers in the city’s five police districts and again outlined the confidentiality agreement and the study. Further, at the beginning of each observation the officer was again explained the confidentiality agreement and the purpose of the study. Finally, project observers were required to complete a form stating that if they violated the confidentiality agreement they would be terminated.

Second, observers advised officers at the beginning of each observation period of the project’s purpose, and that there were no hidden agendas to their presence or the study. Similarly, observers were not present to judge, critique or offer suggestions to officers. If officers asked observers to judge how they ‘handled’ a situation, observers were instructed to deflect the question and explain that they are not trained police officers and thus not in a position to offer a judgement.

A third safeguard to reduce reactivity was a long term orientation of observers in the various police districts. In other words, we conducted observations over a 13 month period,
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7 However, it should be noted that this statute has not been subjected to scrutiny by federal courts.
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and whenever possible, observers were assigned to ride in locations and districts more than once. The rationale for this tactic was that over time, officers would react less to observer presence, especially if the same observer conducted repeated observations in the same location and a rapport was developed between observers and officers. There were several indications which led us to believe this approach was quite successful and that officers became comfortable with observers. For example, very often officers would ask observers about the well being of other observers in the project (e.g., “How is Pat doing? I see him/her here all the time.”). This suggests that the officers were not threatened by the observers’ presence. Also, officers would make comments to observers along the lines of “I know you rode with Officer Jones, and she said you were alright”. Thus, observers gained some level of legitimacy through conversations officers had with one another.

Fourth, following the suggestions made by Mastrofski et al (1997), we chose to utilize students in order to reduce officer reactivity. Students may not be perceived as a threat to officers, rather they may simply be viewed as wanting to learn about policing. Officers may not feel they are being judged or evaluated, and officers may feel less threatened when the observers ask for clarification of what is happening or why an officer chose one course of action over another one.

Finally, though several proactive safeguards were employed in order to reduce reactivity, it is inevitable that some change in officer behavior occurred during the course of the study. As such, observers were queried on every instrument completed (i.e., ride, activity, encounter) whether they believed officers or citizens reacted to their presence, and the nature of the reactivity. In total, observers reported that in only 0.7 percent of all activities did they
perceive the officer to react to their presence. Further, they reported officer reactivity in only 0.5 percent of all encounters between the police and the public, and citizen reactivity in 1.1 percent of these encounters.

**Police Division Crime Data**

All reported crime or crimes known to the police were obtained from the Cincinnati Police Division for the project period. The crime data contained the incident as recorded by officers and the location of the incident. Crimes known to the police represent any reported incident recorded by the police division as a crime. These data, like all official data, have their limitations. First, they represent only those crimes reported to the police, and previous research has noted the under reporting of crime by citizens. Second, they represent an officer’s definition of a crime. For example, an officer may not record a burglary on the basis of their belief that a citizen is lying to collect insurance money. Lastly, these data are collected by the police department and are open to manipulation. For example, a police agency may want to record crimes so as to portray their agency and community in the best light (Vito and Holmes, 1994; see also Butterfield, 1998). However, these data represent incidents that were important enough for a citizen to call the police and for the police to record it as a crime (Roncek and Maier, 1991).

**Census Data**

Bureau of Census data were collected and used to delineate characteristics of neighborhoods and their residents. Census data for neighborhoods were collected at the block group level. Definitions of neighborhood boundaries were obtained from the Cincinnati Police Division. Maps obtained from CPD were then compared with block group census
maps to determine which block groups corresponded with which neighborhoods in Cincinnati. Following a determination of which block groups comprised the study neighborhoods the block group data were aggregated to the neighborhood level.

**Land Use Data**

Data on land use is collected by the Cincinnati Area Geographic Information Service. These data contain information on every parcel of land within the city of Cincinnati. The parcels are categorized as agricultural, extraction, industrial, commercial, residential, public owned, abated, or public utilities. Within each of these categories the land usage (e.g., vacant, warehouse, apartment 4-19 units) of each parcel is recorded. This information is taken from the county auditor’s office which uses it for tax purposes. These data were collected and aggregated to the neighborhood level.

**Officer Surveys**

All Cincinnati police officers observed during the study were surveyed at the conclusion of observations. The purpose of the survey was to collect information on individual officers’ attitudes, job satisfaction, and perceptions of neighborhoods and neighborhoods’ problems.

Questionnaires were modeled after previous surveys conducted in conjunction with community policing projects (see Pate and Shtull, 1994; Rosenbaum, Yeh and Wilkinson, 1994; Travis and Winston, 1998). The survey was pre-tested on a group of Cincinnati police officers not included in the research study. Participants in the pre-test were questioned regarding the survey to determine if changes to the survey were necessary. Only minor changes appeared necessary before beginning to contact respondents (see Appendix 6).
A list of all officers included in the study and their present assignment was compiled. Prior to contacting officers, a memo was sent from the chief to all five police districts stating that researchers from the University of Cincinnati would soon be conducting surveys and that all district personnel should cooperate. Following this memo, research staff contacted district sergeants to arrange to visit roll call on shifts in which target officers worked. Research staff then attended roll call and administered surveys at the end of roll call to those officers observed during the project. Neighborhood police officers were contacted individually and surveys were generally administered at the start of their shifts. Officers transferred to specialized units (e.g., traffic, training) were also contacted individually to arrange for completion of a survey at the start of their shifts.

The packet given to officers included a survey and a letter from the principal investigator. The letter from the principal investigator thanked officers for cooperating in the study and assured confidentiality, stating that all information would be presented in aggregate form and that no identifying information would be disclosed.

**Weather Service Data**

Data on the temperature and precipitation for each day of the project were obtained from the National Weather Service web site. The data were available in text format and had to be printed and entered into a database. Average daily temperature, inches of precipitation (rainfall) and inches of snowfall were obtained. Inches of rain and snow were added to determine the total amount of precipitation on a given day. Trace amounts of rain and snow were recorded as "T" in the Weather Service data. Since trace amounts are so little as to not be measurable they were recorded as zero in the data.
MEASUREMENT OF INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

The two principal objectives of this dissertation are to 1) examine whether there is variation in officer activities, and 2) examine the determinants of officer activities. In order to accomplish these objectives a number of multivariate models will be constructed. The models used in this study include individual officer level characteristics, neighborhood level characteristics, and ride context characteristics as independent variables. The section which follows will describe the measurement of these independent variables (see Table 3 for a description of independent variables).

Individual Level

The officer demographic characteristics of job assignment, race, sex, length of service and education are all included in this study. All of these variables were obtained from the survey of Cincinnati police officers described earlier. Officer assignment is measured as a dummy variable (1 = COP, 0 = beat). Officer length of service is measured in number of years. Officer race is a dummy variable (1 = White/nonhispanic, 0 = Hispanic, African American, and Other). Education is also a categorical variable with the categories of education including high school or GED, some college or trade school, college or trade school graduate, some post graduate work, and advanced degree (see Table 3).

Three measures of officer attitudes and perceptions are also included as individual level independent variables. Officer attitudes toward community policing, officer perceptions of supervisory input, and officer perceptions of the influence of citizens on police work are all included as individual level measures. Specifically, orientation toward community policing is measured using a summated scale composed of five questions from the officer survey. The
questions included in the scale are: 1) “Community policing is something that law enforcement agencies should pursue”, 2) “Police should work with citizens to try to solve problems on their beat”, 3) “Community policing is a highly effective means of providing police service”, 4) “In general, I believe community oriented policing is a good idea for Cincinnati and CPD”, and 5) “Community policing has changed the way I do my job”. Response options for all six questions were “Strongly Disagree”, “Disagree”, “Agree”, and “Strongly Agree”. Higher scores represent greater acceptance of community policing.

Supervisory input into officers’ activities is measured using a single survey item from the officer survey. This measure taps into officers’ perceptions of the extent to which supervisors influence their work. The question used for the measure is “My supervisor determines my daily activities”. The response options for this statement were “Strongly Disagree”, “Disagree”, “Agree”, and “Strongly Agree”. Higher scores on this item represent greater supervisory input into officer activities.

The last individual level variable is a perceptual measure of citizen input into officer activities. This variable is measured using a single item from the officer survey. This variable attempts to tap into officer perceptions of the extent to which citizens influence their daily activities. The item is a response to the following statement: “Citizen desires influence my daily work routine”. Response options for this statement include, “Strongly Disagree”, “Disagree”, “Agree”, and “Strongly Agree”. Higher scores on this variable correspond with greater citizen input.
Neighborhood Level

Neighborhood level measures include characteristics of the neighborhoods and its residents. Two measures of neighborhood residents were created using data obtained from the 1990 U.S. Census. In addition, a measure of the crime rate and two measures of land use within each neighborhood were also developed using data from the Cincinnati Police Division and the Cincinnati Area Geographic Information Service, respectively.

Residents. Five variables were obtained from the Census and include proportion nonwhite, mobility, proportion of persons below poverty, proportion of single parent households, and proportion of renter occupied dwelling units. The first measure, proportion nonwhite, is simply the proportion of the total neighborhood population which are nonwhite. The second variable is a measure of the mobility of a neighborhoods’ residents. Mobility is measured as the proportion of households that have lived in the neighborhood less than five years. Similar measures of mobility have been used in previous research on the police (see Smith, 1986). Third, proportion of persons below poverty provides a measure of the socioeconomic status of a neighborhood. Fourth, proportion single parent households provides a measure of both informal social control of youth and a measure of socioeconomic status (see Smith, 1986). The last census variable is proportion of renter occupied dwelling units. This variable provides another measure of the socioeconomic status of neighborhood residents as well as a measure of residents’ stake in their neighborhoods.

Given the nature of four of the variables measuring resident characteristics it was necessary to combine them into a single measure. Proportion of persons below poverty, 
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8 This operationalization provides a measure of the racial threat hypothesis.
proportion single parent households, proportion nonwhite, and proportion renter occupied
dwelling units all tap into some aspect of socioeconomic status and as such are highly
intercorrelated. Thus, it was necessary to combine these four measures into a single variable.
These four measures were transformed into standardized z-scores and summed. This scale
taps into neighborhood family structure, racial composition, housing structure and income.
Higher values on this scale represent lower socioeconomic status.

Crime Rate. A measure of crime in each of the neighborhoods is computed using
crimes known to the police collected from the Cincinnati Police Division. Neighborhood
crime rates are computed using all of the twenty-nine different crimes classified by the Federal
Bureau of Investigation as Part I and Part II. Part I crimes include murder, rape, robbery,
aggravated assault, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft, and arson. Part II crimes
include forgery and counterfeiting, fraud, embezzlement, buying and receiving stolen
property, vandalism, weapons possession, prostitution, sex offenses, drug violations,
gambling, offenses against the family, DUI, liquor law violations, drunkenness, disorderly
conduct, vagrancy, suspicion, curfew and loitering law violations, run-aways, and a residual
category of all other offenses (except traffic). A crime rate for each neighborhood was
computed by summing all of the crimes known to the police during the project period and
dividing this number by the population of the neighborhood.

Land Use. The use of land within a neighborhood is hypothesized to influence the
activities of police officers. Specifically, the more commercial activity which attracts large
numbers of persons, thereby increasing the number of potential targets, potential offenders,
and the anonymity of the area, the more time officers may spend engaged in law enforcement,
traffic enforcement, and order maintenance (see generally, Felson, 1991; Roncek and Maier, 1991). As such, the proportion of anonymous high activity parcels within each neighborhood is calculated. The parcels included in this measure are areas which are classified as commercial retail, entertainment and government property.

In addition to this measure, the proportion of total parcels which are industrial and agricultural property are also computed. It is hypothesized that these types of land uses will attract persons who are familiar to each other (e.g., fellow employees), thereby decreasing anonymity, and will include large spaces which are “assigned” for a particular purpose (e.g., employee parking, loading areas). In other words, strangers will have no purpose for being in these areas and will be easily recognized by workers. In addition, workers will be inside private property working and police will have little reason to engage in activities in these types of areas since they have little “unassigned space” and anonymity is more difficult for potential offenders. Thus, it may be hypothesized that guardianship and informal social control will be high and formal social control low (see Black, 1976 for a discussion of the relationship between formal and informal social control) in these areas.

Crime & Anonymity

Zero order correlations reveal that the crime rate of neighborhoods and the proportion of high anonymity parcels are highly intercorrelated. Thus, both of these measures were combined into a single measure of crime, anonymity and high activity. The two measures were transformed into standardized z-scores and then summed. The resulting scale ranges from -1.42 to 11.57 with higher scores representing higher anonymity, crime and activity.

Combining these two measures is necessary for statistical reasons, but is also
substantively meaningful. One of the goals of the present study is to determine if neighborhoods influence officer activities. The crime rate of neighborhoods is related to the extent of anonymity and activity in neighborhoods. Since both of these constructs converge in neighborhoods then combining them provides a measure of differences between neighborhoods. Wilson and Kelling (1982) argue that neighborhoods that have high levels of anonymity and a lack of informal social control (guardianship) are also more likely to experience disorder and crime. Thus, it is not surprising that neighborhoods with a high crime rate also have a larger proportion of parcels that increase the anonymity and reduce guardianship. Both of these variables may be considered as a proxy for lack of informal social control, which is hypothesized to be related to police activities. As stated earlier, neighborhoods lower on informal social control may have greater amounts of formal social control (i.e., police activities). For example, in high crime/high activity neighborhoods citizens may call police more often to intervene in more crime related and other situations.

Ride Context

Due to the nature of some of the analyses conducted in this study, climate conditions are included as control variables in the multivariate analyses. Average daily temperature and total precipitation in inches are hypothesized to influence the activities of police officers. Both of these variables are measured at the interval level in degrees Fahrenheit and total inches, respectively. Total precipitation includes total rainfall and total snowfall. On days in which only trace amounts of rain or snow occur the national weather service only reports that trace amounts fell. As such, these days are classified as having no snow or rainfall.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Officer Assignment | Dummy variable:  
0 = beat officer  
1 = COP officer |
| Officer Race | Dummy variable:  
0 = White/nonhispanic  
1 = Hispanic, African American, and Other. |
| Officer Education | Educational level of police officer measured as a categorical variable:  
1 = High school or GED  
2 = Some College or Trade School  
3 = College or Trade School Graduate  
4 = Some Post Graduate Work  
5 = Advanced Degree. |
| Length of Service | Length of time served as a Cincinnati police officer measured in number of years (Mean = 6.85, min = 1, max = 17). |
| Officer Sex | Dummy variable:  
0 = Male  
1 = Female |
<p>| Orientation Toward Community Policing | Summed scale consisting of five responses from police officer survey. Higher scores represent greater acceptance of COP (Alpha = .8433, mean = 15.86, min = 5, max = 20). |
| Supervisory Input | Single survey item asking to what extent supervisors determine officer activities. Higher scores represent greater supervisory input (mean = 1.95, min = 1, max = 4). |
| Citizen Input | Single survey item asking to what extent citizen desires influence daily work routine (mean = 2.79, min = 1, max = 4). |
| <strong>Neighborhood Level</strong> | |
| Crime Rate &amp; Anonymity | Standardized scale consisting of neighborhood crime rate and Proportion of total parcels within neighborhood which are classified as commercial retail, entertainment and government property (alpha = .7122, mean = .005, min = -1.42, max = 11.57). |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>Proportion of households that have lived in neighborhood less than five years (mean = .487, min = .21, max = .67).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>Standardized scale consisting of proportion below poverty, proportion single parent households, proportion nonwhite, and proportion renter occupied (alpha = .8639, mean = 0, min = -.5.94, max = 7.03).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Industrial/agricultural</td>
<td>Proportion of total parcels within neighborhood which are classified as industrial or agricultural.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ride Context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>Average temperature measured in degrees Fahrenheit (mean = 53.74, min = 18, max = 85).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>Total precipitation in inches (mean = .225, min = .00, max = 13.01).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEPENDENT VARIABLES**

There are sixteen variables used in the examination of work routine and the analysis of variation. In addition, six unique dependent variables are included in the multivariate analyses (see Table 4).

The sixteen activity categories used for the examination and comparison of work routine were developed from observation data. As stated earlier, every minute of observed police officers’ shifts was recorded as either an activity or an encounter. Encounters were included in the activity categories which best capture the underlying activity engaged in during the encounter. For instance, if an officer encountered a citizen during a traffic stop then this encounter was included in the activity category of traffic enforcement. These categories when taken together represent all observed officer time. That is, every observed behavior is included in these sixteen categories of activities (see Appendix 7).

For the analysis of variation and the multivariate analysis these sixteen categories are
collapsed into six categories. The collapsed categories of activities include order maintenance, service, law enforcement, traffic enforcement, routine patrol, and community policing activities (see Appendix 8 for a list of activities in these categories). These variables were calculated using data from observations of police officers.

For the analysis of variation a proportion of the total amount of time spent in a particular neighborhood on a particular activity was calculated. The numerator represents the total amount of time officers spent in a particular neighborhood on a particular activity. The denominator represents the total amount of time spent in the neighborhood, excluding time spent in a police facility.9

The last type of dependent variable is designed to measure the amount of time officers spend on different activities in neighborhoods during a typical day. This variable is the proportion of an officer’s shift spent on a given category of activities in a particular neighborhood. The numerator represents the total amount of time officers spent performing the particular category of activity on the observed shift (excluding time spent in a police facility). The denominator of this measure represents the total amount of time officers were observed in a particular neighborhood during a particular shift, excluding time spent in a police facility. Observations vary in length due to the fact that shift lengths vary. For example, some officers may arrive late for work or leave work early for personal business. As such, the denominator is not always eight hours, but rather however long officers worked in the neighborhood on that particular day. Thus, the dependent variable for this portion of

9 Time spent in a police facility was excluded due to the fact police officers spend a considerable amount of time in police facilities which would inflate the denominator for neighborhoods in which a police facility is located.
the analysis is the proportion of total time, on a particular shift, an officer spent in a particular neighborhood on a particular activity.

### Table 4. Description of Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity Categories</strong></td>
<td>See Appendix 7 for a listing of all activities in the categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot patrol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor patrol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative-crime related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem focused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information gathering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings with other nonpolice service providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En-route/waiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collapsed Activity Categories</strong></td>
<td>See Appendix 8 for a listing of all the activities in the collapsed categories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor patrol</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community policing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion (Variation analysis)</td>
<td>Numerator = Total time spent by officers on particular activity in particular neighborhood (excluding time in police facility).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denominator = Total time spent by officers in particular neighborhood (excluding time in police facility).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion (Multivariate analysis)</td>
<td>Numerator = Total time spent during a shift on a particular activity in a particular neighborhood (excluding time in police facility).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denominator = Total time spent on shift in neighborhood (excluding time in police facility).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA ANALYSIS

Data analysis ranges from frequency distributions to multivariate hierarchical modeling. The analysis proceeds in three major phases. First, work routine is analyzed by comparing the proportion of time spent by officers on sixteen different activity categories. Next, to assess whether community police officers' activities vary from traditional beat officers' activities, t-tests are conducted between community and traditional beat officers on the proportion of time spent on the different activity categories. This first phase provides an examination and comparison of the daily activities of community and traditional police officers.

Second, a two step approach is used to determine if the proportion of time spent on activities varies across neighborhoods. First, a series of dummy variable analyses were conducted in which each neighborhood is used to predict the proportion of time in all other neighborhoods in the city. Essentially, this procedure provides a test to see if each neighborhoods proportion is significantly different from the mean for all other neighborhoods in the city. In other words, the proportion of time spent on different activities in individual neighborhoods is compared to the norm for the city. Second, the proportion of time on activities is compared between individual neighborhoods.

The last portion of the analysis involves the use of multivariate models including individual level officer characteristics, neighborhood characteristics, and characteristics unique to each observation (i.e., weather) to predict the proportion of time spent on the six collapsed activity categories. The unit of analysis for this last series of analyses is observed officer shifts (generally 8 hour shifts). In other words, each case represents a shift in which an officer was
observed by a member of the research team. Due to the inclusion of multiple levels of predictor variables in the multivariate models the use of multi-level modeling is considered most appropriate.

Four problems exist with the use of ordinary least squares regression with multiple levels of independent variables. First, multicollinearity often exists between the individual and aggregate levels of independent variables since the aggregate variables are composed of the individuals within the aggregate. For example, neighborhoods with a high proportion of nonwhite residents may be highly correlated with the individual level variable race, since more of the cases in neighborhoods with a high proportion of nonwhite residents will also be nonwhite residents. This problem makes it difficult to say with any certainty which level of analysis is actually influencing the dependent variable.

Second, heteroskedasticity is often a problem when using aggregate level variables. In the present case, the measures for neighborhoods with larger populations will be more accurate than for neighborhoods with smaller populations. This is due to the fact that summary statistics calculated with smaller numbers are less stable (see Hanushek and Jackson, 1977). "The accuracy of the . . . variable will be a function of the number of individuals in the aggregate." (Hanushek and Jackson, 1977:143). Thus, differences in error term variances may exist when studying aggregate units--Heteroskedasticity. This inflates the standard errors making it more difficult to reject the null hypothesis (Hanushek and Jackson, 1977).

Third, spatial autocorrelation is a problem at the individual level since individuals within a group may be more similar to one another than to individuals in other groups. In other words, there may be more within group similarities than between group similarities.
Thus, individual cases within groups may share similar traits to one another. This problem deflates the standard errors making it easier to reject the null hypothesis (Hanushek and Jackson, 1977).

Finally, the use of ordinary least squares regression with multiple levels of predictor variables provides biased statistical tests of the aggregate level variables. Since the unit of analysis is at the individual level, the sample size of the aggregate variables is artificially inflated to the sample size for the individual level variables, thus making it easier to reject the null hypothesis. In the present case, the number of shifts or observations would be used rather than the number of neighborhoods. In other words, the sample size for the aggregate is 48, but using ordinary least squares the sample size would be inflated to the number of observations (606) since the unit of analysis is observed shifts.

Thus, the use of OLS regression techniques with multiple levels of independent variables is considered inappropriate. For these reasons a hierarchical linear modeling procedure is used for the present analysis (for recent discussions of the applicability of multi-level modeling to criminal justice research see Welsh, Greene and Jenkins, 1999).

**Multi-level Modeling Procedure**

In the present study these four problems were dealt with using two-stage weighted least squares regression.\(^{10}\) First, to correct for heteroskedasticity, a weight is created for use in the two-stage regression. The weight is equal the square root of the number of cases

---

\(^{10}\) The only available multi-level software package (hierarchical linear modeling software--HLM) could not be used with the data in this study. Only data with a large number of cases within groups can be analyzed using the HLM software. Many of the aggregates in the present study have a small number of cases within them, as such the HLM software could not be used for the present study.
within each neighborhood. Second, weights were created to correct for spatial autocorrelation. These weights are the square root of one minus rho-squared (serial correlation coefficient-squared). Third, the individual and aggregate variables were centered. Centering individual level variables was accomplished by subtracting the group mean from every case and then adding the grand mean. Aggregate level variables were centered by subtracting the grand mean from each case. Centering uncorrelates the two different levels of variables.\textsuperscript{11} Lastly, two-stage weighted least squares regression was used to analyze the variables. The use of two-stage regression corrects for biased statistical tests, while centering and inclusion of the two weights, one at each level, corrects for heteroskedasticity, spatial autocorrelation, and multicollinearity.\textsuperscript{12}

Together these analyses will provide a detailed description of the types of activities officers engage in during a typical workday, whether community oriented officers differ from traditional officers, if officers vary their activities depending on the neighborhood, and what factors influence the activities of officers.

\textsuperscript{11} Regression models were run using both the centered and uncentered individual level variables. The results were insignificantly different and thus for ease of interpretation the uncentered models are presented.

\textsuperscript{12} Prior to the multi-level modeling procedure a check for multicollinearity within levels was conducted. First, bivariate correlations were run to test for collinearity between individual variables. Second, each level of predictor variables was factor analyzed to look for collinearity caused by interactions between variables. Total explained variation above 50\% suggests collinearity. In both cases total explained variation was less than 50\%. Thus, no harmful collinearity was detected.
CHAPTER 4
FINDINGS

This chapter provides the findings for the analysis of work routine, variation in activities across neighborhoods, and the multivariate analysis. First, the proportion of time COP and beat officers spend during a typical work day performing various activities is presented. This is followed by a comparison of the work routines of COP and traditional beat officers. Second, the proportion of time spent on six collapsed activity categories is examined across neighborhoods within the city to determine if officer activities vary from neighborhood to neighborhood. Finally, the results from multivariate analyses of factors influencing police activities are provided.

OFFICER WORK ROUTINE

The following analysis of work routine provides a description of both community oriented and traditional police officer activities during first and second shift observations. These descriptions do not provide a detailed description of all police officers in Cincinnati, but rather only those street-level officers working between the hours of 7:00 am and 11:00 pm. As discussed in the methods section, third shift was not selected because COP officers are encouraged to work during first and second shift only. Since COP officers typically only work first and second shift in Cincinnati, it does provide a description of the activities engaged in by the typical COP officer in Cincinnati.

Table 5 presents the total number of observed minutes and the proportion of time spent on sixteen different activity categories for all observed COP officers and beat officers. A total of 188,510 minutes (3,142 hours) were observed. The first column lists the sixteen
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Table 5. Proportion of Time Spent on Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>Collapsed Activity*</th>
<th>All Officers</th>
<th>COP Officers</th>
<th>Beat Officers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Minutes</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foot Patrol</td>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Patrol</td>
<td>Patrol</td>
<td>49,710</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>20,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Incidents</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>18,677</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>6,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative- Crime Related</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>4,477</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>8,009</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>2,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Enforcement</td>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>9,270</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Maintenance</td>
<td>Order</td>
<td>4,849</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>Service</td>
<td>5,201</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>2,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance Enforcement</td>
<td>COP</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Service</td>
<td>COP</td>
<td>3,483</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>3,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Focused</td>
<td>COP</td>
<td>1,879</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Gathering</td>
<td>COP</td>
<td>6,204</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>4,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings W/Other Nonpolice Service Providers</td>
<td>COP</td>
<td>1,644</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1,413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>35,984</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>20,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>En route/Waiting</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>19,260</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>7,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Excluded</td>
<td>17,951</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>10,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>188,510</td>
<td></td>
<td>86,142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Collapsed activity categories are used in the analysis of variation and the multivariate analysis.

different activity categories. Column two designates the six collapsed activity categories used in the analysis of neighborhood variation and the multivariate analysis. These collapsed categories are presented to provide a link between the work routine analysis and the following
two analyses. Columns three and four present total observed minutes (both COP and beat combined) for each activity and the proportion of total time spent on these activities. Columns five and six present this same information for COP officers, while column seven and eight display this information for observed beat officers.

All Officers

The third and fourth column in Table 5 provide the total number of minutes spent by both groups of officers combined on sixteen activities and the proportion of total time spent on these activities. As can be seen from these two columns, police officers in Cincinnati spend almost no time on foot patrol (less than 0.3% or ½ hour per month). Motorized patrol on the other hand is engaged in during approximately 26 percent of a police officers day (over 2 hours per shift).

Time spent on crime related activities consumes approximately 16 percent or roughly 1 hour and 20 minutes per shift. Crime related activities include responding to criminal incidents (10 %), conducting crime related administrative tasks (2 %), and conducting investigations (4 %). As described in Chapter 3, the category of criminal incidents include activities such as serving papers (warrants), attempting to locate a suspect, or responding to calls for service that involve specific criminal incidents. Crime related administrative tasks include transporting prisoners, meeting about specific cases, processing arrestees and other administrative duties related to specific criminal incidents. The last activity included as crime related is investigative activities. This category includes activities such as surveillance, responding to suspicious circumstances, interrogation and various other activities directed toward investigating criminal or potential criminal occurrences.
Together, the two activities traditionally considered as the core of police work (crime related and patrol) account for a substantial proportion of the observed time. Patrol and crime related activities account for 43 percent or approximately 3 ½ hours of an officer’s working day.

Traffic enforcement, order maintenance and service activities are all conducted for 5 percent or less of an officer’s day. Specifically, traffic enforcement (e.g., moving violations, responding to accidents) is conducted for approximately 20 minutes (5 %) during an officer’s shift. Officers also spend 3 percent or about 15 minutes per shift on order maintenance activities, such as, keeping the peace or responding to a public nuisance or disorderly teenagers. Service activities, such as providing medical or motorist assistance, take up only about 3 percent or 15 minutes of an officers’ day.

Officers spend about 8 percent of their day or 38 minutes on nontraditional police activities such as ordinance enforcement, community-based service, problem focused tasks, information gathering and meetings with other service providers. Ordinance enforcement (e.g., business regulations, liquor permit checks) was observed during only 1 percent of the observation time or about 5 minutes per shift (1 hour 35 minutes per month). Officers perform community-based service activities, such as attending community meetings or conducting school visits during approximately 2 percent of their shifts or 10 minutes per day.\textsuperscript{13} Problem focused activities, such as conducting research or inquiring about a specific

\textsuperscript{13} Attendance at community meetings is under represented in this study since these meetings are generally held in the evening and officers working 1st shift will attend these meetings as overtime. In fact, it was pointed out by members of CPD that since COP officers spent less time in court, and thus received less opportunities for this source of overtime pay, they were allowed to attend community meetings and record it as overtime.
community problem, were observed during only 1 percent of the observed time or about 5 minutes per shift. Information gathering by officers is done for almost 15 minutes (3%) during a shift. These activities include, among other things, crime analysis and collecting information for a community meeting. Lastly, meetings with nonpolice service providers, such as social workers, is only engaged in for about 5 minutes per day (1% or 1 hour 35 minutes per month).

The last three categories in Table 5 include administrative duties, en route to locations and waiting for other police, and personal business. Police officers in Cincinnati spend 1 hour 30 minutes (19%) per shift on general administrative duties such as roll call and shift preparation. Time spent en route to locations and waiting for the arrival of other police consumes 10 percent or 48 minutes of an officers’ day. The final activity, personal time (e.g., meals, personal errands), also consumes 10 percent or 48 minutes of an officers’ day.

Community Police Officers

Looking at the fifth and sixth column in Table 5, COP officers in Cincinnati spend very little time on foot patrol. COP officers spend less than 0.5 percent or roughly 2 ½ minutes per shift (48 minutes per month) patrolling on foot. Thus, of the sixteen categories COP officers spend the least amount of time on foot patrol. The activity which consumed the largest proportion of time was routine motor patrol. COP officers spend 24 percent or approximately 2 hours during a typical shift on routine patrol.

Crime related activities, including the categories of crime incidences, administrative--crime related, and investigative, account for 12 percent or almost 1 hour of a COP officer’s
day. Specific criminal incidents take up 7 percent or about one-half hour of COP officers' shifts. Administrative duties related to crime take up another 10 minutes or 2 percent of their day. The last activity included as crime related, investigative, is conducted by COP officers 3 percent or for 15 minutes per shift.

The next three activities in Table 5, traffic enforcement, order maintenance, and service, all take up about 2 percent or 10 minutes each of a COP officers' day. COP officers in general spend about 14 percent or nearly 1 hour and 10 minutes per day on nontraditional police activities such as ordinance enforcement, community-based service, problem focused, information gathering, and meetings with other service providers. Of these activities, ordinance enforcement is conducted the least with officers spending only about 1 percent of their day or about 5 minutes on this activity. Community-based service on the other hand consumes approximately 4 percent or 20 minutes per COP officer shift. Problem focused activities take up only 10 minutes per day (2 %) for COP officers. Information gathering consumes the largest share of time out of these five nontraditional activities (5 % or 24 minutes). The last category, meetings with service providers, takes up approximately 2 percent or 10 minutes per day for COP officers.

The last three categories together take up a substantial proportion of COP officers' days. Administrative duties are conducted during about 1 hour 50 minutes (23 %) per shift. Traveling to specific locations and waiting for the arrival of other police consumes an additional 43 minutes or 9 percent of COP officers' days. Finally, time spent conducting personal business, such as meals and personal errands, consumes 12 percent of their work routine or almost 1 hour per shift.
Beat Officers

Examining the last two columns in Table 5 it can be seen that similar to the COP officers, beat officers spend almost no time engaged in foot patrol. Beat officers spend less than 15 minutes per month patrolling on foot. Motorized patrol, on the other hand, is conducted for almost two and one-half hours per day.

The crime related activities of responding to criminal incidents, administrative crime related and crime investigations together consume 20 percent or over 1 ½ hours of beat officers’ days. Specifically, crime incidents alone take up almost 1 hour per day (12 %). Administrative duties related to crime account for another 15 minutes (3 %) per day. Lastly, beat officers also spend 24 minutes (5 %) of their day on investigative activities.

The activities of traffic enforcement, order maintenance and service together only take up about 14 percent of beat officers’ shifts (1 hour 7 minutes). Traffic enforcement consumes the majority of this time with officers spending 38 minutes (8 %) per day on this activity. Order maintenance and service are both conducted for about 15 minutes each per day (3 % each).

As is to be expected, beat officers spend very little time on nontraditional police activities commonly associated with community policing (3 % of their day). Ordinance enforcement is conducted during only 1 percent of beat officers’ days. Community-based service, problem focused activities and meetings with other service providers are all conducted less than 5 minutes per shift or 1 percent of the observed time (one-half hour per month). Information gathering consumes 2 percent or roughly 10 minutes per beat officer shift.
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The last three activities in Table 5 account for nearly 2 hours 10 minutes (27 %) per beat officer shift. Beat officers spend a great deal of time on administrative duties (16 % or 1 hour 17 minutes per shift). In addition to these general administrative duties (roll call, shift preparation, equipment maintenance, etc.), beat officers also spend considerable time traveling to and from locations and waiting for other police. Time spent traveling from one location to another (en route) and waiting for the arrival of citizens or other police personnel accounts for nearly 53 minutes per shift (11 %). Lastly, beat officers take just over one-half hour per day of personal time (7 %).

COMPARISON OF COP AND BEAT OFFICERS

In order to determine if COP and beat officers differ in the proportion of time spent on these sixteen different activities a series of t-tests between the two groups of officers were performed. In addition, to further explore differences between the two groups of officers, time spent in encounters with citizens was removed from the activity categories and treated as its own category (time spent in encounters). T-tests were then performed on the seventeen adjusted categories.

Table 6 presents the results of these t-tests. The first column in Table 6 displays the sixteen different activity categories. The second and third column include the proportion of time observed on the listed activity for both COP and beat officers respectively. The last two columns present t-values from the t-tests. Column four presents the t-values from the comparisons between COP and beat officers on the total amount of time spent on these sixteen activities. The last column includes the t-values from the t-tests between COP and beat officers on the seventeen adjusted categories. In other words, the last column presents
t-values on time proportions where citizen encounters are not included, with the bottom category representing differences in time spent on face to face contact with citizens. Officers were observed a total of 37,160 minutes in encounters with citizens \((COP = 14,127 \text{ or } 16.4\%; \text{beat} = 23,033 \text{ or } 22.5\%).

As can be seen from Table 6, there are seven categories which differ significantly between the two groups of officers. Beat officers spend significantly more time on crime incidents activities, traffic enforcement, and En route or waiting. COP officers spend significantly more time on community-based service, problem focused, and information gathering activities. In addition to these six expected differences, the two groups of officers also differ in the amount of time spent on administrative and personal activities. COP officers spend significantly more time on administrative duties and personal time than do beat officers.

The second set of t-tests between COP and beat officers places encounters with citizens as its own category of activities. Three relationships that were significant are no longer significant when encounters with citizens are placed in a separate category. The two groups of officers do not differ significantly on crime incidents, traffic enforcement, and community-based service activities when encounters are treated as a separate category. However, these activities by their nature generally require some sort of citizen contact or encounter. For instance, it is difficult to have a criminal incident without a victim, witness, or suspect. Thus, it is to be expected that the proportion of time spent in these categories would drop for both groups of officers. Also, significant in this last set of t-tests is the difference between the two types of officers in terms of the proportion of time spent in encounters with citizens. Beat officers spend significantly more time in encounters with
citizens than do COP officers.

Table 6. Comparison of COP and Beat Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>COP</th>
<th>Beat</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>Activities** Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foot Patrol</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>-.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Patrol</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>1.353</td>
<td>1.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Incidents</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>3.992*</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative-Crime Related</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.422</td>
<td>-.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigative</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>-1.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Enforcement</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>3.224*</td>
<td>1.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Maintenance</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>-.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ordinance Enforcement</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-1.215</td>
<td>-.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-Based Service</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-2.025*</td>
<td>-1.515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Focused</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-2.630*</td>
<td>-2.630*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Gathering</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-3.472*</td>
<td>-3.193*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meetings W/Other Nonpolice Service Providers</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.843</td>
<td>-.665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-7.082*</td>
<td>-7.081*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroute/Waiting</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.474*</td>
<td>2.479*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-5.259*</td>
<td>-4.795*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encounters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.397*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.001  
* p<.05  
** T-values when minutes spent during encounters with citizens are removed from proportions of time.
VARIATION ACROSS NEIGHBORHOODS

As a first step towards examining if officer activities vary across neighborhoods a series of dummy variable analyses were conducted for both groups of officers comparing the proportion of time spent on the six collapsed activity categories discussed in Chapter 3 (motor patrol, crime related, service, order maintenance, traffic enforcement, and COP activities) across neighborhoods. This procedure compares the proportion of time spent in each neighborhood to the mean proportion for all neighborhoods in the study. In other words, each individual neighborhood was compared to the norm.

The rationale for collapsing the activity categories rather than using all sixteen is threefold. First, many of the categories are tapping into similar types of activities. For example, crime incidents, investigative and administrative—crime related (reports of specific criminal incidents) are all crime related types of activities and are all interrelated. Second, for the variation and multivariate analysis a number of the categories are not of theoretical interest. For example, the issue of whether or not personal time varies across neighborhoods is not of theoretical interest to proponents of community policing. Further, duties primarily conducted in police facilities (e.g., administrative) will vary greatly across neighborhoods simply because police facilities are located in only a limited number of neighborhoods. Thus, these activities can only take place in certain neighborhoods. Lastly, officers spend very little time on some of the activities. Thus, these categories have small base rates on which to make comparisons. For these three reasons the sixteen categories of activities have been collapsed into six theoretically relevant and manageable categories.

Many of the six collapsed categories are self explanatory and remain unchanged from
the previous sixteen categories (patrol, traffic, order maintenance, service). However, two of the six categories require some explanation. Crime related activities is composed of three activity categories (crime incidences, administrative--crime related and investigative). The community policing activities category is composed of ordinance enforcement, community-based service, problem focused, information gathering and meetings with other service providers. Administrative activities, en route/waiting and personal activities are not included in this portion of the analysis.

**Dummy Variable Analysis**

Six activity categories were analyzed across thirty-five neighborhoods for COP officers. Of the 210 analyses conducted only 12 statistically significant differences were found. At least 10 statistically significant differences would be expected by chance alone at the .05 probability level. Thus, it is likely that these 12 differences are due to chance. Overall, it does not appear that neighborhoods differ significantly from the norm for the city.

For beat officers six activity categories were analyzed across forty-three different neighborhoods. Of the 258 analyses conducted only 15 statistically significant differences were found. At least 13 statistically significant differences would be expected by chance alone at the .05 probability level. Further, as with COP officers it appears that no single neighborhood stands out from the norm in the city in terms of officer activities.

The use of dummy variable analyses comparing individual neighborhoods to the norm is a conservative test which would allow for the identification of neighborhoods which stand out from the other neighborhoods in the city. Thus, to further explore officer activities across neighborhoods and identify more subtle variations a series of bar graphs were created. These
graphs present the data in a format that allows for visual examination of the proportion of time spent across neighborhoods on the six activity categories. Appendix 9 presents the bar graphs for both COP and beat officers on all six categories.

**Beat Officers**

The graphs of beat officers show that in the top quartile of neighborhoods officers spend from approximately 30 percent to almost 45 percent of their time on patrol. Three neighborhoods in the bottom quartile receive roughly five percent of officer time on patrol. For crime related activities, some minor variation appears. In two neighborhoods beat officers spend over 20 percent of their time on crime related activities and in six neighborhoods they spend less than five percent of their time on crime related activities. The time spent on traffic enforcement in neighborhoods ranged between zero and 1 hour 20 minutes per officer shift. Overall there appear to be two levels of traffic enforcement in neighborhoods (those below .05 and those between .08 and .11). Examining it another way, the top and bottom quartiles appear to differ from the rest of the neighborhoods in the city. The top quartile of neighborhoods receive from .10 to .17 on traffic enforcement while the bottom quartile all receive less than .05 and some even receive no traffic enforcement from beat officers.

Service activities were performed infrequently by beat officers in almost all neighborhoods. Beat officers in the top quartile of neighborhoods engaged in service activities between .04 and .08 percent of their observed time. In other words, officers spent between 18 minutes and 38 minutes per shift on service activities. The bottom quartile of neighborhoods on the other hand received no service activities from beat officers. Thus,
although the base rates for service activities are small it does appear that some neighborhoods receive different levels of service activities than others.

Order maintenance activities were also performed relatively infrequently by beat officers. The top quartile of neighborhoods received between 15 minutes per shift and 38 minutes per shift on order maintenance activities. The bottom quartile received no time on service activities from beat officers. Community policing activities, the last category, are also performed infrequently by beat officers. One neighborhood received substantially more than all of the other neighborhoods with over an hour per shift. All other neighborhoods in Cincinnati received less than 20 minutes per shift of community policing activities from beat officers.

COP Officers

The community police officers' graphs appear somewhat different from the beat officers’ graphs. Unlike beat officers, time spent on patrol appears to vary a small amount between neighborhoods. That is, there are eight neighborhoods (roughly the bottom quartile) where officers spend less than 15 percent of their time on patrol, five others in which they spend between 20 and 30 percent, and fourteen where they spend more than 30 percent of their time on routine patrol. Thus, some neighborhoods receive relatively low amounts (just over 1 hour per officer shift) of routine patrol from COP officers while others receive moderate to heavy amounts of routine patrol (as much as 2 hours 24 minutes per shift).

COP officers spend over one hour per day on crime related matters in seven (top quartile) of the twenty-seven neighborhoods examined. All other neighborhoods receive one hour or less per day of crime related activities. COP officers spend very little time on traffic
enforcement and service activities in all neighborhoods. Similar to beat officers, COP officers also do not appear to vary across neighborhoods in the proportion of time they spend on order maintenance activities. The last category examined for COP officers was that of nontraditional or COP activities. Eight neighborhoods (top quartile) received more than 48 minutes per shift of COP activities, whereas eight others (bottom quartile) received zero or almost no minutes per shift. The remaining neighborhoods received greater than zero minutes, but less than 24 minutes per officer shift.

Overall, it appears that the activities of neither COP nor beat officers vary much across neighborhoods. The dummy variable analysis did not reveal any variation in activities across neighborhoods. A visual examination and focusing on the top and bottom quartile for each activity reveals some subtle variation between neighborhoods on a few activities. In other words, the bar graphs suggest variation which was not detected in the dummy variable analysis. Therefore, analysis of variance was used to test for differences on the six activities across neighborhoods. Twelve different ANOVA models were constructed (6 activities for beat officers and 6 activities for COP officers). The results of the ANOVA models are consistent with the dummy-variable analysis. Neighborhoods do not appear to vary in terms of the proportion of time officers spend on the six different activity categories. Overall it appears that officer activities do not vary across neighborhoods to the extent that would be expected by proponents of community policing.

14 Three ANOVA models were significant for each group of officers (routine patrol, order maintenance and traffic enforcement). However, Levene's tests for the homogeneity of variances revealed heteroskedasticity. Thus, the results of the F-test for significance are not reliable. Further, it leads to the conclusion that any differences observed between the explained and unexplained variances may be due to chance fluctuations in some of the neighborhoods with smaller numbers of cases.
MULTIVARIATE MODELS

This last section of the findings chapter presents the results of multivariate analyses using individual and neighborhood factors to predict the proportion of time officers spend in a neighborhood on six different activity categories during a single shift. This analysis includes both COP and beat officers together in a single model in order to examine the direct effects of officer assignment. The unit of analysis for this examination is officer shift or observation period. In other words, every case represents an observation of an officer during a shift of work. Due to the inclusion of two levels of analysis (individual and neighborhood) in the model the use of a multi-level modeling procedure is most appropriate.

Two-Stage Weighted Least Squares Results

Six separate regression analyses were conducted with only the dependent variable changing. Individual officer variables and neighborhood level variables were used to predict the proportion of time spent on the six collapsed activity categories. The same predictors are included in all six regression equations.

Routine Patrol. The results of the first multivariate model predicting the dependent variable routine patrol are presented in Table 7 below. As can be seen from Table 7 both models explain a relatively small proportion of the variation in the dependent variable (3.2% and 3.9%). None of the neighborhood level factors hypothesized to be related to time spent on patrol are significant. Only one individual level variable is significantly related to the proportion of time officers spend on routine patrol. Specifically, officer length of service is significantly related to the proportion of time spent on patrol. In other words, officers who have worked a greater number of years for the Cincinnati Police Division spend a greater
Table 7. Two-Stage Least Squares: Patrol

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=601)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=46)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Assignment</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.004*</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.030</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.753</td>
<td>.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.952*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.423</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
<td>.039</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
proportion of their day on routine patrol, and this holds irrespective of officer assignment.

Order Maintenance. Table 8 presents the results of the second multivariate model predicting order maintenance activities. This model provides somewhat more explanatory power overall than the previous one. The $R^2$ for stage one is .023, but for stage two the $R^2$ is .149. The second stage explains almost 15 percent of the variation in the dependent variable.

Only two variables are significant predictors of order maintenance activities. One individual level variable is significant in this model. Officer orientation toward community policing is negatively related to the proportion of time officers spend on order maintenance activities. In other words, officers that are more positive toward community policing perform less order maintenance activities. The only neighborhood level variable significantly related to order maintenance is the proportion of parcels in the neighborhood that are industrial or commercial warehouses. Officers working in these types of neighborhoods perform less order maintenance activities than officers in neighborhoods with less of this type of commercial activity.

Crime Related. Table 9 presents the results for crime related activities. Stage one of the model explains 3.6 percent of the variation in the dependent variable, while stage two explains 4.5 percent of the variation in the dependent variable. None of the aggregate neighborhood level variables are significantly related to the proportion of time officers spend on crime related activities. One individual level variable, however, is significantly related to crime related activities. Specifically, the variable supervisory input is significantly related to crime related activities. Officers who responded that their supervisors determine their daily
Table 8. Two-Stage Least Squares: Order Maintenance

| Variables                   | Stage 1 (n=518) | | | Stage 2 (n=46) | | |
|-----------------------------|----------------|---|---|----------------|---|
|                             | b   | SE  | Beta| b   | SE  | Beta| |
| Individual Level            |     |     |     |     |     |     | |
| Officer Assignment          | .065| .017| .019| --- | --- | --- | |
| Officer Length of Service   | -.054| .001| -.001| --- | --- | --- | |
| Officer Education           | -.011| .007| -.002| --- | --- | --- | |
| Officer Race                | .049| .013| .014| --- | --- | --- | |
| Officer Sex                 | .023| .019| .009| --- | --- | --- | |
| Supervisory Input           | -.042| .013| -.010| --- | --- | --- | |
| Citizen Input               | .012| .011| .002| --- | --- | --- | |
| Orientation Toward COP      | -.154| .003| -.008*| --- | --- | --- | |
| Temperature                 | .014| .000| .000| --- | --- | --- | |
| Precipitation               | -.045| .006| -.006| --- | --- | --- | |
| Neighborhood Variables      |     |     |     |     |     |     | |
| Mobility                    | --- | --- | --- | -.199| 6.117| -7.858| |
| Socioeconomic Status        | --- | --- | --- | .217| .166| .223| |
| Proportion                  | --- | --- | --- | -.456| 5.006| -11.490*| |
| Commercial/Government       | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |
| Land Use/Crime Rate         | --- | --- | --- | .149| .282| .220| |
| Constant                    | .172| .060*| --- | -.761| .509| --- | |
| F                           | 1.208|     |     | 1.834|     |     | |
| $R^2$                       | .023|     |     | .149|     |     | |
| * p < .05                   |     |     |     |     |     |     | |

104
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=514)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=46)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Assignment</td>
<td>-.099</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.057*</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>1.859*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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activities are more likely to engage in crime related activities. Interestingly, the earlier bivariate finding that beat officers engage in more crime related activities than COP officers disappears when controlling for other influences on officer activities.

**Traffic Enforcement.** The fourth activity examined, traffic enforcement, is presented below in Table 10. The amount of variation in the dependent variable explained by stage one and stage two of this model is 6.6 percent and 6.9 percent, respectively. Again, as with two of the other three activities, none of the neighborhood level variables are significantly related to the dependent variable. Only the officer assignment dummy variable is significantly related to the proportion of time officers spend on traffic enforcement activities. Officer assignment directly influences the proportion of time officers spend on traffic enforcement. This finding is consistent with the earlier bivariate t-test between the two groups of officers in that beat officers spend more time on traffic enforcement.

**Service.** The fifth multivariate model, presented in Table 11, contains no significant predictor variables. None of the neighborhood or individual level factors appear to significantly influence officer service activities. The overall predictive power of the model is low. Stage one explains only two percent of the variation in the dependent variable, while stage two explains 7.4 percent of the variation. It should be kept in mind, however, that very little time is spent on these activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=589)</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Assignment</td>
<td>-0.241</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>-0.080*</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Variables</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td>3.006</td>
<td>3.533</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.082</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.151</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>2.460</td>
<td>-2.212</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Commercial/Government</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F       | 4.084* |
| R²      | 0.066  |
| * p < .05
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=554)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=46)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Assignment</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>4.018</td>
<td>2.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-.177</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>-.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>3.288</td>
<td>5.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-.152</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>-.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.050*</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>.334</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>1.088</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2</strong></td>
<td>.020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Community Policing.** The last multivariate model involves nontraditional or community policing activities. These findings are presented in Table 12. This model is similar to four of the other five models in that it has relatively little predictive power. Stage one explains 11 percent of the variation in the dependent variable. Stage two explains only 6 percent of the variation in the dependent variable. None of the neighborhood factors are significantly related to the dependent variable. Two individual level factors, however, are significantly related to the proportion of time officers spend on COP activities. First, as was expected, officer assignment is positively related to COP activities. Officers assigned as community police officers spend a significantly greater proportion of their shift engaging in community policing activities. Second, officer sex is also significantly related to COP activities. Male officers spend a significantly smaller proportion of their day on COP activities.

In order to test for the direct influences on COP and beat officer activities separately, twelve additional two-stage regressions were calculated. The sample of observations was divided into two samples (COP and beat officer observations). The same procedure as before (two-stage weighted least squares) was used to deal with the problems of multi-level modeling. Because the calculations in the multi-level modeling procedure described earlier are based, in part, on the number of cases within each aggregate the weights had to be recalculated based on the new samples. Six regressions, with only the dependent variable changing, were then conducted with each group of officers for a total of twelve regression
equations. Of the twelve regressions only one variable was significantly related to activities.\textsuperscript{15}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12. Two-Stage Least Squares: Community Policing Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Commercial/Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R\textsuperscript{2}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{15} The variable supervisory input approached statistical significance (p<.051) in the beat officer model predicting crime related activities. The results are presented in Appendix 10.
CONCLUSION

This chapter first provided a description of the activities of both traditional beat and community policing officers in Cincinnati. In addition, both groups of officers were compared based on the proportion of time spent on sixteen different activity categories. Second, it has provided an examination of variation in officer activities across neighborhoods in the city. Lastly, multi-level models were used to predict the proportion of time spent of various activities. Together these analyses represent an advance in our understanding of police activities specifically and police behavior and community policing in general. In the last chapter these findings will be discussed in light of the previous research on officer behavior and community policing.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

This chapter contains a discussion of the results of the study. The chapter follows the same format as the preceding chapters. First, the analysis of officer work routine is discussed. Second, the results of the variation analysis are discussed. Lastly, the multivariate models are addressed in the order they were presented in the previous chapter. In addition, implications for community policing and future research are also discussed.

OFFICER WORK ROUTINE

Most of the literature on community policing suggests, either implicitly or explicitly, that the daily activities of community police officers will differ from traditional beat officers (see e.g., Frank et. al., 1997; Mastrofski, 1992; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1994). Further, it is posited that officers should engage in a broader variety of activities and perform community policing, order maintenance and service activities to a greater extent and traditional crime oriented police activities to a lesser extent (Greene and Taylor, 1988; Kratcoski and Dukes, 1995; Oliver, 1998; Mastrofski, 1988; Mastrofski, Worden and Snipes, 1995). The few empirical studies which have examined community police officer activities find that the types of activities and the frequency of their performance differ between community police officers and traditional police officers (see Frank et. al., 1997; Kratcoski and Dukes, 1995; Travis and Sanders, 1998). In addition, case studies, when taken together, suggest that community police officers may be performing different activities than traditional police officers.

The first analysis in this study examined the proportion of time officers spend on sixteen different activity categories in an attempt to determine what community and traditional
officers in Cincinnati do during a typical day. One of the most noticeable findings was the absence of foot patrol by officers in Cincinnati. Out of the sixteen activity categories, officers in Cincinnati spend the least amount of time on foot patrol. During a typical month officers spend roughly one-half hour on this activity (COP officers 48 minutes per month and beat officers less than 15 minutes per month). This may be due, in part, to the hilly terrain in which the city is located. Additionally, the CPD has separate bicycle and mounted units to patrol parks and other areas amenable to foot patrol. Lastly, officers in Cincinnati are not required to engage in foot patrol. These three circumstances probably contribute to the rarity of observed foot patrol in Cincinnati.

The single largest category of observed activity was routine patrol or what others have referred to as uncommitted time. Officers overall spend 26 percent of their day on routine motorized patrol (COP=24%, beat=29%). This finding is consistent with previous research conducted in Cincinnati which found that community officers spend approximately 22 percent of their day on routine patrol (Frank et. al., 1997). Other research has reported between approximately 24 and 32 percent of beat officers’ time is spent on patrol (see Kelling, Pate, Dieckman, and Brown, 1974; Frank et. al., 1997; see also Cordner, 1979; Greene and Klockars, 1991). Despite a new job position and training, routine patrol is still the “Backbone of policing” in Cincinnati (see Wilson and McLaren, 1977).

One other finding from the first analysis is worthy of note in this discussion section. Officers spend 10 percent of their day on crime incidents (COP=7%, beat=12%). These activities involve responding to specific criminal incidents. Another way of conceptualizing crime related is to include the categories of investigative and administrative crime related.
The inclusion of these two categories brings the total proportion of time spent on crime related activities to 16 percent (COP=12%, beat=20%). These findings are consistent with previous research which finds patrol officers spending between 10 and 17 percent of their day on crime related activities (see Cordner, 1979; Greene and Klockars, 1991 for reviews).

Overall, the findings from the analysis of officer workload are consistent with previous research on officers’ daily activities. Admittedly these studies may not have measured activities in the same fashion as in the present study. However, they are attempting to tap into the same general concepts (crime related, administrative, etc.) and they report similar findings on these activities. Thus, officers in Cincinnati appear to perform activities in similar proportions to officers in other cities studied. They spend a large portion of their day on patrol, responding to criminal incidents, engaging in administrative work, en route to locations, and taking personal time. The remaining 25 percent of their days are spent on various other activities (e.g., order maintenance, service, problem focused). However, it should also be noted that although the findings are similar to other studies, community police officers in Cincinnati spend a significant portion of their day on nontraditional police activities (e.g., community-based service).

COMPARISON

The comparison of community and beat officers revealed a number of significant differences between the two groups of officers. Beat officers spend a significantly greater proportion of their day on crime related activities, traffic enforcement, and en route to locations. Community officers on the other hand spend a significantly greater proportion of their day on community-based service, problem focused activities, information gathering,
administrative, and personal time. It is apparent from these findings that community police officer activities in Cincinnati differ substantially from beat officer activities. Further, the types of activities they perform more frequently are the types of activities proponents of community policing suggest that officers should be engaged in to implement this policing strategy (i.e., community-based service, problem focused, information gathering). In addition, community officers in Cincinnati spend less of their day than do beat officers on traditional police activities, such as, responding to criminal incidents and engaging in traffic enforcement. Thus, as suggested by proponents of community policing, these two types of officers do differ in the types of activities performed and the frequency of performance. At the same time, however, it should be noted that community police officers still spend a significant proportion of their day engaging in these traditional police activities. Further, the mainstay of policing, routine patrol, is still performed by both types of officers at approximately the same rate. In other words, although community officers appear to engage in an expanded variety of activities and perform what are commonly considered community policing activities to a greater extent than traditional beat officers, they are still performing traditional activities during the majority of their workday.

In sum, the typical day of a community police officer in Cincinnati looks different from the typical day of a beat officer. COP officers spend significantly more time on what are commonly considered community policing activities and significantly less of their day on some of the more traditional police activities (crime, traffic enforcement) when compared to beat officers. While COP officers still spend a significant proportion of their day on traditional activities, the findings suggest that, at least in Cincinnati, there is a substantive difference in
the way these two groups of officers spend their day.

VARIATION

A central tenet of community policing, and a central theme of this dissertation, is the notion of differential policing based on neighborhoods. As already noted, it is an assumption regarding how community policing should be implemented. The research to date often highlights variation across jurisdictions (see Maguire, Kuhns, Uchida, and Cox, 1997; Riechers and Roberg, 1990; Weisel and Eck, 1994). In addition, research has examined variation in traditional police officer behavior (see Bittner, 1967; Brown, 1981, Muir, 1977; Walsh, 1985). However, the assumption that community police officer activities will vary within cities has not been tested empirically.

The second analysis in this study examined this issue of variation in police officer activities across neighborhoods within a city. A dummy variable analysis was conducted to determine if the proportion of time spent on six activity categories (activities that community policing theory suggests will differ) in neighborhoods differed from the norm for the city. The results show that neighborhoods do not receive a significantly different proportion of time on the six activity categories. However, due to the conservativeness of the test a second step was performed in order to further examine the issue.

The proportion of time spent on these same six activities was compared between individual neighborhoods by using bar graphs as a visual aid. This second step provided some insight into variation across neighborhoods. There does appear to be some subtle variation in activities across neighborhoods in Cincinnati. Although most neighborhoods receive similar quantities of activities on the six categories, several neighborhoods do appear to
receive somewhat different amounts of police service on some of the six categories. Thus, a further analysis was conducted using analysis of variance. Analysis of variance revealed that officer activities do not appear to vary across neighborhoods. As such, it appears that the variation detected in the bar graphs is subtle at best and may be due to fluctuations in neighborhoods with smaller numbers of observations. Further, it is not what would be expected considering the emphasis placed on variation by proponents of community policing.

There are two possible explanations for the finding that officer activities do not vary substantially across neighborhoods. The first, and most obvious is that officer activities, in fact, do not vary across neighborhoods. Community police officers in Cincinnati may simply be applying a new approach but applying it to all areas of the city in a similar manner. However, the present study failed to tap into neighborhood needs and desires. Thus, it is possible, however unlikely considering the variation in types of neighborhoods, that neighborhood residents in Cincinnati want and need similar activities from police. If such is the case, then there would be less reason to expect variation in police activities across neighborhoods. The second explanation has to do with the categorization of activities. It may be that combining an officer’s entire day into only six categories masks variation. For example, although almost no variation was found in service activities across neighborhoods, it may be that officers are performing different types of service activities across neighborhoods. Thus, had various different types of activities not been aggregated together into one category it is possible that variation might have been detected. However, a dummy variable analysis was also conducted on the sixteen categories of activities between neighborhoods. As with the six category analysis the number of significant relationships was less than would be expected by chance.
considering the extent to which proponents suggest community police officers should vary activities across neighborhoods it is reasonable to expect that activities should vary enough to be detected by the six categories used in this analysis.

The sometimes explicit and always implicit assumption that community policing will vary across neighborhoods is largely unsupported by this analysis. Although some subtle variation is detected, the extent of variation suggested by proponents of community policing is clearly not evident in Cincinnati.

MULTIVARIATE

The final analysis involved the use of multi-level multivariate models to predict the proportion of time officers spend on the six collapsed activity categories. The results from these six multivariate models were somewhat surprising. The models overall were weak predictors of officer activities with few significant variables.

Routine Patrol

The first model predicting routine patrol contained only one significant predictor of patrol. Officers working for the CPD a greater number of years spend a greater proportion of their day on routine patrol. However, it should be noted that due to the correlations between age and tenure on the force it is almost impossible to know whether these findings are the result of experience or age (Sherman, 1980). Nonetheless, this finding suggests that officers with a greater length of service may be less active towards their job in that they spend a greater proportion of their day on routine patrol. Indeed, length of service has been found to be related to productivity (see Langworthy and Travis, 1999).

There are a number of possible explanations for the finding that officers with more
experience spend more time on routine patrol. First, Langworthy and Travis (1999) suggest that older more experienced officers may be more sympathetic and tolerant of citizens. Thus, they may be less likely to make arrests, traffic stops or engage in various other more aggressive activities that involve behaviors directed against citizens. Second, Niederhoffer (1967) suggests that officers become more cynical over time and as a result their level of activity decreases. Ferdinand (1980) also suggests that as age increases, officers’ level of enthusiasm and effort decrease (see also Crank 1993). The present findings and previous research seem to support the common sense notion that older officers are less aggressive (see Langworthy and Travis, 1999; Sherman, 1980).

Overall, the majority of variation in routine patrol is still left unexplained. Thus, although more experienced officers spend more time on routine patrol the present study still does not shed much light on the predictors of routine patrol. One possible reason for this is that routine patrol is something that all officers engage in frequently. Routine patrol may be thought of as a fall back sort of activity. In other words, when officers are not doing anything else or have nothing else to do they patrol. For beat officers in particular routine patrol is what officers do until something happens or until the dispatcher directs them. Indeed, routine preventive patrol is a stated aspect of their job. Community police officers also spend a significant proportion of their day on routine patrol. They may also use patrol as a fall back activity. When they have nothing else to do or want nothing else to do they may simply patrol until either something happens or until they decide to engage in another specific activity again. Further, COP officers in Cincinnati may be encouraged to spend a significant proportion of their day on preventive patrol in their assigned neighborhood. Thus, officers may be doing
what they believe their supervisors expect of them.

Order Maintenance

The multivariate model predicting order maintenance activities contained two significant predictors, one at each level. Officer orientation or attitudes toward community policing are negatively related to order maintenance. As such, officers with a positive attitude toward community policing spend less time on order maintenance activities. This finding appears somewhat contrary to the finding of Mastrofski et. al. (1995) in which officers with pro community policing attitudes were found to be less likely to make arrests and by implication engage in law enforcement activities. They suggest that officers with these favorable attitudes might perform more activities commonly associated with community policing, such as order maintenance. However, an examination of the activities within the category of order maintenance reveals that many of the activities might be considered either order maintenance or law enforcement activities (e.g., vagrancy, non-domestic argument, disorderly behavior). As such, this finding may be consistent with Mastrofski et. al. (1995). Although it should be pointed out that the nonsignificant finding between crime and attitudes toward community policing does not support Mastrofski et. al.’s (1995) conclusion that these attitudes are associated with fewer crime related activities.

The only other significant variable in this model is the proportion of parcels within the neighborhood which are classified as industrial or commercial warehouses. Neighborhoods with a higher proportion of these parcels receive less order maintenance activities. This finding supports the initial hypothesis that these types of neighborhoods may have higher levels of informal social control and thus may require less police intervention (see generally
Black, 1976). Further, these types of neighborhoods may have less pedestrian traffic aside from employees and deliveries. As such, they may experience fewer instances of disturbing the peace, drinking in public and other activities which may require order maintenance activities from the police.

Crime Related

The most surprising finding in this model is the nonsignificant relationship between crime related activities and the dummy variable officer assignment. The bivariate finding that beat officers spend more time on crime related activities than community police officers becomes nonsignificant when controlling for other factors. The other surprising finding is the nonsignificant relationship between orientation toward COP and crime related activities. Officers with a positive attitude toward community policing perform crime related activities in approximately equal proportions to those with more negative attitudes. This finding is contradictory to Mastrofski et. al’s (1995) conclusion on pro community policing attitudes and crime activities.

The only significant predictor variable is supervisory input. Supervisory input is positively related to the proportion of time officers spend on crime related activities. Officers that more strongly agree with the statement that their supervisors direct their daily activities spend a larger proportion of their day performing crime related activities. It may be that supervisors only intervene in officer activities when crime issues need to be addressed, or some supervisors see crime as the key police activity, whether performed by COP or beat officers. Thus, the more input from supervisors the more crime related activities officers will perform. However, this result must be interpreted with caution. Only one survey item was
used to tap into supervisory input. This item does not provide information on how often or how forceful supervisors intervene in officer daily activities. Thus, officers may report that supervisors intervene in their daily activities, however, their may be variation in the extent to which supervisors intervene which is not measured in this study.

Traffic Enforcement

There are three findings that should be discussed regarding traffic enforcement. First, unlike the previous model the traffic enforcement model supports the bivariate findings. None of the neighborhood variables are significant, supporting the variation analysis that traffic enforcement activities do not vary across neighborhoods. This may be due in part to the fact that Cincinnati has a separate traffic enforcement bureau. Neighborhoods which request or need substantially more or less traffic enforcement may receive it from the traffic enforcement unit. Beat and community officers may simply perform traffic enforcement sporadically to fill in down time or when they observe flagrant violations.

The second interesting finding is the nonsignificant relationship between length of service and traffic enforcement. Previous research has found a relationship between traffic stops and length of service (Worden, 1989). The present study, however, supports the finding by Meyers et. al. (1987) that found length of service unrelated to decisions to stop suspected drunk drivers. In other words, although the present study does not support the specific findings regarding drunk driving stops it does support the general finding that length of service is unrelated to traffic enforcement activities.

Third, the significant relationship between officer assignment and traffic enforcement activities supports the bivariate finding that beat officers spend a significantly greater
proportion of their day on traffic enforcement activities. This finding is consistent with the notion that community police officers will be involved in less traditional enforcement type activities. Overall, however, this model does not shed much light on what factors influence decisions by officers to spend more or less of their day on traffic enforcement activities.

Service

None of the individual or aggregate predictors were significantly related to service activities performed by officers. These null findings support the finding that community and beat officers spend a similar proportion of their day on these types of activities. Further, they support the bivariate findings that service activities do not vary across neighborhoods in Cincinnati. Most interesting is the fact that despite previous research finding that certain types of neighborhoods receive more service than others, none of the neighborhood factors were significant. Previous research has found that neighborhoods most in need, in terms of heterogeneity, violence, and single parent households, receive the most service (Mastrofski, 1981; Smith, 1986). All of these factors are tapped into by the socioeconomic status scale and the land use/crime rate variables. Nevertheless, neither of these variables was significantly related to service activities.

Community Policing

The final model involves community policing activities. None of the four neighborhood factors in the model are significant. The proportion of time officers spend on community policing activities does not appear to differ depending on characteristics of neighborhoods. This finding is contrary to the extensive body of literature on community policing which implies that community policing should vary across neighborhoods. Also
interesting, officer orientation toward community policing does not appear to influence the proportion of time officers spend on community policing activities. Officers with a positive attitude toward community policing do not spend a larger proportion of their day performing activities commonly associated with community policing.

The two significant predictors of community policing activities are officer assignment and officer sex. Officers assigned as community police officers spend a significantly greater proportion of their day engaged in community policing activities. This finding supports the t-tests between the two groups of officers and provides support for the city's efforts at implementing community policing. Thus, assignment as a community police officer, irrespective of individual officer characteristics, influences officer activity choices.

In addition, female officers spend a greater proportion of their day in community policing activities. There are two potential explanations for this finding. First, female officers may be more inclined, for whatever reason, to engage in nontraditional policing activities. For example, studies suggest that female officers are more willing (Homant and Kennedy, 1985) and may be better able to mediate disputes (Kennedy and Homant, 1983; see also Balkin, 1988; Langworthy and Travis, 1999). As Langworthy and Travis (1999: 243) state, “female officers may bring a different set of predispositions to the job.” These predispositions may be influencing the proportion of time spent on community policing activities. A second possible explanation is sex stereotyping on the part of supervisors. Supervisors may be encouraging female officers more so than male officers to engage in various community policing activities, such as working with victims or children. In addition, female officers may be given specific assignments which are more closely related to community policing (e.g.,
assigned as a school officer, teaching about diversity or dealing with shelters and children). Future research will need to examine this relationship more closely to determine which of these two explanations is more likely.

If sex stereotyping is taking place then agencies need to find ways to limit the occurrence of this behavior. If, on the other hand, female officers engage in more COP activities of their own initiative then research needs to determine why. The answer may assist agencies in encouraging all officers to engage in COP activities. For example, if the explanation for differences between male and female officers lies in officers' perceptions of citizens and neighborhoods, rather than gender, agencies may consider influencing officers' perceptions of citizens and neighborhoods.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

The study findings have a number of policy implications. The findings from this study are relevant to the implementation of community policing, and more specifically to the selection, training, and evaluation of community police officers.

Implementation

The present study has important implications for the implementation of community policing not only in Cincinnati, but also in other agencies implementing community policing. First, the results clearly show that developing a special unit can result in community police officers spending their day differently than traditional officers.

There are various approaches to the implementation of community policing (Maguire et. al., 1997; Mastrofski, 1993; Riechers and Roberg, 1990; see also Sadd and Grinc, 1996). Indeed, "the literature on community policing is replete with speculation and theorizing about
the type of organizational structure and work environment that is needed to implement these new initiatives successfully” (Wilkinson and Rosenbaum, 1994). However, the empirical literature on the implementation of these various approaches is lacking (Wilkinson and Rosenbaum, 1994).

The particular approach studied here can lead to officers performing activities closely associated with community policing. Whether or not this type of specialized unit will or can result in department wide community policing has yet to be seen. However, for agencies wishing to implement community policing on a limited scale and have officers spend a portion of their day on nontraditional activities this may be an option. Indeed, specialized units are the most common implementation method for large agencies (Langworthy and Travis, 1999) and to start with may be the most manageable approach (see Wilkinson and Rosenbaum, 1994:124). Travis and Sanders (1997) found that in departments with this style of implementation, officers assigned as specialists performed COP activities more often than other officers in the departments. However, they suggest that this may result in less overall community policing activities than in departments that train all officers to perform COP activities. In other words, in agencies without a specialized assignment as community police officer, “all officers may engage, to some degree” in community policing activities (Travis and Sanders, 1999:26). Whereas, in agencies with a specialized assignment only those officers specifically assigned to engage in COP activities may do so, resulting in less overall performance of COP activities than in agencies where all officers engage, at least to some degree, in COP activities. Ultimately, many factors go into such a decision, but it is clear that specialist units such as the one studied here can result in officers performing activities
commonly associated with community policing.

Second, although the present study failed to tap into neighborhood needs and the desires of residents (i.e., residents of different neighborhoods may want and need similar services) the findings suggest that variation across neighborhoods in the six activities studied is not an automatic result of the implementation of community policing. Agencies need to be cognizant of the issue of differential police services across neighborhood. Assigning officers to a special community policing unit and providing them training on community policing may not necessarily result in differential police services. If agencies and the citizens they serve desire this type of police service, which is a central theme of community policing, then it may need to be explicitly addressed in the implementation process rather than assumed.

Lastly, the few significant findings in the multivariate models point to the possible influence on behavior of factors other than individual officer characteristics and neighborhood characteristics. Police organizations may have substantial influence over community police officers’ activities. How they train, supervise, and reward officers may have an influence on officer activities. Thus, agencies implementing community policing should not discount the power of training, supervision and rewards in encouraging officers to perform activities considered appropriate by the agency. For example, training officers to conduct community meetings or organize events may reduce confusion and apprehension on the part of officers in conducting these activities. Further, the use of evaluation measures consistent with community policing rather than traditional policing, such as counting the number of events organized or meetings attended, may encourage officers to engage in these activities.

This conclusion is supported, in part, by the fact that few individual officer
characteristics influence officer activities. Officers may have more discretion over how to carry out activities than in choosing which activities to carry out. Of course more research is needed on this issue to determine the influence of training, supervision and promotion on officer activities (see McLaughlin and Donahue, 1995).

As already alluded to, these three general conclusions regarding the implementation of community policing have specific relevance to the selection, training and evaluation of community police officers. Specifically, the finding that community police officers perform different activities than beat officers has implications for the selection and promotion of officers. The finding that activities do not vary across neighborhoods and the findings regarding the proportion of time spent on various activities has implications for the training of COP officers.

Selection

Agencies implementing community policing need to develop selection criteria to identify qualified community police officers (Walsh, 1995). Indeed, Metchik and Winton (1995:107) argue that agencies need “more positively oriented (i.e., prosocial) selection criteria and procedures”. In other words, agencies need to focus on selecting officers with special skills rather than just simply screening out potential problem applicants. The present method of simply ‘screening out’ applicants “does not allow us to identify and give specialized assignments to the most promising applicants” (Metchik and Winton, 1995:111).

The identification of activities and the amount of time officers spend in these activities may help to guide police administrators by providing a starting point for developing measures for selection and evaluation. In the selection of community police officers in Cincinnati
attention should be paid to the fact that these officers will be spending almost three hours a day on nontraditional police activities (meetings with other nonpolice service providers, information gathering, problem focused, and community-based service). These activities involve an increased interaction with citizens in noncrime, nonthreatening interactions and supports Metchik and Winton’s (1995) suggestion that community police officers may require increased social and interpersonal skills. For example, interpersonal and communication skills (e.g., public speaking) may be important for community police officers who attend and speak at community meetings. Further, increased administrative work and organization of community events may require good written skills. Producing a newsletter and drafting letters to various organizations may also require community police officers to have good written skills. Thus, identifying the different types of activities that officers engage in and the proportion of time they spend on these activities may help police administrators to identify specific skills that these officers need and match officers with specific skills to job assignments requiring these skills.

It is important to identify the necessary skills required to carry out these activities and ensure that promotion and selection standards reflect actual job tasks (Roberg and Kuykendall, 1997; see also Gaines, Costello, and Crabtree, 1989). The present study provides a starting point in terms of activities in which to begin developing these measures (e.g., measures of community-based service). However, a more detailed job analysis and an examination of departmental priorities is still needed prior to the development of selection criteria (see Metchik and Winton, 1995).
Training

There are two issues related to training that emerge from the study findings. First, the Cincinnati Police Division needs to compare what community police officers are doing to what they expect of them and revise training if necessary. Second, as already alluded to above, agencies need to develop training which addresses the issue of specialized police services responding to the needs of specific communities. Officers may need to be taught how to tailor police services to the specific needs of neighborhoods. For example, training officers in how to conduct citizen surveys is one common method of obtaining information concerning neighborhood wants and needs. In a study of community policing supervisors one of the recommendations was task specific training for both community police officers and their supervisors (Walsh, 1995). The task of identifying neighborhood wants and needs may be necessary for differential neighborhood policing.

Evaluation

Police agencies implementing community policing need to develop performance measures that capture the work of community police officers (Frank et. al., 1997; see also BJA, 1994; McLaughlin and Donahue, 1995; Metchik and Winton, 1995). Walsh (1995) notes that a complaint from community policing supervisors is that evaluation processes are often statistically oriented and do not reflect the duties of community police officers. The present study provides the Cincinnati Police Division with information on the activities of officers with which to compare to departmental expectations. If these are the activities CPD wants performed, then the evaluations of officers should be consistent with these activities to help foster their performance. This may also help the agency develop performance
measures based on the proportion of time spent on various activities.

THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

The multivariate findings lead to the conclusion that a different set of factors may influence officer activity choices than the commonly studied factors which influence officer behavior in interactions with citizens (i.e., individual officer and neighborhood characteristics). Officer discretion may be exercised mostly in how officers carry out activities rather than in the choice of activities. Rather than choosing what to do officers may choose how to do things. Supervisors may emphasize certain basic activities to all officers (COP and beat) and therefore officers may perform these activities to get promoted or rewarded. For example, police agencies may be able to control police activities through reward systems. Thus, officers may engage in traffic enforcement because supervisors can monitor tickets. But, supervisors may have more difficulty monitoring the actual behavior of officers while engaged in traffic enforcement. In other words, supervisors may be able to get officers to do traffic enforcement, but may have more trouble controlling how they do traffic enforcement (i.e., who they give tickets to). Thus, the choice of what to do and how to do it may be very different decisions.

Factors such as training, supervision, rewards or informal work groups may have a greater influence on the types of activities officers choose to perform. At present we still know very little about what influences officers’ choices of activities. The present study fails to consider training and promotion. The measure of supervision is a single survey item which attempts to tap into the extent to which supervisors influence officer activities. However, this measure is greatly lacking in that it does not measure the actual amount of supervisory
control, but rather officer perceptions of how much supervisors influence their daily activities. Further, this question may be measuring the amount of influence dispatchers have over officer activities. In other words, officers may perceive dispatch directed activities as supervisory influence over their activities. The development of theories to explain police behavior need to continue to consider all types of police behavior and researchers should consider the integration of supervision when attempting to explain police behavior.

FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research on the subject of police activities and variation in activities across neighborhoods should address a number of areas. First, more research needs to be done in other sites on variation in officer activities. Further, researchers need to determine why officer activities are similar across neighborhoods. One promising avenue of research may be comparing officer perceptions to those of citizen perceptions. If officers do not know what citizens want then they may simply do what they have always done. If this is so, then officers may need to be taught how to discover the unique needs of neighborhoods (e.g., conducting citizen surveys).

Second, future research should examine the influence of supervisors on officer activities. Officers may all be performing the same activities due to their perceptions of how they will be rewarded. Lastly, studies should also look at the influence of different types of training on community police officers. Studies have not been conducted to determine how different types of community policing training influence officers. This type of cross jurisdictional comparisons may help to identify types of training that best fulfill the goals of different agencies.
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CONCLUSION

In summary, this study provides information concerning the daily activities of both community and traditional beat officers in Cincinnati. The creation of a new job position, neighborhood police officer, can result in substantially different activities being performed. It also shows that community police officers in Cincinnati do indeed perform many of the activities associated with community policing. Further, this study reveals that creating a job position and training officers how to do the activities associated with community policing does not necessarily result in differential policing across neighborhoods. The results of the multivariate analysis reinforce the dummy variable analysis and the analysis of variance which found that officer activities do not vary across neighborhoods in Cincinnati. Further, they suggest that a different set of factors, other than neighborhood and individual officer, may influence officer activities. It is possible that officers use their discretion in deciding how to carry out activities, but supervisors, training or other factors determine what types of activities officers perform.
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APPENDIX 1

RIDE FORM
1. Enter the five digit Ride number?

2. Enter your observer ID code?

3. Enter date ride began?

4. Official start time of observed officer's shift? (Military)

5. Did your observation of the assigned officer begin later than the official beginning time of this shift?
   1. no [GO TO Q-7]
   2. yes

6. 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

7. What was the official end time of assigned officer's shift? (Military)

8. Did your observation of the assigned officer end earlier than the official ending time of this shift?
   1. no [GO TO Q-10]
   2. yes

9. 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

10. To what type of unit was the observed officer(s) assigned?
    1. beat officer
    2. community policing officer (SKIP TO QUESTION 12)
    3. other specialist

11. In what beat were you assigned to ride director?

12. Primarily, what neighborhood was the COP officer assigned?
13. 01’s ID number? (USE OFFICER BADGE NUMBER - SEE CODE SHEETS)

14. How long has 01 been regularly assigned to this beat/area of responsibility?

ENTER TIME--IN MONTHS.

15. How many years of education of 01?

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

15b. Officer 01’s sex

1  Male
2  Female

15e. Officer 01’s race:

1  White
2  Black
3  Hispanic
4  Asian
5  Other or mixed race

16. Age of 01? (YEARS)

17. Length of service with CPD? (YEARS)

18. Marital status of 01?

1  Single, never married
2  Married
3  Divorced or seperated
4  Widowed
5  Refused

19. At the beginning of the ride (first 1/2 hour), what was 01’s attitude about having an observer present?

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

20. At the end of the ride (last half hour), what was 01’s attitude about having an observer present?

1  very negative
2  negative
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21. O2's ID number? (USE OFFICER BADGE NUMBER - SEE CODE SHEETS)

IF THERE IS NO O2, ENTER ZERO. [GO TO Q-29]

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

23. How many years 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


25. Length of service with CPD? (YEARS)

25b. Officer O2's sex

1. Male
2. Female

25c. Officer O2's race:

1. White
2. Black
3. Hispanic
4. Asian
5. Other or mixed race

26. Marital status of O2?

1. Single, never married
2. Married
3. Divorced or separate
4. Widowed
5. Refused

27. 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
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28. 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

29. 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

30. What was the average temperature during the ride?

31. 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)

32. 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, other reason (observer did not go, etc.)
APPENDIX 2

ACTIVITY CODES
ACTIVITY CODES

100 ‘ENROUTE TO DISPATCHED ASSIGNMENT’
101 ‘ENROUTE TO LOCATION (OTHER THAN ASSIGNED DISPATCH)’
102 ‘ENROUTE TO LOCATION - NOT DISPATCH DIRECTED’
110 ‘GENERAL MOTOR/PREVENTIVE PATROL’
115 ‘GENERAL BICYCLE PATROL’
120 ‘GENERAL FOOT PATROL’
125 ‘WAITING’
126 ‘WAITING FOR ARRIVAL OF ANOTHER OFFICER’
130 ‘TRAFFIC-ENF’
  131 ‘Mobile traffic enf’
  132 ‘Stationary traffic enf’
140 ‘BU OTHER POLICE’
150 ‘PARADES, DEMOS, CROWD CTRL’
200 ‘PROBLEM-FOCUSED ACTIVITY (SITUATIONAL)’
  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 ‘Att 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 ord enf’
  302 ‘Building code ord enf’
  303 ‘Health/sanitation/trash ord enf’
400 ‘SERVICE’
  401 ‘Check on/fix road conditions’
  402 ‘Check on/fix property or equipment’
  403 ‘Escort’
  404 ‘Transport person’
  405 ‘Direct traffic/parade’
  406 ‘Medical/health service’
500 ‘INFO GATHERING’
  501 ‘Police records info gathering’
  502 ‘Other govt info gathering’
  503 ‘Crime analysis info gathering’
  504 ‘Private sector data sources info gathering’
610 'MEETINGS W POLICE-OFFICIAL BUSINESS'
   611 'Roll call & prepare for shift'
   612 'Electronic communication w police (tele, radio, MDT)'
620 'MEETINGS WITH PUBLIC'
   621 'Neighborhood/housing/group meeting'
   622 'Civic association (crosses nehood boundaries)meeting'
   623 'Victims' group meeting'
   624 'Business group meeting'
630 'MEETINGS W NON-POLICE SERVICE PROVIDERS'
   631 'Government agencies/officials meeting'
   632 'Private sector agencies/indivs meeting'
700 'ADMINISTRATIVE'
   701 'Report writing'
   702 'Auto maintenance, fuel, wash'
   703 'Transport other police'
   704 'Transport prisoner, witness, evidence, materials'
   705 'Calibrate/check equip'
   706 'Process evidence/prop'
   707 'Meet w prosecutor re: case'
   708 'Meet w judge re: case (not formal)'
   709 'Appear in court for hearing, trial, legal proceeding'
   710 'Conduct research/inquiry on a prob'
800 'PERSONAL BUSINESS'
   801 'Meal, snacks, restroom'
   802 'Personal errands, relax'
   803 'Meetings w police-non business'
900 'CHECK OUT SITUATION/GOA (NO ENCOUNTER)'
990 'DEBRIEF BY PROJECT OBSERVER'
999 'UNOBSERVED ACTIVITY'
ACTIVITY CODES

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.

110 GENERAL MOTORIZED 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

Same as 110, only on bicycle.

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.
TRAFFIC-ENFORCEMENT

Mobile
Stationary

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.

PARADES, DEMONSTRATIONS, CROWD CONTROL

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.

Surveillance of particular person
Surveillance of particular address
Check out suspicious circumstances
Residential security check; alarm response
Commercial/industrial security check; alarm response
Warrant/subpoena service
Attempt to locate suspect, witness, informant
Search of crime scene
Pursuit of fleeing suspect
Search property
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

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
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.

- Neighborhood/housing/group
- Civic association (crosses neighborhood boundaries)
- Victims' group
- Business group

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.

- Government agencies/officials
- Private sector agencies/individuals

ADMINISTRATIVE

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

- 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.

- Automobile maintenance, refueling, washing
- Transport other police
- Transport prisoner, witness, evidence, other materials
- 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.
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.
APPENDIX 3

ACTIVITY FORM
ACTIVITY FORM

RIDE INFORMATION
1. Ride Number?

ENTER THE FIVE DIGIT NUMBER OF THIS RIDE

2. Observer number?

ENTER YOUR OBSERVER NUMBER HERE

3. Activity/encounter number?

ENTER THE NUMBER FOR THIS ACTIVITY SEQUENTIALLY FOR THIS RIDE. IF THIS IS THE FIRST ACTIVITY FOR THIS RIDE, ENTER 1, ETC...

4. Time activity began (24 hour clock)?

00:00 = midnight  12:00 = noon

5. Time activity ended (24 hour clock)?

00:00 = midnight  12:00 = noon

6. Community where this activity occurred?

ENTER 2 DIGIT COMMUNITY CODE FROM SHEET

7. Exact Geographic location/address?

ENTER ADDRESS, INCLUDE AVE., ST., RD. FOR INTERSECTION, INCLUDE & & IN BETWEEN STREETS. IE, MAIN ST. & & JACKSON AV.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RIDE
8. What information source led directly to this activity 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)
9. At the time this activity 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

10. Who conducted this activity?

1. O1 only
2. O2 only
3. both O1 & O2

11. How many police (including O1 and O2) were engaged in this activity?

ENTER NUMBER OF OFFICERS.

INCLUDE ONLY THOSE OFFICERS WHOM YOU COULD OBSERVE DIRECTLY.

12. Nature of location of activity?

SELECT LOCATION WHERE MOST TIME WAS SPENT.

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)
7. mass private property, outdoors (e.g., sports facility)
8. mass private property, indoors (e.g., shopping mall)
9. other
13. What was the level of illumination when this activity began?

1. Daylight/brightly lit room: could readily distinguish facial features and hands of persons
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

14. For what percentage of elapsed time did this activity occur within the boundaries a assigned beat or neighborhood?

ENTER A NUMBER BETWEEN 0-100.

ENTER 999 IF UNABLE TO TELL

15. Type of activity?

SEE ACTIVITY CODES

IF ACTIVITY = 100, 101, 102, 110, 115, OR 120 [GO TO Q-25]

PROBLEM SOLVING
16. 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-18]
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

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

SELECT HIGHEST APPLICABLE NUMBER

1. officer--or officer with others
2. other police officers only
3. supervisors or management
4. other
5. unable to determine who created the plan/project

18. At what problem was this activity directed?
USE PROBLEM CODE.

IF ACTIVITY WAS NOT DIRECTED AT A SPECIFIC PROBLEM, CODE 0.

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

20. During this activity, were the police trying to PREVENT the occurrence/recurrence of the problem?

   [PREVENTION EFFORTS MUST BE FOCUSED ON PERIOD BEYOND THE END OF THE SHIFT]
   1  no
   2  yes

21. Did this activity involve a meeting with representatives of a citizen organization?
   1  no [GO TO Q-23]
   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

22. How many citizens were present at this meeting?

   ENTER YOUR BEST ESTIMATE

23. Did this activity involve communicating with representatives of other organizations that provide services to the public?
   1  no [GO TO Q-25]
   2  yes, face-to-face meeting
   3  yes, telephone discussion

24. What type of organization was involved?
   SEE AGENCY CODES.
25. Did the officer request input from the supervisor during this activity?

INCLUDE RADIO/MDT/TELEPHONE COMMUNICATIONS

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

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

1  no [GO TO Q-28]
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

27. 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

28. Was there a supervisor present to observe the officer?

1  no
2  yes

29. Was there another officer present to observe the officer?

1  no
2  yes
3  yes, this is a two officer unit

30. For what percentage of the activity was a supervisor present?

ENTER A NUMBER BETWEEN 0-100. "PRESENT" MEANS OBSERVABLE BY THE OFFICER. RADIO/MDT/TELEPHONE CONTACT DOES NOT COUNT AS
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BEING PRESENT.

31. During the activity, what percentage was another officer or a supervisor in view of this activity?

ENTER PERCENTAGE HERE

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

ENTER PERCENTAGE HERE

33. 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

34. How many times during this activity did the officer request information using the MDT (computer)? (for law enforcement/info gathering purposes)

ENTER NUMBER

34b At any time 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 and 3
5 did not observe entire encounter

34c At any time 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?

1 no
2 yes, O1 displayed PR-24 or flashlight or other nonlethal weapon
3 yes, O1 displayed handgun
4 both 2 and 3
5 did not observe entire encounter
6 NA - no 02 present

35. What percentage of this activity did you observe directly?

ENTER A NUMBER BETWEEN 0-100.

36. Was another project observer present during this activity?

1 no [GO TO Q-35]
2 yes

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

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

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

1 no significant change [GO TO Q-42]
2 yes, a little change
3 yes, a substantial change

40. In what way did the police change their behavior during this activity because of your/other project observer presence?

1 police did more of this activity or did it more intensively than otherwise
2 police did less of this activity or did it less intensively than otherwise
3 police changed manner or style of conducting this activity
4 other

41. What is the basis of your judgment that police changed their behavior because of your/other project observer presence?

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

42. Did you perform any police task during this activity?

1 no
2 yes, offered police information, advice, or an opinion about this activity
3 yes, performed some physical aspect of police work
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4 yes, both of the above
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PROBLEM CODES
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/licit 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 INFICTED 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 **INCECT**

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
institutions 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."
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residence where no indication of unlawful entry is present. It is the crime of stealth 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 barn. 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
SUSPICIOUS PROPERTY CONDITION -- General request to respond to report or sighting of property condition (excluding motor vehicle) that "does not appear right."

PECULIAR OR PUZZLING CIRCUMSTANCE -- Request to respond to report, or sighting of extraordinary or supernatural circumstances (e.g., UFOs, unusual noise, or explosion, etc.).

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."

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.

DAMAGED PROPERTY -- A generalized reference to damaged property.

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.).

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).

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).

FIRE (GENERAL) -- Any problem associated with a specific instance of a fire, past or in-progess ongoing fire or suspected fire. See code 802 for fire prevention.

FIRE IN PROGRESS -- Response to report or sighting of fire in progress.

FIRE ALARM/SMOKE -- Use when there is a response to a mechanical or electronic fire alarm.

INTENTIONALLY DAMAGED PROPERTY -- A general reference to property that was damaged intentionally in some manner.

THREAT TO DAMAGE PROPERTY -- A threat to harm property ("I'm gonna knock this shed down.")

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 illegal 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.
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

PAPERS TO BE SERVED -- A residual code for a general reference to the need to serve papers.

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.

SUPOENA/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.

SEARCH WARRANT TO BE SERVED -- Service of a search warrant.

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

185
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

POLIUTION, 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).

NO CONTACT ("GONE ON ARRIVAL")

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).

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)

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.

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."

INTERNAL AFFAIRS INVESTIGATION -- Use this code for encounters that result from an officer engaging in an Internal Affairs Investigation.
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.).

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.

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.

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.

FALSE REPORT

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)

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.

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.

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 5

ENCOUNTER FORM
ENCOUNTER INSTRUMENT

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

ENTER THE NUMBER FOR THIS ACTIVITY SEQUENTIALLY FOR THIS RIDE.

4. Time encounter began?
5. Time encounter ended?
6. Community where this activity occurred?
7. Exact Geographic location/address?

8. What information source led directly to this 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)

9. At the time this 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

10. How did officer proceed to the scene of this encounter?
    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

11. Nature of initial location of encounter?
    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

12. At any time during this ride did the police indicate or show 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)
    5  private property, outdoors (e.g., yard, front porch)
   6  private property, indoors (e.g., home)
   9  other

14. What was the level of illumination when this 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

15. Before the 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

16. Was this a BRIEF/CASUAL ENCOUNTER?

    1  no
    2  yes, brief encounter [GO TO Q-52]
    3  yes, casual encounter [GO TO Q-52]

17. Type of problem--as radioed by dispatcher or others:

    CODE 0 IF NOT DISPATCHED OR RADIOED BY OTHER. OTHERWISE, ENTER PROBLEM CODE.
18. Type of problem as it appeared at beginning of encounter:

ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

19. Type of problem as it appeared at end of encounter: Most Important Problem?

ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

20. Type of problem as it appeared at end of encounter: Second Most Important Problem?

ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

CODE 0 IF NO SECOND PROBLEM IS APPLICABLE.

21. 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-24]
2 yes

22. What was the nature of the larger problem identified by the police?

ENTER PROBLEM CODE.

23. During this encounter, did the police try to determine the nature, extent, or causes of the larger problem?

1 no
2 yes

24. During this encounter, did the police try to PREVENT the occurrence or recurrence of the problem?

1 no
2 yes

25. Was this encounter part of a long-term plan or project to deal with this problem?

1 no [GO TO Q-27]
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

26. 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
4 other
5 unable to determine

27. Who took the decision-making lead in this encounter?

1 O1 only
28. Did O1 receive advice, guidance, or instructions during this encounter about what to do from a NONSUPERVISOR police officer?
   IF MORE THAN ONE, SELECT THE FIRST THAT OCCURRED.
   1 no [GO TO Q-31]
   2 yes, take an action
   3 yes, do NOT take an action
   4 yes, other

29. Which at action was O1 advised to take or not take by another NONSUPERVISOR 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

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

31. At any time during the ride did the police discuss this encounter with a supervisor? [INCLUDE RADIO/MDT/TELEPHONE]
   1 no [GO TO Q-34]
   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

32. Did the supervisor tell the officer what to do regarding THIS encounter?
   IF MORE THAN ONE, SELECT THE FIRST THAT OCCURRED.
33. 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/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

34. Was there a supervisor present to observe the officer?

1. no
2. yes

35. Was there another officer present to observe the officer?

1. no
2. yes
3. yes, this is a two officer unit

36. For what percentage of the activity was a supervisor present?

37. During the activity, what percentage was another officer or a supervisor in view of this activity?

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

39. What is the identity of the first supervisor present?

40. What is the identity of the second supervisor present?

41. What is the identity of the third supervisor present?

42. Upon arrival at the scene, how many police officers were already present?

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

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

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

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

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

48. 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

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

1 no [GO TO Q-51]
2 yes

50. From what source did they seek information?

ENTER AGENCY CODE.

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

1 no [GO TO Q-53]
2 yes, while enroute to the scene [GO TO Q-53]
3 yes, while at the scene [GO TO Q-53]

52. Type of problem/situation? [SELECT MOST IMPORTANT]

ENTER PROBLEM CODE

53. Did the police file an official report or indicate an intention to file an official report regarding this encounter?

1 no, neither filed nor intended to file
2 yes, filed an official report
3 yes, intended to file an official report

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

ENTER NUMBER

54b. 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
54c. 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.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes, O2 displayed PR-24 or flashlight or other nonlethal weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes, O2 displayed handgun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>both 2 &amp; 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>did not observe entire encounter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>NA - no O2 present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. What percentage of this encounter did you observe O1 directly?

ENTER A NUMBER BETWEEN 0-100.

56. Was another project observer present during this encounter?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>no [GO TO Q-58]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>no significant change [GO TO Q-61]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes, a little change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes, a substantial change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>police more inclined to get involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>police less inclined to get involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>police more inclined to arrest or cite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>police less inclined to arrest or cite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>police more inclined to use force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>police less inclined to use force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>other: explain in narrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>police stated that their behavior changed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>observer inferred it from behavior or manner of police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>other: explain in narrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<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>
</tbody>
</table>
5 yes, two or more of the above

62. How many citizen forms were filled out for this encounter?

ENTER NUMBER HERE

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

ENTER NUMBER HERE
APPENDIX 6

OFFICER SURVEYS
COP OFFICER SURVEY

When answering the first three questions, please use as a reference the neighborhood or beat that you usually police. Please circle the number below that best represents your belief about how satisfied citizens are with the police in your neighborhood/beat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In general, how satisfied do you believe citizens are with the police?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How satisfied do you believe citizens are with the job the police are doing to prevent crime in your assigned neighborhood/beat?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How satisfied do you believe citizens are with the job the police are doing to work together with residents to solve local problems in your assigned neighborhood/beat?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In a typical work week, how many times do you communicate with the beat officers in your area regarding problems (including formal and informal meetings)?</td>
<td>0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In a typical day, what percent of your time involves direct, face to face contact with members of the public (not including phone calls)?</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In a typical day, what percent of your time is spent handling service calls?</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. In general, in the past year, would you say that the neighborhood you police has become:</td>
<td>1. Better place to live</td>
<td>2. Worse place to live</td>
<td>3. Stayed the same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. In general, citizens in the neighborhood I regularly police:</td>
<td>1. Are eager to cooperate with the police to help them perform their job better.</td>
<td>2. Usually have to be forced to cooperate with the police.</td>
<td>3. Are more apt to obstruct police work rather than cooperate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following is a list of things that you may think are problems in the neighborhood(s) in which you work. The columns represent different neighborhoods in which you may work on a regular basis. Please fill in the neighborhood name and check (✓) the appropriate box below each neighborhood, indicating whether it is a BIG PROBLEM (Big), SOMETHING OF A PROBLEM (Some), or NO PROBLEM (None) in each of the neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD NAME</th>
<th>Big</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Big</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Kids hanging out on streets making noise, starting fights, or just bothering people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Litter and trash on the streets and sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. People hanging around on the street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. People using drugs in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Too much traffic on the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Vacant, abandoned or neglected houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Loud parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Gang activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Things being stolen from homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. People being robbed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Graffiti or vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Parking on the street in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Abandoned or neglected cars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please circle the number that corresponds with the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. It is not clear what community policing means in practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Community policing is something that law enforcement agencies should pursue.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Police should work with citizens to try to solve problems on their beat.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Community policing is a highly effective means of providing police service.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Some communities are not suited for community policing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. In general, I believe community oriented policing is a good idea for Cincinnati and CPD.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I think the philosophy of Community Oriented Policing runs throughout the Division, not just among Neighborhood Officers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Community policing has changed the way I do my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Police officers should not have to handle calls that involve social or personal problems where no crime is involved.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Police should make frequent informal contacts with the people in their neighborhood/beat.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Police should try to solve the problems identified by citizens in their neighborhood/beat.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I feel citizens blame the police for some of their problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Police know better than citizens what police services are required in an area.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Assisting citizens is as important as enforcing the law.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The best way for the police to solve problems in a neighborhood is to make more arrests.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I believe that neighborhood organizations are a powerful tool in helping the police prevent crime.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My supervisor determines my daily activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I feel frustrated by my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. My supervisor reviews my actions on a regular basis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. My daily work routine is based on what I believe is best for the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I feel emotionally drained by my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Increased training protects officers from being sued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I encourage community members to use informal methods to solve problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I feel I’m positively influencing other people’s lives through my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I’ve become more callous toward people since becoming a police officer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. My supervisor decides how assigned tasks should be done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I worry that being a police officer is hardening me emotionally.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
52. I feel personally involved in solving the problems of citizens in the community which I work.

53. CPD is a good organization to work for.

54. I am satisfied with the present assignment I have within the Police Division.

55. I have no regrets about my decision to become a police officer.

56. The members of the public want the police involved in a wider range of activities.

57. Police officers receive adequate training in how to solve problems.

58. In solving problems I use other public agencies.

59. In solving problems I use other private agencies.

60. I need to lead the community and other agencies in problem solving efforts.

61. I feel burned out from my work.

62. I am accountable to the citizens in the neighborhood in which I work.

63. There are separate policies that regulate Neighborhood Officer conduct.

64. Officers are sued even when they act properly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65. When I stop a citizen one of the things that goes through my mind is the potential for being sued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Police officers should not be subject to civil suits by citizens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Civil suits against police officers are a barrier to effective law enforcement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. The threat of civil suits stops police officers from violating an individual’s rights.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Citizen desires influence my daily work routine.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Clearly defined procedures and policies reduce an officer’s chance of being sued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. A strong disciplinary system reduces the chances of the department being sued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Good recruitment and selection practices reduce the chances of the department being sued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. My community policing training involved issues concerning the rights of citizens.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Neighborhood officers receive adequate training for their duties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. Community Policing requires officers to think and plan solutions, not just respond to situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76. I make more choices as a neighborhood officer than I did as a beat officer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77. I have been sued for a job related matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

203
78. I personally know an officer (other than myself) who has been sued for a job related matter.

1. Yes  2. No

We would now like to ask you a few questions about yourself. These questions will not be used to identify the officers that complete the survey and responses will only be provided in grouped form. It is necessary that we know the background characteristics of survey respondents. ALL INFORMATION WILL BE HELD IN STRICTTEST CONFIDENCE.

Age: __________ Years

How long have you worked for the Cincinnati Police Division? __________ Years

How long have you been assigned to your current neighborhood/beat? __________ Years, __________ Months

Education:
1. High school or GED
2. Some college or trade school
3. College or trade school graduate
4. Some post graduate work
5. Advanced degree

Marital status:
1. Single, never married
2. Married
3. Divorced or separated
4. Widowed

Prior military experience is:

1. No prior military experience
2. Currently serving (reserves, national guard)
3. Veteran

What is your current assignment?
1. Patrol
2. Neighborhood Officer
3. Other ________________

How long have you been in this assignment?: __________ Years, __________ Months
BEAT OFFICER SURVEY

When answering the first three questions, please use as a reference the neighborhood or beat that you usually police. Please circle the number below that best represents your belief about how satisfied citizens are with the police in your neighborhood/beat.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In general, how satisfied do you believe citizens are with the police?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How satisfied do you believe citizens are with the job the police are doing to prevent crime in your assigned neighborhood/beat?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How satisfied do you believe citizens are with the job the police are doing to work together with residents to solve local problems in your assigned neighborhood/beat?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. In a typical work week, how many times do you communicate with the neighborhood officers in your area regarding problems (including formal and informal meetings).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

5. In a typical day, what percent of your time involves direct, face to face contact with members of the public (not including phone calls)?

% ________

6. In a typical day, what percent of your time is spent handling service calls?

% ________

7. In general, in the past year, would you say that the neighborhood you police has become:

    1. Better place to live
    2. Worse place to live
    3. Stayed the same

8. In general, citizens in the neighborhood I regularly police:

    1. Are eager to cooperate with the police to help them perform their job better.
    2. Usually have to be forced to cooperate with the police.
    3. Are more apt to obstruct police work rather than cooperate.
The following is a list of things that you may think are problems in the neighborhood(s) in which you work. The columns represent different neighborhoods in which you may work on a regular basis. Please fill in the neighborhood name and check (√) the appropriate box below each neighborhood, indicating whether it is a BIG PROBLEM (Big), SOMEWHA'T OF A PROBLEM (Some), or NO PROBLEM (None) in each of the neighborhoods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEIGHBORHOOD NAME</th>
<th>Big</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Big</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Kids hanging out on streets making noise, starting fights, or just bothering people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Litter and trash on the streets and sidewalks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. People hanging around on the street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. People using drugs in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Too much traffic on the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Vacant, abandoned or neglected houses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Loud parties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Gang activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Things being stolen from homes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. People being robbed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Graffiti or vandalism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Parking on the street in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Abandoned or neglected cars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Please circle the number that corresponds with the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. It is not clear what community policing means in practice.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Community policing is something that law enforcement agencies should pursue.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Police should work with citizens to try to solve problems on their beat.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Community policing is a highly effective means of providing police service.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Some communities are not suited for community policing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. In general, I believe community oriented policing is a good idea for Cincinnati and CPD.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I think the philosophy of Community Oriented Policing runs throughout the Division, not just among Neighborhood Officers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Community policing has changed the way I do my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Police officers should not have to handle calls that involve social or personal problems where no crime is involved.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Police should make frequent informal contacts with the people in their neighborhood/beat.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Police should try to solve the problems identified by citizens in their neighborhood/beat.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I feel citizens blame the police for some of their problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Police know better than citizens what police services are required in an area.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Assisting citizens is as important as enforcing the law.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. The best way for the police to solve problems in a neighborhood is to make more arrests.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I believe that neighborhood organizations are a powerful tool in helping the police prevent crime.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My supervisor determines my daily activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I feel frustrated by my job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. My supervisor reviews my actions on a regular basis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. My daily work routine is based on what I believe is best for the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. I feel emotionally drained by my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Increased training protects officers from being sued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I encourage community members to use informal methods to solve problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I feel I'm positively influencing other people's lives through my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I have accomplished many worthwhile things in this job.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I've become more callous toward people since becoming a police officer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. My supervisor decides how assigned tasks should be done.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. I worry that being a police officer is hardening me emotionally.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. I feel personally involved in solving the problems of citizens in the community which I work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. CPD is a good organization to work for.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. I am satisfied with the present assignment I have within the Police Division.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. I have no regrets about my decision to become a police officer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. The members of the public want the police involved in a wider range of activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Police officers receive adequate training in how to solve problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. In solving problems I use other public agencies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. In solving problems I use other private agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. I need to lead the community and other agencies in problem solving efforts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. I feel burned out from my work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. I am accountable to the citizens in the neighborhood in which I work.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. There are separate policies that regulate Neighborhood Officer conduct.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. Officers are sued even when they act properly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. When I stop a citizen one of the things that goes through my mind is the potential for being sued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. Police officers should not be subject to civil suits by citizens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Civil suits against police officers are a barrier to effective law enforcement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. The threat of civil suits stops police officers from violating an individual’s rights.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. Citizen desires influence my daily work routine.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. Clearly defined procedures and policies reduce an officer’s chance of being sued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. A strong disciplinary system reduces the chances of the department being sued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. Good recruitment and selection practices reduce the chances of the department being sued.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. I would enjoy the opportunity to be assigned as a neighborhood police officer.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. I have been sued for a job related matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75. I personally know an officer (other than myself) who has been sued for a job related matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Yes</td>
<td>2. No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
We would now like to ask you a few questions about yourself. These questions will not be used to identify the officers that complete the survey and responses will only be provided in grouped form. It is necessary that we know the background characteristics of survey respondents. ALL INFORMATION WILL BE HELD IN STRICTEST CONFIDENCE.

Age: _________ Years

How long have you worked for the Cincinnati Police Division? _________ Years

How long have you been assigned to your current neighborhood/beat? ________ Years, ________ Months

Education:
1. High school or GED
2. Some college or trade school
3. College or trade school graduate
4. Some post graduate work
5. Advanced degree

Marital status:
1. Single, never married
2. Married
3. Divorced or separated
4. Widowed

Prior military experience is:
1. No prior military experience
2. Currently serving (reserves, national guard)
3. Veteran

What is your current assignment?
1. Patrol
2. Neighborhood Officer
3. Other _________

How long have you been in this assignment?: _________ Years, _________ Months

211
APPENDIX 7

ACTIVITY CATEGORIES
ACTIVITY CATEGORIES
Activity and Problem Codes
A = Activity Code
E = Encounter/Problem Code

1. FOOT PATROL

Foot patrol (A)

2. MOTOR PATROL

Motorized patrol (A)

3. ORDER MAINTENANCE

Crowd control (A)
Public Nuisance (E)
(drunk, disorderly, vagrancy, loitering, obscene activity, noise disturbance, peddling,
begging, argument, domestic argument, non-domestic argument)
Keep peace (E)
Juvenile disturbance (E)
Neighbor trouble (E)
Labor-management problems (E)
Crowd control (E)

4. CRIME RELATED

Warrant/Subpoena Service (A)
Attempt to locate suspect, witness, informant (A)
Search of crime scene (A)
Pursuit of fleeing suspect (A)
Search property (A)
Guard crime scene (A)
Back up other police (A)
Gambling (E)
Prostitution/soliciting (E)
Harassment/stalking (E)
Family neglect/nonsupport (E) (child neglect, nonpayment of support, contributing to
delinquency of minor)
Runaway (E)
Search warrant served (E)
Officer in need of aid/provide weapons cover (E)
Back up an officer (E)
Gang Conflict (E)
Gang problem (E)
Drug violations (E)
Civil disorders (E)
Kidnap (E)
Fights/assaults (E)
Interference with police/weapons violations (E)
Robbery (E)
Sexual crimes (E)
Death--homicide (E)
Civil right violation (E)
Stolen property (E)
Threat to take property (E)
Stolen property (E)
Attempted motor vehicle theft (E)
Theft (E)
Burglary (E)
Trespass (E)
Break-in (E)
Vandalism/arson (E)
Fraud (E)
Hit and run (E)
Serving papers--subpoena/summons (E)

5. INVESTIGATIVE ACTIVITIES

Surveillance of person, address (A)
Check out suspicious circumstances (A)
Residential security check; alarm response (A)
Commercial/industrial security check; alarm response (A)
Check out situation/gone on arrival (A)
Meet complainant (E)
Family trouble (E)
Suspicious person/circumstances (E)
Death (dead body) (E)
Alarm (E)
Suspicious property/vehicle (E)
Fire alarm (E)
Emergency-nature unspecified (E)
Interrogation (E)
No problem (all quiet) (E)
No contact (gone on arrival) (E)
Don’t know problem (E)
No problem—situation no longer a problem (E)
False report (E)
Irrational crank call to police (E)

6. TRAFFIC PROBLEMS

Traffic enforcement (mobile, stationary) (A)
Accident (E)
Road block (E)
Vehicle violation (E)
Routine check (E)
Traffic/road problems (E)
Moving violation (E)

7. SERVICE

Service (A)
Check on or fix road conditions (A)
Check on or fix property or equipment (A)
Escort (A)
Transport person (A)
Direct traffic/parade (A)
Medical/health service (A)
Missing person (E)
Medical assistance (E)
Concern for citizen (E)
Dangerous substance (e.g., dynamite) (E)
Damaged property (E)
Damaged property—unintentional (E)
Fire (E)
Landlord tenant dispute (E)
General request for service (E)
Assist person locked in or out of home, office, other building (E)
Request for surveillance (E)
Store opening or closing call (E)
Escort (E)
Animal problem (E)
Citizen wants information (E)
Giving information (E)
Return of lost property (E)
Assist motorist (E)

8. COMMUNITY BASED SERVICE
Meetings with public (A)
Neighborhood/housing/group (A)
Civic association (crosses neighborhood boundaries) (A)
Victims’ group (A)
Business group (A)

Crime prevention Information (E)
Fire prevention (E)
Litter, trash, refuse, and property appearance (E)
Parks and recreation (E)
Streets and public ways (E)
Pollution, health and sanitation (E)
Housing (E)
Nuisance property (E)
Police-community relations, officer friendly, school visit (E)

9. ADMINISTRATIVE

Administrative (A)
Report writing (A)
Automobile maintenance, refueling, washing (A)
Transport other police (A)
Calibrate/check/check out equipment (A)
Roll call (A)
Administrative proceedings (E)
Internal affairs investigation (E)

10. ADMINISTRATIVE--CRIME RELATED

Transport prisoner, witness, evidence, other material (A)
Process evidence/property (A)
Meet with prosecutor about a case (A)
Meet with judge/magistrate about a case (A)
Appear in court for hearing, trial or other formal legal proceeding (A)
Arrest processing/booking (E)
Transport person in custody (E)
Court proceedings (E)
Hearing (E)
Obtain Warrant (E)
Case-related crime information (E)

11. ORDINANCE ENFORCEMENT
Ordinance enforcement (A)
Parking (A)
Building code (A)
Health/sanitation/trash (A)
Curfew violation or truancy (E)
Civil code problems/violations (E)
Business regulations (E)

12. INFO GATHERING

Information gathering (A)
Police records (A)
Other government records (A)
Crime analysis (A)
Private sector data sources (A)
Citizen wants to give information (E)
Officer wants information (E)
General information (E)

13. EN ROUTE/WAITING

En Route (A)
Waiting (A)

14. PROBLEM FOCUSED

Problem-focused activity (situational) (A)
Conduct research/inquiry on a problem (A)

15. MEETINGS WITH OTHER NON-POLICE SERVICE PROVIDERS

Meetings with other non-police service providers (A)
Government agencies/officials (A)
Private sector agencies/individuals (A)
Need an officer-problem not specified (E)
Assist other department-problem not specified (E)

16. NON-TASKS/PERSONAL

Personal business (A)
Meal, snacks, restroom breaks (A)
Personal errands, relaxation (A)
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Meetings with other police—not business related (A)
Casual conversation (E)
Personal business (E)
APPENDIX 8

COLLAPSED ACTIVITY CATEGORIES
COLLAPSED ACTIVITY CATEGORIES
Activity and Problem Codes
A = Activity Code
E = Encounter/Problem Code

1. MOTOR PATROL

110 Motorized patrol (A)

2. ORDER MAINTENANCE

150 Crowd control (A)
010-021 Public Nuisance (E)
(drunken, disorderly, vagrancy, loitering, obscene activity, noise disturbance, peddling,
begging, argument, domestic argument, non-domestic argument)
025 Keep peace (E)
026 Juvenile disturbance (E)
031 Neighbor trouble (E)
033 Labor-management problems (E)
050-051 Crowd control (E)

3. CRIME RELATED

206 Warrant/Subpoena Service (A)
207 Attempt to locate suspect, witness, informant (A)
208 Search of crime scene (A)
209 Pursuit of fleeing suspect (A)
210 Search property (A)
211 Guard crime scene (A)
140 Back up other police (A)
022 Gambling (E)
023 Prostitution/soliciting (E)
027 Harassment/stalking (E)
060-063 Family neglect/nonsupport (E) (child neglect, nonpayment of support,
contributing to delinquency of minor)
071 Runaway (E)
713 Search warrant served (E)
870 Officer in need of aid/provide weapons cover (E)
871 Back up an officer (E)
032 Gang Conflict (E)
035 Gang problem (E)
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040-046 Drug violations (E)
052 Civil disorders (E)
072 Kidnap (E)
090-100 Fights/assaults (E)
115-118 Interference with police/weapons violations (E)
120-127 Robbery (E)
130-135 Sexual crimes (E)
144-145 Death--homicide (E)
150 Civil rights violation (E)
200/205 Stolen property (E)
221 Threat to take property (E)
223 Receiving stolen property (E)
232-233 Attempted motor vehicle theft (E)
230-231/234-243 Theft (E)
250-252 Burglary (E)
270-275 Trespass (E)
280-287 Break-in (E)
340-352 Vandalism/arson (E)
380-385 Fraud (E)
420-421 Hit and run (E)
710-712 Serving papers--subpoena/summons (E)
101-103 Child abuse
330-331 Intentionally damaged property
332 Bomb threat
201-202 Surveillance of person, address (A)
203 Check out suspicious circumstances (A)
204 Residential security check; alarm response (A)
205 Commercial/industrial security check; alarm response (A)
110-114 Suspicious person/circumstances (E)
201 Alarm (E)
290-292 Suspicious property/vehicle (E)
735 Interrogation (E)

*Administrative Crime Related:
704 Transport prisoner, witness, evidence, other material (A)
706 Process evidence/property (A)
707 Meet with prosecutor about a case (A)
708 Meet with judge/magistrate about a case (A)
709 Appear in court for hearing, trial or other formal legal proceeding (A)
720 Arrest processing/booking (E)
730 Transport person in custody (E)
740 Court proceedings (E)
742 Hearing (E)
741 Obtain Warrant (E)
611 Case-related crime information (E)
*Ordinance Enforcement:
024 Curfew violation or truancy (E)

4. TRAFFIC PROBLEMS

130-132 Traffic enforcement (mobile, stationary) (A)
410-414 Accident (E)
44 Road block (E)
450-454 Vehicle violation (E)
455 Routine check (E)
460-465 Traffic/road problems (E)
470-472 Moving violation (E)

5. SERVICE

400 Service (A)
401 Check on or fix road conditions (A)
402 Check on or fix property or equipment (A)
403 Escort (A)
404 Transport person (A)
405 Direct traffic/parade (A)
406 Medical/health service (A)
070 Missing person (E)
080-086 Medical assistance (E)
160-161/170 Concern for citizen (E)
293 Dangerous substance (e.g., dynamite) (E)
300-314 Damaged property-unintentional (E)
320-321 Fire (E)
386 Landlord tenant dispute (E)
505 General request for service (E)
506 Assist person locked in or out of home, office, other building (E)
510-512 Request for surveillance (E)
513 Store opening or closing call (E)
520-523 Escort (E)
550 Animal problem (E)
610-614 Citizen wants information (E)
640 Giving information (E)
211 Return of lost property (E)
480-482 Assist motorist (E)
*Investigative:
322 Fire alarm (E)
210 Lost property (E)
6. COMMUNITY POLICING ACTIVITIES

120   Foot patrol (A)
*Community Based Service:
620   Meetings with public (A)
621   Neighborhood/housing/group (A)
622   Civic association (crosses neighborhood boundaries) (A)
623   Victims’ group (A)
624   Business group (A)
612   Crime prevention Information (E)
802   Fire prevention (E)
802   Litter, trash, refuse, and property appearance (E)
804   Parks and recreation (E)
805   Streets and public ways (E)
806   Pollution, health and sanitation (E)
807   Housing (E)
808   Nuisance property (E)
560   Police-community relations, officer friendly, school visit (E)
*Ordinance Enforcement:
300   Ordinance enforcement (A)
301   Parking (A)
302   Building code (A)
303   Health/sanitation/trash (A)
800   Civil code problems/violations (E)
801   Business regulations (E)
*Information Gathering:
500   Information gathering (A)
501   Police records (A)
502   Other government records (A)
503   Crime analysis (A)
504   Private sector data sources (A)
*Problem Focused:
200   Problem-focused activity (situational) (A)
710   Conduct research/inquiry on a problem (A)
*Meetings with other nonpolice service providers:
630   Meetings with other non-police service providers (A)
631   Government agencies/officials (A)
632   Private sector agencies/individuals (A)
EXCLUDED:
*Investigative:
900    Check out situation/gone on arrival (A)
005    Meet complainant (E)
028    Family trouble (E)
140-143 Death (dead body) (E)
507    Emergency-nature unspecified (E)
810    No problem (all quiet) (E)
811    No contact (gone on arrival) (E)
812    Don't know problem (E)
813    No problem—situation no longer a problem (E)
861    False report (E)
860    Irrational crank call to police (E)
*Administrative:
700    Administrative (A)
701    Report writing (A)
702    Automobile maintenance, refueling, washing (A)
703    Transport other police (A)
705    Calibrate/check/check out equipment (A)
611    Roll call (A)
750    Administrative proceedings (E)
830    Internal affairs investigation (E)
*Information Gathering:
620-622 Citizen wants to give information (E)
630-632 Officer wants information (E)
600    General information (E)
*En Route/Waiting:
100-102 En Route (A)
125-126 Waiting (A)
*Meetings with other non police service providers:
660/872 Need an officer—problem not specified (E)
874    Assist other department—problem not specified (E)
*Non-Tasks/Personal:
800    Personal business (A)
801    Meal, snacks, restroom breaks (A)
802    Personal errands, relaxation (A)
803    Meetings with other police—not business related (A)
850    Casual conversation (E)
851    Personal business (E)
202    Chronic false alarm (E)
610    Citizen wants info (E)
030    Intergroup conflict (E)
APPENDIX 9

ACTIVITY BAR GRAPHS
Proportion of Time Spent on Motor Patrol: Beat Officers
Proportion of Time Spent on Order Maintenance Activities: Beat Officers
Proportion of Time Spent on Crime Related Activities: Beat Officers

![Bar chart showing the proportion of time spent on crime-related activities for different neighborhood numbers.](chart.png)
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Neighborhood Numbers 1 through 53 are depicted, with varying proportions of time spent on COP activities.
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Neighborhood Numbers

District One
1  CBD/Riverfront
2  Queensgate
3  West End
4  Over the Rhine
5  Mt. Adams
6  Pendleton

District Two
7  East End
8  East Walnut Hills
9  Evanston
10  Hyde Park
11  California
12  Oakley
13  O'Bryanville
14  Pleasant Ridge
15  Kenndy Hts.
16  Mt. Lookout
17  Columbia/Tusculum
18  Linwood
19  Madisonville
20  Mt. Washington

District Three
21  Saylor Park
22  Riverside
23  Sedamsville
24  North Farimount
25  English Woods
26  East Westwood
27  Millvale
28  Fay Apartments
29  South Cummingsville
30  East Price Hill
31  West Price Hill
32  Westwood
33  Lower Price Hill
34  South Fairmount
District Four

35  Mt. Auburn
36  Corryville
37  Avondale
38  North Avondale
39  Paddock Hills
40  Hartwell
41  Carthage
42  Roselawn
43  Bond Hill
44  Walnut Hills

District Five

45  College Hill
46  CUFS
   (Fairview, Clifton hts., Univ. Hts)
47  Fairview
48  Northside
49  Clifton
50  Mt. Airy
51  Winton Hills
52  Winton Place
53  Camp Washington
APPENDIX 10

COP AND BEAT REGRESSION RESULTS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=317)</th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=43)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F   .793  .659
R²  .023  .063

* p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=313)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=41)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.045</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>-.089</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>-.066</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-.005</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.064</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.130*</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F                          | .1076           |          | .418           |          |          |   |
| R²                         | .031            |          | .043           |          |          |   |

* p < .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=313)</th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>-0.050</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>-0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .051$
## Two-Stage Least Squares: Traffic Enforcement (Beat Officers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=316)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=44)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.4.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.729*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F  | .309 | .958
R² | .009 | .087

* p < .05
### Two-Stage Least Squares: Service (Beat Officers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=316)</th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Commercial/Government</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F                              | .466  | 1.158 |
| R²                             | .013  | .114  |

*p < .05*
## Two-Stage Least Squares: COP Activities (Beat Officers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=316)</th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \( F \) = .759
- \( R^2 \) = .022

* \( p < .05 \)
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## Two-Stage Least Squares: Patrol (COP Officers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=283)</th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion Commercial/Government</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Two-Stage Least Squares: Order Maintenance (COP Officers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=284)</th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F                          | 1.128           |                | .583 |
| R²                         | .036            |                | .061 |

* p < .05
## Two-Stage Least Squares: Crime Related (COP Officers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=284)</th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.389*</td>
<td>.197</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F  
1.400  
.212  
R²  
.044  
.023  
*p < .05
### Two-Stage Least Squares: Traffic Enforcement (COP Officers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=282)</th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F      | .872 | .366 |
| R²     | .028 | .039 |

* p < .05
### Two-Stage Least Squares: Service (COP Officers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=282)</th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>-.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constant</strong></td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>.935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>R^2</strong></td>
<td>.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Two-Stage Least Squares: COP Activities (COP Officers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Stage 1 (n=284)</th>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 2 (n=40)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual Level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Length of Service</td>
<td>-.002</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Education</td>
<td>-.010</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Race</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Sex</td>
<td>-.106</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisory Input</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Input</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation Toward COP</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precipitation</td>
<td>-.020</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighborhood Variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/Government</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use/Crime Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>.204</td>
<td>-.057</td>
<td>5.409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| F                             | 1.443 |      |      | .379  |
| R²                            | .045  |      |      | .040  |

* p < .05