



uOttawa

L'Université canadienne
Canada's university

**FACULTÉ DES ÉTUDES SUPÉRIEURES
ET POSTDOCTORALES**



uOttawa

L'Université canadienne
Canada's university

**FACULTY OF GRADUATE AND
POSTDOCTORAL STUDIES**

Zachary Dagg

AUTEUR DE LA THÈSE / AUTHOR OF THESIS

M.A. (Criminology)

GRADE / DEGREE

Department of Criminology

FACULTÉ, ÉCOLE, DÉPARTEMENT / FACULTY, SCHOOL, DEPARTMENT

**Community Policing in the 21st Century:
The Case of the Ottawa Police Service**

TITRE DE LA THÈSE / TITLE OF THESIS

Ron Melchers

DIRECTEUR (DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS SUPERVISOR

CO-DIRECTEUR (CO-DIRECTRICE) DE LA THÈSE / THESIS CO-SUPERVISOR

Michael Kempa

Ross Hastings

Gary W. Slater

Le Doyen de la Faculté des études supérieures et postdoctorales / Dean of the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies

Community Policing in the 21st Century:
The case of the Ottawa Police Service

Zachary V. Dagg

Thesis submitted to
The faculty of Postdoctoral Studies
In partial fulfillment of the requirements
For M.A. Degree in Criminology

Department of Criminology
Faculty of Social Sciences
University of Ottawa

©Zachary V. Dagg, Ottawa, Canada, 2010



Library and Archives
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-65992-2
Our file *Notre référence*
ISBN: 978-0-494-65992-2

NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protègent cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.


Canada

Acknowledgements

First and foremost I would like to thank my parents for all the love and support they provided throughout this wonderful experience.

I would like to thank my supervisor Ron Melchers for his wisdom and guidance over the past two years. You have been invaluable to my success! I would also like to thank all of the graduate professors from the department of criminology whom challenged me to examine various criminological issues with passion and diligence.

Thank you to Professor Gregory Brown and Jane Barker from Nipissing University whom originally supported and encouraged me to pursue a master's degree, I am grateful to both of you.

This has been a tremendous experience and has allowed me to develop both academically and personally, I will always cherish my time at the University of Ottawa.

Abstract

Despite the seemingly widespread support and acceptance of community-policing in the late 1980s and early 1990s, it remains unclear among academics and practitioner's how much community policing continues to influence the service delivery model of police services in Canada. Instead, some believe that community policing is potentially being overshadowed by new policing innovations. This research used Normandeau and Leighton's (1990) definition of community policing as an analytical framework to identify community policing in practice as implemented by the Ottawa Police Service. Five research questions were developed to examine the knowledge and perceptions of community policing among eight police officers and five community members currently involved in community policing. These perceptions were then supplemented by direct observation at five police-community meetings and analysis of the Ottawa Police Service website. The findings have demonstrated that indeed community policing is well perceived by police and community members involved in community policing. However, it is unclear how prevalent these perceptions are outside of those directly involved in community policing. There was no consensus among police officers that a community policing philosophy has become part of mainstream policing. It's clear that the Ottawa Police Service has philosophical, organizational and tactical components of community policing currently in place but the extent to which they are emphasized is unclear. The findings suggest that, regardless of the future direction taken by The Ottawa Police Service, they must take into account several developments since the inception of community policing and most importantly strive to maintain accountability.

Table of Contents

Contents

Acknowledgements.....	i
Abstract	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Chapter 1- Introduction.....	1
Community Policing in the 21 st Century.....	1
Problem Statement	1
Breakdown and Procedure.....	2
Chapter 2- Literature Review	5
Academic Interest in Community Policing	5
Definition of Community Policing	7
<i>Philosophical</i>	12
<i>Tactical</i>	13
<i>Organizational</i>	16
<i>Risk</i>	17
<i>Social Control</i>	20
<i>Costs</i>	21
Chapter 3- Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	22
Observations	23
<i>What community policing initiatives/programs do the Ottawa Police currently claim to adhere to?</i> 23	
Police Interviews	25
<i>What programs do police officers perceive as community policing?</i>	25
<i>What programs do community members perceive as community policing?</i>	27
Perceived Objectives of Community Policing.....	28
<i>Do the perceptions of police or community members lend support to one objective of community policing more than any other?</i>	28
Interpretation of Community Policing	30
<i>Do the perceptions of police or community members lend support to any of the five common interpretations of community policing?</i>	30

Chapter 4 - Methodology	35
Sample	36
Analytical Framework.....	38
Operationalization.....	41
Limitations.....	45
Strengths	47
Ethical Issues	47
Chapter 5 – Description and Analysis.....	50
<i>What community policing initiatives/programs do the Ottawa Police currently claim to adhere to? ...</i>	<i>50</i>
<i>What Programs do police officers perceive as community policing?</i>	<i>57</i>
Community Interviews	72
<i>What Programs do community members perceive as community policing?</i>	<i>72</i>
<i>Do police or community perception lend support to one objective of community policing more than another?</i>	<i>85</i>
<i>Do police or community perceptions lend support to any of the five common interpretations of community policing?</i>	<i>86</i>
Chapter 6 – Discussion and Conclusion.....	89
Transition to Community Policing	89
Resistance to Community Policing among Police Officers	90
Effects on Community Members	93
Objectives of Community Policing	94
Interpretation of Community Policing	95
Conclusions.....	96
References.....	99
Appendix A- Interview Schedule (Community)	110
Appendix B- Interview Schedule (Police)	112
Appendix C – Observation Grid	115
Appendix D- Coding Scheme	117
Appendix E – Consent Form	121
Appendix F – Letter of Information	124
Appendix G – Request for Permission to Observe	127

Chapter 1- Introduction

Community Policing in the 21st Century

In the late 20th and early 21st century there were important developments in policing, many resulting from an emphasis on ‘value for money’ in social services (Rawlings, 1991; Reiner and Spencer, 1993). However, there are some that point out any new development in policing are almost always as much about legitimation as they are about improving police effectiveness (Reiner, 2000). Of these innovations, community policing was one of the most widely adopted, or at least is the most frequently talked about (Newburn and Reiner, 2006). Community policing initiatives proliferated in the 1980s despite there being little evidence that it had any impact on crime. However, the confusion around its definition allows for almost any program to be included under the rubric of community policing (Bayley, 1994). Further, Brodgen (1999 as cited in Maguire, 2007, p.929) explains: “with its connotations of inclusiveness, consensus, communication, and consultation, an idea such as community policing, however difficult to pin down, is almost impossibly seductive.” As a result, it’s unclear if police services have truly adopted community policing as their main policing philosophy or if it is a secondary program implemented to increase police legitimacy among the public.

Problem Statement

With the emergence of new policing innovations, such as intelligence-led policing, anti-terrorism policing and others, scholars and professionals alike are uncertain as to what philosophy guides policing in the 21st century. This confusion may suggest that policing is still at an impasse. As Mastrofski (2006 as cited in Maguire, 2007, p.931) states:

“The tension in community policing lies in the danger that the most well-meaning community- oriented programmes may easily revert to more classic police approaches which use them as a means either of securing legitimacy for police actions or of increasing police information and intelligence.”

This raises some interesting questions and these issues were examined through three main data sources. Normandeau and Leighton’s (1990) framework of community policing was used to examine the extent to which components of community policing could be identified from the data sources and the extent to which they were consistent across data sources.

Breakdown and Procedure

This research begins by examining the history of community policing and its development and introduces the purpose of the current research. The discussion on the history of community policing highlights that there is no consensus on whether community policing is something new or a re-emergence of Sir Robert Peel’s ideas in 1829. The discussion of the development of community policing highlights that its popularity both academically and politically peaked between 1980 and the early 1990’s while the degree to which that popularity remains is unclear.

Chapter two examines the definition of community policing put forth by Normandeau and Leighton (1990), including a description of the components of community policing, and describes the five hypotheses arising from the literature and the resulting research questions that were examined. It is hypothesized that most police services have not made a full transition to community policing. Recent innovations emerging in policing since the 21st century are potentially overshadowing community policing and the extent to which it remains a priority is unclear. Secondly, it is hypothesized that there is often a gap between theory and practice when it comes to community policing, often resulting from resistance among police officers to change

their traditional roles. Thirdly, it is hypothesized that community policing elicits some level of fear reduction or increases the positive perceptions of police. Fourthly it is hypothesized that there are six main objectives of community policing frequently cited in the literature and the current study examines if any one stands out in the current research. Lastly, it is hypothesized that there are five main interpretations of community policing (as cited in the literature) and the current research examines the extent to which any one of these interpretations is supported.

Chapter three describes the methodology used in the current research including a description of the sample, analytical framework, operationalization and limitations of the current research. The coding scheme was developed largely from Normandeau and Leighton's (1990) definition of community policing and supplemented by other literature. The coding scheme is summarized in *Appendix D*. The discussion of the limitations emphasizes that the current research has very limited external validity due to the small sample size and provides a justification for using a qualitative approach to examine the extent to which community policing remains a priority in the 21st century.

Chapter four is an analysis of the data and a description of the findings. This section examines the extent to which there is support for each of the five hypotheses and consists of several direct quotes providing support to any interpretations of the findings. Further, any differences in the perceptions of police and community members are highlighted.

Chapter five consists of a discussion of the main findings, including some inferences made based on the findings of the research. The findings of the current study are then compared to recent literature to determine if there is any consistency and/or disparity with previous research. Chapter five continues in concluding that community policing is well perceived by both

community members and police officers that were interviewed. However, police officers did express a need for evaluation of many current community policing/crime prevention programs to ensure they continue to meet the needs of the community. Although the perceptions among officers involved in community policing appeared to be positive, many officers interviewed hesitated to say that community policing is a service wide philosophy in reality. This chapter concludes by briefly exploring avenues for future research and by looking at the role that community policing could play in the increasingly complex future of policing.

Chapter 2- Literature Review

The first purpose of this chapter is to clarify how community policing can be identified in practice. We will do so by breaking down Normandeau and Leighton's (1990) definition of community policing into three different manifest components: philosophical, organizational and tactical. Next, several latent components of community policing will be identified and explored to facilitate an examination of the data in order to determine if any latent components of community policing can be identified in the perceptions of police or community members. The second purpose of this chapter is to give context to the current study's research questions and hypotheses by examining five main hypotheses from which five main research questions were developed. The current study will explore the knowledge and perceptions of community members and police officers in Ottawa with regards to community policing in an effort to answer the research questions.

Academic Interest in Community Policing

Community policing has been a major topic of interest since the beginning of the 1970s. Recently however, there have been several new policing innovations that have started to dominate the policing literature, possibly overshadowing community policing. Although it was once promoted as the cure-all for many of the problems experienced inside and outside of the criminal justice system (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1994), it is unclear how much of community policing has been integrated into and remains present within police services today.

In the 1970s there was attention given to public dissatisfaction with the professional model of policing. As a result of increased availability of government funds for police research in the U.S. academic interest was generated (Willis, 2001). Researchers began to examine the

role of the police and the effectiveness of traditional policing strategies. The results were not promising. However, it was argued that a closer partnership between the police and the community might help reduce crime and disorder and spread the responsibility for confronting then increasing crime rates (Skogan and Hartnett, 1997). Several studies demonstrated that community policing was improving problems associated with citizen's criticism of police: lack of citizen input, poor police-citizen interaction and public concern about perceived rising crime rates (Dewitt, 1992; Kennedy, 1993; Peak and Glensor, 1999; Skogan and Hartnett, 1997; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1994). As more research was conducted on traditional policing practices it became clear that there were several drawbacks. The police were limited in their capacity to reduce crime on their own. "It was not until the late 1970s that both researchers and police practitioners began to focus more intently on the specific elements associated with community oriented policing" (Willis, 2001, p.1063).

Problem oriented policing and community policing are overlapping concepts but each has distinctive features (Skogan, 2003). Problem oriented policing can take place without many characteristics of community policing, including community involvement, while community policing may tackle a much wider scope of problems and use a variety of tools to address them (Skogan, 2003). Most often, problem-oriented policing incorporates community participation in an attempt to contribute to an officer's capacity to identify and solve neighbourhood problems. According to Willis (2001), when Herman Goldstein proposed a new approach to policing (problem-oriented) it helped synthesize some of the key elements of community policing into a broader and more innovative framework. A closer relationship with the community could foster more knowledge of certain situations allowing police to make connections that may not have otherwise been possible. Because problem-oriented policing emphasized community

partnerships, many aspects were integrated into ideas about community policing (Willis, 2001). The incorporation of these two broader frameworks set the stage for a more coherent (yet still undefined) community policing approach which accelerated interest and research into the philosophy behind it. Throughout the 1980s, several community policing initiatives were attempted by police agencies across the United States and Canada. At the same time, several empirical studies examined the various aspects, intentions and prospects of community policing (Kennedy, Hornick et al; Walker et al., as cited in Chacko, 1993). By the 1990s, community policing had become a powerful police reform movement in both the United States and Canada, with endorsements by both governments. According to Zhao and Thurman (1997):

even though police departments may have been slow to adopt all the philosophical precepts, tactical elements and organizational changes commensurate with the entire community-policing model, its slow and steady evolution suggests that it is a permanent fixture on the landscape of American policing.

To a large extent, the same can be said about Canada. As Murphy (1989) explained, that in a relatively short time frame community policing became a national focus for the future of policing. This research, in part, seeks to understand through a single case study whether or not this is the case with the Ottawa Police Service. We hope to provide some critical insight into the extent to which community policing has been implemented and incorporated by the Ottawa Police Service. This insight is based on the knowledge and perceptions of a select few police officers and community members involved in community policing.

Definition of Community Policing

Without question, community policing has impacted most police organizations in Canada over the past 30 years. In fact, some would even claim that it revolutionized policing (as stated above by Zhao and Thurman) but the precise nature and scope of the transformation remains

debatable (Willis, 2001). Mastrofski (as cited in Braga and Weisburd, 2006), states that community policing is simply too amorphous a concept to submit to empirical evaluation and recommends that researchers evaluate it by breaking it down into more specific components.

The most comprehensive definition of community policing of this period was put forth by Normandeau and Leighton (1990) on behalf of the Solicitor General of Canada (as mentioned in the introduction). We will review Normandeau and Leighton's (1990) twelve point definition of community policing which included the following:

1. *The role of the police should be that of peace officers.* The police should be peace officers in that they should be involved in the reduction and prevention of crime while promoting public order and safety, extending their role beyond enforcement to a more generalist role. This has been recognized by many police departments who have changed their names from police 'department' or 'force' to police 'service' (Seagrave, 1997).
2. *The police should adopt a strategy of community consultation.* This process helps citizens and police better understand each other's concerns and roles in addressing crime and disorder problems. Further, community consultations allow for short and long-term goals for issues of concern to be established (Normandeau and Leighton, 1990). Citizens also gain a better understanding of the difficulties that police often face in attempting to solve or eliminate an issue of community concern such as restrictions in the law which limit the police in what they can do. Often consultations are extremely beneficial for the police in that they result in greater community understanding and patience.
3. *The police should become proactive and identify local crime and disorder problems.* Under a community policing philosophy, police officers are expected to take a more proactive role in the prevention of crime and disorder problems (Normandeau and

Leighton, 1990). Whereas under the professional policing model officers simply waited for calls to respond to, under the community policing model, officers are expected to interact with the community in their day to day activities and on patrol in order to understand the issues and problems facing that community and work towards identifying potential solutions. This often results from community feedback or from analysis of calls for service and the nature of the crimes in a given area (Seagrave, 1997).

4. *A problem-oriented policing strategy should be adopted.* Under the community policing model, there seems to be much more diversity and creativity allowed for addressing crime and disorder problems. This is seen as an advantage over the professional policing model, in that enforcement and specialized teams (reactive policing) can still be used but are combined with any other proactive tactics that may help address a specific community issue.
5. *The police need to tackle the underlying causes of problems.* Again, Normandeau and Leighton (1990) stress the need for police to address the underlying causes of crime as opposed to just its effects. Under a community policing model, a proactive approach to policing must be adopted by all officers and prevention efforts need to be tailored to address the specific issues identified by the community.
6. *There should be more inter-agency cooperation between the police and other service delivery agencies.* Partnership is one principle that most community policing supporters would agree is essential to the success of any community policing effort. Partnership refers to working not only with individual community members but also with other agencies and businesses that may be more equipped to deal with a specific issue identified as a problem within that community. For example, police are not always the

best suited to deal with problems arising from poor health or inadequate housing but can certainly play a partnership role in any proposed solution.

7. *Police personnel should act as information managers who engage in 'interactive policing'*. An essential component to the success of any community policing initiative is a regular and consistent interaction with the community. This not only allows officers to become more knowledgeable about the community they serve but also creates a sense of trust and a willingness to participate and communicate with the police (Normandeau and Leighton, 1990). This approach is very different from the professional model of policing which advocated maintaining distance between the police and the community (Seagrave, 1997).
8. *Tactics should be developed to reduce fear of crime*. Normandeau and Leighton (1990) emphasize that special attention must be paid to reducing fear of crime, especially among certain populations such as the elderly. This can be done by increasing education as well as providing these populations with prevention techniques and/or measures.
9. *Police officers should be encouraged to become career generalists rather than specialists*. Traditionally, police officers played a very narrow role within the community (mainly law enforcement). However, under a community policing model police officers are expected to address any issue brought to their attention even if it is not law enforcement related. If the officer is unable to deal with the issue him/herself, they are expected to contact the appropriate agencies that can help in dealing with the issue of concern.
10. *There should be greater management decentralization*. Increased autonomy of individual officers not only contributes to a greater sense of importance but also more job

satisfaction in that they are expected and rewarded for initiative in dealing with specific community issues.

11. There should be a change in the organizational structure from the hierarchical paramilitary model. Community policing encourages a flattening of the hierarchical structure in which “loyalties are placed not with the chain of command and the police department, as in the past, but with the Charter, the Criminal Code, the common law and the community” (Seagrave, 1997, p.208).

12. The police should become accountable to the community. Police are expected to be accountable to the public through processes such as community consultations. This accountability should not be limited to specific community policing initiatives but should also review their current policies and procedures. This will supplement the legal accountability that already exists through the courts and the administrative and political accountability provided through governance institutions and external review boards (Normandeau and Leighton, 1990).

The above stated definition was broken down into three broad components (organizational, tactical and philosophical) in order to simplify/clarify the analysis. The following section will describe three obvious components (philosophical, tactical, organizational) and three suppressed components (risk, social control and costs) of community policing, in an attempt to better understand what community policing would look like in practice and in order to determine if any components are prevalent in the perceptions of police and/or community members.

Philosophical

Community policing in theory is a fundamental re-orientation of policing from a reactive, independent and largely opaque organization to a proactive, cooperative and transparent organization. Community policing significantly broadens the traditional role of police and emphasizes that crime control and social order are a joint responsibility of the police and the community and can most effectively be addressed through cooperative partnership. It is presumed that increasing police-citizen partnership in addressing community problems will increase the efficiency and effectiveness of crime control, enhance public order, reduce fear of crime and increase safety (Murphy, 1989). The philosophy of community policing emphasizes that the community should be fully aware of the police organization's decision and policy making procedures while also being given the opportunity to voice their concerns. Police are responsible to fully address these concerns as best as possible (Willis, 2001). Community policing demands that a complete philosophical re-orientation occurs at all levels of the police agency. According to Morris Anyah, "community policing demands that officers at all levels of police agencies rethink their role in society and reformulate how they go about performing that role" (As cited in Robin, 2000). While police professionalism remains important, it is no longer established by isolation from the community. Instead, it is established through sharing of information that the police possess on crime and social order problems in society and can facilitate the perception of the police as crime 'experts'. Further, they establish the respect and acceptance of society through frequent friendly and compassionate interaction with the community. A philosophical commitment to community policing is often expressed via mission and/or vision statements of police services which beg the question as to whether or not this is a

rhetorical shift in the way policing is currently justified, legitimated and promoted or if it is in fact reality (Murphy, 1989).

Community policing as a philosophy views reducing community disorder and citizens' fear of crime, solving community problems and providing increased attention to victims of crime just as important as enforcing the law and making arrests (Willis, 2001). The current research seeks to determine to what extent the philosophy of community policing is present in the Ottawa Police Service in the minds of those we have interviewed.

Tactical

An essential component of community policing is establishing and maintaining a good relationship with the community. In order for this to occur, police officers must adopt appropriate attitudes and behaviours towards the community.

There are several tactical components that can address the relationship between the police service and the community. Previous tactics such as team policing and patrol decentralization were put in place to bring the police and community closer together but left out one essential element....they failed to seek assistance and input from residents themselves (Dantzker, 2002). Community consultation is the first step towards community cooperation; giving citizens a forum to voice their concerns and expressing genuine interest in addressing the concerns is very important in establishing credibility, trust, and respect. This can be achieved through door-to-door visits, community-police meetings, community surveys and day-to-day interaction between foot patrol officers and the community. Once community concerns have been expressed, the police can elicit the help of the community in addressing the concerns proactively by encouraging reporting of suspicious behaviour or community involvement in crime prevention

initiatives (Willis, 2001). Police can also use this police-community interaction to their advantage in educating the community on crime prevention and risk management to reduce the likelihood of victimization. This provides a win-win situation for both parties. However, it can be difficult to conjure community support and participation with police, especially in lower socioeconomic and disenfranchised communities (Skogan, 2003).

As previously mentioned, establishing trust is essential to the maintenance of a positive police-community relationship. According to Goldstein (1987), this long-term relationship can be solidified if police are responsive to community concerns and accountable for the actions they take in addressing these concerns. Accountability can come in various forms, most of which demonstrate a continued effort in resolving the problem to the community. For example, continual updates on specific issues, community satisfaction surveys, neighbourhood meetings or phone interviews to evaluate the level of satisfaction with the police services (Willis, 2001). Increased interaction between the police and the community is an important objective of community policing and various tactical elements have been outlined above. However, the quantity and quality of police interaction is often most important (Willis, 2001). The tactical approach to satisfying this objective is often to deploy foot and bike patrol units, a change from traditional policing approaches which have police officers in vehicles. Foot and bike patrols encourage officers to get to know the citizens in the neighbourhoods/beats, allegedly facilitating the building of trust, providing more job satisfaction to officers and can often reduce fear of crime. However, most police department have remained committed to a crime control model focusing on rapid response as a basic operational philosophy (in practice), while community policing remains an add-on program when pragmatically and politically appropriate (Murphy, 1989). A permanent beat assignment often encourages a sense of responsibility and ownership

on the part of the officer assigned to the area (Willis, 2001). Despite the seemingly once widespread support for community policing (both political and public) it is ultimately up to police officers to make community policing an operational reality and that is not so clear in the 21st century (Murphy, 1989).

Problem solving partnerships are another fundamental element of community policing and help reduce the criticism that community policing is simply an attempt by police to make a good impression with the community. Goldstein (1990) advances that police-community partnership in problem solving is a radical departure from traditional policing. Under a community policing philosophy, police services move away from a reactive approach to crime and instead allow the community to identify issues of concerns and work cooperatively with them to address these issues proactively. Further, it is emphasized that police services attempt to address the root causes of crime as opposed to continually reacting to their effects. According to Mastrofski et al. (1995) law enforcement is no longer viewed as the only option. Instead, the police are encouraged to search for alternative forms of social control and/or redirect community concerns to agencies that can more effectively deal with the specific issue of concern. It is up to the police officers to recognize patterns and potential connections between problems. Police officers must also be willing “to choose long-term, judicious, and highly selective solutions over short-term, cumbersome, and universal responses” (Willis, 2001, p.1050). The current research seeks to determine the extent to which various potential tactical component of community policing have been implemented by the Ottawa Police Service.

Organizational

The third overarching component of community policing is organizational change. A true commitment to community policing requires several organizational changes within police services. Traditionally police services have been highly bureaucratic and hierarchical in nature with major decisions being made by those in the highest positions. However, community policing recognizes and values the experience and education of front line officers, allowing them more autonomy in decision making and problem solving within their own community. This autonomy is important in allowing front-line officers the freedom to address specific community problems and concerns. Community policing has had the most visible impact on urban policing (Murphy, 1989). The decentralization of police stations with the creation of neighbourhood substations are specific tactical implementations of organizational change. The organization's "attempt to provide line officers with continuous access to resources, aims to increase organizational flexibility and the capacity of the police officer for solving problems" (Goldstein, 1987, p.34). Community policing has used a variety of modern management principles such as decentralized authority, participatory management, flexible organizational structure and more open environment (Murphy, 1989, Maguire, 2007). Greater emphasis is placed on the need to establish a culture of mentorship and guidance within the police organization as opposed to focusing extensively on written rules to manage officers (Cordner, 1997). According to Skogan (2003), if organizational change has occurred, police agencies should be less complex, less formalized and more decentralized. Secondly, police organizations must move away from traditional performance measures and develop measures of police effectiveness and accountability that are more relevant to community policing. These could include community surveys, public forums etc that would focus on whether or not citizens are happy with the quality

of policing in their neighbourhood, levels of fear, responsiveness of police officers and whether or not problem-solving strategies have been implemented (Willis, 2001). A police organization that is committed to community policing will have implemented organizational and management changes as well as developed relevant measures of police effectiveness and accountability. The current research seeks to determine the extent to which organizational components of community policing have been implemented by the Ottawa Police Service to the extent that our interviews/observations permit.

As highlighted above, community policing has several obvious components that are essential to its effectiveness. However, when community policing is examined from a more critical perspective, there are several suppressed components that can be identified including: risk communication/management, social control and monetary concerns.

Risk

Community policing is largely understood as a philosophy based on working with the community to combat and reduce crime and other social concerns. However, a more critical perspective can identify that many programs under the rubric of 'community policing' favour certain interests and particular groups (Skogan, 1990; Lyons, 1999). Business owners and non visible minority middle-class groups living in the area tend to be overrepresented in community policing programs which can lead to very specific goals often without considering the interests of all individuals who live in the area. This can be partially attributed to the fact that poor, high-crime neighbourhood residents tend to be more distrustful of police, but nonetheless presents a problem (Willis, 2001). In fact, this has been supported by previous research done by Brown and Wycoff (1987) when they found that white, middle-class residents and homeowners in low-crime neighbourhoods were more likely to call community policing stations than renters,

minorities and those with lower incomes. Even in voluntary associations, where membership rules are not restrictive, participation is often skewed to those of higher socio-economic status, married, and homeowners with children (Rosenbaum, 1987, p.108). As a result, 'communities' (collective victims) tend to define themselves by defining suitable enemies or targets (loitering, public drug use, vagrancy etc), which may not have been the targets if these groups were more representative of the entire neighbourhood (Rosenbaum, 1987).

There are some that argue policing and the society in which it takes place is best understood in terms of risk communication or from the perspective of a risk society (Erickson and Haggerty, 1997). In fact, the risk literature can be applied the community policing quite effectively. Community policing is largely based on the partnership and coordination of police with various other social organizations. From a risk perspective, this can be seen as a society-wide attempt at risk management (governance) and security (guarantees against loss) while also providing a discourse rationalizing the policing of risk (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997).

Community policing is very much risk communication in that the police coordinate and partner with various institutions and organizations thus placing more onus on these organizations to be self-sufficient in terms of risk management and crime prevention. Today's society is largely based on institutions organized around fear, risk assessment and provisions of fear (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997). Thus, community policing serves as a discourse to mediate the fears of the various organizations and institutions partnered with the police but also to individuals living in that community. Police are seen as 'experts' on crime knowledge and risk management and this is used by the police to govern individual neighbourhoods in a particular manner. Individual communities become a means for communicating risk management (Stenson, 1993) towards the end of reducing and/or eliminating crime or other neighbourhood problems.

Community policing is a discourse for finding ways to improve connections with the communications circuitry of other risk institutions, that is, they respond to their knowledge needs in a routine manner, to provide them with expert advice, and to help them manage their risks.....Constituted as problem solvers, the police become professional diagnosticians of every risk problem imaginable, and provide treatment directly or through referral to specialists in other risk institutions (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997, p72).

Community policing empowers the police as professional experts due to the knowledge and statistics filtered down from various hi-tech sources and providing information generated from his/her neighbourhood (Trojanowicz and Carter, 1988). Consequently, community police officers are viewed as experts, counsellors and advisors.

The problem with a reliance on risk lies in that community policing may fall into the broader trend in the risk society of focusing on the distribution (displacement) of risk as opposed to the reduction or elimination of risk. Police agencies must be careful not to become more concerned with the distribution of risk than the prevention, incapacitation and punishment of those responsible for creating risk (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997). To be put another way, the police cannot pre-occupy themselves only with notifying the community about risks, they must also actively work on preventing, incapacitating and punishing those responsible for creating the risk. Further, police must be cautious in the development and implementation of a community policing program. The literature on community policing advocates that programs be 'co-produced' by the police and the specific neighbourhood. However, police agencies often resort to selling and implementing pre-packaged strategies devised without any community input taken into consideration (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997), which would completely undermine the main idea behind community policing. The current research will seek to determine the extent to which latent components of risk can be identified in police officers and community member's perceptions of community policing.

Social Control

Community policing can also be viewed as a mechanism of control and a way for government to govern from a distance (Garland, 2001). “Policing has become ‘smarter’, more targeted, more attuned to local circumstances, more responsive to public pressure, more willing to work with the community and to emphasize prevention” (Garland, 2001, p. 169). Technological advances and new management techniques have been used to maintain tighter control of resources and a more targeted, problem-oriented approach. Despite these slight re-orientations, Garland (2001) argues that as legal and organizational entities, policing organizations have not experienced significant change and look much the same as they did several years ago. Community policing stresses partnerships with community agencies in order to address community concerns. An implicit consequence is that crime control is extended beyond the state, engaging actors and agencies of civil society facilitating crime control practices of the state from a distance (Garland, 2001). Thus, crime control is no longer monopolized by the State but rather becomes the responsibility of a number of social and economic actors termed by some as the pluralisation of policing (Crawford, 2007). Of course, the assumption behind these changes is that crime is now accepted as a part of everyday life to be managed. Consequently, the thinking behind modern policing is based on situational crime prevention, routine activities theory and environmental criminology. The focus is not on individual criminals but rather, is focused on reducing criminal opportunities, enhancing situational controls and directing individuals away from criminogenic situations (Garland, 2001; Crawford, 2007). Under a community policing philosophy community safety becomes the main goal and law enforcement becomes merely a means to this end, rather than an end in itself. The dilemma lies in the fact that community safety is often operationally translated by focusing on crime control

and public order maintenance, often resulting in selective enforcement of community standards on some citizens (youth, prostitutes, drug users and vagrants) (Murphy, 1989). The extent to which the government can encourage citizens to augment the amount of social control they exert simultaneously extends the governmental reach, acting as another mode of exerting social control (Garland, 2001, 171). The current research will seek to gain an understanding of the degree to which the implementation of community policing by the Ottawa Police Service adheres to the idea of social control as a latent goal through the examination of the perceptions of a select few police officers and community members involved in community policing.

Costs

Of primary importance, even more so due to tough economic times upon us, are the resources available to police services. Some critics of community policing would argue that community policing is simply a method of reducing the costs of policing. In fact, Murphy (1989, 15) argues that: “the possibility of shifting some policing responsibilities and costs back to the community, and reducing reliance on government-funded public policing, makes community policing a highly pragmatic as well as a politically appealing reform.” The true test of the importance of community policing will come when police organizations themselves are fully funding it (if they are not already) (Skogan, 2003). The current research will also attempt to shed some light on the degree to which cost effectiveness and saving of money has had on the implementation of community policing by the Ottawa Police Service.

Chapter 3- Research Questions and Hypotheses

The current study has five research questions as follows:

- What community policing initiatives/programs are police and community members aware of that the Ottawa Police currently claim to adhere to?
- What programs do police officers perceive as community policing?
 - a. How do police officers perceive community policing program overall?
 - b. What are the perceptions of police officers with regards to community policing programs/initiatives?
- What programs do community members perceive as community policing?
 - c. What are the perceptions of community members involved in community policing programs/initiatives?
- Do the perceptions of police or community members lend support to one objective of community policing more than another?
- Do the perceptions of police or community members lend support to any of the five common interpretations of community policing?

Next, each research question will be examined closer to determine how it was arrived at as a relevant research question.

Observations

What community policing initiatives/programs do the Ottawa Police currently claim to adhere to?

In general, most police agencies have embraced the broad tenets of community policing as it would be difficult not to, based on the political and public appeal, and given that an adherence to these tenets has been key to accessing sources of funding (Skogan, 2003). A number of scholars acknowledge the challenges that community policing has faced following the 9/11 terrorist attacks (Lyons, 2002; Murray, 2005; Oliver, 2006) and some argue we are returning to a more traditional (paramilitaristic) policing style, leaving community policing behind. Some scholars believe that community policing principles are incompatible with new policing innovations such as homeland security and intelligence-led policing (De Guzman, 2002; Oliver, 2004, 2006). For example, a philosophy of building trust in the community is completely undermined by counter-terrorist policing activities. Oliver (2006) argues that ultimately funding drives policing priorities and according to him, funding has shifted towards homeland security.

Others are disappointed by the decreased funding of community policing given the fact that police-community relationships, promoted by a community policing philosophy help in gathering intelligence to combat future terrorist attacks (Henry, 2002; Murray, 2005; Scrivner, 2004; Thatcher, 2005). There are some who believe Intelligence-led policing (ILP) and community policing can be integrated though philosophical similarities may not be obvious (Carter, 2009; Murray, 2005; Pelfrey, 2004). According to Haarr (2001):

community policing has developed skills in many law enforcement officers that directly support new ILP responsibilities: Problem solving, environmental scanning, effective communications with the public, fear reduction, and community mobilization to deal with problems are among the important attributes community policing brings to this challenge.

There is clearly no consensus on whether or not community policing will be able to survive in the wake of 9/11 and several new policing innovations.

Secondly, to a large degree, according to the literature on community policing, neighbourhood problems and needs should determine what type of initiatives are implemented and emphasized. Goldstein (1987) emphasizes the notion that community policing must adapt to the specific needs of communities and the newest projects involve more involvement of the community, greater accountability to the community and improved service to the community. To take it one step further, to the international level, Brogden (2004) has studied the implementation of community policing models in African societies, only to discover that it is a tremendous failure. The failure is due to the fact that it does not account for local circumstances. According to Brogden (2004) community policing can work in African societies but

the key requirement must be that the imitation is local in character. It must draw on local experiences and practice in terms of 'what works'. It should only borrow from the West when two conditions are satisfied. First, those policing goods must come with an attested record of success. Secondly, they must only be implemented when they are constructed with the benefit of local knowledge and sensitivity to local conditions and legitimation.

It is evident that adapting to local circumstances is essential to the successful implementation of any community policing model. However, according to Mastrofski: "Many departments are unwilling or unable to make the sorts of commitment it takes to go beyond the fairly superficial transformations that come from adopting canned programs that are pale replicas of the 'real deal'" (as cited in Braga and Weisburd, 2006, p.57). It is hypothesized that the Ottawa Police Service has not made the full transition to community policing and community policing is potentially being overshadowed by new policing innovations such as intelligence led-policing.

The current study will examine knowledge and perceptions of community policing in order to provide some insight in terms of how much community policing remains a main priority within the Ottawa Police Service as perceived by a select few police officers at various ranks and community members involved in community policing. Secondly, it would be logical to predict that different neighbourhoods in Ottawa will have different implementations of community policing and different tactics, structures and prevention programs will be emphasized (each one adapted to the specific needs of the community). If this is not the case, then we could lend support to the notion that the Ottawa Police Service has not gone beyond superficial transformations in the adoption of community policing.

Police Interviews

What programs do police officers perceive as community policing?

- a. How do police officers perceive community policing overall?*
- b. What are the perceptions of police officers with regards to community policing programs/initiatives?*

Community policing has been widely embraced in theory by most police agencies in one capacity or another in the 21st century. However, the extent to which individual officers have changed their traditional practices is not agreed upon in the academic literature. Community policing tends to broaden a police organization's goals and thus increases the range of issues it is expected to respond to. The problem lies in the fact that community policing can often create unrealistic public expectations in terms of the services a police agency can provide (Mastrofski as cited in Braga and Weisburd, 2006).

As noted in previous research, police organizations are reluctant to accept and try new ideas (Scheingold, 1991). Many individual officers resist the notion of community policing because it represents a change from the traditional reactive approach to policing (Allen, 2002).

“Traditional approaches to crime have focused on strengthening the formal justice system by increasing the capacity of the police force, enforcing harsher legal penalties, and improving criminal investigation” (Acosta, 2007). However, a community policing approach is no longer only about quickly responding to scenes in order to complete paper work as to what happened (Braga and Weisburd, 2006). Rather, community policing, in some ways, expects much more from its officers. Community policing takes a proactive approach to crime, emphasizing prevention. Officers are expected to respond to individual scenes with the intention of identifying the underlying or any patterns associated with the current situation. Community policing effectiveness is not only measured by number of arrests, lower reported crime, and quicker responses to calls for service. Rather, officers are expected to work with residents to create self-regulating, self-sufficient communities (Adams, 2005). “Assisting residents to solve their own problems, developing local institutions that facilitated normative behaviour, and working proactively to solve local issues before they became crime problems underlay community policing” (Adams, 2005, p.45). It is obvious that much of the success or failure of community policing rests on the ability of individual officers to have the flexibility to adapt and embrace a community policing approach (Brown, 1989; Friedmann, 1992). Research on police perceptions of community policing has identified components associated with the acceptance of community policing (Leiderbach, 2008) but there has been very little in-depth analysis of officer perceptions of community policing in the 21st century. Further, little is known with regards to the concordance of officer and community member perceptions of community policing (Leiderbach, 2008). There has been research demonstrating that those involved in community policing have more favourable perceptions of community policing than those who are not involved (Skogan, 2003). It is hypothesized that there is a gap between theory and practice when it comes to

community policing within the Ottawa Police Service involving resistance from officers to change their traditional practices.

The current study will be able to provide some insight into the perceptions of a select few police officers towards community policing, facilitating a judgment of the degree to which there is any resistance on the part of police officers in implementing community policing within the Ottawa Police Service.

What programs do community members perceive as community policing?

- a. *What are the perceptions of community members involved in community policing programs/initiatives?*

The literature consistently highlights several outcomes associated with implementing community policing and provides us with an idea of what we might expect hear from community members involved in community policing.

Research has consistently demonstrated that increased police-community interaction has generated more positive perceptions of police and police-community relations among community members (Skogan, 1994; Skogan et al., 1999). Also, “social relationships in a community have been shown to promote citizen cooperation and partnership with police and to increase participation in and effectiveness of citizen “policing” programs (e.g., community watch or block patrols) and self-help programs” (Acosta, 2007, p.653). Adams (2005) goes on to highlight that the dissemination of information to the public is often the most difficult obstacle facing police agencies. It is difficult to implement a new policing approach if the community is not well aware of such an initiative. Studies have also found that community members living in areas actively involved in community policing have favourable opinions in terms of police responsiveness to their concerns (Skogan and Hartnett, 1997; Skogan et al., 1999). These positive perceptions were

especially noticeable in community members who were knowledgeable and actively involved (Adams, 2005). Most community members would have a general knowledge of community policing but would not be able to highlight the finer points of the philosophy (Mastrofski as cited in Braga and Weisburd, 2006). Mastrofski and Ritti (2000) also found that the police-community partnership aspect was the most mentioned among community members when discussing community policing. Thus, we would expect those involved in community policing to have a fairly extensive understanding of community policing initiatives. It is hypothesized that community policing elicits some level of fear reduction, disorder reduction and cultivation of more favourable opinions of police (Rosenbaum, 2007).

Perceived Objectives of Community Policing

Do the perceptions of police or community members lend support to one objective of community policing more than any other?

Seagrave (1997) outlines six objectives of community policing that are generally agreed upon within the literature including the following: increased police legitimacy (Mastrofski, 2006; Skogan, 2006; Waller, 2006), increased accountability (Garland, 2001), increased efficiency (Garland, 2001; Waller, 2006), increased effectiveness (Waller, 2006), reduce fear/increase public safety and finally to increase job satisfaction (Lurigio and Rosenbaum, 1994).

Police agencies are always concerned with increasing their *legitimacy* in the eyes of the public. This is for obvious reasons in that it makes their job much easier and increases the likelihood of members of the public and other agencies being willing to cooperate with the police. Waller (2006) also highlights that a major objective of community policing is to build police-community partnerships. Police services saw the chance to work closely with local

community organizations and leaders as an opportunity to solidify their legitimacy and repair any harm done under the professional policing model of the 1970's (Garland, 2001).

Increased accountability is another major objective of community policing and through increased public forums and communication with the public, the police should be held more accountable for their actions while the public is more aware of their activities (Seagrave, 1997). However, Garland (2001) sees community policing as an opportunity for police services to spread the responsibility of crime control to agencies, organizations and individuals outside of the justice system. Programs such as neighbourhood watch and many other forms of crime prevention are classic examples increasing self-responsibilization and limit the accountability of the police service for levels of crime.

More *efficient* use of police services through changes in organization and management is always a concern. Through community policing, it was expected that police agencies would be able to utilize community resources which make them more efficient. It has become apparent that continuing to increase police budgets has little effect on levels of crime and continuing to deliver policing according to the standard model (patrols, response to calls for service, and investigations) is unsustainable (Waller, 2006). "For our taxes to be better used to reduce crime, we need smarter police departments, not just smarter police officers" (Waller, 2006, p.73).

Community policing is supposed to create increased *effectiveness* through innovation. One way that police have been able to do this is by focusing on problem-oriented policing (part of CP) which allows services to identify the root causes of problems and use their resources more effectively to address those problems (Waller, 2006). According to Waller (2006, p.134) "what is needed is more funds and ambition to help law enforcement agencies – not just individual

officers - comprehensively adopt a problem-oriented perspective and work closely with other agencies such as school boards and public health to tackle the risk factors that cause crime”.

Another objective of community policing is to *reduce the fear* of crime and increase the sense of public safety (Waller, 2006; Seagrave, 1997). Community policing purportedly does this by increasing police visibility via foot patrols and community policing stations.

Lastly, community policing seeks to increase *job satisfaction* and officer productivity. It is believed that community policing can do so by allowing officers more autonomy in dealing with neighbourhood issues (Seagrave, 1997). With less direct supervision and more friendly interaction with the public, it is believed that officer job satisfaction and productivity will be positively affected (Lurigio and Rosenbaum, 1994). The extent to which these objectives have been achieved is still not known; as a result these objectives remain at the hypothetical level (Seagrave, 1997). It is hypothesized that (based on the perceptions of police officers and community) a few objectives will be more prevalent than other and there will be differences between police officers and community members perceptions of community policing objectives.

Interpretations of Community Policing

Do the perceptions of police or community members lend support to any of the five common interpretations of community policing?

There are various definitions and interpretations of community policing that have been advanced and discussed over the years and, according to Freidmann (1992), this should not be surprising when two commonly accepted terms such as ‘community’ and ‘police’ are linked. Some view community policing as a complete paradigmatic shift and philosophy (Bayley, 1989; Chacko and Nancoo, 1993; Greene et al., 1994, Roth et al, 2000) while others view it more as a

police program. However, when examined carefully, the literature on community policing can generally be divided into five categories and/or interpretations: community policing as rhetorical, as philosophy, as program, as social control, or as imprecise. Most if not all work on community policing can be placed into one of these categories, either implicitly or explicitly.

Some scholars (Garland, 2001; Mastrofski, 2006) view community policing as nothing more than a *rhetorical* term exploited by the police to convey a sense of partnership with the community while also stoking a sense of nostalgia to a time when the police and the community were seemingly one and the same. Community policing tends to evoke metaphors of democracy, small town morality and local autonomy but in reality may lack substance and be little more than rhetorical (Crank, 1994). The rhetorical interpretation of community policing views it as having little depth, being more of a buzz-word designed to persuade and impress the public (Weatheritt, 1988). Garland (2001), points out that by the 1980s community policing had become an all-pervasive rhetoric and was being used to describe many traditional policing practices.

The *philosophical interpretation* of community policing is the most developed and most frequently discussed of the various academic interpretations. In fact, “community policing is a *philosophy*, not a program” is one of the most popular phrases among academics and practitioners (Roth et al., 2000). The main philosophical attribute of community policing is that of ‘partnership’ between the police and the community. There have been several philosophical guidelines put forth by various academics over the years consisting of three to twelve principles depending on the author (Normandeau and Leighton, 1990; Skogan, 2006). The principles generally advocate a broader problem-oriented policing philosophy with less emphasis on crime fighting; decentralization of police power; increased emphasis on crime prevention and letting the community define the problems to be addressed by the police. Because many of these

principles are very similar to those advocated by Sir Robert Peel in the 1800s, it leads some to believe that community policing is really just 'old wine in new bottles' (Seagrave, 1997). The principles of community policing lead to a need for structural change within police departments, which can present many challenges. Police have traditionally viewed themselves as professionals who know best what to do to maintain social order and enforce the law (Skolnick and Bayley, 1988), listening and acting on specific community concerns can be quite a change and may lead to some resistance from officers. "Although police departments are opening up to community input and influence, most police executives remain reluctant to give the community real authority and responsibilities" (Skogan, 2003, p.29). The philosophical interpretation of community policing advocates partnerships between the police and the community in identifying and addressing issues of concern (Mastrofski and Ritti, 2000).

The rhetorical and philosophical interpretations are very broad in nature. However, there are certain interpretations that are much more focused such as those that view community policing as a *specific program*. Some view community policing as a program requiring only three things: community policing councils, inter-agency cooperation and community constables (Alderson, 1982) and can be added onto existing police activities. Although there is no clear definition of community policing, a number of programs that increase police involvement with the community can be seen to be compatible with it. These include neighbourhood foot patrols, community policing stations (storefronts), community consultative groups, neighbourhood watch and community-based crime prevention initiatives (Seagrave, 1997). There are concerns that many of these programs have always existed but have been re-vamped and/or re-named in order to be labelled community policing. "Although agencies have adapted aspects of the rhetoric of community and problem oriented policing, crime fighting and crime suppression remain the

mainstays of the police” (Greene, 2003, p.75). The interpretation of community policing as a program sees little organizational and/or structural change to police agencies. Instead programs are added and/or re-named in an effort to satisfy a community policing component.

Another interpretation of community policing takes a more critical approach viewing community policing as a form of *social control*. Some scholars believe that community policing is an attempt to conceal, mystify and legitimize police use of nonnegotiable coercive force (Klockars, 1989) while others believe that it’s a more covert method to penetrate communities and collect information in an effort to increase state control (Kinsey et al, 1986; Taylor, 1980). This interpretation is often advanced to explain why police make such an attempt to better relations with minority populations. Garland (2001) goes on to say that community policing and other inter-connected activities combine to produce a new culture of crime control. “Community policing seeks to enlist the support of voluntary agencies, businesses and resident groups, harnessing the social control efforts of these bodies and aligning them with the efforts of the official crime control agencies” (Garland, 2001, p. 122).

Finally, unlike the rhetorical interpretation, the *imprecise* interpretation recognizes that community policing has substance, but this substance has yet to be defined (Eck and Rosenbaum, 1994). The ambiguous nature of various definitions of the terms ‘community’, ‘policing’, and ‘community policing’ lead to a variety of practical interpretations (Mawby, 1990). Existing definitions range from those that believe it to be any partnership between the police and the community (Leighton, 1991; Murphy, 1989; Skolnick and Bayley, 1988; Skogan, 2006) to those who see it as a form of social control involving the community (Alderson, 1982; Garland, 2001) and those with a very pessimistic view who advocate that community policing is anything that can be passed off as such and accepted by the community (Weatheritt, 1987; Mawby, 1990;

Mastrofski, 2006). Interestingly, a survey done by Reiner (1991) found that 45% of chief constables in England and Wales believed community policing was a meaningless expression. It would be interesting to determine if Canadian chiefs of police hold the same perceptions. If this is not observed, an alternative explanation could be that tactics previously implemented by police have now be slightly re-organized and/or re-oriented and placed under the title of 'community policing'. Some such as Skogan (2003) would argue that in some cases police organizations (structures, division of labour etc) have not been significantly changed with the adoption of community and problem-oriented policing. It is hypothesized that some interpretations would be more evident than others in the perceptions of police and community members. Further, police and community members will emphasize different interpretations.

The first purpose of this chapter was to highlight the research questions and how they were developed. This chapter gave context to the current study's research questions and highlighted the main research hypotheses.

Chapter 4 - Methodology

This chapter will be divided into three main subsections each of which are required to describe the selected methodology. The first subsection will discuss the method of research and analysis, the sample and the analytical framework used to analyze the results. The second subsection will describe the operational definitions used in this research. The third subsection will focus on the limitations (internal validity, external validity, and reliability), strengths and ethical issues associated with the research design.

This research involves the use of a qualitative case study methodology, and includes direct observation, semi-structured interviews with police and community members involved in community policing and the analysis of secondary data obtained from the Ottawa Police Service website. The original intention was to do ride/walk alongs with police officers to observe their behaviour on the job, but legal and ethical restraints eliminated this potential research method. However, it is believed that going into the field with a focus area derived from an established framework can focus the study and will allow for meaningful results to be achieved. The case study research design can be justified due to the fact that direct control over the environment is not required (Yin, 1994). A case study design was used to explore perceptions of police officers and community members of community policing.

The proposed research design for this study is a non-experimental single case study with multiple sites. “A case study is a method for learning about a complex instance, based on a comprehensive understanding of that instance obtained by extensive description and analysis of that instance taken as a whole and in its context (GAO, 1991, 23).” Berg (1998) indicates that case studies may focus on a single individual, group, or a community. Further, Yin (1994)

indicates that case studies are useful in a variety of situations including neighbourhoods or public agencies. Doing a good case study consists of systematically examining what is happening in a particular context or with regards to a particular phenomenon, selecting instances of this phenomenon, collecting data, analyzing the information, and reporting the results (GAO, 1991). A single case study can test a framework that has specified a clear set of propositions as well as the circumstances within which the propositions are believed to be true (Yin, 1994). This study strives to provide a glimpse of what has been implemented and incorporated by the Ottawa Police and the perceptions of officers and community members involved.

Interviews were used as the primary source of data on the perceptions of community members and police officers involved in community policing. The interviews were supplemented with direct observations and the analysis of secondary data obtained from the Ottawa Police Services website. Direct observation was used as a means of observing the role played by the police while interacting with the community. An observation grid was created in an attempt to guide the observations and to make the observation process more objective (see appendix C).

According to Yin (1994, p. 2), “the case study contributes uniquely to our knowledge of individual, organizational, social, and political phenomena”. The case study approach also benefits from the development of prior research and frameworks to guide data collection and analysis (Yin, 1994).

Sample

Some groundwork was completed prior to the selection of the sample. While waiting for ethics approval from the University of Ottawa Research Ethics Board, research was completed

on the structure of the Ottawa Police Service. The Ottawa Police Service is divided into 6 districts (Central East, East, Central West, West, Rural West and Rural East). Central East and Central West were the focus of the study. The original research plan sought to compare the implementation of community policing by the Ottawa Police Service in different neighbourhoods in Ottawa, however, several obstacles (unable to contact district officers, community leaders etc), encountered early in the research process created the need to alter this approach. The research was conducted within the Central East and Central West divisions of the Ottawa Police Service (also known as 'Downtown West', 'Downtown East' and 'Vanier' areas as identified by the City of Ottawa 2001 Census data). The reasons for this were three-fold. First, there was an assumption that community policing would be more active in urban areas of Ottawa. Secondly, Central East and Central West divisions have a mix of residential, business and social services in place and it appears the various actors meet to address common social, safety and security concerns (although there was no knowledge as to whether or not this was actually occurring). Finally, the limited resources available for research made it more convenient and efficient in terms of data collection to focus the study on Central East and Central West divisions.

Once ethical approval was received, a total of five police-community meetings were attended in the Central East and Central West divisions. From these meetings, contacts were established and interviews were arranged with those willing to participate in the study. While attending community meetings the researcher would introduce himself during roundtable introductions as a graduate student at the University of Ottawa and briefly describe that he was researching community policing in Ottawa and would invite anyone interested to discuss this in an interview to be arranged at their convenience. If there were any questions, they were addressed and an 'information sheet' was circulated throughout the meeting in case anyone

desired more information. Interviews were completed with community members, a business representative and police officers only after a consent form was signed. The sample for this study consists of five community members (one business representatives/ four residents) as well as eight Ottawa Police Service officers. The Ottawa Police Service officers represent several ranks including Chief of police (N=1), Inspector (N=2), Sergeant (N=1) and constable (N=4). The representation of various ranks is intentional in the hopes of discovering any disparities in perceptions across ranks (although this capacity is limited by small sample size). The sample size is small but given the small sample frame of those officers involved in community policing and the accessibility of those officers, the sample at least provides a snapshot of how officers in the Ottawa Police Service and community members perceive community policing. The interviews are supplemented with observational and secondary data obtained from the Ottawa Police Service website 'publications' section, in order to provide a more complete picture.

The five community members interviewed include one business representative and four residents involved in community policing. The sample size was limited by the number of community members involved in community policing and the willingness to participate in an interview. The five community members interviewed provide a snapshot of how community members perceive community policing in Ottawa.

Analytical Framework

In reviewing the literature, the most comprehensive definition of community policing created in a Canadian context was that of Normandeau and Leighton (1990). In order to guide the current research, Normandeau and Leighton's definition was used as an analytical framework.

This definition, as described in chapter two, was used to help identify various philosophical, organizational and tactical components that the Ottawa Police Service adhere to in their implementation of a “community policing philosophy” (ottawapolice.ca, 2009).

Questions in the semi-structured interviews were guided by Normandeau and Leighton’s definition of community policing but also supplemented by other community policing literature (Green and Mastrofski, 1988; Skogan, 2003; Rosenbaum, 2007). This was done in an attempt to elicit the participants’ understanding of community policing and its goals as well as their perceptions and experiences with community policing (see appendix A and B). Further, direct and summative content analysis were used to systematically analyze interview transcripts and in an attempt to test questions surrounding the implementation of community policing in Ottawa by the Ottawa Police Service and to describe the perceptions of those involved in community policing. Secondary document/data analysis elicits how community policing is claimed to be implemented by the Ottawa Police Service.

Community policing was largely developed throughout the late 1980s and early 1990s but it is unclear how much of community policing is actually implemented by the Ottawa Police Service in 2008/9, or how it competes with more recent policing innovations. The existing literature on community policing guided the formulation of the initial coding scheme (see appendix D) in identifying variables of interest and relationships between variables. The main strength of the direct content analysis approach is that a framework can be supported or extended by any findings (Hsiu and Shannon, 2005).

One drawback to direct content analysis is that researchers are often entering the field well informed but with a fairly strong bias (Hsiu and Shannon, 2005). Researchers are thus

somewhat more likely to find evidence that supports their framework as opposed to contradictory evidence. Secondly, probe questions posed by the researcher may be biased and answered in a way by the interviewee that they believe will satisfy the researcher. This was countered by asking probing questions in an objective fashion, being careful not to present any bias.

Summative content analysis consists of both quantitative and qualitative aspects. Summative content analysis often involves identifying and counting the frequency of certain key words or content. In the current study, the researcher counted the frequency of key content identified during the direct content analysis to describe perceptions of how the Ottawa Police Service claims to implement community policing. If analysis were to stop at this point it would remain purely quantitative. However, summative content analysis can also include more qualitative aspects such as latent content analysis (Hsiu and Shannon, 2005). A latent content analysis consists of a process of interpretation of the underlying meaning of certain words or the underlying reason for the usage of certain key words for example (Babbie, 1992). Word frequency counts of an identified term are tabulated and the source of the word is also noted. Counting is used to identify patterns in the data and to contextualize the codes (Morgan, 1993). This allows for an interpretation of the content associated with a specific word or phrase. Further, a researcher will attempt to explain the word usage or the range of meanings that certain words or phrases have within the identified context. Summative content was also used in counting certain key words referring to the goals of community policing throughout the interview transcripts in order to determine if police and community perceptions are consistent with Ottawa Police Service claims. Summative content analysis was used to determine if there were any patterns that emerged from interview transcripts with regards to various latent objectives or interpretations of community policing identified in the literature.

A summative approach to qualitative content analysis can be advantageous in that it provides an unobtrusive and non-reactive way to study the phenomenon of interest (Babbie, 1992). It can also provide basic insights into how certain words are used within the identified context of interest. A disadvantage of this approach is that it relies on the credibility of the researcher and often fails to take into consideration the broader meanings within the content.

Operationalization

As these research questions were formulated, particular concepts emerged which required precise definition. The following concepts were considered as important to be explored:

- Community
- Problem-oriented strategy
- Consultation/ Police-community meetings
- Inter-agency cooperation/ Partnership
- Accountability

What is meant by Community?

Trojanowicz (1988, 1) differentiates between geographic communities and communities of interest:

This has particular relevance to the use of community in community policing...because crime, disorder, and fear of crime can help create a community of interest within a geographic community.... The community of interest generated by crime, disorder, and fear of crime becomes the goal to allow community policing officers and enter into the geographic community. Then the officer and the residents can develop new structures and tactics designed to improve the overall quality of life, allowing new structures of community spirit to build and flourish.

Although there are many means of forming a 'community', especially with the proliferation of the internet and interest based websites/blogs, the focus of this study will be on communities of interest formed within a specific geographic community. According to Rosenbaum (1994) communities are often formed by identifying suitable targets (common interests) within a specific geographic area. The literature on community policing attests to the fact that community policing initiatives should be based on specific community needs (Goldstein, 1987). For the purposes of this research, 'community' refers to a geographical region that shares common interests or problems. Those involved in a community could include residents of the neighbourhood, businesses that operate in the area or other community resources available in that area.

What is meant by a problem-oriented policing?

Problem-oriented policing is a fundamental element to many community policing models. However, according to Eck and Spelman (1987), one of the reasons problem-oriented policing seems superficial is due to the ubiquitous use of the term 'problem solving'. What is often overlooked is that problem-oriented policing is a way of conceptualizing the role of policing in a democratic society, whereas problem solving is a number of processes used to carry out this role and can contain a number of objectives (Eck and Spelman, 1987):

1. Problem handling → addressing the consequences of problems
2. Problem management → finding ways of coping with problems
3. Problem mitigation → reducing the harmful consequences of problems
4. Problem reduction → reducing the frequency or intensity of problems
5. Problem elimination → getting rid of problems

Eck and Spelman (1987, 48) provide a working definition of the concept of a 'police problem' in defining it as: "a group of events that are similar in one or more ways that are harmful to members of the public and that members of the public expect the police to handle". Further, problem-oriented policing consists of the police paying attention to problems and prioritizing community identified problems.

Eck and Spelman (1987) differentiate between problem-oriented policing and community policing, but admit there is some overlap in the concepts. Problem-oriented policing can be done by police alone, but the current research argues that problem-oriented policing also can be part of community policing, and that the community has a fundamental role to play in identifying community problems and working with the police to find solutions to handle, manage, mitigate, reduce or eliminate these problems.

What is meant by Police-community consultation/meeting?

The definition of police-community consultation for the purposes of this study is broad and encompasses several types of meetings through which the police and the community come together to discuss issues of safety and security. For example, most core neighbourhoods in Ottawa have a B.I.A (business improvement area) typically meeting once a month; there are also community/neighbourhood association meetings (usually once a month) and special interest groups that meet with police to collectively discuss neighbourhood specific issues. A 'police-community' consultation can include any gathering of two or more that includes the police, citizens, business owners and representatives of other relevant agencies coming together to identify problems and priorities and collectively develop solutions to some of the specific neighbourhood issues brought forward by any of the parties involved.

The current study seeks to understand the perceptions of those involved in police-community meetings. A look at how much community members feel they are given a chance to speak, who leads the meeting and how much they feel these meetings have been beneficial to them is explored. Police perceptions will also be examined in terms of their perceived role in these meetings and the main goals and objectives of these meetings.

What is meant by Inter-agency cooperation/partnership?

According to the community policing literature, cooperation (partnership) refers to the police working with the community as co-producers of safety and security of the community (Murphy and Muir, 1985; Leighton, 1994). Problem solving partnerships are another fundamental element of community policing and help reduce the criticism that community policing is simply an attempt by police to maintain a good impression within the community. Goldstein (1990) emphasizes that police-community partnership in problem solving is a radical departure from traditional policing. Under a community policing philosophy, police services move away from a reactive approach to crime and instead allow the community to identify issues of concerns and work cooperatively with them to address these issues proactively. Leighton (1993, 247) states that partnership

means that the community, through one means or another, has a say in the definition of what constitutes crime and disorder problems in their community. As well, the police will take these problems and concerns into consideration when establishing their own priorities for delivering policing services.

The key to this relationship is the fact that police are playing a less active role in defining problems and communities are playing a more active role in identifying some problems and priorities for the police. The community should be a partner in setting police priorities, identifying problems and developing problem-solving solutions. The goal of partnership within

the context of community policing, is for a police service to base some of its priorities on the needs, values and concerns of the community, and to facilitate a two-way flow of information. This can result in the prevention of crimes while having a positive impact on police-community relations (Gillis, 1996).

What is meant by Accountability?

Accountability can mean different things to different people and different groups. The issue of accountability has become increasingly important in the realm of policing as policing has 'supposedly' moved away from a professional model and shifted more towards a community policing approach. Spencer (1985, 104) makes the distinction between accountability and consultation:

.....the police are accountable to a committee if they are obliged to inform that committee about their activities and the committee can apply some sanction against the officers responsible if it does not approve of their actions. Consultation between the police and that committee, however, means only that the police listen to the committee's views and vice versa. There is no obligation on either side to act on what the other has said. Consultation is not, therefore, a form of accountability. Under such arrangements, the police are not obliged to tell the committee anything, and if committee members do not like what they are told they are powerless to do anything about it.

This is an important distinction in that the existence of one does not ensure the other. The current study will adhere to this distinction in assessing the degree to which, to the extent that our sources permit, the Ottawa Police Service adheres to a community policing philosophy.

Limitations

Internal validity

Although there are typically significant threats to internal validity when conducting case studies, it is more so the case when referring to explanatory case studies because the author can

make incorrect causal conclusions without being able to identify extraneous variables effecting the relationships between other variables. Descriptive case studies tend to avoid this pitfall in that no ‘causal’ assertions are made (Yin, 2004). Further, there are continuous threats to internal validity when conducting a case study due to the fact that whenever an event is not directly observed the researcher must make inferences as to why it may have occurred (but no causal assertions are made). When the researcher does this without considering alternative explanations there is a threat to internal validity (Yin, 2004).

External validity

Case studies are often criticized for their lack of external validity in that there is often little ability to generalize outside of the specific context of the research (Yin, 1994). However, this study is not concerned with broad generalizations but rather, strives to provide a glimpse of the perceptions of a few of the officers and community members involved.

Reliability

Reliability remains an issue regardless of the methodology being used and as a result, must always be considered by the researcher in order to counteract potential threats (Yin, 2004). Reliability is concerned with the ability to replicate the methodology used by the researcher in case another researcher questions the findings of a study. In order to reduce errors and bias in the current study, an observation grid was created prior to direct observation in an effort to guide observations and make them more uniform throughout the research process. Further, steps were taken during the data analysis portion of the study to articulate each step taken by the researchers in doing the analysis.

Strengths

Some strengths of case study research are that they can create the opportunity for unanticipated discoveries (Shaughnessy and Zechmeister, 1990) and can easily serve as a facilitator for future research questions and hypotheses. As stated, a common criticism of case studies is that they are too subjective and contain too many subjective decisions made by the researcher. This research has taken the initiative to articulate what areas have been investigated and through what means to avoid as many threats to internal validity as possible.

Ethical Issues

There are several ethical issues which need to be addressed in a research process utilizing interviews. The informed consent form advised participants of certain issues potentially arising from being involved in this research such as, risks, anonymity, confidentiality, data conservation, voluntary participation. It was assured that participant information would remain strictly confidential. It was also ensured that participants acknowledged and understood that the researcher and his supervisor would have access to the data. Participants were also informed that the data obtained from the interviews would be used only for the purposes of the researchers master's thesis and related publishing.

Direct observation was used as part of the research. Both public and private meetings were attended for research purposes. As a result, gaining access to these meetings and organizations became an issue (particularly for private meetings). McTavish and Loether (2002, 189) suggest that even research in communities may run amok if appropriate stakeholders are not first consulted. To avoid this issue, a letter of permission for observation was drafted (see attached) and was sent to all gatekeepers relevant to the current study. Official letterhead was

used in all requests for permission to observe as McTavish and Loether (2002) suggest using official University of Ottawa, Department of Criminology letterhead to convey sponsorship and affiliation for preliminary correspondence.

The organizations and/or individuals with which contact was attempted included the Ottawa Police Service, Hintonburg (Ottawa West) Community Association, 'Together for Vanier' leaders including CPO (Crime Prevention Ottawa) representatives, 'No Communities left Behind' (Ottawa Southeast) leaders and community leaders from Dalhousie and Lower town. However, when multiple organizations/representatives did not respond to initial requests for observation, an alternative method of gaining access to relevant meetings was established. The alternative method was facilitated by the Ottawa Police Service which was particularly helpful and accommodating throughout the entire research process. This may partially be due to the fact that the researcher was a volunteer to the service.

There are various ethical considerations that must be considered when using direct observation. Direct observation in a public setting cannot guarantee anonymity or confidentiality (Melchers, 2008). However, in a private setting, anonymity and confidentiality is offered to all individuals who may be observed and/or quoted. Although this study may use direct quotes in the results, pseudonyms or group membership will be used to identify those who are quoted. Confidentiality was maintained as all notes and documents obtained from private meetings will be kept under lock and key in the supervisor's office. However, for the most part the researcher was more concerned with the roles played by the various parties in the meetings and less concerned about the content discussed at these meetings. Prior to observation, the researcher introduced himself to the group and gave a brief synopsis of what he was researching. Although it may have been difficult for participants to identify what the researcher was observing, if a

participant expressed that they did not wish to have their comments recorded, their wishes were respected. A copy of the observations was also made available to those who requested it.

This chapter has described the methodology used to explore how the Ottawa Police Service implements community policing and describe the perceptions of community policing that those involved have. The chapter was divided into three main subsections. Subsection one described the methodology used including: the method of research and analysis, the sample and the analytical framework used to analyze the data. The second subsection described the operational definitions required to conduct the research. The third subsection focused on the limitations (internal validity, external validity and reliability), strengths and ethical issues associated with the research design.

Chapter 5 – Description and Analysis

This chapter outlines the results of the interviews done with various community members and Ottawa police service officers involved in community policing. The semi-structured interview schedules (Appendix A and B) consisted of several questions exploring the knowledge that each party had of community policing and issues surrounding community policing. The anonymity of all interviewees was assured. The exception is the Chief of Police who waived his anonymity. Pseudonyms/group membership will be used to identify all other individuals. In addition to the interviews, direct observation was conducted. Additional notes were taken that could also either refute or support the results of the interviews. This study focused on five main research questions which we will now examine using the information sources.

The Ottawa Police Service and Community Policing

What community policing initiatives/programs do the Ottawa Police currently claim to adhere to?

In general, many if not most police agencies have publicly embraced the broad tenets of community policing; the Ottawa Police Service is no exception. Although the motives for doing so may seem genuine, some feel that police services have been forced to adopt community policing as a philosophy due to its public appeal and to increase access to U.S. Federal funding (Skogan, 2003).

The Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service (Ottawa, Nepean, Gloucester) was renamed the Ottawa Police Service in 2001 after a municipal amalgamation and consists today of almost 2000 officers and civilians (OPS.ca, 2009). The current Chief of Police is Vern White, who was sworn in on May 22, 2007. The Ottawa Police Service's vision is stated as "a partnership within the community that reflects its values and make up, while committed to information and intelligence

sharing and integration to ensure that people's rights, lives, communities and property are secure” (OPS.ca, 2009). The Ottawa Police Service describes its mission in expressing a dedication to:

- The safety and security of our community
- Working cooperatively with the members of our community; and
- Supporting our members personally and professionally.

The Ottawa Police Service’s values are as follows:

- Being an integral part of our community;
- Providing quality services in an equitable and accessible manner;
- Working together to find solutions;
- The importance of respect for the Rule of Law;
- Openness and accountability;
- Valuing the contributions of all our members;
- The safety of our members;
- Providing our members with the supports necessary to do their job;
- Maintaining the highest ethical and professional standards; and
- Being diverse and non-discriminatory police service

Beyond this, the Ottawa Police Service adheres to a ‘*community policing philosophy*’ which is described on its website as follows:

- To move in the direction of implementing a *problem-oriented policing* organization.
- To move as rapidly as possible to include the *community as an active partner* in problem-solving and prevention.
- To re-assess the current community-based activities of the Ottawa Police, and to retain only those which advance progress in the achievement of the above priorities (OPS.ca, 2009).

Although it’s clear that the Ottawa Police Service has articulated a philosophical commitment to community policing, “if we were to measure changes in organization goals by observing police departments’ mission statements and strategic plans, we would undoubtedly conclude that community policing has had a major transformative effect” (Mastrofski, 2006, p.54). However,

mission statements and values by themselves tell us little about the goals that the organization really enacts (Mastrofski, 2006). “By 2000 more than 80% of large police departments had incorporated community policing values into their mission statements” (Roth, Roehl, and Johnson, 2004, p.20). Most departments still focus the majority of their resources on traditional crime and enforcement as opposed to developing methods of evaluating community policing (Skogan and Hartnett, 1997; Greene, 2004).

If the Ottawa Police Service adheres to community policing, we would expect to find a variety of tactical components implemented across the city based on each individual area’s needs and priorities (Goldstein, 1987; Normandeau and Leighton, 1990; Willis, 2001). There should also be some indication of organizational components/change.

The Ottawa Police Service website and the perceptions of those involved in community policing indicate that at the centre of the Ottawa Police Service’s implementation of community policing are the five ‘core’ prevention programs implemented across all neighbourhoods. The five core prevention programs include:

1. **Neighbourhood watch:** “Aims to get citizens involved in discouraging and preventing crime at the local level. The ultimate success of neighbourhood watch depends largely on a commitment to cooperate between area residents and the police - and more importantly, between residents themselves” (OPS.ca, 2009).
2. **Home Security Inspection program:** Home security inspections are completed by police officers or trained volunteers. At the request of the home owner, inspections will be completed and suggestions will be made to reduce the likelihood of being victimized.
3. **Child Print:** “Child Print provides families with practical information should a child go missing. The Child Print program strives to make communities safer for children, and teaches children and adults street safety tips. Education is the first step to safety” (OPS.ca, 2009).

4. **Operation Identification:** "Operation Identification encourages community members to mark or identify valuables as a proactive measure against theft. Marked stolen articles are difficult to sell, and they are more easily traced" (OPS.ca, 2009).
5. **Business Watch:** "Encourages businesses to work with their neighbours to prevent crime and report suspicious activities. Crime prevention through environmental design is used by officers and trained volunteers to evaluate the external and internal areas of the business to provide crime prevention tips and recommendations to reduce opportunities for crime" (OPS.ca, 2009).

More recently, the Ottawa Police Service website has been updated and has added the following prevention programs:

1. **Crime free multi housing:** The Ottawa Crime Free Multi-Housing Program began in 1992 in Mesa, Arizona and was adopted in 1996 by the Ottawa Police Service. The Program is designed to help owners, managers, residents and police work together to keep illegal and nuisance activity out of rental communities (OPS.ca, 2009).
2. **Community safety letters** In October 2007, the Community Safety Letters was launched whereby formal letters are sent to sex trade consumers (also known as "Johns"). The program is used to address community concerns on street prostitution and its negative impact on our communities affected by the sex-trade. Some of the issues are:
 - unwanted traffic in communities;
 - drug trade; and
 - used condoms and needles left in our parks, playgrounds and public areas.

The Ottawa Police Service wants to engage Johns and educate them on the negative impact they are having in our communities. The program complements existing programs such as John Sweeps and John School (OPS.ca, 2009).

3. **Crime stoppers** Crime Stoppers is a community program that helps stop crime in its tracks. Crime Stoppers gathers clues that law enforcement agencies need to solve major crimes. By offering cash rewards and providing a single number to call with information relating to any crime, Crime Stoppers encourages local citizens to

provide clues that can be vital in the solution of a crime. Crime Stoppers programs have been highly successful in reducing the crime rate in many other cities in Canada and the United States (ops.ca, 2009).

According to the literature (Goldstein, 1987, Willis, 2001, Skogan 2003), community policing programs should be tailored specifically to each individual community's needs. It is somewhat logical that officers are given the five core prevention programs as a starting point and have enough autonomy to develop any other programs they feel will address a need of the community. When Chief Vern White was asked about why all neighbourhoods in Ottawa have the same core prevention programs he stated: "we felt that they were the programs that they would work for us. I'm not convinced they are."

Others felt more strongly that the Ottawa Police Service was addressing specific community concerns. For example, one officer had this to say:

there is not really a clear definition of what community policing is. Also, each neighbourhood is different. So you're going to have to assess and analyze the data that you have and then respond accordingly. I know in our area, we deal with our community concerns much differently than other neighbourhoods in the city. It all depends on the population makeup of your community that you have to serve.

Another officer working in a different neighbourhood also felt that the Ottawa Police Service tailored its services to the needs of the community, identifying a ticketing program run in District 24 in which volunteers place notices on vehicles that are at increased risk of being broken into due to the fact that valuables are visible etc. Another officer highlighted the fact that all five of the core programs at one point or another met a need of the community and also pointed out that: "we are not held to those five programs; we understand that that was a launching point and many programs have been built upon those." One officer explains an action initiated based on a community need:

out here what another community officer and I have done is we started going to the immigration centers, English as a second language centers, we've done presentations to new Canadians on the role of the police so that they won't be afraid to call us if they have a problem. Because a lot of them come from countries where police are not liked and even feared. We want to send a message that we are a service, we are here to serve you, we are here when you need us and this is how to contact us. We go over the contact numbers, we review certain rules regarding driving and violence, so that they are aware what our function is the community and they should not be afraid to call us when they need us.

While another explains: "I also created a website so I actually created a virtual mode of communication. Everything that is in the centre is available on the website. The website keeps people informed about what's going on in the community."

It's clear that the Ottawa Police Service values the education and experience of front line community officers, giving them autonomy to come up with initiatives as they see fit for their neighbourhood. This apparent management decentralization demonstrates a less bureaucratic structure. The findings indicate that there are initiatives tailored specifically to community needs, demonstrating a proactive approach to addressing the underlying causes of neighbourhood problems. However, these initiatives are highly dependent on the motivation and creativity of community officers working in each area.

The Ottawa Police Service implements organizational components that are consistent with the implementation of community policing. For example, there are fifteen community policing centres across the Ottawa Police Service's six districts with at least one officer permanently assigned to the area.

There are fifteen officers specifically dedicated to community policing with the Ottawa Police Service. This equates to less than one percent ($17/2000 = .0085\%$) of the Ottawa Police Services officers. While there have been some organization changes in adopting community policing, the overall commitment, to the extent that this can be based on the number of officers,

is not great. Other organizational components of the Ottawa Police Service that indicate a commitment to community policing include the 'partnership in action' program (PIA). This program:

is an initiative that aims to nurture and strengthen respectful, transparent and trusting partnerships at all levels between the police and our community. Partnerships are at the core of where our police service is headed. It's part of our mission. It's part of our vision. And it's an integral part of our corporate values. The Ottawa Police is committed to making partnership the cornerstone of the way we do business (ops.ca, 2009).

Anyone can establish a partnership with the Ottawa Police Service by contacting neighbourhood officers working out of a community policing centre. For example, on April 12, 2007 the Ottawa Police Service signed a protocol with the Wabano Centre for Aboriginal Health.

This agreement confirms a commitment to work together to assist First Nations, Inuit and Métis people to receive services and be supported by the urban Aboriginal community. To that end, both parties recognize the importance of Elders and Traditional Teachers to provide guidance, wisdom and teachings to ensure that the provision of community policing services is delivered in a manner that respects First Nations, Inuit and Métis cultures (ops.ca, 2009).

The Diversity and Race Relations Section was established in 1995 and is another organizational component of the Ottawa Police Service that indicates a commitment to community policing.

This section has created initiatives such as the community police action committee (COMPAC).

The Community and Police Action Committee (COMPAC) was established in 1999, after more than three years of preparation and public consultation. COMPAC is a city-wide community-police advisory and coordinating body representing a partnership between police and visible minority and Aboriginal communities in Ottawa. Its objective is to nurture and develop this community partnership by means of communication, respect, accountability, and freedom from fear and trust (ops.ca, 2009).

Programs such as COMPAC help create an environment of open communication, facilitating a greater understanding and providing a voice for minorities while also creating an opportunity for greater understanding of minorities amongst police.

Tactical components of community policing that the Ottawa Police Service implements include: foot/bike patrol, police-community consultation (beat meetings), community police centres and permanent beat assignments. The knowledge and perceptions of police officers with regards to these tactical components will be described further in the next sections.

Based on the above data there is a clear demonstration of support for community policing at the philosophical, organizational and tactical level by the Ottawa Police Service. Although the extent of this support cannot be described due to the limitations of the current research design, the findings of this research could potentially spur a larger future study. The following sections will examine the knowledge and perceptions of police officers and community members involved in community policing to determine if they can corroborate the support for community policing by the Ottawa Police Service in practice.

What Programs do police officers perceive as community policing?

Community Policing Overall

When asked to describe what community policing was, all police officers interviewed spoke of community problem solving and partnerships. Some police officers specifically referred to working with the community to solve problems, while others alluded to the fact that the community identified the needs and priorities of police officers. For example one officer had this to say:

To me community policing deals with working with and through the community in addressing community related issues. So basically, partnering with the community to address community related issues. At times there can be a high demand for support and resources or a low demand. I think part of it is about problem solving.

Another officer describes what he considers to be community policing and highlights the fact that police are willing to step outside their traditional policing roles in an effort to help the community resolve problems.

I consider it where the police no longer take full ownership of a problem thinking they are the only ones who can solve it. It's more of who can we work with in the community and partner with in the community to address the concerns the community has. A lot of the time the concerns a community has aren't actual criminal offences but we try to work with them and point them in the right direction or the right resources to help them deal with those problems.

- a. How do police officers perceive community policing overall?

Effectiveness

Generally, there were positive perceptions of community policing under the proper conditions, including a sense that the community is willing to cooperate and work with the police. For example one officer explains: "I think that if applied properly it is effective. So in other words, I'm not saying that community policing as a whole is effective everywhere but under the right circumstances can be extremely effective". While another officer expresses positive perceptions of community policing by highlighting the proactive problem-solving aspect of community policing:

It's not a reactive form of policing, it's a proactive form. What you want to do is you don't want a problem that you have to go back to multiple times. You look at a problem you analyze it with the partners that you have and you try to find a way to reduce or eliminate that problem. In the end what this does is it reduces the perception the community has of the problem and it reduces police response to that problem.

Another officer explains that community policing can be effective only when the community is willing to participate and partner with the police:

When the *community takes ownership* of their issues you see almost immediate success. When you see the communities report the problems and hand them over to the police you do not see as much success. An easy example to look at is graffiti; you look at areas and see areas that are littered with graffiti. If you turn the responsibility over to the police to

deal with the graffiti and graffiti artists you're not going to see a very good solution. Whereas if you see the community working collaboratively, the community is taking ownership, then you see a huge impact in the reduction of graffiti.

A more pessimistic officer stated it in this way:

I feel it doesn't work. I've worked in Vanier and I've worked in the Market and it works to the extent that the people are willing to help you but a lot of the communities aren't willing to help the police.

As Chief Vern White expresses, "the perception by many, including cops is that community policing is soft on crime", this become a potential impediment to the complete adoption of community policing.

There is a positive perception of community policing overall from the officers interviewed, however, community policing was perceived as only working to the extent that the community is willing to work with the community. The data indicated that the police officers feel a major objective of community policing is to engage the community so that they can largely police themselves in terms of minor crime issues. Unfortunately, as Skogan (2003) states, it is often the communities that could benefit from community policing the most that are the most difficult to engage. This is a big issue and invites discussion of potential distortion in service provision and displacement effects.

- b. What are the perceptions of *police officers* with regards to specific community policing programs/initiatives?

The knowledge of current community policing programs/initiatives and perceptions of those programs/initiatives among police officers working in community policing will provide a good indication of the extent to which community policing is emphasized and implemented by the Ottawa Police Service in practice. The following subsection will examine the knowledge and

perceptions of police officers with regards to community policing in general and various specific community policing programs/initiatives.

Crime Prevention/ Community Involvement

According to Garland (2001), community policing has allowed police to become more attuned to community needs and to emphasize prevention. Some feel that prevention is emphasized to encourage citizens to increase the amount of social control exerted while simultaneously extending the governmental reach acting as another mode of exerting social control (Garland, 2001).

Effectiveness

All of the police officers interviewed felt that crime prevention was the most important part of community policing. All police officers interviewed agreed that crime prevention is part of community policing, as opposed to something separate. As one officer describes, “crime prevention is community policing. Everything a community officer does is crime prevention. Whether it is the implementation of the core programs, meetings, beautification, information-gathering, it’s how do we prevent things from re-occurring.”

Chief Vern White had this to say: “If you are not preventing crime I’m not convinced community policing can be successful at all. It’s difficult to measure though because if you prevented it you can’t really prove that it would have happened.”

Another Ottawa Police officer explained:

It’s a paramount role. It’s our *raison d’être*. An ounce of prevention is better than a pound of cure. We often miss the opportunities for the ounce of prevention. In terms of community policing, in order to live harmoniously, we need to take every opportunity for crime prevention. So that being in an absence of crisis we have been creating education

and awareness to prevent things from starting, escalating, building. I would say that you need to focus on the community to engage the community in crime prevention.

Also, all officers interviewed felt that community involvement and participation were very important to the successful implementation of crime prevention/community policing. Four of eight police officers also indicated that shared accountability/responsibility with the community was a major factor in the success of crime prevention/community policing. One officer explained the importance of volunteers:

Volunteers are the backbones..... they were here before me, they will be here after me, I learn from them. If it wasn't for them we wouldn't have the home inspection program, we wouldn't have the child print program we wouldn't have neighbourhood watch, because they are a necessity in helping those programs run smoothly.

Surprisingly, despite most officers indicating that community policing involved a partnership with the community, only three of eight officers interviewed felt that crime prevention was the shared accountability/responsibility of the police and the community. This could indicate that officers feel that the community must take the lead in running crime prevention programs and the police are only there when needed.

Current Programs

The Ottawa Police Service currently implements five core prevention programs including: neighbourhood watch, operation identification, business watch, child print and home security inspections (as described above). Most of the officers interviewed were able to correctly identify all five 'core' prevention programs run by the Ottawa Police Service. Although all officers interviewed felt that crime prevention was very important, four of eight officers interviewed indicated that they perceived the crime prevention programs currently in place as in need of re-evaluation. For example one officer explained:

They certainly need to be re-visited. Community policing and crime prevention programs must keep in touch and be relevant with community. It's sort of an ongoing thing in terms of tailoring your service. The five core programs were adopted kind of to get community policing started, they have not sort of been re-evaluated. Some of them are no longer relevant or address community needs.

Another officer had this to say: "They need to be re-vamped. They need to, it's like anything right you need to go out, where you do a survey find out what the community needs and meet their needs." A third officer stated: "we might been in a position now to look at new ideas and new programs in order to keep people interested." A fourth officer highlighted that:

In my opinion the programs need to be revisited and re-evaluated on their effectiveness and maybe restructuring them. We can have these programs for many years and we don't actually realize how they are being delivered. We should maybe be creating new ones.

The Chief of Police explains the importance of crime prevention in saying: "I think it needs to be at the forefront of community policing strategies, as well as crime prevention or crime reduction but don't get hung up on it because it's hard to measure." Interestingly, the Chief had no knowledge of the current crime prevention programs run by the Ottawa Police Service, saying: "I have no idea" when asked which crime prevention programs are currently run that he is aware of. Despite an appreciation for Chief White's candour, such a statement could lead one to reasonably question the commitment that the Ottawa Police Service has to crime prevention. He then goes on to admit that he has doubts about the current crime prevention programs in place: "we felt that they were the programs that they would work for us. I'm not convinced they are."

It appears as though the officers interviewed have positive perceptions of crime prevention overall but feel that the community is largely responsible for the operation of crime prevention programming and are not confident in the effectiveness of crime prevention/community policing programs currently implemented by the Ottawa Police Service.

Future research could address if there is a lack of awareness of crime prevention programs outside of those working in specific community policing roles.

Foot/Bike Patrol

Effectiveness

All officers interviewed expressed the view that foot patrol occurs on a daily basis in the Ottawa Police Service. The Chief explained that it is targeted based on need and mainly occurs in areas such as Elgin Street, Bank Street, Bronson Street, The Market and Montreal Road. Bike patrols take place on a seasonal basis. Foot and bike patrol were seen as playing an important role by five of eight police officers interviewed, while seven of eight viewed it as important, but only in certain situations. One officer expressed positive perceptions about the effectiveness of foot/bike patrol: “Great, bad guys can’t see you when you walk up on them. They can’t see you when you bike up on them. It’s something that people look for.” However another officer highlighted that: “it’s effective but it’s not a solution.” The same officer explained that foot patrol can be: “effective however, they do have a displacement issue..... they tend to push the problems into other areas.” The following section will describe the perceptions of police officers with regards to the objectives of foot/bike patrol.

Objectives

The most commonly identified objectives of foot/bike patrols identified by police officers interviewed were increased effectiveness, relationship building through community interaction and reducing the fear of crime. These three most commonly cited objectives of foot/bike patrol can be related back to Normandeau and Leighton’s (1990) framework which identified that police should be proactive, police should reduce fear of crime and police should engage in interactive policing.

The data indicates that the most commonly cited objective of foot/bike patrol was *increased effectiveness* due to officer's familiarity with the area and being able to access areas inaccessible by car, as expressed by the above statement. Another officer highlighted the benefits of increased familiarity with an area:

It plays a fairly large role if foot patrol is operated properly. When you have the same officers working the same area every day you're going to have a better impact than an officer who is in the district for a period of time and then leaves. First of all, there is a trust built between officers and community (business owners/residents). They get to trust the officers they see every day. They also become subject matter experts in the area that they are working.... They can anticipate problems before they begin because they know the area so well.

Another officer explained that officers become subject matter experts for certain areas which makes them more effective:

When you have the same officers working the same area every day you're going to have a better impact than an officer who is in the district for a period of time and then leaves....They become subject matter experts in the area that they are working.... They can anticipate problems before they begin because they know the area so well. An example being the downtown core: tiny things like they know when recycling day is because you can see the problem of the people going through the garbage and bringing it in to the Rideau street liquor and beer store. So you see a problem there. That's a problem that a foot patrol officer that doesn't know the area might not anticipate, but when you work the area everyday for a long time you get to anticipate the problems before they begin

The second most commonly cited objective of foot/bike patrol was *community interaction* and engagement, six of eight officers interviewed identified it as an objective. Chief Vern White explains:

It plays a fairly large role if foot patrol is operated properly. When you have the same officers working the same area every day you're going to have a better impact than an officer who on in the district for a period of time and then leaves. First of all, there is a trust built between officers and community (business owners/residents). They get to trust the officers they see every day. They also become subject matter experts in the area that they are working.... They can anticipate problems before they begin because they know the area so well.

Another officer provides a very detailed explanation as to why foot patrol is essential to building a relationship with the community:

Probably the most visible part of the police service and most approachable, engaging, there are more opportunities for the community to engage with someone on foot patrol. There is more of a connection and they are more identifiable. I think the role of the foot patrol officer is to give the police a human face, you can see their eyes, you can see their smile, hear them talking when people drive by. It's hard to engage people when you are sitting in a car. Beat offices are visible and accessible. Community policing requires community engagement in order for it to work, it's hard to engage people when you are driving around in your car and it's easier if you are outside of your car walking around. So I guess for the community it puts a human face on the police and for the police it puts a human face on the community because you are seeing people in the absence of crisis.

Another officer explains the importance of building trust with the community through foot patrol:

So foot patrol has a huge impact, the community gets to know the officer so they can contact them and there is a trust built and sometimes a lot of the calls are not captured. Community residents actually know officers by name and can contact them directly on their cell numbers. They help build a better rapport.

Five of eight police officers interviewed felt that foot/bike patrol was important in *reducing fear of crime* through visibility and three of eight identified *information exchange* an objective of foot/bike patrols. For example, one officer highlights how both of these objectives are met in saying:

Foot patrol is very important. We recently implemented foot patrol when our new Chief (Vern White) became our chief and it's working very well. The community feedback that I'm getting is that they love the sense of security that they are getting that foot patrol offers. The fact that they are seeing a face to the badge is important. We get a lot of information through our foot patrol officers in talking with residents and business owners.

When another officer was asked to describe the role that foot patrol plays in community policing he had this to say: "there are a lot of things.....the reality and perception of safety... high visibility provides a sense of security." Other objectives identified less frequently were that

foot/bike patrol acts as a form of crime prevention, increases accountability in the community and are a more rewarding experience for police officers.

It appears as though there is a consensus among officers interviewed that foot/bike patrols are important and the main objectives are increased effectiveness, relationship building and reducing fear of crime.

Police-Community Consultation (Beat meetings)

Effectiveness

The feedback on police-community meetings was again consistent. Seven of eight officers interviewed had a positive perception of police community meetings. One officer explained:

They are very productive, before you had multiple services working separately to solve the same problem but now that everybody is at the same table they are working together you can get a lot more done through a committee of resources rather than individually.

Further, half of the officers interviewed expressed that police-community meetings/consultations occurred at least once a week (or more) in each separate community.

Objectives

When asked to describe the main objective of police-community consultation, there were three primary objectives that emerged. Seven of eight officers felt that these meetings were an opportunity to problem solve in partnership with the community. For example one officer explained:

When we are getting together we are moving forward and finding solutions. I think they are very, very positive because it does enhance that relationship with the community and has a much greater impact on giving us direction. We are hearing very specific community concerns and it creates a very collaborative effort.

Another officer explained the objectives of community consultation by highlighting the fact that solving problems with the community is extremely important: “It’s to address current trends....good and bad, work at addressing problems, targeting problems and resolving the problems. Ultimately creating a better place to live and work.”

Five of eight officers identified information exchange and relationship building. One officer highlighted the importance of relationship building in this way: “It’s an opportunity for me to bridge the relationship between the Ottawa Police Service and the community. It’s integral to what I do, one of the most important aspects of my job and roles/responsibilities.” Another officer highlights both information exchange (communication) and relationship building in explaining the objective of police-community consultation:

Absolutely, these meetings are of utmost importance because it empowers the community. When a community is empowered to want to see change and to get together they can move mountains, they can move mountains so these meetings are very essential. Also, it’s communicating, in every relationship if you don’t communicate, you don’t have a relationship.

Police Role in Meetings

When asked about their roles in police-community meetings there was some variation in terms of response. Seven of eight officers agreed that their main role was that of an educator or to share information with the community. One officer explains his role in saying:

My role is not to go in there as if I had all the answers. My role is to listen; my role is to do what’s best, to provide a simple response to them and to empower them to in place some of the response that I have given them. So actually, my role is to educate and then a small part of it is maybe the enforcement side of it but the rest of it is up to the community.

The literature argues police officers should play a less active role in community meetings (Normandeau and Leighton, 1991; Skogan, 2003). Five of eight officers identified themselves as an equal partner to the community they serve. However, there were four of eight officers that felt it was necessary to play more of a leadership role in order to engage the community when the community is less organized. One officer touched on both of these points in saying:

I see myself as being an equal partner, not a better or superior to anyone else. I see myself as being a partner, I'm just one individual at that table and if yes it does happen that at times we provide leadership that is very dependent on the community and how cohesive they are.

The same officer went on to explain more about times when police take more of a leadership role:

As they become more and more cohesive we play more of a secondary role. But again we are just one other person at that table providing advice and recommendations. It's all about understanding the readiness level of the community..... think in part it's as simple as when you start inviting these people into a room. First you look at if there's already a community association or group. If there's none at all then you start to look at how you can bring one in, that's when we'd play a very strong and active role. If, on the other hand, there is already one then you find out what their terms of reference are for that community. What they are looking for and whether or not that group is representative of the community. What do they see their mandate to be and who is the leader of the community. So if all those elements are already in place we come in as an equal partner. If there is nothing in place then that's when the police may play more of an active role in leadership and guidance to address a certain community issue or problem. In this situation quite often what we'll do is turn to our local councillor; they are already being paid to represent a specific community.

A small number of police officers (three of eight) felt that their role was that of an expert and to communicate risks to the community. For example one officer explained that "for me it's about identifying risks." While another officer explained: "I think approaching every situation to help people become their own solutions and a lot of that is through knowledge and expertise, being patient, empowering them to become part of the solution.

There is evidence based on the data that police officers generally have positive perceptions of police-community consultation and agree that the main objectives are to problem solve, to exchange information and build relationships. Most officers viewed their role as educators and equal partners with the community.

Community Police Centres/ Permanent Beat Assignments

Effectiveness

Community police centres and permanent beat assignments are a form of organizational commitment to community policing and essential to establishing familiarity within the community. The Ottawa Police Service implements both of these as part of their implementation of community policing (as described above). The data indicates that four of eight police officers' were very unsure as to the usefulness/necessity of community policing centres. Overall, the perceptions of the usefulness of community policing centres were largely mixed with no general consensus emerging from the data. The perceptions of this officer highlight the inconsistency of perceptions of the effectiveness of community policing centres among officers interviewed:

This something I'm going to suggest to you is that certain areas are better suited to have a community policing station, there is a need for it, the community requests it and uses it and it is beneficial to the community. Other communities I don't think it has a place at all.

The same officer goes on to explain:

My perceptions of community policing centres (cpc's) are that the cpc's will be as effective as the community that wants to use it. So if you don't have the volunteers to be there to manage the facility that you won't have what is required and won't be able to offer the services. If you have the community and volunteers willing to keep it running then it can be beneficial. The thing with cpc's is that the volunteers have lost a lot of their autonomy, in that there is a lot of things they can't do anymore. Legislation now limits what a volunteer can do. It's police legislation through CPIC; it's all part of the access to information Act. So communities in some ways their roles have been diminished. So to have volunteers waiting there for walk-ins only to have to re-direct them to a police officer to file a report etc, there is a redundancy there. In most instances the centre isn't going to be the place. For me, I'd rather see the centre housed amongst a whole bunch of

other community services/partners so it could be like a one stop shopping and you can share in the cost of operating the centre.

Objectives

Four of eight officers felt that the main objective of community policing centres were community engagement and relationship building. For example one officer explained what he believed to be the main objective of community policing centres: “engaging the community. Delivering the core crime prevention programs and initiating programs that involve the elder, the children and high risk kids.”

One officer did identify relationship building as a main objective of permanent beat assignments:

Effective in particular areas... some areas would not be as effective. If you have a beat in some areas that aren't residential you would not have the same effect. You want to have interaction. For effective foot patrol you need to have interaction, so for certain areas there is not as much pedestrian movement outside so where the interaction is limited it wouldn't be as effective.

Surprisingly, relationship building through community interaction did not emerge as a main objective of permanent beat assignments, despite the fact that it did for foot/bike patrol

Progress of Community Policing

Types of Changes

An interesting note is that some officers felt that community policing programs are not as emphasized as they once were. One officer explained it by comparing the emphasis on community policing in the past to now: “I think there was just more of a push to make it work. Now it's like a dinosaur and they are letting it die”. This does provide some support to the first hypothesis of this research in that community policing is potentially being overshadowed by new policing innovations. The same officer then went on to explain how the evolution of policing has

led to some changes in policing but mainly there are new methods to carry out the same objective:

It's a different job now. Like when I started I was in an office then only spent a year in a cruiser and then I was a beat cop you get to meet all sorts of people and deal with all sorts of crime. I'd say it's the same style. Its status quo, it's the same job as fifty years ago, nothing's really changed you just get new toys, right?

Part of Mainstream Policing?

Officers were asked about the progress of community policing over their career and seven of eight felt that there has been a fair bit of progress over the years. Furthermore, only four of eight felt that community policing had become part of mainstream policing, and three of eight indicated that it has not become part of mainstream policing but has rather remained as a separate program run in addition to regular policing activities. An officer who perceived community policing as part of mainstream policing explained it in this way:

Now your officers are more conscious of the community aspect of policing. When I first started my perspective was almost always the reactive aspect of policing. Now, ten years late I realize that it's very important to address issues at the root of the problem and not just at the surface and community policing deals with that, prevention programs deal with addressing issues before they happen, for example engaging youth and kids and schools and directing them towards a positive area of their lives and focusing on that.

While another officer who did not feel community policing had become part of mainstream policing had this to say: "It should be but I don't think it is. We have to re-define what community policing means. It's needs to be revamped.

Three of eight officers also indicated the importance of leadership in the implementation of community policing. One officer explain it in this way: "Absolutely important..... if the Chief of Police does not endorse community policing then we are headed back towards a reactive policing." When probed as to whether or not the current Chief has demonstrated support of community policing, the same officer explained:

Hahaha, not from where I'm sitting. I think there has been more of an emphasis on patrol, patrol officers and evaluating specialized services. There has been a movement to bolster patrol. Haven't seen any vision or leadership in terms of community policing or crime prevention. He talks a lot about community engagement and sold himself as someone who endorses community policing but since he has been here his priority has been patrol.

Although the significance of this comment is limited due the fact that it appears to be an outlier from the rest of the data, it provides support to the notion that community policing is becoming overshadowed by newer policing innovations emphasizing more traditional police roles.

It appears as though there is no general consensus among the officers interviewed as to whether or not community policing has become part of mainstream policing in Ottawa.

Community Interviews

What Programs do community members perceive as community policing?

Community Policing Overall

Description

Three of five community members described community policing as a partnership between the police and the community. For example, one community member stated:

The idea that has been around for a long time and used in various ways but the common feature is that the police work in alliance with the community, rather than do their own thing. There is a fusion of interests that strengthens the police capacity. It could be police on bicycles, police on foot patrol, still in cars, identifying where the problem spots are etc.

While a business representative described community policing as:

Community policing is proactive, officers are visible on a regular basis without being in a reactive situation. So they are there not because they were called but because they are regularly scheduled to be there. There is cooperation between the community stakeholders and the police. It's a more personal level of policing. Relationships are established as opposed to a patrol officer who just happens to be here on a call.

These are both fair interpretations of community policing, however, the vague nature of these descriptions indicates that community members may have a fairly limited understanding of specific components of community policing. The following section will examine their perceptions of the effectiveness of community policing followed by a description of their knowledge and perceptions of various community policing components.

Effectiveness

Four of five community members interviewed expressed a positive perception of community policing and its importance. For example, a community member explained: “Very positive, it’s unrealistic to expect crime to be deterred by relying solely on the police. The community is in charge and supported by the police.” While a business representative described community policing as: “Proactive. It’s proactively dealing with situations in a coordinated well thought out manner, again as opposed to being reactive. It has been successful as far as the BIA is concerned, what’s the problem, how can we solve it. Both of the above perceptions do have validity but the use of key words such as ‘proactive’ and the acknowledgment that police cannot eliminate crime by themselves indicates that they have bought into community policing and have accepted much of the rhetoric that accompanies community policing. This is not surprising given that the community members interviewed are all in some way involved in community policing. As a result, it’s logical to expect that they believe in community policing and its value. Nonetheless, it will be interesting to explore what community members believe the main objectives of community policing are and then to look at their knowledge and perceptions of various community policing components.

The data indicates that community members perceived the main objective of community policing as increased visibility of police officers on the streets. A disparity between the

perceptions of community members and police officers is apparent with regards to the main objective of community policing. Community members believe community policing will lead to increased police presence while police officers are working to engage community members to largely be able to police themselves with regards to incivility issues, which often take up much of a police officer's time.

- a. What are the perceptions of *community members* involved in community policing programs/initiatives with regards to those initiatives?

Crime Prevention/Community Involvement

Current Programs

The Ottawa Police Service emphasizes five 'core' prevention programs as outlined earlier. Most police officers interviewed were able to correctly identify most of the five programs and generally referred to these programs when asked about crime prevention. It could be expected that if these programs have been implemented effectively, community members should have a similar knowledge and awareness of these five 'core' programs. Interestingly, four of the five 'core' crime prevention programs were not identified by any community members when talking about community policing. However, some crime prevention programs identified by community members included: neighbourhood watch (the only one of five 'core' programs identified), crime stoppers, street crimes unit, CPTED (crime prevention through environmental design), Crime Prevention Ottawa (CPO) and the downtown coalition. Although all of the programs identified by community members could be interpreted as prevention programs, theories of prevention or prevention organizations, it was expected that community members involved in community policing would have more knowledge of the five 'core' prevention programs implemented by the Ottawa Police Service. Instead, it appears as though most

community members are not aware of community policing/crime prevention programs outside of those arising from the community consultation process. A larger scale study could determine the extent of this situation.

Effectiveness

Community members had very little knowledge of programs outside of the ones they were involved in. For example one community member explained: "I don't know. There may be volunteers I'm not involved with that so I don't know." Another community member had very similar perceptions in saying: "I don't know. Not directly involved." Another community member vaguely stated that community members are a support. These perceptions are not completely true as all community members were recruited from community-police meetings, which makes them actively involved in community policing. Therefore, this indicates that community members have very little knowledge of how important their role is in community policing and how big a role community members play in all crime prevention programs.

When asked about what role crime prevention played in community policing there was no consensus among community members. Some felt that prevention needed to play a larger role in community policing. For example, one community member stated: "what I think it is right now, it's not big enough, maybe 30% prevention and 70% reactive." While another community member agreed in saying: "It should play a very heavy role and probably doesn't play in practice as much as a role as it should." Again there is a clear disparity between the perceptions of police officers and community members when it comes to the role of crime prevention in community policing. Police officers overwhelmingly felt that crime prevention was part of, or one and the same as community policing while community members demonstrated no consistency with regards to their perceptions. This finding is somewhat surprising given the fact that an earlier

finding indicated that the community members interviewed appeared to have accepted the community policing rhetoric and the fact that community members must play a role in preventing crime.

Foot/Bike Patrol

Effectiveness

Four of five community members interviewed felt that foot patrol was very positive. One community member explained:

Can't get better in terms of a policing activity. They don't necessarily ticket a lot of people. They prevent crime. They know the people who are causing the problems and they nip it in the but. Just small things like people riding the bikes without helmets. People gathering on the sidewalks or in front of stores. Often just having the police officers around prevents a lot of potential criminal activity. If they see the police on Montreal Road for example they will turn around and walk the other way.

A business representative had this perception of foot patrol as a policing activity: "Proactive, because they are down here on a regular basis. The next section will examine what community members perceived as the main objectives of foot/bike patrol. There is clearly a positive perception of foot/bike patrol among community members interviewed, which was expected given that it is a main source of community interaction and increases perception of safety among community members (Waller, 2007; Willis, 2001).

Objectives

Four of five community members interviewed felt that the main objective of foot/bike patrol was to build a relationship with the community. It appears that there is agreement among community members that foot patrol is a positive activity and mainly serves as a form of trust-building within the community. For example one community member explained the value of foot/bike patrols: "two high values: one is very visible, a good patrol officer has regular contact

with individuals in the market.... Information flows more effectively. Very clear deterrence and information collection.” While a business representative explained the unique opportunity that they have to build a relationship with the police: “they come in to use the washrooms, for a little break once in a while. This hotel has a wonderful relationship with the police.” Another community member explained how foot/bike patrol affects the community’s relationship with the police: “it improves it.....you can talk to them, they are friendly and they seem to care!”

There is more parity between the police and community members with regards to foot/bike patrol objectives. Both community members and police officers interviewed felt that a main objective of foot/bike patrol was relationship building with the community. However, police officers interviewed perceived the main objective of foot/bike patrol as increased effectiveness.

Police-Community Consultation (Beat meetings)

I attended five police-community meetings in an effort to observe the structure of such meetings and the roles of each party in these meetings. After five meetings, it was apparent that the structure of these meetings was standardized and there was very little variation outside of the topics of interest.

Level of Organization

There are several indicators of the level of community organization in the context of community policing including: the existence of a community association, the appropriateness of the meeting facility, the existence of a meeting agenda and everyone being given a chance to speak. These indicators were used to create the observation grid for community meetings (see Appendix C). All meetings were either facilitated by a representative of a community association or a business improvement association. These associations would accommodate the meeting by

providing a facility. All of the meetings attended were held in fairly central locations in the neighbourhoods of interest and the facilities were conducive to communication in that the seating arrangement was circular and allowed everyone to participate. All meetings attended were run by community members (in the case of a community association) or co-chaired by a community member and business representative (in the case of a business improvement association). In all cases, there was a meeting agenda and everyone was given a chance to speak during roundtable introductions before the meeting began. People only interrupted each other for clarification.

Effectiveness/Objectives

All community members appeared to have positive perceptions of this type of police-community consultation. The most common theme in the data was that all community members felt that police-community consultation had a positive impact on their relationship with the police and served as a form of relationship building. For example one community member explained: “every time we meet with them (police) we just become friends. The more information we bring to them the more problems that they know to watch for.” Another community member explained the significance of building a relationship with the police:

You cannot do it without personal contact. There is a trust built in a face to face relationship and this will solve a lot of problems. You’d like to think you can do that in an electronic world but you can’t. The visible presence they are in uniform.

A business representative expressed how police-community consultation has impacted her business: “positively, I’ve gotten to know police much better, the staff sergeants that can have an impact on my business if I have a problem.” A third community member representing a business improvement area re-iterated these feelings: “just meeting with someone on a regular basis just

makes it much easier to communicate with them, instead of having to deal with bureaucratic nonsense”.

Three of five community members felt that police officers played the role of educators and shared much information with the community. They expressed that they were able to become more educated by attending these meetings with regards to local crime trends and the role of the police. For example one community member explains:

They've gone very well. They show up, bring lots of information in terms of what's happening in the neighbourhood. There are different types of meetings: They have to explain their role, what they can do what they can't do. It's about education, educating the people that police are good. Generally, after the first or second meetings then it's more productive. A lot of the people in the area I think they expect they police to know everything that is going on at once.

While another community member also highlights how informative police-community consultation can be:

They are very informative and helpful in dissuading a lot of rumours. You know the people who have someone broke into their car so they expect the entire CSI to come to their rescue. It gives us the opportunity to really understand what the police deal with and how they deal with it and that they can only operate within the letter of the law. They are only part of the solution, not the only solution.

These sentiments were supported by direct observation in that police officers did take ten to fifteen minutes near the beginning of the meeting to explain crime trends and address any other issues that the community may have. After this was completed, the police played a purely supportive role and acted as a resource to the community, answering questions as they were asked. Although these comments indicate that the community members interviewed see the police as serving the role of educators to the community, there are connotations of shared accountability for crime related issues among the police and the community. There appears to be an acceptance of shared accountability for crime prevention among the community members

interviewed. This could mean that the community members interviewed have largely bought into community policing. This is not completely surprising given that all community members interviewed were recruited from a police-community consultation meeting. There are some that would argue that the community is given a voice and collective power that allows them to influence police decision making and ensure more accountability, but at the same time they increase their own accountability for crime related and social disorder issues (Acosta, 2007).

It's clear that the two most prominent themes emerging from the data with regards to police-community consultation were that the community members interviewed viewed this as an opportunity for relationship building and education. These perceptions are fairly consistent with police officers perceptions of police-community consultation.

Role of the Police

There are several indicators of the role that the police play in police-community meetings including: the number of officers present, seating location of officers, the amount and context in which police officers speak, police officer demeanour and whether or not the police lead the meetings (see Appendix C).

Direct observations revealed that the number of police officers present at these meetings ranged from zero to two, and the police officers were never sat at the head of the table but rather off to the side in all meetings attended. Further, in all the meetings attended the police officers provided a presentation lasting 10-30 minutes about crime patterns and any other relevant information that could benefit the community. They then allowed others to carry on and became a passive partner addressing any questions asked of them throughout the meetings.

Four of five community members interviewed agreed that police played the role of a passive partner in community police meetings, while the community took the lead. For example one community member expressed: “I’m not there just to complain but also to bring forward some potential solutions. Police do not lead the meetings, they don’t want to but they are active participants. Chairs are usually a resident or co-chaired with business person.” Three of five community members interviewed felt that police officers played the role of educators and shared much information with the community, and three of five felt that the community played a leadership role in police-community meetings. For example, a community member explained: “If police chaired it, it would be wrong. The ownership would be in the wrong place. We have a co-chair who is a business owner.” While another community member expressed their perceptions of police-community consultation:

Extremely positive. This is where we tell the police what they are worried about in certain part of the environment and where the police educate us as to where the hot spots are etc. Open dialogue, we can report anything we think we have and they can answer questions that we have or complaints. Police inform the public.

There is agreement that police-community meetings are important and most understand the goal of these meetings to be relationship-building and education. The community members interviewed perceived themselves as leaders in the meetings while the police played the role of a passive partner. The perceptions of community members interviewed and the evidence from direct observation indicates that the Ottawa Police Service implements these meetings in a way that is consistent with the literature (Normandeau and Leighton, 1990; Willis, 2001).

Community Police Centres/ Permanent Beat Assignments

Effectiveness/Objectives

All community members interviewed had positive perceptions of permanent beat assignment and the officers they are continually in contact with. For example one community

member explained that the community officers are: “very good, high quality, extremely professional and they have to deal from time to time with some difficult situations.” This sentiment was consistent across community members interviewed. Again, community members perceived the main objective of permanent beat assignments to be to build relationships with the community.

Although there were positive perceptions of permanent beat assignments, three of five community members interviewed felt unsure as to the effectiveness/usefulness of community policing centres. All community members expressed that they were unsure what the purpose of community police centres are. Some community members did not have any awareness of a community police centre in their area but most indicated that it would be some type of home base. For example one community member said: “Don’t know much about them. I guess they are a home base where police and citizens can drop in.” Surprisingly, despite these feelings there were some that expressed a desire to have one in their area, especially from business representatives. One business representative interviewed expressed: “I’d be happy to have one down here and I know several of the social service agencies and businesses have asked for the possibility of having a community police centre.” While a second business person interviewed explained: “central isn’t really far but it would be nice to have them locally.”

These results are consistent with the knowledge and perceptions that police officers had of community police centres and permanent beat assignments. Both police officers and community members have positive perceptions of permanent beat assignments due to their capacity for relationship building, but both are also unsure as to the usefulness of community police centres unless they are being used by the community.

Progress of Community Policing

Types of Changes

Two themes emerged from the data when community members were asked about the overall progress of community policing and its programs. All community members felt that community policing had become more important over the years in Ottawa. For example one community member expressed:

It's certainly stronger. The community is a healthier community than it was earlier. In part because we know plenty more about what's going on and what the police are doing. They know about what's on our minds and they know what's on ours.

Secondly, most community members felt that the police service has always moved in a positive direction in terms of improving their implementation of community policing and that leadership has played a factor in the implementation of community policing. For example one community member explained: "they are always moving a positive direction, not a significant change but enough that I'm encouraged." A second community member expressed:

There is more police presence, that's for sure. Both the task force and the market (dedicated more officers) that makes them specialists in their own right and that's important to have. Most of them enjoy being out here, most of them really wouldn't change the Market.

A third community member expressed how important a change in leadership has been in changing the social dynamic in an Ottawa neighbourhood:

It's keeping people in the neighbourhood. I think a lot of people would have been moving out had this not happened. I don't know if it's community policing or there was a major change about a year and a half ago like we had community policing before but now we have the police with more spirit, partially because of the Chief. We've been calling about things for years and years and people were getting negative comments from police which would prevent them from calling again. We've been trying to convince people that it's changed.

There appears to be a general consensus among community members that there have been positive changes made over the years in the implementation of community policing.

Part of Mainstream Policing?

Four of five community members felt that community policing has become part of mainstream policing rather than remaining as a supplementary program. One community member had this to say when asked if community policing had become part of mainstream policing:

Yes, I hope so. I wouldn't want to see it go back to the way it was.....it should be part of all neighbourhoods. I think the way it used to be with the cruisers, we'd still have police activities but they wouldn't know the difference between the people who were likely to be troublesome and a resident of the area, now they do. They know the patterns.

Another community member expressed similar feelings with more pessimism and acknowledges the importance of community organization:

yeah, it certainly has in the rhetoric. A lot of policing isn't really very good at community policing..... not in this part of Ottawa. I'll go back to my earlier statement that it may be rhetoric in a lot of places but not in this part of Ottawa. To have it be successful you need a well organized community to make it easier to work with police. We do have a strong vibrant community association, we have multiple committees, this makes it easy to work with police. It's hard to without the organization of the community.

In this sample, community members seemed to have more positive perceptions of community policing than police officers, and a larger proportion felt that community policing had become part of mainstream policing. This is somewhat surprising given the fact that police officers would likely have more accurate perceptions of the acceptance of community policing within the organization and community members. The next section will highlight the results of direct observations done in police-community consultation meetings.

Do police or community perception lend support to one objective of community policing more than another?

The current data set can allow for only limited interpretations in terms of the latent objectives and interpretation of community policing, as implemented by the Ottawa Police Service. However, a summative content analysis was done to provide a glimpse of potential latent objectives of community policing and interpretation of community policing, as implemented by the Ottawa Police Service.

There were several objectives of community policing identified in the literature and several interpretations of community policing as a whole (Seagrave, 1997) all described in chapter two. The objectives included the following: to increase legitimacy in the eye of the public, to increase police accountability, to increase efficiency of police services, to increase effectiveness of police services, to decrease fear of crime and increase public safety and to increase job satisfaction for police officers. This includes conducting community policing as long as costs are not too high. One community member explains why there is no longer a community policing centre in the Byward Market area: “there used to be one on Rideau. It closed because of money.” However, an Ottawa Police Service police officer explains:

For me, I'd rather see the centre housed amongst a whole bunch of other community services/partners so it could be like a one stop shopping and you can share in the cost of operating the centre. I'll give you a good example of what happened in Hintonburg. In Hintonburg we were shutting down because rent was going to go from \$85,000 to \$140,000 a year to operate, I could hire a police officer for that price. Well it was ridiculous the cost associated with the centre, if you look at Vanier I'm talking \$25,000 to operate the centre..... I can tell you right now in Vanier we are doing an assessment because I'm not convinced we are getting the best bang for our buck. How many hours am I going to have my officers sitting there waiting for someone to come in. I'd rather have them out at community meetings, community events etc, you'd get more value out of that.

This could be interpreted as indicating that community policing is only a priority if it fits within a certain budget. Initiatives such as community police centres allow community members to run all prevention programs, while being overseen by a single police officer. This limits police accountability for any increases in crime and saves a significant amount of money in having community volunteers run much of the community policing that takes place. The popularity of programs such as neighbourhood watch supports such a theory, as residents are taking responsibility for the safety and security of their own communities.

The second most tallied objective of community policing in this data set is increasing the legitimacy of police. Given the fact that Ottawa is a fairly multi-cultural society and has many immigrants, this explanation seems plausible but cannot be confirmed due to the small sample size. As stated earlier, one officer indicated that he makes trips to the immigration offices in order to educate new immigrants on policing in Canada, as many have had negative experiences and perceptions of policing in their home countries. This is clearly done in an attempt to increase legitimacy which also facilitates increased communication and the reporting of crimes. However, it is unclear if this is the main objective of the Ottawa Police Service's implementation of community policing. The next section will examine if any of the five most common interpretations of community policing were apparent in the current study.

Do police or community perceptions lend support to any of the five common interpretations of community policing?

The five main interpretations of community policing as discussed in chapter two are community policing as a form of social control, a philosophy, a program, as imprecise and as rhetorical.

A summative content analysis of the 13 interviews conducted with both community members and police officers, indicates that the most popular interpretation views *community policing as rhetorical*, meaning little organizational change has occurred. Instead, small re-orientations of existing services and programs have allowed the Ottawa Police Service to label them 'community policing'. Interestingly, six of the nine times police officers identified community policing as rhetorical.

The second most frequently mentioned concern about community policing is that of it being 'imprecise'. This was much more apparent among community members as they did not have much knowledge of specific community policing program/initiatives outside of the ones they were directly involved with. This is once again a much more plausible interpretation and one that may be contributing to some of the rhetoric found within community policing. The imprecision of community policing as a theory is very evident in the literature and again has emerged as a theme in the current study. Although it may be somewhat disheartening to think that some 25 years after its inception as a theory community policing is still not clearly defined, at no point will all services be able to agree upon a definition. As a result, it can be used by police services to suit their needs.

This chapter explored the five main research questions of this study using the three data sources. Firstly, secondary data was described (as outlined on the Ottawa Police Service's website), to determine what the Ottawa Police Service claims to implement in terms of community policing. The knowledge and perceptions of community members and police officers involved in community policing were then described and evaluated in relation to the relevant research questions. Direct observation completed by the researcher was also described to support

or refute the perceptions of those interviewed. The next chapter will discuss the significance of these findings

Chapter 6 – Discussion and Conclusion

This chapter will examine the extent to which various components of community policing were evidenced in the data by addressing the five research questions of the study. This study used Normandeau and Leighton's (1990) definition of community policing as an analytical framework. Their definition was broken down into six components: philosophical, organizational, tactical, risk, social control and costs. Which components were evident in the Ottawa Police Service's implementation of community policing was assessed by direct observation at police-community consultation and interviews with a small number of police officers and community members involved in community policing allowed any observations to be verified or contradicted. This allowed for an interpretation of the extent to which community policing has impacted the Ottawa Police Service delivery model and provides some insight as to the Ottawa Police Services commitment to community policing to the extent that sources permit.

Transition to Community Policing

Hypothesis one suggests that most police services have not made the full transition to community policing and that community policing is potentially being overshadowed by new policing innovations.

The data revealed that there is certainly evidence of several components of community policing within the Ottawa Police Service. The Ottawa Police mission statement demonstrates a philosophical commitment to a 'community policing philosophy', emphasizing problem-oriented police, partnership and evaluation. However, as Mastrofski (2006) points out, most police services have demonstrated a commitment to community policing in their mission statements, but this often does not coincide with what actually takes place in practice. The current study used

interviews to provide perspective and examine whether the Ottawa Police Service's philosophical commitment to community policing could be confirmed by examining the knowledge and perceptions of a number of police officers and community members. The Ottawa Police Service has some of the organizational components of community policing. For example, it has fifteen community police centres in operation throughout the city with seventeen assigned officers working out of these centres. However, this remains less than one percent of the total number of officers in the service dedicated specifically to community policing. The Ottawa Police Service also has sections dedicated to building partnerships in the community such as the Partnership in Action program (PIA). Also, the Community Police Action Committee (COMPAC) is dedicated to ensuring positive relations with all cultures and that all cultures have the opportunity to have a voice on what the police service prioritizes.

There are also several tactical components of community policing in place within the Ottawa Police Service, for example: foot/bike patrol, permanent beat assignments, community consultation committees, community police centres, and crime prevention programs.

The existence of philosophical, organizational and tactical components of community policing is a step in the direction of implementing community policing, however, it in no way ensures that these programs have transformed the organization.

Resistance to Community Policing among Police Officers

The second hypothesis of this study was that there would be resistance from officers to change their traditional practices.

In the current study, police officers interviewed had positive perceptions of community policing however, under certain conditions, i.e. when the community was willing to participate.

Officers also felt that crime prevention was part of, and extremely important to the implementation of community policing. It appears as though the officers interviewed have positive perceptions of crime prevention overall but feel that the community is largely responsible for the operation of crime prevention programming. Furthermore, officers are not entirely confident in the effectiveness of the currently implemented crime prevention/community policing programming. According to the literature on community policing (Goldstein, 1987; Skogan, 2003), initiatives should be specifically tailored to the needs of each community. Because Ottawa is such a large and diverse city, one would expect to find different community policing programming in different areas. In reality, the Ottawa Police Service implements the same prevention programs city wide. Beyond these ‘canned programs’ (Mastrofski, 2006), the implementation of specific initiatives tailored to the needs of the community is largely based on the creativity and ambition of individual community officers. This indicates that the Ottawa Police Service values the education and experience of front-line officers and provides them with the appropriate autonomy to do as they see fit. Chief Vern White had no knowledge of current specific crime prevention programs implemented by the Ottawa Police Service.

Two interpretations could reasonably be derived with regards to hypothesis two: either police officers truly don’t believe that community policing can work without the active participation of the community or it could be that the Ottawa Police Service is not willing to dedicate the resources to ensure that these programs are properly functioning or to engage the community in the absence of sufficient community participation. Chief White’s admission that he knows very little about current crime prevention programs would lend support to the latter interpretation (it may also reflect structural aspects; i.e. Crime Prevention Ottawa is a separate organization from the OPS). The positive perceptions of tactical components of community

policing among police officers suggests that they may not be totally resistant to changing their traditional roles. A common objective agreed upon by police officers across all tactical components of community policing is relationship building. Officers interviewed were not reluctant to step outside their traditional policing role and adopt a new approach. Other objectives mentioned by police officers were problem solving with the community, information exchange and being an equal partner to the community. All represent a significant departure from traditional police objectives and roles. It would appear that, at least among the officers interviewed, there was very little resistance to changing their traditional police practices. There was an exception when it came to positive perceptions of tactical components among police officers interviewed. Police officers were unsure as to the effectiveness and usefulness of community police centres but most agreed that the main objective was community engagement and relationship building. These perceptions were largely based on the perception that volunteers serve a limited role due to privacy legislation and officers feel as though they would better serve the community outside of a community police centre.

Police officers interviewed had very mixed feelings with regards to the progress of community policing over the years and most were not sure whether or not it had become part of mainstream policing. Although there was a small sample, one would expect that those working within community policing would have a clear perception of the extent to which community policing has permeated throughout the police service. Given that there was not an overwhelming consensus among the officers interviewed, could provide support for hypothesis two, that community policing may not be fully implemented.

Effects on Community Members

Thirdly it was hypothesized that the notion of community policing involves some objective of fear reduction, disorder reduction and cultivation of more favourable opinions of police (Rosenbaum, 2007).

The community members interviewed appreciated increased interaction with police officers. Most community members interviewed explained that it was a partnership between the police and the community. There was certainly evidence to support hypothesis three in terms of positive perceptions of community policing among community members interviewed. Community members viewed the main objective of community policing as increasing police presence/visibility, which tends to increase feelings of safety, despite the fact that there is no empirical evidence to suggest that visibility increases safety in reality (Maguire, 2007; Mastrofski, 2006; Kelling, 1988). However, community members tended to have very little awareness of community policing/crime prevention programs outside of the programs they were directly involved in. The community members in the study were unsure of the role that crime prevention plays in community policing or its importance, which represents a contrast to police perceptions. However, community member perceptions of other tactical components of community policing were very similar to police. A consistent theme emerging from community members' perceptions of tactical components was that relationship building was always an objective. Of note, community members viewed themselves as the main role players in police-community consultation and viewed police as a passive and equal partner. However, they were also very open to sharing that they viewed any consultation process as a chance for education on how to better protect themselves/deter crime.

Consistent with police perceptions, community members had positive perceptions of permanent beat assignments due to their capacity for relationship building but were unsure as to the usefulness or the role that a community police centre plays in community policing. Despite, not understanding the role of community police centres, there were some community members that expressed they would like to have one in their area. This is not overly surprising, given the fact that most community members saw increased police visibility as one of the main objectives of community policing. Community members tended to express a much more consistently favourable view of the progress that community policing has made over the years. Community members express much more positive perceptions of community policing than police officers and a larger proportion of community members felt that it had become part of mainstream policing. This is not overly surprising due to the fact that the officers most of these community members would have interacted with were working within a community policing role. As stated earlier, perhaps (it is possible that) officers working outside of a community policing role that have not accepted the community policing.

Consistent with hypothesis three, community members did express a more favourable view of community policing than officers themselves. These positive perceptions seemed to derive from increased visibility and police presence which is argued to be related to decreased feelings of insecurity.

Objectives of Community Policing

Fourthly it was hypothesized that community policing has six main objectives consistently mentioned in the literature (as discussed in chapter four).

The data reveals that increased efficiency was the most commonly cited objective of community policing among both community members and police officers in the current study. This is not surprising given the fact that police services are constantly looking to get more for their money and their priorities are partially based on a cost/benefit analysis. While community members as taxpayers are perhaps looking for increased efficiency from the police service, what they consider to be evidence of efficiency may be quite different from what police services define that to be. The second most tallied objective of community policing in this study was increasing the legitimacy of the police. Because of the challenges faced under the traditional policing model, most approaches developed since have focused at least partially on ensuring public satisfaction and perceptions of legitimacy. Community members are also well aware of the problems faced under the traditional policing model and understand that the police have made an effort to solidify the support of community members.

There is certainly support for hypothesis four in that all objectives were identified in the data, however, increased efficiency and increasing legitimacy were the most commonly identified.

Interpretation of Community Policing

The fifth hypothesis of this study was that there are five main interpretations of community policing (as identified in the literature).

Surprisingly, despite the positive perceptions among police officers and community members with regards to community policing, the most commonly identified interpretation of community policing was that of viewing community policing as rhetorical. Interestingly, this was much more prevalent among police officers. Again, this could indicate that officers working in a

community police role may be well aware that the idea of community policing has not been accepted by many, if not most, of their colleagues working in more traditional police roles (patrol, investigation). The second most commonly identified interpretation of community policing among the perceptions of police and community members interviewed was that of community policing being imprecise. This was much more apparent among community members which follows from the fact that they tended to have very little knowledge of community policing programs and their objectives outside of what they were directly involved in.

Conclusions

Significance of Findings

The findings of this research can provide a starting point for future research in the area of community policing in the 21st century. The findings have demonstrated that indeed community policing is well perceived by police and community members involved in community policing. However, there was no consensus among police officers interviewed that a community policing philosophy has become part of mainstream policing. It's clear that the Ottawa Police Service has philosophical, organizational and tactical components of community policing currently in place but the extent to which they are implemented is unclear.

The findings indicated that community policing as implemented by the Ottawa Police Service has two main objectives according police and community members interviewed: increased efficiency and increasing police acceptance. Increased efficiency is likely attributed to the tough economic times that we all currently face, not to mention that any government funded organization is always closely scrutinized in terms of spending. Police legitimacy as a main objective of community policing is also somewhat expected. When all is said and done, policing

in a democracy must be based on consent (Skogan and Frydl, 2004). Skogan and Frydl (2004, p. 293) go on to explain: "Police fairness is an end in itself. In a democracy where citizens are policed by consent, the exercise of state power must be seen as an expression of the community and not an action against it." Based on this idea alone, community policing must play an important role in any service delivery model in the 21st century.

Future research could address the extent to which these objectives are agreed upon within a larger sample of police officers and community members or if four of the other objectives described by Seagrave (1997) emerge. The findings also indicated that the most common interpretation of community policing as implemented by the Ottawa Police Service according to the police and community members interviewed is that community policing is largely rhetorical and imprecise. A more in-depth examination of police and community members perceptions of community policing, including a larger sample size could affirm or contradict the current study's findings.

Concluding Remarks

The current study has provided some insight with regards to the extent community policing remains a priority affecting the Ottawa Police Services delivery model in the 21st century but due to the small sample size generalizability is not possible. The study has also prompted several future research questions that could be addressed by a larger research project. The perceptions of police and community members regarding community policing are largely positive. However, the Ottawa Police Service may be at an impasse in terms of which direction to proceed as a result of pressure to compete with various other agencies for funding while also trying to satisfy demands of increased security as a result of the 2001 terrorist attacks. There is by no means a simple solution to this problem but regardless of the final decision the Ottawa

Police Service should uphold their accountability to the public and keep them informed of their priorities. Further, they must develop more effective and consistent strategies of evaluations of community policing in Ottawa. As Kempa (2008, p.10) states:

A vital part of this enterprise is to develop the measurement tools required to evaluate the efficacy of their programs in terms of the values they are explicitly and consciously seeking to promote: there is no use promoting interesting alternative aims if we cannot demonstrate the benefits of such programs to government in a language they can understand.

References

- Acosta, J. and Chavis, D. (2007). Build the capacity of communities to address crime. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 6 (4), p.651-662.
- Adams, R.E; Rohe, W.M. and Arcury T.A. (2005). Awareness of community-oriented policing and neighbourhood perceptions in five small to midsize cities. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33, p. 43-54.
- Alderson, J. (1982). "The future of policing" in Bennett, T. (Ed.) *The future of policing.* Cambridge: Institute of Criminology.
- Allen, R.Y.W. (2002). Assessing the impediments to organizational change: A view of community policing. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, p. 511-517.
- Babbie, E. (1992). *The practice of social research.* New York: Macmillan.
- Bayley, D. and Shearing, C. (2001). *The new structure of policing.* Washington DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Bayley, D. and Shearing, C. (1996). The future of policing. *Law and Society Review*, 30 (3), p.586-606.
- Bayley, D.H. (1994). *Police for the future.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bayley, D. (1988). "Community Policing: A Report From the Devli's Advocate" in J.R. Greene and S.D. Mastrofski (eds.), Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New York: Praeger.
- Bayley, D.H. (1991). *Managing the future: Prospective issues in Canadian policing.* Ottawa: Ministry of the Solicitor General of Canada.
- Becker, M. (2004). *Effectiveness of bicycle patrols.* International police mountain bike association. Baltimore, MD.
- Berg, B.L. (1998). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences (3rd ed).* Needham Heights, MA: Pearson Education
- Broderick, J. (1991). Review essay: Community policing and problem oriented policing.

- American Journal of Police*, 10 (4).
- Brodgen, M. & Nijhar, P. (2005). *Community policing: National and international models and approaches*. Oregon: William Publishing.
- Brogden, M. (2004). Commentary: Community policing: A panacea from the west. *African Affairs* 103/413, 635-649
- Brogden, M. (1999). "Community policing as cherry pie." In R. Mawby (ed.), Policing across the world. London: UCL Press.
- Brown, M. (1989). *Working the street: Police discretion and the dilemmas of reform*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Brown, L.P., and Wycoff, M.A. (1987). Policing Houston: Reducing Fear and Improving Service. *Crime and Delinquency* 33, 71– 89.
- Carter, D.L. and Carter, J.G. (2009). Intelligence-led policing: Conceptual and functional considerations for public policy. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 20, p.310
- Casey, J. (1999). *Twenty years of community consultative committees: Is it possible to solve the conundrum?* Australian Institute of Criminology, conference paper.
- Chacko, J. and Nancoo, S. (1993). *Community Policing in Canada*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc.
- City of Ottawa. (2001). Neighborhood census data. Retrieved February 2009 from:
www.cityofottawa.ca/profiles
- Clairmont, D. (1991). Community-based policing: Implementation and impact. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 33(3-4), 469-484.
- Cordner, G.W. (1995). Community policing: Elements and effects. *Police Forum*, 5(3).
- Cordner, G.W. (1997). "Community Policing: Elements and Effects." In Alpert, G.P and

- Piquero, A. Community Policing: Contemporary Readings. Prospect Heights, Ill.: Waveland Press. Pages 45–62.
- Crank, J.P. (1994). Watchman and the community: Myth and institutionalization in policing. *Law and Society Review*, 28(2).
- Crawford, A. (2007). “Crime prevention and community safety” in Maguire, M (eds), The Oxford handbook of Criminology. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crawford, A., Blackburn, S., and Burnett, J. (2005). *Plural policing: The mixed economy of visible patrol in England and Wales*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Crawford, A. (1998). *Crime prevention and community safety: Politics, policies and practices*. Harlow: Longman.
- Dantzker, M.L., and Hunter, R.D. (2002). *Research methods for criminology and criminal justice: A primer (2nd Ed.)* Toronto: Jones and Bartlett Publishing.
- De Guzman, M. C. (2002). *The changing roles and strategies of the police in time of terror*. *ACJS Today*, p. 8-13.
- Dewitt, C.B. (1992). Community policing in Seattle: A model partnership between citizens and police. *Research in Brief*
- Eck, J. E., & Rosenbaum, D. P. (1994). “The new police order. Effectiveness, equity, and efficiency in community policing.” In Rosenbaum, D.P. (Ed.), *The challenge of community policing. Testing the promises* (pp. 3-23). London: Sage.
- Eck, J.E. and Spelman, W. (1987). *Problem-Solving*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- Edwards, A. (1998). *Police community consultative committees: Some issues for consideration*. Australian Institute of Criminology, conference paper.
- Ericson, R.V. and Haggerty, K.D. (2002). “The policing of risk” in T. Baker and J. Simon (eds), Embracing risk. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Ericson, R.V. and Haggerty, K.D. (1997). *Policing the risk society*. Toronto: University of

- Toronto Press.
- Friedmann, R.R. (1992). *Community policing: Comparative perspectives and prospect*.
NY: St. Martin's Press.
- General Accounting Office (1991). *Case study evaluations*. United States: Program
Evaluation and Methodology Division.
- Garland, D. (2001). *The culture of control: Crime and social order in contemporary society*.
Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Gianakis, G.A. and Davis, G.J. (1998). Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of
community-oriented policing. *Public Administration Review*, 58 (6), 485-498.
- Gillis, J. (1996). *A study on a community policing initiative: Police-community consultative
committees*. Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa, in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the Degree of Masters of Arts.
- Goldstein Herman. (1987). Toward community-oriented policing: Potential, basic requirements,
and threshold questions. *Crime and Delinquency*, 33(1), 6-30.
- Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented policing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Greene, J.R. (2004). "Community policing and organizational change." In Wesley G. Skogan
(ed.), Community policing: Can it work? Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Greene, J.R., Bergman, W. and McLaughlin, E. (1994). "Implementing community policing:
Cultural and structural change in organizations", in Rosenbaum, D.P. (Ed.) *The
Challenge of Community Policing*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, California
- Green, J. and Mastrofski, S.D. (1988). *Community policy: Rhetoric or reality?* New York:
Praeger.
- Green, J. and Taylor, R.B. (1988). "Community- based policing and foot patrol: Issues of
theory and evaluation." In Greene, J.R. and Mastrofski, S.D. (Eds.), *Community policing:
Rhetoric or reality?* (195-223). New York: Praeger.
- Greene, J.R., Bergman, W.T. and McLaughlin, E.J. (1994). "Implementing community policing:
Cultural and structural change in police organizations in Rosenbaum, D.P. (Ed.). *The*

- challenge of community policing: Testing the promises.* California: Sage.
- Haarr, R. N. (2001). The making of a community policing officer: The impact of basic training on occupational socialization on police recruits. *Police Quarterly*, 4, 402-433.
- Hastings. R. (1991). An ounce of prevention. *The Journal of Human Justice*, 3(1).
- Hennigan, K.M., Maxson, C.L., Sloane, D. and Ranney, M. (2002). Community views on crime and policing: Survey mode effects on bias in community surveys. *Justice Quarterly*, 19(3).
- Henry, V.E. (2002). The need for coordinated and strategic local police approach to terrorism: A practitioner's perspective. *Police Practice & Research*, 3, 319-336.
- Herbert, S. (2006). *Citizens, cops and power: Recognizing the limits of community.*
Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Hornick, J.P., Burrows, B.A., and Phillips, D.M. (1991). An impact evaluation of the Edmonton neighborhood foot patrol program. *The Canadian Journal of Program Evaluation* 6 (1), 47-70.
- Hsiu, H.F. and Shannon, S.E. (2005). Three approaches to qualitative content analysis.
Qualitative Health Research, 15, 1277
- Johnston, L. and Shearing, C. (2002). *Governing security.* London: Routledge.
- Jones, T. (2003). "The governance and accountability of policing" in T. Newburn (ed.), The handbook of Policing. *Cullompton, Devon: Willian.*
- Jones, S. (1983). "Community policing in Devon and Cornwall: Some research findings on the relationship between the public and the police." In Bennett, T. (Ed.) *The future of policing.* Cambridge: Institute of Criminology.
- Keazor, E. (2003), *Fighting Crime on Two Wheels: An Exploratory analysis of the Impact of Police Bicycle Patrols on Various Reported Offenses.* UMI, Ann Arbor, MI.
- Kelling, G.L. and Moore, M.H (1989). "From political to reform to community: The evolving strategy of police." In J.R. Green and S.D. Mastrofski (Eds.) Community Policing:

- Rhetoric or reality. New York: Praeger.
- Kelling, G. and Moore, M.H. (1988), *The evolving strategy of policing*. Perspectives on Policing, National Institute of Justice, Vol. 4, pp. 1-15.
- Kempa, M. (2008). *The Political Economy of Human Security: A Conceptualist Approach to Police Studies and Reform*. The University of Ottawa.
- Kennedy, D.M. (1993). The strategic management of police resources. *Perspectives on Policing*, 14.
- Kinsey, R., Lea, J. and Young, J. (1986). *Losing the fight against crime*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell
- Kleinig, J. (1996). *The ethics of policing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klockars, C.B. (1989). "The rhetoric of community policing" In J.R. Green and S.D. Mastrofski (Eds.) Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New York: Praeger
- Klockars, C.B. (1988). "The rhetoric of community policing." In Greene, J. And Mastrofski, S. (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality?* New York: Praeger
- Law Commission of Canada (2006). "In Search of security: The future of policing in Canada." The Government of Canada.
- Leiderbach, J., Fritsch, E.J., Carter, D.L. and Bannister, A. (2008). Exploring the limits of collaboration in community policing: A direct comparison of police and citizen views. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 31 (2), p.271-291
- Leighton, B. N. (1991). Visions of community policing : Rhetoric and reality in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 33(3-4), 485-522.
- Leighton, B. (1993). "Community-based policing and police/community relations" in Chacko, J. and Nancoo, S.E. (eds.), *Community policing in Canada*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press Inc.
- Leighton, B.N. (1994). "Community policing in Canada: An overview of experience and evaluations." In Rosenbaum, D.P. (Ed.) *The challenge of community policing: Testing the*

- promises*. California: Sage.
- Lurigio, L.J. and Skogan, W.G. (1994). Winning the hearts and minds of police officers: An assessment of staff perceptions of community policing in Chicago. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40(3), 315-330.
- Lyons, W. (2002). *The politics of community policing: Rearranging the power to punish*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Lyons, M. (1999). *The Politics of Community Policing: Rearranging the Power to Punish*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Maguire, M., Morgan, R and Reiner, R. (2007). *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mastrofski, S. (2006). "Community policing: A sceptical view" in D. Weisburd and A.A. Braga (eds). *Police innovation: Contrasting perspectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mastrofski, S.D. and Ritti, R.R. (2000). Making sense of community policing: A theory based analysis. *Police Practice and Research*, 1(2), p. 183-210.
- Mastrofski, S.D. (1988) "Community Policing as Reform: A Cautionary Tale", in Greene, J.R. and Mastrofski, S.D. Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New York: Praeger.
- Mastrofski, S.D.; Worden, R.F. and Snipes, J.B. (1995). Law Enforcement in a Time of Community Policing. *Criminology* 33, no. 1: 539–563.
- Mawby, R.I. (1990). *Comparative policing issues: The British and American experiences in International perspective*. London: Unwin Hyman Ltd.
- McTavish, D.G. and Loether, H.J. (2002). *Social research: An evolving process (2nd ed)*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Melchers, R. (2008). Personal communication. University of Ottawa
- Morgan, R. (1989). "Police accountability: Current developments and future prospects", in

- Weatheritt, M. (ed.) *Police research: Some future prospects*. Aldershot: Gower Publishing.
- Murphy, C. and Muir, G. (1985). *Community-based policing: A review of the critical issues*. Ottawa: Solicitor General of Canada.
- Murphy, C. (1989). "The Development, Impact and Implications of Community Policing in Canada". In Greene, J.R. and Mastrofski, S.D. (Eds.), Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New York: Praeger, pp. 177-189
- Murphy, C. (1988). Community problems, problem communities, and community policing in Toronto. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 25, 392.
- Murphy, C. (1993). "The development, impact and implications of community policing in Canada" in Chacko, J. and Nancoo, S.E. (Eds.), Community Policing in Canada. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.
- Murray, J. (2005). Policing terrorism: A threat to community policing or just a shift in priorities? *Police practice and research*, 6(4), 347-361.
- Newburn, T. and Jones, T. (2006). "Understanding plural policing" in T. Jones and T. Newburn (eds), Plural policing: A comparative perspective, London: Routledge.
- Newburn, T. and Reiner, R. (2006). "Police research", in R. King and E. Wincup (eds.), Doing research on Crime and Justice, 2nd Edn, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Normandeau Andre, & Leighton Barry. (1990). *A vision of the future of policing in canada: Police-challenge 2000: Background document*. Ottawa, CAN: Solicitor General Canada.
- Oliver, W. (2006). The fourth era of policing: Homeland security. *International Review of Law, Computers and Technology*, 20, p. 49-62
- Oliver, W.M. (2004). The homeland security juggernaut: The end of the community policing era? *Crime and Justice International*, 20(79), 4-10.
- Ottawa Police Service (2009). Vision, mission, values. Retrieved April 2009 from:

www.ottawapolice.ca

Peak, K.J. and Glensor, R.W. (1999). *Community Policing and Problem Solving*. Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.

Pelfrey, W.V. (2004). The inchoate nature of community policing: Differences between community policing and traditional police officers. *Police Quarterly*, 21 (3), 579-601.

Rawlings, P. (1991). "Creeping privatization? The police, the conservative government and policing in the late 1980s", in R. Reiner and M. Cross (eds), Beyond Law and Order, London: Macmillan.

Reiner, R. and Spencer, S. (1993). *Accountable Policing: Effectiveness, empowerment and equity*. London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Reiner, R. (1991). *The Politics of the Police*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Robin, G.D. (2000). *Community policing – origins, elements, implementation, assessment*. New York: The Edwin Mellen Press Ltd.

Rose, N. (1999). *Powers of freedom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenbaum, D.P. (1994). *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promises*. London: Sage Publications.

Rosenbaum, D.P. (2006). "The limits of hotspot policing" in Weisburd and Braga (eds), Police innovation: Contrasting perspectives. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Rosenbaum, D.P. (1987). The theory and research behind neighbourhood watch: Is it a sound fear and crime reduction strategy? *Crime and Delinquency*, 33, p. 103-134

Roth, J.A., Roehl, J and Johnson, C.C. (2004). "Trends in the adoption of community policing" in W.G. Skogan (eds.), *Community policing: Can it work?* Belmont CA: Wadsworth.

Roth, J.A. et al. (2000). *National Evaluation of COPS program: Title 1 of the 1994 Crime Act*, Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute

Sampson, R.J., Laub, J.H. (1990). Crime and deviance over the life course: The salience of adult social bonds. *American Sociological Review*, 55, 609- 627

- Seagrave, J. (1997). *Introduction to policing in Canada*. Scarborough, ON: Prentice Hall Canada.
- Scheingold, S. (1991). "The politics of street crime." Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Scrivner, E. (2004). "The impact of September 11 on community policing." In Fridell, L. & Wycoff, M.A. (Eds.), Community policing: The past, present, and future. Washington, DC: Annie E. Casey Foundation and Police Executive Research Forum.
- Shaughnessy, J.J. and Zechmeister, E.B. (1990). *Research methods in psychology*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Skogan, W.G. (2006). *Police and community in Chicago: A tale of three cities*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Skogan, W.G. (2003). *Community Policing: Can it Work?* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Skogan, W.G., Dubois, J., Comey, J., Kaiser, M., and Lovig, J. (1999). *On the beat: Police and community problem solving*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Skogan, W.G., and Hartnett, S.M. (1997). *Community Policing, Chicago Style*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Skogan, W.G. (1990). *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighborhoods*. New York: Free Press.
- Skolnick, J.H. and Bayley, D.H. (1988). *Community policing: Issues and practices around the world*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Spencer, S. (1985). *Called to account: The case for police accountability in England and Wales*. London: National Council for Civil Liberties.
- Stenson, K. (1993). Community policing as governmental technology. *Economy and Society* 22, 373-399.
- Taylor, I. (1980). The law and order issue in the British general election and the Canadian federal election of 1979. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 5(3).
- Thacher, D. (2005). The local role in homeland security. *Law and Society Review*, 39(3), p.635-676

- Trojanowicz, R. and Bucqueroux, B. (1994). *Community policing: How to get started*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.
- Tranjanowicz, R.C. and Carter, D. (1988). *Philosophy and role of community policing*. National Institute of Justice.
- Tranjanowicz, R.C., Moore, M.H. and Kelling, G.L. (1988). *Crime and Policing*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice
- Walker, S. (1993). Does Anyone Remember Team Policing? Lessons of the Team Policing Experience for Community Policing. *American Journal of Police*, 12(1), p. 33-55.
- Waller, Irvin. (2006). *Less law, more order: the truth about reducing crime*. Westport: Praeger Publishers.
- Weatheritt, M. (1988). "Community policing: Rhetoric or reality." In Greene, J.R. & Mastrofski, S.D. (Eds.), Community policing: Rhetoric or reality? (pp.153- 176). New York: Praeger.
- Weber, R. P. (1990). *Basic content analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Weisburd, D. and Braga, A.A. (2006). *Police innovation: Contrasting perspectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Weisel, D. (1999). *Conducting community surveys: A practical guide for law enforcement*. US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Williams, B.N. (1998). *Citizen perspectives on community policing: A case study in Athens, Georgia*. Albany: State University of New Press. York
- Willis, James J. (2001). *Police: Community policing*. Encyclopedia of Crime and Justice, Vol 3, New York.
- Yin, R.K. (1994). *Applications of case study research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yin, R.K. (2004). *The case study anthology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Zhao, J. and Q.C. Thurman (1997). Community policing: where are we now? *Crime and Delinquency*, 345- 357

Appendix A- Interview Schedule (Community)

Background Questions

1. How long have you been living in this community/neighborhood?

2. Since what year have you been living in this neighborhood?

Community Policing

3. What do you consider to be community policing?
 - a. What do you think of when you hear community policing?
 - b. How would you define community policing?
 - c. What are your perceptions of community policing?

4. Is there police officer foot patrol in your neighborhood?
 - a. How often do you see them?
 - b. How many times a week?
 - c. What are your perceptions of foot patrol as a police activity?
 - i. How does it affect your relationship with the police?

5. How many police/community meetings are there per year in your area/neighborhood?
 - a. What are your perceptions of police/community meetings?
 - i. How do police/community meetings affect your relationship with the police?

6. How would you describe your role (community member) in police/community meetings?
 - a. What role do the police play in police/community meetings?
 - b. Do you express yourself frequently in these meetings?
 - i. How many times per meeting?
 - c. Do you feel as though you have an opportunity to express your concerns?
 - d. Who leads police/community meetings?
 - i. Police vs. Community members/leaders

7. What community policing programs are in place that you are aware of?
 - a. How would you describe the community policing programs/ initiatives in place today?
 - b. How would you describe them in comparison to when you first moved to the neighborhood?
 - c. How many community policing programs initiatives does this neighborhood currently have in place?
 - d. How would you describe community policing today in comparison to when you first moved into the neighborhood?

- i. How many community policing programs/initiatives were in place when you first moved to the neighborhood?
8. What role does crime prevention play in community policing?
 - a. What crime prevention programs are offered in your neighborhood?
 - b. What role do volunteers play in crime prevention programs?
 - c. How many crime prevention programs are run by community members in this neighborhood?
 - d. How many community policing volunteers do you have in your neighborhood?
 - e. How do you feel about crime prevention programs?
9. Does your neighborhood have a community policing station?
 - a. What are your perceptions on the community policing station in your neighborhood?
10. Do you regularly see the same police officers in this neighborhood?
 - a. What are your perceptions of the police officers you see all the time?
 - b. Are these officers friendly with you (smile, nod etc)?
 - c. Do they speak to you (casual conversation)?
11. How would you describe your involvement in the community?
12. How would you describe the community involvement in community policing?
 - a. How would you describe your community involvement in this neighborhood?
 - b. How would you describe your community involvement today compared to when you first moved to the neighborhood?
13. What are your views of community policing?
 - a. How would you describe the importance of community policing today in comparison to when you first moved to this neighborhood?
 - b. Do you think it has become part of mainstream policing?
 - c. Do you think community policing is a supplementary program to regular policing activities?
 - d. How would you describe the changes in policing since you first moved to the neighborhood?
14. Have any community policing initiatives/programs been abandoned over the years?
 - a. Which ones? Nothing comes to mind. Restrictions in manpower.
 - b. Why?
15. Does this neighborhood have a community/neighborhood association?
 - a. How many members does it have?
 - b. How would you describe the community involvement in this community?
16. How would you describe community/neighborhood involvement at police/community meetings?
 - a. How many are neighborhood association members?
 - b. How many are non-members?

Appendix B- Interview Schedule (Police)

Background Questions

1. What is your occupational rank?
2. What neighborhood do you patrol/are you responsible for?
3. How long have you been a police officer?

Community Policing

4. What do you consider to be community policing?
 - a. How would you define community policing?
5. What are your perceptions of community policing?
6. What are the main goals and objectives of community policing?
7. What role does foot patrol play in community policing?
 - a. How long per shift?
 - b. How many times a week?
8. What are your perceptions of foot patrol as a police activity?
 - a. What are the goals and objectives of foot patrol?
 - b. How does it affect your relationship with the community?
 - c. How many police/community meetings (beat meetings) are there per year in your area/neighborhood?
 - d. What are the main goals and objectives of beat meetings?
 - e. What are your perceptions of police/community meetings?
 - f. How do police/community meetings affect your relationship with the public?
9. How would you describe your role (police officers) in police community meetings?
10. What role does crime prevention play in community policing?
 - a. What role do volunteers play in crime prevention programs?
 - b. How many crime prevention programs are run by community members in this neighborhood?
 - c. How many community policing volunteers do you have in your neighborhood?

11. Does your neighborhood have a community policing station?
 - a. What are the main goals and objectives of community policing centres?
 - b. What are your perceptions on the community policing centres?

12. Is there permanent beat assignment in this neighborhood?
 - a. Why are there permanent beat assignments/ neighborhood officers?
 - b. How many are there for this neighborhood?
 - c. What are your perceptions of permanent beat assignments?

13. What are some community policing initiatives currently in place?
 - a. What are their main objectives?

14. How would you describe the community policing programs/ initiatives in place today?
 - a. How would you describe them in comparison to early in your career (first 2-3 years)?
How many community policing programs initiatives does this neighborhood currently have in place?
 - b. How would you describe community policing (as a whole) today in comparison to early in your career (first 2-3 years)?
 - c. How many community policing programs/initiatives were in place early in your career (first 2-3 years)?

15. How would you describe the community involvement with community policing?
 - a. Is it important to the successful implementation of programs?
 - b. How would you describe the community involvement in this neighborhood?
 - c. What factors affect community participation?
 - d. How would you describe the community involvement today compared to earlier in your career (first 2-3 years)?

16. Do all neighborhoods in Ottawa have the same community policing initiatives/programs?
 - a. Which ones are common across all neighborhoods?
 - b. Why do you think this is?
 - c. Why aren't all community policing initiatives the same across neighborhoods?
 - d. According to the literature on community policing, programs should be based on community/ neighborhood needs. Do you think Ottawa Police adheres to this aspect of the literature?

17. What are your views of community policing?

18. How would you describe the importance of community policing today in comparison to early in your career (first 2-3 years)?

- a. Do you think there has been organizational change by the Ottawa Police in adopting a community-based policing strategy?
 - i. How so?
 - b. Do you think community policing has become part of mainstream policing?
 - c. Do you think community policing is a supplementary program to regular policing activities?
19. How would you describe the nature of the changes in policing over your career?
 - i. In terms of the degree or amount of community policing?
20. Have any community policing initiatives/programs been abandoned over the years?
 - a. Which ones?
 - b. Why?
21. How would you describe the community involvement in this community?
 - i. Does having a community/neighborhood association have any effect on neighborhood participation?
22. How would you describe community/neighborhood involvement at police/community meetings?
 - a. Are certain demographics represented more than others?
 - b. Are all perspectives represented at these meetings?

Appendix C – Observation Grid

Criterion	Notes of Evidence
<i>Observable Criteria for level of Organization of Community</i>	
1. Community organization exists	
2. Organization of the meeting room - Conducive to communication	
3. Appropriateness of Meeting facility	
4. Meeting run by a community member/leader	
17. Attendance - Number of people present - Number of people who speak	
6. The existence of a meeting agenda	
7. Everyone is given a chance to speak	
8. People do not interrupt each other	
9. Number of supporting agencies present (e.g. police, elected officials etc)	
10. Number of issues addressed at the meeting	
11. Degree of progress from one issue to the next	

<i>Observable Criteria for Role of Police</i>	
1. Number of Police Officers present	
2. Number of Uniformed Police Officers	
3. Seating location of police officers - Front, audience, off to the side etc.	
4. Number times police officers speak at meetings	
5. Context in which they speak (are they asked questions vs. jumping in to offer their opinion)	
6. Do the police lead the meetings or are they a supporting party?	
7. Amount of time police officers take up speaking	
8. Police officer demeanor	
9. Manner with which they speak to the public (condescending vs. friendly)	
Issues Discussed	

Appendix D- Coding Scheme

Concept	Indicators
1. Community Policing	
a. Organizational Components	<p>The interviewee/website discusses and/or there are indications of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased autonomy of individual officers - Decentralization of police services including community policing centres (objectives, perceptions etc), the police or more specifically community officers (role in the community, role in meetings, perceptions of police, perceptions of leadership, objectives) - Non-traditional performance measures (community surveys, community meetings)
b. Philosophical Components	<p>The interviewee/website discusses and/or there are indications of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reducing disorder in the community - Decreasing fear of crime - Community problem-solving (includes the community identifying their needs/priorities and working in partnership with the community to solve problems) - Increased attention to needs of victims - Proactive approach (prevention)
c. Tactical Components	<p>The Interviewee/website discusses and/or there are indications of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Foot patrol (including perceptions and objectives) - Bike patrol (including perceptions and

objectives)

- **Community** (including the importance of community organization, the importance of involvement, hindrances to involvement the importance of interaction/visibility and the roles, perceptions, objectives and opportunities to express oneself at meetings, frequency of meetings and the representativeness of the population)
- **Accountability** (including keeping the public informed and allowing them to identify needs through meetings/consultations and shared accountability/ownership)
- **Permanent beat assignments/neighborhood officers** (including perceptions and objectives)
- **Alternatives to law enforcement** (including the responsibility, role, perceptions, programs and objectives of crime prevention)

d. Mainstream

The interviewee/website discusses and/or there are indications of:

- The whether or not community policing is mainstream.
- For the specific interview question this will be a bivariate (yes/no).

e. Supplemental

The interviewee/website discusses and/or there are indications of:

- The whether or not community policing is mainstream.
- For the specific interview question this will be a bivariate (yes/no).

f. Objectives

The interviewee/website discusses and/or there are indications of:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased legitimacy - Increased accountability - Increased efficiency - Increased effectiveness - Reduce fear/ increase public safety - Increased job satisfaction - Information gathering
--	---

g. Perceptions of Community Policing

The interviewee/website discusses and/or there are indications of perceptions of:

- Effectiveness
- Progress
- Relationship with community/police
- Programs
- Objectives
- Necessity
- Importance
- Terminology

h. Interpretations of Community Policing	<p>The interviewee/website discusses and/or there are indications of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community policing as a form of control (including governance/risk communication) - Community policing as a philosophy (including organizational change) - Community policing a program (very specific set of programs) - Community policing as imprecise (no clear definition or consensus on what it consists of) - Community policing as rhetoric (no
---	--

real changes have occurred)

- A form of cost-cutting or monetary reasons.

Appendix E – Consent Form

Title of the Study

Community policing in the 21st Century, the case of the Ottawa Police Service

I am asked to participate in a research study conducted by Zachary Dagg (supervised by Dr. Ronald-Frans Melchers) from the Department of Criminology at the University of Ottawa. The results will contribute to the master's thesis of Zachary Dagg.

If I have any question or concerns about the research, I may feel free to contact Dr. Ronald-Frans Melchers at:

The purpose of this study is to determine which community policing initiatives that have taken root in Ottawa and which have withered over time (and why), and the study is designed to assess the degree to which community policing in Ottawa is being implemented according to the literature/theory of community policing.

Participations Procedures

I am invited to:

- Participate in one face-to-face interview lasting approximately 45- 60 minutes. I will be asked for my opinions, perceptions of and experiences with community policing in Ottawa. The interview will be conducted at an agreed upon time and place that is most convenient for me. The data collected in this study may be used for related research purposes by the same researcher or his supervisor.
- The results and publications will be available upon request at the completion of the study. Request should be sent to:

- There are no foreseeable **risks** to participation in this study. I should not expect any risks or discomfort (physical, psychological, emotional, financial and/or social).
- This research has three **objectives**. The first objective of this research is to determine which community policing initiatives have taken root in Ottawa. The second objective of this research is to determine which community policing initiatives have withered with time. The third objective is to gain some insight as to why certain community policing initiatives have withered with time. Participation in this research will create knowledge for researchers and police agencies on how to improve their services to the public.
- I have received assurance from the researcher that the information they will share will remain strictly **confidential**. I acknowledge and understand that the researcher's supervisor will also have access to the data. I understand that the contents will be used only for the purposes of completion of a Master's Thesis and related publishing. Confidentiality will be protected as no one will know that I have participated in this research. Participants understand that only the researcher will conduct the interview and, only the researcher and supervisor will have access to the data. The data from the interview will be coded by a number and participant names will not appear in the interview. **Anonymity** will be protected in that my name or any information pertaining to my identity will not be disclosed in this research if I am a private citizen. If quoted in the results I will be referred to by a pseudonym and/or group membership. Anonymity cannot be guaranteed for public figures and/or people who hold a vocational position within the organization of interest.
- The **data collected** (e.g. interview transcripts, tape-recordings, written notes) will be kept secure. The data will be stored under lock and key in the supervisor's office in which only the researcher and the supervisor will have access to. Any electronic data will be stored on the researcher's laptop protected by a password. This data will be conserved for 3 years after which it will be destroyed (shredded and deleted).
- I am under no obligation to participate and if I choose to participate, I can **withdraw** from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences. If I choose to withdraw, all data gathered until the time of withdrawal will be destroyed.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this interview is anonymous.

I can choose to participate in this study or not. If I volunteer to be in this study, I may withdraw at any time or refuse to answer any questions. I may also refuse to answer any questions and still remain in the study.

If I have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, Tabaret Hall, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 159, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5

Tel.: (613) 562-5841

Email: ethics@uottawa.ca

There are two copies of the consent form, one of which is mine to keep.

Participant's Signature:

Date:

Researchers Signature:

Date:

Appendix F - Letter of Information

Title of the Study

Community policing in the 21st century, the case of the Ottawa Police Service

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by Zachary Dagg (supervised by Dr. Ronald-Frans Melchers) from the Department of Criminology at the University of Ottawa. The results will contribute to the master's thesis of Zachary Dagg.

If you have any question or concerns about the research, please feel free to contact Dr. Ronald-Frans Melchers at:

The purpose of this study is to determine which community policing initiatives that have taken root in Ottawa and which have withered over time, and the study is designed to assess the degree to which community policing in Ottawa is being implemented according to the literature/theory of community policing.

Participations Procedures

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to:

- Participate in one face-to-face interview lasting approximately 45- 60 minutes. You will be asked for your opinions, perceptions of and experiences with community policing in Ottawa. This interview will be conducted at a time and place that is most convenient for you. The data collected in this study may be used for related research purposes by the same researcher or his supervisor.

- The research results and publications will be available upon request at the completion of the study. Request should be sent to:
- There are not foreseeable **risks** to participation in this study. Participants should not expect any risks or discomfort (physical, psychological, emotional, financial and/or social).
- This research has three **objectives**. The first objective of this research is to determine which community policing initiatives have taken root in Ottawa. The second objective of this research is to determine which community policing initiatives have withered with time. The third objective is to gain some insight as to why certain community policing initiatives have withered with time. Participation in this research will create knowledge for researchers and police agencies on how to improve their services to the public.
- Participants have received assurance from the researcher that any information shared will remain strictly **confidential**. Participants acknowledge and understand that the researcher's supervisor may also have access to the data. Participants understand that the contents will be used only for the completion of a Master's Thesis and related publishing. Participant confidentiality will be protected as no one will know that I have participated in this research. Participants understand that only the researcher will conduct interviews and, only the researcher and supervisor may access the data. The data from the interview will be coded number and participant names will not be associated directly to the interview or its transcripts. Participant **anonymity** will be protected in that their name or any information pertaining to their identity will not be disclosed to anybody or than the researcher and his supervisor if they are private citizens. Participants will be referred to by a pseudonym and/or group membership in the results. Anonymity cannot be guaranteed for public figures and/or people who hold a vocational position within the organization of interest.
- The **data collected** (e.g. interview transcripts, tape-recordings, written notes) will be kept secure. The data will be stored under lock and key in the supervisor's office in which only the researcher and the supervisor will have access to. Any electronic data will be stored on the researcher's laptop protected by a password. This data will be conserved for 3 years after which it will be destroyed (shredded and deleted).
- Participants are under no obligation to participate and if they choose to participate, they can **withdraw** from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences. If they choose to withdraw, all data gathered until the time of withdrawal will be destroyed.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this interview is anonymous.

You can choose to participate in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time or refuse to answer any questions. You may also refuse to answer any questions and still remain in the study.

If you have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, Tabaret Hall, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 159, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5

Tel.: (613) 562-5841

Email: ethics@uottawa.ca

Appendix G – Request for Permission to Observe

Title of the study: Community policing in the 21st Century, the case of the Ottawa Police Service

I am asked to participate in a research study conducted by Zachary Dagg (supervised by Dr. Ronald-Frans Melchers) from the Department of Criminology at the University of Ottawa. The results will contribute to the master's thesis of Zachary Dagg.

If I have any question or concerns about the research, I may feel free to contact Ronald- Frans Melchers at:

Participations Procedures

If you accept to be observed in this study, we would ask that you:

- Grant Zachary Dagg access to public or private community meetings for the purposes of direct observations. The researcher will remain unobtrusive and will not participate in the meeting in any way, he is simply there to observe and take notes. The meeting will be recorded for accuracy in transcription.
- The research results and publications will be available upon request at the completion of the study. Request should be sent to:
- There are no foreseeable **risks** to participation in this study. Participants should not expect any risks or discomfort (physical, psychological, emotional, financial and/or social).
- This research has three **objectives**. The first objective of this research is to determine which community policing initiatives have taken root in Ottawa. The second objective of this research is to determine which community policing initiatives have withered with

time. The third objective is to gain some insight as to why certain community policing initiatives of the past have withered with time. Participation in this research will create knowledge for researchers and police agencies on how to improve their services to the public.

- Participants (group members) have received assurance from the researchers that the information they will share will remain strictly **confidential**. Group members acknowledge and understand that the researcher's supervisor will also have access to the data. The contents will be used only for the purposes of completion of a Master's Thesis and related publishing. Confidentiality will be protected as no one will know that I have participated in this research. Only the researcher will conduct the interview and, only the researcher and supervisor will have access to the data. Anonymity will be protected in that names or any information pertaining to identity will not be disclosed in this research. Participants will be referred to by a pseudonym and/or group membership only in the results. The group name may be used but the location of the meetings will not be disclosed in any publication.
- The **data collected** (e.g. interview transcripts, tape-recordings, written notes) from the meeting(s) will be kept secure. The data will be stored under lock and key in the supervisor's office in which only the researcher and the supervisor will have access to. Any electronic data will be stored on the researcher's laptop protected by a password. This data will be conserved for 3 years after which it will be destroyed (shredded and/or deleted).
- Participants (group members) are under no obligation to participate and if they choose to participate, they can **withdraw** from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions, without suffering any negative consequences. An announcement prior to the commencement of the meeting will be made to ensure that all participants are aware of the presence and intentions of the researcher. If individual group members do not wish to participate they can leave the meeting or simply limit their participation. If they choose to withdraw, all data gathered until the time of withdrawal will be destroyed.

Any information that is obtained in connection with this interview is anonymous.

You can choose to participate in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time.

Acceptance: I, _____, on behalf of _____(community group) agree to letting the researcher and / or his supervisor attend the community meetings.

If I have any questions about the study, I may contact the researcher or his supervisor.

If I have any questions regarding the ethical conduct of this study, I may contact the Protocol Officer for Ethics in Research, University of Ottawa, Tabaret Hall, 550 Cumberland Street, Room 159, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5

Tel.: (613) 562-5841

Email: ethics@uottawa.ca

There are two copies of the consent form, one of which is mine to keep.

Participant's signature: *(Organizational Leader)* Date: *(Date)*

Researcher's signature: *(Researcher)* Date: *(Date)*