

8**CHAPTER**

Poor Police–Community Relations

Introduction

There are many reasons why the police have difficult interactions with the communities they are supposed to “serve and protect.” Many of these stem from the fact that overall, police departments have contrasting “perspectives, poor communications, and concerns about the nature of social control in a free society” (Radalet and Carter, 1994, p. 7).

The police deal with the community on several levels: individually, as a group/organization, and as political actors. When it appears that law enforcement represents the interests of the communities in which they police, there is general harmony. When police are out of sync with these sentiments, there is discontent and dissention. Also, keep in mind that “Different community groups view the police differently and have varying notions of the priorities and objectives of law enforcement and criminal justice” (Cordner and Scarborough, 2007: 10). Also, difficulty at one level of the interaction can have repercussions at another.

This chapter defines police–community relations; distinguishes it from public relations, community service, and community participation; reviews the history of improving police–community relations; and then analyzes the strategies of community policing and problem-solving policing. The remaining portion examines how community policing can be easily misused and what to do to put it back on course.

Definitional Issues

There are a considerable number of definitions for police–community relations. Nevertheless, this term generally refers to the sum total of attitudes and behaviors between police and the communities they serve. They can range from positive to negative in general or with respect to particular things police do. One of the ways that police–community relations has been understood (and defined) is by seeing it as part of a tripod, including public relations, community service, and community participation (Radalet and Carter, 1994). Taken as a whole this conceptualization makes sense.

However, if one of these component parts is all there is, police–community relations can be quite problematic.

Public Relations

Many times police–community relations is primarily the practice of public relations, which is a collection of communication techniques used by individuals or organizations to convince an audience about the merits of an idea, organization, program, practice, or policy. Public relations tries to convince an audience based on appeals to reason. Despite what might appear to be an innocuous kind of communication, the public relations process tends to be one way—from the police department to citizens. And if the community is consulted, sometimes only selected constituencies’ ideas or preferences are taken into account (i.e., addressed), thus upsetting those who were ignored and/or left out.

The problem here is that “what a police department views as good for the department may not necessarily be good for the community; or it may be good only for that part of the community to whom the police are particularly responsive and not for other parts” (Radalet and Carter, 1994, p. 31).

Community Service

Alternatively, community service refers to the activities whereby police engage in prosocial activities to enhance the well-being of the community beyond law enforcement and order maintenance. Examples include running a Police Athletic League or night basketball league. Community service can provide a public relations benefit. Frequently the words and expressions *public relations* and *community relations* are used interchangeably. But in reality, there is a difference between the two. Although public relations was defined earlier in this book, a community relations program is best seen as “a long-range, full scale effort to acquaint the police and the community with each other’s problems and to stimulate action aimed at solving those problems” (Radalet and Carter, 1994, p. 31).

Community Participation

Finally, community participation involves members of the community taking an active role in trying to genuinely help the police. “It is the widely used social work concept of community organization, with particular attention to the pivotal responsibility of the police and other criminal justice agencies” (Radalet and Carter, 1994, p. 34).

In the end police–community relations is a process where the entire police department (not a specialized unit) is engaged with the communities they serve in order to make it a safe and better place to live (Radalet and Carter, 1994, p. 32).

Importance of Police–Community Relations

When there is good police–community relations, police have a better understanding of the public’s concerns (especially those that are crime related), and citizens are more inclined to report crimes that occur to the police, provide tips/intelligence to law enforcement, willingly serve as witnesses, and are happy to participate in jury trials. By extension, police also become more proactive, thereby preventing crimes before they occur or minimizing their impact, instead of simply reacting to calls for service. Good police–community relations prevent the possibility that the public thinks that police are simply a mechanism for intelligence collection.

When there are poor police–community relations, the police typically lack a basic understanding of community problems, goals, and desires, and the community, particularly those citizens who are experiencing high rates of crime, poverty, and homelessness, perceive police as an occupying and out-of-touch force that does more harm than good. In these situations, police departments primarily assume a reactive mode of response to community problems.

In sum, police–community relations refers to the ongoing and changing relationship between the police and the communities they serve. This includes issues of cooperation, race relations, fear of police, violence, and corruption.

Emergence of the Problem of Poor Police–Community Relations

The notion of police–community relations derives from Sir Robert Peel’s principles of law enforcement. As you may recall, before the creation of the first modern police department, it was the duty of every able-bodied person to take their turn at the watch, thereby contribute to the policing of their community. If there was a threat to the community, the night watch would raise a hue and cry. This would wake up the community, and its citizens would collectively repel an attack from wild animals or intruders, help put out a fire, and so on. Why did this break down?

Early History of Police–Community Relations

Developments during the early part of the 20th century (e.g., the advent of motorized vehicles, the development of more efficient mass transportation systems, police officers not living in the same jurisdiction in which they patrolled) led to a breakdown in police–community relations. In short, there are numerous reasons for poor police community relations. These can include:

- Socialization of children by parents to fear/distrust the police
- Hostility toward the police

- Confidence in police ability has decreased
- Less contact by police with citizens
- Bad cops (rude, corrupt, violent)
- Some veteran officers would rather not deal with the community
- Police are not the best communicators
- Police and citizens have different perspectives on how crime is caused and how to respond to it.

These factors in whole or in part prompted police reformers to search for appropriate solutions. One of the more notable was the integration of the human relations movement into law enforcement. The human relations movement and some astute police executives believed that police had to move beyond simply being responsible for enforcing the law and actually connect with the communities they policed (Radalet and Carter, 1994, p. 23). Some of the initial attempts to increase awareness and techniques of police–community relations were started with the introduction of human relations training into police training academies (Radalet and Carter, 1994; Bayley and Mendelsohn, 1969). Human relations consisted of a series of techniques to both better understand how individuals behaved in groups and to improve their productivity and cooperation in organizational contexts.

After World War II, there was a fledgling interest in human relations training for police officers and the communities they policed (Radalet and Carter, 1994, p. 23). Police administrators interested in having their departments improve interactions with the communities they police occasionally sent officers to summer workshops that were led by organizations such as the National Conference of Christians and Jews (NCCJ). “A few police officers enrolled in these workshops as early as 1947, seeking help in understanding human relations or in setting up departmental training programs on the subject” (Radalet and Carter, 1994, p. 23). In 1954, in Philadelphia, the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the National Association of Intergroup Relations Officials sponsored a two-day conference for police executives and other professionals involved in human relations.

The National Institute on Police and Community Relations

In 1955, based on the relative success of these initiatives, through the combined efforts of the NCCJ and the Michigan State University (MSU) School of Police Administration and Public Safety, the National Institute on Police and Community Relations (NIPCR) was formed. The NIPCR’s training involved workshops and/or institutes. “The institute, a five-day conference, proved to be so popular that it was repeated each May until 1970. It brought together teams of police officers and other community leaders to discuss common problems and to develop leadership for similar programs at the local or state levels” (Radalet and Carter, 1994, p. 24).

The police–community relations programs during the 1950s and 1960s were useful in articulating the contours of the field. They also “encouraged a teamwork or interprofessional approach to problems of police–community relations, by using a kind of laboratory method that brought together citizens of widely diversified community interests and the police and other criminal justice people to discuss problems of common interest [and] promoted the idea of police–community relations program development on a national scale” (Radalet and Carter, 1994, pp. 25–26).

In 1961, through financial support from the Field Foundation, the School of Police Administration and Public Safety at MSU conducted a national survey of 168 law enforcement agencies that supported establishment of a National Center on Police and Community Relations. The center opened on the Michigan State campus in August 1965 with further financial assistance from the Field Foundation, the United States Commission on Civil Rights, and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Moreover, a handful of Jewish organizations (e.g., Anti-Defamation League of the B’nai Brith) and prominent African-American organizations (e.g., National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) also encouraged this kind of program (Radalet and Carter, p. 27).

Post-Riot Phase: 1969–1994

During the 1960s race riots and student demonstrations in the United States called into question the efforts that were initiated in the field of police–community relations during the previous decade (Radalet and Carter, 1994, p. 27; Bayley and Mendelsohn, 1969). “Traditional patterns of community organization (block committees, precinct councils, and so on) were evidently not doing the job; many police officers and others began to express skepticism about whether it was ‘worth the effort’ and to ask ‘What have we done wrong?’” (Radalet and Carter, 1994, pp. 27–28).

Why had many of the police–community relations programs not done the job? One of the reasons why is because proper (i.e., rigorous and scientific) evaluations had not been conducted. “In fact, there was even some resistance to such research by eager program developers who preferred not to be reminded that the attitudes of many people were not being changed and that many people were not being reached . . . [and there was] little or no progress in solving basic societal problems that vitally affect police–community relations” (Radalet and Carter, 1994, p. 28). This, however, did not stop the creation of new police–community relations programs in selected jurisdictions between the years 1967 and 1973. Although many of these programs focused mainly on public relations, a few government-funded programs did offer innovative features.

For reasons that are not completely known, in 1969 the National Institute on Police and Community Relations was closed. Since then most of the police–community relations programs changed to “community-based crime prevention efforts” (Radalet and Carter, 1994, p. 30). This was largely

stimulated by the public concern over “predatory crime, with acknowledgement of the necessity for police–community cooperation to achieve anything significant in preventing crime” (p. 30).

Problem-Oriented Policing (POP)

In 1979, law professor Herman Goldstein published a seminal article on problem-oriented policing. Goldstein argued that police need to look at crime more proactively and try to find solutions that address the underlying causes of crime.

How does one go about doing problem-oriented policing? In short, the community, in cooperation with the police department, identifies issues that need to be fixed that are within the realm of the law enforcement agency’s mandate. In an effort to improve this process, Piquero and Piquero (2001) developed a schema to identify and solve problems encountered by police departments. Much like all new kinds of policies, there are problems with obtaining appropriate resources and resistance to change in most departments. Overall, although crime rates do not appear to have changed much, police officers reported more job satisfaction with problem-oriented policing.

One of the most important techniques used in POP is SARA, an acronym for scanning, analysis, response, and assessment. Swanson, Territo, and Taylor (2008) define those four elements as follows:

- *Scanning*—“officers are encouraged to group individual related incidents that come to their attention as ‘problems’ and define these problems in more precise and useful terms.”
- *Analysis*—“officers working on a well-defined problem then collect information from a variety of public and private sources, not just traditional police data, such as criminal records and past offense reports.”
- *Response*—“the knowledge gained in the analysis stage is then used to develop and implement solutions. Officers seek the assistance of [a broad array of constituencies] who can help develop a program of action. Solutions may go well beyond traditional police responses to include other community agencies and/or municipal organizations.”
- *Assessment*—“officers evaluate the impact and the effectiveness of their responses. Were the original problems actually solved or alleviated? They may use the results to revise a response, to collect more data, or even to redefine the problem.” (pp. 40–41)

Problem-oriented policing has been implemented in numerous jurisdictions, and empirical research indicates that it has been relatively successful (e.g., Eck and Spellman, 1987; Green-Mazerolle and Terrill, 1997; Kennedy, 1997; White, Fyfe, Campbell, and Goldkamp, 2003). Nevertheless, there are significant shortcomings with this technique.

Because police departments may interpret problem-oriented policing as a passing fad, they may not embrace the philosophy and the practices and thus do not significantly invest organizational resources in properly implementing it. Moreover, “The police culture is notoriously resistant to change, and problem-oriented policing represents a significant and fundamental shift in the police paradigm. Others have argued that the typical rank and file officer does not have the necessary skill-set to engage in the problem solving process” (White, 2007, pp. 101–102). White continues:

Experts recognize that the problem-solving process may produce solutions that are not necessarily transferable to other problems and other jurisdictions (Reitzel et al., 2005). In fact, a central element of problem-oriented policing is that the problem-solving process should produce a solution that is specifically tailored to the identified problem and underlying condition. (pp. 97–98)

In addition, relatively recent research on the San Diego Police Department (Cordner and Biebel, 2005) suggests that even in law enforcement agencies that have gained a considerable amount of exposure to the POP model, it may not be implemented entirely and in the same way throughout the entire rank and file, and officers may be experiencing fatigue over its use.

Problem-oriented policing experts suggest that law enforcement agencies keep good records on the situations in which they intervene and the strategies that worked and ones that failed. This will become an important part of institutional knowledge that other officers and police management can draw on in the future.

Solutions: Community Policing and Problem-Oriented Policing¹

An outgrowth of problem-oriented policing was community-oriented policing, or community policing for short. This practice involves a cooperative effort between police and the communities they serve where both work together to solve crime and crime-related problems. It also includes a series of strategies that bring the police closer to the community to reduce and solve crime and crime-related problems. Community policing is often defined by the programs it subsumes, including bike patrol; kobans; storefront or mini police stations; problem-oriented policing, “Policing by Objectives”; neighborhood meetings with the police; crime prevention programs; foot patrol by beat cops; and police getting more involved in community activities. In 1994 Congress passed the Crime Bill. Not only did it establish the Office of Community Policing as a part of the Department of Justice, but it provided funds to eligible law enforcement agencies to hire 10,000 new police officers who would be doing community policing. It also provided funding for research on community policing.

Over the past two decades, no self-respecting chief or commissioner of police will admit to not having community policing. There are many

reasons for this. Community policing is good public relations. It could reduce the number and kind of stereotypes both the public and the police have of each other. And it could open up more channels of communication.

Nevertheless, two important evaluations of community policing have occurred. First, Skogan and Harnett (1997) evaluated the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS). This program, initiated by the Chicago Police Department, was implemented over a five year period. The evaluation was done on five districts. The program had a number of objectives. “Through regular meetings between police and citizens, a wide range of problems were identified. Drug dealing was the most commonly cited problem, but many of the other most prominent issues involved disorder-type problems . . . Based on the issues that arose in specific neighborhoods, police and residents engaged in a multitude of approaches to alleviate the problems” (White, 2007, pp. 109–110).

Predictably, the measures were mixed. “Some goals were achieved while others were not. Importantly, in the evaluated districts there was less crime, less fear of crime, less gang activity, and more positive attitudes toward the police” (White, 2007, p. 110). There were some drawbacks, however, particularly that there was “the lack of citizen involvement in certain poor, high-crime areas. In particular, Latinos, low-income households, and those without high school diplomas were not engaged by the CAPS program” (p. 110).

Second, Cordner (2005) examined the practice in 60 police departments. He looked at seven basic elements. There appeared to be some decreases in crime, fear of crime, disorder, and calls for service, but these improvements were either mixed or not across the board. Similarly, there were some moderate improvements in community relations, police officer attitudes, and police officer behavior.

Adoption of community policing can backfire (Oliver and Meier, 2001) or be seen as increased surveillance of the poor by the police (Websdale, 2001). Even though community policing has a series of laudable goals, and in some contexts has solved a number of community problems, many police, academics, politicians, and community organizations have overstated the success of this approach. Moreover, there has been a disproportionate emphasis on public relations programs in support of community policing initiatives in lieu of implementing community policing as its originators (e.g., Goldstein, 1979) intended it to be (Manning, 1988; Klockars, 1988).

The remainder of this chapter reviews how community policing is too often implemented as a public relations tactic; outlines some of the effects of community policing as public relations; and suggests a number of strategies to minimize community policing as public relations in order to maximize what the framers of community policing conceived it to achieve.

Literature Review²

Without question, several academics (e.g., Alderson, 1979; Goldstein, 1987; Skolnick and Bayley, 1986, 1988), police professionals (e.g., Darryl

Stephens), and the federal government through the establishment of the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) (as a consequence of the 1994 Crime Bill) have advocated and facilitated community policing. Most of these political actors stress the prosocial goals and achievements of community policing.

At the same time, some individuals and organizations have difficulties with community policing as it currently exists and question both the assumptions for its implementation and the evidence marshaled to demonstrate the success of these types of initiatives. There are several general critiques (e.g., Manning, 1984, 1988; Smith, 1987; Weatheritt, 1988) and analyses of obstacles (Skolnick and Bayley, 1988) to community policing. More common are specific difficulties with respect to particular assumptions underlying the concept of community policing.

Conceptually, community policing has been criticized for being built upon fallacious assumptions about crime, criminals, and communities; definitional problems (Manning, 1984); and the variety of methods it entails (Eckblom and Heal, 1982).

Other problems with community policing include its inability to reduce crime and fear; poorly conceptualized evaluation studies; lack of transferability of community policing models from one setting to another; insensitivity to cultural differences among and inside advanced industrialized states; failure to build the partnership between the police and the community; poor response time to citizens and crime; police officers' negative view of community policing; emphasis on intelligence gathering rather than attempts to reach out to the community; increased politicization of the police; greater potential for police corruption; and the use of community policing as public relations (Weatheritt, 1983, 1988; Trojanowicz, Steele, and Trojanowicz, 1986; Morgan, 1987; Bayley, 1988; Klockars, 1988; Manning, 1988).

Although the literature makes a good case that community policing is a public relations technique, it does not outline strategies that academics, community activists, or well-informed and well-intentioned police officers and administrators can use to either stop or minimize the public relations aspect of community policing and redirect it into what it is supposed to accomplish.

The notion of community policing as public relations can be interpreted in three ways: the characterization of community policing as public relations, its causes, and effects. This section of the chapter is structured around these three processes and concludes with a series of recommendations for change (Ross, 1995b). The following are recommendations to control and change how community policing is implemented.

Overcoming Community Policing as Public Relations

A number of experts have offered suggestions on how to improve the implementation of community policing programs. Bayley (1988), for example, outlines four improvements, including systematically monitoring the effectiveness "of community policing as a crime-control strategy" (p. 236); giving

“an institution outside the police . . . the authority and capacity to determine whether community police operations conform to the rule of law” (pp. 236–237); improving the selection and training of police officers who will engage in community policing; and “develop[ing] the capacity to formulate and implement general policies of policing, calling on all resources both public and private so as to provide effective and equal protection to all segments of the population” (p. 237).

According to Manning (1984), “If a community police scheme is to be successful it will require: structural and legal change, changes in habits of dispute settlement and definition, in organizational structure, performance evaluation and in reward structures within the police” (p. 224). These suggestions are necessary to help community policing become a concrete reality, but are not in and of themselves sufficient. As formulated, these proposed changes do not minimize the problems and their unflattering effects on community policing.

Methods to Implement Change

Opinion leaders, academics, observers of the police, the media, community activists, and well-informed police officers and administrators should oppose the use of community policing for public relations purposes. This constituency can accomplish this task by persistently explaining the causes for and negative effects of using public relations techniques in lieu of implementing community policing and by suggesting alternative methods for improving implementation of this latest development in modern policing. Six basic interrelated strategies should be employed by those who may be called “devil’s advocates” of community policing to minimize its unnecessary public relations component. These interrelated methods are, from least to most important:

1. Refuse to be co-opted into public relations legitimating exercises.
2. Educate others.
3. Organize concerned community actors to influence the process of community policing.
4. Become knowledgeable on the subject.
5. Conduct research on community policing programs.
6. Assist the police in the implementation and evaluation of community policing.

These techniques are a handful of many possibilities that are limited only by our creativity and imagination. By becoming involved in community policing, its true advocates will develop a repertoire of experience from which to draw the best way to approach the police, government officials, media, and public in order to prevent uncritical acceptance of actual or postured community policing initiatives (see Exhibit 8.1).

Exhibit 8.1 “Stop Snitchin” and the Baltimore Police Department Response

In 2000, a controversial video entitled “Stop Snitchin,” which included shots of the back streets of Baltimore set to a hip-hop soundtrack, was surreptitiously shot and released. Eventually posted on the popular Web site www.youtube.com, it suggested that anyone who cooperates with local law enforcement in the prosecution of someone who has been charged criminally would be subjected to violence or even killed. It also mentioned that local police officers were corrupt. The DVD gained national attention because it featured Carmelo Anthony, a former Baltimore resident and well-known National Basketball Association player in one of the scenes.

This led to a considerable amount of media attention through cable television news personalities such as Fox National News’ Bill O’Reilly, who claimed the video was evidence of how morally decadent professional basketball, Baltimore, and, by extension, society was becoming. As a way to address the negative public relations storm, selected members of the Baltimore Police Department decided to create a counter-video entitled “Keep Talking,” along with a t-shirt bearing a specially designed logo. This was not the first time that police departments (or other state-run agencies, such as the military) have used the Internet and popular music to get their message out and create the impression that they are hip and in touch with the community. Having a band composed of police officers playing contemporary music to reach out to the community is perceived by many police departments to be good public relations.

Conclusion

Community policing, like majority rule or equal rights, is perceived by many to be a widely accepted and/or sacred institution. Challenging community policing is not welcomed by most police administrators, politicians, or citizens who have championed its implementation. The actions of advocates for true and effective community policing may well be interpreted as counter-productive. Criticisms against the implementation, methods, and effectiveness of community policing as it is commonly perceived will be interpreted as an attack against its goals and the core values and assumptions of the processes (e.g., Klockars, 1988). However, the drawbacks of using community policing as public relations is far more damaging to a city and its police force than being branded as unsympathetic to this change in policing. In sum, it is preferable to be an informed realist rather than a naive idealist.

In many respects community policing is a thing of the past. It has been replaced by CompStat (a relatively new management technique that includes weekly meetings of senior police personnel, especially the chief/commissioner and district commanders, to review crime that has occurred in their sector/district/borough in order to monitor their responses and to reduce crime in those areas) and by the pressing concerns of the possibility of terrorism in the wake of 9/11. More will be said about CompStat in chapter 12 and terrorism in chapter 18.

As we move into the post-9/11 era and with the current economic insecurity, almost all criminal justice budgets have been slashed and all “non-essential activities” are being cut. This includes community policing, which is mostly perceived as soft policing.

Notes

1. An earlier version of this section appeared as Ross (1995b).
2. This section builds on Ross (1995b).

Glossary

Chicago Alternative Police Strategy (CAPS): A well-funded and highly publicized and evaluated community policing initiative in Chicago that started in 1992.

Community-oriented policing: A cooperative effort between police and the communities they serve where both work together to solve crime and crime-related problems. Also, a series of strategies that bring the police closer to the community to reduce and solve crime and crime-related problems. It is often defined by the programs it subsumes, including bike patrol, kobans, storefront policing, and problem-oriented policing.

Community participation: When members of the community participate/help police in achieving their mission. Typically this goes beyond simply reporting crimes and serving as witnesses to crimes.

Co-optation: When an individual or group is forced to join the mission/support the mission of an individual or organization.

Crisis of legitimacy: When an individual or organization faces a situation in which its legitimacy is called into question.

Devil’s advocate: A person or group who calls into question the assumptions and evidence that organizations and individuals proffer as common or accepted knowledge.

Koban: A stand-alone, often portable, hut strategically placed in a jurisdiction where police officers can work. Typically, no more than two officers can comfortably work in this location. This concept originated in Japan and has had experimental use in selected jurisdictions in the United States.

National Institute on Police and Community Relations: Founded in 1955 at Michigan State University, this organization pioneered programs and research to improve relations between communities and police on a national basis.

Police–community relations: The ongoing and changing relationship between the police and the communities they serve. This includes issues of race relations, fear of police, violence, and corruption.

Proactive policing: When police act to prevent crime and other police-related concerns before they occur.

Problem-oriented policing: A process in which police and the community work together to understand the sources of crime or crime-related problems in their communities and come up with a plan they believe will systematically minimize or eliminate the causes.

Public Relations: Collection of communication techniques used by individuals or organizations to convince the public/news media about the merits of an organization, program, or policy. Primarily makes appeals based on reason.

Reactive policing: When police respond to crime (or calls for service) after it occurs.

SARA: an acronym for scanning, analysis, response, and assessment. Steps used in problem-oriented policing.

Chapter Questions

Part One: Multiple Choice Questions

1. In which way has police–community relations benefited the most through active problem-solving strategies?
 - a. public relations
 - b. neighborhood watch
 - c. community participation
 - d. community service
 - e. all of the above
2. Where was the National Institute on Police and Community Relations established?
 - a. John Jay College of Criminal Justice
 - b. Western Illinois University
 - c. Eastern Kentucky University
 - d. Michigan State University
 - e. Penn State University

3. Starting after WWII, which organization started offering classes in reducing tensions between elements of the African-American community and the police?
 - a. National Institute of Justice
 - b. National Conference on Christians and Jews
 - c. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
 - d. President's Commission on Law Enforcement
 - e. International Association of Chiefs of Police
4. Community policing and problem-oriented policing are:
 - a. the same thing
 - b. unrelated to each other
 - c. related techniques
 - d. both in danger of being simply public relations
 - e. none of the above
5. What is one of the biggest problems with community policing?
 - a. Too often it is simply public relations.
 - b. Rural police already do it.
 - c. There is no commonly accepted definition.
 - d. We do not know why police departments implement it.
 - e. It is too frequently confused with problem-oriented policing.
6. The history of community policing can be traced back to the principles written by
 - a. Chambliss
 - b. Manning
 - c. Peel
 - d. Sherman
 - e. Vold
7. Who is regarded as one of the most important theorists of community policing?
 - a. Brownstein
 - b. Goldstein
 - c. Reiss
 - d. Ross
 - e. Williams
8. Which organization did the 1994 crime bill establish?
 - a. OST
 - b. NIJ
 - c. COPS
 - d. Knapp Commission
 - e. National Institute on Police and Community

9. In advanced industrialized democracies, if the police ignored the public, the public would
 - a. report more crimes
 - b. not report crimes
 - c. not testify in court
 - d. both b and c
 - e. none of the above

Part Two: Short Answer Questions

1. What is the National Institute on Police and Community Relations?
2. What is a koban?
3. What are three reasons why good police–community relations are important?
4. What is meant by the expression “community policing is public relations”?
5. What is the difference between public relations and community relations in the context of police–community relations?
6. What is the difference between proactive and reactive policing?
7. What does the acronym SARA stand for?

Part Three: Essay Questions

1. What are three problems with community policing? How can we address these challenges?
2. What are the implications of community policing used disproportionately as public relations?
3. What are three realistic ways you could better interact with police in your neighbourhood that would have a positive effect on police–community relations?
4. Why is it difficult to improve police–community relations?

