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The purpose of this study was to evaluate community policing in "Small City," Iowa from the point of view of the citizenry and the police. There were four objectives in the study: (1) To examine the extent to which the COP philosophy is being implemented in Small City, (2) To see if COP is working in the minds of both the citizens and police officers, (3) To examine what influences citizen attitudes toward the police in general, and (4) To see if citizens view any additional benefits to COP (increased social capital and increased community involvement in areas besides crime reduction) besides COP's traditional benefits (crime and fear reduction). A variety of methods were utilized to meet the above objectives, including focus groups with neighborhood group members, interviews with police officers and a city official, and a mail survey of the general population of Small City. This study also utilized the criminal events perspective and the concept of social capital. Results show that COP in Small City is an addition to the existing structure rather than a city and department-wide philosophy. This has been exacerbated because the police department is under-funded and under-staffed, causing inter-departmental political turmoil. Because of these problems the experiences of respondents with COP have not always been positive. Attitudes toward the police in general are largely determined by actual contact with the police, perceptions of fear and perceptions of
neighborhood livability, and contextual factors such as age, sex, race, and home ownership status. It is possible that COP could work in Small City because of neighborhood organizing and other network building between neighborhood groups and public agencies, increased social capital within and between neighborhood groups and public agencies other than the police department, and overwhelming citizen support for COP. However, there are many barriers preventing such success. These barriers include small levels of consistent citizen involvement, a lack of all neighborhoods being organized, a lack of resources for the police which causes animosity among officers and other inter-organizational problems, and a lack of genuine communication and trust between the citizenry and the police.
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Community policing (COP) is very popular in government and law enforcement circles. The move toward COP across the country has been sparked by increased media coverage of COP success stories, increased awareness of the political and public relations benefits of COP, and the broader movement to reinvent government. This move has also been assisted by recent federal legislation that encourages local police departments to enact COP (Maguire et al 1997). Even though COP is very popular, there are problems defining what actually entails COP. There are about as many conceptions of COP as there are police departments supposedly practicing it. There is also a dispute regarding the efficacy of COP to restore order, reduce fear, and reduce crime in a civil manner.

Many studies have been conducted on public attitudes toward the police and police attitudes toward COP. However, studies of both public and police attitudes toward COP in general and co-production in particular are extremely rare (Williams 1998). A majority of the studies on the effects of community policing have been based in major cities such as Chicago, Illinois (Maguire et al 1997). Small mid-western cities with largely white populations have understandably not received as much research attention.

The general purpose of this study, therefore, is to evaluate COP in "Small City," Iowa from the point of view of the citizens and the police. This study will be conducted from
a sociological perspective, utilizing multiple methodologies. The incorporation of citizen and officer opinion, the utilization of both qualitative and quantitative methodologies, and the utilization of the social capital and criminal events perspectives in this study will bring a more comprehensive and sociological analysis to COP evaluations than we have often seen in the past.

In order to achieve the purpose of the study, there are four objectives: (1) To examine the extent to which the COP philosophy is being implemented in Small City, (2) To see if COP is working in the minds of both the citizens and police officers, (3) To examine what influences citizen attitudes toward the police in general, and (4) To see if citizens and the police see any additional benefits to COP (increased social capital and increased community involvement in areas besides crime reduction) besides COP's traditional benefits (crime and fear reduction).
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Citizen attitudes regarding the police

A number of individual level variables have been found to influence attitudes toward the police. However, their influence appears to be small, inconsistent, and with little direct effect (see Scaglion and Condon 1980). Thurman and Reisig (1996) found a small positive relationship between age and attitudes toward the police. Gender played an even smaller role, and socioeconomic status was found to be at best an inconsistent predictor (Thurman and Resig 1996). Earlier research found that while females, whites, and the elderly set the most rigorous police standards, males, minorities, and youth were most dissatisfied with police practices (Hadar and Snortom 1975).

Apparent differences in individual level variables are most likely confounded by differences in contextual variables (Decker 1981). Contextual variables that negatively affect favorable attitudes toward the police include lower perceived levels of police services and higher perceived levels of crime within a neighborhood, the experience of being a victim of a crime, having knowledge of a criminal victimization, and being fearful of victimization (Thurman and Reisig 1996).

There are community and neighborhood differences in attitudes regarding the police as well. Communities vary considerably in residents' expectations for police services,
especially if they are culturally distinct (Dunham and Alpert 1988: 505-6). Even though there is a strong consensus within neighborhoods regarding attitudes toward the police, there is variation between neighborhoods (Dunham and Alpert 1988).

Obviously, police behavior also influences citizen attitudes of police officers. The opinion that certain segments of the population will have negative opinions toward the police regardless of how patrol officers behave is false (Scaglion and Condon 1980: 493). Scaglion and Condon (1980) claim that the primary factor determining general satisfaction with the police and police service seems to be actual personal contact with specific police officers in a positive context (p. 493).

What the police can do to positively affect citizen attitudes toward the police

There are a host of things that police departments can do to improve citizen attitudes toward them and increase co-productive behavior. There are also a host of things that police departments have tried that do not seem to reach their intended effect. Police-community relations programs aimed at public education by emphasizing the positive side of the police role but lacking personal officer-citizen interaction are likely to have limited success (Scaglion and Condon 1980). It also appears that programs based on community policing where an officer is not acting in an official police context
would not alone build strong police-community relations or reduce hostilities toward the police (Scaglion and Condon 1980:492-3; Smith and Hawkins 1973). Programs designed to reduce citizen anxiety about crime do not guarantee an improved police image. Even if the police do improve their public image, it does not mean that people will be more likely to report victimization (Smith and Hawkins 1973). If actual victimization is reduced, it does not mean that attitudes toward the police will be more favorable either (Smith and Hawkins 1973).

The police may be much to blame for poor police-community relations. However, this problem is more easily rectified than previously thought (Smith and Hawkins 1973:148). In the effort to change citizen attitudes for the better, it has been argued that all police officers, not just special units, should be part of any changes. One must also keep in mind that an improvement of the police image for minority groups will require major structural changes within society as well as within the organization of the police (p. 148). Because neighborhoods can be culturally distinct, there is a need for differences in police practices by neighborhood (Dunham and Alpert 1988). "It is apparent that the police must accommodate not just one community but a whole range of demographic mini-communities, each with somewhat different expectations and reactions to police procedures" (Hadar and Snortom 1975:49).
Because the police need to discern the attitudes of residents in different neighborhoods, research is a necessary component for assessing and changing citizen attitudes toward the police. Limiting evaluation to crime statistics ignores and discounts many services that police departments provide which help to maintain order (Furstenberg and Wellford 1973). Including order maintenance tasks in the assessment of police performance and allowing citizens to participate in police evaluation might have a powerful impact on how the police deliver their services (pp. 394-5). It has been demonstrated that residents are willing to participate in evaluation. Using citizen surveys allows the police to look at trends and shifts in citizen reaction to the police, and would provide a continuous baseline for gauging the success of new policies and programs (p. 404-5). If interviews with citizens are being conducted, other citizens should be conducting the interviews, especially if minority group members are being interviewed (p. 405).

In general, broad based programs which bring together citizens and police officers acting in an official capacity seem to increase positive citizen attitudes toward police (Scaglion and Condon 1980). In order to reduce negative attitudes toward the police, the police must take greater care in their on-duty behavior, inform victims what will be done after the victim reports an incident, show courtesy and respect for victims, and act in a non-hostile manner while
making arrests (Smith and Hawkins 1973:147-8). Even though Smith and Hawkins (1973) found that fear reduction measures did not necessarily improve citizen attitudes of the police, Brown and Wycoff (1987) assessed which fear reduction strategies did work in Houston, Texas. Strategies in Houston included victim re-contact, newsletters, citizen contact patrol, having a police community station, and community organizing (pp. 75-8). Victim re-contact and victim newsletters did not have the desired effect of fear reduction, but citizen contact patrol and the presence of a community station were related to lower levels of fear of personal victimization, reduced perceptions of the amounts of personal and property crime in the area, and reduced perceptions of social disorder (p. 84). Citizen contact patrol and community station presence were also associated with greater satisfaction with the area as a place in which to live. However, African Americans and renters did not appear to have a share in the program benefits, and were not as likely as other respondents to know of the community station's existence (p. 84). The use of the community organizing response team was associated with reduced perceptions of social disorder and improved the evaluation of police services, but the program did not reduce fear, was very expensive, and was difficult to implement (p. 85).

The fear reduction campaign example shows that attitudes toward the police might improve when the police, acting in an
official capacity, work and interact with citizens. The example also shows that a police force needs to ensure that all citizens are included in the process. The things that help reduce negative attitudes toward the police are often considered as elements of the broad concept of community policing (COP), which will now be discussed in the next section.

Community policing

There are various reasons for the decrease in support for traditional policing strategies that are not based on COP. First of all, traditional strategies have a narrow "crime fighting" approach which focuses on arrests, crime rates, and response time. This strategy of placing officers at the front end of the criminal justice system reduced corruption and placed the police out of the political system, but the strategy has failed to the point that the police no longer believe they can do anything to reduce crime (Kelling and Coles 1996). In their summary of the problems with current strategies, Kelling and Coles (1996) also fault the 911 emergency system. They claim that 911 systems drain police resources from where they could be used to more effectively prevent crime. The system isolates police from neighborhoods, greatly reducing police-citizen interactions. The consequence of this isolation has brought about a siege mentality where an officer feels he or she must win each encounter. 911 is
reactive rather than proactive, and it is marketed so much that people often call the number for non-emergency reasons (Kelling and Coles 1996). Other problems associated with traditional policing strategies include the failure of interception patrol and motorized patrol as a deterrent, the treatment of officers as factory workers, and the development of a police culture that views citizens as an enemy rather than as a partner (Kelling and Coles 1996). Traditional policing, therefore, is not conducive to increased satisfaction with the police, nor is it conducive for a police/citizen partnership in reducing crime and disorder.

COP is a strategy that is supposed to end the above problems. It is partially based on the "broken windows" philosophy, which argues that attentiveness to minor crimes and disorder will lead to a decrease in more serious crimes (Wilson and Kelling 1982). Some fear that an emphasis on community policing reduces attention on serious index crimes, but it appears that curbing disorder does in fact reduce index crimes (Kelling and Coles 1996: 164). The COP strategy is also designed to enact the belief that the police should enhance public safety, manage disputes to everyone's satisfaction, reward police for diversified service, and hold police accountable to their citizenry (Pepinski 1991: 110). However, COP is not just a police strategy: the whole community enacts COP. In a nutshell, COP is a process in which the citizenry, the police, and other public and private sector
organizations work together to solve community defined crime related problems. The most effective basis of order and control in society is at the community level (Murphy 1988), and COP is designed to build community and democracy. "As community members gain power to interact and cooperate to meet one another's needs and concerns, this flow of current generates energy in the form of compassion, essentially the bond of interpersonal cohesion, which alone inhibits violence, including crime and retaliation for crime" (Pepinski 1991: 100).

Even though community policing is extremely popular, there are many different views as to what actually entails COP, demonstrating the need for conceptual and empirical elaboration (Murphy 1988). In one study, for example, almost half of the police chiefs and sheriffs were unclear about the practical meaning of community policing, and only the same amount agreed that implementation would require a sea change of organizational policies or goals (Travis 1995b: 1). Because of these problems it is necessary to define community policing here. The model of community policing offered here is one that encompasses many of the facets of COP that consistently appear in the literature. COP philosophy implementation in Small City will be compared with the model of COP offered below.

First, in COP, there is the commitment to a broad policing function that goes beyond simple crime fighting and
law enforcement. Police would also keep the peace and public order, protect constitutional liberties, ensure security, resolve conflicts, assist persons in danger, manage problems that endanger citizens, and respond to emergencies (Kelling and Coles 1996). This allows the police to be more proactive than reactive (Goldstien 1993). The police must also develop a department-wide set of values that would complement the commitment to a broad policing function. These values may include that police departments preserve and advance the principles of democracy, place its highest values on the preservation of human life, set crime prevention as its top priority, involve the community in the delivery of its services, believe that it must be accountable to the community it serves, commit to professionalism in all aspects of its operations, and maintain the highest standards of integrity (U.S. Department of Justice 1993: 2-4). These commitments would have to apply toward all citizens in the community the department serves. The establishment and enforcement of police guidelines can help ensure that these police values are carried out equitably, justly, and in a way that preserves public peace (Kelling and Coles 1996).

Second, the police rely on citizens in multiple senses. Police rely on citizens for the authority to police neighborhoods, for information about the nature of neighborhood problems, and for collaboration in solving problems with citizens (Kelling and Coles 1996). The police
and the community must be on good terms, and problem solving plans should be a collaborative effort. However, Kelling and Coles (1996) state that if a neighborhood is so far out of control that citizens cannot organize on their own behalf, police will need to take the lead, acting on behalf of citizens (p. 159). If the police do need to take the lead, however, they must make sure that they made the attempt to open channels of communication with the neighborhood, and are not reacting emotionally to a temporary crisis (see Department of Justice 1993: p. 18).

Third, the police engage in specific tactics to target specific problems that have been identified by the citizens of a neighborhood, the police, other public agencies, and the private sector (Kelling and Coles 1996). For example, a community may decide to concentrate on certain drug "hot spots" (Travis 1996). When Jersey City implemented such a program, calls for service (a key indicator of crime and disorder) from those areas and the areas surrounding them decreased. In Seattle, specific programs were implemented to lower criminal trespassing, drug trafficking, and graffiti, and to increase the "call out only" status of certain city pay phones to reduce drug deals (DeWitt 1992).

Specific problem solving makes use of proactive problem-solving models in order to construct crime prevention programs in collaboration with others. A popular four-step model is as follows: 1. Scanning (identify the problem), 2. Analysis
(study the problem and identify possible solutions), 3. Response (implement a custom-designed response), and 4. Assessment (evaluate the action taken) (Fleissner and Heinzelmann 1996: 2). The results of assessment can be used to revise responses, collect more data, or even redefine the problem (Spelman and Eck 1987). In this process, officers of all ranks from all units should be able to use the procedures as part of their daily routine. The system must encourage the use of a broad range of information not limited to conventional police data, encourage a broad range of solutions not limited to the criminal justice process, and must be one that any large police agency could apply (Spelman and Eck 1987: 4). The police would be a necessary but not sufficient part of this process. In this process the police may be enabled to take the lead in problem-solving, and police work of this kind can assist society in achieving the preconditions under which social justice can be developed (Kelling and Coles 1996).

Fourth, police departments are decentralized to the neighborhood level so that the police can more effectively deal with specific neighborhood problems. If authority is devolved to lower levels, the police agency overall will be more flexible, and the necessary input from line-level personnel will be more accessible (Birzer 1996). This decentralization, however, will require leadership and the willingness to change the current structure. In some
instances this will be difficult. Goldstein (1993) suggests that legislative steps such as offering early retirement to officers who resist change can be one way to solve that problem. Kelling and Coles (1996) emphasize the importance of bringing in new leadership to help ensure that changes are made correctly. Collaborative learning is also needed between different neighborhood officers through the discussion of successes and failures. Rather than seeing middle managers as an obstacle, one can tap into their potential for delegating authority for implementing community policing (Travis 1995c). Middle managers' bureaucratic skills will still be needed, but their duty would change from controlling lower ranking officers to coaching them. Well-trained and motivated officers would be delegated to lead at the neighborhood level (Goldstein 1993; Travis 1995c), and chiefs would work with middle managers to devise strategies and modify systems and procedures to support community policing (Travis 1995c).

Fifth, the police must work with the community and keep it informed through open channels of communication, and help develop a foundation of mutual trust and understanding (U.S. Dept. of Justice 1993: 18). The police should adopt a community-oriented attitude in every facet of their operations, and training must be in place to insure that all officers, veteran and recruit alike, are sensitive to the social and human relations problems that surface in the community (p. 18). Working with community groups and other
non-governmental organizations also allows the police to tap into community resources (p. 18). Instead of constantly fighting with civil liberties groups, police organizations should work with them in developing crime prevention plans and legislation (see Kelling and Coles 1996).

One way to realize a police-community partnership is to design a citizen's police academy (Cohn 1996). The basic purpose of such an academy is to increase mutual understanding through education. Participants engage in rides with police officers, and gain an overview of departmental organization, police selection and training, patrol procedures, law, vice and narcotics, domestic violence, police use of force, traffic stops, police stress, and crime prevention (p. 267). It appears that citizens who have participated in these academies gained more positive views of the police, and many stereotypes citizens held about the police were reduced. This would make the police-community partnership more stable and trusting. However, those who participate in the academy should have a genuine interest in crime reduction, and be a member of an organization which is dedicated to this type of effort. If follow-up activities are not planned, citizen interest may wane and the positive benefits may disappear (p. 271). One must also ensure that the police make an equal effort in learning from the citizens, especially from those citizens who reside in neglected neighborhoods. The police can conduct surveys for residents about crime problems, use neighborhood
substations to inform residents of high-crime areas and ways to improve them, and prepare educational materials on security and other related matters (Fleissner and Heinzelmann 1996).

Sixth, the police must also work with other public and private sector organizations, including other police departments and service delivery organizations. As with working with citizens in the community, there must be an attempt at opening lines of communication, trust-building, and resource sharing. For example, the police could work with architects and urban planners to help increase security (Fleissner and Heinzelmann 1996). Also, much more could be accomplished if police organizations did not compete with and hide information from each other.

Finally, continual evaluation is crucial to success. The collective evaluation of crime prevention strategies (mentioned above) is one obvious area. If a program is not working, steps should be taken to figure out why it is not working and how to improve or replace the program. We must also evaluate other issues, such as police discretion, organizational effectiveness, citizen assessment of police, and police opinions (Goldstein 1993; Travis 1995a).

As the roles of officers and supervisors change, so too must evaluation methods. Instead of basing evaluations on producing numbers every month, supervisors should evaluate officers primarily on their ability to assess and solve community problems, and their ability to remain in touch with
and communicate with citizens in the community (Birzer 1996: 9). Police officers that have been evaluated under this performance measurement process have been satisfied with the process and the recognition they received for their work (Wycoff and Oettmeier 1994).

These evaluations are so crucial because of the various problems that have emerged when police departments have tried to implement COP. Skogan (1995) has found challenges to both implementation and effectiveness. In some areas the rise in calls for service have increased too much. Mid-level managers may resent their loss of authority to lower ranking personnel. There is also the obvious problem of trying to restructure a police department. In many places COP seems to be limited to rhetoric. COP may also become too political, where the programs exclusively benefit suburbanites, and minorities get targeted and labeled as the problem (Skogan 1995). The National Institute of Justice has found similar problems, including officer resistance their new role because it is seen by the officers as impeding real crime fighting (Sadd and Grinc 1996). The police have also had difficulties working with other agencies and groups, resulting in the limited use of other public agencies. Champions of COP have also been criticized for exaggerating the limitations and failures of conventional policing, while at the same time offering a COP alternative which lacks an agreement on what constitutes its
central propositions, assumptions, and measurable objectives (see Murphy 1988).

In addition to the above problems, the problems associated with police discretion may actually increase after the implementation of COP if it is left unchecked (Skogan 1995). COP encourages increased discretion to enhance long term problem solving. However, as discretion increases, the risk that police officers will be swayed by extra-legal factors (suspect's race, sex, age, demeanor) will increase as well (Mastrofski 1996). Mastrofski and Uchida (1993) found that while officers with positive COP attitudes made fewer arrests than officers with negative COP attitudes, they were modestly influenced more by extra-legal factors. A primary concern, therefore, is that COP officers may be more willing to abuse their power based on these extra-legal factors and the "broken windows" philosophy. As Alexander Cockburn (1997) writes:

[In order to fix broken windows] prosecute turnstile jumpers vigorously, hound beggars, give graffiti artists a hard time and in many ways and diverse ways harass and terrorize the poor, thus fixing the 'window.' Apply this paradigm to the police. Maybe it starts with cops faking a reason to stop and search a car. Next we have them beating the suspect in the precinct and telling a novice cop to write up the report, describing how the suspect 'became violent and had to be subdued.' Thus the novice is integrated into the overall lawless police culture and is soon lying his head off in court. (p.9)

In other words, problems associated with police discretion and police brutality may not improve and in fact may become worse.
Despite the above problems, the future of community policing can be bright if it is implemented properly. Skogan (1995) notes that sticking to bureaucratic rules and making officers responsible for their assigned neighborhood areas can help control police abuses of power. It has also been noted that the critical literature has resulted in a more explicit discussion and debate about the practical and political assumptions and consequences of COP (Murphy 1988: 408). If citizens respond positively to new police actions, COP can be more than just rhetoric. It is also crucial that departments overcome officer resistance (Sadd and Grinc 1996). If COP is framed as a crime fighting philosophy ("fighting disorder reduces crime"), and ethically aggressive order maintenance is part of a community policing action plan, then the police will be more likely to support it (Kelling and Coles 1996).

Community policing must also be a city agency-wide phenomenon (Travis 1995a). The community must be involved in every aspect of the planning and evaluation process, because it is their demands that are being addressed.

The explanation of community policing above allows for increased citizen participation in crime prevention and can also be used to improve citizen attitudes toward the police. But even though the academic world may define community policing in the above manner, many police departments across the country, for a variety of reasons, do not adhere to this definition. The implications of this may include effects on
citizen satisfaction, citizen participation with the police, and co-production effectiveness.
CHAPTER 3: THE CRIMINAL EVENTS PERSPECTIVE AND SOCIAL CAPITAL

The criminal events perspective is one of the most significant contributions to the criminological literature in recent years. Most theories and perspectives of crime and deviance concentrate exclusively on either offenders, victims, or kinds of places. If crime is only understood in terms of the actions of criminal offenders, for example, "crimes represent little more than the enactment of the will of people who are motivated to behave criminally" (Sacco and Kennedy 1996: 49).

The criminal events perspective views crimes as social events with diverse character (Sacco and Kennedy 1996). The criminal event cannot be separated from the physical and social settings in which the event occurs (Miethe and Meier 1994). As Miethe and Meier (1994) argue, social explanations of crime require attention to offenders, victims, and the context in which criminal acts take place.

A criminal event occurs in three stages: precursors, transactions, and aftermath (Sacco and Kennedy 1996). Precursors relate to the way the people and the law in the community define acceptable behavior and morality. Precursors also includes the locational and situational factors that bring people together in time and space. Factors to be examined here are offender motivation, opportunity, assessment of deterrence, the victim's relationship to the offender and
the victim's vulnerability, and the role of third parties, including police and criminal justice response.

Understanding criminal events as deriving from predisposing conditions helps us to separate the social behavior that is criminogenic from that which is not. Studying the precursors of criminal events also allows us to see that, depending on circumstance, behavior that is defined or that evolves into criminality in one situation may not have the same consequences in other situations. The relationship between participants, the interpretation of the harmfulness of the acts, the anticipated responses to certain behavior, the nature of the location— all may or may not combine to create a criminal outcome. (pp. 72-74)

The transaction phase occurs at the actual time and location of the criminal offense. Factors examined in this stage include the offender's action in committing the crime, the victims actual harm and action taken to reduce the chance of further harm, and, if present, the action (or lack of action) that bystanders or police take in intervening or deterring the crime (p. 73). The aftermath is the social response to the criminal act. Factors examined here include any report to the police, their response, offender escape or apprehension and punishment, victim recovery from injury and fear, and the long-term consequences of the event in terms of public reactions and the changing of laws (pp. 72-73). In totality, therefore, the criminal act itself is but one part of a criminal event.

COP can be studied with the use of the criminal events perspective because the criminal events perspective provides a context in which COP can be evaluated (Grekul 1996). The
criminal events perspective takes a holistic view at studying the criminal event, and COP is a philosophy that takes a holistic approach at solving crime problems (Grekul 1996). In studying COP, the precursor stage of the criminal events perspective is the most relevant. COP is implemented to prevent crime before it starts, and recognizes that crime problems do not occur in a vacuum. Through co-production between citizens, the police, and other law enforcement agencies and groups, one hopes to reduce the motivation of potential criminals, make potential victims more guarded and less attractive as victims, and increase the actions of third parties (citizens, the police, etc.) to reduce crime. As community members become more active in crime prevention, acceptable behavior and morality may become more clearly defined. By attacking general disorder, locational and situational factors that bring people together in time and space may be safer and less attractive to potential criminals.

When citizens and police work together to reduce crime, one could argue that this is evidence of social capital. As a precursor, social capital could reduce the chances that crime will occur. To put it another way, the lower the amount of social capital in a neighborhood, the more crime ridden the neighborhood will be (Hagan 1999).

Like COP, social capital is under-theorized and often over-simplified (Foley and Edwards 1997a). Also, like COP, social capital is often seen as a "cure-all" for any social
problem (Portes 1998: 2). Bourdieu conducted the first systematic contemporary analysis of social capital, and, ironically, this analysis the most theoretically refined to date (Portes 1998: 3). In his work, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (1992) Bourdieu sees culture as a practice and a resource, largely through communication. He distinguishes between four types of capital: 1) Economic, 2) Social (networks (who you know)), 3) Cultural (upper class ways to thinking and behaving) and 4) Symbolic (honor and prestige) (Bourdieu 1992). He specifically defined social capital as "the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition" (Bourdieu 1985: 248). Bourdieu's conception of social capital can be broken down into two elements: first, social relationships that allow individuals to access resources possessed by their associates, and second, the amount and quality of those resources (Portes 1998: 3-4). This conception is very individually and economically oriented, emphasizing social networks that are used to gain upward mobility. Hagan's (1999) conception of social capital used in his criminological theory is largely based on Coleman's equally individualistic conception. Unlike Bourdieu, however, Coleman does not distinguish the resources themselves from the ability to obtain them (Portes 1998: 5).
A helpful and recent version of social capital is offered by Newton (1997). Newton describes three dimensions of social capital: 1) Norms and values (such as trust and reciprocity), 2) Networks, and 3) Consequences (voluntarily produced collective facilities and resources). Norms, values, and attitudes of individuals influence how these individuals relate to each other. Those values related to trust and reciprocity are crucial for social and political stability and cooperation (pp. 575-6). Social capital prompts people to act together by attacking ego-centric individualism, bringing about shared interests and a sense of the common good. Social trust is subjective and hard to measure. However, social networks and organizations (which are closely related to social trust), are objective and observable (p. 577). One could therefore examine the effectiveness of networks built from norms and values of trust and reciprocity. Though one can argue which comes first (trust or the network) (p. 577), the author argues that they mutually reinforce one another. There must be some trust to start with, but the level of trust and the strength of the network will change over time based on the consequences of social capital. The consequences of social capital, or outputs, could include car pools, charitable services, and baby-sitting circles (p. 577). For our purposes, the outputs of social capital could also include neighborhood groups organized to fight crime with the police.
What are the sources of social capital? Portes (1998) outlines two distinct sources of social capital, namely consummatory and instrumental. The latter is based largely on reciprocity exchanges and enforceable trust. The former is based on value introjection and bounded solidarity. Portes (1998) notes how consummatory sources find their theoretical origins in Marx's analysis of how class consciousness emerges in the industrial proletariat. Workers in a common situation learn to identify with each other and support each other's initiatives. This emerges from common fate, rather than norm introjection during childhood (pp. 7-8). However, this solidarity is bounded. Their solidarity is limited by the limits of their community.

Portes (1998) also notes three different effects of social capital: 1) As a source of social control, 2) As a source of family support, and 3) as a source of benefits through extrafamilial networks (p. 9). One could argue, for example, that as citizens become concerned about crime and join organized neighborhood groups, value introjection emerges among neighborhood group members, with members supporting each other and working together on crime fighting initiatives. This solidarity is also bounded to that group, and may not extend to the police and other organizations. The outputs of social capital that concern us here, therefore, would be social control and benefits through extrafamilial networks.
Just having social capital does not mean that the output will be positive, and social capital is not always a bottom-up phenomenon (pp. 578-80). For example, as we will describe later, neighborhood groups in Small City were initially established not by the group members but by the police and a "Safe Streets Coordinator" in a top-down fashion. If we take a functionalist view of social capital, as Coleman does, we will not be able to separate what social capital is from what it does (Edwards and Foley 1997b). Social capital cannot be seen as a cure-all. We must also recognize the negative effects of social capital, such as the exclusion of outsiders, excess claims on group members, restrictions on individual freedoms, and downward leveling norms (Portes 1998). We must also keep in mind that social capital is not evenly distributed throughout American society, and that the value of social capital is inextricably linked to the fate of the social sectors in which it is nested (Edwards and Foley 1997b: 672). Newton (1997) also warns us that we may place too much emphasis on the importance of voluntary organizations as a foundation for social capital.

A similar term to social capital that has been used in reference to crime problems is "collective efficacy" (Sampson et al 1997), which is defined as social cohesion among neighbors combined with their willingness to intervene on behalf of the common good (p. 918). This is a neighborhood level concept that asks whether or not a neighborhood, rather
than an individual, is willing to intervene for the common good. Like social capital, it is embedded in the larger structural context and mutual trust. An example of collective efficacy would be neighborhood residents willing to supervise each other's children and working to maintain public order. Sampson et al (1997) found that disadvantaged neighborhoods that had collective efficacy had lower violent crime rates than disadvantaged neighborhoods without collective efficacy. These findings can help strengthen social disorganization theory. The author argues that collective efficacy and social capital are largely two different terms for the same concept, with common roots and outputs. It would probably be most helpful to use one term for these phenomena (social capital) so that the term can be more explicitly defined and theorized.

For COP to work in the precursor stage of criminal events, social capital needs to be present. This social capital should extend among the citizenry, the police, and other public and private sector organizations, rather than being bounded within them. This study will find out the extent to which social capital/collective efficacy is present and how this is related to the effectiveness of COP oriented strategies in Small City.
CHAPTER 4: METHOD

Though one can never be sure of COP's influence, there are a number of methods one could use to gain an initial understanding. A mixture of quantitative and qualitative methods are necessary in order to gain this near-accurate picture (Grekul 1996). In this study, qualitative and quantitative methods are utilized to test the perceived effectiveness of COP related strategies in Small City.

Three different methods will be used in this study: focus groups with members of neighborhood groups, one-on-one semi-structured interviews with a city official (the "Safe Streets Coordinator), a police captain, and 2 COP officers, and a mail survey sent to a random sample of the general population of Small City. The mail survey data will be used to meet the objective of finding what influences attitudes toward the police in general, and the other methods will be used to meet all of the stated objectives.

Study site

Small City, Iowa is located in Eastern Iowa on the banks of the Mississippi river. The city first came into existence in the summer of 1833 when a fur trading post was erected on the site. In 1835 another trading post that supplied wood for steam boats was erected and a small settlement started forming. In 1836 the settlement was named "Bloomington" by a
man from Bloomington, Indiana, but the people of the town changed the name to "Small City" in 1849. Small City became a stopping place on the Mississippi river and assumed importance as a lumbering center from the 1850s to the early 1900's (Small City Chamber of Commerce 1987). Now, according to the 1990 U.S. Census, the city has 22,881 inhabitants (8% of Hispanic origin, and around 1% of other racial minority groups). The unemployment rate is at 6.3%, and the median income in 1989 was $33,138 with a per capita income of $12,438. Nearly twelve percent of the population lives below the poverty level (Iowa PROfiles 1997).

Crime appears to be a big issue in the city. In September of 1997, the city approved a controversial ordinance pushed by neighborhood groups that demands parents to exercise "reasonable control" of their children. If this reasonable control is not exercised (a child gets involved with the law) the parents can be fined as much as $200 and be required to attend a parenting class (ISU Daily 10/6/97). The police, however, feel that the law is unenforceable.

Focus groups

Table 1 displays descriptive statistics for the focus group participants. Four organized neighborhoods (of 12 in the city) were selected (two with stationed COP officers, two without) for focus groups. Focus group members were selected from citizens that live in those neighborhoods who are known
to attend neighborhood meetings. Citizens who attend these meetings are more likely to be informed and have opinions regarding issues such as COP and the police in general, cooperating with the police (co-production), crime and fear of crime, disorder, and other crime or quality of life problems or concerns. These focus groups provided information with which to gauge the major incidents, experiences, and perceptions of the respondents on these issues. Prior to the actual focus group interview, a pre-focus group questionnaire was filled out by each of the participants to help the respondents focus on the issues to be covered in the focus group interview. Prior to distributing the pre-focus group questionnaires, consent issues were discussed. Appendix 1 shows the consent forms for focus groups and interviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Participant Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hood 1| Latina female, 46, housewife  
White male, 39, plant manager  
White female, 23, accountant |
| Hood 2| White female, 56, retail worker/on disability  
White female, 52, lab technician  
White female, 49, newspaper driver/breakfast cook  
White female, 57, housekeeper |
| Hood 3| White female, 33, shelter supervisor  
White male, 38, high school teacher  
White male, 54, retired |
| Hood 4| White female, 30, customer service  
White female, 60, bank teller |
The use of focus groups in social science research is a fairly recent phenomenon, so there is some debate about when it is appropriate to use the technique. Focus groups offer a number of advantages, including their flexibility, high face validity, speedy results, low cost, and the fact that focus groups are a socially oriented research method capturing real-life data in a social environment (Krueger 1988). Contrary to conventional wisdom, focus groups can be moderated by someone who has experience working with groups, but who has not been formally trained as a focus group facilitator (Morgan and Krueger 1993). Well-planned focus groups can also consist of respondents who know each other (how else are we to study organizations, communities, and other ongoing social settings?). Sensitive subjects can also be covered without producing conformity or a group think phenomenon. Finally, focus groups do not need to be validated by other methods (Morgan and Krueger 1993). This is true when qualitative methods such as interviews and focus groups have a distinct advantage over quantitative methods. An example would be when the research is directed at a specific context, such as evaluating COP. When the goal is specification rather than generalization, as is the case here, qualitative methods are preferable (p. 9).

Another issue is focus group reliability and validity. Krueger (1988) states that "focus groups are valid if they are used carefully for a problem that is suitable for focus group
inquiry" (p. 41). Reliability is perhaps a more complex issue, since in this case there is only one researcher conducting and analyzing the focus group data. However, since there are a number of focus group sessions, it is possible to assess the reliability of the data by comparing statements within and across sessions (Knodel 1993). "The extent to which consensus is found within and between groups about their expectations, allowing for possible systematic differences, can indicate the reliability of the information collected" (p. 50). The systematic differences between the focus groups here include neighborhood location in the city and whether or not a COP officer is stationed within the neighborhood.

**Interviews**

Interviews were conducted with a captain of the police department, the "safe streets coordinator," a patrol officer, and two COP officers (each assigned to a different neighborhood area). The data from the police captain mostly provides background information on how the Small City police department conducts COP. The data will also permit a comparison between the Small City approach to COP and the COP literature previously reviewed.

The Safe Streets coordinator's job in the city government is to help organize neighborhood groups, inform the neighborhood groups, and to assist cooperation between the police and the neighborhoods. Because this person works with
both citizens and the police, her insights into the issues are valuable. Interviews with the COP officers and the patrol officer will tackle issues mirroring that of the focus group interviews mentioned above. The author was unable to conduct a focus group with patrol officers. Only one officer was willing to participate, and he did not want to be tape recorded (all other focus groups were taped and transcribed). The author received a few comments from two other patrol officers, but the vast majority of information from patrol officers came from the one officer the author interviewed. Even so, because of the officer's assurances and the comments from the other two officers, the author feels confident that the opinions of the one officer closely match those of the majority of patrol officers in the department. See Appendix 2 for the questions used for the various interviews and focus groups.

From the focus groups and interviews, the author will be able to test the following hypotheses:

1. Perceived neighborhood concerns will differ by neighborhood.

2. Neighborhoods that have COP officers stationed within them will have more positive attitudes toward a) the police in general and b) co-production than neighborhoods without COP officers stationed within them.

3. Programs which bring together citizens and police officers acting in an official capacity will be positively related
to attitudes toward a) the police in general and b) co-
production.

4. Neighborhoods with COP officers stationed within them will reveal a) lower levels of fear of personal victimization, b) lower perceptions of the actual amounts of crime in the area, and c) lower perceptions of social disorder than neighborhoods without COP officers stationed within them.

5. Attitudes toward the police are largely influenced by personal contact with the police.

Analysis of focus group and interview data

All of the focus groups and interviews (except for the interview with the patrol officer) were tape recorded and transcribed. Hand written notes from the patrol officer interview were typed as well. There are two basic parts to the analysis of this kind of qualitative data: 1) Physically organizing and subdividing the data into meaningful segments, and 2) Determining criteria for organizing the textual data into analytically useful subdivisions (coding) and the subsequent search for patterns within and between these subdivisions to draw substantively meaningful conclusions (Knodel 1993: 44-5). For the first basic part the author organized the data by study objective, and for the second the author coded the data within those objectives for later analysis. Appendix 3 shows the coding scheme and the codes within each larger objective category.
Mail survey

A survey of a random sample of the citizens of Small City was conducted in order to gauge the attitudes of the citizenry as a whole toward the police and other related issues. Even though community forums and information from key informants provide useful data, "direct knowledge of a community's orientation to a particular issue is best acquired through systematic, firsthand data collection with representative samples of the community's population" (Thurman and Reisig 1996: 572). The data-gathering instrument is a mail survey (see Appendix 4). Some of the questions on the survey are unique, while others are obtained from studies conducted by Ferraro (1995), Ferraro and LaGrange (1987), and a survey conducted previously by the Small City police department.

One-thousand residences were randomly sampled using area probability sampling from a 1996 Small City city directory with the use of six 6-sided dice. One-Hundred residences were randomly selected from each of ten city precincts. The ten precincts contain approximately equal numbers of households in each precinct.

In order to maximize the response rate, Dillman's (1978) "total design method" was utilized. The cover letter of the survey described how important it is that the potential respondent fill out the survey. About ten days after the initial mailing, a reminder post card was sent requesting a prompt completion and mailing of the survey. Unfortunately,
budget constraints did not allow for a second mailing of the survey to non-respondents. The response rate was 42% (N=418).

Below are the hypotheses that are tested with the survey data via regression analysis. See Appendix 5 for variable construction information. The dependent variable is "Copsgood."

6. Older people will have more favorable attitudes toward the police than younger people (Thurman and Reisig 1996).
7. Those with higher levels of education will have more favorable attitudes toward the police than those with lower levels of education (Thurman and Reisig 1996).
8. Whites will have more favorable attitudes toward the police than non-whites (Hadar and Snortom 1975).
9. Women will have more favorable attitudes toward the police than men (Hadar and Snortom 1975).
10. Those who perceive low levels of disorder will have more favorable attitudes toward the police than those who perceive high levels of disorder (Thurman and Reisig 1996).
11. People who have not been a recent crime victim will have more favorable attitudes toward the police than people who have been recent victims (Thurman and Reisig 1996).
12. People who do not know of any recent victimization of a friend or relative will have more favorable attitudes toward the police than people who do know of any recent victimization of a friend or relative (Thurman and Reisig 1996).
13. People who are less fearful of crime will have more favorable attitudes toward the police than those who are more fearful of crime (Thurman and Reisig 1996).

14. Home owners will have more favorable attitudes toward the police than renters (Brown and Wycoff 1987).

The following four hypotheses are derived from the COP philosophy. Citizens who actively participate in the betterment and safety of their home and neighborhood are expected to have more favorable attitudes toward the police. "Free riders" that receive benefits from the work of fellow neighbors (such as the perception that the neighborhood has become more livable) might also have more favorable attitudes than those who live in areas that do not have as many community activities geared toward crime reduction.

15. Members of neighborhood associations will have more favorable attitudes toward the police than those who are not neighborhood association members.

16. Positive attitudes toward the police will increase with the number of personal steps taken to prevent victimization.

17. Positive attitudes toward the police will increase with positive attitudes toward the livability of one's neighborhood.
 CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

Perceived problems in the community and in neighborhoods

Transcripts from focus groups and interviews revealed information regarding perceived community and neighborhood problems. Table 2 summarizes perceived community problems. Most all of the respondents noted that community problems included drugs, gangs, juveniles, and the economy. The Safe Streets Coordinator said the following:

I do know that they have the labs in town, most of them are on the south end of town. Because there is an odor from GPC that masks the odor of the meth labs. So that's a new problem that has crept into the city. Guns, we've always had guns, coming in. Marijuana. Our biggest Marijuana users are people my age, people from the 70s, the Vietnam war era. I think the meth is the new problem. I think we are doing a good job of fighting it, but I think it will always be there until something else comes up. Wal-Mart even had to pull Sudafed off of the shelves because that was one of the ingredients that they would use. They were selling 30 to 50 boxes of Sudafed every night, so get a clue. So now it is locked up and you have to have a drivers license and sign your life away to get Sudafed out at Wal-Mart. But they need their values brought up and morals, and this is a working community, we are definitely blue collar. The economy says both mom and dad have to work. So that leaves our kids out in the street. And then you got the gangs that help suck them right into it.

Members of 3 of the 4 neighborhood groups noted that the town was dirty and trashy. This issue, along with the drugs and juvenile gangs, seems to be very important to these groups. Members of the hood 2 focus group said the following (numbers next to each quote correspond with the order of listed respondents from each group in table 1. For example, the 56
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe streets coordinator</td>
<td>shootings and graffiti in the past, teenagers beyond hope selling drugs, methamphetamines, guns, marijuana use (mostly among Vietnam era individuals), lack of values and morals in children because both mom and dad have to work which leaves kids out on the street, housing costs too high, city leaders cut corners with city employees and cutbacks in funding even though it is not necessary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patrol officer</td>
<td>juvenile crime such as joy riding and bike theft, drugs, &quot;this is a shit hole river town,&quot; drug problem not aggressively gone after because of fear of negative publicity, pot and methamphetamines pushed by Mexican Mafia, low education of residents, high pregnancy, welfare people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 1</td>
<td>traffic, dying down town area and businesses, gangs, drugs, inability of town to expand, lack of volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 2</td>
<td>gangs and violent street activity in the past, lack of COP implementation from the police department, relations between public and police are not as good as they could be, lots of street people with nothing to do causing trouble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police captain</td>
<td>gangs, domestic violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 1</td>
<td>gangs, loitering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 2</td>
<td>drugs, gangs (Latin Kings, skinheads), kids involved in selling drugs, too much money in this town to buy drugs, indifference to problems, trash, lack of pride and commitment toward the city, abandoned buildings, &quot;our children are lost,&quot; kids in families who cannot afford to get involved in activities such as little league sports, poverty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 3</td>
<td>general lawlessness, gangs, community is dirty, drugs, people mostly living in rental units, graffiti, unsafe living conditions such as garbage and unkept buildings, town has a scary and dreary reputation as a dirty little river town, city govt. not interested in beautification issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 4</td>
<td>No one in the neighborhood knows each other, drugs, some properties not properly taken care of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
year old white female retail worker on disability from in hood
2 would be #1, and so on):

1: People have too much money to buy drugs. And I think
that is one of our problems. I think indifference is a
problem. I think trash in town is a problem. It's just
symptomatic of the way people see this town. There is a
lack of pride, a lack of commitment to the city itself,
and drugs.

Author: What would you say?

3: Basically it has been covered, but to go into the
trash and that type of thing. The parents of the city
have abandoned buildings, I don't know how, but get
people involved to where they care what the city looks
like.

Members of the "hood 3" group put it another way:

3: It seems that [Small City] has always had a reputation
of being a dirty little river town.

2: Yeah

1: I do not know if it is politically driven or what but
there seems to be areas of this town that over the past
16 years have been a trouble corner. It's a pitiful,
pitiful corner. I don't know why and that is a main
influx into this town and into the down town area. Why
can't we get rid of that? Why can't we do something in
the community where the hog market is and stuff the
crappiest looking street in this whole stinkin' town (ha
ha). We tore down this thing here, up here by 5th and
Mulberry there is a vacant lot. And it seems like
pulling teeth to get anybody to go over there and pull
weeds, and it would take 15 minutes.. and every time I go
by there, I think, you know, why can't we put some kind
of and spend 2,000 dollars and put a play ground and put
some park benches in there, keep the weeds pulled. It's
sand, it would be a great place to go, kind of what
Muscatine considers an inner city for those kids to play.
And it looks dumpy all the time. You drive by there and
it looks dumpy. It is better than when the building was
down there I guess but it is still looks dumpy. And
there is certain places in the town, and I do not know
why this community cannot get together and say "we as a
community are not going to accept this." We don't want
it to be like this. And I don't understand why we cannot
do that.
Commonly mentioned neighborhood specific problems and concerns included drugs, traffic, and trash. However, perceptions of the most important neighborhood concerns and problems did differ by neighborhood by and large, rejecting null hypothesis 1. When asked about neighborhood specific problems, the Safe Streets Coordinator replied, "It depends on the neighborhood and who you're talking to. A lot of people, their main concern is trash. As far as I'm concerned I think there's more important things than trash. I think our kids are more important."

Table 3 summarizes perceived neighborhood problems. The main problems in hood 1 appeared to be traffic and one particular drug house. As one respondent said about the traffic:

The worst thing right now is traffic. Traffic is really bad. And doing all of that construction. We have a lot of traffic. I think the worst thing really would be the traffic. We need signs for people to slow down because they have a lot of children in our neighborhood and there are a lot of speeding cars that come up over the hill. They would not even know if they were there.

Hood 1 focus group members and the author had the following exchange about the drug house:

3: Well one of the neighbors is doing something that he probably shouldn't be doing.

Author: Namely..

3: Well I believe it is drug related.

1: My neighbor?
Table 3: Perceived neighborhood specific problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe streets coordinator</td>
<td>the organized neighborhoods are in the worst areas of town, gangs hanging out on the corner in hood 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patrol officer</td>
<td>10 kids are doing all of the stealing in the hood 2 area but no initiative is going on there about it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 1</td>
<td>in hood 1: gangs and drugs, traffic from expanding industry, gang problem that had disappeared is coming back because of several families that moved in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 2</td>
<td>violence in the past, traffic, trains, individual type problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police captain</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 1</td>
<td>drugs, shootings in the past, traffic and speeding cars threatening the safety of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 2</td>
<td>rail road blocks traffic, kids getting into drugs, kids don't understand consequences, people cannot afford to fix up their homes, shootings, Latin Kings and skinhead gangs fight over territory (Latin Kings are more serious and dangerous), bicycle thefts, speeding cars, perception is that this neighborhood is tough and crime ridden persists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 3</td>
<td>drugs, prostitution, kids with no supervision, no COP officer stationed in neighborhood, kids beating up other kids and looking suspicious at school, trash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 4</td>
<td>drugs in rental units, car windshield smashed (hate crime against gay man) one year ago, graffiti, cars play stereos too loud, houses too close together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3: Yes. I believe it is drug related. His friends come for 5 or 10 minutes and then they are gone. He leaves the house sometimes a day with a little pouch.

3: I just don't, that is the one thing just the one neighbor. We have had a lot of trouble with the people that have moved into that house.

The COP officer stationed in hood 1 mentioned the same problem. He said, "we are having several families that moved into the neighborhood that are bringing some of the gang problems back again that we had before. We cleared them out pretty much, we had them under control, and now they are
starting to move back in again due to a couple of the houses that we have that were taken care of."

In hood 2, the main problems seem to be the rail road tracks (which can block motorists in if a train has stopped), drugs, and juvenile gangs. As one respondent said about the drugs and gangs, "I'm watching the little neighbor boys being dragged into the drugs. You watch them go up the road on their bicycles and come back with another kid. They all head down to the same house." This group constantly mentioned the railroad tracks. As one member said:

1: The worst thing is the rail road tracks. (laughs from the group). We are on the wrong side of them. I was born and raised there. It is like big brother is watching you or whatever, the railroads have us blocked in from three ways and the river is the other side.. and people just laugh at us, 'well if you choose to live there.' That has nothing to do with choice. That should be something we wouldn't have to put up with at any time of the day.

When the hood 2 COP officer was asked about neighborhood specific problems other than violence, he replied, " Actually I have been there about a year and a half, and before that time I was not assigned that area even as an area car. But I can tell you, an ongoing concern and yet to this day, traffic, especially concerning the trains in the area. Rail road. I am sure it was a problem then."

The main concerns for hood 3 were trash and people living in rental units. They felt that most people causing problems such as trash were those living in rental units:

Author: When the organization first started what issues immediately rose?
1: Trash.

3: Trash

1: One of our biggest ones, trash.

3: Yeah, mostly just trash.

1: Cuz it was right down that street.


In regards to the rental units specifically:

2: They do what they want. Typically on the 4th of July you have people shooting fireworks. That kind of mentality carries out through most of the year until it gets cold. It is a lack of accountability.

Author: Who would "they" be?

2: Tenants, kids, mostly rentals, not necessarily residents who own. More the rental units.

The main concern of hood 4 respondents was a particular area:

2: I don't think we can identify a drug dealer or a drug house, but we do have a lot of heavy traffic late Saturday morning, Sunday morning, because I think basically it probably is drinking and things that they are trying to break the police on park avenue which they usually stake out and I think the police have done a good job of that, getting over into our area. I see the police in our area a lot. They're there.

1: And we had a car that was smashed, the front windshield was smashed in about a year ago.

2: But they did label it a hate crime.

1: Yeah

2: But that again mostly happens in the area where the hate crime was so I don't know if that had anything to do with it. Maybe it had nothing to do with it, but it seems like there is a lot of crime done in that area (other respondent agrees).
Since this research deals with police issues in a city with around a 9% minority population, race was seen as an important issue to investigate as a potential problem. The author was able to gain some information during the interviews of the police respondents and the Safe Streets Coordinator. Information was also obtained from the Latina respondent from hood 1 in a separate interview following the hood 1 focus group.

It appears that there are racial tensions in the larger community. However, within the neighborhood groups themselves, there appears to be racial minority participation in meetings and a general lack of tension. It was also apparent that all of the respondents (except for the Latina respondent) felt a little uncomfortable speaking about the issue.

The Latina respondent mentioned that one particular area of the city (the corner of 5th and Mulberry) used to be called "little Mexico," and that virtually all of the Mexican American residents lived in that area. Now she says the Latina/o population is more scattered. The police captain, however, mentioned that even though this area is not the highest crime area, some whites still avoid the area because they see it as the crime ridden "Mexican area." The racial tensions in the city were getting better, according to the Latina respondent, until people started getting worried about the "Mexican gangs" in the area. However, she thought that
race relations in the city were much better now than before, and that her neighborhood group has no racial problems:

Well it was getting better for a while and then when they started all this things with gangs and all this, like I said when I was walking down Mulberry, this old lady saw me in the Cadillac, I was Hispanic, she locked the door you know as if I was gonna jump her just because of the color of my skin. In my neighborhood everybody is equal, nobody treats my kids any different. Like I said they go across the street playing with ___'s kids and with the neighbors kids you know like that. I baby sat ___'s kids, my daughter baby sits for her now, you know, she trusts us even though we are Hispanic with her own kids and I say that's something.

The Latina respondent also claims that she does not think the police are racist, even if others may think they are. She also made sure to make a distinction between herself and the Latino drug dealers, who she claimed were "wet backs."

I don't think the police are [racist], I know people would say different but I don't think, that is not one problem these police officers have. They are not racist or whatever. Nowadays when I hear a kid say, "Oh their prejudiced, you know..." they don't know what prejudice is. They don't know what we went through, and I am sure even before me, my parents had it even worse and my grandparents. But I am a 5th generation born United States citizen.

The patrol officer claimed that the Latina/o population contributed significantly to the crime problems in the city, but that there are 3rd and 4th generation crime families in both the white and Latina/o populations. He did claim that community groups were conscious of the diversity. When asked about race possibly affecting the neighborhood groups, the Safe Streets Coordinator responded:
As it affects the neighborhoods, I really don't think so. I really don't. We have blacks that come to the meetings, we have Hispanics that come to the meetings, we have a Hispanic that holds an office in the midtown heart area. I really don't think so. And I am not real sure about this but I think statistically more of the gang members in Muscatine are white, but as far as the hoods are going, I really do not think so.

COP officer 1 said:

We started having neighborhood meetings, and that is one good thing about having a structured neighborhood meeting where you have a lot of different cultures and a lot of different people involved in it. You sort of get past those barriers where you are on a first name basis, and a friendly basis and get to know each other and I think that is really important, and that is where you start breaking down all of these barriers or all these different opinions or outlooks you have some of these when you get to know them and that is one thing good about neighborhood groups. You just overcome that.

COP officer 2 stated:

I think we probably have a fair representation of non whites that come to the meeting. I know we have blacks and Hispanics both show up at the meeting. I don't think that the people who show up, I don't think they feel any discrimination of any kind and I don't think there is any. Out on the street is a different matter. And again it comes down to perception and a lot of it right or wrong, yeah there probably are racial tensions.

When asked if minorities might be targeted as a problem by the neighborhood groups, COP officer 1 responded, "They are not targeting one race over another, what they are doing is they are hoping that they get quality people, it is not, race has nothing to do with it." The Safe Streets Coordinator responded this way:

No I really don't think so. Now you are always going to have your people out there that say 'round em all up put a big fence around them and take a shot, an M-16 and just kill them all' but you are always gonna have people like
that, but I really don't, as long, from what I can see, and I don't care, you can be purple for all I care, you don't hurt me, I don't care, I will talk to anybody (ha ha). I really will.

To what extent is COP happening in Small City?

Small City has 40 police officers, 5 of whom are hired on grant money. The police department is short somewhere between 10-15 officers based on the per capita national average. 11 of the 40 officers are patrol officers, with the rest being upper brass, COP officers (3), or in special units such as the drug task force (2), the street crimes unit (2), and the DARE officer. Only three patrol officers (minus upper brass) are on duty during the night shift.

There are three grant funded COP officers in Small City. All three were patrol officers in the same community prior to becoming COP officers, and volunteered to take the COP officer positions. The COP officers received formal training prior to working as COP officers. Patrol officers did not receive the same formal training. One COP officer is stationed at a shopping mall in the DARE office, and he mostly patrols the business areas. The other two are each stationed in 1 of the 12 organized neighborhoods, one near the center of town (hood 1) and the other on the south end of town (hood 2). These two neighborhoods were selected to have COP officers stationed within them because those two neighborhoods were viewed as having the worst crime related problems. There is one
substation in the mid town neighborhood, and currently both of the neighborhood-stationed COP officers and the safe streets coordinator are stationed there. The south end COP officer will get his own substation soon. The COP officers are not required to live in their designated areas.

The Safe Streets Coordinator's job is to act as a liaison between the citizenry and the police, to organize neighborhoods, to direct people to the proper authorities to solve problems, and to attend monthly neighborhood group meetings and relevant community meetings. Members of all of the 12 neighborhood groups also attend a single large meeting (community council) once a month to discuss issues. These neighborhood groups were drawn geographically by the Safe Streets Coordinator based upon crime related crises. When residents of a particular area became concerned, that area was either created as a neighborhood group area or was incorporated into an pre-existing area. The main reason for not making COP a departmental-wide philosophy, according to the police captain, is a lack of funds. The city council, according to most all of the respondents, purposefully underfunds the police department.

The author examined the transcripts from the focus groups and interviews for evidence of COP philosophy implementation. Table 4 summarizes the results. All respondents mentioned evidence of open communication between the community and the police and the collective construction of specific plans to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>General Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe streets coordinator</td>
<td>police relying on citizens, specific tactics used to target specific problems, open communication between the community and the police, police working with other public and private sector organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patrol officer</td>
<td>police relying on citizens, specific tactics used to target specific problems, open communication between the community and the police (all the above occurred when respondent engaged in COP himself)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 1</td>
<td>broad policing function, police relying on citizens, specific tactics used to target specific problems, open communication between the community and the police, police working with other public and private sector organizations, continual evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 2</td>
<td>broad policing function, specific tactics used to target specific problems, open communication between the community and the police, police working with other public and private sector organizations, continual evaluation, community involvement has increased, COP officer 2 tries to empower children who are doing work for him for community service punishment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police captain</td>
<td>broad policing function, police relying on citizens, specific tactics used to target specific problems, open communication between the community and the police, decentralization of police department to neighborhood level, police working with other public and private sector organizations, continual evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 1</td>
<td>broad policing function, specific tactics used to target specific problems, open communication between the community and the police, working with other public and private sector organizations, group members personally involved in COP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 2</td>
<td>specific tactics used to target specific problems, open communication between the community and the police, working with other public and private sector organizations, COP officer does his job, COP officer knows the neighborhood area well, COP officer is the best one in town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 3</td>
<td>broad policing function, specific tactics used to target specific problems, open communication between the community and the police, group members tell others in meetings how they can help themselves solve community problems, group members personally involved in COP, neighborhood meetings largely deal with problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 4</td>
<td>specific tactics used to target specific problems, open communication between the community and the police, neighborhood meetings largely deal with problem solving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
target specific problems (co-production). Examples of this co-production include citizen record keeping of license plate numbers seen at suspected drug houses, and citizen/police foot and car patrols of neighborhood areas.

About 2/3 of the respondents mentioned collaboration between the police and other public and private sector organizations. One private company bought an old house and donated it to the police department for the first sub-station, and another company has donated computers to the police department. In order to make residents feel safer, the police have worked with the utility company to help brighten neighborhoods at night by adding stronger lights and cutting branches off of trees. The police helped the shopping mall create and enforce dress codes and other rules, and the COP officers visit the schools in their designated areas. Neighborhood groups and the police have also utilized the city housing inspector to help evict tenants suspected of selling drugs.

About half of the respondents mentioned the police taking on a broad policing function that goes beyond answering calls. These actions include foot patrols with and without residents in the neighborhoods, attending neighborhood meetings, visiting children at the schools, and even doing fun activities with children and helping out with parades.

Nearly all of the interview respondents ("non citizens") mentioned evidence that the police rely on the citizenry in
multiple senses. For example, one time the police got a tip that a car from Illinois was going to deliver guns. The police contacted the neighborhood groups and asked them to be "on the look out" for an unfamiliar car with Illinois license plates. Some citizens saw the vehicle and the police were able to stop the would be distributors. Another example is the recording of license plate numbers mentioned above.

The author also examined the transcripts for evidence that the COP philosophy was definitely not being implemented. Table 5 summarizes the results. It appears that most of the respondents do not have a clear idea of what COP actually is, and definitions of COP provided by respondents varied widely. The Safe Streets Coordinator did not even provide the author a definition. All she would say was, "I think it is a great concept.. I think COP is great." COP officer 1 defined it this way: "COP to me would be helping people help themselves discover new ways of solving existing problems that have been around for a long time and no one knew how to do it.. helping people help themselves solve problems of today." COP officer 2 and the author had the following exchange:

COP officer 2: Well it is a philosophy, and that's the truth.

Author: What kind of philosophy is it?

COP officer 2: Well, the idea that the community's problems are often different from what we perceive the problem to be, so with that in mind, we let the community define what the problem is, we determine what they've defined as the problem. Then we try to address that along with our input also. But for the most part we try
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>General Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe streets coordinator</td>
<td>lack of organizational leadership in police department (COP officers not properly supervised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patrol officer</td>
<td>COP officers are not being police officers, COP officers not doing their job, no broad policing function, specific problems not targeted, channels of communication with citizenry are not open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 1</td>
<td>Whole city not implementing COP, citizens do not care enough, COP officer 1 does many unofficial fun activities with children, channels of communication with citizenry are not open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 2</td>
<td>police not relying on citizens, COP not community wide even though the citizens want it that way, channels of communication with citizenry are not open, no organized efforts with public and private sector organizations, hood 2 members have him involved in many non crime fighting activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police captain</td>
<td>COP not implemented city wide, not all neighborhoods are organized, lack of resources, lack of broad policing function, police not working with public and private sector organizations, lack of continual evaluation, many activities police do are not crime fighting oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 1</td>
<td>lack of broad policing function, specific problems not pursued, channels of communication with citizenry are not open, COP officer 1 does not do his job, COP officer 1 only does non-crime fighting activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 2</td>
<td>no camaraderie in the police department, group appears to engage in largely non-crime fighting affairs, lack of broad policing function, specific problems not pursued, channels of communication with citizenry are not open, animosity between patrol officers and COP officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 3</td>
<td>COP officers not doing their jobs, COP officers doing non-crime fighting activities, lack of broad policing function, officers do not show up to neighborhood meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 4</td>
<td>lack of broad policing function, channels of communication with citizenry are not open, group leader appears very uninformed and out of touch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to see what they perceive the problem to be and try to address that and sometimes it can be done realistically.

The police captain defined COP as "...a process in which a philosophy is presented to the community as well as the police agency in which we empower the citizens to take control of issues in their own neighborhoods with the police aiding them in finding solutions. A lot of COP is based on perceptions that people have." Neighborhood group respondents mainly saw COP as an increased police presence in their neighborhoods as well as the police and residents getting to know each other better. Hood 3 respondents provided the following exchange:

1: My view of COP is police officers walking around their neighborhoods getting out of their cars where they are assigned, because they are assigned at 6-month intervals to a specific area. The neighborhoods need to know their officers and who is patrolling. This is about what I expect from COP for you. I expect my COP officers to be if there is a school. I want the officer on the playground before school and after school and during recesses. I want that COP officer walking around the community before school starts when children and parents are already gone. I want the officer at work before school. I want the COP officer walking around after school walking around the neighborhood because these latch key kids are a big problem. COP officers should be police, (respondent 2)'s right, they should still be police. They don't have to be the rough and tough slam em police that probably some officers believe they need to be but they need to be a presence, a positive authoritative.

3: So what we are saying is that COP is police representative within the neighborhood to address problems instead of a positive presence.

1: Exactly.

Author: Would yall agree with what she expressed?

2: Yeah.
3: Yeah.

Hood 4 members, who are the most recent group of the 4 sampled neighborhood groups to form, tried to define COP as well:

1: I don't know. I thought it was kind of a, where they drive through and kind of look around and keep an eye out through your neighborhood from time to time, is all I am under the impression that it is. I am not sure what specifically it is.

Author: What would you say it is.

2: I think it is to cover a large area overall and to really know the area, but I don't expect them to drive up and down the street every half hour. But to be able to zero immediately when something happens. And to have so much knowledge about the area, to know every house, I think that if they got out more walking police, or stop and talk to just kids, I think a lot of times, I don't know, I think they need to know people, but they talk about us getting aquatinted with our neighbors. They need to know us better too

Author: So there is anything else you might expect from COP?

2: Be there when I need them (laughs).

1: I thought they were like to be available. So people know they are there, to have a presence in the area, and so the criminals will know that that area is well policed, we are not gonna get away with a whole lot there.

What about the neighborhoods that have COP officers stationed within them? Hood 1 residents had this exchange:

Author: What would you like to see a COP officer do?

1: Be out in the community.

3: Walk.

1: See them out in the community doing something.
3: I want them to patrol on foot. That was supposed to be passed we thought for about three days and then you didn't see another one ever.

Author: Would any of you add anything as to what you think COP is?

3: They need to be willing to work with the community, go door to door, introduce yourself. I think, I know in here you ask a question about do you know your community officer by name, I think everybody in that neighborhood should know that community officer by name.

1: Everyone, not just people

3: Community. It does not mean, 4, 5, 7, 10 year olds, it means community.

Hood 2 residents said the following:

3: I think that COP is where they are getting officers back into the neighborhoods, aware of what is going on in the neighborhoods, know the people, know the kids, are there for the kids and the people whenever there is a problem.

1: I just think it is really kind of neat that they say, "Hi mike, I talked to your dad a couple of days ago."

2: But I think the philosophy of COP is very important because I think right now we have officers in cars and they don't have any interaction at all with the people and they don't have any interaction at all with the environment that they are in. They drive through the neighborhood and have no interaction with anyone or anything unless it is bad, but their training gives them, it's an us against them mentality. To a cop we are all bad guys and because of the nature of their job these are the people that they see most frequently, are the bad guys, but that is maybe 1% of the population, the rest of us are the good guys and I think it could make their job so much easier and I think as a city we could make do with many fewer police officers if we can work together. If they can use our eyes and ears. And the knowledge that we have, but we have to be able to trust them and they have to be able to trust us, and they are not being trained that way right now and the way they are doing their job does not allow them to think that way and I think if we are going to make any changes those are the kinds of things that are going to have to happen. We have to interact with these people, the only way that the
police officers, the only way we can do that is if they get out of their car.

Almost all of the respondents mentioned evidence that open communication between the community and the police was not occurring properly. Hood 1 members mentioned that police officers and even their own COP officer doesn't show up to neighborhood meetings anymore. Hood 4 members said that officers do not show up to their meetings any more as well. Hood 4 respondents do not know any officers by name, and claim that officers just drive through their neighborhood instead of patrolling of foot and talking to people. Hood 2 members complained about the lack of communication and co-production as well:

Author: Um, have the police tried proactively to work with you to solve crime problems?

2: Before the neighbors time?

Author: Or even after, like if they come to you and said.

1: No.

Author: So you are always contacting them, then they react and tell you how to do the problem or something like that.

2: And I find that I can get them better response than other people in the neighborhood.

1: Yeah they are afraid of [2].

1: Well I don't know about that. They know me better.

3: It is like who you know and who you are.
2: ..I think it is who you are and who you know depends on the kind of service you get. If you are an anonymous person you are not gonna get good service.

3: And that's a fact.

2: I think it is.

3: I know it is.

Author: You all are shaking your heads. Ok.

1: I remember one of my neighbors told me one time she was really upset cuz she told [COP officer 2] something and she was kind of 'umm hmm' well, it happened, I knew that he took care of the problem within a couple of days but he didn't ever tell her. She never knew that anything ever came of what she told the police, so I think that would help right there. It is not that they don't do it but they don't let you know they did it.

Author: have any of you made these suggestions to the police themselves?

4: Laughs.

2: Yes. (laughs). You look surprised.

Author: What did you tell them? How did they receive it?

2: Usually not well (laughs). They justify it or something like that. [3] was just saying, I did the citizens police academy so I had an opportunity to, it wasn't like I went into the station and said, 'I think you are doing this wrong!' They ask. So we told them.

All of the non-citizen respondents and one group of citizens noted police organizational problems that hinder COP philosophy implementation, including a lack of adequate funds, a lack of camaraderie among officers, animosity between patrol officers and the COP officers, and a lack of supervision of the COP officers. One member of the hood 2 group said the following:
2: I think there is an animosity between the patrol officers and the COP officers.

Author: In what way do you think there is this animosity?

2: The patrol officers are jealous basically. Yeah. A little story. One night one of the patrol officers stopped by to chat and it was a typically thing, and we were talking, and I wanted the police to be more involved with national night out. Well I know they are short handed, and I really hate to go to the chief if I can go to the officers themselves to get something done. And I knew this particular officer is involved in the police association, so I ask him do you think this is something police association would like to work on the national night out thing, it could be really good. Well he went into a tirade about how short handed they are and they don't have time, and this COP thing is a bunch of crap and, oh no, before that he said he told me he says well this is something you should take up with your COP officers. And I had already spoken to them and they felt that they did not have time to do it either. Then he started ranting and raving about some things. And then he went on about something that one of the COP officers had done and the patrol officers thought he should have been fired for it. So in the process all of these other patrol officers were ready to jump on his job. Now these are the COP officers don't do anything according to the patrol officers, ok, but as soon as they think his job is gonna be open they are all going to apply for it. Then they said, this officer says well, these COP officers are good for nothing, that is just a bunch of bull crap and everything, and he says when anybody in those neighborhoods asks us to do anything we tell them to go talk to their COP officers that is the same as telling them to go to Hell. And I said like you just told me a little bit ago? (laughs). The poor guy didn't know what to say.

1: Well he probably hasn't got his foot out of his mouth yet.

2: But I think the thing is, it is, they can work whatever hours they want, they are basically their own boss, it is like any work place until you do somebody else's job that other guy is not doing anything. I work 6 times harder than that guy does. And so it is that sort of thing, and it is really necessary that the COP be not a particular officer or officers, but a philosophy for the entire department. Because otherwise it isn't going to work. The COP officer does not get any backup. They are out there all by themselves except for us. (laughs).
It is like any other team, we need them to work together. Not only they have to work with each other as a team but they have to work with us. We all have to work together to deal with these kinds of problems.

Author: So you think the animosity might be hampering what could be done, or might hamper officer willingness to...

2: Well I think it hampers what they are doing in our neighborhoods too. They feel, it is not my job, the COP officer can do it. And they see things like working with the kids as being kooshy. But yeah I think there are problems in that respect.

The patrol officer and half of the citizen focus groups mentioned that specific problems were not being pursued. For example, the patrol officer thought that the drug problem was not being pursued because of a fear of negative publicity. He also mentioned that a bike theft problem in the hood 2 area was not being pursued.

It also appears from the author's observations that the two COP officers stationed in the neighborhoods engage in a disproportionate amount of non-crime fighting and fun activities. Hood 1 members claim that their COP officer would "rather play with the kids" than do more serious police work. When the author asked COP officer 1 about what he typically does, he mentioned a lot of these kinds of activities. He also claimed that the activities had many benefits:

Some of the activities and stuff that I have organized, too would be like fishing tournaments for the children, organized a trip to Chicago, we took some of the underprivileged children, not only from my neighborhood, but also officer (COP officer 2)'s which is the South End, we took them to Chicago on a trip. We orchestrated and had bowling parties, we have taken kids out to Wild Cat Den, so we actually organized and been in front of a lot of
different activities for the youth... combined efforts, like for Christmas we had the shop a cop where we were raising funds. We have done things like that together. I have conducted an organization, a bicycle club is actually what it is, so we get these old bicycles in this neighborhood and we put them together and we give them out to kids that have not had an opportunity to have a bicycle, so we have worked with a lot of different organizations doing that. And that is one thing I am really proud of, it is our bicycle club. We have done a lot of good things. In fact we have probably reduced the theft of bicycles in this neighborhood just by doing that. One year we put together and gave away at least 40 or 50 bicycles to the kids in the neighborhoods that haven't had them, and that gives them a sense of ownership too because the bicycles, what we do is take the children down to where we have our bicycles stored, find their frame for them and they are responsible for putting it together. We help and show them what to do, give them guidance, but once they get the bike completed they get to take it home with them, so it gives them a sense of ownership and pride and they are more apt to take care of it that way then just handing it to them. So we work together with a lot of different organizations doing that.

COP officer 2 mentioned the following:

The community comes up with things down there in [Hood 2]. And generally speaking they determine what we are going to do, although there is the bicycle shop down there and they learn how to use some tools and things. The fishing expedition and things... Most every meeting we have neighbor to neighbor and that is me and I spin them a yarn or two. They love to hear war stories. And there is usually some refreshments and it lasts a couple hours, and there is a good turn out. Usually probably 20-25 people. We have had some events in the last month or so ago we had that national night out party and like 50 people showed up. Some of the kids put on a talent show and it was good.

Hood 2 members appear to want recreational activities from their COP officer because they perceive benefits from it as well:

Author: When the neighborhood groups and the police do an activity of some kind together is it more often recreation like a parade or picnic or something, or is it in an official police capacity or a crime related
problem? Which one more often happens, or is it all one thing?

3: Ours is more recreational.

Author: Do you think it is more recreational?

2: That is how we get the police involved more.

4: We drag them in with the friendly meetings and then when we want something we will have them there and then we can jump on them (ha ha ha).

1: They sometimes get a little more in their pockets and bargain for us.

2: We look at it from the standpoint we feed them first, you understand that concept.

Author: I understand. (laughs).

2: You feed them first, and kind of get to know them and then they stand around at the meeting. And it is easier to work with.

3: But it is not always just at the meeting. It is like you know the parade, [Cop officer 2 helped with the parade], national night out he came and brought the fish, so he is involved.

The Hood 3 area does not have a stationed COP officer, but they had plenty to say about COP none the less. Regarding the non-crime fighting activities, they stated a more pessimistic view:

1: I guess if you count doing spaghetti suppers for 300 old people community policing I guess you are doing a pretty good job. I don't. My idea of a COP officer is not what we have in Muscatine.

Author: What do you think we have?

1: Nothing. We have nothing. We have zilch. We have police officers who I believe are not doing their jobs. I can see it with my own eyes because my other job is in the community police officer's program. My idea of COP is not taking a bunch of kids on city money or even grant money for that matter to Chicago, which has happened.
2: I know at one time we had a couple of officers who were walking a beat down town and that seemed to have just a tremendous impact.

1: And they stopped doing it.

2: And they stopped doing it.

In summary, the COP philosophy is not being implemented community wide, and it is not an entire departmental philosophy. It is only an addition to the existing structure. Even so, they are practicing the philosophy in a limited way, and have concentrated on forming neighborhood groups to try to get the citizenry to proactively solve their own problems. The problems that have resulted from not being able to implement the COP philosophy city wide will become apparent below.

Is COP perceived to be working in Small City?

Transcripts from the qualitative data were examined for perceptions of whether or not COP was working in Small city. Table 6 summarizes the perceptions that COP is working.

Nearly all of the respondents perceived that crime, fear, and disorder have decreased or at least remained stable over the past 3 years. Most all respondents also mentioned the effectiveness of the street crimes unit and the drug task force, and respondents took their own credit for the crime and disorder decreases. Even though all of the neighborhood groups (except hood 4) perceive that crime, disorder, and fear have decreased (or at least remained stable) since COP
Table 6: Respondent references to COP working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>General Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe streets coordinator</td>
<td>COP is reducing crime, fear, and disorder, two COP neighborhoods doing a better job at reducing crime than other organized neighborhoods, street crimes unit and drug task force are good, co-production between citizens and police is effective, citizens are more aware of &quot;what is going on,&quot; especially through the safe streets office, citizens now know what to do to help themselves, this is empowerment at the grassroots level, citizens and police are more willing to work together, more communication between the police and citizens. citizens have more realistic expectations toward the police, COP is a worthwhile effort, COP officer 3 is good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patrol officer</td>
<td>patrol officer was effective when engaging in COP activities, citizens and police can work together to solve crime problems, citizens bend over backwards to help, patrol officers, detectives, the street crimes unit, and the drug task force are effective in reducing crime, COP officer 3 is good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 1</td>
<td>COP works, Co-production with citizens effective, COP officer presence alone makes COP neighborhoods more effective than other organized neighborhoods, COP officers remove barriers to communication between citizens and the police, COP, street crimes unit, and the drug task force make a difference in reducing crime, patrol officers walking the beat reinforces the COP philosophy, patrol officers have a better attitude towards COP, COP is a worthwhile effort, fear, crime, and disorder are down, COP should be department and city wide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 2</td>
<td>citizens like foot patrol, people know me by name, my presence alone is a deterrent, department is reducing crime, COP is working, citizens appreciate the broader policing function, COP is more effective than straight patrol, calls for service reduced, level of community involvement is satisfactory, vast majority of citizens are willing to work with the police, crime and fear are down, COP is a worthwhile effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police captain</td>
<td>co-production is effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 1</td>
<td>it is helpful when officers attend neighborhood meetings, COP officer 2 is a good officer, neighborhood residents know each other since COP started, crime problems moved out of neighborhood, fear reduction in neighborhood, neighborhood is safer, crime and disorder reduced, &quot;we've truly bettered our neighborhood,&quot; safe streets coordinator is great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 2</td>
<td>Kids trust the police, barriers between citizens and police reduced, police are more visible, it is helpful when officers attend neighborhood meetings, COP officer 2 is great, neighborhood problems are now less visible,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People are wanting to move back into the neighborhood, the neighborhood has become better overall, criminal activity is less visible, fear and crime have decreased, calls for service are lower.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood 3</td>
<td>Citizens are more aware of things in the community, co-production good, safe streets is great, residents are willing to work with the police, fear has decreased, citizens learn to do things for themselves, public housing inspector is great, COP officer 3 is good, neighborhood is better, problems are being addressed and have been improved, the town is cleaner now, crime and disorder have decreased, safe streets is great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hood 4</td>
<td>Foot patrol has helped, the police are well aware of neighborhood problems, citizens have more realistic expectations of the police, information exchange and open channels of communication at neighborhood meetings, neighborhood looks better, fear level has not increased, citizens are more aware of problems, disorder is down.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

started, it appears that each neighborhood group sees these issues differently. Even so, the author cannot reject null hypothesis 4. In Hood 1, the 2 female respondents thought the neighborhood was safer than three years ago, but the male respondent thought it was the same:

1: It is safe compared to what it used to be. It's very safe now. You can actually go out at night without being scared anymore.

3: We bettered the neighborhood and it is safe, and I would not be living in there if it wasn't. I moved in 5 or 6 years ago, and I used to be scared to death to walk up to my door.

2: About the same, if there is a group of kids you know and I am walking by myself, I do a lot of walking, If I am walking by myself I am a little ancy whether you know what their race is. I'm not afraid of them but I am not you know having to always look over my shoulder and wondering if they are gonna come and jump me or whatever you know.
In Hood 2, crime was viewed as less visible, and fear and disorder were perceived to be lower. The following exchange illustrates:

Author: You have already alluded to this, but would you say there is less crime than there was three years ago or do you think it is just different?

3: I think it's less.

2: I think there is a lot less, well the police chief was out at a meeting about 4 months ago and he said that before we started this neighborhood group there were 45 calls in a month, and that was everything from the most serious to dog barking, and now there are only 6 to 12 calls.

Author: Calls for service are lower.

2: So that is down quite a bit so that is really good. I think the big thing that the drugs are still there, but we don't really have any way of knowing what's really going on with that because it isn't like if somebody shoots you that is something very obvious and you go in and make arrests and do whatever. Where the drug thing takes somebody some time to try to... and in that respect yeah crime is still there. That particular crime, that is still going on. But hopefully we will get rid of that too.

3: Do you think it is as strong as it was about 3 years ago?

2: No. It is definitely not as blatant, and we know when, a dealer died, when a dealer moved away, we lost one, one got burned out, so it is like God is watching over us you know, God does not cause bad things to happen, but you know, circumstances have been such that some of our major problems have practically disappeared, and not necessarily because of us, but we will still take credit for it (laughs).

Hood 3 respondents appear to be less fearful of crime, and they see both crime and disorder decreasing as well. Hood 4 respondents see fear and crime differently, especially crime:
Author: Are you more or less fearful than you were when you first?

1: I suppose depending of the time. It is generally geared one type of person, like the people in that apt. building. I don't think that there is going to be any, I don't have any fear of a drive by shooting going down our street and if there is it will be aimed at that house or that apt. building.

2: I think sometimes you can be in circumstances at the wrong time.

1: I suppose if you're out walking.

2: I walk by that house every once in a while. I am not any more fearful.

Author: Do you try to avoid places in your neighborhood, like at night or during the day? Or do you generally just walk everywhere?

2: I think that, I kind of agree that if you mind your own business they are not really going to bother you. Because they don't want you there either, they don't want you to know what they are doing, so they mind their business, probably if you started meddling...

1: Yeah.

2: Because I think that drugs sometimes gets in the way of anything. You might pay the consequences.

Author: Do you think, compared to 3 years ago, do you think there is less crime in your neighborhood? Violent crime, drugs, that sort of stuff.

1: I think there is more. I am just hearing about it all, so for me it seems more. More recently since I have been getting more involved.

2: I think the police overall have a, more awareness, I think they probably shut it out first, too. I think a lot of times we do bury our heads in the sand and I think part of it is if you don't admit you have a problem you won't have a problem.

1: Right.

2: And I think they themselves have agreed to say that we do have a big problem.
Some of the respondents felt that the citizens and police were more willing to work together, and that co-production between the police, the citizens, and other agencies was effective when it happened. The Safe Streets Coordinator said the following:

I think the police have realized that they're getting more accomplished with less effort utilizing the neighborhoods. They didn't have to call us and say 'hey we're looking for an Illinois license plate car, it may have guns in it.' They could have just gotten the macho attitude and say 'we will just stop every Illinois car.' They called us and said 'hey, keep your eye out.' And it works. Communication is opening up more.

The patrol officer used to do some COP-oriented work, and said that citizens were always willing to work with him. For example, he had people call him when their neighbors with outstanding warrants were home so he could go arrest them. He was also able to arrest an arsonist with the help of citizens taking down license plate numbers. COP officer 1 also gave an example:

...we had problems with gang members hanging around on the corners, so what we did was we installed a monitoring camera on top of one of the polls, and that was accomplished by the citizens, by a power company in Muscatine, and the police department. So it was a unity of different organizations and people working together to get problems solved. And it did it took care of our problem, the gang members moved away from the corner, away from this area because of that camera mounted up there, it was just a combined effort of everybody...

One respondent in Hood 3 gave another example:

I had four little vandals that did some work to my garage, and so they got caught. And this was good, it was neighborhoods working with police, working with the guardians of these kids, and they ended having to come on one of the hottest days of the year and they had to spend
about 4 hours cleaning up the entire alley. And then the
city came in the next Monday and swept the alley
perfectly, and then later that day we had that storm that
wiped out the town so it went all to hell.

Some positive remarks were made regarding the COP
officers. Most of these comments were directed toward COP
officer 2 and the COP officer stationed at the shopping mall.
The Safe Streets Coordinator mentioned positive remarks about
COP officer 1 and the COP officer at the mall:

He (COP officer 1) did do the kid ID program, it was a
fantastic program. And he videoed all the first graders,
and fingerprinted them, and then did a 5 to 10 minute
tape that he got donated and then they got to take these
tapes home, because it's easier if you have a missing
child to do the tape and the enhancement of the tape than
it is on a still for an aging thing, you know. A great,
great program. It really was. Community policing is a
big program. I think [Mall COP officer] is doing an
excellent job. He is the north end, the third COP
officer. The other cops also respect [him]. When I
worked with the police department I didn't like him. I
really didn't. But now our positions have changed. I'm
here, he's a community policing officer. He carries a
radio and if there is a call in his area or any area as
far as we know he'll go and do an assist without being
called...If I have a legal or policing question I do feel
like I can ask the COP officers even if it concerns
another neighborhood. And they are willing to help me and
give me the information and where to look if I don't know
where, you know that type of thing.

The patrol officer had positive comments toward the third COP
officer. He claimed that the third COP officer is "the only
one that has done anything right." He claimed that most
patrol officers didn't mind that COP officer, and that the COP
officer works more than the other 2 COP officers. One member
of the Hood 3 focus group also liked the third COP officer
better than the other two. One member of Hood 1 said she
would rather have COP officer 2 than COP officer 1 in her neighborhood, because she hears of COP officer 2 attending neighborhood meetings and being "out in the community." Hood 2 respondents also like COP officer 2 in their neighborhood. They feel he is aware of the neighborhood problems, knows most of the children in the area, and follows through on people's requests and questions. This exchange gives an example:

2: I think [COP officer 2] also kind of knows the elderly in the area. One of the gals is sick a week or so ago and he stopped by and checked on her, see what is going on, so I think he does a certain amount of that. He has a pretty good idea of who lives where and what is going on and that's one of the things I think most of us wanted in a, this officer, and if somebody who knew who belongs there, who doesn't belong there, what should be going on at that house and what shouldn't be going on and I think he is pretty much aware of those kinds of things. And I think that I think hanging around at school does a lot of that too because the kids, kids always know what is going on in the neighborhood and he was with the kids. That gives him a good idea what is going on.

Author: Do all of you feel like you can trust him?

ALL: Yes.

Author: So as far as your expectations are concerned he's, you think he's doing his job like he should.

ALL: yes.

4: To us our police officer is doing more than the other one's are. (laughs).

2: Yeah, I think that is very true.

A few of the respondents would mention other benefits of having COP in their community. Examples include that the citizens are more aware of community problems and are more able to solve problems themselves. Other examples include
increased communication between the police and the citizenry, increased police awareness of neighborhood problems, citizens having more realistic expectations of the police, and the police being helpful when attending neighborhood meetings.

However, there were also plenty of instances where the respondents obviously thought that COP was not working. Table 7 summarizes these findings.

The Safe Streets Coordinator, the patrol officer, and the Hood 3 respondents all had nothing positive to say about either of the two COP officers stationed in neighborhoods. Claims included that the COP officers don't do their jobs, do not engage in real crime fighting, don't care, and so on. The Safe Streets Coordinator said the following about COP officer 1 (she and COP officers 1 and 2 were all in the same substation at this time):

SSC: I think they need personal supervision.

Author: Who is they?

SSC: The community policing officers. Or not just take people that sign up for the position, but screen their people better and make sure they are self-starters and can work independently...they could feel safer if we had a good officer...This is totally confidential?

Author: Totally.

SSC: OK. (laughs). He's never here. He does not return phone calls. He has morals I would rather throw out the window than think about. He is not concerned the way he should be. He works the wrong hours. He works from 6am to 2 in the afternoon. He needs to work with the children. They get out of school at 3:15. He's not here. He will not change his hours. He could have weekends off and be here during school hours or after school, work the late shift, I don't care. He will not do that. We don't need him here at 6 O'clock in the morning but that's ok
Table 7: Respondent references to COP not working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>General Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe streets coordinator</td>
<td>COP officers never work beyond their assigned areas, COP officers 1 and 2 are terrible, COP officer 1 is unaccountable and unsupervised, hood 2 is a &quot;feel good&quot; neighborhood organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patrol officer</td>
<td>patrol officers and COP officers have barriers, COP gets credit for the work that patrol officers do, COP officers 1 and 2 are terrible, &quot;The department wants COP officers to be tree huggers and baby kissers&quot; (department does not want to do real COP), COP gets credit for things it shouldn't, Patrol has lost man power and other resources because of COP, COP has nothing to do with reductions in crime, COP, DARE, and accreditation are all bad, COP officers are not accountable, COP neighborhoods are less effective than other organized neighborhoods, citizens are less willing to work with the police because of COP officers, Co-production not working, Day shift patrol officers are lazy, hood 2 area looks worse now, citizens are back-stabbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 1</td>
<td>Some animosity between patrol staff and COP officers because patrol officers don't understand the program or understand what COP officers do, COP cannot work unless it is a community wide effort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 2</td>
<td>Patrol is understaffed which leads to animosity between patrol staff and COP officers, some hood 2 expectations of me are unreasonable and unrealistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police captain</td>
<td>many parents are do not know how to keep track of their children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 1</td>
<td>crime mapping may not work, COP officer 1 is terrible, few neighbors are willing to work with the police, patrol officers are terrible, no trust in patrol officers, hood 1 problems were moved to hood 2, citizens &quot;cry wolf&quot; by calling the police for stupid reasons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 2</td>
<td>COP officers do not get back up from patrol staff, patrol staff have animosity toward COP officers, many police officers are untrustworthy and engage in criminal activity, neighbors largely not willing to work together to solve crime problems, citizens not comfortable talking with patrol officers, the average citizen does not know that there are problems with the police department, neighbors are more noisy now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 3</td>
<td>Patrol officers don't follow through on problems, co-production with police is limited, police are not responsive, citizens go through other channels besides the police if they want something done, no camaraderie</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hood 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in the police department, the police seem distant and unfriendly, COP officers 1 and 2 are terrible and need to go, COP officers do not act like police officers, citizens make too many stupid calls to the police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>red tape hinders what the police can do, police are not always helpful, many citizens are afraid to work with the police, police do not seem to get things done, no camaraderie in the police department, police can be overly aggressive when worrying about personal safety, citizens do not feel talking with the police, crime and graffiti are up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

because he does not come here at 6 in the morning. He's goes with his wife or his girlfriend, ok?

Author: So he is not actively engaged in community policing work as you see it?

SSC: No. No. He did not attend 3 [hood 1] meetings in a row. The middle one, he did have a death in the family, ok. I'll give him that one (laughs). But his job is to put flyers out, he didn't put flyers out for three months. Last month he did put them out but he did it ten days early, to fit into his schedule. So I had people wanting to come to national night out a week early you know...He doesn't make personal contacts. The president of [Hood 1] has definitely clamped down on him. That is not our job. That is not her job. That is his supervisor's job. He did come to the national night out. He invited kids. And it is really amazing. The kids he invites, which is fine, we could have had a hundred kids there and that would have been fine, the kids got there before he did. And they were great. They were absolutely great. They could help, and having a good time, but as soon as Mike got there it went to hell in a hand basket. There was absolutely no control. None. And Mike let it go, and they know they can get away with it. So they do. A kid is gonna push until they meet the limit, well there is no limit with Mike. You can do what you wanna do. He only does feel good things. He's a feel good cop. He wants everybody to like him.

One respondent in Hood 3 said the following regarding COP officers 1 and 2:

1: It's crummy. The concept is not crummy. COP in Small City is crummy. Two of three COP officers we have right now need to go. They do not do their job. They look at
that job as putting in their time until they retire kind of thing. I guess if you count doing spaghetti suppers for 300 old people community policing I guess you are doing a pretty good job. I don't. My idea of COP is not taking a bunch of kids on city money or even grant money for that matter to Chicago, which has happened. That is not doing anything to benefit our community as a whole. That is probably a shallow way of looking at it because those children, maybe would have done something to the community that day and they would have been out in the community and maybe that is giving them a sense of responsibility and that kind of thing, but I don't believe that. Our COP officers really want guns, well one of them. They don't give people tickets. COP officers should be police, [2]'s right, they should still be police.

2: Visible

1: In the community, and visible, in the community not driving around in their car constantly and not hiding in their offices somewhere, which is what ours do.

The Hood 1 respondents do not like their own officer either for the same reasons. Below are some of the exchanges relating to this:

3: OK, [COP officer 2] patrols, he's out, he's with the community, I see him with the community, he goes to all the meetings down there, unlike our officer who tells the community that he doesn't go. Well shoot he is 4 months behind on monthly reporting to us. He is supposed to give us a report every meeting because he decided that instead of having to give me a weekly report he would get a monthly report. He is four months behind. I think our COP officer from that substation is the reason for loitering on that corner. (laughs).

Author: [2], how would you define COP as you see it?

3: That does not focus on our COP officer (laughs).

2: Actually we had a cook out here recently and he invited those kids, and those kids showed up before he did, and they were excellent, I was in attendance, and they were well behaved, well mannered, as soon as he walked in there, it was a difference between day and night.
3: He says, I left him a note, it is a community day, you have to be there. Cuz I am the president, which means I have authority over that boy (laughs) in that sense anyway...

1: They had a camera up.

3: We said, "hey, this house, there has got to be something going on." A teenager has realized this, it is like, do something about it.

Author: Has he like, worked with you on anything like that?

3: Nah, he would rather play with the kids.

1: mm hmm.

Author: You don't see him working at night? Just the day time?

3: ha ha ha!!

1: Do you ever see him in the day?

3: Do I ever see him in the day? Do I ever see him at night? I will maybe see him at 8 in the morning, that is about the time I see him.

Many respondents noted that there were barriers within the police organization (such as animosity between COP officers and patrol officers) and among the citizenry (apathetic, not aware, are not willing to work with the police, not getting information to officers on time, calling 911 for stupid reasons, etc.). The Safe Streets Coordinator said the following about the Hood 2 neighborhood group: "It is a whole new ball game down there. I call them my feel good neighborhood. They don't fight to change ordinances and (tape side ends) . We got the kind of responsibility to push through. That neighborhood down there, their president would
not even inform the neighborhood that they could go. If they wanted to support it, she would not even tell them. She did not tell them anything about it."

The patrol officer claims that citizens sometimes call the police after threatening kids and telling them that they will call the police. When this happens the kids have ran away before the police even get there. He also says that too many citizens are afraid to call the police. Finally, he thought that citizens were "two-faced" when the citizens would complain to him about the COP officers and then fight with the city council to keep the officers. COP officer 2 said that some of the things Hood 2 residents want from him are unrealistic:

No it is not always realistic. You know in the community itself, they, a lot of the problems they try to address themselves, and they try to make improvements on the community. And you do have a lot of activism. But sometimes, all the kings horses and all the kings men, all that put together there are some things that are not gonna change. An example would be the rail road trains down in [Hood 2]. Can't make them go away, that is part of why the area is prosperous. Some of it is really even unreasonable. You will have neighborhood people upset because the neighborhood kids are playing basketball in the alley, and maybe they don't like the sound of the basketball bouncing all of the time or something. Some of it is unreasonable. We don't understand it, maybe we don't think the same way, maybe we are just not subjected to it enough, I don't know but a lot of things like that you really cannot stop.

The police captain was amazed at how many parents do not know what their kids are up to. At a meeting with parents who's kids are in gangs, the parents did not know how to keep track of where their kids were, and he had to tell them about how
they can keep track of their kids. One member of the Hood 3 focus group said the following about bad 911 calls:

1: But I think too on the other side you have to consider that they get a bunch of really dumb calls that they do not have any idea, they get calls that makes their job doubly stressful when you have a 25 year old hysterical drunk woman screaming that she has a bat in her house and she is calling 911. Those are the kinds of calls that they get. People will call because their electricity went out. Someone called because they had a broken pipe, well call a plumber!(laughs). What are they gonna do, lay on the pipe? So they get these calls they have to respond to because citizens are calling so they have to respond to them.

Many complaints were made regarding the patrol officers. The patrol officer claimed that officers on the day shift "do not want to work," and would rather go after garage sale signs instead of things like suspended drivers. He thought officers on the night shift (like himself) worked a lot harder. He claimed that when young officers work during the day they "rock up big numbers" because the older officers usually work during the day. COP officer 1 said, "There are some [patrol officers] that probably have reservations about [COP] because they don't understand the program or understand what they do. I think the majority probably think we do a good job. I hope so."

All four of the neighborhood groups claimed that the patrol officers were less than adequate in terms of following through on calls. These groups all felt uncomfortable working with the police and speaking with them on a one-on-one basis about crime problems as well. Other complaints included charges of illegal activity on the part of officers,
womanizing, and other moral deficiencies. Hood 3 members explained how they often give up on getting help from the police, and therefore "get things done" through some other service such as the city housing inspector. Proactively finding ways to solve their problems in this way seems to give the group a sense of accomplishment and empowerment. One Hood 3 respondent said:

2: I really do believe that a lot of people feel the police are distant and that they do not necessarily follow through and that why even try it won't make any difference. There is an awful lot of that. I used to feel frustrated that way, but most of the issues that have been dealt with in my area have had to go through some other service. After a while it comes across as far as I'm concerned that they [the police] can't do anything, and so you do what you want and they talk to you and they leave. I live where windows and doors have been kicked in, knocked out, everything else, a lot of theft, things like that, vandalism. The police make their entrance. Well it's that person's word against that person, see ya. And nothing's really done. So ____, the city housing inspector can come in and see that the place is unsafe to occupy, we will get this place cleaned up and shut the place down. And that is what gets the job done. It is not necessarily the police. And it seems like unless they are there watching something happen it just doesn't get done. Being here long enough I've seen the layer of crap they have to go through, the legal crap so that they can do their job and not be held liable, and doing consistent professional manner and everything else. But the perception is that they are not user friendly.

Here are some other comments members of Hood 3 provided:

2: My concern this can get into labels and everything I could be considered an educated person, college educated, I have got this kind of professional, this this this this, I'm community active, and I don't feel that I could walk in and say anything that they would seriously listen to. Joe Blow who's got their 40 hour a week job and rents, I don't think that they feel that they have a say in the world. That's the thing, you cannot feel like you make a difference.
Author: You don't feel like you have access to the police yourself, as an individual.

3: Not really.

1: And cops hate it when you walk up to a car. They don't like it. You would be better off to flag them down. If you see a cop parked somewhere, or pulled over to the side of the road, filling out a report or something you would be better if... him come out of the car and walk down and talk to you rather than you walking up to the car, they hate that.

Members of the other non COP officer neighborhood (Hood 4) also expressed negative views of patrol officers, including being uncomfortable talking with the police about various problems, police departmental in-fighting, and excessive use of force:

1: I think a lot of the officers can get a little carried away in how they handle things from time to time. They can be a little harder on people than they need to be sometimes.

2: Sort of Barney Fife.

1: They think that.

2: Respect for authority

1: You are lower than dirt and they treat you as such sometimes.

When asked if they make suggestions to the police, hood 4 respondents said the following:

Author: Have yall suggested this to the police, those suggestions?

2: No.

Author: Would you feel comfortable telling them?

1: If there was like a community meeting.

2: If there was a reason to tell them.
1: It is not like I would go knock on their window and say 'hey by the way.'

Author: You don't feel comfortable doing that.

1: No. They would blow me off, but if the community as a whole were to tell them these things they would listen.

2: I think the biggest concern now is teamwork, and I have lost a lot of respect in the last month and a half as far as their team work, if they are more interested in position and where they stand and petty little things among themselves getting in the way then I think they are not going to give us their complete attention, and I think that there needs an intense interest among themselves and we say we need to get involved as a community, but they need to get involved as a team, too.

1: uh huh.

2: And not worry about who is gonna be captain next.

1: Right. They are supposed to be there for us, and a lot of times they are not. And they are not sensitive to your needs, either.

The neighborhood groups with COP officers stationed within them expressed negative comments toward the patrol officers as well. Hood 1 members provided the following dialogue:

Author: How do you feel about in general police services in the whole town?

1: Some of these police officers here in Small City are really something else. They have a problem right now, didn't they just let go a couple of officers that were fired or something? Some of them have an attitude problem, some of them just think they can do whatever the heck they want to because they are a police officer.

3: Yes.

2: And some of them don't care whatsoever as far as I'm concerned.

1: And some of them don't care what, they will just turn around and head the other way.
3: The cop stops girls and won't give a ticket if they are nice to them.
1: mmm hmmm

Author: Define Nice?
3: Define nice, get in my car.

Author: Not putting words in your mouth, but would you say then that your general impression is negative?

ALL: Yeah.

Hood 1 respondents had other complaints regarding police responsiveness and trust:

3: Okay say he responds to your call, that does not mean they take care of the problem. They will come there but that does not mean they will take care of the problem.

Author: Do you feel like you can walk up to them and talk with them.

1: Yes, but some of them you walk up to them you talk to them and they kinda like ignore you?

2 and 3: Yeah.

1: Oh, I thought I was the only one. I thought it was just me. You start to talk to them and they, you know..

2: I know it was a problem.

3: If you wave at them they are like, "what are you doing wrong." (laughs).

Author: Do you think you know who it is you can trust? Like if it is a certain problem, call this officer..

1: right.

3: Well I had some stuff stolen out of my vehicle and I caught the only officer I knew that would actually do something about it. But he is not on the force anymore.

Author: Do you have anything to say, [2]?

2: I don't know which ones you can trust.
Author: Do you feel comfortable working with the police?

1 and 3: It depends on which officer.

2: I don't really think they want to really help anybody to be truthful. They try to do their job.

3: The community policing academy is not gonna do it. I would not ride in no car with them I would get shot! Seriously, that is how much I trust these police officers.

2: Not everybody's lying to them. They think everybody is lying.

Hood 2 respondents felt that there were very few patrol officers that could be trusted:

4: ..the kids on the street will tell you trust this one this one this one. There are some that they did not mention that I know can be trusted but the ones they view mostly. But at one time they said there are only 5 you can trust. I know personally there are a couple you can trust so I know that they don't know all, just the ones they are dealing with. They deal with a lot of it and they know what's going on and they will talk and tell you what is going on. I asked one officer one night, well I didn't ask him, I said, what we need is a chart of all the officers and what we can go to them for, and what we can't go to them for. For example you can't go to ____ for drug problems. He just laughed and said, "no you can't." It's scary because you don't know when you go to the police if it is actually going to be to your benefit. I had a officer tell me he is afraid to walk. He doesn't make waves because he is afraid to walk into an abandoned building and not come out. Because of his fellow officers.

Author: Not to put words in your mouth but you feel like you can't trust the police? Is that what you are getting at, or would we use another word?

2: You certainly don't know who you can trust with what. It is like some of them..

4: You need a score card.

2: Some of them, you don't want to go to tell them what you know about who is dealing what drugs where.. others,
they may be, ok, I suppose it is like anybody else, each cop has his own area that he is death on. You SOB if you are beating your wife I'm really gonna come down on you, but that's his thing, but if you're dealing drugs, that's ok bud, I've got my money in my pocket. And as a citizen you don't have any clue, like [4] said you don't have a score card. You don't know who is doing what. We know that there are cops who are fencing stolen property. You know kids go out and steal something, they don't arrest the kids, but they keep whatever's been stolen and sell it themselves. There are a number of them that are into the drugs but I think all of them sleep with everybody else's wives (laughs). Typical stuff that you are never gonna get rid of. But some of this stuff is dangerous even to us. And this has been several years ago, I think part of the problem is, we for a long time didn't have a police chief in this town, so the officers pretty much did what they wanted and ran the police dept. however they felt. And so our current chief really has his hands full, I mean he has had all along and I think he's making strides I think but I had a problem a few years ago where the police, I filed a complaint and the officers tore up the complaint, it disappeared. It happened within a 7 month period it happened 5 times that I know of.

Author: Does this still happen now or was this just a few years ago?

4: I'm not sure but somebody went in and filed a complaint and one of the officers made a photocopy of it for them because he knew it was gonna disappear. They aren't all dishonest, they aren't all perfect, but you don't know when you tell somebody that you do trust, who they are gonna tell that you cannot trust.

The patrol officer respondent had many harsh charges against COP and COP officers. He said that the COP officers do not do their jobs (especially COP officers 1 and 2). COP officer 1, according to the patrol officer, does not provide needed information to patrol units, will not attend neighborhood meetings, and works when the criminals are asleep. He also said that COP officers 1 and 2 "have probably not gotten more than 5 arrests together in 3 years," don't
return calls according to citizens, and will not work out of their designated areas even if it is near by. He said that they should be charged with theft when they try to pick up their check, pay back past ones, and be fired because of the poor jobs that they do. "Guys could get $8.00 and hour to do what our COP officers do." He also said that needed resources were going to COP instead of the patrol units, such as computer equipment and man power.

A couple of other patrol officers walking by during the interview with the patrol officer agreed with the interviewee that COP, DARE, and accreditation ("silly rules that take free thinking away from officers") were all terrible in Small City. The patrol officer was also displeased with the way COP was being run in Small City by the department. He showed the author the article by John Eck entitled "10 Things You Can Do To Undermine Community Policing," and said that those ten things are the bylaws of the department. Some of these 10 things include creating a special unit or group (COP officers), divorcing COP officers from "regular" officers, and "over selling" COP. As evidence for the over-selling COP, the patrol officer claims that in the newspaper the department claimed that the mall area COP officer reduced personal injury accidents (car crashes). The patrol officer also said that "the department wants COP officers to be tree huggers and baby kissers." He continued by stating that the 12 neighborhood
groups are all too small (should be reduced to 3) and that the COP officers should cover larger areas as well.

One of the patrol officer's main complaints was that COP was getting credit for things that it should not. Personal injury accidents are one example, but the prime example the officer gave dealt with the violent and drug related crime reductions of about three years ago in Small City. The patrol officer claimed that right when COP started three years ago, prosecutions of key violent and drug related offenders were occurring. Using aggressive target hardening, he said the patrol units investigated and arrested a lot of the key violent drug pushers in the town, bringing calls for service down in the areas where the criminals frequented. After bragging about how effective the police force was to the author, he then said that COP got the credit for the crime decreases instead of the patrol units.

It was stated above that the COP philosophy in Small City was not being fully implemented. The consequences of that have just been demonstrated in this section. It appears, however, that when the police and the citizenry actually do work together to solve a crime related problem, it works. Unfortunately, it appears that they have problems getting to that point. This leads the author to reject the null hypothesis for hypothesis #3. When the police and the citizenry worked together in an official capacity, it tended
to work well, and the respondents would mention positive results and positive attitudes toward the police.

In terms of hypotheses 2a and 2b, it appears that the null cannot be rejected. With 2a, it is obvious that all 4 of the neighborhood groups distrusted the police. If anything, those in the neighborhoods with stationed COP officers have more negative attitudes than those without stationed COP officers. Hood 4 disrespected the police for political infighting and taking police safety a little too far, and hood 3 residents were displeased with a perceived lack of "following through" and "getting things done." While hood 3 residents had more to say about individual officer's lack of morals than did hood 4 residents, those from hoods 1 and 2 had the most to say about the personal failings of the police and the lack of personal trust they had in the police. The interesting pattern found here is that those with the most amount of contact with the police (hoods 1 and 2, followed by hood 3 and then hood 4 respondents) had the most complaints and the least amount of trust in the police. The more contact residents have, the more displeased they are.

What influences attitudes toward the police?

Results show that both the precursors and the aftermath of criminal events affect attitudes toward the police. Quantitative results will be discussed first. Appendix 5 demonstrates how all of the primary variables were
constructed. Appendix 6 displays tables of the correlations among all of the variables used in the study (variables named with numbers correspond with question numbers on the survey in appendix 4), and tables 8 and 9 display descriptive statistics of the primary variables.

The average age of respondents was 53. About 1/5 of the respondents have been victims in the past year, and about 2/5 know of a victimization of a friend or relative that occurred in the past year. There were low numbers of respondents who were non-white, neighborhood association members, and renters. Respondents overall had a positive, but close to neutral, attitude toward the police.

Table 10 displays the bivariate regression models testing the initial hypotheses regarding attitudes toward the police. Three variables were separately used to measure fear (genfear, propfear, and avoid). None of the individual characteristic variables were significant, except for the weak significant effect of age, and the significant effects of victim and victim2, in the predicted direction. All other variables were significant in the predicted direction. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected for hypotheses 6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, and 17, and the author failed to reject the other null hypotheses (7, 8, 9, 14, and 15). The predictive power of individual characteristic variables on attitudes toward the police have been weak throughout the literature, so these findings do not necessarily contradict previous findings.
Table 8: Descriptive statistics of primary variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>St. Dev</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>copsgood</td>
<td>15.11</td>
<td>0.427</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td>84.37</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>17.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victim</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victim2</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genfear</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propfear</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoid</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proactiv</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndisorder</td>
<td>52.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoodgood</td>
<td>32.40</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>53.46</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ownrent</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educ</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoodass</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Individual characteristic variable information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ownrent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoodass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-member</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-victim</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know of victim</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
After examining these results, it appears that all of the significant variables (other than age) measure two basic attitudinal concepts: fear and satisfaction. The construction of these two variables are also explained in appendix 5. All of the variables used to create the two new variables had significant effects on the dependent variable. The two variables added together to create the satisfaction variable \( (\text{ndisorder and hoodgood}) \) each had a stronger effect on the dependent variable than the others. With the exception of one variable \( (\text{proactiv}) \), all of the variables added together to create the fear variable each had a stronger effect on the dependent variable than age. After these two variables were constructed, the author hypothesized that a person's fear of crime is negatively related to positive attitudes toward the police, and if a person is satisfied with his or her

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ind. Var</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>beta</th>
<th>s. e.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R^2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>12.64</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>+3.69***</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educ</td>
<td>14.92</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>+0.41</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>+0.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>+1.66</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ndisorder</td>
<td>06.57</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>+9.01***</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victim</td>
<td>15.70</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-5.16***</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victim2</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>-5.73***</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genfear</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>+4.35***</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>propfear</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>+6.94***</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoid</td>
<td>16.60</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-2.76**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ownrent</td>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>-1.81</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoodass</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proactiv</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-2.77**</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoodgood</td>
<td>06.93</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>+9.53***</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
neighborhood conditions, the person is more likely to have positive attitudes toward the police.

After examining the correlations among the individual characteristic variables and the variables that formed the satisfaction and fear constructs, the author concluded that the data did not warrant the construction of a large theoretical model displaying direct and indirect effects on attitudes toward the police. There does not seem to be this kind of bigger picture. An examination of the moderating, or interaction effects between the individual characteristic variables and the fear and satisfaction variables on attitudes toward the police proved to be a far more interesting examination. For whom does fear and satisfaction affect attitudes toward the police? Table 11 displays the results.

As predicted, a person's fear of crime is negatively related to positive attitudes toward the police, and if a person is satisfied with his or her neighborhood conditions, the person is more likely to have positive attitudes toward the police. This was found to be the case in all of the regression equations. The satisfaction variable had a stronger effect on the fear variable in all of the equations. The only significant moderating effect with fear and satisfaction on attitudes toward the police is sex. Women are more likely than men to have positive attitudes toward the police. Those who fear crime are more likely to have negative attitudes toward the police, and the significant interaction shows that
Table 11: Test for interactions (dep = copsgood)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-Action</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Ind. Char. beta (se)</th>
<th>Attitude beta (se)</th>
<th>Inter- action beta (se)</th>
<th>R^2c</th>
<th>R^2r</th>
<th>F***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex and fear</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>.11* (.43)</td>
<td>-.47*** (.05)</td>
<td>.15* (.07)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>4.8***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>00.27</td>
<td>.80** (2.1)</td>
<td>.64*** (.02)</td>
<td>-.70** (.28)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>6.8***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race and fear</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>.02 (1.0)</td>
<td>-.40*** (.04)</td>
<td>-.01 (.15)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>04.40</td>
<td>-.44 (5.2)</td>
<td>.50*** (.01)</td>
<td>.43 (.06)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>2.7***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ownrent and fear</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>-.12* (.62)</td>
<td>-.40*** (.04)</td>
<td>.08 (.11)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>2.4***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>03.63</td>
<td>.40 (3.3)</td>
<td>.52*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.40 (.04)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>2.7***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoodass and fear</td>
<td>15.23</td>
<td>-.10 (.84)</td>
<td>-.40*** (.04)</td>
<td>.10 (.14)</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1.5***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>03.50</td>
<td>.24 (3.1)</td>
<td>.52*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.30 (.04)</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>3.9***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educ and fear</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>.03 (.14)</td>
<td>-.40*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.00 (.02)</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>04.10</td>
<td>-.03 (.13)</td>
<td>.52*** (.01)</td>
<td>-.03 (.01)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>age and fear</td>
<td>13.30</td>
<td>.14** (.01)</td>
<td>-.32*** (.04)</td>
<td>.02 (.00)</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfied</td>
<td>02.90</td>
<td>.11* (.01)</td>
<td>.50*** (.01)</td>
<td>.01 (.00)</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001  
**** all df>= 325
this is stronger for men. Those who are satisfied with neighborhood conditions are more likely to have positive attitudes toward the police, and this is also especially true for men, even though women have more positive attitudes toward the police than men in general. Therefore, it appears that men are more likely to attribute their fear or satisfaction to the police than women.

Some interesting information might have been lost by constructing the fear and satisfaction variables. Therefore, interactions were constructed between all of the original individual characteristic variables and all of the variables that were used to construct the fear and satisfaction variables. What kinds of fear and satisfaction affect attitudes toward the police? Significant results are displayed in table 12. All of the satisfaction measures are coded in a positive direction (for example, "too many drunk/high people," would actually measure "not too many drunk/high people").

Significant moderating effects were found between fear/satisfaction variables and each of the following variables: sex, race, and ownrent. The moderating effects with sex demonstrate the same pattern as above. The two fear related measures (fear of property damage, and knowing of the victimization of a friend or relative) and the satisfaction measures (all others listed) were stronger for men. The results demonstrate that these kinds of fear and disgust are
Table 12: Other interactions (dep = copsgood)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-Action</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Ind. Char. beta (se)</th>
<th>Attitude beta (se)</th>
<th>Inter-Action beta (se)</th>
<th>$R^2c$</th>
<th>$R^2r$ F****</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sex and fear measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fear property damaged by vandals</td>
<td>14.70</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex and satisfaction measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighborhood a good place to live</td>
<td>05.60</td>
<td>.63**</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>-.55** .166</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>7.00***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>youth are well supervised</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>-.30* .124</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>4.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too many drunk/high people</td>
<td>07.00</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>.51***</td>
<td>-.43* .168</td>
<td>.155</td>
<td>5.70***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loitering</td>
<td>05.84</td>
<td>.73***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>-.70*** .173</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>13.04***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>too many drug sales</td>
<td>06.70</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>-.50** .161</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>7.50***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people look out for each other</td>
<td>09.00</td>
<td>.44**</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>-.40* .119</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>5.42***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race and fear measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avoidday</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>.11* .034</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>4.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kpwep</td>
<td>15.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.14* .042</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>6.00***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 12: (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inter-Action</th>
<th>Constant</th>
<th>Ind. Char.</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Inter- $R^2c$</th>
<th>$R^2r$</th>
<th>$F^{***}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(beta)</td>
<td>(beta)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(se)</td>
<td>(se)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**race and satisfaction measures**

neighborhood
a good place
to live 09.13 - .81** .40***  .82** .156 .139 7.40***
(6.00) (.14) (1.00)

over past yr
hood worse
place to
live 10.50 - .34* .40*** .40* .159 .146 5.70***
(3.10) (.11) (.55)

trash and
litter 11.70 - .50* .30*** .50* .111 .097 5.83***
(3.80) (.11) (.61)

dilapidated
buildings 11.20 - .50* .28*** .50* .101 .090 4.40***
(4.60) (.12) (.74)

drunk/high
people 09.80 - .34 .40*** .40* .154 .144 4.20***
(3.50) (.13) (.60)

abandoned
cars and
parts 11.50 - .60* .23*** .61* .074 .061 5.20***
(5.50) (.14) (.61)

too many
drug sales 10.51 - .40* .33*** 40* .138 .125 5.20***
(3.30) (.12) (.54)

ownrent and fear measure

victim 15.30 - .10 - .32*** .20** .096 .076 8.00***
(.62) (.24) (.60)

ownrent and satisfaction measures

over past yr
hood worse
place to
live 09.80 .33* .42*** - .41** .162 .144 7.83***
(1.90) (.12) (.34)
stronger for men than women. The interaction with the strongest effect on the dependent variable was loitering.

Interesting moderating effects were found between race and fear/satisfaction variables as well. Those who avoid places during the day are more likely to have negative attitudes toward the police, and this is especially true for whites. However, while those who keep a weapon for protection are more likely to have negative attitudes toward the police, this is especially true for non-whites. While these two findings are inconsistent, the findings with the satisfaction variables show a consistent pattern. Controlling for the satisfaction related variables and their interactions with race, whites are more likely to have positive attitudes toward the police than non-whites. Those who are satisfied with neighborhood conditions are more likely to favor the police, and the interactions show that this is especially true for non-whites. The interaction with the strongest effect on the dependent variable was "neighborhood a good place to live." In sum, it appears that non-whites will attribute their satisfaction with
neighborhood conditions to the police more than whites. Fear related influences on attitudes toward the police for whites and non-whites may depend on the type of fear that is present.

Ownership status revealed a few moderating effects with fear and satisfaction variables as well. If one has been a victim of a crime, he or she is more likely to have negative attitudes toward the police. This is especially true for owners. Controlling for the two satisfaction related measures and the interaction, renters have more favorable attitudes toward the police, but the finding is only significant with the "neighborhood a better place to live" variable. Those who feel their neighborhood is a better place to live and think that the youth in their neighborhood are well supervised will have more favorable attitudes toward the police, and this is also especially true for owners as well. Appendix 7 displays figures of these interaction patterns (not drawn to scale).

Some of the quantitative findings presented here have their limitations. Many regression equations were computed with interactions between each individual characteristic variable and the fear/disgust variables. Therefore, it could be that the significant interactions on attitudes toward the police (especially the three interactions between ownrent and the fear/satisfaction variables) were produced by chance. Furthermore, some of the interactions may be correlated, which would increase the probability that some of the significant
interactions are spurious. Unfortunately, the sample size of the data is not large enough to explore this possibility.

Qualitative data from the focus groups and interviews reveal the same primary predictor of attitudes toward the police found in the literature: attitudes toward the police are largely determined by actual contact with the police in an official capacity. Therefore the null hypothesis for hypothesis #5 is rejected. Examples presented from the previous two sections help demonstrate this. When the police officer respondents and the Safe Streets Coordinator were asked about what they thought influenced citizen perceptions of the police, they answered (in various ways) that past experience with the police would largely determine attitudes. The Safe Streets Coordinator said, "It depends on when you had asked them...it just depends. If they haven't had a bad experience within I'd say 30 or 60 days then they're doing ok. But if they get caught it a speed trap they are not gonna be happy." COP officer 2 put it this way:

Oh it's gonna vary widely, depending on the experiences they've had, the contact they have had with the police department, and what they see in the news media. Also, all of your family history and the way the parents relate their contacts with the police to the kids, you know we have run across 4th graders who have openly told us that from their parents they have gotten the idea that when they see a cop they should run. Then you have people who have had a problem who have called the police department and have gotten a real good response. You have people who call the police department and have gotten perhaps a rude dispatcher or a rude officer or slow response or no response while people have been victims. They might not get good response from the investigation or whatever, a lot of times this is nothing that can be helped, a lot of crimes are not going to be solved. A lot of times man
power really is short, and response time really is long, longer than it should be anyway. There are some areas of town who would like to have a COP officer in their area and they don't and they are not happy with that. I have been asked to do things outside of my area and although I have done a few my response to that is no. Negative, I am not gonna take on things outside of my area because if I do then I am not a [hood 2] COP officer. And for that reason you know that has upset people.

A few examples from the neighborhood group members will help illustrate this point further. One respondent from Hood 3 related this experience to his overall negative impression of the police:

2: A few years ago for example there was an arsonist in town here from the East Coast. He just happened to be here for a while and he just decided to set a few places on fire. He also did my garage and the garage next to mine. He was charged with all 4, but he got convicted of the two houses, but I always got the same letter when I called. It would say, "this crime is unsolvable." And this form letter they send out, and I mean they even have the signature at the bottom, it is a photocopy of a photocopy of a photocopy. You think they could at least put a new letter together to make it look better. But that just kind of irritated me that it was just, the guy went to jail, but it seemed kind of obvious that they could have nailed something like that and there is a lot of those things. Once again, its they come out and make the visit but nothing gets done.

One could argue that the above complaint may be unreasonable because there could be a good reason why the criminal justice system was able to convict the suspect on charges other than that of the respondent's. However, the police did not bother to say why it was unsolvable and that seems to be what is bothering this respondent and others who say the police "don't follow through" and are "unresponsive." Another example from a respondent in Hood 2 is as follows:
2: We have these stories, happening kinds of things with young girls and you know young men that they harass. I think the thing that bothers me the most about our police officers, and I am sure it's just a human thing but it really bothers me, especially the police officers, I think they should be role models. They should not be above the law. They set themselves above the law day after day time after time, and that is the part that really bothers me. I really wish they were better role models. They screw around on their wives, they speed, they go through lights, they drink and drive on a regular basis, all of the things that they are arresting other people for. It is just not right, and I realize that they are human. I can tell which cop drives from bowling every Thursday night drunker than a skunk, they can tell you which cop routinely goes through red lights, which ones deal drugs, which ones beat their wives, which ones, like most of them are screwing around (laughs from the group). That is part of being a cop I guess. They need some different classes (more laughs from the group).

With attitudes like these, it is no wonder that a lack of trust exists between the public and the police. This lack of trust inhibits the potential success of COP and the possibility of increasing social capital.

In sum, attitudes toward the police are affected by the precursors of crime (feelings related to fear and attitudes toward neighborhood conditions, age, and the moderators of sex, race, and home ownership) and the aftermath (actual contact with the police in an official capacity). An explanation for the patterns found in quantitative data may be that men and non-whites come into contact with the police in an official capacity more than women and whites (the main determinant of attitudes toward the police), and therefore their attitudes toward the police may be more swayed by these precursor factors. Owners may be more swayed by these
precursors than renters because owners feel more attached to
and have a greater stake in their neighborhood than renters.

Additional benefits of COP? Community involvement and social
capital

Table 13 summarizes perceived additional benefits of COP in
terms of increased community involvement and social capital.
Hood 1 respondents were the only ones to mention an increase
in community involvement outside of their neighborhood group.
It appears that many of the members of the other groups were
already involved in the community prior to joining. Hood 1
respondents mentioned the following in terms of increased
involvement:

Author: Since you have been a member of [hood 1] have
you been involved in any other community activities non
crime related since you started?

3: I have been involved in city council meetings.
Voting, Pot luck...[#2] has been to city council
meetings...

Author: Would you say you have been more involved in more
activities just community wide or the same since you have
been a member?

2: Oh probably more. (laughs).
1: We get him involved.
3: We support our community.

Author: How about you [#1]?
1: The same.

Author: So do you think that being a member of this group
has gotten you involved in other things?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Mentioned Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe streets coordinator</td>
<td>citizens aid the police now and they work together, momentum in neighborhood groups has been sustained, safe streets is a good resource connection for neighborhood groups, neighborhood groups realize they can solve problems themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patrol officer</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 1</td>
<td>citizens are committed to bettering themselves, citizens are pulling together to solve problems, cooperation and resources from various organizations is good, citizens work with the police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 2</td>
<td>sense of community is good in hood 2, people have pride in their neighborhood, more people are involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police captain</td>
<td>citizens pressure each other to take better care of their neighborhoods, neighborhood groups get some cooperation from government officials, cooperation from other organizations good, citizens and police work together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 1</td>
<td>members more involved in community since joining neighborhood group, neighbors get along very well and work together well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 2</td>
<td>neighborhood group does many different kinds of activities for the neighborhood, neighbors are good people and can be trusted, COP officer 2 can be trusted, more police officers liking COP philosophy, neighbors feel empowered, low residential mobility allows for trust and network building, collective action good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 3</td>
<td>many resources available to better neighborhood besides the police, safe streets is good for grass roots efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 4</td>
<td>neighborhood group members working to be more involved and empower themselves</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1: Oh yes, oh yes.

3: Cuz I am 23 years old and I am the president of this group. You know you would not normally see that in a 23 year old. 23 year old is like, "lets go get some beer!" (laughs). I have a few children, a wife, and a member of [hood 1].

Another benefit of COP other than increased community involvement could be increases in social capital. Since others were already involved in their communities prior to joining neighborhood groups, they may have started with promising social capital building potential. Transcripts were examined for evidence of increased trust, reciprocity, networks, and collective action from COP in Small City. Some of the examples below will obviously overlap in terms of the 4 facets of social capital mentioned above, but it is helpful to try to examine examples of each separately.

Respondents provided examples of trust within the neighborhood groups and between the police and the citizenry. When asked if the citizens are willing to work with the police, the Safe Streets Coordinator said, "You will see people now, three years ago this wouldn't have happened, somebody is running across yards and you will see people say, 'he went that way' or 'he went in that house.' Three years ago, no one would have even come out the door and cared. So yeah, they are more than willing to work with them." COP officer 1 mentions the trust he perceives between himself and neighborhood residents:
I like working with the neighborhood, the people are really open, and they are really open to suggestions. They wanna make themselves better, and it is nice to work with people that want that to happen and they want to do it themselves, too. It is not that they just want to turn everything over to like the state or local govt. to do something. They wanna have a say in the way their lives are going. I really like that about this neighborhood. They really are pulling together and really working towards that end.

COP officer 2 described his area's sense of community:

Down in [Hood 2] the sense of community is real good. They are south of the tracks and I think that for some reason or another not too many years ago there were not any curbs or gutters down there, the place was relatively undeveloped, that is my beat area, it's zoned industrial and commercial. Most of the houses down there are not high dollar affairs. And yet it is clean for the most part. People who are living there any length of time consider themselves residents of that area and they have a sense of community and a sense of pride... it is a contagious thing. They go to the meeting. They talk to their neighbors, and in some way it gives all of them something that they need to live up to. Pride, I guess. They take care of their property a little better. I think yesterday I had some guys, some scrapper type grease monkey type individuals out there and they actually stopped me and said, 'Come on over and look at the new car cover we put on the car here.' And here is their junk car sitting out in the yard and they have actually gone to the trouble of putting a cover on it to make the thing look better. And that I am sure would not have happened it wasn't for the general communication in the community. That somebody kind of gave a shit.

Hood 1 respondents mentioned trust and other facets of social capital (networks and collective action) among their group in this small exchange:

Author: What do you think is the best thing about the neighborhood you live in?

3: I think the neighbors. We have put away all the drug dealers all the gang members, all the people that do nothing but harm people with discontent. The neighbors is the best thing.
1: We all know each other.
3: And we all play together.
1: Yup.
2: Like they said I was not living here when it was the worst but I think it is a pretty decent neighborhood.
1 and 3: Yeah right about that time it got better.
Author: Have you seen it get better do you think?
2: Yeah.
1: All our kids play together, crossing that street back and forth.

Hood 2 residents also mentioned evidence of trust. They trust their COP officer, and they feel that people in their neighborhood know and trust one another. One respondent told a story about a young woman who yelled from her car at some would be criminals, making the would be criminals run away:

2: The thing was that she let them know that our neighborhood was not going to tolerate that kind of action and she knew that where she was she knew people, and she knew that as soon as she started yelling someone would call the police or she could go to their house. She knew people too and that is part of what keeps you more secure is knowing, Oh I know so and so lives in this house and so and so lives in this house.

Trust often comes with a sense of belonging in something. A couple of respondents from hood 2 mentioned the advantages of the group over the individual:

2: We understand that if you get a bunch of you together of course it works better, a bunch of people can get something done better and faster than one person alone. At council one night another group was having a problem in their neighborhood and we would try to get across to them, we are all in this together, all of us, we can come help you with your problem in your neighborhood, we are all in this. And that is the object, we are in this
together. Us, police, and anyone who cares about this town, and the people who live in it. I think, probably, most people would do things to solve problems, especially if there is someone you can trust without fear.

3: Know they aren't by themselves. They are not alone.

Evidence of reciprocity was mentioned by COP officer 1 and the police captain. COP officer 1 explained how he got cooperation from a land lord of an apartment complex that has had "problem tenants" to construct a questionnaire for screening potential applicants. The police captain mentioned reciprocity from a more instrumental source of social capital (enforceable trust and reciprocity):

Very much like I was saying that the successes can also be seen in neighborhoods where they start taking a little more pride in their neighborhood, more pride in their sidewalks and things. They have a peer to peer thing in the neighborhood groups. Peer to peer is simply that the sidewalk was not salted. Somebody will go salt it and then send a letter to that person saying that the neighborhood group put salt on your sidewalks. You need to do this so people do not fall. So in the future would you please, you know. So they work with that.

One hood 2 respondent mentioned that reciprocity and trust are needed between the citizens and the police:

2: I think they're starting to, I don't know if it is because they are being made to cuz I know that COP is very important to the chief. He says he is bringing COP to the city or he is getting out of here. So this is something that is important to him. And that may be why some of the officers are responding the way they are, but I think some of them are starting to come around. They are starting to get to know some of the people in the neighborhoods. And part of it may be too the people in the neighborhoods are making an effort to get to know them. It's gotta be a two way street but we are aware of who they are and they are aware of who we are and I think those are the kinds of things that are starting to
happen. But the only way that can happen, I mean you can wave at a cop going by in a car, but it doesn't really do you any good, there is still no interaction. But if he is out on the street you can still wave and say hello.

Networks are an incredibly important part of both social capital and COP. Many respondents mentioned that even if attendance at neighborhood meetings often dwindle, a core group tends to stay, keeping the organizations going. The structure always stay intact through a strong network of a few individuals. It also appears that there is indeed more networking going on in Small City within and between the neighborhood groups, the police, and other organizations. The Safe Streets Coordinator provided the following:

Author: What community groups do you come into contact with?

SSC: All of em.

Author: Any groups other than these organized neighborhoods?

SSC: Oh yeah. When I said all of them, it is all of them. Comprehensive strategy, Iowa community empowerment, I'm in contact with the hospital, people on my board are from school, substance abuse and drug awareness, so all of this is all inter-linked, and if there is something going on, I go to that meeting so I can inform the neighborhoods what's happening. So that everyone gets all the information. When I came on board I came up with the FYI, if there is something going on that everyone needs to know, they have it hard copy in front of them and they can say, "well, this is what's happening." And it eliminates rumors. This way everyone knows all the same information, and that's part of my job, making sure everyone is informed. Yeah, so I go to a lot of meetings (ha ha). One more thought. No matter what happens in this town, it is a concern to my neighbors and to my neighborhood members, so that is why I go to all of these meetings, because they have the right to know and they have the right to be represented. Because if something is going to change, it is going to affect them. Because
this is the grass roots. When the people up here in the suits change anything sooner or later it will trickle down and it is going to affect my members so they need to be aware that they can either stop it, help it, or whatever they want to do, but they need to be made aware of what is going on.

The police captain and COP officer 1 mentioned linkages between different organizations. For example, the new substation in the hood 1 area was donated by a local company, and the power and water company in Small City has helped install brighter street lights and a monitoring camera.

All of the neighborhood groups mentioned the importance of networks within the neighborhoods and with the police. Hood 3 residents felt that networks with organizations other than the police department were necessary in order to "get things done:"

2: ___, the city housing inspector can come in and see that the place is unsafe to occupy, we will get this place cleaned up and shut the place down. And that is what gets the job done. It is not necessarily the police. And it seems like unless they are there watching something happen it just doesn't get done. Being here long enough I've seen the layer of crap they [the police] have to go through, the legal crap so that they can do their job and not be held liable, and doing consistent professional manner and everything else. But the perception is that they are not user friendly. And because of that, that adds to the helplessness that people feel. They don't know how to use the police to benefit their neighborhood and when people say they have a problem I usually don't tell them to call the police. I tell them to call [the housing inspector], because he seems, if it is a rental they can do something. If it is a violence situation call 911...neighborhood groups like [hood 3], community council, safe streets program is a program that has seemed to have filled a lot of gaps over the last couple of years and helped put more people in touch with things when, like the police department which is more distant.
Evidence of collective action has been mentioned above, but a few more examples in light of social capital would be helpful. The safe streets coordinator spoke about collective action in terms of empowerment:

They [the police] will get a lot of phone calls in the first month or two, more so than what they did before. The numbers will really increase and then they will gradually decrease because they will start believing to, and realizing that they can do this themselves. You don't call the city that there is trash in your alley, you go pick it up. That type of thing, which a lot of people would call on that. So, and the data bases, knowing that if there is a problem of cars, we have one member that has made a data base that we then give this lady the license plate numbers, she puts them in the data base, prints it out and gives it to the police department. So we help them too. And they give it to the drug task force and the street crimes unit. And they have taken this data base and shown it to other departments in the state and other states are envious of what they have available to them, but it helps build cases against the drug houses and all of this stuff.

The police captain provided an example of collective action on the part of the citizenry. The city council was originally not going to provide money to keep one of the COP officers on duty after the grant that funded the officer was depleted. However, members of neighborhood groups went to the city council meeting and demanded that the council provide the needed funds. Neighborhood group members were also said to be empowered by the fact that school board and city council members would show up to their neighborhood meetings when asked.

Almost all of the neighborhood group focus groups mentioned the "tool shed." The tool shed is a place where
citizens can borrow tools with which to fix up their homes. The citizens who started it see it as a way for people to make the neighborhoods look nicer, and to take pride in their own neighborhoods. Hood 3 members also mentioned a project they did through safe streets. The safe streets office supplied group members with dumpsters so that people in the neighborhood could pick up trash and debris. Hood 2 members talked of patrolling their neighborhood area on foot, which makes them feel safer and knowledgeable about their neighborhood. One member of hood 2 described one proactive step that makes her feel safer:

1: It is as simple as leaving your porch light on. You know I do that every night I leave my porch light on. And at first 2 or 3 people said that is ridiculous but that is one thing I can do. It makes me feel safer because I am not going to open my door unless I can see who's on the porch. And now there's 3 or 4 people around me who are doing the same thing and some of them are people who leave and they must have their lights on timers or something because they go camping a lot but their light comes on every night. And that makes me feel better because I am alone.

Hood 2 members like to use various methods to get people involved in COP:

3: Somebody will come up with an idea, like yard of the month, we just started that, business, mobile home, and home of the month, and that was somebody's idea, and we thought, well that's great lets go with it. So we did. And that has made a big difference. And the people who got the awards, they were just thrilled. Even the business, they came to the meeting and accepted the award.

Hood 2 gave another example of collective action and trust:

2: [she was] very concerned about them [drug dealers] and she quite didn't wanna get involved. She was afraid so I
relayed messages from her to the police department. Finally it got to the point that she called the drug task force and ended up offering them to sit in her house to watch the drug deals. Sometimes it just takes building that trust, ok we can do this, and I think a lot of that is not necessarily fear of the police, but fear of retaliation from the neighbor or the drug dealer.

There were, of course, plenty of examples regarding a lack of social capital in Small City as well. Table 14 displays a summary of the negative remarks. The police captain described the lack of trust police officers have in the citizenry:

So we want to implement a volunteer program within the police department that gets citizens and volunteers to do things that you do not have to be a sworn police officer to do. Well there is some baggage that comes right with that. And issues. They are little, but one of the biggest issues is police officers accepting them because police officers who are like anybody else, they have the security needs and they get concerned.

Examples above show the lack of trust hood 1 respondents have in the police. Hood 3 respondents mentioned their lack of trust in the police as well. When asked if they thought their neighbors were willing to work with the police, the author received the following response:

2: They would be willing to? Yes. I don't think they think its realistic.

3: We got to have the opportunity to talk. Maybe that is the difference between blocks but in our end of the neighborhood, sure. If we get cooperation, partnership thing with the police? If it was walking the block and working on a problem, yeah. Could be. Don't know if it will be massively extensive.

2: My concern, this can get into labels and everything. I could be considered an educated person, college educated, I have got this kind of professional, this this this
Table 14: Perceived COP disadvantages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Mentioned Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>safe streets coordinator</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patrol officer</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 1</td>
<td>city council cuts police department funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP officer 2</td>
<td>no data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>police captain</td>
<td>neighborhood groups easily fall apart when officers no longer keep it together, neighborhood groups come together only in crises, police uneasy about working with citizens, not enough volunteerism among citizenry, city council cuts police resources which leads to a lack of physical capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 1</td>
<td>police officers ignore and don't want to talk to citizens, lack of trust in officers, not enough neighbors are involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 2</td>
<td>lack of pride for the city, police are not trustworthy and the police do not trust each other, police are not helpful to everyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 3</td>
<td>lack of trust in the police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hood 4</td>
<td>not many people in neighborhood know each other, neighborhood group in danger of dissolving</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

this, I'm community active, and I don't feel that I could walk in and say anything that they would seriously listen to. Joe Blow who's got their 40 hour a week job and rents, I don't think that they feel that they have a say in the world. That's the thing, you cannot feel like you make a difference.

Hood 4 respondents provided this exchange about problems among neighbors and attempts to keep the group going:

1: I wanna go with saying earlier, I really don't know because I really don't pay attention. I don't do a whole lot in our neighborhood. We are really busy, so we just don't come a lot. The only thing I know is, and personally, I really don't know anybody in our neighborhood besides our closest neighbor. So I don't feel like our neighborhood is really friendly towards each other a whole lot. I don't think anybody really knows each other.
2: ..it was right at 4\textsuperscript{th} of July, we were having really good attendance.

Author: How many?

2: Well the first one the room was full.

1: Yeah there had to be 20-25 people.

2: No but did you go over to the one at the.. It was full that night, and the next one was a little less but it was still quite a group. The next one was a little less and then we skipped a month and you know when you do that sometimes it just drops off. I thought it was very small last time. But we do have a couple of new people there.

Hood 2 residents had this to say about officers not trusting each other:

1: There is a lack of pride, a lack of commitment to the city itself, and drugs.

4: It's scary because you don't know when you go to the police if it is actually going to be to your benefit. I had a officer tell me he is afraid to walk, he doesn't make waves because he is afraid to walk into an abandoned building and not come out. Because of his fellow officers.. Because the public is ignorant of what is actually going on. They are not even worried about police officers.

2: But I think the thing is, it is, they [COP officers] can work whatever hours they want, they are basically their own boss, it is like any work place until you do somebody else's job that other guy is not doing anything. I work 6 times harder than that guy does. And so it is that sort of thing, and it is really necessary that the COP be not a particular officer or officers, but a philosophy for the entire department. Because otherwise it isn't going to work. The COP officer does not get any backup. They are out there all by themselves except for us. (laughs). It is like any other team, we need them to work together. Not only they have to work with each other as a team but they have to work with us. We all have to work together to deal with these kinds of problems.
Lack of reciprocity also seems to be a problem. The police captain and COP officer 1 mentioned that the city council cuts the funds of the police department, keeping the department under-funded and under-staffed. A hood 1 respondent talked about the lack of involvement of others in the neighborhood (free riders) saying, "If they don't want to help the neighborhood we do not want to help them. It is as easy as that. We can't help them unless they let us know what the problem is. That is what the meetings are about, let us know what the problems are."

Networking is an additional problem. The police captain said that organizations do not take advantage of volunteerism in the community, and hood 1 members claimed that attendance and involvement can be low. Hood 2 members talked about how one of their members gets a better response from the police than the others:

2: And I find that I can get them better response than other people in the neighborhood.

1: Yeah they are afraid of [2].

2: Well I don't know about that. They know me better.

3: It is like who you know and who you are.

2: And I don't like that I think that if they are going to tell me to go to H that's fine you know but they better be telling everyone else in the neighborhood. If they are willing to help me with whatever the problem is they had better be telling everyone else in town with that same problem. And I think I really think that our police department is very bad about that. I think it is who you are and who you know depends on the kind of service you get. If you are an anonymous person you are not gonna get good service.
3: And that's a fact.
2: I think it is.
3: I know it is.
2: Just like the police, their only experiences with us are negative. Because they are stopping the people who are speeding.

Because of these above problems, collective action and co-production between the citizens and the police are rare.

Respondent suggestions for improvement

Table 15 summarizes suggestions for improvement. Many respondents noted that COP officer 1 needed to be either fired or more closely supervised. However, respondents seemed split on the fate of COP officer 2. Hood 2 respondents (people living in his assigned area) liked the work he was doing, but the Safe Streets Coordinator, the patrol officer, and Hood 3 respondents thought he needed to be fired or more closely supervised.

Common suggestions for improvement included the hiring of more officers, making COP a city wide phenomenon, increasing the amount of COP oriented behavior among all officers, and that the police department needs to fix its inner-organizational political problems. Other suggestions included increased citizen awareness and involvement and increased cooperation between the public and the police (co-production). Half of the neighborhood groups also mentioned setting up something similar to a citizens review board. In regards to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Suggestions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| safe streets coordinator| - enlarge the police department, have preventive programs that start with younger children (0-5), latch key kid programs, more COP officers, supervise COP officers, safe streets needs more staff, organize the whole town - patrol officer COP officers should still make arrests (act like old beat cop), get rid of COP and make it part of patrol, get rid of DARE and accreditation, change organization of police department and neighborhood areas, have police attend police related meetings rather than social service meetings - COP officer 1 whole community needs to work to rid the problem rather than simply move it, all our forces should be focused on COP, COP should be a department wide philosophy, more cooperation in the police department, don't put fear into kids about cops, take care of trash, drug houses, and gangs - COP officer 2 more "COP oriented behavior" needed by the police department, public/police relations need to improve, officers of all ranks should answer calls to help out patrol and improve community relations, hire more officers - police captain hire more policemen - hood 1 Have some COP officers work in the evening, more foot patrol and communication with the public, hire new officers (turnover), more involvement from the police department, get more citizens involved, officers should have a better attitude, citizens should stop "crying wolf," more signs to control traffic, COP officer 1 should work with people other than the good kids, police should control the problem rather than make the problem - hood 2 cops should take some etiquette or character classes and be more concerned, get rid of the us against them mentality, police should not be above the law, police should be tougher on criminals, reorganize shifts in the department, more communication with and response to citizens, upper management needs more awareness of what goes on at lower levels, we need parents more than laws, citizens need to inform police of problems better, prevention programs at a young age, COP needs to be a department wide philosophy, more officers needed, more specialized training for officers, children need to see the police in a more positive light - hood 3 ticket more people for garbage, more foot patrols, be more visible (including top brass), police should follow through on calls, pursue those accused with more consistency and intensity, inform the public when it is appropriate to call 911, more neighborhood participation needed, citizen review board, beautification projects
needed, COP officers should be at the public park and tourist areas, business areas, and schools, police should be more accountable and increase patrols, have beat cops in every neighborhood, fire COP officers 1 and 2 and hire new ones, get police out of their cars, hire more officers, revamp police department and put more effort into COP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>hood 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More beat patrols and communications with citizens, we need to get more aquatinted with our neighbors and the police need to get to know us better as well, hire more police officers, more evaluation on the part of the police, try to free up red tape and paper work, more community involvement, police need to work as a team and so do the residents, police should not concentrate of inter-departmental politics, police need to &quot;be there for us&quot; and they need to be more sensitive to the needs of the residents, give cell phones to residents so they can patrol, put a COP officer and a substation in the neighborhood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

enlarging the police department, the Safe Streets Coordinator said the following:

The money is available and they [the city council] are not funding the police department. What are we now, 15 officers short per capita? I think that's disgusting. And the officers we do have are obviously overworked. They have to work too many hours, they get grumpy, their human. So I think they need to enlarge the police department which would take time, it is not an overnight thing, you can't just hire someone to go out on the street. It takes like a year to get an officer to get on the street. It is gonna take us forever. By the time we get up to 15 officers we're still gonna be 15 short.

The Safe Streets Coordinator also wants her office to have more staff so she can have time to organize more neighborhoods and inform citizens. Her end goal is to have all of Small City organized, with everyone knowing their neighbors.

The patrol officer would like the special COP programs dropped and put on patrol staff. He also wants to end the DARE
program and accreditation. In his mind, the 3 COP officers would be back on patrol, and the other 2 of the 5 grant hired officers would be used as traffic enforcement officers to cover OWI, making time for other patrol officers. He would also have one patrol officer engage in COP related activities per shift for three different areas (3 officers total, one each for the east part of town, the central part of town, and the south part of town). These officers would also fluctuate in attending neighborhood meetings and make sure that the meetings concern specific crime reduction issues.

In addition to wanting more follow up on calls, Hood 3 residents wanted more visibility and communication from the police:

2: But it would be nice if there was more visibility. You see cars drive around but I just always thought it would be nice in my hood if they don't have anything to do, if they've got a sack lunch, just on my block. Pull over and eat in the car, make people squirm a little bit. Other people will ask, "why are they here?" It may make people a little uncomfortable or more comfortable depending on which side of the issue you are on. So they can eat on my porch if they want. So that kind of stuff, if they knew that they could just do that, that sure beats them zooming around when they go somewhere else where they are out of the neighborhood. I am just gonna keep hitting visibility and accountability because that is what I see makes a difference. Otherwise it just seems like people know the system does not work...

1: I want the officer on the play ground before school and after school and during recesses. I want that CP officer walking around the community before school starts when children and parents are already gone. I want the officer at work before school. I want the CP officer walking around after school walking around the hood because these latch key kids are a big problem...

3: You get a community policing officer that has just not residential but commercial businesses. I would like to
see that COP officer going in getting to know the small business owners, the down town area asking if they have any problems, having that person walk up and down the sidewalks, up and down in the parks, in the pathways if they have bicycle pathways or things like that, walk down the river front.

One Hood 3 respondent wanted something similar to a citizens review board or meeting:

2: This just came to the top of my head. It is one of those things where, as a music teacher I have put what I do in front of an audience all the time which changes my accountability all the time because I know I'm being watched. If they had something that was several times a year where people could come in and might be a bitch session but they have a handful of the police department there. They get to go in and voice their concerns. I don't know what would get done but at least people might feel like they're being heard. Rather than having to go to these groups. Joe Blow or Susie blow, whatever, can walk in off the street and could say what they think. Schools have school board meetings. There is no way, even you go to the city council, but the police dept. does not have to talk with the community.

Hood 4 residents wanted more involvement in informing the police about criminal activity in the neighborhood (such as engaging in citizen patrols), and they wanted a COP officer and a substation in their neighborhood as well. They also agreed with the Hood 3 respondents that more visibility and cooperation from the police was needed:

2: ...And to have so much knowledge about the area, to know every house. I think that if they got out more walking police, or stop and talk to just kids, I think a lot of times, I don't know, I think they need to know people, but they talk about us getting aquatinted with our neighbors, they need to know us better too...

1: Well I agree with her suggestion that if they get out and really talk to people and get to know them, know people instead of know "residents as a whole" you know.

Below is what Hood 4 residents said about police department priorities:
2: I think the biggest concern now is teamwork, and I have lost a lot of respect in the last month and a half as far as their team work, if they are more interested in position and where they stand and petty little things among themselves getting in the way then I think they are not going to give us their complete attention, and I think that there needs an intense interest among themselves and we say we need to get involved as a community, but they need to get involved as a team, too.

1: uh huh.

2: And not worry about who is gonna be captain next.

1: Right. They are supposed to be there for us, and a lot of times they are not. And they are not sensitive to your needs, either.

2: But I think the more walking, we have one walking policeman, I think, or is it two, with the grant, unless the grant runs out. I think that has helped.

Hood 1 residents echoed the same kind of sentiments as the others regarding foot patrol and visibility:

2: I think COP would work real well if people were doing their job. Of course most of the time they work during the day and I work during the day and I don't see much of their activities, but I do believe poor people that do work during the day, there should be one in the evening.

Author: What can or should the police do in your opinion to provide better police services?

1: Be there.

2: I think yeah maybe if they do more foot patrol or something you know, even the regular officers get out of their car, walk around for a while, talk to people. I am sure they are assigned to areas they got to patrol and stuff. Maybe get to know the people in their areas.

3: I am always sitting outside. I would love it if a cop came up and sat on the porch with us.

2: Talk to us, you know..

3: Other than that I would say turnover. New people. (laughs).
Author: More foot patrols, different cops, anything else?

1: No, if they would just get more involved.

Author: More involved with the people getting to know them?

1: Right.

Author: What do you think can help the police solve problems, what do you think would help them?

3: That would be our part, wouldn't it? I think we do enough. What would help the police?

1: Get more people like us involved.

2: I think if the officers had a better attitude it would help them.

Hood 1 residents also wanted their COP officer to expand his role:

1: You know there is a reason for him to do it but I think he is working with the wrong kids. He does it to get involved with the kids that keep him out of trouble or something like that but mostly he is working with little kids like , , you know. Those are kids that are not into trouble right now, they are too young. He should go to a higher age, you know what I'm saying?

3: He is like should like maybe expand to adults too. He is a community officer. Community. It does not mean, 4,5, 7, 10 year olds, it means community. When we started this, when we started all these neighborhoods, it was to base the facts on getting the crime and knocking it out. Well, his little thing was to get the kids to play with him.

Hood 2 residents best explained the wish that police officers changed their attitude toward the citizenry:

2: They need to be more concerned, they need to realize that people are people, or that they are human, I don't know how to say it.

Author: Be more humanistic?
1: That you are not just a number or just a speeder.

2: We are not "them." It is that us/Them mentality. I think the thing that bothers me the most about our police officers, and I am sure it's just a human thing but it really bothers me, especially the police officers, I think they should be role models. They should not be above the law, they set themselves above the law day after day time after time, and that is the part that really bothers me. I really wish they were better role models.

One hood 2 resident also thought the citizens should be more active:

2: I think one of the things that residence need to realize is that just because you see it and it is common knowledge where you live that this is what is going on, it does not mean that the police know it. We forget, we somehow think that they are all seeing and all knowing and they aren't. We have to call them and tell them, they don't know that they are dealing drugs at this house unless someone calls them and tells them.

Hood 2 respondents also thought that COP should be a city wide phenomenon:

4: It needs to be the whole police force not just three officers in town.

2: Exactly. It needs to be a philosophy.

4: Right!

2: for the entire department.. not three officers.. it is really necessary that the COP be not a particular officer or officers, but a philosophy for the entire department. Because otherwise it isn't going to work. The COP officer does not get any backup. They are out there all by themselves except for us. (laughs). It is like any other team, we need them to work together. Not only they have to work with each other as a team but they have to work with us. We all have to work together to deal with these kinds of problems...Again, I think COP needs to be the philosophy, the police department needs to be more involved with the citizens. There needs to be more communication. As a citizen I would like to be able to go to the police station and say, 'you know, this is what's
happening in my neighborhood right now.' Not necessarily on a daily basis but you know, [briefing officers before a shift]. Bring in someone from the neighborhoods, 'There is a bunch of kids running around stealing bicycles.'

1: Like you say, they do need to know that that is a concern.

2: Those are the kinds of things that if the police officers contact these kids that are causing problems and they are problems, it is more safety for the child at that point, but they should not be doing those things and they need to follow rules and if the police say, it is that interaction with the police where they are not hauling them off to jail but they are there to help them...I think another thing especially in the hoods like ours, a lot of times the only contact that the kids have with the police are negative things too. A policeman comes to arrest dad when he was beating on mom or mom is drunk and the policeman comes and takes somebody away, this is gotta be frightening to a child, they don't understand what is going on but the policeman is the bad guy in the situation. It helps if these kids can see at least one police officer in a more positive light.
CHAPTER 6: SUMMARY

It would be helpful to provide a brief summary of the major findings. Commonly stated community problems by respondents included, drugs, gangs, juveniles, the economy, and the trashy and dirty looks of the city. Neighborhood groups did not always have crime as their number one priority. The groups were also concerned with disorder (broken windows) and quality of life issues. Commonly stated specific neighborhood problems included drugs, traffic, and trash, but the perceived primary problem in each of the 4 neighborhoods studied did differ. While respondents did acknowledge racial tensions in the community, they all stated that racial problems or tensions within neighborhood groups themselves did not exist.

While the city has partially implemented the COP philosophy (organizing neighborhoods, stationing COP oriented officers in neighborhoods, forming the Safe Streets office), it appears to merely be an addition to the existing police organization. Because of this, COP philosophy implementation is not always perceived as working. When the police and the citizenry work together to solve a crime related problem (which seems to be more rare than it should), or when the citizenry find a way (often facilitated by the safe streets office and other networks) to solve their problems themselves, COP philosophy implementation is perceived to work.
Attitudes toward the police in general are indeed largely determined by actual contact with the police (usually in an official capacity). But there are other factors that can influence one's attitude, including perceptions of fear and the livability of one's neighborhood. Individual characteristic factors such as age, sex, race, and home ownership status also appear to mildly influence citizen attitudes toward the police.

While most citizen respondents had already been active in their community prior to joining the neighborhood groups, respondents from hood 1 mentioned engaging in new activities such as voting and attending city council meetings. The social capital generated among and between the neighborhood groups, the safe streets office, and other public agencies such as the city housing inspector is strong. However, the social capital is mostly bounded to those groups, and does not yet extend to the police. The links with the safe streets office and other public and private organizations may be the only reason why any genuine co-production has occurred between the police and the citizenry at all. Within the neighborhood groups, the social capital generated is not bounded to working on crime related problems. This social capital has kept the groups active in times of non-crisis.

Common suggestions for improvement included intensifying the supervision of the COP officers, hiring more officers in general, making COP a city wide phenomenon, increasing the
amount of COP oriented behavior among all officers, and that the police department needs to fix its inner-organizational political problems. Other suggestions included increased citizen awareness and involvement, and increased cooperation between the public and the police (co-production). Half of the neighborhood groups also mentioned setting up something similar to a citizens review board. It is obvious that all respondents in the study would like COP to continue and to improve.
CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS

It is possible that COP could work in Small City because of neighborhood organizing and other network building, increased social capital in areas outside of the police department, the presence of the safe streets coordinator, and overwhelming citizen support for COP. However, there are barriers that hinder proper COP implementation. These barriers include small levels of consistent citizen involvement, a lack of all neighborhoods being organized, a lack of resources for the police which causes animosity among officers and other inter-organizational problems, and a lack of genuine communication and trust between the citizenry and the police.

There are a number of things that can improve COP philosophy implementation in Small City. A major problem is resources. The police department needs to find ways to practice the COP philosophy while it is under-staffed, under-funded, and going through political turmoil. First, the city council needs to be asked to look into increasing police department funding. All officers need closer supervision, and bureaucratic rules regarding co-production with the citizenry need to be strictly enforced. COP officers could cover larger neighborhood areas, and one patrol officer per shift could assist in each of these larger areas while being available to assist other patrol officers on calls for service. Officers (especially the COP officers) should make sure to attend all
neighborhood meetings and find other ways to engage in open communication with the citizenry. The police should also work harder to make use of other public and private sector organizations, and work to get more citizens involved with the Safe Streets office. The social capital generated by the neighborhood groups can be tapped into to assist in this as well. If the police and the citizenry increasingly engage in more genuine dialogue, more volunteerism from the citizenry, as well as more co-production to fight crime and its precursors, is possible.

The data collected for this study are rich and massive in scope, and there are many questions the data have yet to answer. Collecting data of this kind can be very helpful for both theoretical and policy oriented research. Policy oriented research geared toward evaluating COP is often too limited because of its narrow focus on phenomena such as crime reduction (which can be a spurious finding) and process. There has also been a general lack of attention in evaluative research toward the actual opinions of the citizens who supposedly benefit from COP.

Evaluative research that utilizes both quantitative and qualitative methods should be replicated in different types of communities in different stages of COP philosophy implementation. Within these communities, one could include an examination of the differential involvement of different organizations in COP and other quality of life initiatives.
(such as socioeconomic development) as part of a comprehensive endeavor. The rich findings from such research can help any community start COP "on the right track" or learn how to improve an existing implementation. Even if resources and/or time are not available to do extensive qualitative data collection, a useful questionnaire can be constructed based on the findings here and in other studies that use qualitative methods. Incorporating social capital and collective efficacy questions in such a questionnaire could help a researcher explore those complex phenomena without spending a large amount of time. One could also over-sample certain groups from theoretically important under-represented populations. For example, in communities such as Small City, one might want to over-sample racial and ethnic minorities, renters, and neighborhood group members.

Research on attitudes toward the police lacks a theoretical approach. However, the findings presented here may help correct this problem. Any theory of attitudes toward the police would need to include actual contact with the police in an official capacity, fear of crime, satisfaction or disgust with neighborhood conditions, and individual context variables such as race, sex, home ownership status, and age. Research on community policing in general also tends to lack a theoretical approach. The use of the criminal events perspective and social capital can help reverse this trend, even if they themselves are not theories. For example, one
could conduct in depth studies of neighborhood attempts at COP using social disorganization theory, theories of offending and victimization, and social capital and/or collective efficacy variables.

The criminal events perspective can extremely helpful in examining COP. Both are holistic in scope, and the use of the perspective reminds us that crime and reactions to crime are indeed events that cannot be examined in a vacuum. The criminal events perspective is also helpful in examining attitudes toward the police in general. As demonstrated above, precursors and the aftermath of criminal events affect attitudes toward the police.

Social capital is also helpful in measuring COP implementation effectiveness, because it is central to issues such as trust and genuine dialogue between different groups, the ability to collectively tap into various resources, and the ability of people to work together to solve various problems. Some level of social capital is necessary for COP to work, and it cannot be bounded to certain groups.

The criminal events perspective and the social capital concept even help us define COP because they tell us what needs to happen in a community in order to prevent street crime. The criminal events perspective alerts us to the fact that there should be a co-productive relationship between the citizenry and the police in the precursor stage. For co-production to begin there would need to be at least a small
amount of social capital and strong leadership. However, social capital may not increase because of the police. Instead, it may increase solely because of the citizenry, as we have seen in Small City. Social capital among the citizenry in Small City does not yet extend to the police. The police do not appear to be viewed by the citizenry as part of the "community." The police are instead seen as a distant entity. We can separate conceptually the social capital of the citizenry from that of the police and view them as separate entities that need to overlap in order for co-production to occur.

The separation of the police and the community is to be expected. This separation, or alienation, has been present in American cities for several decades and relates to changes in police organization and philosophy of service delivery. For several decades, American police have been only marginally part of the community they police. Interaction between police officers and citizens is strained, formal, and sporadic. These are precisely the problems COP is supposed to address by bringing the police and the community into a partnership arrangement with respect to social order and social control.

Such partnerships appear to be an effective way to decrease crime. Social capital levels should increase after successful co-production, creating a circular pattern of increased co-production, crime reduction, and increased social capital levels. It should not be a surprise, therefore, that
social capital levels between the citizenry and the police in Small City continue to be relatively low. The amount of co-production between the citizenry and the police are perceived to be low by both groups. In order to achieve co-production, there is a certain amount of social capital needed to achieve this overlap between the social capitals of the citizenry and the police. What we need to determine is the precise level of social capital needed to produce co-production at the neighborhood level.

It is possible that small towns may not have stronger social capital levels than urban centers. In some cases, COP has been quite successful in large urban centers compared to smaller cities such as the one studied here. Researchers must examine each community differently before making comparisons and assumptions. We should then determine what makes one community or neighborhood have stronger levels of social capital and mechanical solidarity than another. Communities and neighborhoods shift socially and spatially over time, and we must take these considerations into account as well.

Research of this kind can show that there is more to COP than co-production and crime reduction. As we have seen to a limited extent in Small City, initiatives to implement COP can lead to other forms of citizen-led empowering actions to better the lives of citizens and improve quality of life. One can conclude from these findings that when individuals are given access to and have the opportunity to work with the
government and other agencies to improve their quality of life, those individuals will seize the opportunity. COP is but one example. These issues should be explored more systematically in subsequent work.
INTERVIEW CONSENT FORM

We are interviewing people in Small City, Iowa to learn more about policing in Small City. The purpose of this study is to see if community policing is working in the minds of the residents and police officers of Small City, Iowa. It is hoped that the findings of this research will facilitate Small City's efforts in practicing the community policing philosophy. Your perceptions on this matter are therefore very important. At the beginning or at anytime during the interview, feel free to ask questions or make any comments regarding this study, including procedures used for selecting individuals to be interviewed, or anything else of concern to you. Also it is your option to deny participation in the study or not to answer specific questions. However, please understand that all of your comments will be treated confidentially. This means never associating your comments with your name. Do you have any questions before we begin?

VERBALLY: Request permission to use a tape recorder for better accuracy. Also indicate that the tape will be erased immediately following transcription.

COMPLETION OF INTERVIEW: Thank you very much for your assistance. Also should you have specific concerns or requests about this study, please feel free to contact me, Nathan Pino, at (515) 204-8012.

FOCUS GROUP CONSENT FORM

This form is intended to further ensure confidentiality of data obtained during the course of the Community Policing in Small City, Iowa study. All parties involved in this research, including all focus group members, will be asked to read the following statement and sign their names indicating that they agree to comply.

I hereby affirm that I will not communicate or in any manner disclose publicly information discussed during the course of this focus group interview. I agree not to talk about material relating to this study or interview with anyone outside of my fellow focus group members and the researcher. All persons involved will remain confidential.

(Respondent and Moderator both sign)
APPENDIX B: FOCUS GROUP/INTERVIEW QUESTIONS AND PROBES
Focus Groups (Organized Neighborhood, non COP)

1. Thinking over the past three years (or fewer if you have not lived here that long), what are the major problems facing this community?
2. What are the best things about your neighborhood? The worst things?
3. Thinking over the past three years, is your neighborhood an overall better or worse place to live? Why?
4. What are the new problems of the community? What is (are) the cause(s) of the new problems?
5. Has the community changed over the past few years? How?
6. Have you become more fearful or less fearful of crime over the past three years? Is there less crime in your neighborhood? Less disorder?
7. How do you think or feel about police services in Small City?
8. Do you like the police better now than before? Why?
9. How do you think or feel about the police officers who work in Small City? What makes you feel that way?
10. How would you define community policing? What do you expect from it?
11. Is the policing style in this neighborhood the same as it was three years ago? How is it different? Is it better than it was three years ago?
12. Do you know the officers in your neighborhood by name? How long have you known them?
13. How would you describe the role of the police officer(s) who works in this neighborhood (what does he or she do)?
14. Have you been involved in any individual or group activities that seek to reduce crime? What have you done?
15. Have you been more involved in your community in activities other than crime reduction since being a member of the neighborhood organization? What are those activities?
16. How was your hood organization formed? What issues immediately arose? Have those problems been solved?
17. How does a neighborhood meeting work? Do the police often attend? What do they do? Is it helpful?
18. Do you think officers are willing to work with you to solve problems you have identified?
19. Do you think your neighbors are willing to work with the police to solve crime problems?
20. Do you feel comfortable working with the police to solve crime problems?
21. When the police and neighborhood groups get together, is it usually in an official capacity or a recreational capacity?
22. Have the police tried to work with you to solve crime problems? What have they done and how? How do you feel about that?
24. What can or should the police do to provide better police services to residents of your community? Do you ever express to the police these suggestions?
25. What do you think can help the police solve problems where you live?
26. If you, as a citizen were in charge of making decisions on policing for your community, what would you do? What would your priorities be? Would your actions be the same as the officers or different? How?

Community Focus Groups (Organized Neighborhood, COP)

1. Thinking over the past three years (or fewer if you have not lived here that long), what are the major problems facing this community?
2. What are the best things about your neighborhood? The worst things?
3. Thinking over the past three years, is your neighborhood an overall better or worse place to live? Why?
4. What are the new problems of the community? What is (are) the cause(s) of the new problems?
5. Has the community changed over the past few years? How?
6. Have you become more fearful or less fearful of crime over the past three years? Is there less crime in your neighborhood? Less disorder?
7. How do you think or feel about police services in Small City?
8. Do you like the police better now than before? Why?
9. How do you think or feel about the police officers who work in Small City? What makes you feel that way?
10. How would you define community policing? What do you expect from it?
11. Is the policing style in this neighborhood the same as it was three years ago? How is it different? Is it better than it was three years ago?
12. Do you know the CP officer by name? What does he do? Has he worked with you to solve crime related problems?
13. Do you know the names of other police officers in your neighborhood? How long have you known them?
14. How would you describe the role of the police officer(s) who works in this neighborhood (what does he or she do)?
15. Have you been involved in any individual or group activities that seek to reduce crime? What have you done?
16. Have you been more involved in your community in activities other than crime reduction since being a member of the neighborhood organization? What are those activities?
17. How was your hood organization formed? What issues immediately arose? Have those problems been solved?
18. How does a neighborhood meeting work? Do the police often attend? What do they do? Is it helpful?
19. Do you think officers are willing to work with you to solve problems you have identified?
20. Do you think your neighbors are willing to work with the police to solve crime problems?
21. Do you feel comfortable working with the police to solve crime problems?
22. When the police and neighborhood groups get together, is it usually in an official capacity or a recreational capacity?
23. Have the police tried to work with you to solve crime problems? What have they done and how? How do you feel about that?
24. What can or should the police do to provide better police services to residents of your community? Do you ever express to the police these suggestions?
25. What do you think can help the police solve problems where you live?
26. If you were in charge of making decisions on policing for your community, what would you do? What would your priorities be? Would your actions be the same as the officers or different? How?

COP Officer Interviews

1. Thinking over the past three years (or fewer if you have not lived here that long), what are the major problems facing this community as well as the neighborhood you are assigned to?
2. What are the new problems of the community and the neighborhood you are assigned to? What is (are) the cause(s) of the new problems?
3. Has the community/neighborhood changed over the past few years? How?
4. What is the best thing about the community/neighborhood? The worst?
5. How do you think the residents feel about police services in Small City? Residents in your neighborhood? What do you perceive influences their viewpoint on police services?
6. Do you think the police department is making a difference in reducing crime? How (why)?
7. How would you define community policing? Do you perceive it to be a worth-while effort?
8. Do you think it is possible for citizens and the police to work together to solve crime problems?
9. Do you think the citizens are willing to work with you to solve crime problems?
10. How would you describe the role you play as a law enforcement officer in Small City?
11. How would you describe your job as a community policing officer?
12. What kinds of community policing activities have you engaged in?
13. What crime reducing activities, if any, have you engaged in when you are working in concert with citizens? Have they been successful? Why?
14. Do you think CP is working in the neighborhoods where they are trying it? Better than in the other organized neighborhoods?
15. Have you engaged in any community organizing activities?
16. What community groups do you come into contact with? What are their suggestions of community improvement? What have you done about those suggestions?
17. How do you feel about the level of community involvement in combating the problems facing this community?
18. If you were in charge of making decisions on policing for your community, what would you do? What would your priorities be? Would your actions be the same as other officers or different? How?

Patrol Officer Interview

1. Thinking over the past three years (or fewer if you have not lived here that long), what are the major problems facing this community?
2. What are the new problems of the community? What is (are) the cause(s) of the new problems?
3. Has the community changed over the past few years? How? What is the best thing about the community? The worst?
4. How do you think the residents feel about police services in Small City? What do you perceive influences their viewpoint on police services?
5. Do you think the police department is making a difference in reducing crime? How (why)?
6. How would you define community policing? Do you perceive it to be a worthwhile effort?
7. Do you think it is possible for citizens and the police to work together to solve crime problems?
8. Do you think the citizens are willing to work with you to solve crime problems?
9. How would you describe the role you play as a law enforcement officer in Small City?
10. What kinds of community policing activities have you engaged in?
11. What crime reducing activities, if any, have you engaged in when you are working in concert with citizens? Have they been successful? Why?
12. Do you think CP is working in the neighborhoods where they are trying it? Better than in the other organized neighborhoods?
13. Have you engaged in any community organizing activities?
14. What community groups do you come into contact with? What are their suggestions of community improvement?
15. How do you feel about the level of community involvement in combating the problems facing this community?
16. If you were in charge of making decisions on policing for your community, what would you do? What would your priorities be?

**Safe Streets Coordinator Interview**

1. How would you describe the role you play as a safe streets coordinator?
2. Thinking over the past three years (or fewer if you have not lived here that long), what are the major problems facing this community?
3. What are the new problems of the community? What is (are) the cause(s) of the new problems?
4. Has the community changed over the past few years? How? What is the best thing about the community? The worst?
5. How do you think the residents feel about police services in Small City? What do you perceive influences their viewpoint on police services?
6. Do you think the police department is making a difference in reducing crime? How (why)?
7. How would you define community policing? Do you perceive it to be a worth-while effort?
8. Do you think it is possible for citizens and the police to work together to solve crime problems?
9. Do you think the citizens are willing to work with the police to solve crime problems?
10. Do you think the police are willing to work with citizens to solve crime problems?
11. Does policing differ in the organized neighborhoods with community policing officers? How?
12. What crime reducing activities, if any, have you seen where police are working in concert with citizens? Have they been successful? Why?
13. Do you think CP is working in the neighborhoods where they are trying it? Better than in the other organized neighborhoods?
14. Have you engaged in any community organizing activities?
15. What community groups do you come into contact with?
16. What are their suggestions of community improvement?
17. How do you feel about the level of community involvement in combating the problems facing this community?
18. If you were in charge of making decisions on policing for your community, what would you do? What would your priorities be? Would your actions be the same as other officers or different? How?
Police Captain Interview

1. Define CP as you see it.
2. When did the department start implementing CP and how did it all begin?
3. Are all officers a part of the changes, or only a set of CP officers?
4. How does the department assess police performance? (When assessing police performance, do you look at their ability to assess and solve community problems? How they communicate with citizens?)
5. Do you think officers are receptive to the current performance assessing methods?
6. How do officers approach crime problems? (Do you have a proactive approach to crime, or reactive, or both?)
7. Does the police dept. engage in proactive problem solving using solutions not limited to the CJ process?
8. Has the department established a department wide set of values? If so, what are they?
9. Does the department engage in specific tactics to target specific problems identified in an area?
10. Has authority been devolved to lower levels (decentralized units)? If so, is it more effective?
11. Does the department work with and share information with other law enforcement agencies? Does it work better when you do this?
12. Does the department work with other public sector agencies to solve crime problems?
13. Does the department work with the private sector to solve crime problems?
14. Is their resource sharing among partners?
15. Does the department engage in continual evaluation of various issues such as:
   - Crime prevention strategies?
   - Police discretionary practices?
   - Organizational effectiveness?
   - Citizen assessment of police?
   - Police opinion towards CP, citizens, and the like?
16. Are citizens involved in police evaluation?
17. Describe the departments various community relations programs. (In your community relations programs, do you have programs that have cops acting in an official capacity (greater proportion of beat patrol over car patrol))? 
18. Does the department engage in community organizing efforts?
19. Does the department rely on citizens in all neighborhoods to help fight crime? How?
20. Does the department keep the community informed through open channels of communication? How?
21. Does the department work with various community groups to help fight crime?
22. Does the department do a citizens police academy? Does it have any follow up activities? What do they learn? Do you learn from citizens at these academies as well?
23. Does the department prepare educational materials?
24. What do you think are the largest crime related problems in Small City?
APPENDIX C: QUALITATIVE CODING BY OBJECTIVE
The numbering system below is out of order because the codes were originally written down in the order they were conceptualized. Codes were organized by objective after all of the codes were created and the transcripts were coded.

Objective 1: To what extent is COP being implemented?

1. What COP is (defined)
2. COP happening
3. COP not happening
6. Collective action w/cops recreational
7. Collective action w/cops official
8. Collective action without cops recreational
9. Collective action without cops official
14. Personal involvement in COP
16. Community involvement is same since COP
17. Community involvement increased since COP
18. Community involvement decreased since COP
19. Policing style same since COP
20. Policing style different since COP
23. Policing different by hood
24. Policing is the same in all hoods
25. How hood meeting works
80. What COP officer does

Within these codes, the author coded elements of COP provided in the literature review (1. broad policing function/dept. set of values, 2. reliance on the citizenry, 3. specific tactics for specific problems, 4. decentralization of police organizational structure, 5. working with community and opening channels of communication, 6. working with public and private sector organizations, and 7. evaluation).

Objective 2: Is COP working in the minds of residents and officers?

4. COP working
5. COP not working
10. COP benefits
11. COP disadvantages
12. Co-production good
13. Co-production bad
26. Officers willing to work with hood
27. Officer not willing to work with hood
28. Neighbors willing to work with cops
29. Neighbors not willing to work with cops
30. Patrol officers are great
31. Patrol officers are bad
32. COP officer(s) are great
33. COP officer(s) are bad
39. Police are reducing crime
40. Police are not reducing crime
45. Hood better since COP
46. Hood worse since COP
47. Hood is the same since COP
50. Problems in hood solved
51. Problems in hood not solved
52. Community has improved
53. Community has not improved
54. Community is the same
55. Fear has increased since COP
56. Fear has decreased since COP
57. Fear level is same since COP
58. Crime is up since COP
59. Crime is down since COP
60. Crime is the same since COP
61. Disorder is up since COP
62. Disorder is down since COP
63. Disorder is the same since COP
74. COP is a worthwhile effort
75. COP is not a worthwhile effort
77. Citizens screw up
83. Safe Streets good
84. Safe Streets bad

**Objective 3: What influences citizen attitudes toward the police?**

34. Personal experience w/patrol cops good
35. Personal experience w/patrol cops bad
36. Personal experience w/COP officers good
37. Personal experience w/COP officers bad
38. What do you think citizens feel about cops?
78. Attitudes towards cops differ by hood
79. Attitudes towards cops same by hood

**Objective 4: Are thee additional benefits to COP?**

15. Personal involvement in community after joining hood group
66. Social capital happening
67. No social capital is happening
For codes 66 and 67, the author also coded for 1. trust, 2. reciprocity, 3. networks, and 4. collective action (or other outputs). These four phenomena are included within the definition of social capital provided by Newton (1997).

Suggestions for improvement

41. What police should do
42. What can help the police
43. What you would do if you were in charge
44. Citizen suggestions for improvement

Problems in the neighborhood and community at large

48. Problems in the hood
49. Problems in the community
64. Race problems
65. No race problems
68. Problems differ by hood
69. Cause of problems
70. Community has changed
71. Community has not changed
72. Best thing about Small City
73. Worst thing about Small City
76. Different issues by neighborhood
81. Best thing about hood
82. Worst thing about hood
APPENDIX D: COMMUNITY SURVEY
Dear Citizen,

The Small City police department is continuing its efforts to introduce "community policing" into our community. Community policing is both a philosophy and an organizational strategy that promotes partnerships between citizens and police. These partnerships are based on the premise that it is necessary for the police and the community to work together to identify, prioritize, and to begin to solve community problems such as crime and other quality of life issues. The purpose of this brief questionnaire is to determine the concerns and views of the residents of Small City about how we can best serve the needs of the community. Your views are very important to us. It’s not known what people like yourself think on these important issues, so we are trying to find out.

This questionnaire is totally confidential. When you return the questionnaire in the enclosed postage paid envelope, an ID number will be used to ensure confidentiality. After the study is completed, the questionnaires will be destroyed. All information will be kept confidential and will be used only for the purposes of the study. Your participation is completely voluntary. If you do not wish to answer any question, you may skip it and continue on.

Again, please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage paid envelope. Thank you for your cooperation and assistance with this project!

Listed below are statements regarding crime related issues in Small City. Some of the statements are positive while others are negative. For each statement listed below, on a scale from 1 to 7, please indicate how much you agree with the following statements (1=STRONGLY DISAGREE, 7=STRONGLY AGREE) by circling the number that best represents your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Overall, I believe that my neighborhood is a good place to live.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Over the past year, my neighborhood has become a worse place to live.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Trash and litter lying around my neighborhood is a serious problem.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. In general, I do not have inconsiderate neighbors.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Graffiti on sidewalks and walls are a serious problem in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. In my neighborhood people take care of their property</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. There are too many dilapidated buildings in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The youth are well supervised in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. There is too much noise in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. In my neighborhood there are too many people high on drugs and alcohol.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. There are too many abandoned cars and car parts lying around in my neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. We do not have a violence problem in my neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. There are too many people hanging around for no apparent reason in my neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I see strangers in my neighborhood very often.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. There are too many drug sales in my neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I fear being approached on the street by a beggar or panhandler in my neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I fear that someone will attempt to break into my home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I fear that my property will be damaged by vandals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. In general, over the past year, I have become less fearful of crime.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. The Small City Police Department has not been handling problems well in my neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. The police in Small City relate well to neighborhood residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. The police in Small City are not fair to all residents.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. In general, the residents of my neighborhood are committed to improving neighborhood conditions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. In general, my neighbors are willing to work with police to address neighborhood problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. In general, residents of my neighborhood fear retaliation if we work with police to solve crime problems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The people in my neighborhood look out for each other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, we need to ask a few questions about your background and past experiences. This information, as with all information provided in this survey, will be used for statistical analysis only and will remain strictly confidential.

27. What is your age (as of last birthday)? ____________ years.

28. Your Sex? _____ male _____ female

29. What is your current marital status? _____ single (never married) _____ married
   _____ divorced _____ separated
   _____ widowed

30. What is your highest level of formal education attained?
   _____ grade school _____ high school/GED _____ some college, no degree
   _____ associate degree _____ bachelors degree _____ graduate or professional degree

31. How would you describe yourself? _____ White _____ Mexican American
   _____ African American _____ Native American
   _____ Asian American _____ Other

32. How long have you lived in Small City? _____ years, _____ months.

33. How long have you lived at your current residence? _____ years, _____ months.

34. Do you own or rent your current residence? _____ own _____ rent

35. How many people, including yourself, live in your household? _____ persons.

36. Are you a member of a neighborhood association? _____ yes _____ no

37. Have you installed extra locks on windows or doors at your current residence? _____ yes _____ no

38. Have you added outside lighting to your current residence? _____ yes _____ no
39. Do you keep a weapon in your home for protection? _____ yes _____ no

40. Have you learned more about self-defense? _____ yes _____ no

41. Do you carry mace or some other form of protection when you leave your home? _____ yes _____ no

42. Do you generally avoid certain areas during the day to avoid crime? _____ yes _____ no

43. Do you generally avoid certain areas during the night to avoid crime? _____ yes _____ no

44. In the past year, have you been a victim of any crime? _____ yes _____ no

45. If yes, what crime(s) was it?

46. Was the crime(s) reported to the police? _____ yes _____ no

47. If you answered no to question 46, please tell us why you decided not to report the crime(s) to the police.

48. In the past year, has a close friend or relative of yours been the victim of a crime? _____ yes _____ no

Thank you very much for your cooperation!

Small City Police Department
&
Iowa State University
P.O. Box 393
Small City, Iowa 52761
APPENDIX E: EXPLANATION OF PRIMARY VARIABLES
Variables with number names correspond to the question number on the survey.

**Copsgood**: Positive attitudes toward the police. Variables 20-22 were added together after all were recoded to increase in a positive direction. (alpha = .60)

**Age**: From question 27. Age in years.

**Educ**: From question 30. Grade school is coded 1, graduate or professional is coded 6.

**Sex**: From question 28. 0 = male, 1 = female.

**Race**: From question 31. 0 = white, 1 = non-white/other.

**Ownrent**: From question 34. 0 = own, 1 = rent.

**Hoodass**: From question 36. 0 = no, 1 = yes.

**Victm**: From question 44. 0 = no, 1 = yes.

**Victm2**: From question 48. 0 = no, 1 = yes.

Confirmatory factor analysis yielded the following variables for initial hypothesis testing:

**Genfear**: From question 19. Refers to general fear of crime

**Propfear**: Variables 17 and 18 are added together and recoded to increase in a positive (non-fear of property crime) direction.

**Avoid**: Questions 42 and 43 are added together. 42 and 43 are coded 0 for no and 1 for yes. However, for the avoid variable, 1 = don't avoid areas during the day or night, 2 = avoid areas at either the day or night but not both, and 3 = avoid areas during the day and at night.

**Proactiv**: Questions 37 through 41 are added together. Refers to individuals taking proactive steps to reduce the chances of victimization. Each question was coded 0 for no and 1 for yes. (alpha = .60)

**Hdisorder**: Refers to a general lack of disorder. Variables 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 15 were added together after recoding the variables so they would all increase in a positive direction. (alpha = .90)

**Hoodgood**: Refers to feelings that one's neighborhood is a good place to live. Variables 1, 2, 8, 23, 24, and 26 were added
together after recoding the variables so they would all increase in a positive direction. (alpha = .83)

**Satisfaction:** Refers to a lack of disgust regarding one's neighborhood. A higher score means the individual sees a general lack of disorder and feels that one's neighborhood is a good place to live. All variables that made up both the disorder and hoodgood variables were added together. (alpha = .90)

**Fear:** Refers to general fear of criminal victimization. All of the variables that made up the variables victim, victim2, 19, propfear, avoid, and proactiv were added together after being recoded so they would all increase in a negative (more fear) direction. All of the variables were standardized before being added together as well. (alpha = .71)
APPENDIX F: TABLES OF CORRELATION MATRICES
Table 16a: Correlations among satisfaction variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.44***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.49***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.23***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001
Table 16b: Correlations among satisfaction variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.34***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.42***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.47***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
<td>.45***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.40***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>.52***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.41***</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.63***</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.17***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.59***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.21***</td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.72***</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.60***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001
Table 17a: Correlations among satisfaction and fear variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>genfear</th>
<th>adlit</th>
<th>avday</th>
<th>avnit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.37***</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.36***</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>-.33***</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.20***</td>
<td>-.12***</td>
<td>-.13***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.41***</td>
<td>-.47***</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.20***</td>
<td>-.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-.37***</td>
<td>-.39***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-.45***</td>
<td>-.48***</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.43***</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.20***</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>-.25***</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>-.23***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
Table 17b: Correlations among satisfaction and fear variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fear</th>
<th>xlocks</th>
<th>kpwep</th>
<th>macept</th>
<th>slfdef</th>
<th>victm</th>
<th>victm2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.20***</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
<td>-.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.25***</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.25***</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.10*</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-.13**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.25***</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
Table 18a: Correlations among fear variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>genfear</th>
<th>adlit</th>
<th>avday</th>
<th>avnit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.76***</td>
<td>.26***</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genfear</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.18***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adlit</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avday</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avnit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kpwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>macept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slfdef</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victm2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001
Table 18b: Correlations among fear variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>xlocks</th>
<th>kpwep</th>
<th>macept</th>
<th>slfdef</th>
<th>victm</th>
<th>victm2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.11**</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genfear</td>
<td>.15**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adlit</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>.17**</td>
<td>.11*</td>
<td>.17***</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.12*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avday</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avnit</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlocks</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.19***</td>
<td>.18***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kpwep</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.39***</td>
<td>.14**</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>macept</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.12*</td>
<td>.13**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slfdef</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victm2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
Table 19: Correlations among individual characteristic and satisfaction variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual</th>
<th>Satisfaction age</th>
<th>educ</th>
<th>hoodass</th>
<th>ownrent</th>
<th>race</th>
<th>sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>-0.13**</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.13**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>educ</th>
<th>hoodass</th>
<th>ownrent</th>
<th>race</th>
<th>sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genfear</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adlit</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avday</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avnit</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlocks</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kpwep</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>macept</td>
<td>-0.10*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slfdef</td>
<td>-0.13**</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victm</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victm2</td>
<td>0.27***</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  
** p < .01  
*** p < .001
Table 21: Correlations among individual characteristic variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>age</th>
<th>educ</th>
<th>hoodass</th>
<th>ownrent</th>
<th>race</th>
<th>sex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.22***</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.23***</td>
<td>-0.15**</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educ</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoodass</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ownrent</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001

Table 22: Correlations between all dependent and individual characteristic variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>age</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educ</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hoodass</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ownrent</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>race</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sex</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001
Table 23: Correlations between all dependent and satisfaction variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.12*</td>
<td>0.11*</td>
<td>0.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.25***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.19***</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.29***</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.33***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
<td>0.22***</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.26***</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
<td>0.30***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.20***</td>
<td>0.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.10*</td>
<td>0.28***</td>
<td>0.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.16**</td>
<td>0.37***</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>0.35***</td>
<td>0.21***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001
Table 24: Correlations between all dependent and fear variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>-.18***</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>genfear</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
<td>-.16**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avday</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.13*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avnit</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.11*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adlit</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xlocks</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kpwe</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>macept</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>slfdef</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victm</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-.19***</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>victm2</td>
<td>-.17**</td>
<td>-.21***</td>
<td>-.25***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05
** p<.01
*** p<.001
Table 25: Correlations among all dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.18***</td>
<td>0.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001
APPENDIX G: GRAPHS OF INTERACTIONS
Figure 1: Sex Interaction with Fear and all Fear Variables:

Figure 2: Sex Interaction with Satisfaction and all Satisfaction Variables:
Figure 3: Race Interaction with Avoidday

Figure 4: Race Interaction with Keepweap

Figure 5: Race Interaction with Satisfaction Variables
Figure 6: Ownrent Interaction with Victim

Figure 7: Ownrent Interaction with Satisfaction Variables
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