Criminal Justice Review
Volume 26, Number 1, Spring 2001

©2001 College of Health and Human Sciences
Georgia State University

COMMUNITY POLICING AND THE WORK ROUTINES OF STREET-LEVEL OFFICERS*

Brad W. Smith, Kenneth J. Novak, and James Frank

Most of the literature on community policing suggests, either implicitly or explicitly, that the daily activities of community police officers will differ from the activities traditionally engaged in by police officers. The majority of studies examining officer work routines were conducted prior to the rapid proliferation of community policing throughout police departments in the United States. Any attempt to determine the nature and extent of community policing needs to include an examination of the daily activities of line-level personnel charged with its implementation. The current study, using systematic social observation data, provides a description and comparison of the work routines of both community-oriented and traditional police officers in a city implementing community-oriented policing. Many of the findings are similar to those of previous workload studies. However, the findings also indicate that community officers devoted significantly more time to nontraditional policing activities than beat officers. Further, 911 beat officers spent significantly more time engaged in traditional policing activities than community officers.

Researchers have taken a variety of approaches to studying the behavior of police officers. One important avenue of research in this endeavor is the study of how officers spend their time—commonly referred to as workload studies (Parks, Mastrofski, DeJong, & Gray, 1999). The majority of workload studies were conducted prior to the rapid proliferation of community policing throughout police departments in the U.S. (Cordner, 1979; Cumming, Cumming, & Edell, 1965; Greene & Klockars, 1991; Mastrofski, 1983; Reiss, 1971; Webster, 1970). With this rapid growth of community policing, Frank, Brandl, and Watkins (1997) have suggested that it is important to revisit the issue of how officers spend their time. Indeed, most of the literature on community policing suggests, either implicitly or explicitly, that the daily activities of community policing officers will differ from the activities traditionally engaged in by police officers (Frank et al., 1997; Mastrofski, 1992; Parks et al., 1999; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1994).

Under community policing it is posited that officers will engage in a broader variety of activities and will perform community policing, order maintenance, and service activities to a greater extent and traditional crime-oriented police activities to a lesser extent (Greene & Taylor, 1988; Kratcoski & Dukes, 1995; Mastrofski,

*This work was supported by the National Institute of Justice, grant number 96-IJ-CX-0075. Points of view are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the view of the U.S. Department of Justice or the National Institute of Justice. A previous version of this article was presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, held in Washington, DC, November 11-14, 1998. Please submit all correspondence to Brad Smith.

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 17 (2001)

1988; Mastrofski, Worden, & Snipes, 1995; Oliver, 1998). Parks et al. (1999) suggest that an agency's overall "theme" or approach to community policing will influence the activity choices of officers. Although authors may dispute the mechanisms through which community policing may influence officer behavior, few dispute that, if implemented, community policing will influence the activities of police officers.

In addition to theorists suggesting that community policing activities should vary from those engaged in by traditional beat officers, some law enforcement agencies have also attempted to prevail upon their community officers to allocate time to the performance of certain tasks. Organizational efforts have taken a variety of forms, though they generally involve the assignment of some portion of the force to be community officers under a split-force plan (Maguire, 1997; Skogan & Hartnett, 1997). The extent to which these officers are directed to specialize in community policing tasks only or are to perform them in conjunction with other, more traditional beat-level tasks (i.e., respond to calls, perform patrol and traffic functions, etc.) varies by agency.

Regardless of the hypothesized and planned changes associated with community policing, any organizational policy can be undermined by those who are charged with its implementation. In police organizations those who create policies are often not those who are responsible for implementation of the policies. Police officers have considerable discretion, coupled at times with limited supervision, and are often placed in the role of what Lipsky (1980) referred to as "street-level bureaucrats"—charged with turning policy into reality at the street level. In this role officers can comply with organizational policies willingly, ignore those policies, or at times actively undermine or sabotage planned changes (Brehm & Gates, 1997). Thus, many organizational policies are filtered through the discretion of line-level personnel. Community policing places even greater discretion and decision-making authority into the hands of these line-level officers. One consequence of such devolution of authority is that policy makers and police supervisors often have even more limited information regarding officers' daily activities, and their ability to shape these activities is thus even more constrained. Therefore, any attempt to determine how community policing is implemented needs to include an examination of the daily activities of line-level officers charged with its implementation.

Community policing can also be undermined by mid-level managers. Implementing community policing means shifting power and discretion away from supervisors and placing it in the hands of line officers, and this may result in a perceived or actual loss of power, control, and discretion. In order to decentralize decision making, middle management (particularly sergeants) give up a great deal of authority. This organizational strategy is strangely reminiscent of the team policing experiments conducted in the 1970s. Sherman, Milton, and Kelly (1973) noted that sergeants who were responsible for implementing team policing viewed

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 18 (2001)

the policy as a threat to their power and attempted to subvert successful implementation. Further, line officers may mimic the ideals and values of their immediate superiors in expectation of positive performance evaluations and promotions (DeJong, Mastrofski, & Parks, 2001). Organizations interested in implementing community policing should therefore be cognizant of the attitudes of frontline supervisors. As Skogan and Hartnett (1997, p. 90) noted regarding the Chicago experience with community policing, "it was also clear that the program could not become a reality until officers believe that their immediate supervisor really expected them to carry [community policing] out."

Although community-oriented policing is presently the preferred strategy of many police agencies, until recently there existed very little information about the actual tasks engaged in by street-level community policing officers (Maguire & Mastrofski, 2000; Zhao, Lovrich, & Thurman, 1999). There is also only a minimal amount of knowledge about how the performance of community policing officers varies nationally from the behavior of traditional patrol officers (Frank et al., 1997; Parks et al., 1999; Skolnick & Bayley, 1987). If community policing within a jurisdiction involves efforts to change the tasks that officers perform and the way that they perform them, it is necessary to understand what officers do when they take on community policing responsibilities. Thus it is important to examine the activities of line-level officers because these tell us, in part, what community policing is, if anything, in a particular locale. What officers do on a daily basis also has implications not only for determining whether and how an agency implements community policing but also for how citizens experience policing. Different activities on the part of community police officers may have different consequences for the citizens being policed.

Despite the fact that proponents have outlined the types of activities that community police officers should undertake and the fact that police agencies around the country rally behind the cry of community policing, "we [still] know remarkably little about what it [community policing] means to the work of the street-level officer" (Mastrofski, 1992, p. 23). Few studies have empirically examined the daily activities of community police officers (Cordner, 1995). The purpose of the present study is to expand this limited but growing body of research on officer behavior. The current research provides a description, analysis, and comparison of the work routines of both community-oriented and traditional police officers in Cincinnati, Ohio.

OFFICER TASKS AND WORK ROUTINES: COMMUNITY AND BEAT OFFICERS

A number of scholars have attempted to give direction to police agencies and officers implementing community policing. These scholars have listed various daily activities that they suggest embody the philosophy of community policing.

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 19 (2001)

Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994), for example, developed a detailed list of categories of community-oriented police (COP) officer activities. Mastrofski (1992) also listed a variety of activities that community police officers can undertake during a typical work day; the list includes surveys of residents, park-and-walk patrol, neighborhood substations, involvement with citizen groups, and problem-solving. The lists of activities described by Mastrofski (1992) and Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994) are similar to those found in other works that contend that one would expect COP officers to spend more time in order maintenance and service activities than in law enforcement activities (Greene & Taylor, 1988; Mastrofski, 1988; Mastrofski et al., 1995; Oliver, 1998). Specifically, one would expect COP officers to spend more time on activities such as problem-solving, foot patrol, activities involving citizens, and helping activities, among others, and less time on law enforcement and traffic activities.

In addition to explicit listings of activities, some authorities have provided theoretical perspectives on community policing that imply that officers will have to engage in certain activities in order to carry out the community policing philosophy. For example, Manning (1988) suggested that community police officers should work as a link between citizens and other governmental agencies. In order to do this, officers may spend more time engaging citizens and other governmental service employees. Further, scholars imply that officers are expected to help organize citizens around the issue of crime and other quality-of-life issues (Goldstein, 1987; Skolnick & Bayley, 1987). These types of objectives may also require changes in police officer activities. Parks et al. (1999) suggested that the approach to community policing or the theme taken by a department will influence the objectives and thus the activities and time allocation of officers. Although these authors do not directly list the activities of community police officers, they do imply that line personnel will spend their time differently under community policing.

Whatever the theoretical discussions and direct instructions on what to do, the question of what officers actually do remains an empirical one. Although many researchers have examined the behavior of police officers, only a handful have looked directly at the issue of officer activities. Four studies bear directly on this issue.

Empirical Studies of Officer Activities

Using duty logs, Kratcoski and Dukes (1995) examined the amount of time spent by community officers on six different categories of activities. "To our surprise, we found that time use by neighborhood police officers was much like that reported by many researchers for district officers during the past two decades with the notable exception that [a considerable amount of] time is dedicated to communication with citizens" (p. 161). Although they provide some information about the daily activities of community police officers, Kratcoski and Dukes' broad general

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 20 (2001)

categories mask the distinctive qualities of officer tasks that underlie several of their activity classifications. With all activities collapsed into six broad categories, it is unknown whether a small number of activities were responsible for the findings regarding a particular category. For instance, the category of law enforcement included felony and misdemeanor arrests, traffic citations, moving misdemeanors, parking tickets, issuing and serving of summonses, and radio calls. It is very likely that writing traffic and parking tickets will heavily outnumber felony and misdemeanor arrests and thus may dominate this category. Further, the accuracy of activity logs is contingent upon officers' cooperation, honesty, and interest in the reporting of activities and times (Cordner, 1979). These logs are designed to allow supervisors to review the work of police officers, and officers may not wish to report activities or the use of time that would reflect poorly on their work (Cordner, 1979; see also Greene & Klockars, 1991). Thus, studies using data from these logs may be biased toward activities that officers believe supervisors expect of them as community police officers.

Travis and Sanders (1998), using surveys of police departments and task analysis surveys of both community and traditional beat officers in Ohio from 1981 and 1996, examined the daily work activities of officers across departments and years. The task analysis survey asked respondents to report the frequency with which they engaged in 24 different tasks during the previous 12 months. They found that community officers responding to the 1996 survey "report higher frequency of involvement in a range of community policing activities than do other officers" (Travis & Sanders, 1998, p. 28). For instance, they found that COP officers reported a higher frequency of involvement in representing departments with other organizations, patrolling on foot, giving directions, providing various types of information to citizens, and visiting schools. This study provides insight into the daily work routines of community police officers across jurisdictions in Ohio and suggests that community officers perform different activities than traditional beat officers. However, because of the nature of the data collection methods (surveys), the researchers were limited to examining a restricted range of activities.

Using data collected during observations of police officers, Frank et al. (1997) examined the daily work activities of street-level officers. They classified into 35 categories the daily activities of both traditional beat officers and community-oriented police officers and examined the frequency with which officers engaged in these various categories of activities. They also collapsed the 35 categories into nine more general groupings similar to those commonly used in research examining officer activities. Thus, they avoided the problems of relying on officers for information and the use of broad categories that may mask activities. Similar to Travis and Sanders (1998), they found that the daily activities of community officers differed from those of traditional beat officers. They noted that "the findings show that neighborhood officers engage in a broader range of non-traditional police activities than do patrol officers" (Frank et al., 1997, p. 725).

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 21 (2001)

More recently, Parks et al. (1999), using data from observations of police officers, examined how officers spent their time in two cities. They grouped all officer activities into seven categories and compared traditional generalist officers with community policing officers. They found that community officers spent more time engaged in information gathering, administrative work, and personal time, while generalists spent more time in encounters with citizens and on patrol. The focus of their research, however, was predominantly on how officers spent time with citizens.

The research on officer activities in the era of community policing is limited but expanding. The current research builds on this previous work using data from a large number of field observations of both traditional beat officers and community policing specialists. Every minute of observed officers' shifts was recorded and categorized. In addition, the activities of these two groups of officers were compared across 16 activity categories.

METHOD

Data on the activities of police officers were obtained through systematic social observations of police officers, which, as noted by Cordner (1979, p. 51), "should result in the most accurate and detailed information" regarding the activities of officers. The data include observations conducted in Cincinnati, Ohio, over a 13-month period between April 1997 and April 1998.

The primary purpose of the larger observation study was to document the activities of community policing officers and beat officers in one city. In order to make the desired comparisons of COP and beat officers, the study observed officers in similar contexts during similar times of the day and on similar days of the week. To accomplish this, a random sample of 29 of the 43 COP officers in the city were selected for inclusion in the study. Because COP officers were assigned to neighborhoods, the selection of a COP officer brought with it a beat that corresponded to the neighborhood. The beat officer assigned to the corresponding beat on the selected day and time was then observed. Thus, a sample of beats allowed for observations of beat officers in contexts and at times that were comparable to those of the COP officers selected.

With the selection of COP officers in the study and the location of beat officers to be included, dates and times for the observations were then chosen. The sampling frame consisted of valid days of the week (i.e., Monday through Saturday) and valid shifts (i.e., first and second). One day per month was randomly selected for each COP officer and for officers in the corresponding beat in which observations were to be conducted.

Beat officers can be assigned to any shift on any day of the week, whereas COP officers typically work five consecutive days (Monday through Friday or Tuesday through Saturday) during first or second shift. Therefore, observations were limited

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 22 (2001)

to first and second shifts on Monday through Saturday. This places obvious limitations on the generalizability of the results. Clearly, the activities and behavior of police officers working "midnights" or third shift on Friday nights will most likely not resemble first shift officers on Tuesdays. Though observed behavior cannot be interpreted as the manner in which policing is done in Cincinnati as a whole, the beat officer observations included in our study do represent an adequate comparison group and the findings are generalizable to COP officers in Cincinnati.

Trained observers accompanied police officers during the selected times and recorded everything that officers did during their normal work days. In order to systematically structure observations and ensure reliability, the framework described by Mastrofski et al. (1997) was adopted. Prior to conducting observations, observers were required to complete a training course over a period of several weeks. In the training course, the project and its purposes were described in great detail, and the organizational arrangement of the police division was reviewed. The majority of effort in these training sessions was devoted to reviewing and discussing the data coding instruments and clarifying and interpreting each of the standardized questions. The primary purpose of the training was to ensure the use of standard coding rules and hence increase inter-coder reliability.

One disadvantage of field observations is reactivity. Officers may engage in behavior that they perceive to be acceptable, or they may want to "show the observer a good time." This may result in researchers overestimating or underestimating the prevalence of some phenomena. Understanding the potential for this problem, the research team took numerous steps to minimize reactivity. In addition to the training provided to observers, the research team also explained the purpose of the project to officers and assured them of confidentiality. Furthermore, questions regarding reactivity were included on coding instruments in order to determine whether reactivity occurred (see Mastrofski et al., 1997). Although steps were taken to minimize reactivity, it is inevitable that some changes in officer behavior occurred during the course of the study. For this reason, observers were queried on every coding instrument about whether they believed that officers or citizens reacted to their presence and were asked to describe the nature of the reactivity. In total, observers reported that in only 0.7 percent of all activities did they perceive officers to react to their presence. Further, they reported officer reactivity in only 0.5 percent of all encounters between police and citizens.

In all, observations were conducted with 131 different beat officers (236 observations for a total of approximately 1,888 hours observed) and 31 different community-oriented police officers (206 observations for a total of approximately 1,648 hours observed). A total of 442 shifts were observed, or approximately 3,536 hours.

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 23 (2001)

Community Policing in Cincinnati

Community policing in Cincinnati during the study period is best described as "specialist" in nature (McGarrell, Langston, & Richardson, 1997). In other words, community policing was set up in Cincinnati as a specialized unit within the department, rather than as a department-wide philosophy involving all officers. The result was two groups or types of officers within the Patrol Bureau: specialist neighborhood officers and traditional beat patrol officers. (For a discussion of the development of community policing in Cincinnati see Frank et al., 1997.)

Community or neighborhood officers applied for these positions and were selected to serve in this assignment. Community officers obtained their assignment through an intra-division bid and review process. After officers applied for the position, they were interviewed by community policing sergeants and other division supervisors, as well as members of the communities where the officers would be assigned. After selection, officers were given an additional 40 hours of academy training geared toward community policing and problem solving. (All officers in the CPD received 8 hours of community policing and problem-solving training through in-service training.) These officers were then assigned to a specific neighborhood, or in some cases several neighborhoods, on a long-term basis in which to perform community policing functions. The assigned functions included carrying out general duties common to all officers in the patrol bureau, in addition to becoming acquainted with citizens in their assigned neighborhood, identifying problems, forging partnerships to solve problems, networking with local service providers, representing the agency at community meetings, and performing crime prevention functions, among other tasks (Cincinnati Police Division, 1998). In order to facilitate the performance of these duties, community officers were not responsible for radio runs and worked flexible schedules. Traditional beat officers, on the other hand, were responsible for responding to calls for service and for traditional patrol responsibilities within their assigned beats. They worked rotating shifts and were not responsible for the specialized duties of the community officers. Because neighborhood and beat boundaries were the same, residents received the services of both types of officers.

Measurement of Variables

Sixteen mutually exclusive activity categories were created: foot patrol, motor patrol, crime incidents, administrative (crime related), investigative, traffic enforcement, order maintenance, service, ordinance enforcement, community-based service, problem-focused, information gathering, meetings with nonpolice service providers, administrative, en route/waiting, and personal (see Appendix for a detailed description of activity categories). The 16 activity categories used for the examination and comparison of work routines were developed from the data

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 24 (2001)

collected during observations of police officers. Every minute of an observed police officer's shift was recorded as either an activity or an encounter, and the beginning and ending time for each activity was also noted by the observer. An *activity* was defined as any behavior engaged in by an officer that did not involve a face-to-face interaction with a citizen, whereas an *encounter* was a personal interaction between a citizen and a police officer. Activities were classified into 23 different activity categories that included 71 different tasks. Encounters were classified into 102 different types of encounters. For the purposes of this study, each of the 23 activity categories and 102 encounter categories was recoded and included in one of the 16 activity categories that best captured the underlying activity engaged in during each activity or encounter. For instance, if an officer encountered a citizen during a traffic stop, then this encounter was included in the activity category of traffic enforcement. These 16 categories, taken together, represent all observed officer time.

FINDINGS

Officer Work Routine

The following analysis of work routine provides a description of both community-oriented and traditional police officer activities during first- and second-shift observations (7:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.). These descriptions do not provide a detailed description of all police officers in Cincinnati, but rather only those street-level officers working between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m. Third shift was not selected for observation because COP officers are encouraged to work during first and second shift only. Because COP officers typically only work first and second shift in Cincinnati, this does provide an accurate description of the activities engaged in by the typical COP officer in Cincinnati, and it allows for comparison with the activities of a typical beat officer working the same shifts in the same neighborhoods.

Table 1 presents the average number of observed minutes per shift and the proportion of total time spent on the 16 different activity categories for all observed COP officers and beat officers.[1] A total of 188,510 minutes (3,141.83 hours) were observed. The first column lists the 16 different activity categories. Columns 2 and 3 present the average minutes per shift observed for community officers on each activity and the proportion of total time spent on these activities. Columns 4 and 5 present this same information for beat officers, while columns 6 and 7 display these data for all officers combined (COP and beat).

[1]Even though some observed shifts were not a full eight hours in length, because officers had to leave early or started late, for purposes of this analysis the times are standardized to an eight-hour shift.

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 25 (2001)

Table 1

Average Minutes per Shift and Proportion of Total Time

Activity	COP officers Minutes per shift	%	Beat officers Minutes per shift	%	All officers Minutes per shift	%
Foot patrol	2	0	1	0	1	0
Motor patrol*	115	24	139	29	125	26
Crime incidents*	34	7	58	12	48	10
Administrative (crime related)	10	2	14	3	10	2
Investigative*	14	3	24	5	19	4
Traffic enforcement*	10	2	38	8	24	5
Order maintenance	10	2	14	3	14	3
Service	10	2	14	3	14	3
Ordinance enforcement	5	1	5	1	5	1
Community-based service*	19	4	1	0	10	2
Problem-focused**	10	2	2	0	5	1
Information gathering*	24	5	10	2	14	3
Meetings with nonpolice service providers*	10	2	1	0	5	1
Administrative*	110	23	77	16	91	19
En route/waiting*	43	9	53	11	48	10
Personal*	58	12	34	7	48	10

*$p < .01$. **$p < .05$.

Community Officers

The second and third columns in Table 1 provide the data on the activities of community officers only. Specifically, column 2 gives the average number of minutes per shift that an activity was observed being performed by neighborhood officers. The third column provides the proportion of the total time that community officers in the study were observed performing each category of tasks. Several findings are apparent from a review of these two columns in Table 1.

First, two activities were performed to a far greater extent than any of the other 14 categories of work tasks during a community officer's shift. Specifically, random motorized patrol consumed the largest proportion of time, as these officers spent 24 percent of their work day or approximately 1 hour and 55 minutes during a typical shift on routine patrol. Administrative tasks (shift preparation, roll call, internal reports, etc.) constituted the second most frequently performed type of

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 26 (2001)

activity. This type of work was conducted for approximately 1 hour and 50 minutes per shift (23 percent of the work day). Furthermore, each of these activities consumed approximately twice as much community officer time as the next most frequent activity category (personal time). These two activity categories (patrol and administrative) consumed almost half of a neighborhood officer's typical shift.

Second, activities related to specific reported crime occurrences—what we term crime incidents, administrative (crime related), and investigative—accounted for 12 percent of the observed community officer time or almost 1 hour of a COP officer's day. Specifically, criminal incidents consumed 7 percent or about one half-hour of community officers' shifts. Administrative duties related to crime occupied another 10 minutes or 2 percent of their day. The last activity included as crime-related, investigative, was conducted by COP officers for 14 minutes per shift. Two additional activities focused on applying the law, traffic enforcement (2 percent or 10 minutes of a COP officer's day) and ordinance enforcement (1 percent of the day), contributed an additional 15 minutes of crime-related tasks.

Third, activities typically described as those that officers should perform if implementing a community policing philosophy consumed approximately 15 percent of the typical work day of neighborhood officers. For example, community-based service activities were performed during 4 percent of a community officer's shift, while problem-focused activities, general service activities, and meetings with service providers each consumed an additional 2 percent of the work day. Information gathering consumed the largest share of time out of these five nontraditional policing activities (5 percent or 24 minutes). It should be noted that community officers rarely performed foot patrol.

Fourth, the last two categories together took up a substantial proportion of COP officers' days. Traveling to specific locations and waiting for the arrival of other police consumed an additional 43 minutes or 9 percent of COP officers' days. Finally, time spent conducting personal business, such as meals and personal errands, consumed 12 percent of their work routine or almost 1 hour per shift.

Beat Officers

Examining the time spent by beat officers displayed in Table 1 reveals, first, that random motorized patrol was the individual activity that consumed the greatest proportion of beat officer time. This activity, on average, was performed during 29 percent of these officers' shifts or more than 2 hours per day. Furthermore, foot patrol was rarely performed by beat officers.

Second, the three crime occurrence activities, responding to criminal incidents, administrative (crime related), and crime investigations, together consumed an additional 20 percent of beat officers' days or about one and a half hours of beat officers' shifts. Specifically, crime incidents alone took up almost 1 hour per day (12 percent), while administrative duties related to crime accounted for another 14

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 27 (2001)

minutes (3 percent) per day. Finally, beat officers also spent 24 minutes (5 percent) of their day investigating reported criminal behavior. Together, patrol and crime-related activities accounted for almost 50 percent of the work routine of beat officers. Furthermore, traffic and municipal ordinance enforcement consumed another 11 percent of the typical shift of these officers.

Third, the three activities listed at the bottom of Table 1 accounted for nearly 2 hours 44 minutes (34 percent) per beat officer shift. Beat officers spent a substantial proportion of their work day on administrative duties (16 percent or 1 hour 17 minutes per shift). In addition, beat officers also spent considerable time traveling to and from locations and waiting for other police. Time spent traveling from one location to another (en route) and waiting for the arrival of citizens or other police personnel accounted for nearly 53 minutes per shift (11 percent). Finally, beat officers took just over one half-hour per day of personal time (7 percent).

Fourth, beat officers spent very little time on nontraditional police activities commonly associated with community policing (6 percent of their day). Community-based service, problem-focused activities, and meetings with other service providers were all conducted for less than 5 minutes per shift or 1 percent of the observed time (one half-hour per month). Information gathering consumed 2 percent or roughly 10 minutes per beat officer shift, and general service activities consumed an additional 3 percent of beat officer time.

Comparison of Community and Beat Officers

To determine whether COP and beat officers differed in the proportion of time spent on these 16 different activities, a series of *t*-tests between the two groups of officers were performed.[2] Significant differences are indicated by asterisks in Table 1.

There were 11 categories that differed significantly between the two groups of officers. Beat officers spent significantly more time on motor patrol, crime incidents, investigative, traffic enforcement, and en route/waiting. COP officers devoted significantly more time to community-based service, problem-focused, information gathering activities, and meetings with nonpolice service providers. In addition to these expected differences, the two groups of officers also differed in the amount of time spent on administrative and personal activities. COP officers

[2]Because we could not with certainty meet the assumption that our COP sample came from a normal population (i.e., they were self-selected to apply and then were chosen by the administration) we also conducted a series of Mann-Whitney distribution free tests. In the 48 tests of significance only three differences appeared between the two types of tests. For readers' ease of interpretation the results of the *t*-tests are presented. For the comparison of all activities (encounters and activities combined) the category of administrative (crime related) was found to be significant using the Mann-Whitney test. Finally, for the activities only comparison, the category of investigative activities was found to be significant using the Mann-Whitney test but was not found to be significant using the *t*-test. For all other comparisons the results did not differ between the two types of tests.

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 28 (2001)

spent significantly more time on administrative duties and personal time than did beat officers.

To further explore differences between the two groups of officers, a series of *t*-tests were performed with encounters with citizens separated from activities not involving direct interaction with citizens. As can be seen in Table 2, statistically significant differences were observed for 10 activity categories that were also significant in the first series of *t*-tests (motor patrol, crime incidents, traffic enforcement, community-based service, problem-focused, information gathering, meetings with nonpolice service providers, administrative, en route/waiting, and personal time). The two groups of officers did not differ significantly on administrative (crime related), investigative, service, or ordinance enforcement when encounters were treated as a separate category.

Table 2

Average Minutes per Shift and Proportion of Total Time Observed: Activities

	COP officers		Beat officers	
Activity	**Minutes per shift**	**%**	**Minutes per shift**	**%**
Foot patrol	2	0	1	0
Motor patrol*	115	24	139	29
Crime incidents*	14	3	19	4
Administrative (crime related)	10	2	14	3
Investigative	10	2	14	3
Traffic enforcement*	1	0	10	2
Order maintenance	1	0	1	0
Service	5	1	5	1
Ordinance enforcement	5	1	5	1
Community-based service*	10	2	0	0
Problem-focused*	10	2	2	0
Information gathering*	19	4	5	1
Meetings with nonpolice service providers*	10	2	1	0
Administrative*	110	23	77	16
En route/waiting*	43	9	53	11
Personal*	53	11	34	7

*$p < .01$.

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 29 (2001)

Table 3 presents comparisons between COP and beat officers on the proportion of time spent in encounters with citizens. Beat officers spent significantly more of their shifts interacting with citizens on crime incidents, in investigative activities, and during traffic enforcement. COP officers spent significantly more of their shifts interacting with citizens during ordinance enforcement, in community-based service, in information gathering, and during their personal time.

Table 3

Average Minutes per Shift and Proportion of Total Time Observed: Encounters

	COP officers		Beat officers	
Activity	**Minutes per shift**	**%**	**Minutes per shift**	**%**
Foot patrol	-	-	-	-
Motor patrol	-	-	-	-
Crime incidents*	19	4	38	8
Administrative (crime related)	1	0	2	0
Investigative*	5	1	14	3
Traffic enforcement*	10	2	24	5
Order maintenance	10	2	14	3
Service	5	1	10	2
Ordinance enforcement**	5	1	1	0
Community-based service*	10	2	1	0
Problem focused	-	-	-	-
Information gathering*	5	1	2	0
Meetings with nonpolice service providers	0	0	0	0
Administrative	-	-	-	-
En route/waiting	-	-	-	-
Personal*	5	1	1	0

*$p < .01$. **$p < .05$.

DISCUSSION

This study observed the activities of community policing and traditional beat officers during 442 shifts in an effort to decipher whether and how community policing is implemented in our study site. The police department in our study location has adopted a split-force plan, which by assignment has given responsibility for engaging in community policing initiatives to community officers while beat

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 30 (2001)

officers retain responsibility for responding to 911 calls and conducting more traditional street-level behaviors. In this section, we first assess our findings concerning the workload of both types of officers and discuss them in relation to existing research. Next, an examination of the differences and similarities between the activities of study officers is provided in an effort to describe community policing efforts in Cincinnati. Finally, we discuss implications of our findings for future community policing efforts.

Officer Work Routines

The single largest category of observed activity for each type of officer was motorized patrol, or what others have referred to as uncommitted time. Overall, officers spent 26 percent of their day on motorized patrol (COP 24 percent, beat 29 percent). This finding is consistent with previous research conducted in Cincinnati (Frank et al., 1997) and other locations, which has reported that between approximately 24 percent and 32 percent of beat officers' time was spent on patrol (Cordner, 1979; Frank et al., 1997; Greene & Klockars, 1991; Kelling, Pate, Dieckman, & Brown, 1974). Despite a new job position and training, it appears that in Cincinnati patrol remains the "backbone of policing" (see Wilson & McLaren, 1977). It should be noted that officers rarely engaged in foot patrol (COP officers 48 minutes per month and beat officers less than 15 minutes per month). Of the 16 activity categories, officers spent the least amount of time on foot patrol. This may be due, in part, to the hilly terrain in which the city is located. Additionally, the CPD has separate bicycle and mounted units to patrol parks and other areas amenable to foot patrol. Finally, officers were not required to engage in foot patrol. These three circumstances probably contributed to the rarity of observed foot patrol.

Also similar to findings from existing research, we found that officers spent a substantial proportion of their time involved in crime-related activities. Officers dedicated 10 percent of their day to crime incidents (COP 7 percent, beat 12 percent). The inclusion of investigative and administrative (crime related) activities that were focused on a reported criminal incident brings the total proportion of time dedicated to crime-related activities to 16 percent (COP 12 percent, beat 20 percent). These findings are consistent with previous research that found patrol officers spending between 10 percent and 17 percent of their day on crime-related activities.

Finally, administrative activities consumed a significant portion of both types of officers' daily shift (COP 23 percent, beat 16 percent). This finding is also similar to reported findings from prior research. Overall, the findings from the analysis of officer workload are consistent with previous research on officers' daily activities.[3]

[3]Admittedly these previous studies may not have measured activities in the same fashion as in the present study. However, they were attempting to tap into the same general concepts and they reported similar findings on these activities.

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 31 (2001)

Thus, officers in Cincinnati appear to perform activities in proportions similar to those performed by officers in other cities studied. They dedicated a substantial portion of their day to doing motorized patrol, responding to criminal incidents, engaging in administrative work, and taking personal time.

Comparison of Beat and COP Officer Activities

The comparison of community and beat officers revealed a number of significant differences between the two groups of officers. Beat officers spent a significantly greater proportion of their day on motorized patrol, crime-related activities, investigative activities, traffic enforcement, and time spent en route to locations. Community officers on the other hand spent a significantly greater proportion of their day engaged in community-based service, problem-focused activities, information gathering, meetings with nonpolice service providers, administrative tasks, and personal time.

Consistent with Parks et al. (1999), our data indicated that beat officers spent more time in face-to-face encounters with citizens than did community officers. This likely occurred for reasons related to their job assignments. Specifically, beat officers were primarily responsible for responding to calls for service, performing traffic enforcement, and investigating criminal activity. All three of these types of activities, by their nature, involve face-to-face contact. Moreover, beat officers have little or no discretion regarding whether to respond to dispatched calls or investigate a criminal incident. Consequently, beat officers have less of a choice in picking how often or with whom they interact. In contrast, COP officers, freed from dispatch-directed activities, have greater discretion in deciding how often and with whom they interact (Parks et al., 1999).

At the same time, there are several similarities between the activities of the two types of officers. Most importantly, the category that consumed the largest proportion of time for both community and beat officers was motorized patrol (approximately 26 percent of their shifts). In addition, general service, order maintenance, administrative (crime related), and ordinance enforcement activities consumed similar although limited amounts of time for both groups of officers.

Implications for Community Policing Efforts

In general, the activities that community officers performed more frequently were the types of behaviors that proponents of community policing suggest that officers should be engaged in to implement this policing strategy (i.e., community-based service, problem-focused, information gathering, and meetings with nonpolice service providers). In addition, community officers in Cincinnati spent less of their day than did beat officers on traditional police activities, such as responding to criminal incidents and engaging in traffic enforcement. Thus, as suggested by advocates of community policing, these two types of officers did differ in the

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 32 (2001)

amount of time that they spent performing some activities. At the same time, however, it should be noted that community police officers still spent a substantial portion of their day engaging in "traditional" police activities. Further, the mainstay of policing, preventive patrol, consumed the largest portion of time for both types of officers.

One question that remains is how different the activities of community police officers should be in order to effectively implement community policing under a split-force plan such as the one in the study site. On a related matter, why do community officers continue to perform similar activities as traditional beat officers, and does this indicate unsuccessful implementation of community policing? Unfortunately, the study data do not definitively address these issues, though the findings do provide insight into these questions. First, our data indicate that motorized patrol and crime-related activities consumed almost one half (49 percent) of beat officers' work routine and more than one third (38 percent) of the shift time of community officers. Both types of officers were therefore left to perform other activities for more than half of their shift. Community officers, using their discretion and hopefully guided by their assigned duties, appeared to select activities that are more closely aligned to a community policing philosophy (community-based service, problem-focused activities, and information gathering). At the same time, beat officers turned more to traffic enforcement in order to effectuate their department mandate.

It is more difficult to unravel the problem of why less variation occurs and to determine the basis for officer activities. Admittedly, community-oriented policing theorists envision community officers performing more problem-solving, community-based service and experiencing more nonconfrontational encounters with the public, while also spending less time on routine motorized patrol than we observed. One credible explanation is that officers make choices about their work routines that are intended to increase their personal and professional satisfaction. Officers must fill an eight-hour shift with activities, and community officers may select activities that are personally rewarding. This may occur because the activities are consistent with the officers' perceptions of their role as community officers as well as law enforcement personnel. It should be remembered that community officers are still police officers and as such are responsible for controlling people and preventing crime, in addition to other assigned roles. All community officers started their careers as patrol officers and spent considerable amounts of time performing this role, and thus they may see this work as central to policing. Community policing officers may perhaps engage in more patrol than is expected because patrol, after all, is police work. As Paoline, Myers, and Worden (2000) have noted, police culture accords priority to law enforcement and crime fighting.

Relatedly, community officers may perform traditional policing activities in order to satisfy peers. Numerous researchers have noted the existence of a unique occupational subculture among police officers that stresses group solidarity

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 33 (2001)

(Skolnick, 1975; Van Maanen, 1973; Westley, 1970). Furthermore, research has suggested that officers rely on policing not only for a paycheck but also for friendships and social activities (see, e.g., Skolnick's discussion [1975] of police social activities). As a consequence, the desire to maintain ties and friendships at work may exert a powerful influence on officer activity choices. For instance, community officers may engage in routine patrol or serve as backups on calls (as our data suggest) in order to show that they perform "real police work" and are there to support fellow officers. One of the pitfalls of the split-force organizational arrangement is that officers engaged in traditional activities may view community officers as shirking their true policing responsibility by not engaging in activities such as calls for service and patrol. Although community officers were freed from responding to calls for service, they often volunteered for calls in their area, particularly during high-volume hours of calls for service. When volunteering, the community officers would advise the dispatcher of their desire to respond to a call. Although they could have done so via the in-car mobile dispatch terminal, most chose to notify the dispatcher via the radio, meeting the dual purpose of advising the dispatcher *and* the beat officers of their willingness to pull their own weight. Most likely, decisions to engage in certain activities result from a combination of factors, all of which may be related to making the work day a more pleasurable experience while at the same time providing the community officers with greater legitimacy among their peers.

Another explanation for the similarities may be the influence of middle managers. As discussed previously, both line officers and supervisors are in a position to covertly or overtly sabotage the implementation of community policing. While officers may be motivated to avoid activities that they view as fruitless and ineffective, supervisors may view community policing as a threat to their decision-making power and officer control. Although it is merely speculation that community policing is being "sabotaged" in Cincinnati, clearly this would provide further explanations for the findings, and further research should more clearly identify the supervisor's role in community policing implementation.

Although similarities are apparent between the two groups of officers, they also differed in the proportion of time that they spent on a number of activities. An explanation for these differences may lie in the structure of the organization or with the people involved. One explanation may be that officers were responding to departmental reward systems. COP officers were evaluated separately from beat officers by COP supervisors. Thus, it would be expected that COP supervisors want to encourage COP activities. Undoubtedly this had at least some influence over officer behavior.

An alternate explanation for some of the differences between the two groups of officers may lie in a selection bias. That is, officers applied and were selected to serve as COP officers. Thus these officers may have performed differently from their peers regardless of assignment. Although we have no way of assessing this contention it remains a possibility.

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 34 (2001)

Another important issue must be raised related to the findings. COP officers engaged in traditional policing activities during a large part of their work days. Proponents of COP do not suggest that COP officers will cease engaging in traditional policing activities or that traditional policing activities will not be used as part of community policing. Indeed, some of the traditional activities engaged in by COP officers may have been done to fulfill the desires of citizens encountered during community meetings. Thus, some of the COP time spent on traditional police activities may have been part of community policing initiatives.

Whether the differences found in the current study constitute community policing depends on the criteria used to establish whether or not an agency is engaging in community policing. Given the various desires of citizens and the various definitions of community policing, the question of whether or not Cincinnati has community policing cannot be answered empirically. Ultimately, what constitutes acceptable community policing in a city is a matter left to policy makers and citizens. However, given the discretion of line-level police officers, policy makers need to examine the actual activities of officers to determine whether their policies are having the intended impact.

REFERENCES

Brehm, J., & Gates, S. (1997). *Working, shirking, and sabotage: Bureaucratic responses to a democratic public.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press. .

Cincinnati Police Division. (1998). [Position classification].

Cordner, G. W. (1979). Police patrol work load studies: A review and critique. *Police Studies, 2*, 50–60.

Cordner, G. W. (1995). Community policing: Elements and effects. *Police Forum, 5*(3), 1–8.

Cumming, E., Cumming, I., & Edell, L. (1965). Policeman as philosopher, friend, and guide. *Social Problems, 12*, 276–286.

DeJong, C., Mastrofski, S. D., & Parks, R. B. (2001). Patrol officers and problem solving: An application of expectancy theory. *Justice Quarterly, 18*, 31–62.

Frank, J., Brandl, S., & Watkins, R. C. (1997). The content of community policing: A comparison of the daily activities of community and "beat" officers. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 20*(4), 716–728.

Goldstein, H. (1987). Toward community-oriented policing: Potential, basic requirements, and threshold questions. *Crime and Delinquency, 33*, 6–30.

Greene, J. R., & Klockars, C. B. (1991). What police do. In C. B. Klockars & S. D. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Thinking about police: Contemporary readings* (2nd ed.) (pp. 273–284). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greene, J. R., & Taylor, R. B. (1988). Community-based policing and foot patrol: Issues of theory and evaluation. In J. R. Greene & S. D. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality* (pp. 195–223). New York: Praeger.

Kelling, G., Pate, T., Dieckman, D., & Brown, C. (1974). *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A summary report.* Washington, DC: The Police Foundation.

Kratcoski, P. C., & Dukes, D. (1995). Activity time allocations of community policing officers. In P. C. Kratcoski & D. Dukes (Eds.), *Issues in community policing* (pp. 153–167). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Maguire, E. R. (1997). Structural change in large municipal police organizations during the community policing era. *Justice Quarterly, 14*, 547–576.

Maguire, E. R., & Mastrofski, S. D. (2000). Patterns of community policing in the United States. *Police Quarterly, 3*(1), 4–45.

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 35 (2001)

Manning, P. K. (1988). Community policing as a drama of control. In J. R. Greene & S. D. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality* (pp. 27–45). New York: Praeger.

Mastrofski, S. (1983). The police and non-crime services. In G. Whitaker & N. C. Phillips (Eds.), *Evaluating performance of criminal justice agencies* (pp. 33–61). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mastrofski, S. D. (1988). Community policing as reform: A cautionary tale. In J. R. Greene & S. D. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality* (pp. 47–67). New York: Praeger.

Mastrofski, S. D. (1992). What does community policing mean for daily police work? *National Institute of Justice Journal, 225*, 23–27.

Mastrofski, S. D., Parks, R. B., Reiss, A. J., Worden, R. E., DeJong, C., Snipes, J. B., & Terrill, W. (1997). *Systematic observation of public police: Applying field research methods to policy issues.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Mastrofski, S. D., Worden, R. E., & Snipes, J. B. (1995). Law enforcement in a time of community policing. *Criminology, 33*, 539–563.

McGarrell, E. F., Langston, E., & Richardson, D. (1997). Implementation issues: The specialized unit or department-wide community policing? In Q. C. Thurman & E. F. McGarrell (Eds.), *Community policing in a rural setting* (pp. 59–64). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Oliver, W. M. (1998). *Community-oriented policing: A systematic approach to policing.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Paoline, E., Myers, S., & Worden, R. (2000). Police culture, individualism, and community policing: Evidence from two police departments. *Justice Quarterly, 17*, 575–605.

Parks, R. B., Mastrofski, S. D., DeJong, C., & Gray, M. K. (1999). How officers spend their time with the community. *Justice Quarterly, 16*, 483–518.

Reiss, A. J. (1971). *The police and the public.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Sherman, L. W., Milton, C. H., & Kelly, T. V. (1973). *Team policing: Seven case studies.* Washington, DC: The Police Foundation.

Skogan, W. G., & Hartnett, S. M. (1997). *Community policing: Chicago style.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Skolnick, J. (1975). *Justice without trial: Law enforcement in a democratic society.* New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Skolnick, J. H., & Bayley, D. H. (1987). Theme and variation in community policing. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and justice* (pp. 1–37). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Travis, L. F., & Sanders, B. A. (1998). *Community policing activities: The Ohio Task Analysis Project.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Trojanowicz, R., & Bucqueroux, B. (1994). *Community policing: How to get started.* Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Van Maanen, J. (1973). Observations on the making of policemen. *Human Organization, 32*, 407–418.

Webster, J. A. (1970). Police task and time study. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science, 61*, 94–100.

Westley, W. (1970). *Violence and the police.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Wilson, O. W., & McLaren, R. C. (1977). *Police administration* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Zhao, J., Lovrich, N. P., & Thurman, Q. (1999). The status of community policing in American cities. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 22*(1), 74–92.

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 36 (2001)

APPENDIX

Activity category	Description
Foot patrol	Proportion of time spent patrolling on foot
Motor patrol	Proportion of time spent patrolling in vehicle
Order maintenance	Proportion of time spent on activities intended to maintain or restore order, such as attempting to keep the peace and dealing with public nuisance problems (i.e., disorderly, drunk, noise disturbance, or arguments)
Crime incidents	Activities involving a response to a violation of criminal law, for example searching property, serving warrants, or responding to crime calls (e.g., burglary)
Investigative	Activities involving an unknown problem (e.g., checking out suspicious circumstances, alarm response, or interrogation)
Traffic enforcement	Activities involving vehicles or the roadways, for example traffic enforcement, traffic or road problems, road block, or accidents
Service	Activities providing service or assistance to citizens, for example assisting motorists, returning lost property, giving information, providing medical assistance, assisting a citizen locked out of a building, or giving directions
Community-based service	Providing service or assistance to a community or neighborhood, for example attending meetings, dealing with nuisance property, or addressing police–community relations
Administrative	Administrative activities such as report writing, roll call, or vehicle maintenance
Administrative (crime related)	Administrative duties directly related to a criminal case, for example processing evidence, meeting with judges or prosecutors, or attending court proceedings
Ordinance enforcement	Enforcement of city ordinances, for example parking, building codes, or curfew violations
Information gathering	Gathering of information for community meetings or for individual citizens, particularly related to crime prevention
En route/waiting	Time spent en route to locations or waiting for the arrival of other officers or citizens
Problem-focused	Activities intended to deal with a specific problem, for example conducting research on a problem
Meetings with nonpolice service providers	Meetings with social service agencies or private sector agencies
Personal	Personal time, such as meals, breaks, and personal business

HeinOnline -- 26 Crim. Just. Rev. 37 (2001)