AN ASSESSMENT OF HASKELL COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS' ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS TOWARD THE COMMUNITY

By

SHAWN J. WESTBROOKS

Associate of Arts
Eastern Oklahoma State College
Wilburton, Oklahoma
1991

Bachelor of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1993

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
July, 1996

AN ASSESSMENT OF HASKELL COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT

OFFICERS' ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS

TOWARD THE COMMUNITY

Thesis Approved:

Harjit S. Sandhu

Thesis Advisor

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to my major advisor, Dr. Harjit Sandhu for his guidance and inspiration to enter the field of corrections. I would like to thank the other members of my committee, Dr. John Cross and Dr. Larry Hynson for their guidance and assistance during my completion of this program. I would also like to thank the entire Department of Sociology for their support and friendship through the past three years.

Most certainly, I wish to express my sincere gratitude to the officers and dispatchers of the Haskell County Sheriff's Department, Stigler Police Department, Keota Police Department, Kinta Police Department, McCurtain Police Department, and Oklahoma Highway Patrol Troop C. This research would not have been possible without their cooperation.

I would also like to give my special appreciation to my wife, Tami, for her love and understanding during this research, as well as her ability to support my choice of a stressful and time-consuming career. Thanks also go to my parents for the support and encouragement which they have always expressed.

Finally, I would like to thank the people of Haskell County, Oklahoma for all the support they have shown to law enforcement. It has been an honor to serve them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

During the late 1980s, the term "community policing" became a popular buzzword among the law enforcement community. Police agencies throughout the country began implementing, or at least claiming to implement community policing philosophies. A great deal of research has been conducted which attempts to explain what community policing is and how to incorporate this policing method into current law enforcement strategies. Despite the variations which may be found among the definitions of community policing, the basic principle of this philosophy is a positive working relationship between the police and the community.

Of the numerous studies conducted on the topic, not one major study can be found which examines community policing in rural areas. The study population for community policing research tends to be very large, urban areas. This may be due, in part, to the availability of research funds in these larger cities. It is unfortunate that researchers do not examine small, rural areas where the close-knit relationship between the police and the community encourages community policing.

The objective of this research is to develop a better understanding of community policing and to gain insight into the relationship between officers and members of a small, rural community. The study population used in this research was Haskell County, Oklahoma. While this research was being conducted, the author of this study served as an officer in Haskell County, thus providing full access to the officers and a

participant-observer role in the observations of community policing in practice.

In the assessment of Haskell County law enforcement officers' attitudes and behaviors toward the community, this research set out to answer three basic questions: First, "Do officers in Haskell County express favorable attitudes and behaviors toward the community?"; second, "How knowledgeable are officers in Haskell County about community policing?"; third, "Are officers' attitudes and behaviors toward the community different when compared by department, rank, age, experience, and education?" The research also set out to examine the development of community policing through a literature review, to demonstrate the disregard of small departments in previous community policing studies, and to compare the crime rates of not only rural areas to metropolitan areas, but Haskell County's crime rate to other geographically near areas.

This research will use both qualitative and quantitative methods. The observational findings of the participant-observer study will be combined with the statistical data collected from examining crime rates and survey findings. After examining the various aspects of this research, it is hoped that the reader will develop a better understanding of community policing and gain an insight view to the relationship between officers and their community in Haskell County, Oklahoma.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The Evolution of Policing

Early forms of policing were very community oriented. Able bodied men volunteered their time as night watchmen, warning of fires, cattle breaking loose, assisting lost travelers, and questioning suspicious persons. Most everyone recognized their role in protecting the community.

Imitating the policing system of England, the principle law enforcement officers in early America were county sheriffs. These sheriffs, assisted by deputies, were paid not by salaries, but by the services they performed (Adler, Mueller, and Laufer, 1991, p. 377). By the early nineteenth century, the growth of metropolitan areas lead to the need of a more formal system of law enforcement. Instead of community volunteers, policing was beginning to be the job of organized uniformed forces paid by local governments. Boston, Massachusetts, organized its first police force in 1838, followed by New York City in 1844 and Philadelphia in 1854 (Ibid., p. 378).

By the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, police officers were government employees which were considered different than civilians in the community. This difference, however, did not alienate the policy from the public. Officers patrolled on foot or horseback, coming into direct contact with the citizens they protected. Officers personally knew each member of the community they patrolled due to the constant one on one contact.

As with other professions during that era, technology changed the way in which officers performed their duties. The most significant change occurred in the late nineteenth century with the introduction of the automobile. In 1899, the Akron, Ohio Police Department became the first law enforcement agency in the world to use a motorized patrol vehicle (The New Encyclopedia Britannica, 1992, p. 967). The automobile provided a more comfortable means of patrol, as well as increasing the rapidness of response to calls. Departments across the nation began using motorized patrols, slowly replacing foot patrols through the early twentieth century.

On the surface, motorized patrols seemed to be the greatest advancement in law enforcement to date. Officers were not fatigued due to lengthy foot patrols, response time was decreased, and officers could carry more equipment in their vehicle than they ever could on their body or horse. While these were certainly positive aspects of motorized patrol, the major negative aspect of this new technology was overlooked. Officers were becoming detached from their community. Instead of walking through neighborhoods and business areas, personally interacting with the public, officers now drove down the street without speaking to anyone. The only direct interaction anyone had with an officer by this time was as a victim of crime or as an offender. Motorized patrol began to alienate the police from the community.

The diminishing relationship between the police and the community was brought to a head in the 1960s. Civil rights and anti-war protesters had numerous highly publicized clashes with police. To many citizens, especially minorities and youth, the police were seen as the enemy, a tool of government oppression. Instead of being comforted by

policy presence, many members of the community were actually in fear of the police. A study published in 1966 found that 43% of blacks and 36% of whites were afraid to call the police (Cromwell and Keefer, 1973, p. 3.)

Unfortunately, it is the very people who need the police the most who often have the greatest fear of them. While many of these people are fearful at the thought of calling the police, it is the police that is often their primary source of aid and assistance. For example, whereas a middle class family might consult a psychotherapist over a serious domestic problem, a lower class family is more likely to present a similar case to the patrolman who answers a disturbance call at their residence (Fink and Sealy, 1974, p. 120-121).

Police officers became increasingly frustrated as their relations with the community worsened. A survey in the mid-1960s found that 26% of officers believed "relations with the public" was the principle problem faced by the police. When asked what factor they liked least about police work, 22% of officers cited "lack of respect" (Cromwell and Keefer, 1973, p. 2). Another survey of officers during that time found that 73% of police officers felt the public was "against the police" or "hates the police." Only 12% of officers surveyed felt that the public "likes the police" (Westley, 1970, p. 107).

Police-Community Relations

Recognizing the need for change, police agencies and institutions sought methods to improve relations between the police and community. This effort aimed at decreasing the alienation between citizens and the police became known as police-community relations. Some authors have traced the development of the police-community relations concept to an

annual conference in 1955. Entitled, the "National Institute of Police and Community Relations," the meetings were sponsored jointly by the National Conference of Christians and Jews as well as the Michigan State University School of Police Administration and Public Safety (Schmalleger, 1991, p. 183).

One of the most important aspects of police-community relations was correcting the misperceptions the police and the public may have toward each other. Police and the community had to rid themselves of the negative stereotypes of each other which hampered positive relations. According to James Sterling (1972, p. 280), better relations would result if effective communication between the police and the public was accomplished. As police officers and members of the community became more familiar with each other, each would begin to recognize their stereotypes and work toward ending any prejudicial feelings toward the other group.

The standard police-community relations practice during the late 1960s and early 1970s was for each department to establish a police-community relations or public relations unit. These units were made up of a group of officers whose goal was to "make friends" with the community (Trojanowicz and Carter, 1988, p. 3). These public relations units would promote the police department by speaking to civic groups, meeting with business leaders, and giving tours of the police station to the public.

In the late 1960s, the Waco, Texas Police Department became one of the first in the nation to establish a "ride-along" program. Citizens were allowed to ride with an officer for a few hours during the day and actually experience police work first hand. Myths and stereotypes about

officers began to fade as members of the community had the opportunity to judge police from the inside (Fink and Sealy, 1974, p. 81).

The Burnsville, Minnesota Police Department became very active in police-community relations. Police Chief David Cooper renamed his police officers "public safety officers" and required each of them to hold at least a bachelor's degree. To add to their professional appearance, all officers were required to wear dress-style blazers as part of their uniform (Bopp, 1972, p. 409).

One of the most radical programs during the public relations era was "Operation Empathy." In this program, several Covina, California police officers went undercover as "skid row bums." Living on the streets for several days at a time among the homeless, these officers judged the way they were treated by fellow police officers who came in contact with them, unaware of the "bum's" true identity. Not only did this program allow officers to view their profession from a different perspective, it caused many of them to become more sympathetic to the homeless (Fink and Sealy, 1974, p. 94).

According to Bopp (1972, p. 339), the efforts of police-community relations can be classified into four types by their orientation: Externally Oriented, Youth Oriented, Service Oriented, and Internally Oriented.

Externally oriented programs were those police-community relations efforts which were designed to benefit the community as a whole through police involvement. These programs were open to most everyone and were designed to improve the public's perception of the police. Examples of externally oriented programs were tours of the station house, ride-alongs, organizing neighborhood watches, and improving relations with

the media so that a more positive portrayal of officers is given to the public.

Youth oriented programs were those designed to directly assist youth people and improve relations with juveniles. An example of such a program was "Cop on Campus," a program conceived in the Fall of 1966 by the Monterey Park Community Relations Committee. The project involved placing an officer on the school's campus on a regular basis to meet with students and discuss questions they may have about law enforcement. The assigned officer was used strictly for providing information to the students, not involving himself with any police investigation or action on campus. It was hoped that the program would result in increased communication between police and young people, which would continue into adulthood (Ibid., p. 184-185).

Service oriented programs were designed to alleviate problems in the community. These programs assisted with unemployment, rehabilitation, and poverty. Officers were already accustomed to service calls, as they are a major part of an officer's duties. A study of citizen calls to the Syracuse, New York Police Department for a two week period during the summer of 1966 revealed that 37.5% were service calls (Fink and Sealy, 1974, p. 188).

Internally oriented programs are those which seek to improve police-community relations by focusing on the department itself. Examples of internally oriented efforts include special training for officers to teach them more effective public communication or improving the hiring standards of officers. "Operation Empathy," mentioned earlier in this paper, is an excellent example of an internally oriented police-community relations program.

The use of auxiliary or reserve officers increased during the era of police-community relations. The first widespread use of reserve police officers came during World War II as a means of replacing the thousands of officers who left their communities to become soldiers. During the 1960s, many departments recognized the usefulness of reserve officers and began recruiting candidates.

The reserve officer can provide a vital link between the police and the community. Officers view the reservist as a part-time police officer while the community recognizes the reservist as a fellow citizen who they may trust more than a full-time officer. Many victims or offenders may recognize the reserve officer from work, school, church, or their neighborhood. Many citizens may be able to speak more comfortably to this familiar face. Also, it has been found that reserve officers have less of an authoritarian attitude than many full-time officers and thus can better relate to people (Ibid., p. 64).

Reserve officers are police academy trained, but usually have less training than full-time officers. These reservists work part-time, frequently without pay. While some departments use reserves for secondary roles such as clerical or traffic control duties, other departments use them to maintain two-may units or give them the same powers, responsibilities and duties as their full-time officers (Bopp, 1972, p. 58-59).

Team Policing

An extension of the police-community relations movement was the use of team policing. The idea of team policing originated during the 1940s in Aberdeen, Scotland. The idea was to replace traditional beats with a large district, to be patrolled by a team of constables under the

command of a sergeant who had sufficient discretionary power to adjust patrolling methods and administrative disposition of the men in his command to suit the needs of each district (Fink and Sealy, 1974, p. 151).

In 1967, the Police Task Force of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice proposed team policing as a vehicle to bring together the beat officer and the community (Rosenbaum and Lurigio, 1994, p. 301). Team policing has been defined as a "strategy for improving contacts between citizens and the police, whereby a team of officers is responsible for a specific neighborhood on a twenty-four hour basis" (Adler, Mueller, and Laufer, 1991, p. 391).

Team policing assigned officers on a semi-permanent basis, or long-term beat assignment, to a particular neighborhood. It was expected these officers would become familiar with the problems and concerns of the community. It also gave officers more power to process incidents from the time it was reported until it was resolved, thus allowing crimes to be investigated and solved at the local level (Schmalleger, 1991, p. 184).

All of the efforts the era of police-community relations and team policing were important steps to including the community in law enforcement. Unfortunately, many of the efforts during this era were more for show than for substance. All too often, police-community relations emphasized "public relations" instead of making a philosophical change in the way police related to their constituents. Citizens often rightly perceived that the goal of public relations units were to put a "good face" on whatever the police did. Many citizens viewed these officers with skepticism, correctly perceiving that they

had no ability to effect changes within the department or governmental structure (Trojanowicz and Carter, 1988, p. 3). Police agencies had recognized the importance of the community within the concept of policing, but a more genuine philosophy was needed.

Community Policing

By the late 1980s, the importance of involving the community in their own local law enforcement became popular once again. This time, however, proponents wanted a more sincere effort. Instead of public relations gimmicks, a philosophy of the police and citizens working in cooperation to solve problems within their community was developing across the nation. This community oriented focus by law enforcement became known as community policing.

Perhaps there is no truly accurate definition of the term "community policing." For each person who deals with the subject, there seems to be an additional definition. Definitions and descriptions of the philosophy range from one simple sentence to pages of complex explanations. The book, Criminology, defines community policing as a "strategy that relies on public confidence and citizen cooperation to help prevent crime and make the residents of a community feel more secure" (Adler, Mueller, and Laufer, 1991, p. 390). Former Minneapolis Police Chief Anthony Bouza wrote that community oriented policing "is nothing more than the recognition that something must be done about conditions that threaten the community's sense of order and well-being, whether the conditions are police problems or not" (Bouza, 19980, p. 237).

Community policing seeks to bring the police and the public together so that they are jointly responsible for social order. This is

done by creating a working partnership between the community and the police as a result of actively involving the community with the police in the task of crime control. According to Jerome Skolnick, community policing is "grounded on the notion that, together, police and public are more effective and more humane coproducers of safety and public order than are the police alone" (Schmalleger, 1991, p. 185).

One of the major researchers and proponents of community policing was Robert Trojanowicz. Trojanowicz was the director and professor of the School of Criminal Justice at Michigan State University. He authored numerous books and articles on community policing during the late 1980s and early 1990s. He defined community policing as "a philosophy and not a specific tactic, community policing is a proactive, decentralized approach, designed to reduce crime, disorder, and, by extension, fear of crime, by intensely involving the same officer in the same community on a long-term basis, so that the residents will develop trust to cooperate with the policy by providing information and assistance to achieve those three crucial goals" (Trojanowicz and Cater, 1988, p. 17).

> Community policing seeks to intervene directly in the twin problems of crime and disorder in communities by direct involvement in the community. The community policing officer acts as a uniformed armed presence to deter crime, but equally as important, he or she also takes action with citizen assistance to resolve problems before they erupt as crime. The officer performs a myriad of service, from educating citizens on preventing crime and organizing neighborhood organizations to gathering information that leads directly to the apprehension of criminals. In addition, the community policing officer also targets specific populations for special attention, typically children, women, and the elderly. The officers' efforts have concrete impact on the day-to-day lives of community residents (Ibid.).

Community policing should not be mistaken as simply another public relations effort. While improved relations with the public is certainly a positive result of community policing, it is not the goal. David T. Bayley has stated that "as a public relations strategy, community policing is exceedingly clever" (Ibid., p. 20). Citizens should be genuinely satisfied with their police not because of community policing's outward appearance, but the positive results of the philosophy.

When compared, there is a clear difference between community policing and police-community relations.

Not only is community policing different from police-community relations, it is different from traditional policing as well. While traditional policing focuses on solving crimes, community policing is a broader problem-solving approach. Traditional policing deals with incidents, especially those crimes involving violence and high dollar property loss. Community policing deals with the problems and concerns of citizens, especially those which disturb the community the most. Finally, traditional policing's effectiveness is determined by response times while the effectiveness of community policing is determined by public cooperation (Sparrow, 1988, p. 8).

While traditional methods of law enforcement are different than those of community policing, they are not incompatible. These two methods of law enforcement should remain partners. Within community policing, therefore, arrest-oriented, get-tough solutions are not only used, but often requested from citizens (Fleissner and others, 1992, p. 16). As Portland, Oregon Community Police Officer Wayne Kuechler said, "Rather than to admonish and abandon tradition, community policing

Community Policing	Police-Community Relations
Based on organizational theory, open systems theory, critical theory, normative sponsorship theory, and public policy analysis.	Based on conflict theory, inter group relations theory, and communications theory.
Requires a fundamental change in the overall mission of the department and increased expectations of the community.	Implies a narrow, bureaucratic response to a specific problem.
Requires everyone in the department, sworn and civilian personnel at all levels, to explore how they can carry out the mission through their actions on the job.	Uses an isolated specialty unit made up exclusively of staff personnel whose duties are bound by the narrow definition of their goals.
Measures success qualitatively, such as citizen involvement, fear of crime, improvement in quality of life, and real and perceived improvement in chronic problems.	Measures success quantitatively, such as number of arrests, clearance rates, and number of complaints against officers.
The goal is to solve problems.	The goal is to change attitudes and project a positive image.
Regular contact of office with citizen.	Irregular contact of officer with citizen.
Department wide philosophy and acceptance.	Isolated acceptance often localized to PCR unit.
Officer encourages citizens to solve many of their own problems and volunteer to assist neighbors.	Citizens are encouraged to volunteer but are told to request and expect more government (law enforcement) services.

(Trojanowicz, 1990, p. 7-10).

seeks to expand the reach of traditional law enforcement and is not a replacement, but rather an enhancement, of the system in place" (Kuechler, 1992, p. 12).

Now that we have established that community policing is different from both traditional policing and police-community relations, a more practical explanation of community policing is needed. According to the National Institute of Justice (1992, p. 3-4), there are several important elements of community policing. For example, individual officers are moved from the isolation of a patrol car to direct contact with members of the community. This increased contact with citizens helps to develop a partnership between the community and the police, thus increasing police accountability. Officers become familiar with the needs of their community and are given more power and authority to solve neighborhood problems. Also, officers are put into positions to engage in crime prevention more than just emergency response.

A typical community policing officer's daily activities include numerous activities not traditionally associated with police work. Community police officers may be seen on foot patrol, going door-to-door asking residents how the department can better serve them. These officers meet with community groups, local merchants, and students at school. Community police officers analyze and solve neighborhood problems, as well as help organize citizen crime prevention programs. In larger cities, police substations may be opened and operated by community police officers (Mastrofski, 1992, p. 24).

In 1990, Portland, Oregon became one of the first cities in the United States to make a complete transition to community policing. According to Kuechler (1992, p. 13), there are several suggestions which

should be followed by a department when using community policing: Every officer should be involved and contribute, it is not an effort for only a select group. Do not replace traditional policing methods, but enhance them with community policing methods. Because the implementation of community policing may take years, everyone must be patient. The department should be consistent with its efforts, inconsistencies are often used to justify resistance. Don't attempt to change everything at once, supervisors must first change before officers should be expected to accept the philosophy. Finally, change will bring resistance so be prepared and develop strategies to address these concerns.

Another needed and important aspect of community policing is citizen satisfaction. Across the nation, citizens are demanding the satisfaction and efficiency of their police officers that they would be private business. Many consumers of policing services have reacted to their lack of satisfaction by reducing their tax dollars for police, while spending more and more dollars for private security. There are currently more private security officers in the United States than sworn police officers (Trojanowicz and Carter, 1988, p. 7). Community policing allows citizens to feel more satisfaction and have more control over the implementation of their police, as they would with private security.

Service Orientation of Police

When many people think of police officers, they see rough and tough uniformed officers speeding down the road with red lights flashing, siren wailing, prepared to do battle. When the officer arrives at the scene of the crime, a gun battle erupts, trapping the officers behind

their cars. Just as it seems the criminals are about to defeat them, the heroic officers suddenly take control, shooting their way in and arresting those criminals who survived the battle.

This view of police work can be accredited to, or blamed on, the media, movies, and television. According to Bouza (1990, p. 29), the American public receives most of its information on the police from television programs. Unfortunately, these programs convey grotesque distortions of reality and cause citizens to have unrealistic views of police work. Television programs and movies rarely show police conducting their most frequent and common duty, service calls.

A study of citizen calls to the Syracuse, New York Police Department for a two week period during the summer of 1966 revealed that 37.5% of calls were for service, 30.1% had to do with order maintenance, 22% were for information gathering, and only 10.3% concerned law enforcement (Fink and Sealy, 1974, p. 188). The notion that when any service is needed, simply call the police, became easier to do in 1967 with the development of the 911 system. At least 80% of the calls officers respond to have nothing to do with crime (Bouza, 1990, p. 24). Sterling (1972, p. 280) also found that only 20% of an officer's time is spent handling law enforcement calls while 80% of an officer's time is spent performing a variety of community service activities.

Other research has found even lower percentages of an officer's time is spent enforcing the law. According to Bopp (1972, p. 51), about 90% of a peace officer's time is spent on non-punitive activities. Another research project which analyzed a typical patrolman's duty hours found that crime control and law enforcement account for only slightly more than 10% of an officer's time (Fink and Sealy, 1974, p. 109). This

figure is also supported by research conducted by the Bureau of Justice Statistics which found that less than 10% of a patrol officer's time is spent on crime related activities. The remainder of an officer's time is spent handling service calls (Trojanowicz and Carter, 1988, p. 9).

While it is clear that 80% to 90%, depending on which sources are used, of an officer's time is spent on non-law enforcement activities, very little training is given to officers on handling service calls. While an officer spends 90% of his time in public service activities, only 10% of his training concerned these service activities. Likewise, only 10% of an officer's time is spent enforcing laws, but 90% of his training is in law enforcement (Cromwell and Keefer, 1973, p. 20).

Community policing deals more directly with the service orientation of police work than have traditional law enforcement practices. A community policing officer is more accepting of his service-oriented duties and recognizes that such calls for service are an important part of police work. By assisting with the needs of the community, community policing can even further reduce the number of law enforcement calls by alleviating those problems which may lead to crime. A successfully completed service call may prevent numerous calls for law enforcement.

The Importance of the Individual Officer

The key to successful community policing is the individual police officer. It is the individual patrol officer who comes into direct contact with citizens. By handling the public's most pressing problems and making complex decisions as situations arise, patrol officers have the most important mission in law enforcement. According to Crisley Wood, executive director of the Neighborhood Justice Network in Boston, "The cop on the beat, who meets regularly with citizen groups, is the

single most important service that the Boston Police Department can provide" (Kelling, 1988, p. 4).

Not only do patrol officers come into direct contact with citizens, but their discretionary power also adds to their importance in the successful implementation of community policing. While on patrol, officers decide which laws to enforce, who to speak with in the community, and thus, the extent to which community policing will be used (Schmalleger, 1991, p. 186). For example, the discretionary power that officers have on a traffic stop is an important element in the public's perception of police officers. While writing a traffic warning or ticket may seem routine to an officer, it may be a very stressful experience to the motorist being stopped (Bopp, 1972, p. 394). Some citizens' only one on one contact with an officer may be during a traffic stop, thus the importance of the individual officer is increased. Each contact on officer makes with a citizen should be handled with the professionalism expected of a community policing officer.

Despite the importance of patrol officers, uniformed patrol is typically the lowest paid and least respected division of police work. The low preferential value of patrol is due, in part, to the belief that "anyone could do it" (Saunders, 1970, p. 23). This view is further supported by the practice of using patrol as a dumping ground for disciplined officers. Getting "busted to patrol" is a common punishment given to higher ranking officers who fail to perform to some standard of judgment (Kelling, 1988, p. 4).

Patrol officers are usually the lowest ranking officers within a police department, comparable to a private in the army. To more

properly define the individual patrol officer's role in community policing, the status of these officers must change. One idea is to give patrol officers the same status as an aviator in the military, that of a commissioned officer with individual authority (Meese, 1993, p. 3). This distinction should represent the respect, authority, and discretion deserved of patrol officers.

Due to the importance of the individual officer, the educational requirements and academic training of these officers are important to consider. For many years, a debate has raged over whether or not police officers should be required to have a college degree. Many believe if officers are highly educated, their professional status would be improved and therefore command more respect from the public.

The educational level of the average police officer has risen during the past twenty years. In 1967, the average educational level for police officers was 12.4 years, today it is 13.6 years. The most recent study of police education found that 65.2% of officers had one or more years of college. The study also found that 22.6% of officer's hold a bachelor's degree and 3.7% have a graduate degree (Ibid., p. 6).

Before officers can be expected to hold a college degree, police administrators must be held to the same, if not stricter standards. In the early 1970s, two-thirds of police administrators had never attended college. Less than 10% held a college degree (Cromwell and Keefer, 1973, p. 19). The educational standards of administrators are also important for them to earn the respect of lower ranking officers. A rookie patrolman with a bachelor's degree may resent saluting a captain or chief who never attended college.

According to the Police Training and Performance Study, submitted to the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in December, 1969, community relations training accounted for only 6% of police academy training (Fink and Sealy, 1974, p. 9). Today, community policing is an important part of not only academic training, but recruitment as well. When police recruiters interview potential officers, they are looking for self-starters with the initiative to process information, organize the community, analyze crime, and work as a school liaison (Meese, 1993, p. 5).

The following skills are a necessary part of police academy training if community policing is to be successful. Communication skills, the ability to effectively talk with and listen to all types of citizens. Public speaking, the ability to articulate ideas and motivate others as well as leading community meetings. Problem-solving techniques, the ability to identify, analyze, and develop solutions to problems. Conflict resolution and negotiating, knowing how to help citizens solve their own problems without formal intervention (Ibid., p. 6). Such successful training should produce a "new breed" of police officers who have greater knowledge about and expertise in problem solving and community engagement activities (Lurigio and Skogan, 1994, p. 316).

Foot Patrol

One of the most simple and widely used component of community policing is the re-establishment of foot patrols. The practice of "walking the beat" has been largely replaced by the introduction of the automobile, almost 100 years ago. Community policing foot patrols seek to reduce the alienation from the public which resulted from motorized

patrols. By walking the streets of business districts and neighborhoods, the foot patrol officer can establish friendly relations with the public as he speaks to as many people as possible (Cromwell and Keefer, 1973, p. 236).

One of the first studies on foot patrols was conducted by the Police Foundation for the National Institute of Justice in the late 1970s in Newark, New Jersey. Although the findings of the Newark experiment showed that foot patrols had no apparent impact on reported crime and victimization, it did conclude that citizens' perceptions about crime and police services improved (Mastrofski, 1992, p. 23). The experiment in Newark also found significant reductions in citizens' fear of crime and their perceptions of disorder (Rosenbaum and Lurigio, 1994, p. 305).

Foot patrols have also found success in Flint, Michigan. After the implementation of foot patrols, researchers found significant reductions in crime in a number of target areas (Ibid.). The Flint experiment also resulted in a reduction of calls for service. More importantly, perhaps, was the finding that both citizens and police officers were more satisfied and developed closer relationships with each other after the implementation of foot patrols (Kelling, 1988, p. 5). Citizens in Flint have shown their support for foot patrols by twice voting for tax increases to maintain the program, the second by a two-to-one margin (Ibid., p. 4).

Foot patrols have demonstrated the ability to make a positive impact on the root causes of crime. Considering that fear of crime can be as big a problem as crime itself, foot patrol's ability to reduce fear is an important aspect of community policing (Trojanowicz and

Bucqueroux, 1990, p. 41). This practice can be implemented by the smallest of departments and is very popular with the communities which currently use it.

Some departments may be fearful that foot patrols will reduce response time and unnecessarily fatigue officers. To prevent this, officers should be assigned to foot patrols in shifts which place some officers in cars and others on foot. Every few hours, the shifts can rotate, thus allowing the officers in cars to relieve those on foot. Also, hand held radios, known as "walkie talkies," keep foot patrol officers in constant contact with both motorized units and dispatch.

Juvenile-Oriented Programs

It is true that the future of our society lies in the hands of our youth. If a person develops problems as a child, such as criminal activity, those problems are likely to grow into adulthood. Any problems with the law a child may develop, therefore, will effect society in the future. Community policing provides the police with an opportunity to work directly with juveniles, dealing with their problems and possibly preventing problem situations from growing into criminal ones. Community policing officers also provide positive role models for youngsters, many of whom come from single-parent families (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1991, p. 17).

The importance of focusing on juveniles has been known since the era of police-community relations. One of the first juvenile-oriented programs conducted by police was "Cop on Campus." Conceived by the Monterey Park Community Relations Committee in the fall of 1966, the project involved placing a police officer on the campus of a school on a regular basis. This officer met with students, answering any questions

they may have had about law enforcement. By increasing the communication between officers and students, it was hoped that this positive relationship would continue into adulthood (Bopp, 1972, p. 184).

A more modern juvenile-oriented program is the Community Opportunities Program for Youth, better known as COPY Kids. Implemented during the summer of 1992 by the Spokane Police Department, COPY Kids was an attempt to reach out to disadvantaged youth who were at risk of becoming involved in crime (Thurman and others, 1993, p. 555). Working under the direction of police officers and business leaders, each of the youths were assigned to community service jobs, paid for their work, and taken to a local bank to open a savings account. The purpose of this program was expose these youths to positive role models, demonstrate the correlation between working and being paid, and help these youth to develop a sense of responsibility and self-esteem (Ibid., p. 556).

Perhaps the most popular and widespread community policing program aimed at juveniles is D.A.R.E. America. D.A.R.E., Drug Abuse Resistance Education, was initiated in 1983 by Los Angeles Police Chief Daryl Gates in an attempt to slow drug use and the crimes related to drugs by bringing officers into direct contact with students on a regular basis (D.A.R.E. Fact Sheet, 1990, p. 1). The program was an instant success and began to spread nationally.

D.A.R.E. is a program is which a police officer is employed as a regular classroom teacher. Each classroom of students meet weekly with a D.A.R.E. instruction as part of their school curriculum. These D.A.R.E. instructors must be veteran officers, attend an 80 hour course, and receive updated training each year. These officers use their own

knowledge and experiences to teach kids how and why to resist drug use, the importance of self-esteem, that there are consequences to all actions, and street survival skills (Ibid., p. 2).

By 1990, over 2000 communities had the D.A.R.E. program in their schools, reaching over 4.5 million children (Ibid., p. 3). D.A.R.E. is financially supported largely through donations from the community. D.A.R.E. officers frequently hold public meetings to explain the program and update the community on its progress. D.A.R.E. America is one of the greatest community policing efforts in existence today.

Critics of Community Policing

Not everyone is supportive of community policing, or policing in general. Early policing in the United States had a reputation of corruption and inability to protect the rights of citizens. In order to prevent corruption, many police agencies believed it was necessary to centralize authority, limit discretion of officers, and reduce intimacy between police and citizens (Kelling, 1988, p. 7). These ideas are contrary to community policing. Many agencies resist the implementation of community policing due to the fear it may lead to the corruption of the past.

Community policing is also hampered by the separateness and secrecy of the police culture. The sincerity of the partnership of citizens and the police might be questioned due to the history of officers' antagonism toward groups such as auxiliary officers (Bouza, 1990, p. 31). Police officers must overcome their resistance of community involvement in order to successfully implement community policing.

One of the major criticisms of community policing can be found in Stephen Hester and Peter Eglin's book, A Sociology of Crime, which

describes community policing as more a sinister plot than a sincere effort. The authors' descriptions of community policing often uses the word "schemes" instead of programs, philosophies, or efforts, as if to imply some hidden agenda. An example of Hester and Eglin's suspicious attitudes toward community policing is their description of youth-oriented programs. "The aim of youth liaison was to foster consent for the police and to obtain information about youth" (Hester and Eglin, 1992, p. 156). This implies that programs such as "Cop on Campus" or "D.A.R.E." are covert spy missions by the police to pretend to be friendly, but in actuality are used as undercover information gathering.

Foot patrols are described by Hester and Eglin as a way for the police to improve "both the police image and information gathering" (Ibid.). The authors also accuse community policing (relations) of being a racist philosophy. "Community relations neither altered the racist character of everyday policing nor brought about a reorientation amongst the black community toward the police (Ibid., p. 155).

The only source listed by Hester and Eglin in their analysis of community policing was a 1987 article by P. Gordon entitled "Community Policing: Towards the Local Police State?" which originally appears in a publication called Law, Order and the Authoritarian State. Naturally, such anti-law enforcement extremists are ready to criticize any efforts by police, but their protests are vastly overshadowed by numerous articles and books by legitimate researchers who support community policing. To imply that community policing is some sort of plot to establish an authoritarian police regime is beyond misleading and should be considered an outright lie advocated by a handful of extremists.

Current Status of Community Policing

During the summer of 1994, community policing became a nationally debated issue due to its inclusion in the "crime bill." This bill, which later passed and became law, provided federal grants to state and local governments to be used for the hiring of officers and implementing community policing. The crime bill was intended to add up to 100,000 additional police officers in chosen communities over a six year period (Congressional Digest, 1994, p. 169).

Opponents of the crime bill argued that the bill did not provide enough funding to hire 100,000 officers and that those departments which participated would end up with the long term costs of additional officers, thus eventually laying them off due to a lack of funds. Also, the federal government should not be involved in community law enforcement. Federally mandated community policing contradicts the notion of giving members of each community more control of and participation in their local law enforcement.

Some researchers believe the crime bill was premature in its passing. "There's not enough research being done," according to Wesley G. Skogan, Northwestern University political science professor. "President Clinton is talking about putting 100,000 more cops out there to do this, and they are doing this without a clue to its effectiveness" (Clark, 1993, p. 1).

Deciding which communities would receive the federal community policing grants is another controversial aspect of the crime bill. Would the communities within the districts of congressmen who supported the crime bill be more likely to receive the grants? Also, by including community policing within a bill which contained many controversial and

unpopular proposals such as midnight basketball leagues, strict gun control, and questionable social programs, the philosophy is now unfortunately linked to many issues which should not be associated with community policing.

Measuring Community Policing

Any program, no matter how well defined, is not useful unless a strategy is in place which can measure the effectiveness of that program. Community policing is not different. Most evaluations of this philosophy focus on victimization rates, citizen satisfaction, fear of crime, and other quality of life indicators (Mastrofski, 1992, p. 23). Some question the ability to measure community policing altogether.

According to Michael Julian, Chief of Personnel for the New York City Police Department, "Nobody is really measuring this (community policing" in a formal way. The academic studies talk about what you should measure, but they don't tell you how to measure" (Clark, 1994, p. 1). "We've never had a way to measure police effectiveness," said Thomas Koby, Boulder, Colorado Police Chief, "and community policing is not different policing. Policing is policing" (Ibid.).

One of the ways which is used in an attempt to measure community policing is citizen surveys. Such surveys were used by the Houston Police Department's Community Organizing Response Team (CORT) as part of the Fear Reduction Project. The findings indicated that CORT did not reduce fear of crime, but residents did perceive a decline in social disorder as well as reporting more positive evaluations of the police (Rosenbaum and Lurigio, 1994, p. 307).

According to Bonnie Bucqueroux of the National Center for Community Policing, citizen surveys are one of the most effective measurement

strategies of community policing. Bucqueroux stresses that these surveys must be specific to each department and be developed with community input (Clark, 1994, p. 8). Such citizen surveys have resulted in positive findings concerning community policing. Research by Wesley Skogan found that in fourteen areas targeted by community policing in six cities, nine showed positive changes in residents' attitudes toward police, seven showed reductions in fear of crime, six showed declines in perceived neighborhood disorder, and three showed reductions in victimization rates (Rosenbaum and Lurigio, 1994, p. 309).

Another method of measuring community policing is surveying those officers involved with the philosophy. As discussed earlier in this paper, the success of community policing depends on the individual officers who are on the street implementing it. A recent study of officers assigned to New York City's Community Police Officer Program (CPOP) found that officers attitudes were changed by community policing. By walking the beat and getting to know neighborhood residents personally, officers were exposed to "the good people" and not just those citizens with whom they had previously interacted with usually during crisis situations (Lurigio and Skogan, 1994, p. 317).

Surveys have also found that the police are generally willing to cooperate with the community. A survey conducted in Chicago, Illinois found that 87% of police officers believe the community and police have a joint responsibility in the prevention of crime (Ibid., p. 326). This study also found that the older and higher-ranking officers expressed more favorable attitudes toward community policing (Ibid., p. 329).

An extensive measurement of community policing which involved surveying officers was conducted within the Louisville Division of

Police. The self-administered questionnaire included 119 items designed to compare officers' attitudes toward policing and their job satisfaction. The items focused on officers' assessments of district and department performance, job satisfaction, community-police relations, neighborhood problems, experience and knowledge of community-oriented policing, the effect of community-oriented policing on their jobs, and the effectiveness of community-oriented policing (Wilson and Bennett, 1994, p. 358).

The Louisville study found that officers are most likely to agree that crime prevention should be a responsibility shared by the police and community. Most officers also agreed that reducing the fear of crime should be a goal of community policing. The survey also found that officers were least likely to support changes within departmental methods to reduce crime (Ibid., p. 365).

Perhaps one of the best studies on measuring the outcomes of community policing was conducted in Madison, Wisconsin. This three year study, opened in April 1988, created an "Experimental Police District," or EPD, using one-sixth of the department serving approximately one-sixth of the community. Community policing was implemented within the test site and not within the rest of the community (Wycoff and Skogan, 1993, p. 1). Citizens and police officers were periodically surveyed to monitor the experiment's progress (Ibid., p. 2).

After the three year period, surveys were conducted which compared the perceptions of citizens within the Experimental Police District to those citizens not exposed to community policing. The results were that more positive outcomes were found within the EPD with community policing that those areas without community policing. Citizens exposed to

community policing had a greater perception of police presence, more frequently attended meetings which featured police officers, believed robbery, as well as crime in general, is less of a problem in their neighborhood that in other neighborhoods, and believed the police did a good job of focusing time and effort toward problems which concerned the community the most (Ibid., p. 81).

The Disregard of Small Departments in Community Policing Studies

Police departments, like any other agency in our society, may range in size greatly depending upon the community it serves. Based on population, police employment in the United States ranged from 0 to 44 officers per 1000 residents. Geographically, the number of officers per square miles ranges from 0 in Angoon Division, Alaska, to 1278.5 officers in the Manhattan Borough of New York City (Trojanowicz and Carter, 1988, p. 11).

Unfortunately, more attention is given to large police agencies than small ones. There is a great deal of research which can be found on large departments' community policing efforts, such as those in New York City, Los Angeles, or Chicago, but little, if any, attention is given to smaller agencies. This absence may suggest that small communities are not considered significant enough to study or perhaps researchers are not interested in studying small agencies which do not have the financial ability to fully fund an extended research project.

An example of smaller agencies and communities being overlooked is the Bureau of Justice Assistance's Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing (INOP) Program. This program provided funds to eight separate jurisdictions which were supposed to be greatly diverse in size. The

populations of the eight communities ranged from 7,000,000 in New York City to 200,000 in Hayward, California. The size of the departments ranged from over 25,000 officers in New York City to just under 200 officers in Hayward (Vera Institute of Justice, 1992, p. 20). While there is a big difference between New York City and Hayward, California, Hayward is still a large city when compared to most other communities.

With close to 200 officers, Hayward's police department is one of the larger in the country. For example, nearly two-thirds of sheriff's departments across the county employ less than 25 officers (Reaves, 1992, p. 1). While Hayward, with a population of 200,000, was the smallest community's department studied by the Bureau of Justice Assistance, 54.1% of departments serve a population of less than 25,000 and 23.2% serve a population of less than 10,000 (Ibid., p. 3).

It is very unfortunate that smaller departments and communities have been ignored by previous research. The close community ties of small towns and rural counties provide excellent examples of citizens being willing and able to work together. The police officers of small communities are known by most everyone, likewise, the officer knows most residents on a first name basis. The positive relationships found between officers and the community which exists in these rural areas are excellent examples of a community policing philosophy. By overlooking small communities, researchers have missed golden opportunities to study the community policing which naturally exists in these areas.

Perhaps the most perfect example of community policing can be found in the old television program, "The Andy Griffith Show." Sheriff Andy Taylor, along with his deputy Barney, had a relationship with their community which would be considered a utopia of community policing.

There are small communities across the country today which are surprisingly similar to Mayberry. Despite this, researchers continue to study large, urban areas without first examining the successful community policing which naturally exists in small, rural communities. Before community policing can be expected to succeed in large cities, smaller communities must first be examined so that future research on larger cities will have a model to be based on.

To help demonstrate the relatively low rate of crime found in smaller communities, the crime rates of rural areas, small cities, and large metropolitan areas can be examined. Keep in mind, most federal and private studies on community policing are based on the models put forth by large metropolitan areas. These figures are based on the uniform crime reports submitted by the agencies found in each area.

TABLE A

OFFENSES KNOWN TO THE POLICE PER 100,000 POPULATION AS OF JULY 1, 1989
(Information Please Almanac, 1992, p. 854)

Offense	Metropolitan Areas	Other Cities	Rural Areas
Murder	10	5	5
Forcible Rape	42	27	21
Robbery	293	58	16
Aggravated Assault	435	304	147
Burglary/ Breaking or Entering	1412	1040	673
Larceny/Theft	3534	3380	995
Motor Vehicle Theft	771	221	117
Total of All Crimes	6496	5034	1974

As the table above shows, the crime rate of rural areas is significantly lower than other areas. Small cities, which would be included in "Other Cities," have a lower crime rate than the large metropolitan areas. This was true for each category of crime as well. The numbers clearly show that rural areas and small communities are much safer than urban metropolitan cities, where most all community policing studies are conducted. While these figures do not prove that community policing exists in smaller communities, nor that such a philosophy is responsible for the lower rate of crime found in rural areas, it does show that smaller communities have a lower crime rate. Based on these findings, metropolitan areas should examine the law enforcement aspects of smaller areas and imitate the attitudes and behaviors of the smaller community officers.

Haskell County as a Study Population

In order to examine the attitudes and behaviors of small department officers, who have found success in controlling crime based on crime rate figures, such a community must be the target of a study. Haskell County, Oklahoma provided for an excellent site to conduct such a study. Before the methodology and findings of the study can be discussed, we must first examine the county itself.

Haskell County is located in eastern Oklahoma, between Lake Eufaula and Kerr Lake. The rural county's terrain ranges from level grasslands to rugged steep hills to deeply wooded forests. Located in the area of Oklahoma known as "Little Dixie," the county has deep southern roots. Many would conclude that Haskell County has more in common with Arkansas, just twenty miles to its east, than the rest of Oklahoma.

As of 1993, the total population of Haskell County was 11,036. Stigler, the county seat and largest city in the county, has a population of 2,550 (Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation, 1994, p. 103). Most of the county's population lives in the smaller communities and rural settlements scattered throughout the county. Due to the small population and close-knit, family-like atmosphere of the area, the entire county is a community within itself.

The county is protected by six separate law enforcement agencies. The majority of residents rely on the Haskell County Sheriff's Department, which is responsible for protecting all county residents except those residing within the city limits of Stigler. The sheriff's department has eight full-time officers, supported by a reserve force of eight volunteers. The Stigler Police Department has eight full-time officers and three reserve officers. The small communities of Keota, Kinta, and McCurtain has one officer each, with one additional reserve officer in Keota. There are also four Oklahoma Highway Patrol State Troopers assigned to the area.

The Haskell County Sheriff's Department is typical of most rural county law enforcement agencies in that it is under-staffed and severely under-budgeted. As a result of its lack of funds, the department lacks equipment which would be considered a necessity by larger departments. Deputies must purchase their own weapons and equipment on their mere $1100 per month salary as well as drive high-mileage patrol cars, one of which is more than ten years old. In order to be as effective as possible under the circumstances, the department has purchased surplus vehicles to save money and relies heavily on volunteer reserve deputies to maintain enough manpower to operate safely.

Despite its small budget, the sheriff's department has been effective in fighting crime. This is shown by the low rate of crime in the county. According to the 1988 Bureau of Justice Statistics, Haskell County was one of only 21 of Oklahoma's 77 counties which had a UCR index of less than 20 offenses per 1000 population (U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1988, p. 18). In 1992, Haskell County's crime rate per 1000 population was only 16.03 (Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation, 1994, p. 103), less than one-third of the state's crime rate of 54.26 (Ibid., p. 129).

About 23% of Haskell County residents live in Stigler. During the day, the population of Stigler swells as county residents come to town for work and shopping. What few businesses and services which exist in the county can mostly be found in Stigler. The small city is served by a police force of eight full-time officers and three reserves. The department is well funded and well equipped for its size. It is believed that Stigler was the first city in Oklahoma to install video cameras in their patrol cars.

The following table shows the crime rates of Haskell County and the state of Oklahoma during the previous three years. The county crime rate is also broken down to show those crimes occurring within the jurisdiction of the Stigler Police Department verses the sheriff's department.

As the table below shows, the crime rate of Haskell County is significantly lower than the state's crime rate. Despite the 47.5% increase from 1992 to 1993, the county's crime rate is still less than half of that of the state. The higher crime rate of Stigler, when compared to the rest of the county, can be explained by the fact that

Stigler is the center of activity in the county. With the increase number of people coming into town during the day combined with the majority of county businesses being located within the city limits, a higher percentage of the county's crime is naturally going to occur in Stigler.

TABLE B

CRIME RATES OVER A THREE YEAR PERIOD
(Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation, 1994, pp. 102, 103, 129)

	1991	1992	1993
Oklahoma	56.63	54.26	52.91
Haskell County	19.29	16.03	23.65
Sheriff's Department	16.46	15.92	21.68
Stigler Police Department	28.48	16.36	30.20

To demonstrate the relatively low rate of violence in Haskell County, its violent crime rate should be compared to the six counties which surround it. The counties which boarder Haskell County as: LeFlore County to the east, Latimer County to the south, Pittsburg County to the west, and McIntosh, Muskogee, and Sequoyah Counties to the north. As this research will show, each of these counties have a higher rate of violence than Haskell County.

The following table shows the ranking of each county for selected indicators of violence. The findings of this table is based on crime dates from 1989 to 1992. Each of Oklahoma's 77 counties were ranked based on the per capital number of selected incidents of violence

reported to the police, "1" being the most violent, and "77" being the least violent.

TABLE C

COUNTY RANKINGS OF SELECTED VIOLENCE INDICATORS
(Addressing Violence in Oklahoma Coalition, 1993, pp. 38-39)

County	Homicide	Rape	Domestic Violence	Child Maltreatment	Adult Maltreatment
Haskell	62	72	38	45	67
Latimer	18	70	48	35	41
LeFlore	22	56	72	12	42
McIntosh	16	57	44	20	35
Muskogee	6	3	37	10	5
Pittsburg	36	16	10	48	29
Sequoyah	10	67	36	3	75

As the table above shows, Haskell County ranked lower than any of its surrounding counties in incidents of homicide and rape. Haskell County was the second lowest ranking in both child and adult maltreatment compared to its surrounding counties. The county's domestic violence ranking fell in the middle of the group. Overall, a tally of all five indicators shows Haskell County to be the least violent of the group of central-eastern Oklahoma counties. With an average ranking of 57, Haskell County is among the top one-fourth of Oklahoma's safest counties.

To further demonstrate Haskell County's low rate of violent crimes, the homicide, forcible rape, and domestic violence rates of the county

are outlined on the following table and compared to the average rate of the surrounding counties as well as the rate of Oklahoma.

TABLE D

COMPARATIVE RATES OF VIOLENT CRIMES (1989-1992)
(Addressing Violence in Oklahoma Coalition, 1993, pp. 43, 47, 49)

	Homicide Rate	Forcible Rape Rate	Domestic Violence Rate
Haskell County	2.29	13.27	658.94
Surrounding Counties	10.25	43.19	678.50
State of Oklahoma	8.25	90.88	936.47

As the table above shows, Haskell County's homicide rate is less than one-fourth of its surrounding counties and less than one-third of the homicide rate for the state of Oklahoma. The rate of forcible rapes in Haskell County is less than one-third of its surrounding counties and is almost one-seventh of the state's rate. Haskell County's domestic violence rate was close to, but still lower than its surrounding counties, and just over two-thirds of the entire state's rate. The numbers clearly show that Haskell County is the least violent county of its immediate area and one of the safest counties in Oklahoma.

Now that Haskell County's low rate of crime and violence has been established, it is important to focus on the law enforcement practices of the county. As discussed earlier in this paper, Haskell County has a rural, close-knit, family-like atmosphere which allows for a positive

relationship between officers and the community to exist. It is not suggested that the community policing relationship found in Haskell County is solely responsible for the area's low rate of crime, but it does show that the type of community which practices this philosophy is a relatively safe community. Efforts which have helped make this county safe will be exposed as the extent to which community policing exists in Haskell County is examined by looking at the attitudes and behaviors of officers toward the community through observational and survey studies.

METHODOLOGY

The methodology of this research was both qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative research attempts to study social phenomena in their natural setting and/or through the use of "natural" data collection techniques. The strength of a qualitative approach is that more information can be examined and dealt with than if only a numerical approach was used. Quantitative research attempts to numerically examine the extent to which a phenomena occurs. A strength of quantitative methods is that research should be easily validated with similar findings when examined by other researchers.

The time dimension of the observational study was a one year longitudinal study. The qualitative observations were made from November 1993 to December 1994. This was an individual unit of analysis, observing the behaviors of individual law enforcement officers in Haskell County, Oklahoma. With my position as a Reserve Deputy Sheriff, which gives me jurisdiction over the entire county, I have had the opportunity to work with all officers in the county, including the municipal and state officers.

As a participant observer, my observational study focused on the community policing practices I observed from my fellow officers. It also includes the community policing in which I have personally participated. My ability to identify community police efforts comes from the extensive reading I have done of the subject, the college course work I have completed which discussed this issue, and the 132

hour law enforcement academy I graduated from in order to become a certified reserve officer. The various community policing practices I witnessed during the over 600 hours of patrol I worked during 1994 will be discussed.

The second part of this research involved surveying officers in Haskell County. For the sample population, an attempt was made to survey every officer in the county. A survey was made available to every full-time county, municipal, and state law enforcement officer. A survey was made available to most reserve officers as well. The surveys were to be completed by each officer at his or her convenience and then returned to me. As the table below shows, the majority of officers returned their survey.

As the table shows, 68.6% of the officers in Haskell County completed and returned their surveys. Over three-fourths of full-time officers and half of reserve officers participated in the survey. Officers from all six department in the county were represented.

While no less than half of any group was surveyed, the sample population of full-time officers was especially strong. This is significant because it is the full-time officers who are on the street more, actively participating in community policing. As many as 87.5% of full-time county officers were surveyed as well as 73.3% of municipal officers. Stigler, the largest municipal department, had three-fourths of its full-time officers represented. All three of the full-time officers employed by the three smaller communities in the county were also surveyed.

TABLE E

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE
(Comparing Total Number to Numbered Surveyed)

	Total Number	Number Surveyed	% of Force Surveyed
COUNTY	16	11	68.8
Full-Time	8	7	87.5
Reserve	8	4	50.0
MUNICIPAL	15	11	73.3
Stigler - Full-time	8	6	75.0
Stigler - Reserve	3	2	66.7
Stigler - Total Force	11	8	72.7
Keota (including 1 reserve)	2	1	50.0
Kinta	1	1	100.0
McCurtain	1	1	100.0
STATE (OHP)	4	2	50.0
Full-Time Total	23	18	78.3
Reserve Total	12	6	50.0
Total	35	24	68.6

The survey participants were also a good representative sample of the total population of Haskell County law enforcement officers. The following table demonstrates this.

As the table shows, the number of county officers in the sample population was almost the same statistically as the number of county officers in the total population. Both the municipal and state sample population was within 3% of their total population. Full-time officers were over-represented in the sample, however, the greater number of hours these officers work compared to reserves justifies a need to place more emphasis on their group.

TABLE F

REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE
(Comparing Total % of Officers to Total % Surveyed)

	Officers in Haskell County		Officers Surveyed	
	Total %	Number	Total %	Number
County Officers	45.7	16	45.8	11
Municipal Officers	42.9	15	45.8	11
State Officers	11.4	4	8.3	2
Total	100.0	35	100.0	24
Full-Time Officers	65.7	23	75.0	18
Reserve Officers	34.3	12	25.0	6
Total	100.0	35	100.0	24

While these surveys were used in cooperation with a qualitative study, they are also quantitative in nature due to the method which will be used to numerically break down the findings. Quantitative research attempts to quantify, or numerically measure, social phenomena. A strength of survey research is reliability. If another researcher dealt with this same material, the finds should be the same because the numbers would not change. The validity of survey research is a weakness because it limits the scope of the research due to its time constraints and does not allow the researcher to explore as many other options as qualitative.

The four page survey contained 27 items and a 20 item Guttman scale. The first 7 items were sociodemographic and designed to categories each officer based on which department he or she was employed with, that officer's rank, age, experience, length of resident, educational level, and normal hours patrolled. Items 8 through 27

contained a mix of attitudinal and behavioral items. Twelve of the items measured each officers' attitude toward community policing and eight items measured their amount of community police oriented behavior.

Items 8 through 16 were open ended questions, in which officers could elaborate on their answers. Items 17 through 23 were close ended questions which asked officers to give a specific number or yes/no answer. The 20 item Guttman scale simply asked each officer to check each listed community policing practice which he or she had personally participated in.

By using both qualitative and quantitative approaches, the relevancy and accuracy of the findings are strengthened. The qualitative approach of the participant observer research supports the validity of the research. The quantitative attributes of the survey research increases its reliability. By using a quantitative method as part of an overall qualitative study, the findings should not only be more accurate, but more understandable to the reader as well.

FINDINGS

Observational Findings

As a reserve deputy with the Haskell County Sheriff's Department, I have had the opportunity to research community policing in Haskell County as a participant observer. I have worked closely with each and every officer and have patrolled every community in the county. This has given me the opportunity to observe community policing in action, as well as personally interact with members of the community. I have also ridden along with most officers in the county to personally observe their community interaction.

During the first few months of 1994, I spent at least six nights per month with the Stigler Police Department. After completing my reserve law enforcement academy, I worked numerous nights for the sheriff's department. During the months of August and September of 1994, I worked three nights per week on a regular shift on the east side of the county. I also worked a one week shift on the west side of the county to provide vacation relief for a full-time deputy. I gained a wealth of knowledge during this time and the community-oriented nature of Haskell County law enforcement became clear to me. Before I discuss some specific examples of officers' efforts to assist the community, the community policing nature of officers and departments in the county will be discussed.

Law enforcement officers in Haskell County are almost never a stranger to the area. Officers are most usually hired from within the

community. This is a good practice associated with community policing. If the officer is already familiar with local residents, this helps insure his acceptance and full integration into the community as an officer.

The officers in Haskell County are a diverse group which represents the people of the county demographically. With a large number of Native Americans living in the area, it is important to point out that several officers, including reserves, are Native American. All age groups are represented as well. This is especially important to establish a closer relationship with juveniles. Many officers, especially reserves, are in their early 20s and most teenagers can remember when these officers were in high school, only a few grades above them. Without a "generation gap," these younger officers may be able to more effectively communicate with local juveniles.

After the election of Leon Upton as sheriff in 1992, new ground was broken for females within Haskell County law enforcement. A female dispatcher, Gayla Adcock, was commissioned as a reserve deputy. In January 1994, the Stigler Police Department hired one of the full-time deputies as a city patrolman, thus leaving an opening with the sheriff's department. After all applicants were examined, Gayla Adcock became the first full-time female deputy sheriff in Haskell County history. Within a year, she became the reserve supervisor and is a member of the special operations team.

Another practice commonly associated with community policing is finding officers living in all communities of the area patrolled. This is true of Haskell County. In every city, town, community, and settled area of the county, an officer's home can be found. This allows all

residents to view at least one officer as their neighbor, someone they can go to and feel more comfortable with. It also allows law enforcement to have representatives spread throughout the county for more direct communication with the community. I have personally noticed on several occasions while talking to various county residents that officers living closest to a particular resident are requested when a problem develops. It is also common to find citizens calling a particular officer's home for assistance, instead of going through the dispatcher.

Due to budget constraints, Haskell County law enforcement relies heavily on reserve officers. This is especially true of the sheriff's department. Approximately one-third of officers in Haskell County are reserves. These volunteer officers must attend at least 120 hours of police training and meet the same physical and mental conditions of full-time officers. Most reserves work about four to eight days per month, giving their department needed manpower and allowing relief for the overworked full-time officers.

While the use of reserves is an economically wise decision, it is also an important part of community policing. In my experience as a reserve, I have witnessed on several occasions the benefits reserve officers bring to a department's relationship with the community. Some citizens are more comfortable speaking to a reserve officer, who they see as more of an equal. Reserves may also be able to relate more to the average citizen. The use of reserve officers also brings a greater variety of backgrounds into a department. These volunteer officers often use the knowledge and experience of their regular career to benefit the department and community.

Another program which has assisted in the development of community policing is the lake deputy program. Each summer, the U.S. Corps of Engineers subsidizes the sheriff's department to patrol the federal parks of Lake Eufaula and Kerr Lake. Two additional officers are temporarily hired during the summer months, each assigned to exclusively patrol one of the lakes. These lake deputies assist the Corps Park Rangers and protect the lives and property of tourists camping, boating, or fishing on the lake. During this time, these officers have the opportunity to meet tourists from about the country and positively represent the people of Haskell County. This helps to encourage tourists to return next year to the county, thus bringing needed revenue to local businesses. County residents also benefit from this project, which helps insure their safety while they recreate on the lake. It is hoped that the extra sense of security makes everyones' vacation or weekend trip more enjoyable.

Haskell County law enforcement is very concerned about the youth of the county. Both the sheriff's department and the Stigler Police Department has D.A.R.E. officers. All students in the county up to the sixth grade have D.A.R.E. as part of their regular curriculum. The students not only learn to resist drugs and violence, but become more comfortable to interacting with officers. Many of the students give officers a "high five" hand slap when they see them to show they are a D.A.R.E. student. I can personally testify to the warm feeling deep in an officer's heart when children greet me with respect and enthusiasm. Children in Haskell County know that they can turn to a police officer for assistance any time needed. In addition to D.A.R.E., the Stigler

Police Department has a juvenile officer which specializes in the needs and concerns of children.

Officers in both the sheriff's department and municipal departments also have the opportunity to interact with students during football and basketball season. While providing security at these school events, officers interact with hundreds of children and parents. This provides yet another opportunity to visit with the community and encourage more interaction between police and citizens.

A new program still in the making in Haskell County is the Boy Scout Explorer Program. This program allows Boy Scouts to ride-along with officers and personally witness what law enforcement officers do. Not only does this program allow young people to gain a realistic view of police work, but may spark an interest for future officers. Destroying some of the negative misconceptions some youth have toward law enforcement may be the program's greatest accomplishment. Breaking barriers which may exist between officers and members of the community, especially the young, is a vital step in establishing a working relationship and cooperation between the two.

Haskell County officers are also very involved in many activities and organizations in the county. While some officers are members of well-known organizations such as the Masons, other officers associated with less traditional groups. During the survey portion of this research, one officer proudly boasted of his membership in the Mountain Fort Mule Association. Many officers' wives are members of women's community organizations. Officers frequently visit various community groups periodically to make presentations and accept contributions to community policing efforts.

A popular sport in Haskell County is rodeo. A large number of officers, including supervisors, are no stranger to this sport. While some officers are participating in events, other officers use the rodeo as an opportunity to visit with spectators. During the summer of 1994, a law enforcement sponsored rodeo was held in Stigler. The event began with an afternoon parade of police cars, fire trucks, rescue vehicles, and ambulances escorting a posse of mule and horse-backed cowboys and cowgirls down Main Street of Stigler. Residents who lined up and down the street to wave and cheer at the riders recognized the sheriff, chief, assistant chief, troopers, game rangers, deputies, D.A. investigator, and even the judge on their mule or horse. As the driver of the lead police car in the parade of mounted officers, I can testify to the excitement and enjoyment members of the community expressed that afternoon. This festive event was an excellent example of the friends relationship between officers and the community.

Rodeos are not the only community activity that officers actively participate in. During the annual Stigler Reunion Days, officers both on and off duty can be found walking among the crowds visiting with residents and meeting new members of the community. An annual chili cookoff which is sponsored by local civic clubs is yet another opportunity for officers to become involved in community programs. One group of officers have become infamous for their chili creation. The annual car show is another opportunity for officers to socialize with others.

It should be noted that officers in Haskell County volunteer a great deal of time to their community and go above and beyond the call of duty. For example, many Stigler officers volunteer their time as

reserves for the sheriff's department. Some officers are also volunteer firemen for their local community. There are also dispatchers who are members of the civil defense and work as first responders.

Now that we have examined some of the general community-oriented practices of Haskell County law enforcement officers, specific examples will be given of excellent community policing which I have personally witnessed. Most of these accounts come from my first few months on the force when I rode with many different officers as part of my field training. During this time, I witnessed many acts by officers which made an impression on me.

On November 21, 1993, my first night as a reserve deputy, I rode with the most experienced officer on the sheriff's department. That night, we stopped by a senior citizen center located in a remote, rural section of the county. Inside the small building sat over a dozen retired residents playing games and visiting. As my senior officer introduced me to the group, each of the senior citizens eagerly shook my hand and encouraged my decision to enter law enforcement. After the approximate twenty minute visit, the officer discussed with me the importance of visiting with members of the community. This was my first hands-on experience with community policing.

I also worked many nights with an officer on Lake Eufaula patrolling campgrounds. As we would come across a group of kids, we would make a point to stop and visit with them. The officer always had a supply of balloons, D.A.R.E. stickers, or stick-on badges to give the children. Before giving children a stick-on badge, the officer would go over the rules of being a junior deputy such as not getting into the car of a stranger and the importance of telling an adult when something is

wrong. Many parents or grandparents of the little campers would thank us for our concern for their children. We would also visit with and meet dozens of tourists and local residents during each shift on the lake.

On another occasion, I was riding with a Stigler police officer when we received a call of a domestic problem between a father and teenage son. When we arrived, the officer interviewed everyone involved and determined the father may have abusive tendencies toward his son. The officer then got the son alone and asked it there was someone he could contact for him. The officer offered to contact a counselor for the teenage boy and follow up on his welfare. The boy was made aware that the police were concerned for his safety and would help him in any way they could. As I observed this officer's concern, I realized he went above and beyond what many officers would have done. Instead of simply writing a report and leaving, the officer got involved and attempted to make a difference.

During the 1994 annual car show in Stigler, I along with several other officers participated in a foot patrol of the downtown area. This gave us the opportunity to visit with residents and meet car show participants. The foot patrol gave residents, especially teenagers, the opportunity to show off their hot rods and classic cars to police officers. I spoke to many teenagers who were excited in being able to show an officer their vehicle and brag about its features. Instead of the hostility many may associate with the relationship between teenagers and police, each were eagerly visiting with each other. This was another opportunity for the police and community to come together and positively communicate.

In October 1994, I was assigned to work the Kinta Halloween Carnival. I, along with the Kinta police chief, foot patrolled the carnival which was held at the Kinta school. At the carnival, students and local community groups had games and activity booths to raise money for various organizations. The Kinta officer and I enjoyed walking about and visiting with residents and students. The probation and parole officer for Haskell County was the sponsor and creator of one of the booths. I spent several hours at the carnival interacting with hundreds of people. Not only did I meet many new people, but I had the opportunity to reunite with many people I hadn't seen in years, thus reintroducing myself as a deputy for their community. The carnival provided a great way for officers to speak to members of the community about various issues which concerned them. Many residents made us aware of situations which may have otherwise went unreported if the informal meeting between officer and citizen had not taken place. The Kinta Halloween Carnival is one of the most enjoyable memories I have as a deputy.

Many of the community policing skills I have witnessed from officers did not involve a specific event but a continuing occurrence between officers and citizens. For example, it is common for a group of officers to get together in the afternoon and eat at one of several restaurants in the community. While this may sound like simple officer camaraderie, it is also another good opportunity to make officers readily available to residents. As other customers enter the restaurant, they frequently approach the officers asking questions about police matters or just visiting. I have frequently noticed that as I visit with officers at a 24-hour convenience store in Stigler during the

night, citizens who come into the store usually stop by our table for conversation. Such interaction helps to establish lasting friendships between the community and law enforcement.

The positive relationships between individual police officers and members of the community are the key to community policing in Haskell County. This relationship has helped to insure that officers are very approachable to the public. Not only are officers well known in the community, but they know most everyone as well. As officers and citizens come together in a working relationship, everyone benefits.

These observations found that officers expressed very favorable attitudes and behaviors toward the community. Each officer demonstrated a positive attitude toward the community through the patience, caring nature, and sincerity I witnessed. Officers also demonstrated favorable behaviors toward the community as so often they went above and beyond the call of duty in order to assist people with their needs, even when not directly related to law enforcement.

Post-Study Observations

Since the completion of the observational and survey research of this thesis in December 1994, I have had more opportunities to observe and participate in community policing in Haskell County. These opportunities were a result of my commission as a Stigler Police reserve, and especially my promotion from a reserve to lake patrol deputy with the Haskell County Sheriff's Department. Each of these positions allowed me to interact more directly with the community as well as increased opportunities to observe the actions of other officers.

In the spring of 1995, while employed as a security officer in Stillwater, I was commissioned as a reserve police officer for the city of Stigler. I was already very familiar with their department from riding with their officers and assisting them as a county reserve. The shifts I volunteered varied and averaged about 24 hours per month. This provided me with even more access to observe the police-community interactions of my study population. These new observations did not change any perceptions I had about the department's attitudes and behaviors toward the community, but only reinforced the earlier observations I had made.

In May 1995, I left Western Security and accepted a lake patrol deputy position with the Haskell County Sheriff's Department. This provided me with the opportunity to study community policing in Haskell County on a daily basis for a period of three months. I worked five shifts per week for the county and usually volunteered my off days to the Stigler reserve force. During this time, I logged over 550 hours on lake patrol as well as at least 80 hours reserving for the Stigler Police Department. This experience not only provided the opportunity to collect additional observations, but also allowed me to compare a three month observation in 1995 to the one year study from 1994.

As discussed earlier in the observational findings, the sheriff's department hires two lake deputies each summer, their salaries subsidized by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. I was assigned to Kerr Lake which included Keota Landing and Cowlington Point recreational areas. I also answered calls and responded to incidents for the northeastern section of Haskell County as well as backing up the regular deputy on duty and the Keota Police Department. On Sunday nights, when

Keota did not have an officer on duty, I patrolled that city and answered their calls.

Keota, with a population of about 800, is the second largest city in Haskell County. Keota Police Chief Leonard Cowett, along with Reserve Officer Jim Knowles, have a relationship with their community which would be the envy of most departments. These two officers know virtually everyone in their community. Keota residents feel comfortable approaching these officers at any time. During my time as a lake deputy, I developed a close working relationship with the Keota Police Department and it did not take long for the people of Keota to welcome me into their community after seeing me on a daily basis. I developed a deeper appreciation for community policing as Keota residents began viewing me as the deputy they turned to first when dealing with the sheriff's department. In essence, I became the community police liaison between the sheriff's department and the people of Keota.

During my summer employment with the sheriff's department, several things developed within Haskell County law enforcement which should be viewed as promising toward community policing. Both the sheriff's department and Stigler Police Department receives COPS grants, which are federal grants aimed at assisting departments in the development of community policing. These grants allowed for each agency to hire an additional officer and devote more time to programs aimed specifically at the community.

A reserve officer's academy was held in Stigler during the summer of 1995 to train additional volunteer officers for both the sheriff's department and city police department. This academy was instructed by local officers who taught cadets not only legal and tactical methods,

but the importance of the community and developing a positive working relationships with the people you are sworn to protect. The reserve force of the county was greatly increased and thus the safety of both the community and other officers was improved. Weekly articles in the Stigler News Sentinel kept the community updated on the progress of the reserve cadets. The local newspaper also ran weekly articles on community programs, drug busts, and arrests by law enforcement officers which resulted in positive community feedback.

Juvenile programs also continued. When the sheriff's department ran out of funds for the D.A.R.E. program, the city of Stigler stepped in and took over the county D.A.R.E. program to insure that all children in Haskell County would have the opportunity to learn to resist drugs and violence. The community continued to express their support for the program.

I was impressed by the positive relationship I observed between the community and the police not only during my three months as a lake deputy, but the entire duration of my study. The attitudes and behaviors of officers toward the community were very positive and showed potential for increased use of community policing in the future. The observational findings were very supportive of the survey findings, which are discussed next.

Survey Findings

The first item on the survey questionnaire asked "What department are you employed with?" Eleven of the respondents worked for the Haskell County Sheriff's Department. There were also eleven municipal officers surveyed including eight Stigler officers, one Keota officer,

one Kinta officer, and one McCurtain officer. Two Oklahoma Highway Patrolmen who are assigned to the area were also surveyed.

The second item asked "What is your rank?" Half of the respondents (twelve) were classified as "patrol officers," which included patrolman, deputy, and trooper. Six of the respondents were classified as "supervisors," which included chief, assistant chief, sergeant, and undersheriff. The remaining six respondents were classified as "reserves," which included reserve and auxiliary officers.

TABLE G

A COMPARISON OF OFFICERS BY AGE, EXPERIENCE, AND RESIDENCY
(Numbers expressed in terms of years)

	Age	Experience	Residency
DEPARTMENT			
County	32.73	5.00	20.00
Municipal	36.27	5.73	23.91
State	40.50	18.50	19.00
RANK			
Reserve	30.83	1.33	26.50
Patrol Officer	36.80	10.33	23.33
Supervisor	37.00	3.67	17.17
EDUCATION			
High School	34.50	3.50	18.38
1-3 Years College	34.70	9.10	25.20
4 or More Years College	36.17	6.50	24.17
Total Average	35.00	6.46	21.71

The average age of the respondents was 35, ranging from 21 to 58 years of age. State officers were older on average, with an average age of 40.50. The second oldest group was municipal officers, with an average age of 36.27. County officers were the youngest on average, 32.73. Respondents were shown to be older in relation to their rank. The average age for reserves was 30.83, 36.08 for patrol officers, and 37.00 for supervisors.

The respondents surveyed have been officers an average of 6.46 years. State officers were the most experienced group, with an average of 18.50 years of service. Municipal and county officers were less experienced on average, 5.73 and 5.00 years respectively. While patrol officers had an average of 10.33 years experience, supervisors averaged 3.67 years experience. The least experienced group were reserve officers, with an average of 1.33 years of services.

When asked "How many years have you lived in Haskell County?", the average of all respondents was 21.71 years of residency. The greatest length of residency was found among municipal officers with an average of 23.91 years. County officers responded with an average of 20.00 years and state officers averaged 19.00 years of residency in Haskell County.

The educational level of all respondents were divided into three categories: high school, 1-3 years of college, and 4 years or more of college. "High school" included those officers with only a high school diploma or a G.E.D. The "1-3 years" category included those who have completed at least one college semester or accumulative hours, but have not completed enough hours to hold a bachelor's degree. This category also included those officers with associates or vocational degrees. The

"4 years or more" category included those officers with a bachelor's degree as well as any graduate hours.

As Table H shows, eight officers, or 33% of the respondents, have only a high school education. Ten officers, or 42%, have 1-3 years of college, and six officers, or 25%, have 4 years or more college. Two-thirds of the officers surveyed have an educational level beyond a high school diploma.

TABLE H

A COMPARISON OF OFFICERS BY HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION

	High School		1-3 Years College		4 or More Years College	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
DEPARTMENT						
County	3	27.5	3	27.5	5	45.0
Municipal	5	45.0	6	55.0	0	0.0
State	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0
AGE						
21-29	3	33.3	3	33.3	3	33.3
30-39	3	43.0	4	57.0	0	0.0
40 and Above	2	25.0	3	37.5	3	37.5
RANK						
Reserve	2	33.0	1	17.0	3	50.0
Patrol Officer	3	25.0	6	50.0	3	25.0
Supervisor	3	50.0	3	50.0	0	0.0
EXPERIENCE						
1 Year or Less	4	50.0	0	0.0	4	50.0
2-6 Years	4	40.0	6	60.0	0	0.0
More than 6 Years	0	0.0	4	67.0	2	33.0
Total Average	8	33.0	10	42.0	6	25.0

The educational level of both state and county officers was high. Of the state officers, one had 1-3 years of college and the other had 4 years of college. Almost three-fourths of county officers had attended college, 45% of them holding as least a bachelor's degree. Municipal officers were the least educated group, with 45% only having a high school diploma. While 55% of municipal officers had 1-3 years of college, not one municipal officer had a bachelor's degree.

Age did not appear to make much difference with the educational level of respondents. As Table H shows, officers in their 20s and 40 or more were divided among the three educational categories, while officers in their 30s were less educated.

Officers with a high school education had no more than six years experience as an office, half of them having no more than one year of experience. Those officers with 1-3 years of college had at least two years experience. Officers with a bachelor's degree or more were either new to law enforcement with one year experience or less or well experienced with at least sixteen years of service.

Surprisingly, the higher an officer's rank, the lower his educational level was. The lowest ranking officers, reserves, had the highest level of education on average with half of the reserves holding a bachelor's degree. Half of patrol officers had 1-3 years of college and were equally divided between high school and bachelor degrees. Half of supervisors only had a high school diploma and not one held a bachelor's degree. This suggests that an officer's educational background has little, it anything to do with promotional opportunities in Haskell County.

Item seven asked "What hours do you normally patrol?" Seventeen of the officers listed nightly hours. Five of the officers stated that their hours vary. Two of the officers responded that they only work days. This item was removed from the survey findings related to officer characteristics because the working hours of most officers change every so often. The responses given were based on the hours each respondent happen to be working at the time they were surveyed and did not represent a permanent shift. With the exception of a few Stigler Police Department officers, an officer in Haskell County will end up working every type of shift imaginable, therefore, it is not possible to truly categorize these officers based on what hours they work.

In order to measure community policing, it is important to examine what motivated each officer to enter law enforcement. The responses given were placed into one of three categories: to help themselves, to help the community, and other reasons. Responses classified as "help themselves" included responses such as personal enjoyment, retirement benefits, job security, excitement, and like being in charge. Responses categories as "help community" included those such as helping people, protect and serve, make a difference, and alleviate problems. "Other reasons" included childhood dream, family tradition, talked into it, and the more unusual response given on this item "mayor asked me to." For the purpose of this measurement, only the responses categorized as "help themselves" and "help community" will be examined.

As Table I shows, more officers were motivated to help the community than to help themselves. These were eight respondents classified as "help themselves" and ten classified as "help community."

When comparing the responses to this question of the various categories of officers surveyed, interesting patterns were found.

Municipal officers were more likely to have listed a response which showed personal gain as a motive in becoming a police officer. While 45% of municipal officers gave a response classified as "help themselves," only 27% listed a "help community" response. County officers were just the opposite, listing a desire to help the community more often. While 67% of county officers listed a response classified as "help community," only 18% listed a "help themselves" response. State officers were divided between "help themselves" and "other reasons."

There were also interesting patterns among the different age groups. Officers in their 20s were overwhelmingly more likely to give a "help community" response, with 67%, while only one officer in their 20s listed a "help themselves" response. Officers in their 30s were more closely divided with three listing "help themselves" and two listing "help community" responses. Officers 40 and above were twice as likely to give a "help themselves" response than a "help community" response. These findings suggest that younger officers are motivated to become a police officer by a desire to help others, but as they become older, consider their own welfare more.

An officer's rank was also found to be related to their reason in becoming a police officer. Two-thirds of reserve officers entered law enforcement to help the community. This number fell to 42% among patrol officers. Supervisors, on the other hand, were three times as likely to list "help themselves" responses than "help community."

TABLE I

ITEM 8: WHY DID YOU CHOOSE TO BECOME A POLICE OFFICER?

	Help Themselves		Help Community		Other Reasons	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
DEPARTMENT						
County	2	18.0	7	64.0	2	18.0
Municipal	5	45.0	3	27.5	3	27.5
State	1	50.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
AGE						
21-29	1	11.0	6	67.0	2	22.0
30-39	3	43.0	2	28.5	2	28.5
40 and Above	4	50.0	2	25.0	2	25.0
RANK						
Reserve	2	33.0	4	67.0	0	0.0
Patrol Officer	3	25.0	5	42.0	1	17.0
Supervisor	3	50.0	1	17.0	2	33.0
EXPERIENCE						
1 Year or Less	1	12.5	6	75.0	1	12.5
2-6 Years	4	40.0	3	30.0	3	30.0
More than 6 Years	3	50.0	1	17.0	2	33.0
EDUCATION						
High School	2	25.0	4	50.0	2	25.0
1-3 Years of College	5	50.0	3	30.0	2	20.0
4 or More Years College	1	17.0	3	50.0	2	33.0
Total Average	8	33.0	10	42.0	6	25.0

An officer's years of experience as a police officer was also related to their motivation to enter the career. Three-fourths of officers with one year experience or less listed a "help community" response. This number fell to 30% among officers with 2-6 years experience, with 40% of that group listing a "help themselves" response.

Officers with more than six years experience were three times as likely to have become a police officer to help themselves than the community.

While half of the officers with only a high school diploma wanted to help the community, 25% of them wanted to help themselves. Of those officers with 1-3 years of college, 50% listed a "help themselves" response and 30% wanted to help the community. Of officers with a bachelor's degree or more, half became a police officer to help the community and only one listed a "help themselves" response.

When respondents described the primary responsibility of a police officer, each answer was placed into one of four categories: protect and serve, law enforcement, keep the peace, and community service. Respondents frequently listed multiple answers, which were all included in the findings, therefore, the percentages on Table J equal more than 100%.

"Protect and serve" was the most common response, listed by two-thirds of all officers surveyed. It was the most common response of both county and municipal officers, of all age groups and of all ranks. The second most common response of all officers surveyed was "law enforcement," listed by 38% of respondents. "Law enforcement" was equal to "protect and serve" among officers with more than six years experience and those officers with 1-3 years of college. "Law enforcement" was the most common response given by state officers and the findings show that the more experience an officer has, the more likely they will view the enforcement of law as their primary responsibility.

TABLE J

ITEM 9: DESCRIBE THE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY OF A POLICE OFFICER
(Multiple answers result in percentages equaling more than 100%)

	Protect and Serve		Law Enforcement		Keep the Peace		Community Service	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DEPARTMENT								
County	7	64.0	3	27.0	0	0.0	3	27.0
Municipal	8	73.0	4	36.0	2	18.0	1	9.0
State	1	50.0	2	100.0	0	0.0	1	50.0
AGE								
21-29	6	67.0	3	33.0	1	11.0	3	33.0
30-39	5	71.0	3	43.0	0	0.0	1	14.0
40 and Above	5	63.0	3	38.0	1	13.0	1	13.0
RANK								
Reserve	4	67.0	2	33.0	1	17.0	2	33.0
Patrol Officer	9	75.0	5	42.0	0	0.0	2	17.0
Supervisor	3	50.0	2	33.0	1	17.0	1	17.0
EXPERIENCE								
1 Year or Less	5	63.0	2	25.0	0	0.0	3	38.0
2-6 Years	7	70.0	3	30.0	2	20.0	1	10.0
More than 6 Years	4	67.0	4	67.0	0	0.0	1	17.0
EDUCATION								
High School	6	75.0	0	0.0	1	12.5	1	12.5
1-3 Years of College	6	60.0	6	60.0	1	10.0	2	20.0
4 or More Years College	4	67.0	3	50.0	0	0.0	2	33.0
Total Average	16	67.0	9	38.0	2	8.0	5	21.0

The answer most closely related to community policing, "community service," was given by 21% of respondents. While "community service" was not the most common response given by any particular group, it was given at a higher rate by some when compared to their opposing groups. County officers were three times more likely to list "community service"

as the primary responsibility of a police officer than municipal officers. Those officers who listed "community service" were most commonly in their 20s, reserves, and had one year experience or less. It was also found that the more education an officer had, the more likely he was to list "community service" as the primary responsibility of a police officer.

Each of the officers surveyed were asked what they believe determines the effectiveness of the police. The responses given were placed into one of three categories: individual officer, community relations, and quantitative statistics. "Individual officer" answers included any response which reflected that officers themselves determine police effectiveness. "Community relations" included any response which reflected a view in which the community determine police effectiveness. Answers classified as "quantitative statistics" included answers which viewed crime rates and statistics as the way to determine police effectiveness.

Many officers gave multiple answers to this question, which were all included, therefore, the percentages of each category may equal more than 100%. The most common response given by officers was "community relations," given by 54% of the respondents. Both the "individual officer" and "quantitative statistics" answers were given by 38% of respondents.

The majority of county officers, 64%, believed the community determines the effectiveness of the police. Municipal officers were equally divided between "individual officer" and "community relations." State officers were divided between "community relations" and "quantitative statistics."

An interesting trend was found among the age groups. Officers in their 20s viewed both "community relations" and "quantitative statistics" as important indicators of police effectiveness, while viewing the "individual officer" as considerably less important. This view reversed with age. The older an officer was, the more he viewed himself as important and the less he relied on crime statistics. The community remained at around half among all age groups.

Among the various ranks, reserve officers overwhelmingly viewed the community as the determinate of police effectiveness. Supervisors were also more likely to view the community as a more important indicator than individual officers or statistics. Patrol officers viewed themselves as the most important indicator of police effectiveness. It was also found that more rank an officer had, the less he relied on statistics.

A pattern was also discovered in relation to an officer's experience. Officers with one year experience or less were most likely to view the community as the indicator of police effectiveness and least likely to view the individual officer as the indicator. There was a closer gap between the two responses among officers with 2-6 years experience. Officers with more than six years on the force were most likely to view themselves as the primary indicator of effectiveness. These findings show that the more experience an officer has, the more he views himself as an indicator of effectiveness and the less he views the community as an indicator.

Very little difference was found between the responses of officers of different educational backgrounds. "Community relations" was the most common response among all three educational groups, slightly higher

among those with a bachelor's degree. Both other responses ranged from 33% to 40% among all educational groups.

TABLE K

ITEM 10: WHAT DETERMINES THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE POLICE?
(Multiple answers result in percentages equaling more than 100%)

	Individual Officer		Community Relations		Quantitative Statistics	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
DEPARTMENT						
County	4	36.0	7	64.0	5	45.0
Municipal	5	45.0	5	45.5	3	27.0
State	0	0.0	1	50.0	1	50.0
AGE						
21-29	2	22.0	5	56.0	5	56.0
30-39	2	29.0	4	57.0	4	50.0
40 and Above	5	63.0	4	50.0	2	25.0
RANK						
Reserve	1	17.0	5	83.0	3	50.0
Patrol Officer	6	50.0	5	42.0	5	42.0
Supervisor	2	33.0	3	50.0	1	17.0
EXPERIENCE						
1 Year or Less	2	25.0	5	63.0	3	38.0
2-6 Years	4	40.0	5	50.0	4	40.0
More than 6 Years	3	50.0	2	33.0	2	33.0
EDUCATION						
High School	3	38.0	4	50.0	3	38.0
1-3 Years of College	4	40.0	5	50.0	4	40.0
4 or More Years College	2	33.0	4	67.0	2	33.0
Total Average	9	38.0	13	54.0	9	38.0

Item eleven of the questionnaire asked "What do you believe in the most common cause of crime?" Of the various answers given, each can be placed into one of seven categories: drugs/alcohol, unemployment/poverty, family environment, biological explanation, breakdown of morals/values, lack of punishment, and lack of education. The two most common responses were drugs/alcohol (38%) and unemployment/poverty (33%). Many officers gave multiple answers, which caused the findings to equal more than 100%.

There were several interesting findings among the different demographic groups. For example, all four respondents which listed a breakdown of morals/values were county officers. Municipal officers were much more likely to view unemployment/poverty as a cause of crime than county or state officers. Also, the older an officer was, the more variety of answers given.

Perhaps the most interesting answers given were those which reflected a biological explanation for crime, given by one out of six officers surveyed. This shows that the theories of Lombroso, Hooten, Sheldon, and the Glueks are still being used by some officers. The majority of those which gave a biological explanation were county officers and those officers with one year experience or less. Officers with a bachelor's degree were more likely to give a biological explanation for crime than those less educated.

Each officer was given the opportunity to describe how they believe crime could be reduced in their community. Of the various answers given, each can be placed into one of six categories: more police/funds, more juvenile programs, stricter law enforcement, community involvement, drug prevention, and better economy. The two most common

TABLE L

ITEM 11: WHAT DO YOU BELIEVE IS THE MOST COMMON CAUSE OF CRIME?
(Multiple answers result in the percentages equaling more than 100%)

	Drugs and Alcohol		Unemployment and Poverty		Family Environment		Biological Explanation		Breakdown of Morals/Values		Lack of Punishment		Lack of Education	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DEPARTMENT														
County	4	36	2	18	1	9	3	27	4	36	2	18	0	0
Municipal	5	45	6	55	2	18	1	9	0	0	0	0	1	9
State	0	0	0	0	1	50	0	0	0	0	1	50	1	50
AGE														
21-29	4	44	4	44	0	0	2	22	2	22	1	11	0	0
30-39	4	57	1	14	2	29	0	0	0	0	1	14	1	14
40 and Above	1	13	3	38	2	25	2	25	2	25	1	13	1	13
RANK														
Reserve	4	67	3	50	1	17	1	17	1	17	1	17	0	0
Patrol Officer	2	17	3	25	3	25	2	17	3	25	2	17	1	8
Supervisor	3	50	2	33	0	0	1	17	0	0	0	0	1	17
EXPERIENCE														
1 Year or Less	3	38	2	25	1	13	3	38	1	13	1	13	1	13
2-6 Years	5	50	5	50	0	0	1	10	1	10	0	0	0	0
More than 6 Years	1	17	1	17	3	50	0	0	2	33	2	33	1	17
EDUCATION														
High School	3	38	3	38	0	0	1	13	1	13	0	0	1	13
1-3 Years of College	5	50	3	30	3	30	1	10	1	10	2	20	0	0
4 or More Years College	1	17	2	33	1	17	2	33	2	33	1	17	1	17
Total Average	9	38	8	33	4	17	4	17	4	17	3	13	2	8

responses were "community involvement" and "more police/funds," each with 37.5%. The third most common response was "stricter law enforcement," given by one out of four officers. Due to multiple answers, which were all included, the findings of each group may equal more than 100%.

There were strong patterns found among the answers of the various groups. While county officers were most likely to list "stricter law enforcement" and "community involvement" as ways to reduce crime, the majority of municipal officers wanted more police officers or funding for their department. All state officers listed "community involvement."

There were also interesting patterns among the different age groups. Officers in their 20s were most likely to list "community involvement" as the way to reduce crime in their community. Officers in their 30s were most likely to want more officers and funds. Officers 40 and above were most likely to list "stricter law enforcement" as the way to reduce crime. "Drug prevention" appeared to decrease in importance with age. While three officers in their 20s listed "drug prevention," only one officer in their 30s and no officers 40 and above listed "drug prevention." It was also found that "stricter law enforcement" became more important with age while "community involvement" became less important.

Another interesting pattern can be found among the various ranks. Reserve officers were most likely to list "stricter law enforcement" and "drug prevention" as ways to reduce crime. Patrol officers were more likely to list "community involvement." Supervisors were overwhelmingly

TABLE M

ITEM 12: HOW DO YOU BELIEVE CRIME COULD BE REDUCED IN YOUR COMMUNITY?
(Multiple answers result in the percentages equaling more than 100%)

	More Police Officers or Funds		More Juvenile Programs		Stricter Law Enforcement		Community Involvement		Drug Prevention		Better Economy	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DEPARTMENT												
County	3	27	0	0	4	36	4	36	2	18	1	9
Municipal	6	55	3	27	2	18	3	27	2	18	1	9
State	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	100	0	0	0	0
AGE												
21-29	3	33	1	11	1	11	5	56	3	33	0	0
30-39	4	57	1	14	1	14	2	29	1	14	1	14
40 and Above	2	25	1	13	4	50	2	25	0	0	1	13
RANK												
Reserve	1	17	1	17	3	50	2	33	3	50	0	0
Patrol Officer	3	25	2	17	3	25	6	50	1	8	2	17
Supervisor	5	83	0	0	0	0	1	17	0	0	0	0
EXPERIENCE												
1 Year or Less	1	13	0	0	3	38	4	50	2	25	0	0
2-6 Years	7	70	1	10	1	10	2	20	1	10	0	0
More than 6 Years	1	17	2	33	2	33	3	50	1	17	2	33
EDUCATION												
High School	4	50	1	13	2	25	2	25	1	13	0	0
1-3 Years of College	5	50	2	20	1	10	3	30	2	20	1	10
4 or More Years College	0	0	0	0	3	50	4	67	1	17	1	17
Total Average	9	37.5	3	12.5	6	25	9	37.5	4	17	2	8

most likely to believe more officers and funding for their department was the answer to reducing crime.

Among officers with one year experience or less, "community involvement" and "stricter law enforcement" were the two most common responses. Officers with 2-6 years experience were most likely, by a strong 70%, to view "more police/funds" as the way to reduce crime in their community. Officers with more than six years experience were more diversified in their answers, listing answers from all six categories. Half of these veteran officers listed "community involvement." It was also found that with experience, an officer was more likely to want "more juvenile programs" and officers with more than six years experience were the only group to list "better economy" as a way to reduce crime.

Hiring more police officers and providing more funding to departments was the most popular answer among officers with a high school diploma as well as those with 1-3 years of college. Interestingly, not one officer with a bachelor's degree wanted "more police/funds." Officers with bachelor's degrees were most likely to list "community involvement" and "stricter law enforcement" as ways to reduce crime. The findings show that the more education an officer had, the more of an emphasis he placed on "community involvement."

When officers were asked to describe their definition of community policing, the most common definition involved a working relationship and cooperation between citizens and the police. Many officers mentioned individuals officers participating in some type of community service, such as volunteering time to set up neighborhood watches. Several officers also spoke of the importance of listening to the community.

Helping the community work to solve their own problems and improving communication between citizens and the police were also common responses. Two other responses were making officers more approachable to the public and insuring that the community is well informed. All of these answers are common definitions of community policing.

Only one officer defined community-oriented policing as improving the relationship between police and the community, the goal of the old police-community relations efforts of the late 1960s and early 1970s. This respondent was one of the older officers, trained during the era of police-community relations, which explains his response. Overall, the officers in Haskell County had a good understanding of community policing.

Item fourteen of the questionnaire asked each officer to "Give examples of community-oriented policing used by your department." The most common practice listed by officers was the D.A.R.E. program, listed by 73% of municipal officers, 55% of county officers, and half of state officers. The two other most common responses involved officers having individual contact with citizens and officers speaking to citizen groups. Some of the other answers included Project We Care (a program by the Stigler Police Department aimed at assisting the elderly), departments sponsoring juvenile athletic events, Make a Wish Program, and the Boy Scout Explorers ride-along program.

One of the more interesting examples given was the use of C.B. radios to allow direct contact between citizens and individual officers in patrol cars. This direct communication allows citizens quicker access to an officer, thus increasing their sense of security, and allows the officer to speak directly to citizens and broadcast

information on various emergencies or matters which may concern them. While there were a variety of examples given, two officers, one county and one municipal, could not list any community policing practice used by their department.

When the officers surveyed gave examples of how they have personally used community-oriented policing, the most frequent response, listed by about one-third of respondents, was visiting with and personally interacting with citizens. Two other common responses were working with juveniles and volunteering free time to community programs. Other examples included foot patrol, setting positive examples for others to follow, sensitivity to victims, educating the public, and assisting with the needs of the community. Two officers did not list any examples of personally using community policing.

When asked what types of programs each officer would like to see their department focus on in the future, the two most common programs listed by officers were youth-oriented programs and drug prevention programs, both listed by 29% of officers. Raising the educational standards of officers and improving communication with the public were next, both with 21%. The fifth most common answer, listed by four officers, was establishing neighborhood watch groups. Other ideas for future programs included domestic violence intervention, more aggressive law enforcement, gun safety classes for the public, and increased use of foot patrol. Two officers wrote "Don't know" as their answer.

Of the total respondents, fourteen officers (58% of the total respondents) had formal training in community policing while the remaining ten did not (Table N). The majority of both county and municipal officers had training in community policing, as well as half

of the state officers. The survey found that younger officers were more likely to have had community police training than older officers. While two-thirds of officers in their 20s had training, 57% of officers in their 30s and only half of officers 40 and above had community police training.

There were also differences found among ranks. Reserve officers were equally divided between those who did and did not have the training. Three-fourths of patrol officers said they had community police training while two-thirds of their supervisors did not. Officers with one year experience or less and those officers with 2-6 years experience were both equally divided between those which had the training and those who did not. Officers with more than six years experience, however, were much more likely to have had training in community policing, with 83% responding "yes."

The education of an officer had a relation which could be shown with being trained in community policing. The majority of officers with only a high school diploma did not have the training, only 38% did. Among officers with 1-3 years of college, 60% had training. An 83% majority of officers with a bachelor's degree or more had community police training.

Each officer surveyed had read an average of 2.63 journal articles or books on community policing in the past year. As Table O shows, there were several major differences between the various groups. For example, lower ranking officers have read many more articles and books than higher ranking officers. While reserves had read 5.87 more books than the total average, supervisors had read 1.42 less articles and books than average. The education of each officer had a great deal to

do with the number of articles and books on community policing read. Officers with 1-3 years of college read more than twice as many articles and books as those officers with only a high school diploma. Officers which held at least a bachelor's degree had read more than eight times as many articles and books as high school graduates.

TABLE N

ITEM 17: HAVE YOU RECEIVED ANY TRAINING IN COMMUNITY-ORIENTED POLICING?

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
DEPARTMENT				
County	7	64.0	4	36.0
Municipal	6	55.0	5	45.0
State	1	50.0	1	50.0
AGE				
21-29	6	67.0	3	33.0
30-39	4	57.0	3	43.0
40 and Above	4	50.0	4	50.0
RANK				
Reserve	3	50.0	3	50.0
Patrol Officer	9	75.0	3	25.0
Supervisor	2	33.0	4	67.0
EXPERIENCE				
1 Year or Less	4	50.0	4	50.0
2-6 Years	5	50.0	5	50.0
More than 6 Years	5	83.0	1	17.0
EDUCATION				
High School	3	38.0	5	62.0
1-3 Years of College	6	60.0	4	40.0
4 or More Years College	5	83.0	1	17.0
Total Average	14	58.0	10	42.0

There was also a relation found between an officer's age and the number of articles and books read. Officers in their 30s read five times as many articles and books as officers 40 and above and officers in their 20s read twice as many articles and books as officers in their 30s. Also, while officers with one year experience or less and those with more than six years experience read more articles and books than average, officers with 2-6 years experience scored the lowest of any group, reading an average of only .50 articles and books per year.

Item nineteen of the questionnaire asked "In the past year, how many times have you volunteered your free time to community programs?" Five of the answers were deleted due to a non-numerical answer such as "few," "several," or "many." Of the nineteen officers which answered in a correct manner, the average number was 8.26. There were not major differences found between the responses of each group as there has been with other items. It was found that the group which volunteered their free time the least were high school educated officers while those with 1-3 years of college volunteered their time the most. It was also found that the more experience an officer had, the more likely he was to volunteer his time to the community. It should be pointed out, that all reserve officers volunteer their time each shift they work.

TABLE O

ITEM 18: IN THE PAST YEAR, HOW MANY JOURNAL ARTICLES OR BOOKS HAVE YOU READ ON COMMUNITY-ORIENTED POLICING?

	Average Number of Articles Read
DEPARTMENT	
County	5.27
Municipal	1.73
State	3.00
AGE	
21-29	6.33
30-39	3.14
40 and Above	.63
RANK	
Reserve	8.50
Patrol Officer	2.25
Supervisor	.83
EXPERIENCE	
1 Year or Less	6.33
2-6 Years	.50
More than 6 Years	3.67
EDUCATION	
High School	1.00
1-3 Years of College	2.30
4 or More Years College	8.83
Total Average	2.63

TABLE P

ITEM 19: IN THE PAST YEAR, HOW MANY TIMES HAVE YOU VOLUNTEERED YOUR FREE TIME TO COMMUNITY PROGRAMS?

	Average Number of Volunteered Time
DEPARTMENT	
County	8.26
Municipal	8.38
State	6.50
AGE	
21-29	8.80
30-39	7.29
40 and Above	8.86
RANK	
Reserve	10.00
Patrol Officer	7.00
Supervisor	9.25
EXPERIENCE	
1 Year or Less	6.00
2-6 Years	8.86
More than 6 Years	9.82
EDUCATION	
High School	5.86
1-3 Years of College	11.29
4 or More Years College	7.40
Total Average	8.26

When asked, "Do most officers in your department display a professional appearance to the public?", all municipal and state officers replied "yes" (Table Q). Three county officers, 27% of the department surveyed, said "no," their officers did not appear professional to the public. Of the officers which responded "no," two were patrol officers and one was a reserve. It should be pointed out in

fairness to the county that a few months after this survey was taken, the county received new uniforms for their officers which may now increase their professional appearance. All supervisors believed their officers displayed a professional appearance.

TABLE Q

ITEM 20: DO MOST OFFICERS IN YOUR DEPARTMENT DISPLAY A PROFESSIONAL APPEARANCE TO THE PUBLIC?

	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
DEPARTMENT				
County	8	73.0	3	27.0
Municipal	11	100.0	0	0.0
State	2	100.0	0	0.0
RANK				
Reserve	5	83.0	1	17.0
Patrol Officer	10	83.0	2	17.0
Supervisor	6	100.0	0	0.0
Total Average	21	87.5	3	12.5

The officers surveyed estimated they spoke to an average of 45.96 citizens during one shift (Table R). County officers spoke to more citizens than municipal and state officers. It was found that younger officers spoke to more citizens than older officers. While officers in their 20s spoke to an average of 56.50 people per shift, officers in their 30s and 40 and above spoke to approximately 40 citizens per shift.

TABLE R

ITEM 21: ESTIMATE THE NUMBER OF CITIZENS YOU SPEAK WITH DURING ONE SHIFT

	Average Number of Citizens
DEPARTMENT	
County	54.70
Municipal	39.09
State	40.00
AGE	
21-29	56.50
30-39	40.71
40 and Above	40.00
RANK	
Reserve	33.40
Patrol Officer	55.42
Supervisor	37.50
EXPERIENCE	
1 Year or Less	56.71
2-6 Years	32.00
More than 6 Years	56.67
EDUCATION	
High School	54.29
1-3 Years of College	41.50
4 or More Years College	43.67
Total Average	45.96

Patrol officers spoke to more people than reserves or supervisors. While officers with one year experience or less and those officers with more than six years experience spoke to about 56 citizens per shift, officers with 2-6 years experience spoke to only 32 citizens. Officers with only a high school education spoke to more citizens than those with a college education. While high school graduates spoke to an average of

54.29 citizens per shift, those with 1-3 years of college spoke to 41.50 and officers with four years or more college spoke to an average of 43.67 citizens per shift.

Item twenty-two asked officers "Of the citizens you speak with during one shift, about what percentage of those contacts are corrective in nature?" (Table S). This item was intended to measure how punitive each officer was. The average of all officers surveyed was 20.17%, or that one out of five contacts are corrective. County officers were the most punitive department, with 23.91% of contacts being corrective. Municipal officers scored just below average and state officers were found to be the least punitive. Both troopers surveyed estimated that only 5% of their contacts are corrective. This is contrary to the stereotype some people have of state troopers being strict and punitive. The findings of this study suggests that state troopers practice much more community policing than simple enforcement of law.

Among the age groups, officers in their 30s were the most punitive with one in four contacts being corrective. Officers in their 20s scored just below average while officers 40 and above had the lowest percentage of corrective contact, 17.13%. Supervisors were found to be the most punitive rank at 23.00%, followed by reserves at 22.67%. Patrol officers were the least punitive rank with 17.50% of their contacts being corrective.

There was a strong relation found between an officer's experience and how punitive he was. The percentage of corrective contacts fell sharply with experience. Officers with one year experience of less reported an average of 28.75% of their contacts being corrective. This average fell to 19.30% among officers with 2-6 years experience.

Officers with more than six years experience reported only 10.17% of their contacts being corrective. It was also found that officers with only a high school diploma were more punitive than those with a college education. While high school graduates reported an average of 30.25% of their contacts being corrective, 12.90% of officers with 1-3 years of college and 18.83% of contacts of officers with four years or more college were corrective.

TABLE S

ITEM 22: OF THE CITIZENS YOU SPEAK WITH DURING ONE SHIFT, ABOUT WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THOSE CONTACTS ARE CORRECTIVE IN NATURE?

	% of Contacts
DEPARTMENT	
County	23.91
Municipal	19.18
State	5.00
AGE	
21-29	19.00
30-39	25.14
40 and Above	17.13
RANK	
Reserve	22.67
Patrol Officer	17.50
Supervisor	23.00
EXPERIENCE	
1 Year or Less	28.75
2-6 Years	19.30
More than 6 Years	10.17
EDUCATION	
High School	30.25
1-3 Years of College	12.90
4 or More Years College	18.83
Total Average	20.17

Most officers stated they knew more than half of their community by name (Table T). The average number of persons in the community the officers knew by name was 56.54%. Of the departments surveys, state officers knew the highest number of citizens at 75%, followed by municipal officers at 64.45%. County officers knew the fewest citizens, 45.27%. There was less differences found between age groups, with only a 6% variation from the lowest group in their 30s to the highest group in their 20s.

It was found that among the ranks, patrol officers knew the highest percentage of citizens. While patrol officers knew 61.50% of citizens by name, reserves and supervisors knew just over 51% of citizens. The findings show that the more experience an officer has, the more citizens he knew. While officers with one year experience or less knew 50.50% of citizens, officers with 2-6 years of experience knew 52.80%. This percentage jumped to 70.83% among officers with more than six years experience. While there was little difference found between the educational groups, it was discovered that the more education an officer had, the fewer citizens he knew. The time away from the community in order to receive a college education may account for this.

The officers surveyed showed a great deal of faith in the community's ability to reduce crime (Table U). Nineteen of the officers surveyed, 79%, believed the community had the greatest ability to reduce crime. Four of the officers, 17%, believed the court system had the greatest ability to reduce crime and one officer responded that law makers did. Not one officer surveyed believed the police had the greatest ability to reduce crime.

TABLE T

ITEM 23: ESTIMATE THE PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS IN YOUR COMMUNITY THAT YOU KNOW BY NAME

	% of Persons
DEPARTMENT	
County	45.27
Municipal	64.45
State	75.00
AGE	
21-29	58.67
30-39	52.71
40 and Above	56.88
RANK	
Reserve	51.67
Patrol Officer	61.50
Supervisor	51.50
EXPERIENCE	
1 Year or Less	50.50
2-6 Years	52.80
More than 6 Years	70.83
EDUCATION	
High School	57.13
1-3 Years of College	57.00
4 or More Years College	55.00
Total Average	56.54

TABLE U

ITEM 24: WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING HAS THE GREATEST ABILITY TO REDUCE CRIME?

	Community		Police		Court System		Lawmakers	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DEPARTMENT								
County	8	73.0	0	0.0	2	18.0	1	9.0
Municipal	9	82.0	0	0.0	2	18.0	0	0.0
State	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
AGE								
21-29	8	89.0	0	0.0	1	11.0	0	0.0
30-39	6	86.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	14.0
40 and Above	5	63.0	0	0.0	3	37.0	0	0.0
RANK								
Reserve	6	100.0	0	0.0	1	12.0	0	0.0
Patrol Officer	9	75.0	0	0.0	3	25.0	0	0.0
Supervisor	4	67.0	0	0.0	1	16.5	1	16.5
EXPERIENCE								
1 Year or Less	7	88.0	0	0.0	1	12.0	0	0.0
2-6 Years	7	70.0	0	0.0	2	20.0	1	10.0
More than 6 Years	5	83.0	0	0.0	1	17.0	0	0.0
EDUCATION								
High School	7	88.0	0	0.0	1	12.0	0	0.0
1-3 Years of College	7	70.0	0	0.0	2	20.0	1	10.0
4 or More Years College	5	83.0	0	0.0	1	17.0	0	0.0
Total Average	19	79.0	0	0.0	4	17.0	1	4.0

The community was the most common response of all categories of officers surveyed, but there were still patterns found among the other responses given. It was found that the older an officer was, the less sure he was that the community had the greatest ability to reduce crime. Over one-third of officers 40 and above looked to the court system to

reduce crime. Also, the more rank an officer had, the less he believed in the community's ability to reduce crime. While every reserve officer surveyed responded that the community was the key to reducing crime, three-fourths of patrol officers and two-thirds of supervisors responded the same.

It was also found that the more experience an officer had, the less he had faith in the community's ability to reduce crime. As with age, the more years behind the officer, the lower the percentage of community responses and the greater the number of court system responses. There was no significant differences found between the educational groups.

Virtually every officer surveyed believed they were supported by their community (Table V). Of the twenty-four total officers surveyed, nineteen responded "supportive," four "very supportive," and one "unsupportive." No officer responded "very unsupportive."

A 91% majority of county officers believed the community was supportive of law enforcement and one county officer said it was unsupportive. No county officers believed the community was very supportive of them. Municipal officers believed they had more community support than county officers. Eight municipal officers believed the community was supportive and over one-fourth of them believed the community was very supportive. State officers were equally divided between supportive and very supportive.

Officers in their 30s were less likely to feel as much support from the community as officers in the other age groups. There was no significant differences found between the ranks. While officers with one year experience or less were solid in believing the community was supportive of them, the responses became more diverse, both negatively

and positively, with 2-6 years experience. Officers with more than six years experience were more in agreement that the community was supportive. While college educated officers found strong support from the community than those with only a high school education, it should be noted that the only officer to find the community unsupportive also had a college education.

TABLE V

ITEM 25: HOW SUPPORTIVE IS YOUR COMMUNITY OF LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT?

	Very Supportive		Supportive		Unsupportive		Very Unsupportive	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DEPARTMENT								
County	0	0.0	10	91.0	1	9.0	0	0.0
Municipal	3	27.0	8	73.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
State	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
AGE								
21-29	2	22.0	7	78.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
30-39	0	0.0	6	86.0	1	14.0	0	0.0
40 and Above	2	25.0	6	75.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
RANK								
Reserve	1	17.0	5	83.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Patrol Officer	2	17.0	9	75.0	1	8.0	0	0.0
Supervisor	1	17.0	5	83.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
EXPERIENCE								
1 Year or Less	0	0.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2-6 Years	3	30.0	6	60.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
More than 6 Years	1	17.0	5	83.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
EDUCATION								
High School	0	0.0	8	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
1-3 Years of College	3	30.0	6	60.0	1	10.0	0	0.0
4 or More Years College	1	17.0	5	83.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total Average	4	17.0	19	79.0	1	4.0	0	0.0

Ten of the officers surveyed ranked their department's relationship with the community as "very good" (Table W). Five officers ranked their department's relationship as "good" and nine as "average." No officer ranked their department's relationship as any response below "average." While county officers were diverse in their opinion, municipal officers were clearly divided between two groups, those who believed their department's relationship was "very good" and those who believed it was "average." Both state officers responded in having a "very good" relationship with the community.

Among the age groups, officers in their 20s were most likely to rank their department's relationship as "very good." Officers in their 30s ranked the relationship the lowest, with 54% responding "average." The answers of officers 40 and above were well distributed. While half of reserved responded their department's relationship with the community was "good," half of patrol officers and supervisors responded "very good."

It was found that the more experience an officer had, the better he ranked his department's relationship with the community. While one-fourth of officers with one year experience or less ranked their department's relationship as "very good," half of those with 2-6 years experience and well as those with more than six years experience ranked their relationship as "very good." There was also an interesting pattern found among the educational groups. A clear majority of each group gave a different answer than the other educational groups. A 75% majority of high school graduated ranked their department's relationship as "average," while a 60% majority of officers with 1-3 years of college responded "very good." Of those officers with a bachelor's degree or

more, a 67% majority ranked their relationship with the community as "good."

TABLE W

ITEM 26: HOW WOULD YOU RANK YOUR DEPARTMENT'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE COMMUNITY?

	Very Good		Good		Average		Poor/Bad/ Very Bad	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DEPARTMENT								
County	3	27.5	5	45.0	3	27.5	0	0.0
Municipal	5	45.0	0	0 0	6	55.0	0	0.0
State	2	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
AGE								
21-29	5	56.0	2	22.0	2	22.0	0	0.0
30-39	2	29.0	1	14.0	5	57.0	0	0.0
40 and Above	3	37.5	2	25.0	3	37.5	0	0.0
RANK								
Reserve	1	17.0	3	50.0	2	33.0	0	0.0
Patrol Officer	6	50.0	1	8.0	5	42.0	0	0.0
Supervisor	3	50.0	1	17.0	2	33.0	0	0.0
EXPERIENCE								
1 Year or Less	2	25.0	3	37.5	3	37.5	0	0.0
2-6 Years	5	50.0	1	10.0	4	40.0	0	0.0
More than 6 Years	3	50.0	1	17.0	2	33.0	0	0.0
EDUCATION								
High School	2	25.0	0	0.0	6	75.0	0	0.0
1-3 Years of College	6	60.0	1	10.0	3	30.0	0	0.0
4 or More Years College	2	33.0	4	67.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total Average	10	42.0	5	20.0	9	38.0	0	0.0

Each of the respondents was asked "Which of the following fictitious police officers do you more relate to?" (Table X). The choices were: Sheriff Andy Taylor of The Andy Griffith Show, Sergeant Joe Friday of Dragnet, Detective Axel Foley of Beverly Hills Cop, and Inspector Harry Calahan of the Dirty Harry movies. This was without a doubt the most discussed and popular item in the survey according to the officers. Even several months after completing the survey, I have overheard officers discussing the question and asking each other which officer they chose and why.

This attitudinal item gave officers an opportunity to compare themselves to the type of officer they hope others view them as. Andy Taylor represents the ultimate community police officer, a good-hearted sheriff who is very familiar with residents and respected by the entire community. Joe Friday represents the serious-minded, by-the-book officer who is a stickler for detail. Axel Foley represents the good-humored, energetic officer who may resort to unusual methods to accomplish goals. Dirty Harry is the most punitive type of officer who views the system as sympathetic to criminals and believes crime should be dealt with more aggressively.

The most common response given by all officers was Andy Taylor, given by 42% of the respondents. Joe Friday and Axel Foley each received 25% of the total responses. Only two officers related themselves as Dirty Harry.

County officers were most likely to relate themselves to Andy Taylor or Joe Friday, while municipal officers were just as likely to relate to Axel Foley as Andy Taylor. While the serious-minded Joe Friday was the second most common response among county officers, it

was the least most common response among municipal officers. Also, both officers who related to Dirty Harry were municipal.

TABLE X

ITEM 27: WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FICTITIOUS POLICE OFFICERS DO YOU MOST RELATE TO?

	Andy Taylor		Joe Friday		Axel Foley		Harry Calahan	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
DEPARTMENT								
County	5	45.0	4	36.0	2	19.0	0	0.0
Municipal	4	36.0	1	10.0	4	36.0	2	18.0
State	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
AGE								
21-29	2	22.0	3	34.0	2	22.0	2	22.0
30-39	2	29.0	2	29.0	3	42.0	0	0.0
40 and Above	6	75.0	1	12.5	1	12.5	0	0.0
RANK								
Reserve	3	50.0	1	17.0	2	33.0	0	0.0
Patrol Officer	4	33.0	4	33.0	3	25.0	1	9.0
Supervisor	3	50.0	1	16.6	1	16.6	1	16.6
EXPERIENCE								
1 Year or Less	5	63.0	2	25.0	1	12.0	0	0.0
2-6 Years	2	20.0	2	20.0	4	40.0	2	20.0
More than 6 Years	3	50.0	2	34.0	1	16.0	0	0.0
EDUCATION								
High School	5	63.0	2	25.0	1	12.0	0	0.0
1-3 Years of College	2	20.0	2	20.0	4	40.0	2	20.0
4 or More Years College	3	50.0	2	33.0	1	17.0	0	0.0
Total Average	10	42.0	6	25.0	6	25.0	2	8.0

Among the age groups, officers in their 20s were more diversified in their answers, as if searching for their identity. Officers in their 30s eliminated Dirty Harry as a choice, and related more to Axel Foley. By the time an officer was 40 or above, a clear majority related to Andy Taylor. It was concluded from this pattern that the older an officer was, the less serious-minded like Joe Friday and the less punitive like Dirty Harry he was, and the more community-oriented like Andy Taylor he became.

While reserve officers and supervisors related more to Andy Taylor, patrol officers were more diverse in their responses. Officers with one year experience or less related more to Andy Taylor. With 2-6 years experience, the responses became more diverse with an emphasis on Axel Foley. After more than six years experience, the average response returned to Andy Taylor. Officers with only a high school diploma responded with a 63% majority to relating to Andy Taylor while only 20% of officers with 1-3 years of college responded the same. This group was most related to Axel Foley. Among officers with at least a bachelor's degree, half related to Andy Taylor and one-third to Joe Friday.

The last page of the questionnaire was a twenty item Guttman scale which asked officers to "Please check any of the following community-oriented police practices which you have personally participated in within the past year." A list of twenty common community policing practices were listed. The most common practiced checked was "making security checks of businesses," given by twenty-three of the twenty-four officers surveyed. The next most common response were "provide security at a school event," "introducing yourself to new member of the

community," and "participating in a parade," each checked by nineteen officers. "Encouraging citizens to solve their own problems without legal intervention" rounded off the top five responses with eighteen checks. Table Y lists the practices and their frequency of being checked. Only two of the choices were not listed by any officer, "volunteer as a Big Brother or Sister" and "conducting door-to-door survey of residents."

TABLE Y

GUTTMAN SCALE: ON THE TWENTY COMMUNITY POLICING PRACTICES LISTED, THE AVERAGE NUMBER EACH DEMOGRAPHIC GROUP CHECKED AS PERSONALLY PARTICIPATING IN WITHIN THE PAST YEAR

	Average # of Practices
DEPARTMENT	
County	7.64
Municipal	8.55
State	12.00
AGE	
21-29	8.44
30-39	8.71
40 and Above	8.13
RANK	
Reserve	7.00
Patrol Officer	9.58
Supervisor	7.83
EXPERIENCE	
1 Year or Less	8.25
2-6 Years	6.60
More than 6 Years	11.67
EDUCATION	
High School	7.63
1-3 Years of College	8.90
4 or More Years College	8.67
Total Average	8.42

The average number of practices checked by all officers was 8.42. County officers checked just below the average number while state officers checked the most with an average of 12.00 practices. There was very little variation found between the age groups. Patrol officers checked the higher number of practices among the ranks, while reserves checked the fewest. Of course, reserve officers work less and therefore do not have as much opportunity to participate in as many activities.

Officers with one year experience or less checked near the average with 8.25. Officers with 2-6 years experience checked fewer practices with 6.60. At an average of 11.67 practices, officers with more than six years experience chose the most practices of that category. While there was little difference found between the educational groups, it was found that officers with a college education checked on average one more practice than those officers with only a high school diploma.

Summary of Survey Findings

Now that we have examined each item of the survey separately, it is important to examine the overall findings of this survey. As discussed earlier, items 8 through 27 were a mix of attitudinal and behavioral items. Items in the survey categorized as attitudinal were as follows: 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 20, 24, 25, 26, and 27. The items categorized as behavioral were: 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, and the 20 item Guttman scale. Of the seven demographic items on the survey, five were included for the comparison of officers: department, age, rank, experience, and education. By combining the findings of the attitudinal items and behavioral items, conclusions can be made about the community policing abilities of each demographic group.

After examining the attitudinal items, it was found that state officers demonstrated more favorable attitudes toward the community than county and municipal officers. Municipal officers showed the least favorable attitude. When examining the behavioral items, both state and county officers equally expressed more community policing behaviors than municipal officers. Overall, state officers expressed the most favorable attitude and behaviors toward community policing and municipal officers showed the least amount.

When comparing the age groups, officers in their 20s showed more favorable attitudes and behaviors toward the community than older officers. It was found that the younger the officer, the more community police-oriented he or she was. These findings in Haskell County did not match the findings of a similar study conducted within the Chicago Police Department in 1993. According to Lurigio and Skogan (1994, p. 329), older officers in Chicago expressed more favorable attitudes toward community policing than younger officers. The Haskell County study did, however, discover that the older an officer was, the less likely he was to have a punitive role model and the more likely he was to have a community-oriented role model. This was based on the findings of item twenty-seven of the survey.

After comparing the ranks, reserve officers (the lowest ranking group) expressed the most favorable attitudes toward the community. Again, this did not match Lurigio and Skogan's findings that higher ranking officers are the most favorable toward community policing. A review of item eight's findings is an excellent example of the trend found in Haskell County. When answering the question "Why did you choose to become a police officer?", two-thirds of reserve officers and

42% of regular officers said "to help the community," while supervisors were three times as likely to list "help themselves" than "help community." Interestingly, patrol officers expressed the least favorable attitude toward the community, but they showed the most community policing behaviors of any rank. This suggests that these patrol officers may not be as enthusiastic toward the philosophy of community policing as other ranks, but they readily practice community policing on the job.

When comparisons were made of officers based on their experience, officers expressed the most favorable attitudes toward the community with one year experience or less. When comparing community policing behaviors, however, officers with more than six years experience expressed the most. This suggests that as an officer enters law enforcement, he or she has more optimistic attitudes toward the community. As the officer gains experience, the more likely he or she is to participate in community policing behaviors.

Officers were also compared based on their highest level of education. Officers with at least a bachelor's degree had the most favorable attitude toward the community, followed by those with 1-3 years of college. When comparing the community policing behaviors of each educational group, officers with 1-3 years of college expressed the most, followed by those with four years or more college. Officers with only a high school diploma showed the least favorable attitude and least amount of behavior toward community policing.

While certain demographic groups showed more community policing skills than others, it is important to note that all officers in Haskell County showed potential in this philosophy. Just because certain

officers are excellent at community policing does not mean that other officers lack these skills. Overall, each department, age group, rank, experience level, and educational group demonstrated sufficient knowledge of community policing, had positive attitudes toward the community, and expressed behaviors which are favorable toward community policing.

CONCLUSION

After reviewing numerous literature on community policing, conducting a participant observer study, and surveying officers, it is clear that the objectives set forth by this study have been completed. An understanding of community policing has been established through an extensive literature review. The disregard of small communities in community policing studies has been shown as well as the low rate of crime in rural areas, especially Haskell County, when compared to larger populations. Through both observational and survey findings, officers in Haskell County were found to have favorable attitudes and behaviors toward the community. The survey portions of the study also found differences in the responses of officers when compared demographically.

While numerous explanations of community policing were found while conducting this research, each definition was basically the same. Community policing is a philosophy which encourages the community and the police to work together with the common goal of making their community safer. It is a back to the basics philosophy in which the community itself takes responsibility for its own protection by working directly with law enforcement. It is important that officers have a positive attitude toward the community and exhibit community policing behaviors in order to make this philosophy work. An understanding of community policing had to be established in order to realize what attitudes and behaviors expressed by officers should be considered positive toward the community.

As discussed in this study, previous research on community-oriented policing has ignored smaller departments and communities. This research shows the valuable information which many researchers are missing by ignoring smaller departments and communities. Not only should more research be done on rural community policing, but such research can provide a framework or model for larger departments to follow. The factors which create the close-knit community and excellent police-community relations found in rural areas should be duplicated by larger departments which are establishing a community policing program. Haskell County is an excellent example of a rural community in which citizens and law enforcement have an excellent relationship which encourages the existence of community policing.

The crime statistics which were examined during this research clearly showed that Haskell County's crime rate is low compared to its surrounding counties and the state of Oklahoma. Haskell County's rate of violent crime was especially low. While there is no direct evidence that community policing or the excellent relationship between officers and citizens in Haskell County alone is responsible for the county's low rate of crime, it is clear that community policing can exist in a community of few crimes. This finding can be used to discredit those critics who view community policing as ineffective against crime. This is further evidence which shows that Haskell County makes an excellent model for other agencies interested in community policing to follow.

Perhaps the most significant finding of the participant observer was the use of both traditional and non-traditional methods of law enforcement in Haskell County. While I observed and participated in traditional police methods such as patrol, investigations, traffic, and

arrests, I have also had the opportunity to participate in activities which would not be found in many departments, especially those located in larger cities. The law enforcement rodeo and parade which provides an unforgettable source of entertainment to the community is a very unique and non-traditional activity. Very few law enforcement agencies have a close enough relationship with their community to even attempt such an event.

Through my numerous assignments of working ball games, dances, parades, carnivals, and other community events, I found myself being more of a law enforcement representative than simply providing security. Most everyone goes out of their way to speak to officers, relaying information, making suggestions, or simply visiting. I have also been very impressed by the community's financial assistance to law enforcement. When money is needed for equipment or a program, especially one such as D.A.R.E., the community rallies together and insures the funds are made available through generous donations.

The survey portion of this research gave an insight to the attitudes and behaviors of Haskell County law enforcement officers. While certain demographic groups such as state officers, younger officers, and college educated officers showed more community policing skills than others, all officers demonstrated a generally positive attitude toward community policing and actively use the philosophy. The positive attitudes found in the surveys were confirmed by the positive behaviors exhibited by officers during the observational study. The surveys also gave officers the opportunity to reflect on their actions and given more thought to improving their own community policing skills.

Based on the findings of this research, both through literature review and survey, an officers' attitudes and behaviors toward community policing improved with education. It was also found that the more police training an officer had, the more community police-oriented the officer was. This suggests that departments can increase their ability to effectively use community policing by having a well educated force. While it would not be practical for a small department to require every officer to hold a bachelor's degree, incentives which encourage officers to continue their education and receive more advanced police training would be a good step in assisting with the philosophy of community policing.

An important part of this conclusion is the recommendation which should be considered by any agency with access to this study. Copies of this research will be made available to all agencies in Haskell County. I would encourage all officers who read this research to use it to further educate themselves on the topic and continue to make improvements on their community policing skills.

As a result of my observational study as an officer in the field, I have concluded that the two most common problems which lead to crime in Haskell County are alcoholism and domestic violence. The majority of domestic violence calls I have made also involved alcohol. Based on this, I would recommend that the community and police work together more aggressively to combat alcoholism and thus reduce the problems caused by alcohol consumption in the county.

Each department in Haskell County should consider the recommendations of officers as given in the survey portion of this research. For example, item twelve of the survey findings showed that

37.5% of officers believed more community involvement would be a major factor in reducing crime in their community. Just as many officers also wanted more officers hired and increased funding for their department. In order to satisfy these recommendations, departments can encourage more involvement from the community and the community itself can in turn put pressure on county commissioners and other obstacles which cause law enforcement funding to be low.

Item sixteen provides another opportunity to hear the recommendations of officers. As stated in the survey findings, the two most common programs officers would like their department to focus on in the future are youth-oriented and drug prevention programs. Raising the educational standards of officers and improving communication with the public were also common recommendations. All ideas listed by officers should be seriously considered by each department.

I would recommend that each department establish periodic community policing forums. Such public meetings would provide a way for officers to speak to the community of various issues such as crime prevention, volunteerism, and home safety. The community could be educated on the importance of readily knowing such information as having exact directions to their house if they call for emergency services. These meetings could also provide a way to introduce new officers or members of the community to each other. Not only should officers speak to citizens, but a community policing forum provides a good opportunity for citizens to voice their ideas and concerns. Members of the community would be welcome to get involved in their own protection, such as establishing the very effective program of a neighborhood watch. Both the officers and community of Haskell County would benefit from such periodic forums.

Based on the literature review and comments made by several officers and citizens to me, I would recommend that municipal departments establish a regular foot patrol through business districts and residential neighborhoods. The largest municipal agency in the county, Stigler Police Department, could assign one office to this duty or rotate the assignment to all officers. As discussed earlier, research has found that foot patrols are an effective way to gain more direct access to the public. This practice helps to reverse the alienation caused by motorized patrol. While it would be impossible for the sheriff's department to foot patrol the vast rural county, the municipal departments could easily establish such a program.

The survey portion of the research found that several officers suggested the establishment of a foot patrol, thus showing that an interest already exists for such a program. One officer suggested that the Stigler Police Department activate a bike patrol in the community. This is common supplement to foot patrol. By using bicycles, officers fatigue is decreased and response time is increased while still allowing direct contact with citizens. All municipal agencies in the county, especially Stigler, would only benefit from such community-oriented patrols. With the recent COPS grant, such programs should be easier to implement.

It is hoped that this research has helped to further promote the use of community policing by educating readers on the subject. Haskell County provided an excellent study population for research on community policing. I found that officers were more than happy to cooperate not only with me on this study, but most importantly with the community as a

whole on a daily basis. Officers were eager to learn more about community policing and were anxious to participate in the study.

The two questions asked at the beginning of the research have been answered. The first question asked "Do officers in Haskell County express favorable attitudes and behaviors toward the community?" The findings of this research clearly indicated the officers expressed very favorable attitudes and behaviors toward the community. The second question asked "Are officers' attitudes and behaviors toward the community different when compared by department, rank, age, experience, and education?" There were differences found between the demographic groups, suggesting that certain officers may be more prone to the philosophy of community policing. Further research should be done to determine exactly why variations are found among the different groups.

This research has also shown the significance of including smaller agencies and communities in community policing studies. If major researchers would stop ignoring smaller departments, it is possible that they could discover why a lower rate of crime exists in these rural areas and develop methods of encouraging metropolitan areas to copy the examples of smaller communities. Haskell County should be considered an excellent example of law enforcement officers expressing positive attitudes and behaviors toward the community, thus encouraging the existence of community policing.

In closing, I wish the community and officers of Haskell County a successful continuation of their working partnership in combating crime. I would also like to thank the officers of Haskell County for their dedication to protecting others, a dedication which I have found to be very inspirational in my decision to pursue law enforcement as a

career. I will never forget how proud I was to serve the citizens of Haskell County.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Addressing Violence in Oklahoma Coalition. Addressing Violence in Oklahoma. Oklahoma State Department of Health Films and Publications, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, 1994.

Adler, Freda, Gerhard O. W. Mueller, and William S. Laufer. Criminology. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, New York, 1991.

Austin, David. "Community Policing: The Critical Partnership," Public Management. July 1992, pp. 2-9.

Bopp, William J. Police-Community Relationships. Charles C. Thoams, Springfield, Illinois, 1972.

Bouza, Anthony V. The Police Mystique. Plenum Press, New York, New York, 1990.

Clark, Jacob R. "Does Community Policing Add Up?" Law Enforcement News. 15 April 1994, pp. 1, 8.

Congressional Digest. "Crime Control Issues," Congressional Digest. June-July 1994.

Cromwell, Paul F. and George Keefer. Police-Community Relations. West Publishing Company, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1973.

D.A.R.E. Fact Sheet Drug Abuse Resistance Education, Los Angeles, California, 1990.

Fink, Joseph and Lloyd G. Sealy. Community and the Police--Conflict or Cooperation? John Wiley and Sons, New York, New York, 1974.

Fleissner, Dan, Nicholar Fedan, David Klinger, and Ezra Stotland. "Community Policing in Seattle: A Model Partnership Between Citizens and Police," National Institute of Justice Journal. August 1992, pp. 9-18.

Hester, Stephen and Peter Eglin. A Sociology of Crime. Routledge, London, 1992.

Information Please Almanac. 46th Edition, Hought Mifflin Company, Boston, Massachusetts, 1992, p. 854.

Kelling, George L. "Police and Communities: The Quiet Revolution," Perspectives on Policing. June 1988.

Kuechler, Wayne. "Community Policing and Cultural Change: An Officer's View." Footprints. Winter/Spring 1992, pp. 12-13.

Lurigio, Arthur J. and Wesley G. Skogan. "Winning the Hearts and Minds of Police Officers: An Assessment of Staff Perceptions of Community Policing in Chicago," Crime and Delinquency. July 1994, pp. 315-330.

Mastrofski, Stephen D. "What Does Community Policing Mean for Daily Police Work?" National Institute of Justice Journal. August 1992, pp. 23-27.

Meese, Edwin. "Community Policing and the Police Officer," Perspectives on Policing, January 1993.

National Institute of Justice. "Community Policing in the 1990s," National Institute of Justice Journal. August 1992, pp. 2-8.

Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation. State of Oklahoma Uniform Crime Report 1993. University Printing Services, Norman, Oklahoma, 1994.

Reaves, Brian A. "Sheriffs' Departments 1990," Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin. U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., February 1992.

Rosenbaum, Dennis P. and Arthur J. Lurigio. "An Inside Look at Community Policing Reform: Definitions, Organizational Changes, and Evlauation Findings," Crime and Delinquency. July 1994, pp. 299-314.

Rosenbaum, Dennis P., Sandy Yeh, and Deanna L. Wilkerson. "Impact of Community Policing on Police Personnel: A Quasi-Experimental Test," Crime and Delinquency. July 1994, pp. 331-353.

Saunders, Charles B., Jr. Upgrading the American Police. The Brookings Institute, Washington, D.C., 1970.

Schmalleger, Frank. Criminal Justice Today. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1991.

Sparrow, Malcolm K. "Implementing Community Policing," Perspectives on Policing. November 1988.

Sterling, James W. Changes in Role Concepts of Police Officers. International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C., 1972.

The New Encyclopedia Britannica. Volume 25, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., Chicago, Illinois, 1992.

Thurman, Quint C., Andrew Giacomazzi, and Phil Bogen. "Research Note: Cops, Kids, and Community Policing--An Assessment of a Community Policing Demonstration Project," Crime and Delinquency. October 1993, pp. 554-565.

Trojanowicz, Robert. "Community Policing is Not Police-Community Relations," FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. October 1990, pp. 6-11.

Trojanowicz, Robert and Bonnie Bucquerouz. Community Policing and the Challenge of Diversity. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, 1991.

Trojanowicz, Robert and Bonnie Bucquerouz. "The Community Policing Challenge," PTM. November 1990, pp. 40-44, 51.

Trojanowicz, Robert and David Carter. The Philosophy and Role of Community Policing. The National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center, East Lansing, Michigan, 1988.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Report to the Nation on Crime and Justice. Second Edition, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1988, p. 18.

Vera Institute of Justice. "Innovative Neighborhood-Oriented Policing," National Institute of Justic Journal. August 1992, pp. 19-22.

Westley, William A. Violence and the Police. The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1970.

Wilson, Deborah G. and Susan F. Bennett. "Officers' Response to Community Policing: Variations on a Theme," Crime and Delinquency. July 1994, pp. 354-370.

Wycoff, Mary and Wesley K. Skogan. "Community Policing in Madison: Quality from the Inside Out," National Institute of Justice. December 1993.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IN HASKELL COUNTY OKLAHOMA

QUESTIONNAIRE OF THE STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING
IN HASKELL COUNTY OKLAHOMA
(Responses will remain anonymous and findings are for research purposes only.)

1. What department are you employed with? _____

2. What is your rank? _____

3. What is your age? _____

4. How many years have you been a police officer? _____

5. How many years have you lived in Haskell County? _____

6. What is your highest level of education? _____

7. What hours do you normally patrol? _____

8. Why did you choose to become a police officer? _____

_____

_____

_____

9. Describe the primary responsibility of a police officer.

_____

_____

_____

10. What determines the effectiveness of the police?

_____

_____

_____

11. What do you believe is the most common cause of crime?

_____

_____

_____

12. How do you believe crime could be reduced in your community?

13. Describe your definition of community-oriented policing.

14. Give examples of community-oriented policing used by your department.

15. Give examples of how you personnally use community-oriented policing.

16. What types of programs would you like to see your department focus on in the future?

17. Have you received any training in community-oriented policing? _____

18. In the past year, how many journal articles or books have you read on community-oriented policing? _____

19. In the past year, how many times have you volunteered your free time to community programs? _____

20. Do most officers in your department display a professional appearance to the public? _____

21. Estimate the number of citizens you speak with during one shift. _____

22. Of the citizens you speak with during one shift, about what percentage of those contacts are corrective in nature? _____

23. Estimate the percentage of persons in your community that you know by name. _____

24. Which of the following has the greatest ability to reduce crime?

A. The community
B. The police
C. The court system
D. The lawmakers

25. How supportive is your community of local law enforcement?

A. Very Supportive
B. Supportive
C. Unsupportive
D. Very Unsupportive

26. How would you rank your department's relationship with the community?

A. Very Good
B. Good
C. Average
D. Poor
E. Bad
F. Very Bad

27. Which of the following fictitious police officers do you more relate to?

A. Sheriff Andy Taylor (Andy Griffith Show)
B. Sergeant Joe Friday (Dragnet)
C. Detective Axel Foley (Beverly Hills Cop)
D. Inspector Harry Calahan (Dirty Harry)

PLEASE CHECK ✓ ANY OF THE FOLLOWING COMMUNITY-ORIENTED POLICE PRACTICES WHICH YOU HAVE PERSONALLY PARTICIPATED IN WITHIN THE PAST YEAR.

1. ____ Meeting with community groups (VFW, Lions Club, New Century, etc.)
2. ____ Membership with community groups (Lions Club, Kiwanis, Masons, etc.)
3. ____ Meeting with senior citizen group
4. ____ Meeting with local merchants
5. ____ Meeting with a religious group
6. ____ Volunteer for Boy/Girl Scouts, Campfire, Brownies
7. ____ Volunteern as a Big Brother or Sister
8. ____ Sponsoring/assisting with a juvenile-oriented sporting event
9. ____ Talking with students at their school
10. ____ Attend school board meeting
11. ____ Provide security at a school event
12. ____ Conducting a door-to-door survey of residents
13. ____ Patrolling a neighborhood on foot
14. ____ Making security checks of businesses
15. ____ Introducing yourself to new members of the community
16. ____ Participating in a parade
17. ____ Assisted in contacting a counseling service for someone
18. ____ Assisting with community crime prevention programs (neighborhood watch, etc.)
19. ____ Analyzing and solving neighborhood problems
20. ____ Encouraging citizens to solve their own problems without legal intervention

APPENDIX B

HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW APPROVAL

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
HUMAN SUBJECTS REVIEW

Date: 09-28-94 **IRB#:** AS-95-010

Proposal Title: A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE STATUS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IN HASKELL COUNTY, OKLAHOMA

Principal Investigator(s): Harjit Sandhu, Shawn J. Westbrooks

Reviewed and Processed as: Exempt

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s): Approved

APPROVAL STATUS SUBJECT TO REVIEW BY FULL INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD AT NEXT MEETING.
APPROVAL STATUS PERIOD VALID FOR ONE CALENDAR YEAR AFTER WHICH A CONTINUATION OR RENEWAL REQUEST IS REQUIRED TO BE SUBMITTED FOR BOARD APPROVAL.
ANY MODIFICATIONS TO APPROVED PROJECT MUST ALSO BE SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL.

Comments, Modifications/Conditions for Approval or Reasons for Deferral or Disapproval are as follows:

Provisions received and approved.

Signature:  Date: November 7, 1994

Chair of Institutional Review Board

VITA

Shawn J. Westbrooks

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: AN ASSESSMENT OF HASKELL COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS' ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS TOWARD THE COMMUNITY

Major Field: Corrections

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Stigler, Oklahoma, on October 1, 1971, the son of Sam and Colette Westbrooks. Married Tami Gail Ross, August 6, 1994.

Education: Graduated from Stigler High School, Stigler, Oklahoma in May 1989; received an Associates of Arts degree in History and Political Science from Eastern Oklahoma State College, Wilburton, Oklahoma in May 1991; received a Bachelor of Science degree in Secondary Education from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma in July 1993; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree in Corrections at Oklahoma State University in July 1996.

Experience: Employed by Wal-Mart in Stigler, Oklahoma; Student Teacher at Perry Mid-High, Perry, Oklahoma; Reserve Deputy Sheriff, Haskell County Sheriff's Department; Armed Security Officer, Western Investigations and Security, Stillwater, Oklahoma; Reserve Police Officer, Stigler Police Department; Lake Patrol Deputy, Haskell County Sheriff's Department; Communications/Reserve Officer, Perry Police Department; Currently a Probation and Parole Officer for the Oklahoma Department of Corrections, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

Professional Memberships: American Deputy Sheriff's Association.