As it is generally conceptualized, community-oriented policing (COP) is a set of values relating to the proper role that the police play in a contemporary democratic society, one that embodies the principles of COP as shared empowerment of both the agency and the community in controlling crime and reducing disorder (Eck and Rosenbaum, 1994; Kelling and Moore, 1988; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990). In Spokane, Washington, one avenue for operationalizing the COP philosophy involves the assignment of community policing officers (CPOs) to impoverished city sectors in order to link more closely police resources with schools and local residents. This research note reports data from a second-year assessment of the Spokane CPO program as a follow-up to an original study that was published earlier in this journal (Thurman et al., 1993a).1

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Historically, police reform to curb police-community tensions has treated crime and related concerns as technical problems to be solved through the application of technical solutions (e.g. the automobile, two-way radio communications and fingerprinting), innovative patrol strategies, or modifications to the command and control structures. However, Manning (1977) asserts that, in many cases, reform efforts are more cosmetic than substantive, and are primarily designed to manage appearances which give the impression of more efficient crime control.
Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990) have stressed that, unlike earlier reform efforts, COP is value-based rather than solely programmatic. For COP to occur, change must occur on two major fronts. Organizations must seek to redefine or expand their service mission and seek effective means to transform these “corporate values” into practice (see Goll and Zeitz, 1991).²

Many police organizations have publicly acknowledged their interest in the COP philosophy and a few have even moved toward implementation (see Couper and Lobitz, 1991; Wycoff and Skogan 1994) despite the fact that, although evidence is mounting, there still exists relatively little empirical support for the effectiveness of COP (Roberg and Kuykendall, 1990). The Spokane Police Department has proved unusual in its willingness to experiment with COP and document the results (see Thurman, 1995). In 1995, the National League of Cities designated Spokane as the winner of the Annual Innovation Award for “innovative approaches to rethinking public safety” in recognition of the city’s COP efforts.

**THE SPOKANE COP EXPERIENCE**

In contrast to a more traditional law enforcement role, the Spokane Police Department (SPD) envisions COP as a model in which greater discretion is left to field officers to investigate complaints, resolve disputes and refer citizens to appropriate social service agencies. The officer closest to the scene, who ordinarily would be constrained by rules which mandate checking with supervisory personnel before proceeding, is empowered to act in a broad range of circumstances and settings. Appropriately administered, such discretion provides more flexibility and innovation, and thus builds greater support for the police among community members.

In Spokane, Police Chief Terry Mangan views COP as an innovative means further to enforce the law, reduce the fear and actual incidence of crime and provide a more enriched and less alienating work environment for police officers. Beginning in 1988, Chief Mangan set in motion efforts to unite police employees in a common mission to improve both employee satisfaction and community service. The acronym SPD was translated by employees to denote the values of service, pride and dedication.³
In 1991, all employees underwent developmental exercises to determine a shared vision for the agency. Later that year, a strategic planning team was formed and was open to all members of the department. Team members underwent problem-identification and problem-solving training, which they were then encouraged to employ during regularly scheduled meetings throughout 1992.

With the role of the community prominent in determining the department’s future, a first step was taken to address internal department-wide reorganization. The COP movement was viewed as a “journey” rather than a destination, and the need for fine-tuning the vehicle that would get employees there was identified as crucial.

While the internal focus of the strategic planning team was viewed as a necessary component for fully operationalizing COP, SPD went forward with several COP initiatives (see Thurman, 1995). COPY Kids, which is described in depth elsewhere (see Giacomazzi and Thurman, 1995; Thurman et al., 1993b), is a summer outreach program for youths that is administered in economically disadvantaged areas of Spokane to reaffirm a positive work ethic, emphasize the value of community involvement and promote a positive image of police personnel. Neighborhood investigative resource officers (NIROs), like COPY Kids, is another planned innovation that involves the reassignment of detectives to patrol sectors as part of a geographically-based effort to detect and prevent crime. Community policing officers, the subject of this research note, are discussed in more detail in the next section.

It should be noted that the strategic planning team broadened its resource base to include the Washington State Institute for Community Policing (WSICOP). In turn, WSICOP set out to devise survey instruments for measuring changes in employee and citizen perceptions of SPD over time.

WSICOP is composed of faculty and graduate students from Washington State University who work in cooperation with representatives from the Washington Training Commission and the Washington Association of Sheriffs and Chiefs of Police. The purpose of the Institute is to promote the study and development of COP in order to leave a lasting signature on community-based efforts to promote social and cultural renewal.

WSICOP focusses on the philosophies of COP, which include the development of broad community partnerships, the strengthening of informal social control and the coproduction of order, police employee
and community empowerment, long-term problem solving and increased cultural and social awareness. The Institute provides training, research design, conferences and consultation for Washington and western regional communities which are committed to, or are contemplating the implementation of COP.

**SPOKANE’S COMMUNITY POLICING DEMONSTRATION PROJECT**

Coinciding with national and regional interest in COP, the Spokane Police Department initiated a COP demonstration project in January of 1992 which involved the selection, training and assignment of two community policing officers (CPOs) to two economically disadvantaged neighborhoods in the city. West Central and East Central Spokane were noted for having some of the city’s highest rates of adult and juvenile crime and delinquency, as well as disproportionately high rates of drug use, domestic violence, victimization of elderly residents, robberies and burglaries.

The initial indications from this particular demonstration project were encouraging. Program monitoring data appearing in this journal (Thurman et al., 1993a) suggested that the Spokane CPOs were in high demand in the communities in which they served. In particular, evidence suggested that: Both previous expectations of what the CPOs might accomplish prior to the program’s inception and expectations for the future remained high; the CPOs appeared committed to COP and, indeed, expressed heightened levels of job satisfaction since their switch to COP; and levels of public satisfaction with the CPOs appeared to be high, indicating that program implementation had largely been successful.

Partly in response to the favorable assessment of the implementation and short-term impact of the two CPOs in 1992, the Spokane Police Department expanded the scope of the project in 1993 by assigning an additional CPO to a third disadvantaged neighborhood of the city. Accordingly, this research note reports findings from a second-year implementation study of the continuing efforts of the two original CPOs as well as the addition of the third CPO assigned to Northeast Spokane’s Hillyard neighborhood.
METHODOLOGY

Three distinct forms of data collection, which were used to gather relevant information for assessing pilot program implementation during the project’s first year, were relied on again in 1993 to monitor the CPOs in their second year of COP. In addition, a fourth source of data was added to the research design, based in part on recommendations from criminal justice scholars who reviewed the study previously for the American Journal of Police.

First, responses from a standardized questionnaire administered to key informants (collected in West Central and East Central Spokane in 1992 and Northeast Spokane in 1993) were used to establish a baseline of program expectations from a portion of the public which would be best informed about CPO performance. Second, direct observation of officer job performance was undertaken after the program had become somewhat routine at all three sites in order to assess CPO performance. Third, the officers themselves used a standardized coding form designed by the research team to document the frequency and quality of officer-citizen interactions. In addition, new for the 1993 study, a fourth form of data collection involved telephone call-back verification of contact sheet data from a random sample of neighborhood residents who were in contact with the CPOs during the course of the study.

FINDINGS

Key Informant Data

Prior to the implementation of the CPO demonstration project (1992 in West Central and East Central Spokane and 1993 in Northeast Spokane) a questionnaire was administered to principals and vice-principals from the four middle schools and directors from the three community centers in the targeted neighborhoods. It was anticipated that the questionnaire would help to identify critical needs in the West Central, East Central, and Northeast neighborhoods from the points of view of the community leaders who were most likely to work closely with the CPOs, as well as to provide some indication of their expectations for program success.
Respondents from the West Central, East Central, and Northeast neighborhoods generally rated themselves as somewhat well-informed to extremely well-informed about both the problems that face the residents of their neighborhood and SPD’s plan to assign a CPO to their neighborhood. They also agreed that it was important for the CPO to spend time developing better lines of communication between the SPD and the Spokane residents, and that each CPO should work to encourage cooperation among residents to solve crime-related problems in their area. In addition, West Central and East Central residents thought that it was either extremely important or very important that the CPO worked to promote the image of law enforcement in Spokane, while those from Northeast Spokane placed less emphasis on law enforcement than did their West Central and East Central peers. Northeast respondents generally rated efforts to reduce citizen fear of crime and maintain a strong law enforcement presence higher than did respondents from the West Central and East Central neighborhoods. Representatives from all three neighborhoods largely agreed that efforts by the CPO to solve old crimes in the area were relatively unimportant, as was encouraging cooperation among residents to solve community problems not directly related to crime.

A second questionnaire, administered to the same school officials at the program’s mid-point, produced results compatible with the first. Data indicated that key informants from the West Central, East Central, and Northeast neighborhoods rated themselves as somewhat familiar to extremely familiar with the efforts of the CPOs in their communities. All three groups indicated that developing better lines of communication between Spokane police and neighborhood residents, promoting the image of law enforcement, reducing fear of crime and encouraging cooperation among neighborhood residents to solve crime-related problems in the area were important CPO objectives. In addition, all respondents broadly agreed that it was less important, compared with other goals, that CPOs spend time trying to solve old crimes.

All respondents reported that the CPOs had appeared to be most successful at improving the relationship between the police and youths and least successful at improving police-community relations (although they tended to attribute these shortcomings to factors that were beyond the ability of the CPOs to control, such as deficiencies in available time and/or resources). All respondents reported a high degree of confidence that the continued assignment of a CPO to the community would have a significant positive effect on residents in the future.
CPOs on the Job and Direct Observation

Ride-along observations with each CPO were conducted on August 19 and 20, 1993 and November 17 and 18, 1993. On both occasions, the observations were conducted by graduate students from the Criminal Justice Program at Washington State University. All of the students who participated in the observation process were well-informed about specific details of the CPO demonstration project and knowledgeable about COP operations as recorded in the scientific literature.

From the observations, it appeared that not only had the CPOs mastered the COP rhetoric and terminology, they seemed to have internalized the philosophy itself – a necessary first step toward the successful implementation of any COP program (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990). Without exception, the CPOs were of the opinion that not only can COP succeed in Spokane, but that it is in fact the best way to provide police services to the neighborhoods they served. Furthermore, one officer was of the opinion that only a drastic change in the composition of Spokane’s police force, or in the policing philosophy of the SPD’s top administrators, could prevent COP in Spokane from growing and prospering.

The CPOs identified two principal benefits of COP to their neighborhoods. The first benefit concerned crime control, which included both crime fighting and crime prevention. The CPOs noted, for example, that they believe COP allows them to accomplish more with a smaller expenditure of resources (e.g. police officers, equipment, time, etc.). Compared to routine patrolling, COP promotes information networks that allow the CPO to identify neighborhood problems and coordinate crime prevention activities more effectively.

The second benefit the CPOs identified might be characterized as improving relations within the community, including both police relations with the public and those among residents. The CPOs cited empowering the public, encouraging citizen cooperation with the police and with each other, and other general sorts of community relations activities as being an important facet of COP.

As noted in the earlier evaluation (Thurman et al., 1993a), the demands placed on the CPOs appear to be considerable. Data from observations made in 1992, and confirmed again by available data in 1993, suggest that the CPOs often work extra-long days, sometimes without taking a break. An important factor which seems to promote
dedication to CPO job performance appears to be the flexibility that the police department has provided the CPOs when scheduling their work assignments since, by all appearances, COP does not always lend itself to a traditional work schedule. This is not entirely unexpected in the Spokane case, given that each officer is the primary COP agent for a neighborhood with a sizeable population (exceeding 10,500 people in the least populated neighborhood).

A variety of people from the community, as well as Spokane PD representatives, seek input and/or action from the CPOs on a continual and daily basis. Time is split among the following: visiting families of troubled youths; instructing classes about the risks associated with gangs, drugs, and alcohol; attending meetings where either crime or crime-related problems are a specific focus or where the officer is a featured speaker at a civic function; patrolling the neighborhood for abandoned cars and other correctable eyesores; serving as backup for other patrol officers; looking for crime suspects; interacting with local residents one-on-one; and preparing written reports.

Given the demands placed on the CPOs’ time, a very real threat exists regarding task overcommitment. When asked about the possibility of job-related burnout in 1992, the CPOs from the West Central and East Central neighborhood responded that, rather than perceiving their responsibilities as a CPO as burdensome, they saw the situation as enhancing their ability to accomplish a wide variety of tasks (Thurman et al., 1993a). One year later, these demands remain problematic. While only one of the three CPOs characterized his workload as a problem, all three acknowledged that their workload placed heavy demands on their available time.

When asked to recommend a solution or solutions to the problem of overcommitment, one CPO indicated that he would like to see the SPD add more CPOs, and another noted that secretarial help with his paperwork would free up more of his time. The most sweeping change recommended by the CPOs was an increased emphasis by the patrol officers on delivering COP services. It was felt that this would ease some of their burden as the principal deliverers of COP services in their neighborhoods. 7

Observations of the CPOs working in the neighborhoods and the schools suggest that there is general support for the officers among teachers, counselors, students, and neighborhood residents. Even those identified by the CPOs as criminally-inclined approached the officers to talk and, in more than one instance, they took the opportunity to introduce
their children to the CPOs. Teachers, in particular, view the CPOs as an educational resource they can use to promote refusal skills relating to the temptation of gangs, drugs and alcohol.

School counselors also appear to view the CPOs as a welcome influence in dealing with parents of at-risk youths. Their presence seems to increase the awareness of parents as to the seriousness of a student’s problems as well as to prevent home visits from becoming argumentative and counterproductive. Students (especially those with AWARE or DARE exposure) behaved as though they found the CPOs approachable, and were willing to talk about problems they were having; this was despite the presence of a stranger (i.e. the research observer). They also seemed quite willing to share information with the CPOs about criminal activity they believed was occurring, or was likely to occur in the future.

One problem noted in other cities which have experimented with COP is that such work is not considered “real” police work. Although all CPOs formerly served in the SPD in the capacity of regular patrol officers, they did not want their current emphasis on COP to be viewed as a disdain for law enforcement. As a result, the CPOs made additional efforts to engage in some more traditional forms of policing duties, such as citing traffic violators, responding to calls for backup, etc.

The CPOs credit the efforts of the police chief and the positive media exposure COP has received with educating police officers and the public about the promised benefits of COP and thereby overcoming significant resistance to the program. Consequently, the CPOs perceive little or no resistance to COP within either the department, the schools, or the neighborhoods. What resistance there is appears to be largely confined to a few more traditionally-oriented police officers and those people in the community who tend to be the most criminally active.

**Data Collection Using Contact Sheets**

Simultaneous with the start of the COP demonstration project, the CPOs were provided with contact sheets for recording the characteristics of their day-to-day interactions with members of the public.

While the contact sheet serves as a measure of the frequency and quality of CPO interactions and was intended by design to be brief enough that the burden of completion was kept to a minimum, the stipulation that all contacts were to be recorded was difficult to guarantee. Those contacts that were least likely to be recorded, however, appear to be those which were of a casual nature and not goal-oriented. In addition,
because of the manner in which one of the CPOs recorded his encounters, contact sheet data for statistical analysis of one neighborhood were not deemed usable for data analysis.8

Just over one-half (53.4%) of the West Central CPO’s contacts were school-related (i.e. the contact took place between the CPO and a school official, teacher, staff member, student or parent). Just under one-half (44.7%) of the Northeast CPO’s contacts and a mere 20.1 percent of the East Central CPO’s contacts were school-related. The majority of the East Central CPO’s contacts were with local residents (40.3%), and those classified as “other” (39.6%). “Other” included, for example, other police officers and employees of other city agencies (e.g. Spokane’s animal control).9

Hand-in-hand with the type of person who was contacted was the nature of the contact’s concern. Of the contacts in West Central Spokane, 62 percent expressed a personal concern (i.e. one that was specifically the concern of the contact) while only 26.8 percent in East Central Spokane and a mere 12 percent in the Northeast neighborhood did the same. Data collected by the East Central CPO indicated that about half of all contacts represented their concerns as an item of general concern to people in the neighborhood. The Northeast CPO most frequently (84.0%) indicated that his contact’s concerns fell into the “other” category. For this reason, it is unclear from the data collected in Northeast Spokane whose concerns are being represented by CPO contacts in that neighborhood.

Data for the three neighborhoods also differed as to how the contacts were initiated. In West Central Spokane, 85.8 percent of all contacts occurred when someone approached the CPO to talk about a specific issue or problem. This happened only 52.1 percent of the time for contacts in East Central Spokane and 14.4 percent of the time for contacts in Northeast Spokane. In contrast, contacts in East Central Spokane were much more likely than contacts in West Central Spokane to occur by chance as, for example, when the CPO was traveling in the neighborhood. Almost all (84.3%) contacts that occurred in Northeast Spokane were said to have “happened due to some other reason”.

Contacts across the three neighborhoods also differed in terms of actions they expected the CPO to take and, in turn, the course of action that the CPO indicated that he would take. The two most typical expectations from the West Central contacts were that the CPO would either solve their problem immediately (31.1%) or “keep an eye on the situation” (26.9%), while East Central contacts most frequently expected that the CPO would keep an eye on the situation (32.2%) or do something
which the CPO classified as “other” (36.1%). Northeast Spokane contacts most frequently indicated that they expected the CPO to do something which the officer characterized as “other” (84.8%).

In answer to these expectations, the two most frequent CPO responses in West Central were to solve the problem personally in a direct way (26.9%) or keep an eye on the situation (28.8%), while the East Central CPO typically indicated that he would keep an eye on the situation (33.0%) or do something which he recorded as “other” (35.8%). In contrast, the Northeast CPO indicated that in approximately 85 percent of the cases he would do something which he classified as “other”.

Past research has shown that people are generally satisfied with their encounters with the police (Manning, 1984). This appears to be especially true of Spokane residents according to the contact sheet data recorded. In slightly more than 70 percent of the cases, the CPOs indicated that the contact was either very satisfied or somewhat satisfied, and in less than 3 percent of the cases the CPOs recorded that the contact was either somewhat dissatisfied or very dissatisfied.

A closer analysis of the data collected through the contact sheets indicates that school officials were the most likely to be very satisfied with their contact, followed by students, parents and teachers. Conversely, the CPOs reported that other school staff members and local residents were the least likely to be very satisfied with their contacts, although their overall level of satisfaction continued to remain quite high.

The relationship between the nature of the person contacted and their level of satisfaction remained fairly consistent from the 1992 to the 1993 evaluation. The study undertaken in 1992 suggested that this relationship might be explained by the relative level of knowledge of COP possessed by each of these groups (see Thurman et al., 1993a). As school officials and administrators could be expected to have the greatest knowledge of COP among the various groups, it seems reasonable that they knew best what response they might receive and, hence, were most satisfied with the attention they were given. In contrast, local residents, in all probability, are the group least familiar with COP. Therefore, while their satisfaction with the help they received was quite high overall, their unfamiliarity with the role of the CPO may have led them to adopt expectations that were inconsistent with the principal CPO mission (see Table 1).

The data also suggest that satisfaction was highest when the citizen personally sought out the services of the CPO, and that satisfaction was lowest when a citizen was contacted by a CPO at the
Table 1
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NATURE OF THE CONTACT AND THE RESPONSE OF THE PERSON CONTACTED AS PERCEIVED BY CPOs IN WEST CENTRAL AND EAST CENTRAL SPOKANE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>School Official</th>
<th>School Staff Member</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Local Resident</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unsatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 101.04745
DF = 30
Significance = 0.0000
request of someone else or as part of an officer-initiated inquiry. This relationship is virtually identical to the one observed in 1992. It stands to reason that some people and groups will desire involvement with the police more or less than others, and that those who seek out the assistance of a CPO are more likely to expect positive benefits from such involvement than those who do not initiate such contact, possibly because of their involvement in illegal activities (see Table 2).

Finally, the CPOs recorded that citizens were most satisfied when the CPOs indicated that they would personally solve a citizen’s problem in a direct way. (This relationship also was observed in 1992.) It appears from the data that people want a police officer who is willing to get involved personally in the resolution of their concerns. This may be especially true of citizen expectations of CPOs because such involvement shows a personal concern on the part of the officer for the citizen’s welfare and supports the image of COP that is being portrayed by the media. Anything less than direct and personal involvement by the CPOs might lead citizens to conclude that, given their expectations, COP is nothing more than a traditional patrol strategy of policing with a new name (see Table 3).

Telephone Re-contact Data

One weakness of the 1992 study was the heavy reliance on contact sheet data to assess citizen satisfaction with CPO performance. Since the CPOs collected these data themselves without any direct supervision, there existed the possibility for biased recording, which might tend to exaggerate CPO effectiveness. While other forms of data helped indirectly to cross-validate contact sheet data during the 1992 study (i.e. key informant interviews and police ride-alongs), a more concerted effort was made in 1993 to verify directly the validity of CPO-reported information.

Telephone interviews with residents contacted by the CPOs during the course of the evaluation process were conducted in December 1993 to verify the accuracy of the information recorded on CPO contact sheets. Initially, 50 CPO contacts from each neighborhood were randomly selected for telephone interviews, with care taken to avoid duplicate contacts. A total of 68 contacts agreed to telephone interviews for an adjusted response rate of 66 percent after excluding ineligible respondents.  
Table 2  
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE PURPOSE OF THE CONTACT AND THE RESPONSE OF THE PERSON CONTACTED AS PERCEIVED BY CPOs IN WEST CENTRAL AND EAST CENTRAL SPOKANE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Officer Initiated at Request of Other</th>
<th>Officer Initiated as Part of Inquiry</th>
<th>Contact not Planned</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Officer Was Approached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>81.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unsatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 110.01684  
DF = 20  
Significance = 0.0000
Table 3

The Relationship between the Indicated Course of Action and the Response of the Person Contacted as Perceived by CPOs in West Central and East Central Spokane

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Directly Solve Problem</th>
<th>Refer Problem</th>
<th>Gather Information</th>
<th>Keep Eye on Situation</th>
<th>Refer and Keep Eye on Situation</th>
<th>Gather Information and Keep Eye on Situation</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>78.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indifferent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Unsatisfied</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi Square = 159.09646
DF = 30
Significance = 0.0000
Random telephone call-backs of citizen contacts indicate that satisfaction with the CPOs remains high. This finding coincides with data collected during direct observation of the CPOs on the job and data recorded in the contact sheets by the officers themselves. Overall, 70.6 percent of the respondents indicated that they were satisfied with the CPO’s response to their concern, and an additional 10.3 percent indicated that they were very satisfied with the CPO’s response. Only 10.3 percent said that they were dissatisfied with the officer’s response.

In addition, 70.6 percent of respondents indicated that they were satisfied with CPO job performance in their neighborhood, and only 8.8 percent said that they were dissatisfied with the CPOs. Finally, over one-half rated the performance of the CPOs as outstanding or better than most SPD officers, whereas only 5.9 percent rated their job performance as inferior to that of other officers.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION**

The research team’s prior experience with the city’s COP demonstration project in 1992, coupled with the data gathered in 1993, allow the authors to make some tentative conclusions about Spokane’s COP experience. First, key informants from the middle schools and community centers in the most economically disadvantaged sectors of the city indicated that there is a continuing need for improving communication between the police department and neighborhood residents, and between the residents themselves. In addition, they noted the importance of improving the image of law enforcement and encouraging residents to take an active role in solving crime-related problems in their neighborhood.

Second, observational data suggested that the CPOs enjoy their work and appear quite successful at it. Moreover, those who come into contact with the CPOs appear to appreciate the job that the CPOs are doing and want it to continue. This observation is supported by the various forms of data that were collected, including call-backs of residents who have come into contact with the CPOs during the course of the evaluation process.

The popularity of the CPOs in economically disadvantaged parts of Spokane is probably attributable to their innate personal qualities, their commitment to the COP philosophy and, to a lesser extent, their training. With regard to the latter, the evaluation report from 1992 noted that the
training provided to the CPOs in 1992 was intensive but, in all likelihood, of too short a duration to prepare fully the officers for the tasks they were asked to perform. This observation appears to be consistent with the experiences of the newest CPO, who seemed at first to be overwhelmed by his new assignment.

Over the past year, the CPOs have attended numerous meetings and training seminars on COP, largely overcoming this initial deficiency. Nonetheless it is probable that no amount of training can ever fully prepare the CPO for the job. In Spokane, the role of the CPO has been based in many instances on the intuition and experience of the individual officer, and is likely to remain so for the foreseeable future.

It is the flexibility to interact on a personal level with residents and view problems in the area from a local perspective that seems to be the first step toward effective problem solving. In part, what leads to public support is the commitment of the officers to use their training and knowledge to prioritize needs and then connect with appropriate city agencies to see that something gets done. The fact that the CPOs have demonstrated a strong attachment to their assigned neighborhoods is of great benefit to the communities they serve. The officers appear to have internalized ownership of the problems and issues important to the quality of life in their respective sectors, and they are sincere in their desire to take an active role in the resolution of problems experienced by neighborhood residents.

Researchers in the future need to evaluate COP experiences in other settings with particular emphasis on community satisfaction and officer participation. Furthermore, to facilitate agency-wide COP development, more knowledge is needed concerning the value of COP to the officers themselves, their cohorts, and the organizational structure itself.

NOTES

1. Few studies exist which specifically document the experiences of CPOs. For example, Scheffer (1987) reports on the experiences of CPOs as school-based resource officers in Boise, Idaho. More recently, Kratcoski and Dukes (1995) have published research on the activity time allocations of CPOs assigned to neighborhood mini-stations in Cleveland, Ohio.
2. Although much crime and disorder is caused by processes which largely are beyond the ability of the police to control (Manning, 1977), Roberg and Kuykendall (1990) suggest that a primary responsibility of the police should be to reinforce the community’s ability to deal effectively with crime-related problems.

3. Limitations to innovation in the field are best summed up in the words of the department’s most successful CPO Tim Conley; “We will do everything in our power to solve a problem as long as our actions are moral, legal and ethical”.

4. Each NIRO is outfitted with an unmarked car, a pager and a cellular telephone. The added benefit of having a car permanently assigned to each NIRO (along with a cellular telephone) comes with the expectation that the NIRO will respond immediately to the scene of a freshly committed felony regardless of whether he or she is on duty at the time of the call. A quick response is perceived as beneficial for building neighborhood ties and helping detectives to stay directly informed of events that may be connected to other criminal activities in the neighborhood. To date, such information has been judged invaluable to other officers. When fully operationalized, 21 NIROs will be assigned to specific neighborhoods throughout Spokane.

5. Direct observations were scheduled so that two days during the summer and two days during the course of the school year were spent observing the CPOs. In each case, researchers also questioned the CPOs following a standardized list of questionnaire items.

6. Additional visits to Spokane for business relating to the Community-Oriented Policing Demonstration project allowed further, albeit sporadic, observation of the CPOs working in their assigned neighborhoods.

7. A geo-based redistribution of police resources is scheduled for implementation in Spokane in 1995 which would result in the assignment of a school-based resource officer, a neighborhood-based resource officer, and a minimum of two neighborhood
investigative resource officers (detectives) to each distinct neighborhood of the city.

8. The CPO assigned to the Northeast neighborhood recorded that information in most cases (with respect to what was requested by the researchers on the contact sheets) fit into the “other” category which the research team had included as a catch-all category for those contacts which were so unusual so as to not be classifiable in other ways. While it is not clear why the same instrument that was used reasonably well to record CPO-citizen interactions in West and East Central in both 1992 and 1993 was deemed inapplicable to contacts in Northeast Spokane during 1993, the data produced from the latter were not descriptive and produced so little variance as to render them useless for analysis.

9. Differences in the distribution of contacts probably are due to different COP foci in the various neighborhoods. For example, while the activities of the CPOs in the West Central and Northeast neighborhoods are closely tied to a primary association with the school system, the CPO assigned to the East Central neighborhood primarily served a broader, more community-wide constituency.

10. The original sample of 150 contacts was reduced to 103 eligible respondents after minors and people without usable telephone numbers (due to a disconnected telephone service, a telephone number that was no longer in use by the original contact, and those with identifiable telephone numbers who refused to admit or could not recall having had contact with a CPO) were excluded from the sampling frame.
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