







This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

COMMUNITY POLICING AT MSU: COMMUNITY PREFERENCES,  
COMMUNITY SATISFACTION AND POLICE/CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

presented by

Elizabeth Ann Jones

has been accepted towards fulfillment  
of the requirements for

*Master of Science* degree in *Criminal Justice*

*Dennis M. Layman*  
Major professor

Date *July 12, 1999*

**LIBRARY**  
**Michigan State**  
**University**

**PLACE IN RETURN BOX to remove this checkout from your record.**  
**NO LATE FEES return on or before date due.**

DATE DUE	DATE DUE	DATE DUE

**COMMUNITY POLICING AT MSU: COMMUNITY PREFERENCES,  
COMMUNITY SATISFACTION AND POLICE/CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT**

**By**

**Elizabeth Ann Jones**

**A THESIS**

**Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of**

**MASTER OF SCIENCE**

**College of Social Science  
School of Criminal Justice**

**1994**



## **ABSTRACT**

### **COMMUNITY POLICING AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY: COMMUNITY PREFERENCES, COMMUNITY SATISFACTION AND POLICE/CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT**

**By**

**Elizabeth Ann Jones**

The purpose of this study was to determine whether community preferences, community satisfaction and police/citizen involvement at Michigan State University (MSU) indicate a community preference for community policing, currently being practiced by the Department of Public Safety.

The objectives of this study were to determine the following: the MSU community preferences for services, community satisfaction, and preference for police/citizen involvement, in relation to community policing.

A questionnaire was administered to a sample of the community at MSU. Eight hundred and fifty-four questionnaires were returned -- a 27 percent response rate. Percentages were used in the analysis portion of the study.

The data indicate that the MSU community prefers services which are practiced by community policing, the community satisfaction with their police is partially due to the practice of community policing, and the degree and type of police/citizen involvement encouraged by community policing is desired by the community.

**Copyright by  
Elizabeth Ann Jones  
1994**

## **DEDICATION**

**To my husband Paul -- for all of his patience, support and encouragement.  
Also, to my daughter, Shauna -- for her patience and love. I couldn't have  
finished it without you both.**



## **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This thesis was completed with the assistance and support of many people. In recognition of this, I would like to thank Bruce L. Benson, Andrew P. McEntee, David L. Trexler and the men and women of the Department of Public Safety at Michigan State University, without whose support the collection of the research data would not have been possible.

I would like to thank Dennis M. Payne, my committee chair, for his continued support and interest in the completion of this thesis. I would also like to thank Ken Christian, my advisor, and Jay Seigel for their encouragement and guidance.

Lastly, I would like to thank my father, Mahlon C. Smith, for his insight and wisdom.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Listing of Tables . . . . .	vii
Introduction. . . . .	1
<b>REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE</b>	
Types of Services Community Policing Can Provide . . . . .	5
The Effect of Community Policing on Community Satisfaction . . . . .	13
Degree and Type of Police/Citizen Involvement "Encouraged" with Community Policing . . . . .	16
Summary of Review of Literature. . . . .	28
Methodology . . . . .	29
<b>ANALYSIS OF DATA</b>	
Introduction . . . . .	31
Comparison of Survey Results for the 1987 & 1992 Surveys . . . . .	32
Discussion of Research Questions . . . . .	54
Summary of Analysis . . . . .	65
Conclusions . . . . .	66
Recommendations . . . . .	69
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
A. Survey Instrument . . . . .	71
B. Responses to Open Ended Questions from the 1992 Survey. . . . .	75
Bibliography . . . . .	90

## **LISTING OF TABLES**

### **Table**

<b>1</b>	<b>Respondent Preferences for Public Safety Focus. . . . .</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Respondent Preference for Investigative Efforts . . . . .</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Respondent Prioritization of Service Types . . . . .</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Respondent Responsibility in Dealing with Crime. . . . .</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Respondent Prioritization of Services . . . . .</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Respondent Victimization Rate . . . . .</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Respondent Comparison of the Department of Public Safety. .</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>Respondent Familiarity with Campus Police Officer. . . . .</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>9</b>	<b>Respondent Perceptions of the DPS Strengths . . . . .</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>10</b>	<b>Respondent Perceptions of the DPS Weaknesses . . . . .</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>11</b>	<b>Respondent Recommendations for DPS Change. . . . .</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>12</b>	<b>Respondent Knowledge of Community Policing. . . . .</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>13</b>	<b>Respondent Preferences for Police Requests. . . . .</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Respondent Preference for Police/Citizen Involvement. . . . .</b>	<b>50</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>Respondent Perception Regarding DOS Officer Availability . .</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>16</b>	<b>Respondent Perceptions Regarding DPS Officers Availability .</b>	<b>51</b>



17	Respondents Rate Department of Public Safety Effectiveness .	51
18	Respondent Recommendation to Improve DPS Effectiveness .	52

## **INTRODUCTION**

This study is designed to determine 1) if the types of services the Michigan State University Community prefers are commensurate with services that a community police force provides, 2) if the level of satisfaction of the Michigan State University community with their police force is related to the fact that their police practice community policing, 3) if the degree and type of police/citizen involvement which the Michigan State University community prefers, correlates with the degree and type of police/citizen involvement which is provided by a community policing force.

In June 1987, a survey was conducted by the School of Criminal Justice and the Department of Public Safety at Michigan State University. The survey consisted of a questionnaire whose focus included such topics as types of services the community would like their police to provide, the satisfaction level the community has with their police service, and the degree and type of police/citizen involvement both experienced and preferred by the community. In September 1987, the Community Policing program was implemented at the Department of Public Safety at Michigan State University.

Another survey was conducted at Michigan State University (MSU), in

March 1992 (Appendix A), which is identical to the aforementioned survey up to, and including, question number 11. Questions 12 through 18 are new and include a focus on the same three areas as the survey of 1987. The following three areas will be concentrated on here: the types of services the community would like their police to provide, the satisfaction level the community has with their police service, and the degree and type of police/citizen involvement both experienced and preferred by the community.

The distribution and collection of the two surveys was done in the same manner and the format is the same; therefore, the results of the surveys can be compared to each other. As the methodology was the same as that used in the 1987 survey, and as 11 of the questions are identical, the research can also be used for a longitudinal study of a community which experienced five years of community policing. The results of the two surveys, given five years apart, are tabulated with the findings.

The unique nature of the campus community may or may not be a limitation. There are many ways in which the MSU community differs from a non-campus community. The characteristics of the student population differ greatly from the characteristics of a city or town population. The age group of the student population is very narrow in range when compared to a city population. The city will contain many more people who are elderly, middle aged and under 18. Citizens of different ages will have different ideas on police prioritization. The city will have greater focus on factors which affect the very



young and the very old. The student population will have a greater focus on factors which affect the young adult .

The college mentality will also be a factor here. Not only is the student population relatively limited in age variation, this population also consists of single men and women who are in a transitional stage in their life. This is a vulnerable time for them and they need to feel that they have a caring police force. For the first time, they are free of the immediate influence of parents, they do not yet have the responsibility of career and family, they are in an exploratory and experimental stage in their lives where the transition between teen and adult takes place. There is likely to be more experimentation with drinking, drugs and sex than would be found in a city community. There would be less focus on making the neighborhood safer for children and the elderly than there would be in a city.

The campus population needs their police to emphasize programs specific to the needs of their unusual community. A campus community has a greater need for educational programs regarding such matters as drug and alcohol abuse, date rape, and specific areas of crime prevention. The programs on crime prevention would focus on different problems than would be focused on in a city. There is a greater incidence of property crime on campus, calling for specific crime prevention practices. There is also a greater incidence of sexual assault, also calling for specific crime prevention practices. Maintaining security is a completely different situation on campus, with residence halls and

classroom buildings, than it is in residential areas of a city or town. Here, again, the police would have to alter their methods to meet the needs of the community.

The campus population is very transient, therefore, the students don't have a feeling of permanence while living there. The long range view of working with their police to better the community may be lacking when compared to the city population. In the summer, the campus population is almost nonexistent.

In spite of the differences inherent in the campus and the city communities, the basic needs remain the same. Both communities need to feel that their specific needs as a community are being considered and met by their police.

## **REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE**

### **Types of Services Community Policing Can Provide**

As community policing becomes more widely used, more and more emphasis is being placed on the specific types of services a community can expect from an agency which practices community policing. There are general types of services, and many specific ways in which these services can be provided.

Some of the more general types of services have been discussed by Fulwood (1990). A look at this discussion shows us the following: The police organize community-based crime prevention activities which are neighborhood specific; neighborhood level input in the development of police operational policy is encouraged, which allows the community to have some influence over the types of services they receive as well as on the prioritization of services; the police also help to focus city resources within each neighborhood to address the identified causes of specific types of crime; police develop juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention activities; and finally, the community policing police would keep the community updated on the results of police operations in their neighborhoods.

Goldstein (1987) also mentions the organization of community based crime prevention activities as a community policing service. The police educate



citizens on how they can avoid becoming the victims of crime and initiate crime watch programs where citizens report suspicious circumstances. Trojanowicz (1982, 80) states that the foot patrol officer's general responsibilities and duties include maintaining "a high degree of contact with the existing citizen action groups operating within the neighborhoods and involving them in planning, designing, and evaluating neighborhood crime prevention programs."

The encouragement of neighborhood level input in the development of policy as a community policing "service" is brought up again by Trojanowicz (1990). Average citizens nominate the problems and cooperate in setting the police agenda in community policing. Bradshaw (1990) provides an example of such a practice in Reno, Nevada, where the city was divided into separate geographical areas, each supervised by a police captain. Each captain formed a neighborhood advisory group (NAG). These groups consist of citizens who represent their geographical area, the area captain, and other police department representatives. At these meetings, neighborhood problems are discussed along with possible strategies; thus, citizens have direct input into the manner in which problems in their community are dealt.

A NAG group in Reno also provides an example of a situation in which the police helped focus city resources to help deal with a specific type of crime. In the desert surrounding Reno, there are vast areas which have historically served as dumping grounds for inoperative vehicles. These can be dangerous for children and are unpleasant to look at. A senior police officer was assigned

to work with NAG groups to remove the abandoned vehicles. This was accomplished by using donated towing equipment (a city resource) to remove more than 100 abandoned vehicles. As a result of being involved in the solution to this problem, the community viewed their police very favorably and showed a positive reaction to the community policing efforts.

Media can also be recruited by police leaders to become actively involved in the campaign against crime and violence. In a newfound freedom to look to all sources for aid in crime prevention, the community police officer can enlist the help of social agencies, local experts, and any other source the officer can think of mobilizing.

Another example of a community policing effort in which community resources were used to address identified causes of a specific type of crime is presented by (Hageman, 1990). The metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia, has three major police agencies as well as police agencies for the colleges and universities. These policing agencies, along with crime prevention specialists and other community based professionals, put together a task force on sexual assault without using any special financial funds or grants. This task force was put together in response to the growing problem of sexual assaults against students at the various universities and colleges in the area. From the community of Richmond, as well as Henrico and Chesterfield counties, the task force included an author who teaches crime and delinquency prevention courses at Virginia Commonwealth University, as well as citizens from the community

who were recommended by police officers. The officers recommended people who had some expertise or power base that could assist the task force.

The YWCA lent support to the sexual assault crisis center, and worked with others to research and affect the problem of rape and its prevention.

Administrative support and sponsorship was provided by the Center for Public Affairs at Virginia Commonwealth University during the first year (the YWCA Rape Crisis Outreach Program took over administrative support the second year). The task force analyzed the previous year's rape reports to determine whether any pattern of rapes and their incidence could be established. They also looked at current services and prevention strategies. At-risk target groups were identified and crime prevention strategies were developed. To best serve the community, the police used community resources to identify the causes and work toward the prevention of a specific type of crime. In serving the community, the police worked not only with the community, but also with other police departments.

Community police officers also use public resources to identify the causes of specific types of crime when they enlist the help of public health professionals and learn what they are doing in terms of research and development (Brown, 1992). One such public source would be the Center for the Study of Interpersonal Violence at the Texas Medical Center in Houston, Texas. There are a multitude of ways in which public resources can be utilized in policing. Each community has its own needs and its own set of resources

available to the police. Therefore, the practice of community policing, which molds itself to the specific needs of each community, can well utilize and focus these resources.

The community police officers can also develop juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention activities. These activities can vary from community to community so as to meet the specific needs of each. Such activities often include the introduction of conflict resolution training in the elementary schools. Another type of activity could be a sports league organized by a community officer for inner city juveniles, who have much idle time. Trojanowicz (1982) mentions the Police Athletic League (PAL), of Flint, Michigan, which is an ongoing juvenile delinquency prevention program which involves young people in field trips to museums, art fairs and the theater, as well as providing them with sports activities. This is an example of a rather extensive provision of delinquency prevention and intervention activities.

Feedback and assistance can be provided in various ways and the community can be kept updated on the results of police operations. The chief executive in Reno, Nevada, created three groups to provide feedback and assistance. These three groups helped keep the communities updated on the results of police operations in their neighborhoods (Bradshaw, 1990). The groups were: a media advisory group, a citizens advisory group, and a technical advisory group. A new "open press" policy was developed and a public information officer appointed, allowing the media access to one person who

could communicate crime and community service information. The citizens group consists of persons selected from each NAG in the four areas of the city, who provide an overview of performance of Community Oriented Policing-Plus (COP+) throughout the city. The technical group consists of representatives from the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) and other individuals from across the country, who make on-site visits to evaluate the operation of COP+ and make recommendations as necessary. As a result, the community was kept abreast of police operations, performance and effectiveness, and the police had constant feedback, which enabled them to alter operations as necessary to better suit the needs of the community.

The services provided by community policing are general services which can be provided in various ways to meet the specific needs of a given community. These services are: the organization of community based crime prevention activities; the encouragement of neighborhood level input in the development of policy; focusing city resources to address the identified causes of specific types of crime; developing juvenile delinquency prevention and intervention activities; and keeping the community updated on the result of police operations (Fulwood, 1990). Where these services are present, community policing is at work.

A community which receives community policing should find that their officers police a specific geographical area, and that the officers are permanently assigned to those areas. This is indeed a service to the community in that with

permanent assignment, an officer can get to know the community, and as such, would be likely to notice a problem developing more quickly than an officer who is unfamiliar with the area. Staying in the same area also enables the officer to organize various activities such as citizen/police groups for discussion of various community problems, solution seeking and prioritization as well as organizing community education regarding drugs, crime prevention, resource centers, and other needed community services. Possible intervention activities such as sports activities, aimed at the young people, can be better organized by a police officer who is familiar with a specific community and its needs and available resources. Permanent geographical assignment also allows the community to get to know the officer better and to encourage a relationship of trust and cooperation.

Along with the actual "beat" being geographically assigned to a specific officer, mini-stations or some kind of a site out of which the officer can work can be assigned to the officer. This is located right in his/her assigned community. This is advantageous to the community in that the officer is readily accessible even when he/she is not patrolling. The frustration of going through various operators, being placed on hold, and finally making contact with someone who is only vaguely familiar with the neighborhood or the problem is greatly reduced if not eliminated. Trust, accessibility, and communication are all increased with on-location work sites.

It would be very difficult to determine all of the specific services which community policing provides, because the very nature of community policing so

customizes police activities, neighborhood by neighborhood, that specific services vary. This is to the advantage of each community, since each community has different needs. The general types of services mentioned here can be provided by community police in various ways, thus, giving the community policing officer an opportunity to be innovative and to become more personally instrumental in servicing the community. The community, in turn, receives more specialized service and has more opportunity to influence policy.

## **The Effect of Community Policing on Community Satisfaction**

A police force must focus on more than crime prevention and criminal apprehension. A high level of community satisfaction is also an important goal. There is little literature available which focuses on the satisfaction of a community with their police force. This is, no doubt, an area of study which is often undertaken by police departments for the primary purpose of self-evaluation and as an aide to be used in future policy making decisions within that specific department. As such, much of the research in this area is likely kept for departmental use and is not readily available for review purposes.

The University of Houston-Victoria, however, has made public the results of a telephone survey conducted in 1989 asking residents to rate the Victoria Police Department (VPD). In Victoria, from June through December 1989 there were 129 victims of burglary. Seventy-seven were contacted by phone and responded to a telephone survey. Ninety-seven percent of the respondents said the first person they spoke with was courteous, 93 percent said the investigator was courteous, 61 percent said the police showed an interest in working the burglary, and 87 percent said the police answered their questions (Nichols, 1991). It can be concluded from these responses that the officers demeanor and self-presentation, the degree of courtesy shown by any police personnel contacted, and a display of respect on the part of the officer were all strong determinants of how the citizen rated their satisfaction with police



performance.

Twenty-two percent of the burglaries were solved (a clear minority), yet there was a clear majority of favorable responses regarding police performance. It seems that, in this instance, whether or not the crime was solved was not a significant factor in influencing the civilians' attitude's toward the police department. Though it is not indicated whether this department was practicing a form of community policing, the results of the survey do indicate that some aspects of police performance, which are emphasized in community policing (officer presentation, courtesy shown, etc.), have greatly influenced the satisfaction level of the community with police performance.

In February of 1990, Nicholas Pastore took charge of the New Haven, Connecticut, police department. The department began a new proactive approach known as community policing. In 1990, this city stood sixth in violent crime per capita among cities of 100,000 people or more (Worsnop, 1993, 99). The number of murders, reported robberies and aggravated assaults had risen 50 percent over the last three years. By 1992, after two years during which community policing came into effect full swing, the reported crime fell by 10.3 percent from the first half of 1991. (The nationwide percentage during that period dropped about two percent.) Though this does not specifically demonstrate that the community of New Haven has a higher satisfaction rate in regards to the policing practice of community policing, it would certainly point in that direction.

In Portland, Oregon, a five-year transition plan to shift to community policing was adopted by the City Council in January 1990. Also in that year, the Portland Police Bureau reported:

Citizens saw the police as special responders who could be called upon only to deal with major problems... Officers came to regard citizens as complainants who called the police and then got out of the way so the police could fight crime alone (Portland Police Bureau, 1990).

Worsnop (1993) states that Portland residents, city employees and police officers regularly got together to solve crime and livability problems. He has depicted various instances where this has been done successfully subsequent to the shift to community policing. Again, this does not specifically demonstrate that this community is more satisfied with their police now that their police are practicing community policing, though it certainly appears as though there is a better working relationship between the police and the community members.

The area of community satisfaction as related to community policing is an area sorely lacking in readily available research. This study, done at Michigan State University, may help in providing some much needed data.

## **Degree and Type of Police/Citizen Involvement "Encouraged" with Community Policing**

For the purposes of this paper "citizen" will represent anyone who is not employed by a law enforcement agency. Some amount and type of police/citizen involvement is incorporated into all types and styles of policing. Community policing, however, focuses very strongly on police/citizen involvement. The degree to which the different types of involvement are emphasized and practiced vary according to community needs and community and police resources. To provide a more specific view of police involvement with citizens, citizens be divided into different groups that interact with the police. It will be useful here to look at the different groups as presented by Trojanowicz (1992): community agencies, the media, elected officials, and any other citizen who may or may not be in any of the above categories.

Police/citizen involvement, as well as varying in regards to these groups, also varies in regards to the purpose or goal of the involvement. Each type of police/citizen involvement is more effectively geared toward specific goals. The *degree* of police/citizen involvement is often implicit by nature of the very type of involvement practiced. Sometimes, however, very specific attention and control over the degree of police/citizen involvement is required to fully take advantage of this aspect of community policing. This will be addressed later.

There are many advantages of community agencies becoming involved with the police. The police spend a great deal of their time doing a lot of

the work that many community agencies are designed to do (counseling, giving referrals to other agencies that are designed to meet specific needs, providing information, animal control...). As Trojanowicz (1992, 11) mentions, by involving community agencies, police can "emphasize teamwork and eliminate duplication of services." Also, this would increase "officers free patrol time so that they could work on more serious problems".

In Portland, Oregon, in preparation for a transition to community policing, the Portland Police Bureau (PPB) found that a great deal of a police officer's time (50 percent in one department) was spent providing information and referral to citizens (Austin and Sweet, 1992). Thus, they hired two professional information and referral (I&R) specialists to create a problem-solving guide to identify community resource information. Using this Problem-Solving Guide, Portland officers have been better able to develop

a written agreement with citizens, business owners and other service providers to share responsibility for solving community problems. Applying this procedure, officers work with citizens to identify a problem area, such as a particular street corner where there is ongoing drug traffic. Using the guide, the officer may contact the water bureau to turn off a water fountain, the telephone company to restrict calls from a nearby phone booth so that drug dealers cannot be contacted at that site and city building inspectors to condemn buildings or order a vacant lot cleared of debris that had provided cover to drug users. Working together, the police, the community and other service providers help eliminate the factors contributing to the problem (Austin and Sweet, 1992, 65).

In Richmond Virginia, law enforcement got together with crime

prevention specialists and other community based professionals to start a task force on sexual assault. The YWCA is a community agency whose support was extremely helpful in developing this task force. Representatives from the crisis program at the YWCA were involved in training local law enforcement officers and in working with others to research and affect the problem of rape and its prevention. The Center for Public Affairs at Virginia Commonwealth University provided administrative support and served as a sponsor (providing a place to meet). Nearly 20 representatives from "law enforcement, security, environmental health and safety, mental health, emergency hospitals, sexual assault crisis centers, junior colleges and universities" (Hageman, 1990, 80) combined their efforts to prepare for the opening session of a sexual assault workshop first presented in Spring 1988. The closing session of the workshop was used to develop a community-based resource network. As a result of this task force, the concept of community agencies cooperating with police agencies in an attempt to develop prevention strategies and education appears to be a viable alternative to agency separation.

In 1987, the Reno Police Department (RPD) initiated a new community policing strategy. As community policing took hold in Reno, community agencies joined in to work with the police in an effort to rid the city of crime. One example of the way in which an agency helped has to do with a local convenience store which was a popular hangout for drug dealers. Pay phones were used by the drug dealers to receive calls from drug users. The RPD in concert with the local

telephone company arranged for the phones to be programmed to receive no incoming calls. At the very least, this displaced the problem from an area heavily frequented by children (Bradshaw, Peak and Glensor, 1990).

Another example of community agency involvement in policing provided by Bradshaw, Peak and Glensor (1990), is that of a neighborhood group, police agency, and a city planning office that worked together and identified a 19-acre, state-owned, parcel of land which was not in use. They began negotiating for its purchase in the hopes of using it for a park for neighborhood children who lived primarily in apartment buildings and had a high need for recreational space. The city parks department allocated seven million dollars to build a park. The city zoning department officials worked on revising the city's master plan to allow a local boys club to construct a building on the property. Thus, community agencies can work with the police in a multitude of ways. These examples show how the police can work with community agencies in an attempt to accomplish a specific goal, such as building a park for the city's youth, relocating drug dealing activities, and opening a sexual assault center.

It is important to note that the police can also work with community agencies toward more general goals such as education. Civic and government institutions including churches and schools can work with the police toward educating citizens about the often irreparable damage that drugs can do, as well as teaching the city's youth to resist the temptation of drugs. Education need not stop here. Alcohol abuse, sexual assault, crime prevention, etc., are all topics

which community police officers, working with community agencies, are addressing in an effort to prevent crime.

Community policing agencies can work with the media in various ways. One way is to keep the media updated on the results of police operations in specific neighborhoods. The media in turn can keep the communities updated. In recreating their police department to encompass community policing strategies, the RPD created a media advisory group. "A new 'open press' policy was developed and a public information officer appointed, allowing the media access to one person who could communicate crime and community service information" (Bradshaw, Peak and Glensor, 1990, 62). Trojanowicz (1992, 11) points out that "Police administrators should use every opportunity to provide information on community policing to the media". This includes holding press conferences, inviting media representatives to walk the beat with community police officers, issuing news releases on recognition and awards programs, etc. The idea is not only to familiarize the community with the concept of community policing, but also to let them know how they can get involved, and to keep them updated on important activities.

To promote community policing in New York City, the Deputy Police Commissioner for Public Information, noted that there would be a radio public service campaign (James, 1991). Again, the police would be using the media, though in a different format (radio), in an effort to familiarize the community with the concept of community policing.

Brown (1992) suggests that the police could do more with the media than working together in an effort to disperse information regarding community policing in general and information regarding different projects within the community which are relevant to policing. The media could be recruited to become actively involved in the campaign against drugs and violence, though this may require quite a bit of assertion on the part of police leaders.

Elected officials represent another group the police can work with in an effort to prevent and control crime. Trojanowicz (1992) stresses the importance of police administrators carefully explaining the tradeoffs implicit in community policing to elected officials. Politicians and community officers should work together on initiatives and share the acclaim, thus affording an incentive to the politician. Trojanowicz (1992) warns that the community, not the politician should set the priorities. Politicians whose jurisdiction is over a community, which may just be beginning community policing, need to grasp why community policing will improve the quality of life so they can explain the rationale to their constituents. The police can help out by first explaining the rationale to the politician.

In 1979, Mayor James Rutherford and Chief Max Durbin initiated the Foot Patrol Program in Flint, Michigan. This is a prime example of an elected official working with the police in a community policing effort. Without the support of the community and of the mayor, this experimental program would never have gotten off its feet (Trojanowicz, 1982). This is a major way in which



an elected official can become involved. As the trend toward more violent crime, greater drug use, and an increase in gangs continues, more and more elected officials are becoming involved with the police to prevent crime by supporting community policing.

The most basic type of police/citizen involvement encouraged with community policing is at the neighborhood level with citizens whose involvement has nothing to do with community agencies, the media, or being an elected official. The police department in Reno encourages police/citizen involvement through a group called NAG. The department has a police captain supervising each geographical area. In each area, the captains form and maintain a NAG, which consists of concerned citizens who represent their geographical area. The members periodically attend meetings with the area captain and other police department representatives and discuss neighborhood problems and possible strategies. Separate models have emerged due to the demographic diversity of each area (Bradshaw, Peak and Glensor, 1990). This advisory group enables citizens to become directly involved with the police and to provide input into problem solving within their own neighborhoods.

Brown (1992) discusses the need for police-community partnerships. He speaks in generalities, bringing up points which are found again and again when looking at community policing. The police must form working partnerships within the community in order to get to the root causes of crime, violence, and fear. "Getting people involved in the community (policing) helps them to identify

and solve their own problems" (Brown, 1992, 3). The police, therefore, should be permanent, highly visible fixtures in the neighborhood, known personally to the people who live and work there. This, in turn, will help facilitate crime solving and prevention.

The Madison Wisconsin Police Department has taken a specific step toward developing police community partnerships by organizing community focus groups and by conducting community feedback surveys (Couper and Lobitz, 1991). Thus, an attempt is made to determine the needs of the community, and a course is then set in an attempt to meet those needs.

Operation Cul-de-Sac (OCDS) (mentioned earlier in research question 1), started as an experiment in LAPD community policing (Vernon and Lasley, 1992). The program was implemented to examine the potential of community-based policing to restore order within the most crime-ridden, inner-city neighborhoods of Los Angeles. Among other things, the police wanted to study the building processes for police/citizen partnerships.

During the first and last month of the operation, a random sample of 350 residents of the OCDS project area were asked to respond to the statement, "I will do anything possible to work with the police to make my neighborhood a better place to live." This question is referred to as a measurement of partnership opinion. The greatest improvement in partnership opinion occurred for those residents who believed that "officers cared about them as a person." This was an 80 percent improvement rate. Next came improvement rate

regarding partnership opinion; polite officers, helpful officers, contacts in the home and in the streets, contacts in the home, daily, weekly, and then monthly personal contact with officers. The results of the research seem to show that police/citizen contact in various frequencies and degrees of involvement do increase the likelihood that a citizen "will do anything possible to work with the police...". This also shows that police/citizen involvement need not be lengthy, nor complex in order to be beneficial to a community policing agency and to the community being policed.

Many community policing agencies initiate crime watch programs which involve the community in reporting suspicious circumstances. The police also educate citizens on how they can avoid becoming the victims of crime (Goldstein, 1987). The possibilities and opportunities for police/citizen involvement are endless. Though the different types of involvement can be split into categories, and examples can be cited, the only true guide is the imagination of the community policing agencies, the community police officers, and the needs and resources of the communities.

The degree of involvement between the police and the citizens can be influenced by the policies and practices of the particular police department. To some extent, of course, the goal the department and community are working toward will dictate the degree of involvement. The two projects mentioned in Richmond, the sexual assault task force, and the project which involved obtaining some land to be used by the neighborhood youth for recreation and

possibly a boys club, could not have been completed without the somewhat extensive involvement of very specific community agencies.

The degree of media involvement depends in large part on the attitudes of the local media and their willingness and incentive to become involved, as well as on the initiative taken by the police department. The degree of involvement of elected officials varies. The incentive for the elected official to become involved—the perceived benefits for the official—would naturally influence the degree to which he/she became involved. Mayor Rutherford of Flint, Michigan, had the support of a great percentage of his constituency for his part in the initiation of the Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program.

The daily opportunities for police/citizen involvement for the average citizen can be influenced, on a more general basis, by the policies implemented by the police department. Citizen groups that meet with the police to discuss neighborhood problems, police prioritization, and problem solving can be initiated as a matter of course by police departments practicing community policing. The success of such citizen groups, as well as the success of Crime Watch and educational programs initiated by the department, will depend for the large part on the willingness of citizens to become involved with the police. This willingness is determined, to some degree, by the manner in which the police treat the citizens when interacting with them, and by the location and frequency of police/citizen contact, as is indicated by the respondents to the survey discussed by Brown (1992).

Trojanowicz (1990, 8) states that, as part of a departments organizational strategy, "the department must permanently deploy a portion of its patrol force as community officers in specified beats so they can maintain direct, daily contact with average citizens." This increases the amount of contact the citizens have with the officers and should increase the willingness on the part of the citizens, to become involved in short and long term proactive efforts aimed at the department's expanded mission.

Vernon and Lasley (1992, 18), mention that in "some communities, a simple friendly gesture by a police officer may be enough to get the partnership underway." Goldstein (1987, 6), mentions elements associated with the general concept of community policing. Most common among these are the involvement of the community in getting the police job done: the permanent assignment of police officers to a neighborhood in order to cultivate better relationships...."

Here, Goldstein (1987, 6) lists permanent assignment of officers as one way to improve relationships between citizens and police, which should in turn encourage the involvement of the community in getting the police job done. Again, repeated contact—a degree of involvement which occurs on a daily or weekly basis—is recommended as an integral part of community policing.

The degree of involvement, in addition to the influence of neighborhood specific goals, can include media involvement, political involvement, and citizen groups, but can also be influenced by the police department's mandate or policy regarding police/citizen contact. In addition to

permanent assignment of officers, the departments are implementing additional foot patrol and motorcycle patrol in order to get the officers out on the street on a regular basis, where they can more readily interact with the citizens in their neighborhood. A specific aim of community policing is to encourage a high degree of police/citizen involvement in a wide variety of areas.

## **Summary of Review of Literature**

Community policing is becoming more and more widely practiced. The literature reveals a variety of experimental programs which have been evaluated and shown to have been successful, but also a variety of programs with a history of success which are being implemented in various cities at once.

A great variety of service types have been reviewed in the literature, all of which are focused on meeting the specific needs of a community. The service types can be so community specific as to change from community to community in order to meet specific needs.

Some evidence has been shown in the literature to indicate that a community experiencing community policing will have a higher level of satisfaction. This evidence is not extensive, though, and there is a need for more research in this area.

The degree and type of police/citizen involvement which is provided by a community policing force has been shown to be quite extensive. Almost every sector of society, down to the single citizen, can become involved in working on reducing crime with their police force. The degree of involvement can be extremely varied depending on the needs of the community and on the opportunity and interest of the citizens.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The Department of Public Safety at Michigan State University began practicing community policing in 1987. Prior to implementation, a survey was distributed to the staff, faculty and students at Michigan State University, identified as the community respondents. In 1992, a second survey instrument was distributed to the respondents.

The research was qualitative, using a multi-variable survey. The research instrument was a questionnaire. There were 18 questions in the survey which was given in 1992, and 11 questions in the survey of 1987. Of the 18 questions on the 1992 survey, the first 11 were identical to the 11 questions of the original survey 1987. The methodology, which will be discussed here, was the same for both surveys.

The questionnaire consisted of open-ended and closed-ended questions. Questions nine, 10, 11 and 18 were open-ended questions. Questions one through eight and 12 through 17 were closed-ended. Three-thousand-two-hundred questionnaires were hand delivered to the respondents by police personnel working at the Department of Public Safety at Michigan State University. The questionnaires had pre-addressed, stamped envelopes included for the respondents' use.

Cluster sampling was used. The population consisted of the students, faculty and staff at Michigan State University. The following clusters at Michigan State University were chosen for the distribution of both the original survey and



the more recent survey of 1992:

- University Apartments (All apartments in Spartan Village)
- Brody Complex (Butterfield, Rather, Bryan, Armstrong, Bailey, Emmons, Brody)
- West Circle Complex (Williams, Gilchrist, Yakeley, Landon, Campbell, Mary Mayo)
- Office Buildings North of River (Farm Lane West, West and East Circle Dr.)
- IM Sports Circle
- Olds Hall
- Library
- Administration Building
- Computer Center
- Music Building
- Museum
- Linton Hall
- Union
- Morell Hall
- Human Ecology

The instrument and the survey design were the same for both surveys.

The sample size was very nearly the same (904 responses for the first survey and 854 for the second). The delivery and return were the same for both surveys and the sampling design was the same for both. All respondents remained anonymous for both. Using the same type of methodology for both surveys enables more accurate comparisons of the results and thus, more accurate analysis of these comparisons. Though this paper will only briefly emphasize this comparison, all pertinent data is included for future analysis.

# **ANALYSIS OF DATA**

## **Introduction**

Data are divided into four sections. In the first section the data obtained from both the 1987 survey and the 1992 survey will be presented. The data is presented in tables. For both surveys, data for questions one through 11 are presented together for ease of comparison. The data for questions 12 through 18 are presented using the same format as one through 11. The responses are tabulated in the form of percentages. The variables of gender, role, residence, and race/ethnic background, are respondent variables which are included in the tabulation of results.

The second, third and fourth sections of data each include analysis. The second section contains data relevant to the first research question, which is included in the purpose of this study. The third section contains data relevant to the second research question. The final section of data reflect responses relevant to research question three.

The literature review which is relevant to sections two, three and four is considered in the analysis following each presentation of data.

## **Comparison of Survey Results for the 1987 & 1992 Surveys**

*All responses have been tabulated and are noted in the first column of every table.* Regarding the demographics of race, only the black, hispanic and white races are tabulated separately as those races account for 82.3 percent of the respondents. Only those response differences of five percent or more were recorded for some of the subgroups in the 1987 survey, therefore, some of the subgroup responses are not tabulated here on the tables depicting the 1987 responses. There is no discussion here regarding the subgroups, as this division of respondents was not relevant to the analysis.

See Appendix A for a copy of the 1992 survey.

**Table 1 - Respondent Preference for Public Safety Focus****N=854**

Focal Area 1992	%	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
	Resp. Pref.	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
Sexual Assaults	90.2	83.4	94.4	88.7	90.7	92.0	89.0	92.3	95.0	100.0	92.3
Robberies	79.6	78.2	80.7	78.6	82.4	80.7	78.3	81.4	86.7	78.3	80.8
Burglaries	78.1	74.9	80.1	77.9	78.7	79.4	76.0	80.2	83.3	91.3	78.5
Property Destruction	68.6	64.5	71.0	64.1	72.2	74.2	62.8	74.5	66.7	78.3	73.1
Auto Theft	66.7	58.3	71.7	67.1	66.7	67.2	66.3	67.8	83.3	87.0	65.5
Office/Residence Thefts	60.3	55.0	63.4	60.1	63.9	61.3	59.9	61.4	53.3	60.9	61.9
Drug/Alcohol Enforcement	53.5	45.0	58.2	48.0	54.6	60.1	47.7	58.9	60.0	60.9	51.1
Theft of Car Parts	45.3	42.0	47.0	48.0	38.9	45.1	48.5	43.1	56.7	47.8	42.9
Moped/Bicycle Theft	41.9	38.4	43.7	47.0	46.3	35.6	46.7	38.4	48.3	34.8	39.4
Traffic Law Violations	26.5	25.7	26.8	22.9	27.8	29.8	25.0	28.5	26.7	17.4	23.9
Loud Parties	18.3	19.2	17.3	21.9	17.6	14.4	21.2	15.1	13.3	13.0	14.5

**Table 1A**

1987

Sexual Assaults	95.1								85.4	95.2	96.8
Robberies	76.4			73.8	77.2	79.3	72.1	79.6	70.8	81.0	77.7
Burglaries	74.9			71.7	78.4	77.4			77.1	81.0	75.3
Property Destruction	62.7	59.3	65.5	57.3	69.8	64.2	54.6	67.5	60.4	47.6	63.8
Auto Theft	62.2	57.9	65.3						64.6	42.9	62.8
Office/Residence Thefts	56.5			55.6	62.3	53.5			56.3	47.6	57.5
Drug/Alcohol Enforcement	50.6	45.7	53.8	40.2	53.7	58.2	42.5	55.6	56.3	76.2	50.3
Theft of Car Parts	38.1			36.0	35.8	41.6			39.6	33.3	37.5
Moped/Bicycle Theft	35.0			38.8	39.5	31.3	40.0	33.8			
Traffic Law Violations	26.0			16.8	34.6	29.8	17.1	30.3	16.7	28.6	26.7
Loud Parties	16.9			15.0	25.9	15.1			8.3	28.6	16.7

The data in Table 1 indicate that the respondents are very concerned about sexual assaults as well as robberies and burglaries. The data in Table 1A indicate that the respondents were concerned most about the very same crimes. While noting that the highest priority for Public Safety focus (sexual assault) dropped about five percent between 1987 and 1992, the respondent preference for focus on robberies, burglaries and property destruction increased around four percent for each area. This could indicate some success on the part of the DPS in dealing with sexual assault during those five years, showing that crimes against the person are a higher priority for the DPS, as well as for the respondents. The next highest priority areas (robberies, burglaries, etc.), then, receive greater focus.

**Table 2 - Respondent Preference for Investigative Efforts****N=854**

Focal Area 1992	%	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
	Resp. Pref.	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
Sexual Assault	94.5	92.5	95.7	93.7	94.4	96.0	93.6	96.0	95.0	91.3	96.0
Assault & Battery	86.5	85.0	87.7	84.7	86.1	89.6	83.9	89.1	91.7	69.6	91.0
Destruction of Property	70.6	72.3	69.9	63.3	81.5	76.1	64.0	77.0	58.3	60.9	75.3
Child Neglect & Abuse	67.2	56.0	73.6	65.1	60.2	72.1	66.1	68.3	63.3	78.3	72.4
Drug/Alcohol Violations	50.9	48.5	52.2	44.7	56.5	56.1	43.9	57.9	56.7	47.8	48.2
Auto & Auto Parts Theft	47.0	53.1	43.3	53.0	46.3	40.5	52.3	42.3	61.7	56.5	42.6
Simple Theft	18.5	23.8	15.6	22.9	20.4	12.9	23.2	13.9	10.0	21.7	17.7
Moped/Bicycle Theft	17.3	20.8	15.2	24.9	14.8	8.9	25.8	9.7	23.3	21.7	14.4
Concealing Stolen Property	15.6	17.9	14.5	18.3	7.4	14.7	18.1	12.9	11.7	8.7	13.5
Credit Crd Fraud/Chk Forg.	14.6	15.6	14.1	18.3	8.3	12.6	19.4	10.4	13.3	17.4	12.3

**Table 2A****1987**

Sexual Assault	98.2										
Assault & Battery	89.1								85.4	95.2	89.7
Destruction of Property	76.4			73.4	80.4	76.8			72.9	85.7	76.4
Child Neglect & Abuse	67.9	61.1	71.4						66.7	81.0	68.4
Drug/Alcohol Violations	51.6	46.9	53.9	40.6	52.1	58.2			60.4	66.7	50.8
Auto & Auto Parts Theft	42.7			39.9	41.1	45.8			43.8	28.6	42.6
Simple Theft	22.6	27.7	19.7						16.7	9.5	22.8
Credit Crd Fraud/Chk Forg.	16.8	13.5	18.5	20.2	9.8	16.9			12.5	14.3	17.6
Moped/Bicycle Theft	15.8			23.6	14.1	9.5					
Concealing Stolen Property	11.0	15.2	8.9	13.3	8.0	10.3			12.5	4.8	10.4

As shown in Table 2, the respondents are concerned primarily about sexual assault, assault and battery, and then destruction of property. The data in Table 2A indicate the same. This shows a primary concern with crimes against the person, with property crimes coming second. Decreases in respondent preference for investigative efforts are shown regarding crimes of sexual assault, assault and battery, and destruction of property between 1987 and 1992, possibly indicating some success on the part of the DPS in handling these areas of crime.

It is also interesting to note that a difference greater than ten percent is shown on both tables 2 and 2A regarding the gender preference for investigative efforts on the area of child neglect and abuse. Females put more emphasis on this area than males.

**Table 3 - Respondent Prioritization of Service Types      N=854**

Service Types 1992	%	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
	Resp. Pref.	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
Teach Sexual Assault Prev.	75.2	67.4	79.9	77.6	73.1	73.6	77.0	74.0	86.7	78.3	76.9
Assist Stranded Motorists	72.8	66.4	76.6	66.8	70.4	81.6	65.8	80.0	66.7	56.5	81.0
Inv. All Vehicle Accidents	69.2	67.1	70.6	61.1	81.5	75.5	61.2	76.5	68.3	65.2	72.6
Office/Res. Sec. Inspection	69.1	68.4	69.7	64.6	77.8	72.1	66.3	73.3	65.0	47.8	71.1
Teaching Crime Prevention	58.9	55.5	61.3	59.0	52.8	60.4	58.7	59.9	68.3	69.6	59.5
Check Welfare of	53.4	59.9	50.0	55.8	52.8	51.5	55.4	51.7	53.3	56.5	54.5
Deliver Emerg. Messages	44.3	45.0	43.9	51.3	35.2	39.3	51.0	38.1	36.7	17.4	44.0
Assist People Lckd Out Car	40.9	35.8	43.9	38.7	38.9	43.6	38.3	43.3	38.3	39.1	41.1
Help People Lckd Hom/Off	27.9	26.1	28.8	26.1	37.0	25.8	27.3	28.2	21.7	43.5	27.7
Home Sec. Chks for Vac.	24.6	36.2	18.2	38.4	16.7	9.8	38.8	10.9	31.7	34.8	16.8
Pick Up Found Property	17.8	21.8	15.6	26.1	9.3	1.3	25.0	10.6	15.0	8.7	16.8
Vehicle Safety Inspections	12.4	14.3	1.3	15.8	10.2	8.6	15.8	9.2	8.3	17.4	8.5

**Table 3A**

1987

Teach Sexual Assault Prev.	78.9			74.3	81.5	81.7	74.1	81.0	
Assist Stranded Motorists	76.4			76.1	71.6	78.4			
Inv. All Vehicle Accidents	76.0								
Office/Res. Sec. Inspection	69.9								
Teaching Crime Prevention	58.5			58.8	51.2	61.3			
Check Welfare of	50.7								
Deliver Emerg. Messages	42.4								
Assist People Lckd Out Car	42.4	38.1	44.5						
Help People Lckd Hom/Off	25.7			25.0	34.0	22.6			
Home Sec. Chks for Vac.	24.5	27.8	22.6						
Pick Up Found Property	16.4			26.8	11.1	11.1	28.4	11.1	
Vehicle Safety Inspections	15.1								



**This, again, could be due to some success on the part of the DPS.**

**N=854**

### Table 4A

1987

Report Crime	98.1					
Report Suspicious Activity	94.2	90.5		96.4	90.0	96.4
Assist Victim Needing Help	93.3					
Assist Officer Needing Help	81.2					
Part. in Comm. Policing	51.5	43.3	52.1	56.4	45.5	54.0
Avoid Involve. with Victim	4.6					
Avoid Involve. with Police	2.2					

The data in Table 4 indicate that the vast majority of respondents would report crime and suspicious activity as well as assist victims and police. Just about 50 percent would also participate in community policing programs. Table 4A shows remarkably similar results.

Off-campus residents show a slightly higher feeling of responsibility to report crime, report suspicious activity, assist a victim needing help, and participate in community policing than on-campus residents. This is interesting to note, as the on-campus residents are more a part of the community, and yet they seem to feel less of a responsibility to participate with the police. Though, as was mentioned, the difference between the on- and off-campus responses is minor, less than three percent for the first three aforementioned areas, with a larger difference of close to nine percent for the area regarding community policing.

**Table 5 - Respondent Prioritization of Services N=854**

Focal Area 1992	%	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
	Resp. Pref.	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
Motor Vehicle Patrol	28.9	30.3	28.4	26.1	27.8	34.0	28.1	31.7	13.3	26.1	31.6
Comm. Policing Foot Patrol	21.9	22.5	21.6	21.9	26.9	20.6	20.7	21.8	15.0	21.7	22.7
Inv. Citizen Complaints	19.1	19.9	18.8	18.3	22.2	19.0	17.1	20.3	28.3	13.0	20.0
Crime Prevention Programs	14.4	14.3	14.5	20.6	5.6	9.2	21.2	8.2	31.7	8.7	10.3
Drug/Alcohol Education	9.8	8.1	10.4	9.3	10.2	10.4	8.9	11.6	6.7	13.0	10.2
Canine Patrols	2.0	1.3	2.4	1.8	0.9	2.8	1.5	2.0	1.7	8.7	1.9

**Table 5A**

1987

Motor Vehicle Patrol	33.7			
Comm. Policing Foot Patrol	22.3			
Inv. Citizen Complaints	17.1			
Crime Prevention Programs	11.0			
Drug/Alcohol Education	6.7			
Canine Patrols	3.8			

As is shown in Table 5, motor vehicle patrol ranks the highest in the first priority ranking, with community policing foot patrols coming second. Investigation of citizens complaint by a detective and crime prevention programs rank third and fourth, consecutively. The data in Table 5A show the exact same order of prioritization. The high interest in patrols reflects a high interest in a service emphasized by community policing.

**Table 6 - Respondent Victimization Rate N=854**

Focal Area 1992	%	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
	Victims	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
Victim of Crime	19.0	20.2	18.2	21.6	25.9	13.8	20.9	15.6	16.7	8.7	21.0
Reported Crime	77.8	82.3	74.5	70.9	85.7	84.4	69.5	85.7	60.0	50.0	79.2

**Table 6A**

1987

Victim of Crime	19.8	23.5	18.0	22.4	23.4	16.9	26.3	16.6	20.8	4.8	20.7
Reported Crime	79.0										

The data here for both Table 6 and 6A indicate that a little more than three quarters of those who have been a victim of crime on campus have reported the crime.

**Table 7 - Respondent Comparison of the Department of Public Safety N=854**

Focal Area 1992	%	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
	Resp. Pref.	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
Same	51.2	44.6	55.0	53.8	44.4	51.2	51.5	50.5	38.3	39.1	53.9
Better	28.7	36.2	24.7	24.1	32.4	31.6	26.8	31.2	35.0	52.2	27.3
Worse	7.3	7.5	7.2	11.3	2.8	4.3	11.0	3.2	16.7	4.3	6.6

**Table 7A**

1987

Same	55.4										
Better	24.9	36.6	19.0	19.2	25.1	28.4	21.4	26.1	20.8	38.1	24.8
Worse	9.3			16.1	7.2	5.7					

The data in Table 7 show that the number of respondents that rated the

DPS better than other police departments with which they were familiar is close to four times greater than the number of respondents that rated the DPS as being worse. The data in Table 7A show that those that rated the DPS better were close to three times greater than the number that rated the DPS as being worse.

A greater percentage of the respondents rated the DPS as being better in 1992 than in 1987, and a smaller percentage of respondents rated the DPS as being worse in 1992. This shows an increase in respondent satisfaction over those five years, possibly due to the practice of community policing.

**Table 8 - Respondent Familiarity with Campus Police Officer N=854**

Focal Area	%	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
1992	Resp. Fam.	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
Don't Know	62.3	61.2	63.2	71.4	74.1	48.5	70.2	54.5	50.0	65.2	60.5
Acquaintance	19.1	18.2	19.3	16.8	15.7	23.0	17.3	20.8	25.0	17.4	19.7
Very Well	11.1	14.3	9.3	5.0	7.4	19.3	5.6	16.8	16.7	8.7	12.3
Moderately	6.4	5.5	7.1	5.8	1.9	8.3	6.1	6.9	6.7	8.7	6.8

**Table 8A**

1987

Don't Know	70.00	60.8	74.5	81.5	74.3	60.9	78.3	66.4	64.60	81.00	69.80
Acquaintance	14.50										
Very Well	8.60										
Moderately	5.50										

The data from both Table 8 and 8A indicate that the majority of respondents did not know any police officers. The data in Table 8, however, show a lower percent that do not know an officer than the data in Table 8A and

show a higher percent that are acquainted with an officer than the data in Table 8A. In 1992, then, the respondents show more familiarity with the campus police officers than they do in 1987. This is another goal of community policing.



**Table 9 - Respondent Perceptions of the DPS Strengths N=524**

<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Number of</b>	<b>% of</b>
<b>1992</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Total</b>
Response Time	93	17.7
Attributes/Qualities of the Personnel	69	13.2
Visibility	62	11.8
Professionalism	60	11.5
Service and helpfulness	40	7.6
Ticketing Parking Violators	30	5.7
Competency, Knowledge and Education	29	5.5
Patrols	29	5.5
Resources	24	4.6
Public Relations	21	4.0
Campus Location	19	3.6
Crime Prevention	19	3.6
Programs and Activities	12	2.3
Traffic Control	8	1.5
Emergency Telephones	3	0.6
Drunk Drivers	2	0.4
Nothing	2	0.4
Female/Minority Officers	1	0.2
Minority Relations	1	0.2

**Table 9A**

<b>1987</b>		
Response Time	117	18.5
Attributes/Qualities of the Personnel	87	13.8
Visibility	63	10.0
Programs and Activities	60	9.5
Competency, Knowledge and Education	60	9.5
Ticketing Parking Violators	50	8.0
Service and Helpfulness	41	6.5
Patrols	39	6.2
Campus Location	31	4.9
Professionalism	28	4.4
Public Relations	15	2.4
Resources	15	2.4
Emergency Telephones	7	1.1
Drunk Drivers	5	0.7
New Director	4	0.6
Low Profile	4	0.6
The Survey	4	0.6
Female/Minority Officers	2	0.3

Regarding the data for Table 9, there were a total of 524 responses to this question. Many respondents made more than one comment regarding a perceived strength of the DPS. The comments have been placed in 19 categories, with the category having the most comments being number one and the rest appearing in descending order. As there was some arbitrariness in placing comments in a particular category categories two, five and seven have some degree of overlap between them.

Regarding the data for Table 9A, there were a total of 632 responses to this question. Many respondents made more than one comment regarding a perceived strength of the DPS. These comments have been placed in 18 categories with the category with the most comments being placed in number one and so forth. Here, there was also some arbitrariness in placing comments.

It is interesting to note that the same three areas--Response time, Attributes/Qualities of the personnel and Visibility--were mentioned most frequently on each table.

See Appendix B for more detailed responses.



**Table 10 - Respondent Perception of the DPS Weaknesses** **N=475**

<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Number of</b>	<b>% of</b>
<b>1992</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Total</b>
Parking Tickets	106	22.3
Resources - Personnel Equipment	69	14.5
Public Relations/Public Opinion	46	9.7
Traffic Control	39	8.2
Priorities	36	7.6
Visibility	32	6.7
Attributes/Qualities of Personnel	29	6.1
Minority Relations	25	5.2
Foot patrol	16	3.4
Communication	15	3.2
Response Time	14	2.9
Patrols	13	2.7
Community Support	8	1.7
Drug/Alcohol Enforcement and Education	5	1.1
Attitudes of Motor Vehicle Officers	4	0.8
Keeping Community Peace	4	0.8
Sexual Assaults	4	0.8
Lighting	3	0.6
Parking Space	3	0.6
Everything	2	0.4
Emergency Phones	1	0.2
Lack of Signs	1	0.2

**Table 10A****1987**

Parking Tickets	176	26.6
Resources - Personnel Equipment	103	15.6
Visibility	74	11.2
Negative Attitudes of Motor Vehicle Officers	61	9.2
Public Relations/Public Opinion	55	8.3
Sexual Assaults	46	7.0
Traffic Control	36	5.4
Foot Patrol	31	4.7
Communication	27	4.0
Response Time	20	3.0
Theft on Campus	8	1.2
Community Support	8	1.2
Drugs and Alcohol	5	0.8
Minorities and Women	3	0.5
Lighting	3	0.5
Prejudice	3	0.5
Emergency Phones	2	0.3

Regarding the data for Table 10, there were a total of 475 responses for this question. Many respondents made more than one comment regarding a perceived weakness of the DPS. The comments have been placed in 22 categories, with the category having the most comments being number one and the rest appearing in descending order. As there was some arbitrariness in placing comments in a particular category, categories seven, 10 and 15 have some degree of overlap between them.

Regarding the data for Table 10A, there were a total of 661 responses to this question. Many of the respondents made several comments regarding a perceived weakness of the DPS. The comments have been placed in 17 categories with the category having the most comments being number one and so forth. There was some arbitrariness in placing comments.

It is interesting to note here that Parking Tickets and resources-personnel equipment were noted most frequently on each table.

See Appendix B for more detailed responses.

**Table 11 - Respondent Recommendations for DPS Changes    N=470**

<b>Focal Area</b>	<b>Number of</b>	<b>% of</b>
<b>1992</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Total</b>
Patrol	50	10.6
Crime Prevention	48	10.2
Public Relations/Public Opinion	47	10.0
Parking Tickets	46	9.8
Foot Patrol	45	9.6
Resources - Personnel and Equipment	43	9.1
Visibility	38	8.0
Community Involvement	33	7.0
Lighting	31	6.6
Crime Prevention/Education	29	6.2
Traffic Control	21	4.5
Minority Relations	14	3.0
Dial-a-Ride	5	1.1
Priorities	5	1.1
Attitude and Demeanor	4	0.9
Response Time	4	0.9
Pedestrian Rights	3	0.6
Survey	1	0.2
Drug/Alcohol Activities	1	0.2
Eliminate DPS	1	0.2
Less Drug/Alcohol Education	1	0.2

**Table 11A****1987**

Foot Patrols	130	19.0
Crime Prevention/Education	96	14.0
Patrol	88	13.0
Parking	77	11.2
Visibility	76	11.1
Resources	45	6.5
Public Relations	44	6.4
Traffic	38	5.5
Attitudes/Demeanor	29	4.2
Lighting	25	3.7
Dial-a-Ride	12	1.8
Pedestrian Rights	10	1.5
Drug/Alcohol Activities	7	1.0
Females and Minorities	7	1.0
Survey	3	0.4
Eliminate DPS	3	0.4
Less Drug/Alcohol Education	2	0.2

Regarding Table 11, there were a total of 470 responses to this question. Many respondents made more than one recommendation for a change in the DPS. The comments have been placed in 21 categories, with the category having the most comments being number one and so forth. As there was some arbitrariness in placing comments in a particular category, categories two, seven and 14 have some degree of overlap between them.

Regarding Table 11A, there were a total of 692 responses to this question. Some of the respondents made more than one recommendation. The recommendations have been placed in 17 categories with the category having the most comments being number one and so forth. There was some arbitrariness in placing comments in a particular category.

Patrols and Crime prevention received the majority of comments for each table.

See Appendix B for more detailed responses.

**Table 12 - Respondent Knowledge of Community Policing**      **N=854**

Focal Area	% Resp.	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
1992	Knowledge	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
Yes	46.7	47.9	46.1	47.5	37.0	49.7	48.0	46.0	61.7	52.2	48.9
Not Sure	34.5	31.3	36.8	32.2	41.7	35.3	32.9	36.6	23.3	13.0	34.2
No	16.9	19.5	15.2	18.8	20.4	12.6	17.6	15.1	15.0	34.8	15.2

The data on Table 12 indicates that the percentage of respondents who know what community policing is, is greater than the percentage of respondents

who do not know what community policing is. About two-and-a-half times more respondents are familiar with community policing than are not.

**Table 13 - Respondent Preference for Police Responses N=854**

Focal Area 1992	%	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
	Resp. Pref.	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
All Calls	50.2	45.0	53.7	56.8	34.3	47.2	57.4	44.8	61.7	56.5	46.6
Serious Calls	44.6	51.8	40.1	40.2	54.6	46.9	39.8	49.0	36.7	43.5	48.1

The data on Table 13 shows that slightly (5.6%) more respondents feel it is important for campus police to respond quickly to all types of calls (serious and minor) as they occur as opposed to responding quickly only to serious calls, thereby spending more time working at solving problems that contribute to crime.

**Table 14 - Respondent Preference for Police/Citizen Involvement N=854**

Focal Area 1992	%	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
	Resp. Pref.	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
Citizens Involved	79.5	77.5	80.7	74.4	86.1	83.4	73.7	84.7	78.3	91.3	82.7
Police Working	16.4	19.2	14.9	22.6	10.2	11.3	23.0	10.4	18.3	8.7	13.1

Seventy-nine point five percent of the respondents indicate on Table 14 that they would prefer citizens to be regularly involved with the police officers in their community as opposed to being involved with police officers solely when the police officers respond to calls.

**Table 15 - Respondent Perception Regarding DPS Officers Availability N=854**

Focal Area	%	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
1992	Resp. Perc.	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
Don't Know	57.1	47.9	62.1	55.0	53.7	62.3	53.8	61.6	56.7	56.5	60.5
Yes	28.0	37.1	23.0	26.1	34.3	26.7	27.6	27.2	23.3	21.7	27.1
No	12.4	13.0	12.3	17.1	7.4	9.2	16.8	8.4	16.7	21.7	10.2

As the data in Table 15 indicate, 28 percent of the respondents felt that the officers are readily available for minor concerns. A minority (12.4%) felt the DPS was not readily available for minor concerns.

**Table 16 - Respondent Perceptions Regarding DPS Officers Availability N=854**

Focal Area	%	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
1992	Resp. Perc.	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
Don't Know	51.2	46.3	53.7	47.7	62.0	52.1	47.4	55.4	40.0	47.8	53.2
Yes	41.1	47.9	37.5	43.5	29.6	42.3	45.0	47.8	45.0	47.8	40.5
No	5.4	4.2	6.1	7.3	4.6	3.1	7.1	3.5	10.0	4.3	4.4

The data on Table 16 indicate that 41.3 percent of the respondents think the DPS responds adequately to emergencies and major concerns. A minority (5.4%) felt the DPS does not respond adequately to major concerns.

**Table 17 - Respondents Rate Department of Public Safety Effectiveness N=854**

Focal Area	%	% Gender		% Role			% Res.		% Race		
1992	Resp. Pref.	M	F	Std.	Fac.	Stf.	On	Off	Black	Hisp.	White
Effective	48.5	46.3	49.6	46.2	44.4	51.2	46.9	50.2	38.3	47.8	50.2
Moderately Effective	24.1	22.8	24.7	30.2	19.4	19.6	28.3	19.8	33.3	17.4	21.8
Very Effective	12.8	16.6	10.8	10.8	15.7	13.8	12.0	13.6	15.0	13.0	13.9
Not Effective Enough	5.2	6.2	4.6	6.3	5.6	4.0	6.4	3.7	5.0	8.7	5.0



The data on Table 17 indicates that the majority of the respondents felt that the DPS was effective in serving the university community. Only five point two percent felt the DPS was not effective enough.

**Table 18 - Respondent Recommendations to Improve DPS Effectiveness** **N=238**

Focal Area	Number of Comments	% of Total
1992		
Crime Prevention	34	14.2
Parking Tickets	33	13.9
Public Relations	28	11.8
Visibility	26	10.9
Resources	18	7.6
Community Education	17	7.1
Patrols	16	6.7
Foot Patrols	13	5.4
Community Involvement	11	4.6
Traffic Control	9	3.8
Response Time	8	3.4
Minority Relations	8	3.4
Priorities	5	2.1
Lighting	5	2.1
Dial-a-Ride	3	1.3
More Drug/Alcohol Education	3	1.3
Attitudes/Demeanor	1	0.4

Regarding Table 18, there were a total of 238 responses to this question. Some of the respondents made several recommendations regarding ways the DPS could improve their effectiveness. The recommendations have been placed in 17 categories, with the category having the most comments being number one and so forth. As there was some arbitrariness in placing comments in a particular category, categories six, 13 and 16 have some degree of overlap

between them.

Crime prevention is mentioned most frequently as an area in which the DPS could improve their effectiveness.

See Appendix B for more detailed responses.



## **Discussion of Research Questions**

### **Research Question 1**

**Are the types of services the Michigan State University community prefers commensurate with services that a community police force provides?**

Questions one, two, three, five, 11, 13 and 18 are all pertinent to this aspect of the study and the results from the questionnaire given in 1992 only, will be discussed in this section of analysis.

The data in Tables 1 and 2 show that the respondents feel that much attention should be given to crimes such as sexual assaults, assault and battery, robberies, burglaries and property destruction. The literature does indicate that community policing provides services which focus on the prevention of such crimes. Programs initiated by the police such as "crime watch"<sup>1</sup> help the community work with the police to help prevent such crimes. Groups such as the neighborhood advisory group (NAG)<sup>2</sup> provide citizens with direct input into the manner in which these crimes are addressed. Sexual assault prevention has also been focused on by a task force which was put together in Reno, Nevada<sup>3</sup>. These services which the community prefers are commensurate, therefore, with services that a community police force provides.

The data in Table 3 indicate that the respondents chose teaching sexual assault prevention programs, assisting stranded motorists, investigation of all

---

<sup>1</sup> Goldstein, 1987

<sup>2</sup> Bradshaw, 1990

<sup>3</sup> Hageman, 1990

vehicle accidents and providing office building/residence hall security inspections as the most important types of public service oriented services. The literature does show that these are the types of services which community policing provides. Goldstein (1987) discusses how community police officers educate citizens on how they can avoid becoming the victims of crime, this could include sexual assault prevention programs. The community Bradshaw (1990) mentions in Nevada discusses various neighborhood problems with their community police officers along with possible strategies. If a neighborhood chose, this could include assisting stranded motorists, and investigation of all vehicle accidents as well as security inspections. These community preferred services are services that a community police force provides.

The data in Table 5 shows that the respondents chose patrolling as a priority in servicing. Next came investigation, crime prevention programs and education. The Operation Cul-de-Sac (OCDS)<sup>4</sup> practiced in California, certainly shows the emphasis community policing puts on patrolling, as does the Foot Patrol Experiment in Flint, Michigan<sup>5</sup>. The very nature of community policing emphasizes investigation, as the officer who is in very close touch with the members of the community and who is very familiar with the daily goings-on in the community is constantly investigating anything out of the ordinary. It has previously been illustrated that the literature shows that community policing is suited to prioritization crime prevention programs and education. Again, the services preferred by this community are commensurate with the services that a

---

<sup>4</sup> Vernon and Lasley, 1992

<sup>5</sup> Trojanowicz, 1982

community police force provides.

The data in both questions 11 and 18 show that to improve the effectiveness of the Department of Public Safety the respondents most frequent recommendations include increasing patrols, emphasizing crime prevention, improving public relations and increasing the visibility of the police. Increasing patrols and increasing visibility tend to go hand in hand. Trojanowicz (1982) emphasizes patrolling, as does Couper and Lobitz (1991), Brown (1992), Bradshaw, Peak and Glensor (1990), Vernon and Lasley (1992) etc., as increased patrolling is an integral part of community policing. As Vernon and Lasley (1992) emphasize, the visibility of the police is crucial also in community policing. Crime prevention is emphasized in community policing as a proactive approach to policing as opposed to a the reactive approach of getting involved only after the crime has been committed. This is demonstrated with the "crime watch"<sup>6</sup> programs and programs such as the sexual assault prevention program<sup>7</sup> in Reno. Improved public relations should be a natural side effect of community policing as the police work more and more *with* the community by increasing their visibility, getting to know the members of the community, organizing community groups to address certain problems which may be specific to that community and actively seeking the input of the community members. The things which the community suggested for increased effectiveness are areas of service which are, therefore emphasized by community policing.

Forty-four percent of the respondents for Table 13 indicated that they feel

---

<sup>6</sup> Goldstein, 1987

<sup>7</sup> Hageman, 1990

it is more important for police to respond quickly only to serious calls, thereby spending more time working at solving problems that contribute to crime. Fifty percent of the respondents for Table 13 indicated that they feel it is most important for the police to respond quickly to all types of calls (serious and minor) as they occur. Response-time was not emphasized one way or the other in the literature. Though, as community policing does encourage citizen input regarding the policing of the community<sup>8</sup>, the community being policed could request a voice on this issue. A voice for the community is a community policing type service.

## **Research Question 2**

**Is the level of satisfaction of the Michigan State University community with their police force related to the fact that their police practice community policing?**

Data from Tables 7, 9 and 10 showing the results from both the 1987 questionnaire and the 1992 questionnaire are pertinent to this question, as well as data from Tables 16 and 17 showing the results from the 1992 survey.

The 1987 survey was taken just prior to the implementation of a community policing program at Michigan State University. By the time the survey was given in 1992, the community policing program had been in effect for five years. As questions one through 11 are identical on each survey, the data from these questions can be used for comparison purposes. By looking at the

---

<sup>8</sup>Trojanowicz, 1990; Bradshaw, 1990

data from questions seven, nine and 10 we can see if, after the DPS has practiced five years of community policing, the respondents respond differently to these questions.

Question seven asks the respondents to rate the overall service of the MSU Department of Public Safety compared to other police departments they were familiar with. In Table 7A the data indicate that 24.9 percent of the respondents rated the DPS better than other police departments they were familiar with, and nine point three percent rated it worse. The data from Table 7 indicates that 28.7 percent of the respondents rated the DPS better than other police departments they were familiar with, and seven point three percent rated it worse. This shows a three point eight percent increase in the number of respondents who rated the DPS better than other police departments and a two percent decrease in the number of those who rated the DPS worse. Though the percent of difference between the data on the two tables is small, the level of satisfaction indicated by the community is higher after five years of community policing have been practiced. As to whether or not this is due to the fact that their police practice community policing or not is more difficult to tell. The data from Tables 9, 9A and 10A give us an idea of what the respondents consider the greatest strengths of the DPS to be and the greatest weaknesses of the DPS to be. These can then be considered in relation to the type of policing emphasized with community policing.

The data for Table 9 (1992) show that the four most frequent things the

respondents commented on as a strength of the DPS were response time, attributes/qualities of the personnel, visibility and professionalism. The data for Table 9A (1987) show the top four to be response time, attributes/qualities of the personnel, visibility and programs and activities. As can be seen, the responses were very similar for the 1987 and the 1992 survey. All categories are services which were emphasized in community policing (Trojanowicz, 1982; Nichols, 1991; Worsnop, 1993; and Vernon and Lasley, 1992). This data does not show a significant change in citizen response between the years 1987 and 1992. This data does show that the areas of policing most frequently commented on as strengths by these respondents are all areas of policing which are emphasized with community policing. This would indicate that the high level of satisfaction (Table 17) with the police force may be due, in part, to the fact that the police practice community policing.

The data for Table 10 (1992) shows that the four most frequent things the respondents commented on as a weakness of the DPS were parking tickets, resources-personnel equipment, public relations/public opinion and traffic control. The data for Table 10A (1987) show the top four to be parking tickets, resources-personnel equipment, visibility and negative attitudes of motor vehicle officers. The areas mentioned here that are particularly emphasized with community policing are public relations/public opinion, Table 10, and visibility and negative attitudes of motor vehicle officers, Table 10A. These areas, however, were not number one or number two on the list. These perceived

weaknesses in things which are emphasized by community policing (Trojanowicz, 1982; Hageman, 1990; Goldstein, 1987) were commented on here by both the 1992 group (Table 10) and the 1987 group (Table 10A). Choosing these areas as weak areas would indicate a desire for more emphasis on these areas which are part of the community policing practice. If not for these perceived weaknesses the satisfaction level may have been even higher. Though it is interesting to note that the number one weakness indicated on both tables is parking tickets, not an area emphasized by community policing. Parking tickets received more than double the number of comments that either public relations/public opinion or visibility did. The data from other questions (3, 5, 11, 13, and 18) shows that the respondents prefer services which are offered by the practice of community policing. As the respondents prefer community policing type services, and the two most frequently mentioned weaknesses are not specifically community policing type services, this would indicate that the respondent's high degree of satisfaction is due in large part to the practice of community policing by the DPS.

The data on Table 16 indicates whether the respondents think the DPS responds adequately to emergencies and major concerns. The majority (51.2%) said they don't know. Forty-one point one percent stated that they DO think the DPS responds adequately to emergencies and major concerns as opposed to the five point four percent who don't. A high level of confidence that the police will respond adequately to major concerns would, of course, show a high level of

satisfaction with their police force. Responding adequately to emergencies and major concerns is emphasized by community policing (Trojanowicz 1990, Worsnop 1993), thus the high level of satisfaction of the MSU community with their police force is in part due to the fact that their police practice community policing.

The data on Table 17 indicates how respondents rate the Department of Public Safety in its effectiveness at serving the University community. A majority 49.9 percent of the respondents felt the DPS was effective in serving the University community, as opposed to the six percent that felt the DPS was not effective enough. This, in and of itself, does not indicate whether the level of satisfaction of the Michigan State University community with their police force is related to the fact that their police practice community policing. However, as their police *are* practicing community policing and as there is a high satisfaction level, it does appear as though the two are related. If the community were not satisfied with *community* policing, they would not be satisfied with their police force in general, since community policing is what they are receiving.

### **Research Question 3**

**Does the degree and type of police/citizen involvement which the Michigan State University prefers correlate with the degree and type of police/citizen involvement which is provided by a community policing force?**

Data from Tables 4 and 14 from the 1992 survey is the data most relevant



to this question.

The survey respondents were asked to check items that they felt were their responsibility, as a citizen, in dealing with crime. The vast majority of respondents indicated that they would report crime and suspicious activity as well as assist victims and police. Forty-nine point six percent would also participate in community policing programs. Goldstein (1987) refers to citizens reporting crime and suspicious activity as a specific part of a community policing program, he mentions a "crime watch" program as one way to encourage a community to help in this manner. Reporting crime, then, is a type of police/citizen involvement encouraged with community policing.

Reporting crime and suspicious activity and assisting victims indicate a more individual type of police/citizen involvement, which is a definite part of community policing (Trojanowicz, 1982). Assisting police and participating in community policing programs, however, opens up a type of police/citizen involvement which can occur on a much larger scale. Citizens in general, as well as elected officials and the citizens who make up community agencies (Trojanowicz 1992) who assist police and participate in community policing programs are also part of community policing. In Portland, Oregon (Austin and Sweet, 1992) the police department made an agreement with citizens, business owners and other service providers to share responsibility for solving community problems. Here the citizens are both assisting the police and becoming involved in community policing. The Sexual Assault Prevention Program in Reno,

Nevada (Hageman 1990) involves the citizens who run and work in all sorts of agencies, in working with the police in a community policing effort to prevent crime. The elected officials Mayor James Rutherford and Chief Max Durbin helped initiate the Foot Patrol Program in Flint in 1979 (Trojanowicz 1982). These are two elected officials who have certainly become involved in community policing. Reporting crime and suspicious activity and assisting victims (as checked by the MSU community) are definitely types of police/citizen involvement encouraged by community policing, though these types of involvement are of an individual nature.

The data in Table 14 indicates which of two degrees of police/citizen involvement the respondents would prefer. Either police officers working to decrease crime with police/citizen involvement occurring solely when police respond to calls, or, citizens regularly involved with the police officers in their community in an effort to decrease crime. A great majority (79.9%) of the respondents, prefer citizens to be regularly involved with the police officers in their community. This shows that the Michigan State University community prefers to be involved with the police to a degree which does correlate with the degree provided by community policing. Regular involvement with the police officers is exactly what is encouraged by community policing (Goldstein, 1987; Trojanowicz, 1990; Brown, 1992; Couper and Lobitz, 1991; and Vernon and Lasley, 1992). Thus, the degree and type of police/citizen involvement the Michigan State University community prefers does correlate with the degree and

**type of police/citizen involvement which is provided by a community policing force.**

## **Summary of Analysis**

The data here indicate that the types of services the MSU community prefers are commensurate with services that a community police force provides. The literature certainly indicates that the types of services preferred by the community are types of services which are considered to be included in the community policing practice.

That the high level of satisfaction the MSU community has shown with their police force (Table 7) is related to the fact that their police practice community policing has been demonstrated. The literature indicates that certain types of services are emphasized by community policing and the MSU community has indicated (Tables 3, 5, 11, 13 and 18) that they prefer those types of services. This, in conjunction with a high satisfaction rate indicates a positive correlation between the satisfaction rate and the practice of community policing.

The degree and type of police/citizen involvement preferred by the MSU community does correlate with the degree and type of involvement provided by a community policing force.

The analysis of all three of the questions addressed here, show a positive response to community policing on the part of the MSU community.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

This study consisted of two surveys which were administered to a sample of the students, faculty and staff at Michigan State University. These surveys were administered five years apart, one in 1987 and the other in 1992. The primary focus is on the data obtained from the survey given in 1992.

The analysis of the data was used in three specific ways. The first was to determine if the Michigan State University community prefers services which a community police force provides. The second was to determine if the community's satisfaction with their police force is related to the fact that their police practice community policing. The third determination regarding the analysis of data was whether the degree and type of police/citizen involvement which the MSU community prefers, correlates with the degree and type of police/citizen involvement which is provided by a community policing force.

In making these determinations, the data obtained from the surveys were considered in relation to a review of literature regarding the practice of community policing. Finally, an overall view of this analysis provides us with a response of a campus community to the practice of community policing.

In focusing on the three determinations mentioned above, the results of this study indicate the following :

1. The types of services the Michigan State University community prefers *are* commensurate with services that a community police force provides.

2. The level of satisfaction of the Michigan State University community with their police force, is related to the fact that their police practice community policing.
3. The degree and type of police/citizen involvement which the Michigan State University community prefers, correlates with the degree and type of police/citizen involvement which is provided by a community policing force.

The data indicate that the campus community has responded favorably to community policing.

The results of this study help show that community policing is a type of policing which can be successfully molded to meet the needs of a specific community. Community policing is so versatile that every community, no matter how unique, can benefit from it. The specific needs each community has for different areas and different types of police involvement can best be met by a police force which is specifically designed to determine those needs (with the help of the community) and then to meet those needs using resources which are available to the police force and the involved members and groups in the community. It is not only the multitude of resources which can become available to the police through the use of such a flexible and community based approach which help the police meet the specific needs of each community, it is also the flexibility of the policy makers within each department. This flexibility enables them to develop policy designed to more directly meet the needs of the community. Different communities benefit from different policies according to their needs. Every community is inherently different from every other community, thus, this type of policing, which redesigns itself from community to

community, is much needed.

The success enjoyed by the Department of Public Safety at Michigan State University demonstrates the positive effects of community policing on an unusual community. The police department has successfully designed itself to meet the needs of this community.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

These recommendations are based on the review of literature and the analysis of data obtained from both questionnaires.

1. It is recommended that further research be undertaken to investigate any correlation between policing style and community satisfaction. This could be done to determine whether a certain policing style (community policing, traditional policing, etc.) results in higher community satisfaction. Longitudinal studies could be done of communities, beginning before the implementation of community policing within a community, and continue on to include a study of the community's satisfaction after having experienced community policing. In investigating any correlation between policing style and community satisfaction, one survey instrument could be given to a city which is experiencing community policing in one half and a more traditional style of policing in the other.
2. It is recommended that campus police departments investigate the specific needs of the community being serviced and develop a policing style which is "custom made" to meet those needs. The experiences of other campus police departments should be reviewed and used as an aid in policy making.
3. It is recommend that studies be done comparing the campus community to the non-campus community in relation to their policing needs. This type of study would be helpful because of the different needs of the college community. To help ensure that geographical area is not a differentiating factor, one could study a college along with the city in which it is located, for example: University of Michigan compared to Ann Arbor; University of Iowa compared to Iowa City; Michigan State University compared to East Lansing; and so forth.

A community police force on a campus would differ from a community police force in a city in a number of ways. The campus police force would more likely have all of the officers involved in community policing. Due in part, to the smaller size of a campus force, the entire force could operate under the philosophy of community policing. A city force is more likely to have some officers designated as community policing officers, while others operate under a more traditional style of policing. The transient nature of the campus community necessitates another difference between a campus community police force and a city community police force. The educational programs are more repetitive on campus, as each year there is a significant number of new community members. Also, the training of various community groups



(community watch, etc.) must occur more frequently than in a city, as the groups are constantly changing members.

As campuses have a greater incidence of property crimes, sexual assault and drug related offenses, the campus police concentrate on meeting these needs, which are somewhat different from the needs of a city community. A city community would have a greater need for maintaining peace and quality of life for families, children and the elderly and would have a greater emphasis on organizing activities for juveniles and on business security. By looking at the policing needs of the campus community as compared to those of the city community a community policing design could be better developed to specifically meet the needs of a campus community.

## **APPENDICES**

**Appendix A**  
**Survey Instrument**

In an ongoing assessment of the Community Policing program, the Department of Public Safety is conducting an anonymous survey of University residents and employees. The information you provide by completing this survey will be helpful in assessing the current Community Policing program and in determining what you, as residents and employees, feel are important priorities for the Department of Public Safety. Therefore, your views concerning the following questions are of utmost importance. Remember, your responses are completely anonymous. You indicate your voluntary agreement to participate by completing and returning this questionnaire. Please answer each question carefully and return the questionnaire in the enclosed envelope through interdepartmental campus mail by Monday, March 2, 1992.

For analysis purposes, please answer the following:

Are you ☐ female  
☐ male

What is your primary role at M.S.U.? (Choose only one)

☐ student  
☐ faculty  
☐ staff  
☐ other, specify

Do you reside on campus? ☐ Yes ☐ No

What is your racial/ethnic background?

☐ Black/African American  
☐ Hispanic  
☐ White  
☐ Native American  
☐ Asian Pacific  
☐ Other, specify

It is generally recognized that the police through random patrol can discourage the following types of criminal activities from being committed. Which would you like to see your police concentrate their efforts on?

Check one answer only for each item:

	1	2	3
	Much Attention	Sometimes	Little Attention
1. How much priority should the police give to:			
Burglaries.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Property Destruction...	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Auto Theft.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Traffic Law Violations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Robberies.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Office/Residences Theft	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sexual Assaults.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Theft of Car Parts.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Loud Parties.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Moped/Bicycle Theft....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Drug/Alcohol Enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. On which of the following crimes that are committed do you think the Department of Public Safety should concentrate their investigative efforts toward solving? Choose only five (5).

- ☐ Simple Theft
- ☐ Assault and Battery
- ☐ Credit Card Fraud and Check Forgery
- ☐ Sexual Assault
- ☐ Moped/Bicycle Theft
- ☐ Malicious Destruction of Property
- ☐ Concealing Stolen Property
- ☐ Auto and Auto Parts Theft
- ☐ Drug/Alcohol Violations
- ☐ Child Neglect and Abuse

3. The following is a list of service types of activities performed by the Department of Public Safety. Which of these do you feel are the MOST IMPORTANT? Choose only six (6).

- ☐ Pick up found property
- ☐ Home security checks for vacationers
- ☐ Assist people locked out of their cars
- ☐ Investigation of all vehicle accidents
- ☐ Deliver emergency messages
- ☐ Vehicle safety inspections
- ☐ Office building/residence halls security inspections
- ☐ Teaching crime prevention
- ☐ Teaching sexual assault prevention programs
- ☐ Checking the welfare of residents
- ☐ Assisting people locked out of their homes or offices
- ☐ Assisting stranded motorists

4. What is your responsibility as a citizen in relation to dealing with crime? Check all that apply.

- ☐ Avoiding involvement with victim
- ☐ Assist victim needing help
- ☐ Report suspicious activity
- ☐ Avoiding involvement with police
- ☐ Reporting crime
- ☐ Assisting police officers needing help
- ☐ Participating in Community Policing programs

5. Keeping in mind that there are limited resources, please rank the following services. ( 1 will be your top priority and 6 will be your lowest priority. )

Motor vehicle patrol

- ☐ Community Policing foot patrols
- ☐ Investigations of citizen's complaints by detectives
- ☐ Crime Prevention programs
- ☐ Drug and alcohol education and enforcement
- ☐ Canine patrols

6. Were you the victim of a crime on campus?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

If yes, what was the crime?

Did you report it to the Department of Public Safety?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No

7. How would you rate the overall service of the MSU Department of Public Safety compared to other police departments you know?

- ☐ Better
- ☐ Same
- ☐ Worse

8. How well do you PERSONALLY know a campus police officer?

- ☐ Very well, on a first name basis
- ☐ Moderately well
- ☐ Acquaintance only
- ☐ Do not know any

9. What do you consider the GREATEST STRENGTHS of the Department of Public safety?

10. What do you consider the GREATEST WEAKNESSES of the Department of Public Safety?

11. What changes would you recommend to the Department of Public safety in order to improve the public safety of the University community?

12. Do you know what Community Policing is?

- ☐ Yes
- ☐ No
- ☐ I'm not sure

13. Which is more important for campus police?

- ☐ Quick response to all types of calls ( serious and minor ) as they occur.
- ☐ To respond quickly only to serious calls thereby spending more time working at solving problems that contribute to crime.

14. Different styles of policing require different degrees of citizen involvement. Of the two degrees of citizen involvement mentioned below, which would you prefer?

☐ Police officers working to decrease crime with police/citizen involvement occurring solely when police respond to calls.

☐ Citizens regularly involved with the police officers in their community in an effort to decrease crime.

15. Do you think that Department of Public Safety officers are readily available for minor concerns ( e.g., assisting stranded motorists, assisting people locked out of their homes or offices, picking up found property, home security checks for vacationers...)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ I don't know

16. Do you think that the Department of Public Safety responds adequately to emergencies and major concerns (e.g., robberies, sexual assaults, assault and battery, auto theft...)?

☐ Yes

☐ No

☐ I don't know

17. Overall, how do you rate the Department of Public Safety in their effectiveness at serving the University community?

☐ Very effective

☐ Effective

☐ Moderately effective

☐ Not effective enough

18. If you feel that the Department is not meeting the needs of the University Community, please indicate what you think the Department needs to do in an attempt to be more effective.

Now that you have completed this questionnaire, please enclose it in the envelope and mail it by interdepartmental mail on Campus by Monday, March 2, 1992.

The results of the survey will be publicly available through the Department of Public Safety. Thank you for your cooperation.

## **Appendix B**

### **Responses to Open Ended Questions from the 1992 Survey**



## **Question 9**

### **What are the greatest strengths of the Department of Public Safety?**

There were a total of 524 responses to this question. Some of the 854 respondents did not make comments. Of those that did respond, many made more than one comment.

The comments have been placed in 19 categories, with the category having the most comments being number one and the rest appearing in descending order.

#### **1. Response Time**

A total of 93 comments related to quick response time. Statements such as, "fast response time, quick to respond, quick response to crime reporting, available, always respond, speedy," were typical.

#### **2. Attributes/Qualities of the Personnel**

Sixty-nine (69) comments related to the positive attributes and qualities of the personnel. The personnel were described as being polite and reasonable, concerned, willing to follow through, committed, well educated, calm, cooperative, friendly, open, and diplomatic. It was mentioned that they seem to be non-judgmental and that they seem concerned with minor as well as serious complaints.

#### **3. Visibility**

There were 62 comments about the high visibility of DPS officers. Such comments included, "They're everywhere!, appear to be everywhere, very visible, seen a lot, a real presence, always around". Positive comments were also made about the apparent availability of the officers due to their high rate of visibility.

#### **4. Professionalism**

There were 60 comments about the professionalism displayed by the DPS officers. The respondents primarily referred to the officers as being "professional" or "very professional". Some respondents included comments regarding the high education level of the officers.

## **5. Service and Helpfulness**

There were 40 comments which related to the service and helpfulness of the DPS. Included with such comments were, "willingness to work with our office, caring individuals, helpfulness in circumstances, willing to help".

The respondents mentioned the officers "genuine interest" in "helping the community".

## **6. Ticketing Parking Violators**

There were 30 comments regarding ticketing parking violators. Some of the comments praised the uses the money goes to. Many were appreciative of the effort to protect designated parking for those it was designated for. It was mentioned that the DPS was so good at giving out parking tickets, that they must spend all their time doing it. On the whole, however, the comments were positive.

## **7. Competency, Knowledge, and Education**

There were 29 comments about the competency, knowledge and education of the officers. The educational level of the officers was frequently mentioned. As well, was their efficiency in handling a variety of situations. Intelligence and competency were mentioned, as well as communication skills.

## **8. Patrols**

Twenty-nine (29) people commented on frequent patrolling by the DPS. The majority commented on the motor patrols. Many also commented on the canine patrols, with a very few comments regarding foot patrols.

## **9. Resources**

Twenty-four (24) comments related to resources. Many of these comments focused on the number of personnel, while a very few mentioned the police cars as being a positive resource.

## **10. Public Relations**

Twenty-one respondents commented on public relations. These respondents mentioned the various communications the DPS made with the University community, and the projected attitude of caring and interest.

**11. Campus Location**

There were 19 comments on the location of the Department of Public Safety. The respondents commented on how the close proximity to the DPS seemed to help provide for a real feeling of community involvement with the police. It was mentioned that this also allowed for a quicker response by officers and more personalized service.

**12. Crime Prevention**

Nineteen (19) comments were made praising the effectiveness of the Department of Public Safety in preventing crime. Effort was also praised, with mention of officers "following through".

**13. Programs and Activities**

Twelve (12) comments were made regarding programs and activities. Most of the comments referred to educational programs on topics such as drugs and alcohol, sexual assault prevention, and security.

**14. Traffic Control**

Eight (8) comments were made regarding the effectiveness of the Department of Public Safety in controlling traffic. Speeding was the primary violation addressed.

**15. Emergency Telephones**

Three (3) commentors mentioned emergency telephones, stating that they were well located and increased ones feeling of safety.

**16. Drunk Drivers**

There were 2 comments regarding the Department of Public Safety's ability to deal well with drunk drivers.

**17. Nothing**

Two (2) respondents mentioned that the Department of Public Safety had no strengths.

**18. Female/Minority Officers**

One (1) respondent mentioned the positive effects of having minority officers.

**19. Minority Relations**

**One (1) comment was made regarding the officers diplomacy in dealing with minorities.**

## **Question 10**

### **What Do You Consider the Greatest Weaknesses of the Department of Public Safety To Be?**

There were a total of 475 responses to this question. Some of the 854 respondents did not make comments. Of those that did respond, many made more than one comment.

The comments have been placed in 22 categories, with the category having the most comments being number one and the rest appearing in descending order.

#### **1. Parking Tickets**

One hundred and six (106) people commented about parking tickets. This category has the largest number of negative responses and included comments such as, "tendency to focus on minor violations - eg. parking tickets, their obsession for giving tickets for parking and 'minor' violations, too much emphasis on parking tickets". The general slant was that this was something the DPS did to excess and that their time would be better spent on "real crime" and crime prevention.

#### **2. Resources/Personnel Equipment**

There were 69 comments regarding resources/personnel equipment. Most frequently mentioned was the number of officers, which were considered to be too few. These comments included, "not enough officers, not enough to go around, too few officers". There were minimal responses regarding equipment.

#### **3. Public Relations/Public Opinion**

There were 46 comments for this category. It was mentioned that the DPS needed to put out more newsletters and to notify the community through the State News of such things as, services provided by the DPS, ways in which the DPS is involved with the community, educational programs provided by the DPS. It was also mentioned that the DPS should make an attempt to be seen as doing something other than handing out parking tickets.

#### **4. Traffic Control**

Thirty-nine (39) people commented on lack of traffic control. Mention was made primarily of too much speeding going on, "inadequate enforcement of speeding (auto) on campus". Rush hour was also mentioned as presenting a traffic problem, and some mention was made of unregulated bike traffic.

#### **5. Priorities**

Thirty-six (36) comments were made regarding the priorities displayed by the DPS. A few of the commentators mentioned that ticketing parked cars should be less of a priority and crime prevention should be a higher priority. Mention was also made regarding the safety and security on campus and recommending that they should be higher on the priority list.

#### **6. Visibility**

Thirty-two (32) respondents commented on low visibility of the DPS officers. Many comments were made suggesting more night patrols and more foot patrols, as well as more building checks and patrols.

#### **7. Attributes/Qualities of Personnel**

There were 29 comments on the Attributes/Qualities of the personnel. Commentors mentioned that they felt a "lack of support" from the officers toward the community, and that the officers sometimes seemed unfriendly and inflexible.

#### **8. Minority Relations**

Twenty-five (25) comments were made regarding minority relations. Actual criticisms were not made so much as suggestions. Mention was made of the officers needing to learn more about minority relations and just in general to work on and improve relations and attitudes toward all minority groups.

#### **9. Foot Patrol**

Sixteen (16) comments were made on the weakness of the DPS foot patrol. Too little night foot patrol was mentioned as well as too little foot patrol in general.

**10. Communication**

There were 25 comments criticizing DPS communication with the campus community. Mention was made that the DPS didn't understand the students and that the officers tended to prejudge and that they tended not to listen.

**11. Response Time**

Fourteen (14) comments were made regarding the response of the DPS officers. Primarily, mention was made that they didn't seem to respond quickly to minor complaints, "not fast in responding to minor complaints, like parties".

**12. Patrols**

Thirteen (13) comments were made regarding patrols. Mention was made of there not being enough night patrols and "not enough patrol on parking lots".

**13. Community Support**

Eight (8) comments were made mentioning community support as a weakness of the DPS. Some of these commentors felt the officers didn't involve themselves with community problems, such as wild children in Spartan village and domestic problems.

**14. Drug and Alcohol Enforcement and Education**

Five (5) comments were made saying there wasn't enough drug and alcohol enforcement and education.

**15. Attitudes of Motor Vehicle Officers**

Four (4) comments mentioned negative attitudes of motor vehicle officers.

**16. Keeping Community Peace**

Four (4) comments were made stating a greater need for "crowd control" and noise control.

**17. Sexual Assaults**

There were 4 comments suggesting rape prevention education and more avid investigation of sexual assaults.

**18. Lighting**

Three (3) commentors mentioned that there wasn't enough lighting on campus.

**19. Parking Space**

Three (3) commentors pointed out a lack of parking space on campus.

**20. Everything**

Two (2) commentors mentioned that everything was a weakness.

**21. Emergency Phones**

There was 1 comment stating that there were not enough emergency phones.

**22. Lack of Signs**

One (1) commentor mentioned a lack of signs.



## **Question 11**

**What changes would you recommend to the Department of Public Safety in order to improve the public safety of the University community?**

There were a total of 470 responses to this question. Some of the 854 respondents did not make comments. Of those that did respond, many made more than one comment.

The comments have been placed in 21 categories, with the category having the most comments being number one and the rest appearing in descending order.

### **1. Crime Prevention/Education**

Seventy-seven (77) people suggested increasing the crime prevention efforts of the DPS. These respondents were concerned with security in general, building security, and "security on the parking ramps". Also with safety and night safety - a main concern being with sexual assaults. Many suggested "more prevention programs", more programs on sexual assault, self-defense, property theft and drug and alcohol abuse. Newsletters and such, suggesting safety and security tips were also suggested.

### **2. Patrol**

There were 50 comments regarding patrols. More patrols were suggested. As well as motor patrols, many respondents suggested more motorcycle patrol, bike patrol, and night patrols. There was much emphasis on night patrols to increase student safety.

### **3. Public Relations/Public Opinion**

Forty-seven (47) respondents suggested the DPS improve their public image through more community involvement and through newsletters, pamphlets and the State News. It was also suggested that the DPS inform the community of what it is exactly that they do.

### **4. Parking Tickets**

There were 47 recommendations regarding ticketing parked cars. Suggestions such as, "stop wasting time with parking tickets", and "don't emphasize so much on parking tickets" were common. Most comments

referred to reducing the emphasis on ticketing. It was also suggested the money received from ticketing be obtained elsewhere.

#### **5. Foot Patrol**

Forty-five (45) comments were made suggesting "more foot patrols". Much emphasis was on having more foot patrols at night for safety purposes, especially around frequently used buildings, parking ramps, etc. It was also suggested that more foot patrol in general would encourage community involvement and interaction and give the officers more of a feel for the community at large.

#### **6. Resources/Personnel Equipment**

There were 43 comments suggesting a change in the resources and personnel equipment of the DPS. There were many suggestions to increase the number of emergency phones on campus. There were also suggestions to "increase numbers" of officers. These are the main categories in which changes were suggested. Also included were "surveillance cameras" and an introduction of "auxiliary or cadet corps".

#### **7. Visibility**

There were 38 comments suggesting the DPS increase their visibility. It was suggested that this be done by increasing the number of all types of patrols and by the officers walking through buildings more frequently.

#### **8. Community Involvement**

Thirty-three (33) recommendations were made to increase community involvement. It was suggested that the officers have "more contact with the community" and "more interaction with students".

#### **9. Lighting**

Thirty-one (31) respondents recommended "better light" in general, as well as "better lighting in parking ramps and better lighting in parking lots".

#### **10. Crime Prevention/Education**

Twenty-nine (29) respondents suggested the DPS concentrate on "security on the parking ramp" and more foot patrol lighting, etc., to prevent sexual assault. Also suggested were "more prevention programs", including drug prevention, assault prevention & security and

**safety information.**

**11. Traffic Control**

**There were 21 responses regarding traffic control. Most were concerned with speeding problems.**

**12. Minority Relations**

**Fourteen (14) respondents suggested the DPS improve their minority relations, though it was not made clear as to how it should be done.**

**13. Dial-a-Ride**

**Five (5) comments were made recommending expanding the Dial-a-Ride program.**

**14. Priorities**

**Five (5) comments were made suggesting the DPS change their priorities. It was suggested parking be de-emphasized and safety and crime prevention be emphasized.**

**15. Attitude\Dememeanor**

**Four (4) recommendations were made suggesting the DPS work on having a more friendly attitude.**

**16. Response Time**

**Four (4) recommendations were given suggesting the DPS work on "quick response to crime reporting".**

**17. Pedestrian Rights**

**Three (3) respondents suggested that pedestrians should have more rights.**

**18. Survey**

**One (1) respondent mentioned "surveys, trade demonstrations".**

**19. Drug/Alcohol Activities**

**One (1) respondent mentioned putting more emphasis on drug/alcohol activities.**

**20. Eliminate DPS**

One (1) respondent suggested eliminating the DPS.

**21. Less Drug/Alcohol Education**

One (1) respondent suggested less drug/alcohol education

## **Question 18**

**If you feel that the Department is not meeting the needs of the University Community, please indicate what you think the Department needs to do in an attempt to be more effective.**

This question asked respondents to indicate what they think the department needs to do in an attempt to be more effective.

There were a total of 238 responses to this question. Some of the 854 respondents did not make comments; others made several comments.

The comments have been placed in 17 categories, with the category having the most comments being number one and the rest appearing in descending order.

### **1. Crime Prevention**

Thirty-four (34) respondents mentioned emphasis on crime prevention. Respondents mentioned that the DPS should "keep [their] eyes open to crime" and "have more night security everywhere on campus". The greatest emphasis seemed to be on night security.

### **2. Parking Tickets**

Thirty-three (33) comments related to parking tickets. It was strongly suggested that the DPS spend less time ticketing.

### **3. Public Relations**

There were 28 comments suggesting the DPS improve their public relations. It was suggested this could be done through media usage and through improving the friendliness of officers.

### **4. Visibility**

Twenty-six (26) respondents suggested the DPS increase the visibility of the officers. It was mentioned that this could be done through an increase in motor patrols, foot patrols and building checks.

### **5. Resources**

Eighteen (18) respondents suggested the DPS increase their resources. Most of these suggested the DPS "increase staff" and hire "more personnel".

**6. Community Education**

Seventeen (17) respondents suggested an increase in community education with an emphasis on sexual assault prevention.

**7. Patrols**

Sixteen (16) respondents suggested more frequent patrols by motor vehicle personnel.

**8. Foot Patrol**

Thirteen (13) respondents suggested more foot patrols. It was also suggested that the DPS "put more officers in buildings".

**9. Community Involvement**

There were 11 responses regarding community involvement. One respondent wrote "I like the idea of community policing". This seemed to be the consensus among these respondents.

**10. Traffic Control**

Nine (9) respondents suggested an increase in traffic control.

**11. Response Time**

Eight (8) respondents suggested the DPS increase their response time. One respondent commented "Please react as soon as you can to emergency calls!".

**12. Minority Relations**

Eight (8) respondents suggested the DPS work on improving their relations with minorities.

**13. Priorities**

Five (5) respondents suggested the DPS change their priorities. Again, it was suggested more emphasis be put on crime prevention.

**14. Lighting**

Five (5) respondents suggested the DPS improve the lighting on campus.

**15. Dial-a-Ride**

Three (3) respondents suggested the DPS expand the Dial-a-Ride programs.

**16. More Drug/Alcohol Education**

Three (3) respondents suggested the DPS increase their number of drug/alcohol education programs.

**17. Attitudes/Demeanor**

One (1) respondent suggested an improvement in the attitudes of the officers.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**



## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

Austin, Sergeant D. and Sweet, Carroll. 1992. Information and referral efforts extend department's reach. The Police Chief. pp. 65-66

Blumenthal, Ralph. 1992. Brown says community policing will endure. The New York Times. 141 pB4(L), col 1

Bradshaw, Robert V., Peak, Ken, and Ronald W. Glensor. 1990. Community policing enhances Reno's image. The Police Chief. 57 No. 10, pp. 61-65

Brown, Lee P. 1992. Building support for community policing. The FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. 61 No. 5, pp. 2-5

Couper, David C., and Sabine Lobitz. 1991. The customer is always right. The Police Chief. 58 No. 5, pp. 16-23

Cox, John F. 1992. Small departments and community policing. The FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. 61 No. 12, pp. 1-4

Field, Mark W. 1990. Evaluating police services through citizen surveys. The Police Chief. 57 No. 10, pp. 69-72

Fulwood, Isaac, Jr. 1990. Community empowerment policing. The Police Chief. 57 No. 5, pp. 49-50

Goldstein, Herman. 1987. Toward community-oriented policing: Potential, basic requirements, and threshold questions. Crime and Delinquency. 33 No.1, pp.6-30

Hageman, Mary Jeanette. 1990. Crime prevention and the phenomenological approach. The Police Chief. 57 No. 10, pp. 76-86

Hartmann, Francis X., Brown, Lee P. and Darrel Stephenson. 1988. Community Policing: Would you know it if you saw it? Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

Holloway, Lynette. 1993. Walking the beat on mean street: Tough neighborhoods put community policing to the test. The New York Times. 142 Sec. 1, p27(L), col 2

Horne, Peter. 1991. Not just old wine in new bottles. The Police Chief. 58 No. 5, pp. 24-29

Jackson, Eric. 1992. Campus police embrace community-based approach. The Police Chief. 59 No. 12, pp. 63-64

James, George. 1991. On foot and twirling a night stick, via Madison Avenue. The New York Times. 141 pB1(L), col 2

Mitchell, Helen Buss. 1992. Police/community relations: A non-traditional training approach. The Police Chief. 59 No. 12, pp. 58-61

Nichols, Warren R. 1991. Putting our best foot forward. The Police Chief. 58 No. 5, pp. 31-35

Riechers, Lisa M. and Roy R. Roberg. 1990. Community policing: A critical review of underlying assumptions. Journal of Police Science and Administration. 17 No. 2, pp. 105-114

Skolnick, J. H. and Bayley, D. H. 1986. The New Blue Line. New York: Free Press

Terry, Don. 1992. Difficult balancing act of watching the police. The New York Times. 142 pA10(N) pA16(L), col 1

Trojanowicz, Robert C. 1992. Building support for community policing. The FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. 61 No. 5, pp. 7-13

Trojanowicz, Robert C. 1990. Community policing is not police-community relations. The FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. 59 No. 10, pp. 6-11

Trojanowicz, Robert C. 1982. An Evaluation of the Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program in Flint, Michigan. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

Trojanowicz, Robert C. 1989. Preventing Civil Disturbances: A Community Policing Approach. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

Trojanowicz, Robert C. and Hazel A. Harden. 1985. The Status of Contemporary Community Policing Programs. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

Vernon, Rupert L. and James R. Lasley. 1992. Police/Citizen partnership in the inner city. The FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin. 61 No. 5, pp. 18-22

Williams, Jerry and Ron Sloan. 1990. Turning Concept Into Practice: The Aurora, Colorado Story. Charles Stewart Mott Foundation.

Wolff, Craig. 1992. Brown legacy: Community policing. The New York Times. 141 pB2(L), col 1

Wolff, Craig. 1992. To teach new policing, a new kind of teacher. The New York Times. 142 pB1b(L), col 5

Worsnop, Richard L. 1993. Current situation. Congressional Quarterly, Inc. 3 No. 5, pp. 10-11

Worsnop, Richard L. 1993. Is community policing the best answer to the nation's crime problem? Congressional Quarterly, Inc. 3 No. 5, pp. 99-103



MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293010461774