

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLICE

EDITOR

Scott H. Decker
University of Missouri
at St. Louis

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Allen E. Wagner
University of Missouri
at St. Louis

EDITOR-ELECT

Gary Cordner
Eastern Kentucky University

EDITORIAL BOARD

Mark Blumberg
Central Missouri State University

Roy Roberg
Louisiana State University

Stephen E. Brown
East Tennessee State University

Frank A. Schubert
Northeastern University

Jack R. Greene
Temple University

Mittie D. Southerland
Eastern Kentucky University

Robert Homant
University of Detroit

Craig Uchida
University of Maryland

Merry Morash
Michigan State University

Ronald E. Vogel
University of North Carolina
at Charlotte

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLICE

Vol. VI, No. 1 Spring 1987

Special Issue on Foot Patrol and Community Policing

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF POLICE is published twice annually, Fall and Spring. The copyright is with Anderson Publishing Co. Subscriptions are \$20 for individuals and \$35 for institutions.

TO ORDER OR SUBSCRIBE CONTACT:

Pilgrimage - A Division of Anderson Publishing Co.
P.O. Box 2676
Cincinnati, Ohio 45201

**CITIZENS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE POLICE:
RESULTS FROM AN EXPERIMENT IN
COMMUNITY POLICING IN ISRAEL***

Robert R. Friedmann, Ph.D.
*Department of Criminal Justice
Georgia State University*

**This is a revised version of a paper presented at the 38th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Atlanta, GA. October 29-November 1, 1986. The author expresses deep gratitude to the Division of Planning and Organization of the Israel Police for their support and commitment to the Neighborhood Police Officer Research Project. Also, thanks to Robert Snow for his statistical comments.*

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the effects of the Israeli Neighborhood Police Officer (NPO) experimental police crime reduction project—aimed at greater cooperation with the community—on attitudinal changes toward the police and the community. More specifically, this study explored whether a set of attitudinal factors such as neighborhood quality, police image, and neighborhood image were affected by the type of neighborhood, time and/or victimization. Within a classical field experimental design, a shorter, modified, version of Bosworth's (1954) original Community Attitude Scale was used to interview 1,350 residents of four neighborhoods with a Neighborhood Police Officer and three without one. Residents were measured independently three times during a one-year period. Findings indicate two distinct attitudinal factors: one with respect to the community and the other with respect to the police. Attitudes changed *positively* toward the community but *negatively* to-

ward the police. Victimization had an effect only on the latter factor. Possible explanations are provided for these findings and implications for police work are discussed.

INTRODUCTION

The need and the practice of various police efforts directed at enhancing rapport and cooperation with the community to achieve greater effectiveness and efficiency is well documented (Decker, 1981; Eisenberg, Fosen and Glickman, 1973; Fink and Sealy, 1975; Kelly and Shellow, 1975; Reasons and Wirth, 1975; Singer, 1975; Trojanowicz, 1983; Wisenhand, Cline and Felkenes, 1974). The importance of positive relationships between the police and the community stems not only from the belief that the former serves the latter and that the latter should be law-abiding, but also from the understanding that the community can aid the police in daily operations, function as a crime reducing factor, assure the provision of better police services and protection, assure greater public concern and involvement in policy decision making and provide the police with needed support. In other words, good cooperative efforts can change the environment in which police and citizens interact as well as the nature and quality of police services. For the police to be effective, both quality of services and a positive image are a prerequisite.

Underlying the cooperation efforts between the police and the community is the assumption that such cooperation rests on and in turn shapes the attitudes citizens hold toward the police (Decker, 1981).¹ These attitudes may affect the character of the relationships between citizens and the police and will function to further or hinder cooperation. The article presents a framework of police community cooperation; it also examines the importance of citizens' attitudes toward the police and the extent to which experimentation with community policing has an impact on citizen attitudes. Finally, victimization will be examined for its possible influence on citizen attitudes. These community and police interactions and attitudes will be discussed in the context of an experimental community-policing project in Israel.

A FRAMEWORK OF POLICE COMMUNITY COOPERATION

Police-community cooperation efforts are expressed by various prevention strategies emphasizing the importance and value of the community as a resource for crime prevention or reduction. The outcome of such strategies is affected not only by the mode of operation of law enforcement agencies but also by the nature of the community's structure, process, and cooperation among residents, voluntary associations and public agencies (Kramer and Specht, 1983; Latessa and Allen, 1980; Trojanowicz, 1972; U.S. Department of Justice, 1980).

According to Janowitz and Suttles (1978), the involvement of the community in crime prevention efforts—as these efforts were initiated by the police—may crystalize community resources (such as human service agencies or volunteer organizations) which in turn will influence the power bases in the community. Without such community involvement, responsibility for combating crime is left to large public agencies which are not always sensitive to specific community needs.

Police community cooperation can be described in at least three different: 1) regular enforcement (no cooperation); 2) public relations cooperation (token or symbolic cooperation); and 3) grass-root cooperation ("genuine" or ideal cooperation). When police are engaging in "by-the-book" enforcement the community may oppose it and activate its own resources often in resistance to police definitions of law and order (O'Brien, 1978; Nelson, 1967). In other words, the community may react as alienated from the police. If, however, the police are concerned only with the improvement of their public image, then the results of this image building (essentially through public relations campaigns) which is not accompanied by structural and procedural (operational) changes, is likely to be found ineffective (Evans, 1974; Norris, 1973) and at times even less "image related" experiments have had little effect on crime (Kelling, 1974). In the area of grass-root cooperation, citizens tend to cooperate with the police when their community structure is relatively homogeneous (Cain, 1979) and if they are given the opportunity to influence decisions which might have affected the nature of crime in their community (Voth, 1979). Accordingly, it is anticipated that police teams placed in the commu-

nity will not be effective or fitting for the community unless their involvement and achievements exceed mere "cosmetic changes" (Evans, 1974). While community homogeneity is not readily given to police policy changes, there is room for citizens to have influence in law enforcement services and policy decisions. This is also a most desirable feature of citizen participation being sought out recently as one solution to citizens' alienation.

These three distinct citizen-police cooperation areas were probably best conceptualized in the work of Whitaker (1980), who identified three types of cooperation termed "coproduction:" 1) *Where citizens request assistance from public agents*, here the agency depends on service requests; 2) *Where citizens provide assistance to public agents*, here citizens initiate or are expected to help an agency to perform its work; and 3) *Where citizens and agents interact to adjust each other's service expectations and actions*, here agents and citizens interact to establish a common understanding of citizens' problems and possible approaches for solutions.

Common to the first two types of coproduction (citizen request and citizen assistance) is a concern with "facilitating" the police in carrying out their duties to provide services. This is where citizens provide proper identification, information, use the police to mediate in disputes, make distress calls, and create a climate in which the service recipient is relying on the police as the service provider (of help, direction, protection) and is cooperating with the police to the extent of enabling a civil exchange. The third area of coproduction (citizen/agent interaction) is where the promise of community change prevails. As this seems to be the level of "successful—or ideal—cooperation" it is important to emphasize that cooperation and trust, which of course support the police, depend at least partially on attitudes of citizens.

A FRAMEWORK OF CITIZENS' ATTITUDES TOWARD THE POLICE

Because public support and citizen cooperation with the police are partially based on trust, and trust depends on images, attitudes which express those images are considered critical, particularly when they are negative (O'Brien, 1978). In other words, the images and perceptions citizens have about "the police" will augment or

restrict their inclination to cooperate with police officers and affect the number of offenses to receive police attention (Decker, 1981). Attitudes toward the police include such matters as police efficiency, police toughness, and assistance to citizens. They may also reflect potential cooperation—or lack of it—with the police. The importance of attitudes held by citizens—in this case toward the police—is well documented in theory and research, emphasizing the nature of attitudes that people develop toward social phenomena (Rusinko, Johnson and Hornung, 1978). Probably the most important aspect of attitude formation relevant to our discussion is the functionality of attitudes (e.g., instrumental, adjustive or utilitarian). This is where people develop positive attitudes toward those objects that are useful in meeting their needs (Katz, 1960; Katz and Stotland, 1959) or in establishing [role-model based] social relationships (Smith, Bruner and White, 1956). The assumption is that community attitudes are shaped by personal experience gained through social interaction (Rokeach, 1968). In this context, Scaglione and Condon (1980) found that personal contacts, particularly respondent's perception of the way in which specific police officers have treated them in previous encounters, is a more significant determinant of general attitudes toward the police than are major SES variables such as race or income (see also: Albrecht and Green, 1977; Decker, 1981). It was also found that people change their earlier-held attitudes toward social service agencies contingent upon new information received (Fitzsimmons and Osborn, 1968; Fitzsimmons and Ferb, 1977). A somewhat similar pattern of attitude change was found as one of the key features in social psychological studies on citizen participation.

It is not surprising then to find that positive attitude formation toward the police may be the first step in resolving challenges the police are faced with, such as high crime rates and lack of cooperation within the community (Chackerian, 1974; Latessa and Allen, 1980; O'Brien, 1978; Rusinko et al. 1978; Trojanowicz, 1972). This is an extremely important point because although police (like other social control agencies) may be perceived as an important and necessary function in society, personal encounters with the police may not leave a positive impression on citizens. This is particularly true for law enforcement type citizen-police encounters. Consequently, there may be a conflict between the long range functionality of police for society with the short range dysfunctionality of negative

personal encounters. Since it is much more likely that crime victims had experienced personal contact with the police than non-victims, it is important to also assess the extent to which citizens' attitudes toward the police are affected by whether they were victimized or not. Victims may have a "double negative" experience: they are first victimized and then are "mistreated" by police (ranging from inefficiency to improper personal exchange). Generally, research reported that victims were less likely to be supportive of the police (Block, 1971; Koenig, 1980; Smith and Hawkins, 1973), but some studies describe these relations as inconclusive or nonexistent (Decker, 1981; Thomas and Hyman, 1977). There is, however, no research on the effect of victimization on other citizen attitudes beyond those pertinent to the victimized citizen-police officer (or criminal justice) encounters.

BACKGROUND

As the result of acknowledging the importance of cooperation between the community and police and attempts at improved relations, a number of communities have utilized a variety of community-police models of cooperation such as police/social work crisis intervention teams, car patrol, foot patrol, neighborhood information units, neighborhood watches, follow-ups on calls to police, community meetings, etc. (Decker, 1981; Kelling, 1974; Sweeney, 1982; Thibault and McBride, 1981; Treger, 1981; Washnis, 1976).

It was within this framework that the Israel Police recently initiated several experimental projects aimed at activating the community in coproduction with the police (Whitaker's "type-3" coproduction) to gain further support from the community and to jointly combat crime more effectively. This was in reaction to the conditions of the last 20 years, where the major policing strategy has been car patrolling. Under this strategy, car patrol units were assigned to certain geographical territories which encompassed several blocks or neighborhoods. The units usually patrolled the areas attempting to notice suspicious events, establish presence and be available upon need. Also, being in radio contact, distress calls were relayed to them. This reflected the conditions of "type-1" coproduction (Whitaker, 1980) where police-citizen encounters were limited mostly to such instances when direct police intervention was

deemed necessary and typified by citizens not knowing their police officers. Police intervention was sought as a "cure" and was provided on a reactive basis. Several experimental projects carried out by the Israel police to enhance cooperation with the community reported a positive attitude change toward the police (Friedmann and Sherer, 1983; 1984). This article explores the most recent experimental police-community cooperation strategy (closer to Whitaker's "type-3") aimed at crime reduction and community resident attitudinal changes toward the police and the community. More specifically, this will be done in view of the possible impact that the experiment, time and victimization may have on such attitude changes.

THE PROJECT

Among the several goals of this experimental community policing project with relevance to police-community cooperation were 1) helping citizens with criminal and non-criminal problems; 2) increasing citizens' sense of security; 3) providing counseling, direct help, property protection; 4) improving the police image in the community; 5) improving the officers' knowledge of community problems and needs; 6) reducing crime.

The study reported here focuses on measuring these project goals as they relate to attitudinal change toward the police and the community. This study also examines the possible influence of victimization on these attitudes. This community policing project introduced—on an experimental basis—a new police role into the community, that of the Neighborhood Police Officer (NPO). Fifteen NPOs were assigned to 15 "problem neighborhoods" in a large metropolitan area in Israel. These officers had a wide-range mandate to act in their respective neighborhoods as community representatives in addition to their regularly assigned car patrol personnel. In fact, most of their daily efforts focused around what could be called a "community social work" role rather than a traditional law enforcement role. This process was aimed at strengthening self-help groups, community volunteers, special committees as well as formal and informal networks, all in the effort to improve the general welfare of the community (Janowitz and Suttles, 1978; Naylor, 1983; Washnis, 1976). In essence, NPOs occupied most of

their time with social service agencies, volunteer groups, public agencies, neighborhood committees, schools and community or neighborhood centers. In addition, they were involved with some direct contact with residents (for example: establishing and even running a troubled youth center). Relatively little, if any, of their agenda was occupied by law enforcement activities.

METHODOLOGY

Employing a classical field experimental design (Campbell and Stanley, 1969), NPO intervention in the neighborhoods was measured three times: in the beginning, middle and end of the NPO project (March 1983, October 1983, and April 1984). "Research neighborhoods" were studied as to the effect of NPO intervention on attitudinal change toward the police. Similar measurements were taken from "control neighborhoods" not assigned an NPO.

In Tel Aviv, Israel, four neighborhoods were randomly selected from the 15 neighborhoods that had an NPO (the police chose those out of 55 neighborhoods and defined them as "problem areas") to constitute the "research" sample; three "control" neighborhoods were matched to these according to neighborhood size, number of household units, population size, age structure, employment rate, household size, (ethnic) origin, population changes (birth, migration, and death rates), vehicle ownership, annual income, number of welfare recipients, and citizens' attitudes toward their neighborhood. Data for this was extracted from the Tel-Aviv Municipality Annual Statistics (1982, 1983).

Within these neighborhoods, residents were randomly sampled using household units, number of neighborhood residents, and number of streets in the neighborhood. Samples of citizens were taken three times in six independent measurements and included the following numbers:

	Time-1	Time-2	Time-3
Research Neighborhoods	473	274	173
Control Neighborhoods	126	150	154

The research instruments included two groups of variables. Group A contained variables relevant to measuring attitudes to-

ward the police and their activities in the neighborhood, protective measures taken by residents, residents' sense of security, feelings of vulnerability to criminal behavior, victimization and their reports/complaints to the police. Other items included their appraisal of police performance and their willingness to volunteer and aid the police in various community activities pertaining to crime prevention.

In an attempt to cross validate attitude change and not limit it to attitudes toward the police alone, another set of variables was employed. Group B consisted of 16 variables measuring community attitudes based on Bosworth's (1954) original Community Attitude Scale (items ranged on a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1="strongly agree" to 5="strongly disagree"); items were then reverse recoded so that the higher the mean the "stronger" the response. Following Bosworth's conceptualization, three attitudinal dimensions consisting of "community services," "community integration," and "civic responsibility" were developed. However, principal factor analysis with iteration and an orthogonal (varimax) rotation resulted in six distinct factors, not three as originally expected. (See Table 1)

Table 1
Summary of Factor Analysis (using Principal Component Analysis with Varimax Rotation) and Reliability coefficients for attitude items (T-1, T-2, T-3; n=1,350)

Factor	NAME	PERCENTAGE OF COMMON VARIANCE	RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT	# OF ITEMS
#1	Neighborhood quality	39.6	.787	6
#2	Police image	26.9	.766	4
#3	Community integration	12.0	-.161	4
#4	Civic responsibility	9.8	.406	3
#5	Community development	7.1	.430	2
#6	Community image	4.6	-.281	2

- Factor 1= ("Compared to other neighborhoods this is a good one;"
 "Compared to other neighborhoods this a secure one;"
 "This is a good neighborhood to live in;"
 "Here everyone cares for themselves on account of others;"
 "My neighborhood has some positive characteristics;"
 "I have not much pride in my neighborhood")/6
- Factor 2= ("Does police activity influence your sense of security;"
 "Is police service generally courteous;"
 "Is police service generally effective;"
 "Does police activity impact crime in your neighborhood")/4
- Factor 3= ("We have too many organizations attempting to benefit the neighborhood;"
 "It is better for the neighborhood if everyone minds their own business;"
 "Each of us can advance only if the neighborhood advances;"
 "One should join only organizations furthering one's interests")/4
- Factor 4= ("Long-term development for the neighborhood is better than immediate benefits;"
 "Citizens should satisfy their needs, not those of authorities;"
 "Authorities should examine public sentiment before they carry out public projects")/3
- Factor 5= ("What is good for the neighborhood is good for me;"
 "Living conditions in the neighborhood should improve")/2
- Factor 6= ("Are you—or members of your household—afraid to walk in your neighborhood during dark hours;"
 "Police should be tough with criminals")/2

The questionnaires of T-1 and T-2 for research and control neighborhoods were administered by hired and trained interviewers. They were equipped with maps including streets, building/house numbers, and a list of randomly pre-assigned sample households. Interviews were held at residents' homes, each lasting about 15-20 minutes. The questionnaires of T-3 were administered by trained volunteers organized by the local neighborhood watch units. This mode of data collection was fashioned after Lewin's

(1951) concept of "action research" and was used twice before on similar projects (Friedmann and Sherer, 1984). The extensive use of volunteers ensured both the rapid completion of data gathering as well as increased community involvement (also see Knupp and Georgiopoulos, 1982).

FINDINGS

Analyzing T-1 data for control and research neighborhoods reveals no significant differences between neighborhoods on the overall attitude scale, age structure and gender. This basic similarity allows for differences found in T-2 and T-3 to be attributed to the NPO intervention.

Within the three measurements of T-1, T-2, and T-3, it was important to observe the extent to which residents were aware of police programs in general, the NPO project, NPO projects carried out in their neighborhoods, and whether they had direct contacts with police officers (the question has not specified NPOs) in the last six months. As expected, no significant changes took place in control neighborhoods; however, in research neighborhoods there was a significant increase in resident awareness of the NPO project from T-2 to T-3 ($\chi^2=26.41$; $p < .001$) and a similar increase in knowing that it was carried out in their neighborhood ($\chi^2=10.83$; $p < .001$). In T-3, residents knew more about special police activities in their neighborhoods ($\chi^2=4.31$; $p < .05$) but there was no significant increase in direct contact with the police. This has important implications for attitudinal changes since whatever changes did occur can not be attributed to direct contact with the NPOs. Apparently NPOs have established themselves in the community via agencies and organized activities, not through daily police-citizen contact. This is reasonable as many of these neighborhoods vary in size but include no less than several thousand residents. Statistically it would be unlikely for an NPO to meet (many) citizens. NPO reports also indicate greater agency contact than individual contact. No significant differences were found in T-2 or T-3 between victims and non-victims.

These police awareness variables were contrasted between research and control neighborhoods and, as expected, in T-2 residents of research neighborhoods knew more about the NPO pro-

ject ($\chi^2=4.80$; $p < .028$) and knew it took place in their neighborhoods ($\chi^2=16.63$; $p < .0001$). The same pattern was repeated in T-3. Research neighborhoods were more aware of the NPO project ($\chi^2=8.77$; $p < .003$) and knew it was carried out in their neighborhood ($\chi^2=64.93$; $p < .0001$).

Several interesting findings are worthy of attention. Factor analysis performed on the total sample ($n=1,350$) demonstrated that there is a more refined structure to the community dimensions than originally proposed by Bosworth. This, of course, could be partly due to the adaptation of his items. However, two key factors, one *community* oriented (factor 1), and the other *police* oriented (factor 2), accounted for 63% of the common variance (see Table 1). The four other factors also tap various dimensions of community integration, civic responsibility, community development, and community image. This factor structure (see factor variable composition in Table 1) was consistently maintained in T-1, T-2, and T-3. The variance in neighborhood quality (factor 1) is accounted for by one main effect element: type of neighborhood (i.e., research or control). Also, there is an interaction effect between neighborhood and time (Table 3). When considering over time patterns, research neighborhoods have a lower view of their neighborhoods than do control neighborhoods (Table 2). Although having a lower view of their community, residents in research neighborhoods demonstrated a positive attitudinal change toward their community compared with a decline and restabilization in control neighborhoods. Neighborhood had a main effect as well as acting in interaction with time. Police image (factor 2) portrays an interesting pattern where positive attitudes toward the police in T-1 drop in T-2 and climb again in T-3. This trend is sharper for the research neighborhoods (Table 2). The police image factor showed main effects of neighborhood and time as well as interaction between neighborhood and time. In community integration and civic responsibility (factors 3 and 4) neighborhood and time account for the main effect in the variance; there were no interaction effects. For community development (factor 5) time accounted for main effects with time and neighborhood interaction, and for community image (factor 6) neighborhood accounted for main effects with the same interaction pattern as in the community development factor.

Table 2: Means of Attitude Items Over Time (victims, non-victims, total sample)

Factor	SAMPLE	NPO Neighborhood			Non-NPO Neighborhoods		
		T-1	T-2	T-3	T-1	T-2	T-3
Neighborhood quality							
Factor 1	Victim	3.08	3.22	3.21	3.78	3.51	3.72
	Non-victim	3.09	3.06	3.03	3.65	3.35	3.65
	Total	3.08	3.19	3.17	3.76	3.48	3.71
Police image							
Factor 2	Victim	3.94	2.66	2.94	4.00	2.95	3.30
	Non-victim	3.77	2.62	2.78	3.34	3.09	3.33
	Total	3.82	2.63	2.82	3.44	3.06	3.33
Community integration							
Factor 3	Victim	2.99	3.00	3.23	2.62	3.06	2.87
	Non-victim	2.96	2.96	3.08	2.68	2.94	2.96
	Total	2.96	2.96	3.12	2.67	2.96	2.94
Civic responsibility							
Factor 4	Victim	3.66	3.21	3.37	3.35	3.37	4.23
	Non-victim	3.67	3.07	3.40	3.78	3.34	3.77
	Total	3.67	3.10	3.40	3.72	3.34	3.86
Community development							
Factor 5	Victim	4.50	4.23	3.80	4.66	4.02	3.48
	Non-victim	4.45	4.10	3.96	4.34	4.18	3.33
	Total	4.47	4.12	3.92	4.38	4.15	3.36
Community image							
Factor 6	Victim	3.81	3.33	3.47	4.11	4.19	3.98
	Non-victim	3.81	3.85	3.55	3.91	4.10	4.12
	Total	3.81	3.76	3.53	3.94	4.12	4.09
		NPO Neighborhoods			Non-NPO Neighborhoods		
		T-1	T-2	T-3	T-1	T-2	T-3
n=	Victims	127	47	40	19	27	30
	Non-victims	346	227	133	107	123	124
	Total	473	274	173	126	150	154

Table 3: Summary of ANOVAs for Factors Over Time
Neighborhood and Victimization

FACTOR	SOURCE	d.f.	MS	F	Sig.	
Neighborhood quality Factor 1	<u>Main Effects</u>	4	20.075	28.573	.0001	
	Neighborhood	1	68.875	28.573	.0001	
	Time	2	.534	.760	.468	
	Victim	1	1.966	2.799	.095	
	<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	5	1.640	2.334	.040	
	Neighborhood time	2	3.700	5.266	.005	
	Neighborhood victim	1	.005	.007	.933	
	Time victim	2	.455	.647	.524	
	<u>3-Way Interaction</u>	2	.207	.295	.745	
	Neighborhood time victim	2	.207	.295	.745	
	Explained	11	8.083	11.505	.0001	
	Residual	1338	.703			
	Police image Factor 2	<u>Main Effects</u>	4	64.838	65.808	.0001
		Neighborhood	1	8.387	8.512	.004
Time		2	124.692	126.557	.0001	
Victim		1	4.956	5.030	.025	
<u>2-Way Interaction</u>		5	9.430	9.571	.0001	
Neighborhood time		2	21.218	21.535	.0001	
Neighborhood victim		1	.082	.084	.773	
Time victim		2	1.450	1.471	.230	
<u>3-Way Interaction</u>		2	2.099	2.130	.119	
Neighborhood time victim		2	2.099	2.130	.119	
Explained		11	28.246	28.668	.0001	
Residual		1338	.985			

continued

Community integration					
Factor 3	<u>Main Effects</u>	4	2.728	6.287	.0001
	Neighborhood	1	6.536	15.060	.0001
	Time	2	3.051	7.031	.001
	Victim	1	.489	1.126	.289
	<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	5	.877	2.021	.073
	Neighborhood time	2	2.015	4.643	.010
	Neighborhood victim	1	.290	.669	.413
	Time victim	2	.110	.254	.776
	<u>3-Way Interaction</u>	2	.363	.837	.433
	Neighborhood time victim	2	.363	.837	.433
	Explained	11	1.457	3.357	.0001
n=1,350	Residual	1338	.434		
Civic responsibility					
Factor 4	<u>Main Effects</u>	4	20.435	28.626	.0001
	Neighborhood	1	16.072	22.514	.0001
	Time	2	34.831	48.791	.0001
	Victim	1	.429	.600	.439
	<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	5	2.094	2.933	.012
	Neighborhood time	2	4.143	5.804	.003
	Neighborhood victim	1	.008	.011	.915
	Time victim	2	1.346	1.885	.152
	<u>3-Way Interaction</u>	2	2.902	4.064	.017
	Neighborhood time victim	2	2.902	4.064	.017
	Explained	11	8.910	12.482	.0001
n=1,350	Residual	1338	.714		
Community development					
Factor 5	<u>Main Effects</u>	4	35.350	47.794	.0001
	Neighborhood	1	9.053	12.240	.0001
	Time	2	54.978	74.333	.0001
	Victim	1	.473	.639	.424

continued

	<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	5	3.589	4.852	.0001
	Neighborhood time	2	8.744	11.823	.0001
	Neighborhood victim	1	.331	.448	.503
	Time victim	2	.381	.515	.598
	<u>3-Way Interaction</u>	2	1.607	2.173	.114
	Neighborhood time victim	2	1.607	2.173	.114
	Explained	11	14.778	19.980	.0001
n=1,350	Residual	1338	.740		
Community image					
Factor 6	<u>Main Effects</u>	4	8.589	12.965	.0001
	Neighborhood	1	30.519	46.068	.0001
	Time	2	1.899	2.867	.057
	Victim	1	1.524	2.300	.130
	<u>2-Way Interaction</u>	5	3.059	4.617	.0001
	Neighborhood time	2	3.659	5.577	.004
	Neighborhood victim	1	2.568	3.876	.049
	Time victim	2	2.834	4.278	.014
	<u>3-Way Interaction</u>	2	1.521	2.296	.101
	Neighborhood time victim	2	1.521	2.296	.101
	Explained	11	4.790	7.231	.0001
n=1,350	Residual	1338	.662		

One survey item ["in the last 12 months have you been a victim to one or more of the following crimes: break-in or attempted break-in to residence or business, personal violence, property theft, auto theft (including parts and/or theft from cars)"] was used to define victimization. A victim in the study was defined as any resident who responded positively to any one or more of these categories.² According to this classification the following victimization frequency (in percents) resulted:

	Time-1	Time-2	Time-3
Resident Neighborhoods	26.8	17.2	23.1
Control Neighborhoods	15.1	18.0	19.5

These figures are somewhat lower than those reported in the U.S. (Block, 1971). Although no significant differences on victimization appear in T-2 and T-3, the measurement in T-1 was significantly different for research and control groups. Despite the fact that neighborhoods were matched as closely as possible, they differ significantly on victimization ($p < .001$). This is understandable only when we realize that the police had selected NPO neighborhoods because they were "problem areas," hence the likelihood they will have higher rates of crime and victimization in comparison to control neighborhoods. The victimization variable is difficult to control in conventional attitudinal research of the sort conducted here.

In order to single out the relative contribution of variables to the variance between research and control neighborhoods and to observe which variables are the "most important" as well as to see their discriminating power, a discriminant function analysis was performed on the six factors, gender, age structure, victimization and complaints. As expected, factor 1 (neighborhood quality) came out as the most powerful predictor, and this set of variables classified correctly over 65% of the cases, which is 15% more than could have been expected by chance alone. It is not surprising that gender and age were not important contributors since communities were well matched on these variables; however, victimization has not showed up as a variable having any impact on this classification (see Table 4).

Table 4: Results of Discriminant Function Analysis of Independent Variables Over Neighborhood

<u>Variable/Factor</u>	<u>Function 1</u>
Neighborhood quality (Factor 1)	.74688
Community image (Factor 6)	.47730
Community development (Factor 5)	-.44107
Community integration (Factor 3)	-.24601
Civic responsibility (Factor 4)	.15543
Gender	-.12920
Victim	.06440
Police image (Factor 2)	.05669
Complaint	.03585
Age	-.00183
p < .00001	

DISCUSSION

First, it seems that whatever has been achieved in terms of attitudinal change due to the NPO project in the research neighborhood was not in way of direct personal one-on-one interaction between citizens and police officers. This suits well the mode of operation enacted by NPOs. The factor and reliability analyses singled out two opposing trends: residents in research neighborhoods improved their attitudes toward the community while their attitudes regarding the police declined. While type of neighborhood and time affected this attitudinal change, victimization influenced attitude change toward the police as victims had greater fluctuations than non-victims independent of the type of neighborhood.

Interestingly enough, the discriminant function analysis demonstrated that factor 1 (neighborhood quality) was the one single variable/factor contributing most to classifying correctly research and control neighborhoods. This raises several interesting questions: 1) Why the opposing trends of (increases in) community and (decrease in) police attitudes? 2) Why had victimization affected only attitudes toward the police? 3) Was the community factor a "masking" effect for victimization?

Before responding to these questions, a key concern about the setting of this research has to be addressed. Specifically, the extent to which the findings are "culture bound" and specific to the Israeli context must be considered. This question is important because a positive response to it may limit the generalizability of this study and disallow contrast with similar research done in other countries. Although there may be certain cultural elements unique to the Israeli scene, there does not seem to be one specific factor that would prohibit such a comparison. Non-western and non-democratic societies may pose such a problem because of the different status and role of police, but Israel has a similar occupational prestige for police officers as other western countries; it has a centralized police like that of England and a pluralistic society like that of the United States. It only seems that Israel, with its small size, can serve as a "laboratory" for other larger societies. Moreover, the sampling, instruments, design, execution of the study all pertain to a general perception citizens hold regarding the police and seem to be free of cultural contamination.

Having set aside issues of research site selectivity, some partial responses to the questions raised above were provided by additional analyses which demonstrated no correlation between victimization and factor 1 (neighborhood quality). Also, when factor 1 was taken out of the equation, victimization (or, for that matter, the equation structure) did not change in importance.

The first two questions are interesting not only in terms of their opposing trends but even more so when these findings are compared with previous research which showed consistent improvement of attitudes toward the community *and* the police in neighborhoods executing police community projects (Friedmann and Sherer, 1983; 1984). It may well be that the experimental design (not utilized in previous research) tapped into genuine attitude change not achieved in previous research. Also, in the present research there is a clear indication that residents were aware of the police project while no such information is known in respect to previous research. Possibly, the opposing factor patterns indicate that attitudes toward the police are part of a greater set of attitudes toward the community. Also, the "control" effect of the design employed in this study resulted in somewhat different factoring components than in previous studies, which may account for the difference in attitudes expressed and changed.

Conceivably, since NPOs had a community orientation and worked more with agencies and organization and less with individuals, the positive attitude toward the community is reflective of that. Since residents in research neighborhoods knew about the NPO project, and since from the close monitoring it seemed to be well received in the communities, it is probable that the more negative attitudes toward the police reflect residents' *general* attitudes toward the police *not necessarily* toward the NPOs. This is acceptable because the current study operationalized attitudes toward the police and police officers, never specifically toward NPOs. If this is the case, how is it that research neighborhoods which "suffered" from a high crime rate and were perceived as more problematic also showed a more positive attitude change toward the community?

One explanation to reconcile this finding is to view the NPOs as "order maintenance" agents focusing on community policing, not on law enforcement (see Wilson, 1968). In this instance, citizens view their neighborhoods more positively from the community per-

spectives (to which the NPOs contribute), but since they are still highly victimized, there is no reason for them to view regular police more positively. The victimization dimension seems to have affected the attitudes toward the police but when looked for in other attitudes was not found. Moreover, analysis showed that the community factor is the single contributing element to discriminating between research and control neighborhoods, and victimization had no importance at all. It may be concluded that the intervention of NPOs had an impact on citizens' attitudes, independent of victimization. Since some research indicates that such a relationship was not evident, or at best was inconclusive, the present research shows some impact of victimization but not one of a major magnitude.

The seemingly contradictory findings point to one other possibility. If NPOs had any impact, it was in strengthening the "community" component in citizens—as reflected by their attitudes—not that of law enforcement. This is reasonable to assume since a project like this, being in effect for one year, did not have enough time to influence any major structural changes in the community. It is possible, however, that the NPOs started what Wilson and Kelling (1982) call "the reinforcement of the informal control mechanisms of the community itself." It still remains to be seen whether, in fact, NPOs achieve this stabilization of informal social control elements, but from what is known about their mode of operation they are certainly in the proper direction. It is up to future research to determine any lasting impact on the community.

This research has produced some important findings but also raises more questions pertinent to police-community relations. What are some implications for police work and police long-range planning? The historical fluctuation between police emphasis on order maintenance on one hand and law enforcement on the other seems to aspire to gain a new delicate balance in the Israeli NPO experiment. Clearly, NPOs were given and developed the mandate of order maintenance because of the unique police structure where only one police officer—NPO—is assigned to a given neighborhood. With the current experiment defined as "successful" by the Israeli police, 80 such positions are now to be filled in the years 1984 to 1989, thereby enabling the Israeli police to promote this community component in addition to and without "sacrificing" its law enforcement capacity.

What will be needed in the future is a close monitoring of the development of these "uniformed social/community workers" and their ability to secure cooperation with their law enforcing peers. Although some possible signs of misunderstanding and tension between these two police roles are already observable, they have not "matured" enough to warrant a closer look. NPOs are to be studied in the future as to their prolonged effect on the community, and citizens' attitudes ought to be studied specifically in the NPO context, not only in the context of general police. The NPO role is very desirable to many police officers. The newness of this role provides the opportunity to mold it to respond to the felt community deficiency of the Israeli Police. Future tensions between these two roles are not to be shied from, nor should they be taken lightly. Since the NPO is currently a supplemental policing strategy, future studies should focus on the NPOs' interagency effectiveness as well as intra-agency efficiency. Closer attention should also be given to the characteristics of relationships the police professional develops with other social service professionals.

NOTES

¹ It also shapes the attitudes of police officers as well: see, for example, Friedmann, R. "Transformation of Roles for Police Officers: Perceptions of a Community-Oriented Role." *Police Studies* 1986, 9(2):68-77.

² A similar variable was composed for filing complaints about victimization. A complainant was defined as a resident responding positively to one or more of the four complaint items (regarding the four victimization items). No significant differences were found between neighborhoods on this scale.

REFERENCES

Albrecht, S.L. and M. Green "Attitudes Toward the Police and the Larger Attitude Complex: Implications for Police/Community Relationships." *Criminology*, 1977, 15:67-86.

Block, R. "Fear of Crime and Fear of the Police." *Social Problems* 1971, 19:91-101.

Bosworth, C. "A Study of the Development and the Validation of Citizens' Attitudes Toward Progress and Some Variables Related Thereto." Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan Microfilm, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1954.

Cain, M. "Trends in the Sociology of Police Work." *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 1979, 7:143-167.

Campbell, D.T. and J.C. Stanley *Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Chackerian, R. "Police Professionalism and Citizen Evaluation: A Preliminary Look." *Public Administration Review*, 1974, 34 (2):141-148.

Decker, S.H. "Citizen Attitudes Toward the Police: A Review of Past Findings and Suggestions for Future Policy," *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 1981, 9:80-87.

Eisenberg, T., R. Fosen and A. Glickman *Police Community Action: A Program for Change in Police Community Behavior Patterns*. N.Y.: Praeger, 1973.

Evans, P. *The Police Revolution*. London: Allen and Unwin, 1974.

Fink, J. and L.G. Sealy "The Community and the Police—Conflict or Cooperation?" *Contemporary Sociology*, 1975, 4(5):481-487.

Fitzsimmons, S. and H. Osborn "The Impact of Public Affairs on Television Documentaries," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1968, 32: 379-399.

Fitzsimmons, S. and T. Ferb "Developing A Community Attitudes Assessment Scale." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1977, 41: 356-378.

Friedmann, R. and M. Sherer (1983) "Activation of Community Resources in Israel." Paper presented at the 35th annual meeting of ACJS. Denver, Colorado, November 9-13, 1983.

Friedmann, R. and M. Sherer "The Effects of Different Policing Strategies on Citizens' Attitudes." *Canadian Police College Journal*, 1984, 8:27-35.

Janowitz, M. and G. Suttles "The Social Ecology of Citizenship." In R.C. Sarri and Y. Hasenfeld (eds.) *The Management of Human Services*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978, pp. 80-104.

Katz, D. "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes." *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 1960, 24:163-204.

Katz, D. and E. Stotland "A Preliminary Statement to a Theory of Attitude Structure and Change." In S. Koch (ed.), *Psychology: A Study of a Science*. Vol. 3. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959, pp. 423-475.

Kelling, G.L. et al. *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A Summary Report*. Washington, D.C.: Police Foundation, 1974.

Kelly, R.M. and R. Shellow "On Improving Police Community Relations." *Journal of Social Issues*, 1975, 31(1):57-98.

Koenig, D. "The Effects of Criminal Victimization and Judicial or Police Contacts on Public Attitudes Toward Local Police." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 1980, 8:243-249.

Knapp, W. and J. Georgiopoulos "Methodology to Clients: An Eclectic Social Casework." *Social Work*, 1982, 27(3):279-281.

Kramer, R. and H. Specht (eds.) *Community Organization Practice*, 3rd Ed., N.J.: Englewood Cliffs, 1983.

Latessa, E. and H. Allen "Using Citizens to Prevent Crime: An Example of Deterrence and Community Involvement." *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 1980, 8(1):69-74.

Lewin, K. *Field Theory in Social Science*. New York: Harper and Row, 1951.

Murphy, C. "Community Policing: Problems, Prospects and Research Possibilities." Paper presented at the 36th annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Cincinnati, OH, November 9-13, 1984.

Naylor, H. "Volunteers: Resources for Human Services." In R. Kramer and H. Specht (eds.), *Community Organization Practice*, 3rd ed., N.J.: Englewood Cliffs, 1983, pp. 154-164.

Nelson, H. "The Defenders: A Case Study of an Informal Police Organization." *Social Problems*, 1967, 15(1):127-147.

Norris, D. *Police Community Relations*. Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath, 1973.

O'Brien, J. "Attitudes Toward Police." *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 1978, 6(3):303-310.

Reasons, C.E. and B.A. Wirth "Police Community Relations Units: A National Survey." *Journal of Social Issues*, 1975, 31(1):27-45.

Robinson, H. "The Future of Policing." Panelist, 36th annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Cincinnati, OH, November 7-11, 1984.

Rokeach, M. *Beliefs, Attitudes and Values*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Rosenbaum, D. and D. Lewis "Community Crime Prevention in an Urban Context: Does it Make a Difference?" Paper presented at the 36th annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Cincinnati, OH, November 7-11, 1984.

Rusinko, W., K. Johnson and C. Hornung "The Importance of Police Contact in the Formulation of Youths' Attitudes Toward Police." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 1978, 6:53-67.

Scaglione, R. and R. Condon "Attitudes Toward City Police." *Criminology*, 1980, 17:485-494.

Sharp, E. B. (1978) "Citizen Organizations in Policing Issues and Crime Preventions: Incentives for Participation." *Journal of Voluntary Action Research* Vol. VII, p. 45-58.

Singer, H.A. "Police Action—Community Action." *Journal of Social Issues*, 1975, 31(1):99-106.

Smith, M.B., J.S. Bruner and R.W. White *Opinions and Personality*. New York, Wiley, 1956.

Smith, P. and R. Hawkins "Victimization, Type of Citizen-Police Contacts and Attitudes Toward the Police." *Law and Society Review*, 1973, 8:135-152.

Sweeney, E. *The Public and the Police*, Springfield, ILL: Charles C. Thomas, 1982.

Tel Aviv Municipality, Center for Economic and Social Research *Physical, Demographic and Socio-Economic Characteristics of City Neighborhoods*, Tel Aviv, 1982.

Tel Aviv Municipality, Center for Economic and Social Research *Tel Aviv Statistical Yearbook*, Tel Aviv, 1982.

Thibault, E. and B. McBride "Institutionalizing the Community Police Model in Canalville: A Case Study." *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 1981, 9(4):390-397.

Thomas, C. and J. Hyman "Perceptions of Crime, Fear of Victimization, and Public Perception of Police Performance." *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 1977, 5:305-317.

Treger, H. *The Police Social Work Team*. Springfield, ILL: Charles C. Thomas, 1975.

Treger, H. "Police Social Work Cooperation: Problems and Issues." *Social Casework*, 1981, 62(7):426-433.

Trojanowicz, R. "Police-Community Relations: Problems and Process." *Criminology*, 1972, 9(4):401-423.

Trojanowicz, R. "An Evaluation of A Neighborhood Foot Patrol Program." *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 1983, 11(4):410-419.

U.S. Department of Justice. *Standards for the Administration of Juvenile Justice*. Washington, D.C., July, 1980.

Voth, D. "Problems in the Evaluation of Community Development Efforts." In E. Blakely (ed.) *Community Development Research*, N.Y.: Human Sciences Press, 1979, pp. 153-174.

Wandersman, A. (1981) "A Framework for Participation in Community Organization." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences* Vol. XVII, p. 27-58

Wandersman, A. and G.A. Giamartino (1980) "Community and Individual Difference Characteristics as Influences on Initial Participation," *American Journal of Community Psychology* Vol. VIII No. II, p. 211-222.

Washnis, G. *Citizen Involvement in Crime Prevention*. Lexington, MASS: Lexington Books. 1976.

Whisenand, P.M., J.L. Cline and G.T. Felkenes (eds) *Police Community Relations: Readings in the Development of Effective Environmental Relations*. Pacific Palisades, CA: Goodyear, 1974.

Whitaker, G. "Coproduction: Citizen Participation in Service Delivery." *Public Administration Review*, 1980, 40(3):240-246.

Wilson, J.Q. *Varieties of Police Behavior: The Management of Law and Order in Eight Communities*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Wilson, J.Q. and G.L. Kelling "Broken Windows" *The Atlantic Monthly*, 1982 (March):31-32.