Tajfel, H. and Turner, J. C. 1986. "The social psychology of intergroup behavior". In *Psychology of Intergroup Relations,* S. Worchel and W. G. Austin (eds), 7–24. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Tracy, K. and Tracy, S. J. (1998). "Rudeness at 911: Reconceptualizing face and face attack". *Human Communication Research* 25: 225–251.

Trinch, S. 2001. "The advocate as gatekeeper: The limits of politeness in protectice order interviews with Latina survivors of domestic abuse." *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 5: 475–506.

USA Patriot Act (2001). "United and strenghting America by providing appropiate tools required to intercept and obstruct terroism, Act of 2001". *United States Congress,* H.R. 3162.

Van den Bulck, J. 1998. " 'Sideshow Bobby:' Images of the police in Flemish film and television". *Public Voices* 4: 1–8.

Ward, S. A., Bluman, D. L. and Dauria, A. F. 1982. "Rhetorical sensitivity recast: Theoretical assumptions of an informal interpersonal rhetoric". *Communication Quarterly* 30: 189–195.

Weatheritt, M. 1988. "Community policing: Rhetoric or reality". In *Community Policing: Rhetoric or reality?* J. R. Greene and S. D. Mastrofski (eds), 225–238. New York: Praeger.

White, C. H. and Burgoon, J. K. 2001. "Adaptation and communicative design: Patterns of interaction in truthful and deceptive conversations". *Human Communication Research* 27: 9–37.

White, M. F. and Menke, B. A. 1982. "Assessing the mood of the public toward the police: Some conceptual issues". *Criminal Justice* 10: 211–230.

CHAPTER 2

Community policing as communication reform

Edward R. Maguire and William Wells
George Mason University, USA /
Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, USA

The community policing movement represents the most significant era in police organizational change since the introduction of the telephone, automobile, and two way radio (Reiss 1992). In the United States and abroad, community policing is influencing the way police professionals, scholars, policy makers, and citizens think about the role of police in society. While community policing is a complex movement with multiple goals voiced by a diverse array of reformers and supporters, implicit in much of the reform rhetoric is the need to improve communications in the internal and external environments of police organizations. This chapter begins by providing a brief introduction to the community policing movement. Next, it shows how communication themes play an implicit or explicit role in much of the reform rhetoric. It then examines community policing within a conceptual framework forged from three related lines of research and theory: organization theory, organizational communications, and public relations. The chapter concludes by assessing the available evidence on the influence of community policing on internal and external communication patterns in police organizations.

A brief history of community policing

While the roots of the community policing movement extend throughout the history of police (Greene, 2000; Walker 1980), most analysts attribute its birth to the convergence of several prominent social forces in the United States during the 1960s (Greene, 2000). Police historians have noted that until the early 1960s, American policing was a somewhat "closed" institution. State and

federal politicians did not routinely run for elective office on platforms related to crime and policing. The average American citizen probably had little knowledge of what police work entailed. Courts did not devote much energy toward scrutiny of the police. In all, policing remained closed to the eyes and ears of the public and their representatives (Walker 1980). For instance, during their landmark study of American policing in the early 1960s, a group of prominent legal scholars commissioned by the American Bar Foundation was surprised to learn about the wide-ranging discretion that police officers have when making such important decisions as whether to make an arrest, use force, detain a suspect, or conduct a search (Goldstein 1960; Walker 1980).

Several circumstances in the 1960s converged to expose American policing to the attention and scrutiny of external audiences. Widespread discontent about the military action in Vietnam, the civil rights movement, and other social forces led a generation of youth to rebel against the conventions of mainstream society (Barlow & Barlow 2000; Walker 1980). Police are the gatekeepers of mainstream society, and much of the civil unrest of this period brought the police face-to-face with citizens expressing various forms of protest, from peaceful civil disobedience to violent rebellion and rioting (Walker 1980).

Police use of force and mistreatment of minority citizens became a prominent theme during the 1960s. Research conducted during that period showed that many police officers held racist attitudes toward minorities (Bayley & Mendelsohn 1969; Reiss 1971: 147; Westley 1970: 99–104). Several of the riots that engulfed American cities occurred in the aftermath of police actions such as shootings, traffic stops, or raids occurring in minority neighborhoods (Walker 1980). The National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders (1968) found that "deep hostility between police and ghetto communities" was a primary determinant of the urban riots that it studied. Stark (1972) chose the term "police riots" to describe many of these confrontations between police and citizens.

The growth of television news meant that many of these encounters between police and citizens were now broadcast to millions of homes on the evening news (Walker 1980). Classic news stories of the era captured images of police officers using excessive force against citizens. Shocking images of the police beating citizens emerged out of civil rights marches in Birmingham and Selma, Alabama, outside of the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago, and in numerous other cities (Barlow & Barlow 2000; Greene 2000; Walker 1980). For the first time, Americans were exposed to massive coverage of the police beating those who looked very much like their children, their brothers, their sisters, and their friends.

The police also began to face significant challenges from the courts. The U.S. Supreme Court, under Chief Justice Earl Warren, began to closely scrutinize the activities of the police. In several "landmark" cases, the Court restricted the powers of the police to conduct searches, obtain confessions, or prevent detainees from consulting with an attorney. While civil libertarians praised this "due process revolution," others complained loudly that these new rules interfered with the ability of the police to fight crime (see Cassell & Fowles 1998; Leo 1996).

Finally, rising crime rates during the 1960s also began to cast doubts on the effectiveness of the police. Between 1958 and 1969, the number of serious crimes recorded by police in American cities more than tripled.[1] Taking into account changes in population, total crime rates nearly tripled, increasing from 13.3 to 30.5 per thousand population. Percentage increases in total crime rates were outpaced by increases in violent crime rates, which more than tripled, rising from approximately 1.5 to 4.8 violent crimes per thousand population. Thus, while Americans were questioning the fairness and equity of the police, rising crime rates led them also to doubt the effectiveness of the police at preventing and responding to crime (Hindelang 1974: 105–107).

All of these factors combined to produce an epidemic crisis of legitimacy for the American police. From 1968 to 1971, three national commissions recommended sweeping reforms: the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals, and the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice. For instance, the President's Commission (1967) recommended that police agencies establish community relations units and citizen advisory committees, improve training on community relations, expand the recruitment of minorities, increase training and education opportunities, adopt policies limiting the use of firearms by officers, and dozens of other suggestions designed to improve the relationships between police and communities. While it is difficult to pinpoint exactly the birth of the community policing movement, most police scholars start with the crises of the 1960s and the resulting recommendations made by these prominent national commissions. Implicit in many of those recommendations was the need for communication reform in police organizations, both internally and externally.

The crisis of confidence in police as an institution was neither restricted to the American police, nor to the 1960s. Nearly every nation in the world, regardless of form of government, size, or location, has experienced an important crisis in the relationship between police and citizens, often as a result of

police action, and often resulting in collective violence. For example, on April 13 1981, tensions between the police and minorities in Brixton, one of London's most impoverished and ethnically diverse neighborhoods, reached a climax that resulted in widespread rioting, looting, and vandalism. Dozens of police, citizens, and firefighters were injured in the ensuing melee. A Commission established to study the incident blamed a pattern of aggressive policing and poor police community relations for setting off the riots. Sir Kenneth Newman, Commissioner of the London Metropolitan Police, turned to the principles of community policing to prevent such occurrences from happening again (Sparrow, Moore & Kennedy 1990). Bayley (1985) has noted that across nations and throughout history, collective violence is often the spark that ignites the flame of police reform.

The next decade saw a number of further developments that laid the groundwork for the emergence of community policing. Evaluation research cast doubt on the three core strategies of policing: random preventive patrol, retrospective criminal investigations, and rapid response to calls for service from citizens (Bayley 1994). Collectively, these evaluations led numerous police leaders, scholars, and reformers to question the basic strategies of policing. A police research industry was born, with doctoral programs producing researchers specializing in the study of the police, and the creation of influential think tanks like the Police Foundation and the Police Executive Research Forum. Police agencies began to experiment with numerous reforms. Some of the most prominent reforms during the 1970s included college education programs for police officers, an increased emphasis on hiring females and minorities, efforts to improve the relationships between police and communities, and new strategies designed to improve the ability of the police to solve community problems.

Early evaluations of these efforts were less than promising. For instance, several communities instituted "team policing" strategies in which police officers were assigned expanded responsibility for improving conditions in certain impoverished and socially disorganized areas with a high volume of criminal activity. Community policing is a direct descendant of team policing, with some important differences that we will explore shortly (Walker 1993). Although the programs varied by city, they all shared three features: a team assigned to a specific geographic area, improved communication and cooperation among the members of a team, and improved communication between the team and the community (Sherman, Milton & Kelly 1973). Research showed that these efforts failed to meet their goals for three reasons: (1) mid-managers

sabotaged the efforts because they were threatened by the autonomy of the teams; (2) other patrol officers refused to cooperate because they were jealous of the team's "elite" status within the organization; and (3) dispatch technology was insufficient to allow team officers to remain within their assigned areas (Sherman, Milton & Kelly 1973).

In addition, many agencies created community relations units to improve relationships between police and communities. The work of these units was largely symbolic and decoupled from the day-to-day encounters between police and citizens on the streets (Ahern 1972; Bordua & Tifft 1971; Geary 1975). Most commentators concluded that these units were ineffective at improving relationships between police and communities. According to Moore (1992), officers in the units were ridiculed by other officers for not doing 'real' police work. Assigning community relations to specialized units isolated it functionally, thus relieving others of the responsibility for improving community relations. Finally, the units were often unable to effectively communicate or disseminate the information they collected from the community to others inside the agency (Moore 1992). Although team policing and community relations units were not successful, they continued to lay the foundation for the community policing movement.

Throughout the 1970s, police agencies and researchers continued to institute reforms designed to improve the legitimacy and effectiveness of the police. By the end of the 1970s, two influential articles appeared that gave direction to the fledgling community policing movement. In 1979, Herman Goldstein sketched the foundation for a new theory of police effectiveness which he called Problem-Oriented Policing. Goldstein recommended that police agencies should stop treating "incidents" as their primary unit of work. Since incidents are often symptoms of one or more underlying problems, Goldstein argued, police should work in collaboration with citizens to identify and solve problems rather than simply responding to incidents. In 1982, James Q. Wilson and George Kelling (1982) published their influential article, "Broken Windows" in *Atlantic Monthly*. They claimed that the police have become so narrowly focused on serious crime that they tend to view other important community problems, such as disorder, as outside the scope of their responsibilities. Wilson and Kelling used broken windows as a metaphor for neighborhood disorder, arguing that unchecked disorder is an open invitation to further disorder and more serious crime. With the community policing movement still in its relative infancy, these two articles served an important role at a time when scholars and practitioners were struggling to redefine the proper

role of police in a democratic society. While there were clear differences between the two reform strategies, both shared some important similarities: first, police need to expand their mandate beyond crime to include disorder and other persistent community problems; second, in responding to these problems, police need to be proactive rather than simply reactive. Both combined with other forces (such as organizational change reforms in the public and private sectors) to stimulate the birth of the community policing movement. Police departments were experimenting with these and other strategies for improving relationships with communities and reducing disorder, crime, and fear. Something was clearly afoot in policing.

Police departments continued to experiment with community policing strategies throughout the 1980s, and their work began to occupy a larger place in police-related scholarship. In 1983, Robert Trojanowicz established the National Center for Community Policing at Michigan State University. The Center provided training and technical assistance to police agencies around the world. In 1986, Skolnick and Bayley released *The New Blue Line*, which highlighted community policing efforts in six American cities. In Greene and Mastrofski's 1988 book, *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality*, several authors addressed the extent to which police agencies were truly embracing its substance, or merely latching on to its "feel-good" appeal. Shortly thereafter, Goldstein expanded his earlier thoughts in his popular 1990 book, *Problem Oriented Policing*. By the end of the 1980s, community policing had gained ground rapidly.

By the early 1990s, community policing was becoming a household term. It occupied a major role in President Clinton's election platform and the enactment of the 1994 Crime Act. At the dawn of a new millenium, the community policing movement rages on. Thousands of police agencies throughout the United States now claim to practice it (Maguire, et al. 1997; Wycoff 1994). While researchers are still attempting to determine the validity of these claims, the majority of changes appear to fall within three domains: improved relationships and partnerships with communities, the adoption of proactive problem-solving techniques, and the institution of various internal changes in police organizations, which Bayley (1994) refers to as organizational adaptation. Community partnerships, problem-solving, and organizational adaptation are the major components of community policing. The first two of these components are externally focused change efforts which concentrate on the relationship between police and external entities. The third component, organizational adaptation, is inwardly focused, concentrating on changes internal to the organization, such as structure, policy, or culture (Zhao 1996).

While communication reform is not the sine qua non of community policing, it is, nonetheless, inherent in both its internally and externally focused domains of change. Police organizations attempt to forge or improve community partnerships largely through communications efforts. These take many forms, from asking patrol officers to "stop and talk" to residents and business owners, to the installment of substations and community outposts. Community meetings, citizen advisory councils, and massive ad campaigns are all efforts to improve partnerships between police and communities. The core of problem-solving is also communication between police and citizens. Goldstein (1990), the pioneer of problem-oriented policing, views this as one of the central features of problem-solving: allowing citizens to nominate the problems to be solved and participate in the design of the solutions. Finally, improved communication is inherent in nearly every organizational adaptation strategy, from the adoption of total quality management to the flattening of organizational hierarchies. Much of the communication reform inherent in this sphere of community policing involves internal organizational communications such as those between officers, or between officers and supervisors. Reformers argue that these improved channels of communication will result in more efficient and effective service delivery, allowing line officers the opportunity to provide more customized services to their communities.

This chapter examines the role of communication reform in the community policing movement. Just as the community policing movement can be characterized by externally and internally focused change, organizational communications also have external and internal dimensions. Therefore, we examine external and internal communications separately. External communications are those between representatives of the police organization and its various external constituents, from citizens and business owners to other city agencies. In the External Communication Reform section that follows, we examine the communication reforms occurring within the externally focused elements of community policing.[2] Internal communications are those falling largely within the domain of community policing which we describe as organizational adaptation (Bayley 1994). They involve all of the various attempts that police managers employ to improve communications within the organization: between officers, civilian employees, supervisors, mid-level managers, and administrators.

External communication reform

Police organizations, like other public service bureaucracies, engage in a great deal of boundary spanning behavior. Line level police officers are among a class of workers that Lipsky (1980) describes as street-level bureaucrats. A notable characteristic of such workers is that they spend a great deal of their time engaging in communications and other transactions with clients or constituents outside the organization. Thus police officers span the boundary between the organization and its environment. While the nature of this boundary spanning behavior differs according the individual worker's hierarchical position in the organization, most police officials must engage in behaviors at the boundary. For instance, although the work of police chiefs involves the expression of leadership within the organization, much of their work consists of symbolic gestures to those in the external environment (Mastrofski 2001). These communications occur at multiple levels with varying degrees of complexity and formality, from individual level communications between a police officer and a citizen, to complex symbolic impression management efforts undertaken by public relations offices within the organization.

External communications are expected to play a central role in community policing. We thus focus attention on how organizations manage the transfer of information with their environments (Sutcliffe 2001). Despite the lack of attention from organizational theories to the transmission of information between organizations and their environments (Sutcliffe 2001), a predominant theoretical framework for understanding organizational communications can be found in public relations, a field concerned largely with the outward flow of information and with relationships between organizations and their publics.[3]

Like many other young disciplines, public relations has struggled to define itself and to establish guiding theories. According to Grunig and Hunt (1984:7), public relations can be understood as "the management of communication between an organization and its publics." It is concerned with management "that establishes and maintains mutually beneficial relationships between an organization and the publics on whom its success or failure depends" (Cutlip, Center and Broom 1994:6). This relational perspective of public relations focuses attention on the importance of establishing and maintaining relationships between organizations and their publics rather than simply manipulating public opinion (Bruning & Ledingham 1999). According to Ledingham and Bruning (1998), desirable relationships between organizations and their publics demonstrate mutual respect and provide benefits to all parties involved.

Furthermore, a primary purpose of public relations is to enable communication, acceptance, and cooperation between organizations and their publics; factors essential to the organization's survival (Bruning & Ledingham 1999).

Many police personnel serve in a boundary-spanning role in which they interact frequently with the public. As liaisons between the organization and external groups, they are implicit agents of public relations (Grunig & Hunt 1984). Therefore, public relations theory provides a useful perspective for viewing both the way police communicate with citizens and the purposes and effects of that communication.

Public relations models

In 1984, Grunig and Hunt delineated four models of public relations that serve as a framework for understanding external organizational communications and for guiding public relations research. The models are useful for describing and explaining how public relations is practiced. Furthermore, they are normative in that they predict effective public relations (Grunig & Grunig 1992; Langworthy 1986). They are formed by cross classifying the direction (one-way vs. two-way) and the degree of symmetry (symmetric vs. asymmetric) in the communication (see Table 2.1).

Table 2.1 Public relations models

One-Way Asymmetric	Two-Way Asymmetric
One-Way Symmetric	Two-Way Symmetric

One-way communication disseminates information like a monologue, from sender to receiver, while two-way communication involves information exchange, more like a dialogue. A defining element of two-way communication is the opportunity it presents for mutual change to occur. One-way communication, on the other hand, allows an organization to control and dominate a public. Grunig and Hunt (1984:23) explain that feedback is not synonymous with two-way communication because feedback can be used by a source "to control a receiver's behavior." Research is another feature that distinguishes two-way communication from one-way communication; research plays a greater role in two-way communication (Grunig & Hunt 1984). As part of two-way communication, research can be used to accomplish a variety of goals: to

determine what publics will embrace, to gauge how publics have reacted to messages that the organization has sent, and to understand how the organization and its environment perceive and affect one another. This latter type of research can ultimately be used to formulate policies and practices that improve the organization and help it to better serve its publics.

The symmetry of communication is important because it concerns the degree to which the organization adapts to or cooperates with its environment (Grunig 1984). The goal of asymmetrical communication is to change the environment while leaving the organization unchanged. The purpose of symmetrical communication, on the other hand is to modify the relationship between the organization and its environment. With symmetric communication publics can change organizations and organizations can change publics. This form of external communication can build and enhance relationships because it entails "creating a sense of openness, trust, and understanding between the organization and the key public, as well as a willingness to negotiate, collaborate, and mediate solutions to issues of concern to both the organization and critical publics" (Bruning & Ledingham 1999: 158). The process of symmetric communication appears to be in congruence with the goals of community policing.

Two-way symmetric communication is often prescribed as the most effective model of external communication because both the organization and its publics benefit. The purpose of this model is to establish mutual understandings between an organization and its environment. Communication takes the form of a dialogue with the possibility that both the organization and its publics will change. Successful communication in this model does not necessarily require mutual change because the communication process constitutes an end in itself (Kent & Taylor 1998). Using dialogue, the organization can enhance its legitimacy and autonomy through interactions with its publics, including those that pose both threats and opportunities to the organization (Sutcliffe 2001). The language used by public relations theorists to describe two-way symmetric communication and the rhetoric used by community policing reformers is strikingly similar. The public relations process of mutual recognition and dialogue is a central component of community policing. For instance, according to Skolnick and Bayley (1986:212), "police–community reciprocity means that police must genuinely feel, and genuinely communicate a feeling, that the public they are serving has something to contribute to the enterprise of policing."

Community policing is based on the premise that the community[4] will be interested in forming a relationship with its police. Similarly, the two-way symmetric model of communication assumes that members of the public, or interest groups to which they belong, have the ability and motivation to engage in dialogue with an organization. Police officers are sometimes frustrated when they are unable to solicit the input and participation of citizens in crime prevention and other community policing activities. These groups of citizens are referred to as "inactive publics." Hallahan (2000) argues that public relations theory has tended to ignore groups who, despite their importance to the organization, possess a low degree of knowledge about or involvement in organizations and their services. These inactive publics might lack the motivation, ability, or opportunity to engage in activities that affect the organization. Hallahan (2000) claims that members of the public who possess this knowledge, ability, and motivation are the most likely to engage in collaborative relationships with an organization.

Recognizing that publics vary in terms of their motivation and ability forces organizations to tailor their communications according to the nature of the public with whom they are attempting to maintain or build relationships. Furthermore, understanding that an organization practices a limited range of communication strategies might explain why attempts to establish external relationships with publics sometimes fail. Organizations must identify and locate inactive publics in order to establish positive relationships, for the sake of the relationship itself, not necessarily because they will succeed in activating inactive members. The burden to engage in this communication process often falls on the organization (Hallahan 2000).[5]

Grunig and Grunig (1992) conclude that most organizations do not practice the model that would best serve them; in addition, organizations sometimes mix the communication models that they practice (see also Grunig 1984). Symmetrical communications are risky because they expose an organization to the turbulence of the external environment. As organization theorists have known for decades, a classic organizational response to a turbulent environment is to seal off its technical core, where the majority of the work is done. Given the nature of their work, police organizations operate within a particularly risky environment, therefore making it difficult for those within the organization who wish to move toward the development of two-way symmetric communications.

An institutional environment might impose pressure on an organization to justify its practices, which may affect external communication strategies

(Sutcliffe 2001). For instance, some police organizations implement community policing based on a heartfelt concern with technical efficiency and effectiveness. Others may face external pressure to adopt community policing, either because doing so will provide needed resources, or because it will confer legitimacy on the organization for "doing the right things" (Maguire & Mastrofski 2001). Structures, programs, and policies have symbolic value, and managing those symbols to send a message or convey meaning to those inside or outside the organization is a potent form of symbolic communication (Meyer 1979; Sutcliffe 2001). Agencies interested in the technical value of community policing would probably select a different model of external communications than those interested in capitalizing on its institutional value for conferring legitimacy. The former might adopt the two-way symmetric approach, while the latter might select one of the other methods in which the communication is either one-way, asymmetric, or both.

The parallels between two-way symmetric communications and community policing are substantial. Building strong and mutually beneficial relationships with community members and community groups is a core element of community policing. Two-way symmetric communication is expected to facilitate the practice of community policing where police organizations and publics, both active and inactive, engage in meaningful dialogue and change. Nevertheless, the practical challenges associated with such communications in policing will have to be carefully considered in order for those efforts to be successful. We now examine existing research on the external communication practices of police organizations and offer an analysis of a variety of forms of external communication prominent in community policing.

External communication by the police

Much of the academic writing on community policing offers a pessimistic appraisal of its impact on external communication by the police. According to Manning (1992: 135), external communication by police is intended to persuade publics "of the legitimate authority, credibility, and power of the police organization." Although police organizations have always struggled to effectively manage their public image, they continue to experience crises of legitimacy and political authority (Maguire & Uchida 2000; Manning 1992). In Manning's view, police agencies actively use public relations to build and maintain better public images rather than to engage in mutually beneficial dialogue with their constituents. One perspective views community policing as a form of communication

that serves to enhance the legitimacy and power of the police. For instance, Klockars (1988: 240) views community policing as "the latest in a fairly long tradition of circumlocutions whose purpose is to conceal, mystify, and legitimate police distribution of non-negotiable coercive force." Hunter and Barker (1993) look at community policing as "BS and buzzwords." Lyons (1999: 185) concludes that community policing simply rearranges and enhances "the power of the police to punish individuals and communities." Barlow and Barlow (1999: 667) view community policing as "image-management policing." Bayley (1994: 100) cautions that "police must not be allowed to make performance a 'con game' of appearance management." Numerous other policing scholars have voiced similar sentiments. The types of external police communication that Manning (1992) describes, including community policing, are not characteristic of two-way symmetric communication. Information flows from the police organization, the source, to the relevant publics, the receiver, with the purpose of changing the publics rather than facilitating mutual change for mutual benefit. Community policing, according to Manning (1992, 1997), is a presentational strategy; a communication device that seeks to reinforce the dominant position of police over their various publics.

Manning (1992) describes three primary types of external police communication: crisis communication, routine communication, and strategic communication. Crisis communication results from an immediate, spontaneous situation that is threatening to the police organization. Crisis communication draws community support for the police because the crisis symbolizes a threat to the entire community. Routine external communications consist of the ordinary, ongoing communications that occur between police and individual members of the public as officers engage in routine functions such as responding to calls for service or conducting patrols. Because various publics are handled one member at a time, there is little widespread awareness of the routine communication that occurs between the police and the public. Routine communications provide the opportunity to build quality relations with the public. Strategic external communication relies on publicity and the media to build a consensus of external support for the police. With strategic communication, the police present information to their publics about programs and policies through press releases, press conferences, and public announcements that reach aggregate groups as opposed to individuals one at a time. Furthermore, Manning asserts that police initiate and control such programs and policies that preserve police autonomy.

The symbolic nature of police external communication plays a central role in Manning's analysis. It is important to recognize the symbolic nature of external police communication because through external communication, the police "dramatize the appearance of control of crime and maintenance of social order" (Manning 1992:139). The police use slogans, symbols, and encoded messages to create and maintain favorable police images (Manning 1992, 1997). This results partially from the inability of the police to meet the expectations and demands placed upon them by both themselves and society. While the police are expected and claim to control crime and maintain order in society, many observers believe they lack the resources and ability to affect the underlying forces responsible for crime and disorder. In response to this crisis, the police must maintain the appearance of control in order to retain and build public legitimacy. Police actively use publicity efforts to enhance their public image (Manning 1992, 1997).

According to Manning (1992), community policing is a prominent theme in American policing that allows police to maintain control over their environment. Community policing, as "a long-term management approach to organizational communication", has the purpose of controlling publics through a reduction in the social distance between the police and the public (Manning 1992:155). As the police become a part of local community life and create the sense that the police and the community share a mutual fate, the police strengthen their position within the community. Furthermore, because the rhetoric of community policing is an appeal for communities to provide support and legitimacy, community policing has the ability to maintain or augment police authority and power (Manning 1992) rather than defuse power to the community itself. Manning's (1992) analysis suggests that external communications occurring under the banner of community policing are neither two-way nor symmetric.

Research on the validity of this perspective is mixed. Lyons's (1999) and Reed's (1999) recent analyses of community policing in Seattle both find evidence to support the critique voiced by Manning and other scholars. Skogan and Hartnett's (1997:133–34) research in Chicago is less damning; in a little less than a third of the beat meetings they observed, citizens and police demonstrated a "balanced and cooperative" relationship or "acted as partners." Kessler's (1999) quantitative analysis found that a community policing effort in Houston reduced citizen complaints against police. Evidence from a recent national evaluation suggests that "true" community partnerships are rare (Koper, Roehl, Roth and Ryan 1998), though the modest progress made so far represents an important breakthrough in police–community relations. Overall, research is in-sufficient to draw sweeping conclusions about the extent to which community policing has produced a shift in the balance of power between police and communities.

External communication through the news media

The media play a critical role in communication between police organizations and their publics. Furthermore, Manning (1992) asserts that police organizations sell the community policing message through the media. Citizens form their impressions of community policing from what is presented in the media. The public image of community policing is critical; it forms the basis for how community policing will be judged and whether it will ultimately persist (Mastrofski & Ritti 1999). Yet, the police exercise some influence over their image by controlling the way they are presented in the news media (Chermak 1995). The way the police are portrayed in the media affects their legitimacy and authority (Manning 1992). Therefore, the media is a powerful and useful external communication tool for the police (Ericson, Baranek & Chan 1989; Skolnick & McCoy 1985). When the police influence media content they exert a degree of control over the messages that the public receives about crime and policing.

Guffey (1992) portrays the relationship between the media and the police as symbiotic. The police need the media in order to promote their activities and image in the community, and the media rely on the police for information about stories that are interesting to readers. Ericson, Baranek and Chan (1989) recognize that a degree of mutual dependency exists between the police and news media. They explain that research conducted from a journalism perspective perpetuates the view that the police — news media relationship is an asymmetrical one that favors police. Yet the conception of a symbiotic police — news media relationship runs the risk of over-simplifying the level of control that police have over official information about crime and police activities and the stake that the police have in shaping communications through the media.

Research suggests that the relationship between the police and the media is asymmetrical because police tend to dominate their interactions with the media and maintain a degree of control over what gets presented in the news media (Chermak 1995; Ericson, Baranek & Chan 1989; Skolnick & McCoy 1985). Reporters tend to depend on police sources for information about crime and police practices. Media personnel are constrained because compromising their relationship with the police, through critical accounts of police organizations and police behavior for instance, might limit their access to information about

crime and law enforcement stories. Ericson, Baranek, and Chan (1989) found that when police culture values conflicted with the values of reporters who worked closely with the police, police values tended to dominate. Chermak (1995) conducted ethnographic research in a large Midwestern newspaper organization and analyzed the content of over 2,000 newspaper stories and over 600 television stories. He found that newspapers increase their access to police information by establishing beats within police organizations. While this arrangement is useful for the news media, it also allows police to promote particular stories for consideration.

Police affect the information that is presented in the media because they play a role in the news selection and production processes. Police affect the news selection process because they regulate the pool of stories from which the news media chose by controlling the flow of information to the news media (Chermak 1995). For instance, police can effectively kill news stories or reduce their impact by not releasing information. In addition to affecting the news selection process, the police also affect the news production process (Chermak 1995; Ericson, Baranek & Chan 1989). The news production process involves framing and writing the actual news stories. Police can shape the information that is available to the news media so that news stories are presented in ways that promote and legitimize police organizations. Chermak (1995:33) concludes that "police frame crime stories in a way that strengthens their position as a crime fighting institution." Nevertheless, Ericson, Baranek and Chan (1989) discovered that the media maintain a great deal of control over the news editing process. Furthermore, although research has successfully highlighted the control that police exercise over their portrayal in the media, many police complain that news organizations consistently portray them in a negative light (Ellis 2001).

Mastrofski and Ritti (1999) analyzed over 6,000 newspaper stories that discussed community policing from 1993 to 1997. They found that most stories (87%) contained factual news rather than editorial or analytical content. In the absence of independent analysis, the way that the media portrays community policing is likely to be a close reflection of what the police want to communicate. Indeed, Manning (1992) argues that the media seldom obtain information independent of the police that might contradict the police perspective. Mastrofski and Ritti (1999) found that news sources touted the effectiveness of community policing in 45 percent of the stories, presented differing points of view about community policing in about 13 percent of stories, and presented community policing in a completely positive light in the majority of stories.

Mastrofski and Ritti (1999:3) hypothesize that one possible outcome of insufficient debate about the merits of community policing is that "the public image of community policing will become even more unified and accepted without debate." It seems that police are able to easily send messages to their publics about community policing through a seemingly independent and credible source: the news media. This can, in turn, serve police organizational goals. By communicating to publics through the media, the police can maintain control of their environments as well as the programs and policies that will be implemented in local communities. At the same time, the police can enhance their legitimacy.

Through the media, police organizations engage in what Manning (1992) terms strategic communication. Such communication does not seem to be aimed at creating opportunities for dialogue and exchange, but rather at creating a positive perception of police practices within publics. The public relations literature explains that while one-way, asymmetric communication might meet important organizational needs, it is not well-suited to managing collaborative relationships between organizations and their publics.

Summary of external communication reform

Many of the strategies that have been adopted or reinvented as part of community policing can be viewed as a form of communication with external audiences. An analysis of these various strategic communications can shed light on the nature and direction of these communication efforts. Implicit in the reform movement is the assumption that two-way symmetrical communications increase the chances police and various publics will build and maintain meaningful, productive relationships. Community policing activities that involve external communication reform include, for instance, building community sub-stations, establishing citizen police academies, encouraging community members to help set police priorities, surveying the consumers of police services, and organizing citizen patrols. The use of these strategies provides the opportunity for direct communication with publics and also communicates symbolic messages to publics. Police use of these sorts of strategies can be viewed and analyzed from a communications perspective. Such an analysis would provide an understanding of the degree to which the strategies involve dialogue between the police and publics and the degree to which police *and* publics change as a result of the communication. Furthermore, this type of analysis will shed light on the degree to which the parties affect the decisions that have implications for the police and the public.

Internal communication reform

Community policing entails a variety of changes within police organizations (Greene, Bergman & McLaughlin 1994). Many of these changes, particularly with regard to structure and culture, are intended to improve internal communications. The dynamics of communication patterns within organizations are complex, and a rigorous analysis of them could easily fill several volumes. Therefore, our discussion of the relationship between community policing and internal communication reform is necessarily abridged. We begin by examining the formal aspects of internal organizational communication, including such important topics as organizational structures, rules, policies, procedures, and other formal elements of the organization that shape, constrain, enable, and otherwise influence communications. We will then examine the informal elements of communication within organizations, including such topics as culture, myths, traditions, symbols, and other informal elements that play an important role in organizational life.

Formal aspects of internal communication

The defining characteristic of organizations is that they are *organized*. They may not be well-organized, and they may even be thoroughly dysfunctional. Although there are numerous definitions (Hall 1999), organizations are comprised of a coordinated and formal set of linkages among actors working to achieve a goal or set of goals within an identifiable boundary. An organization is therefore defined, in part, by the formal relationships between its members. Examining the formal aspects of internal communications is vital. In this section, we begin with a focus on these formal aspects, paying particular attention first to structures and then to rules, policies, and procedures.

Organizational structure. The structure of an organization represents a framework within which communication takes place. An organization's structure has numerous dimensions, among them vertical, functional, spatial, and temporal. These dimensions interact to structure the internal communications of an organization. While the content and meaning of communication is not necessarily determined by the structure of an organization, these dimensions do play a role in formalizing, constraining, and otherwise structuring the pathways and processes through which information flows throughout an organization (Johnson 1993).

One popular framework for analyzing the structures of communication within organizations is to distinguish between horizontal communications, in which messages flow laterally, and vertical communications, in which messages flow both up and down the organization's hierarchy. Another popular approach views communication through the lens of network theory, tracing the way that messages (such as news, rumors, policies, etc...) make their way from person to person within the organization (Johnson 1993; Nohria & Eccles 1992). We believe that both approaches are applicable here, but that neither alone is well suited for examining communication structures within police organizations.

Police organizations divide their work and their workers according to the four primary dimensions we stated earlier: vertical, functional, spatial, and temporal.[6] Organizational structure provides a set of conduits and barriers that affect the patterns of communication: messages flow up and down the hierarchy, across functional and spatial boundaries, and over time. Taken together, these four dimensions have a profound effect on patterns of communication within a police organization. Community policing reformers propose to alter each structural form, both to improve communication patterns, and to achieve other desirable ends. We now explore each dimension in further detail.

Hierarchical or vertical divisions. Police organizations have been described for decades as command-and-control bureaucracies with rigid hierarchies (Reiss & Bordua 1967). While hierarchy is a useful tool for managing workers in industries where front line workers are little more than automatons, police officers are street-level bureaucrats endowed with the discretion to make important decisions about the lives of their clients (Lipsky 1980). Critics have argued that the police hierarchy is a dysfunctional structural form for police because it promotes rigidity and formality in an industry where flexibility and the ability to craft customized solutions to unique problems is a valuable skill (Angell 1971; Guyot 1979; Redlinger 1994; Wadman 1998; also see Cordner 1995). Community policing reformers claim that tall, rigid hierarchies also impede the effective flow of information throughout the organization. As information flows up and down, it is redefined, slotted, categorized, and otherwise modified; communications in police organizations typically do not make the journey from sender to receiver unaltered.

Police officers are the organization's greatest asset. They are like an army of information soldiers; taken together they contain vast pools of untapped information about the organization and its clients. Community policing reformers have argued that tapping into this gold mine of information is crucial

to becoming a more responsive organization capable of self-learning (Alarid 1999; Geller 1997). Yet research has demonstrated that: (1) police organizations frequently do not even try to tap into the knowledge of their front-line workers, (2) even when these workers attempt to make their information known, it frequently does not make it very far up the hierarchy, and (3) as we know about communication in organizations more generally, the information is condensed further and further as it climbs the hierarchy (Geller & Swanger 1995). Information flows more quickly down the hierarchy than up it (Hall 1999: 173; Johnson 1993). For these reasons and more, community policing reformers have urged police executives to reduce the depth of their hierarchies (Cordner 1995; Redlinger 1994; Reiter 1999). Recent research demonstrates that while some police organizations have begun to eliminate middle-management ranks, most have not succeeded in reducing the depths of their hierarchies in the community policing era (Hassell, Peyton, Zhao & Maguire 1999). Furthermore, there is still no evidence to suggest that reducing the depth of the hierarchy will produce the intended benefits, most notably improved vertical communications.

Functional divisions. Police organizations are typically divided into a series of primary, secondary, and tertiary functional divisions. At the primary level, most are divided into patrol, investigations, and support services (Wadman 1998). Each of these divisions is typically broken down into smaller functional units. For instance, patrol is often broken down into a series of secondary divisions with responsibility for a particular time period (like the midnight shift), function (specialized patrol squad), or area (precinct or other spatial division). Each of these secondary divisions is often further divided into a number of specialty areas, with workers assigned to each. Although some police organizations have experimented with matrix-style organizational structures in which officers report to multiple supervisors, these arrangements are rare (Sabo & Kuykendall 1978). In general, officers are typically assigned to a specific organizational niche. These niches represent breeding grounds for intensive communications among those within the niche, but communications with those located outside the niche are often problematic. One of the greatest lessons in the last three decades of policing is that isolating functions within special units produces a myriad of communication-related problems. This problem was integral to the demise of community policing's predecessors — community relations units and team policing.

Community policing reformers argue that police organizations should become less specialized. They envision officers as "uniformed generalists" prepared to respond to a wide array of problem types, rather than the more common practice of referring clients to specialized niches within the organization. This need for officers to take ownership over the problems on their beats is central to the community policing reform movement. Yet, efforts to de-specialize face a number of predictable problems. Specialized units are a structural form that serve as a powerful signal to those both inside and outside the organization that the agency takes that particular problem seriously. For example, Katz (2001) has described the symbolic value of police gang units, even in those communities without a serious gang problem. To disband such units would send a signal that the agency no longer takes the problem seriously (Mastrofski 1998). For this reason, and perhaps others, community policing reformers have been unsuccessful in their efforts to convince police agencies to de-specialize. In fact, evidence suggests that police agencies may actually have grown even more specialized throughout the 1990s (Maguire 1997).

Spatial divisions. According to Gregory and Urry (1985: 3), spatial structure is "now seen not merely as an arena in which social life unfolds, but rather as a medium through which social relations are produced and reproduced." Spatial considerations represent one of the most important concerns in the community policing movement. Early in the history of police organizations, policing was organized according by neighborhood with Precinct Captains running local police stations like mini-chiefs. Citizens had their own beat cops and reported offenses or sought assistance at their own police precinct station. With the advent of the telephone, two-way radio, and patrol car, police organizations centralized administrative control, shut down many precinct stations, and asked citizens to call a centralized location (the 911 center) for help (Reiss 1992). Community policing beckons us to recall a bygone era when the kindly neighborhood beat cop lent a helping hand and maintained neighborhood order. Police historians have cautioned us that the good old days weren't all that good, with problems of corruption, brutality, and unequal treatment of citizens reaching back into the early history of policing (Strecher 1991; Walker 1984). Nevertheless, reformers have still pressed for police organizations to decentralize, organizing their service delivery around social or natural community boundaries rather than arbitrary boundaries that are often drawn through, rather than around, cohesive neighborhoods or communities.

Within the patrol division of nearly every major police department in the country is a secondary division which assigns a mid-level manager (usually a Lieutenant or a Captain) responsibility for either a time-period (often known

as a "Platoon") or a geographic area. Community policing advocates call for reliance on spatial rather than temporal divisions. There is also a movement toward assigning investigative generalists to certain areas to handle a variety of offense types, rather than citywide jurisdiction for a single offense type (Cosgrove 1997). The major reasons for this shift are to produce administrative accountability for conditions within an area, but also to produce improved communications between officers, investigators, other personnel, and citizens within an area. Evidence suggests that spatial differentiation is increasing slowly as police agencies begin to build new precinct houses, mini-stations, and storefront police facilities. Whether these changes are producing the intended benefits for internal communication is unknown. Compstat, an independent but related innovation, involves holding district commanders accountable for criminal activity in their areas of responsibility. Doing so requires these commanders to have information at their fingertips about the conditions in their neighborhoods. Anecdotal evidence on the ability of Compstat to improve communication within geographic units is positive (Bratton 1998).

Temporal divisions. Police organizations are typically open 24 hours per day, 365 days per year. A common rule of thumb is that after factoring in holidays, sick days, shift rotations, and other contingencies, it takes between 5 and 10 officers to ensure that one officer is on patrol every shift of the year (Bayley 1994). Just as assigning officers to a particular functional niche or spatial division constrains and structures their patterns of communication, so too does assigning officers to work a particular shift. Students of police culture know that there are profound differences in the way policing is done during the day and midnight shifts. During the day shift, for instance, administrators and managers are milling about, the streets and sidewalks are being used frequently, and the actions of the police are more visible. During the midnight shift, the streets belong to the police and much of their work remains invisible to the public. While shift-work cannot reasonably be eliminated, assigning commanders responsibility for places rather than times shifts accountability for all that occurs within a certain district to a single individual. Presumably, this shift in accountability produces increased levels of communication between employees working different shifts within the same district. Whether that assumption is true remains untested to our knowledge.

Summary of organizational structure

Just as the skeleton serves as the framework within which the body's major organs operate, the structural dimensions of a police organization have a profound effect on patterns of communication. The formal structure of an organization does not determine the nature of its communications, but it does constrain, direct, or provide the context within which communication occurs (Johnson 1993). Just as the human body is more complex than its skeleton alone, there is much more to internal communications than the structures in which they occur. If changing the organizational structure of police agencies is supposed to produce changes in communication patterns, then community policing reformers are likely to be disappointed. Researchers have demonstrated that changes in structure are occurring glacially if at all. For instance, Maguire (1997) found that community policing had not significantly altered the structures of American police agencies. A recent study of Florida police agencies found that the "organizational impacts of community policing have been minimal" (Gianakis & Davis 1998:496). Similarly, Wadman (1998:68) concluded that "no substantive changes have been made in the organization of America's police departments to facilitate the implementation of community policing." That portion of communication reform that relies on changes in organizational structure does not appear to be occurring in the United States. Evidence from other nations is sparse.

Rules, policies, standards, and procedures

In addition to formal structures, organizations also function by establishing formal written rules, policies, standards, and procedures (Hall, Haas & Johnson 1967). Organizations vary in their levels of formalization, with some relying heavily on informal methods of coordination and control, and others resembling the classic Weberian bureaucratic form. Formalization is typically measured by counting or evaluating the depth of rules, policies, and procedures within an organization. Formalization serves to structure who can talk to whom, when, under what conditions, and in which format. In this sense, it is actually designed to inhibit communication. For instance, in some organizations, the police chief may have an open door policy for officers to voice grievances or recommend new ideas, whereas in others, upward communications may be heavily regulated by policies prescribing how such communications must take place in writing through the chain-of-command. Similar policies may regulate or prescribe how communications must occur vertically, functionally, and spatially.

Community policing advocates often argue that formalization stifles creativity and encourages generic "stock" responses to the complex social problems that the police face each day (Mastrofski 1998). Although police have generally become more formalized during the twentieth century (Reiss 1992), community policing reformers have sought to reverse this trend. Nevertheless, research fails to find evidence for decreases in formalization. If recent trends in accreditation and risk-management continue, police agencies may become even more formalized (Maguire 1997; Worrall, 2001). If this is the case, the flexible organizational atmosphere envisioned by community policing reformers, and the communication reforms such an atmosphere is intended to produce, are unlikely to thrive.

Informal communications

While the formal aspects of organizations are important for understanding patterns of communication, students of organizations have learned the importance of informal structures. In this section, we explore the role of culture in shaping communication in police organizations. Much of this analysis relies on Peter Manning's studies of police organizations in the United States and Britain, though due to space limitations we are unable to explore his work in depth.

Culture plays an important role in the lives of the police. The existence of a police subculture has been discussed by observers of the police for decades (Crank 1998). This culture is characterized by such features as bravery, adventure, and a code of silence which views the police as a "thin blue line" protecting the rest of society from chaos or anarchy. In addition to this occupational culture, police are also exposed to unique organizational cultures. Furthermore, depending on other factors such as race, gender, rank, assignment, and special interests, police officers may also belong to other subcultures within their occupation and their organization. Even though police officers work within the framework of an organizational structure, and are subjected to formal rules, policies, standards, and procedures, their immersion in various subcultures also has an effect on their patterns of communication.

There are as many definitions of culture as there are analysts to dream them up. According to Barnett (1988:107–110), culture represents the interplay of several elements, including language, values, behaviors, stories, and legends. Members of a certain group, whether it is a profession, an organization, a gender, a race, or a special interest, may be culturally similar to other members of the group, using common language or jargon, sharing similar values,

behaving in similar ways, and relying on the same pool of stories and legends to structure their behaviors and outlooks. Culture and communication are inextricably linked in a circular relationship. Cultures are created through communication, yet culture also has a profound effect on communication patterns, setting informal boundaries for the nature and duration of communications. Therefore, culture is both constitut*ed* and constitut*ive*.[7]

One of the primary aims of community policing is to reorient the traditional culture of police away from an excessive focus on crime control toward a broader mandate that includes service to the community. Changing police culture has become one of the principal goals of community policing reformers. While the community policing reform literature is full of prescriptions about the need to change organizational culture, empirical studies of such changes are rare. Zhao, He and Lovrich (1998) argued that individual values and culture are linked, with each affecting the other. Their research showed that the value orientations of American police officers have remained stable over the past two decades. In a later study, Zhao and his colleagues (1999) surveyed police officers from an agency with a national reputation for community policing. They found that from 1993 to 1996, officers' value orientations changed significantly; values reflecting individual happiness, comfort, and security increased over the three-year period, while ratings for more social or collective values decreased. The social value experiencing the greatest decrease in importance among the officers was "equality." These findings were stable across all levels of education and experience. Zhao and his colleagues (1999) concluded that the value changes in their sample of officers were antithetical to the basic shifts in culture expected under community policing.

Research on police officers' attitudes might also be useful for drawing inferences about recent changes in organizational and occupational culture. For instance, studies examining attitudes about community policing have found a lack of understanding and/or acceptance among police officers (Kratcoski & Noonan 1995; Lurigio & Skogan 1994; Sadd & Grinc 1994). Greene and Decker (1989) found that a classroom program in Philadelphia designed to improve relations between police officers and residents actually resulted in poorer officer attitudes toward the community. Wood's (1998) study of community policing in Albuquerque finds that changes in organizational culture are difficult to achieve in the face of the traditional police culture. Despite these frequent negative findings, some research has found that police agencies can change officers' attitudes. For instance, a longitudinal study in Joliet, Illinois found that while "the absence of change was the norm rather than the exception," many

officers showed favorable changes in attitudes toward and knowledge of community policing (Rosenbaum, Yeh & Wilkinson 1994: 349). Other studies have also found evidence of positive changes in police officers' attitudes (McElroy, Cosgrove & Sadd 1993; Wycoff & Skogan 1994). Overall, these studies of police attitudes and values generally suggest that the culture of a police organization can change, but such shifts are not likely to occur often or quickly. Whether attempts to modify police or organizational cultures have succeeded in producing improved internal communications is also unknown.

Summary of internal communication reform

Reformers have urged police organizations to adopt a number of reforms intended to improve internal communications. Some of these involve changes in formal aspects of the organization, such as structures, rules, policies, and procedures. Others involve changes in the informal aspects of the organization, such as values, attitudes, and organizational and occupational cultures. Although we have separated the formal and informal aspects of organizations, they are inextricably linked. As Crank (1998: 27) notes, "police culture is embedded in and bounded by organizational structure." Furthermore, the emergence of communications technologies has further blurred the lines between the formal and informal aspects of the organization. Information technologies make it easier to bypass layers in the hierarchy or communicate across functional, spatial, or temporal barriers (Rogers 1988). Research evidence on both communications technologies and community policing is not sufficiently developed at this point to enable us to draw sweeping conclusions about their impacts on internal communication in police organizations.

Epilogue

Communication reform is both implicit and explicit in much of the community policing reform rhetoric. Community policing is viewed as a solution to a number of problems in the internal and external environments of police organizations. Externally, the development of community partnerships and the use of collaborative problem-solving techniques is intended to produce safer, less fearful, and more satisfied communities. Internally, the adoption of various organizational change strategies is designed to produce less bureaucratic and more responsive police organizations. Across both the external and internal

dimensions of community policing is a vision that improved communications will produce various benefits. Weaving together concepts and theories from public relations, organization theory, and policing, we have provided a framework useful for viewing the role of communication reform in community policing. This framework raises a number of questions about the relationship between community policing and communications. Research evidence is not well-developed at this point to answer many of these questions with confidence.

How can researchers begin to address some of the unanswered questions about the role of internal and external communications in community policing? The primary means is to treat communications themselves as units of analysis in social scientific research. Manning's (1988) research on how calls to the police are processed is one example of treating the content of communications as a unit of analysis. The same kinds of work could be applied to community policing research. To learn more about patterns of external communications, research could examine the nature and content of communications flowing from police to community and community to police. This would provide insights about both the symmetry and direction of communications, a crucial element of both the public relations models we explored earlier and the community policing movement more generally. To learn more about patterns of internal communications, research could examine the flow of information within a police agency, from informal messages such as rumors, myths and legends, to more formal communications like the modes through which new policies or procedures diffuse throughout the organization. Furthermore, the information age is fundamentally altering the way that organizational members communicate with one another, yet very little is known about how technology has affected communication patterns within police agencies. All of these are crucial questions for learning more about the linkages between community policing and communication reform.

Community policing has been described as a revolution in the way police deliver services to their communities. As this chapter goes to press, a variety of scandals continue to haunt the police. The Mayor of Los Angeles recently suggested that "the city set aside 25 years worth of tobacco settlement money — as much as $300 million — to pay for lawsuits anticipated from the city's latest police corruption scandal" in the Rampart Division (Los Angeles Times 2000). In the Washington, DC Metropolitan Police Department, nearly a quarter of the four million e-mails sent by officers to one another in a single year "contained obscenity or hate filled language" (Law Enforcement News 2001). In Cincinnati, the shooting of an unarmed black man by a white police

officer prompted three days of riots resulting in "more than 800 arrests and hundreds of thousands of dollars of damage" (Washington Post 2001). While these are dramatic incidents, they illustrate that much remains to be done in developing a healthy relationship between police and communities. Communication reform, both internal and external, will continue to play a key role in this endeavor.

Notes

1. Serious crime includes the "index" crimes recorded by the FBI: murder, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, larceny, burglary, and motor vehicle theft. The first four offenses constitute violent crimes, while the latter three constitute property crimes. These data were drawn from the 172 American cities with a population of at least 75,000 in 1960 (Federal Bureau of Investigation 1997). This sample was chosen because it was the only comprehensive source available in public archives for crime data from that period.

2. Several forces have also led local police agencies to expand their external relationships with researchers, think tanks, state and federal justice agencies and other police organizations located outside their immediate jurisdictions. It is now common for police agencies, especially those deemed as innovative, to host visitors from numerous external groups (Weiss 1997). There are resources to be won for those agencies demonstrating the best reputations in community policing circles, from professional awards to federal, state, and private grants (Maguire & Mastrofski 2001). While these are all examples of external communication reform, our interest here is in exploring communications within the immediate jurisdiction of the police agency; the area which Scott (1992) describes as an areal organizational field. Thus, our coverage of external communication reform excludes these emerging relationships between local police agencies and other entities located outside their immediate jurisdiction.

3. Organizational theorists use the singular term "environment" to refer to everything outside its boundaries impacted by or having an impact on the organization. Public relations theorists use the plural term "publics" to refer to the various constituencies served by an organization. We use these terms interchangeably in this chapter, often for stylistic rather than substantive reasons. Nonetheless, we recognize the substantive difference between them, most notably that an organization's environment is heterogeneous, consisting of numerous publics, in addition to various other elements.

4. Just as public relations theorists use the plural term "publics" rather than the singular term "public" to describe an organization's multiple, heterogeneous constituencies, some critics have noted that community policing reformers mistakenly view the police as serving a single or homogeneous community (Correia 2000; Lyons 1999; Reed 1999).

5. Although this is nearly always true in community policing, there are some exceptions. For instance, the Omaha, Nebraska Coalition of Citizen Patrols is an independent, grass-roots organization providing volunteer neighborhood patrols (Gartin 1996).

6. There are other dimensions we do not consider here. For instance, one that is closely related to functional differentiation is occupational differentiation, in which workers are divided according to occupational specialty (Langworthy 1986; Maguire forthcoming).

7. We have heard this phrase in the past, but were unable to locate a source for it.

References

Ahern, J. F. 1972. *Police in Trouble*. New York: Hawthorn Books.

Alarid, L. F. 1999. "Law enforcement departments as learning organizations: Argyris's theory as a framework for implementing community policing". *Police Quarterly* 2: 321–337.

Angell, J. 1971. "Toward an alternative to the classic police organizational arrangements: A democratic model". *Criminology* 9:185–206.

Barlow, D. E. and M. H. Barlow. 2000. *Police in a Multicultural Society: An American Story*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.

Barnett, G. A. 1988. "Communication and organizational culture". In *Handbook of Organizational Communication*, G. M. Goldhaber and G. A. Barnett (eds), 101–131. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Bayley, D. H. 1994. *Police for the Future*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bayley, D. H. and Mendelsohn, H. 1969. *Minorities and the Police: Confrontation in America*. New York: The Free Press.

Bayley, D. H. 1985. *Patterns of Policing: A Comparative International Analysis*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers.

Bordua, D. J. and Tifft, L. L. 1971. "Citizen interviews, organizational feedback, and police community relations decisions". *Law and Society Review* November: 155–182.

Bratton, W. 1998. *Turnaround: How America's top cop reversed the crime epidemic*. New York: Random House.

Bruning, S. D. and Ledingham, J. A. 1999. "Relationships between organization and publics: Development of a multi-dimensional organization-public relationship scale". *Public Relations Review* 25: 157–166.

Cassell, P. G. and Fowles, R. 1998. "Handcuffing the cops? A thirty-year perspective on Miranda's harmful effects on law enforcement". *Stanford Law Review* 50: 1055.

Chermak, S. 1995. "Image control: How police affect the presentation of crime news". *American Journal of Police* 14: 21–43.

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

Correia, M. 2000. "The conceptual ambiguity of community in community policing: Filtering the muddy waters". *Policing* 23: 218–232.

Cosgrove, C. 1997. "Investigations in the community policing context". Paper presented at the Community Policing: What Works? Conference, Arlington, VA: November 8–10.

Crank, J. P. 1998. *Understanding Police Culture*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Cutlip, S. M., Center, A. H. and Broom, G. M. 1994. *Effective Public Relations*, 7th Edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Ellis, A. 2001. "If the news media won't cover your positive stories, try this". *The Police Chief* LXVIII: 16–21.

Ericson, R. V., Baranek, P. M. and Chan, J. B. L. 1989. *Negotiating Control: A study of news sources*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. 1997. *Uniform Crime Reports, 1958–1969, and County and City Data Books, 1962, 1967, 1972*: Merged Data [Computer file]. ICPSR edition, Ann Arbor, MI: Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research [producer and distributor].

Gartin, P. 1996. *The Omaha Coalition of Citizen Patrols: A Case Study and Impact Assessment of the Integration of an Independent, Grass Roots Citizens' Organization into a City's Community Policing Approach to Crime Control*. Unpublished proposal submitted to the National Institute of Justice, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Geary, D. P. 1975. "The impact of police–community relations on the police system". In *Community Relations and the Administration of Justice*, D. P. Geary (ed.), New York: Wiley.

Geller, W. 1997. "Suppose we were really serious about police departments becoming learning organizations?" *National Institute of Justice Journal*, December: 2–8.

Geller, W. A. and Swanger, G. 1995. *Managing Innovation in Policing: The untapped potential of the middle manager*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Gianakis, G. A. and Davis, G. J. III. 1998. "Reinventing or repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing. *Public Administration Review* 58: 485–98.

Goldstein, H. 1979. "Improving policing: A problem-oriented approach". *Crime and Delinquency* 25: 236–58.

Goldstein, H. 1990. *Problem-Oriented Policing*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Goldstein, J. 1960. "Police discretion not to invoke the criminal process: Low visibility decisions in the administration of justice". *Yale Law Journal* 69: 543–94.

Greene, J. R. 2000. "Community policing in America: Changing the nature, structure, and function of the police". In *Criminal Justice 2000, Volume Three: Policies, Processes, and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System*, J. Horney, R. Peterson, D. MacKenzie, J. Martin and D. Rosenbaum (eds), 299–370. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Greene, J. R., Bergman, W. and Mclaughlin, E. 1994. "Implementing community policing: Cultural and structural change in police organizations". In *The Challenge of Community Policing*, D. P. Rosenbaum (ed.), 92–110. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Greene, J. R. and Decker, S. H. 1989. "Police and Community Perceptions of the Community Role in Policing: The Philadelphia Experience". *The Howard Journal* 28: 105–123.

Greene, J. R. and Mastrofski, S. D. (eds). 1988. *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality*. New York: Praeger.

Gregory, D. and Urry, J. 1985. "Introduction". In *Social Relations and Spatial Structures*, D. Gregory and J. Urry (eds), Hong Kong: McMillan.

Grunig, J. E. 1984. "Organizations, environments, and models of public relations". *Public Relations Research and Education* 1: 6–29.

Grunig, J. E. and Hunt, T. 1984. *Managing Public Relations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Grunig, J. E. and Grunig, L. A. 1992. "Models of public relations and communication". Pp. 285–327 in *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*, J. E. Grunig (ed.), 285–327. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Guffey, J. E. 1992. "The police and the media: Proposals for managing conflict productively". *American Journal of Police* 11: 33–51.

Guyot, D. 1979. "Bending granite: Attempts to change the rank structure of American police departments". *Journal of Police Science and Administration* 7: 253–84.

Hall, R. H. 1999. *Organizations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Hall, R. H., Haas, J. E., and Johnson, N. J. 1967. "Organizational size, complexity, and formalization". *American Sociological Review* 32: 903–12.

Hallahan, K. 2000. "Inactive publics in public relations". *Public Relations Review* 26: 499–515.

Hassell, K., Peyton, J., Zhao, J. and Maguire, E. R. 1999. "Structural change in large municipal police organizations: Evidence from a national study". Presentation delivered at the annual meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Orlando, Florida (March 12).

Hindelang, M. J. 1974. "Public opinion regarding crime, criminal justice, and related topics". *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* July: 101–116.

Hunter, R. D. and Barker, T. 1993. "BS and buzzwords: The new police operational style". *American Journal of Police* 12: 157–168.

Johnson, J. D. 1993. *Organizational Communication Structure*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Katz, C. M. 2001. "The creation of police gang units." *Criminology* 39: 37–74

Kent, M. L. and Taylor, M. 1998. "Building dialogic relationships through the World Wide Web". *Public Relations Review* 24: 321–329.

Kessler, D. A. 1999. "The effects of community policing on complaints against officers". *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, September.

Klockars, C. 1988. "The rhetoric of community policing." In *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality*, J. Greene and S. Mastrofski (eds), 239–258. New York: Praeger.

Koper, C. S., Roehl, J. Roth, J. and Ryan, J. 1998. "Return on investment: A national evaluation of the COPS program". Paper presented at the National Conference on Community Policing, Alexandria, VA: November 9.

Kratcoski, P. C. and Noonan, S. B. 1995. "An Assessment of Police Officers Acceptance of Community Policing". In *Issues in Community Policing*, P. C. Kratcoski and D. Dukes (eds), 169–186. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Langworthy, R. H. 1986. *The Structure of Police Organizations*. New York: Praeger.

Law Enforcement News. 2001. "You've got hate mail!" March 31.

Ledingham, J. A. and Bruning, S. D. 1998. "Relationship management in public relations: Dimensions of an organization-public relationship". *Public Relations Review* 24: 55–60.

Leo, R. A. 1996. "The impact of Miranda revisited". *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 86: 621.

Lipsky, M. 1980. *Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Los Angeles Times. 2000. "L.A. mayor suggests tobacco money to pay off lawsuits over corruption". February 17.

Lurigio, A. J. and Skogan, W. G. 1994. "Winning the hearts and minds of police officers: An assessment of staff perceptions of community policing in Chicago". *Crime and Delinquency* 40: 315–330.

Lyons, W. 1999. *The Politics of Community Policing: Rearranging the Power to Punish*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

McElroy, J. E., Cosgrove, C. and Sadd, S. 1993. *Community Policing: The CPOP in New York*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Maguire, E. R. 1997. "Structural change in large municipal police organizations during the community policing era." *Justice Quarterly* 14: 701–730.

Maguire, E. R. Forthcoming. *Organizational Structure in Large Police Agencies: Context, Complexity and Control*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Maguire, E. R., Kuhns, J. B., Uchida, C. D. and Cox, S. M. 1997. "Patterns of community policing in non-urban America." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 34: 368–394.

Maguire, E. R. and Mastrofski, S. D. 2000. "Patterns of community policing in the United States". *Police Quarterly* 3: 4–45.

Maguire, E. R. and Uchida, C. D. 2000. "Measurement and explanation in the comparative study of American police organizations." In *Criminal Justice 2000, Volume 4: Measurement and Analysis of Crime and Justice*, D. Duffee (ed.), 491–457. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

Manning, P. K. 1988. *Symbolic Communication: Signifying calls and the police response*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Manning, P. K. 1992. *Organizational Communication*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Mastrofski, S. D. 1998. "Community policing and police organization structure." In *How to Recognize Good Policing: Problems and issues*, J. P. Brodeur (ed.), 161–189. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mastrofski, S. D. 2001. "The Romance of police leadership." In *Theoretical Advances in Criminology*, E. Waring, D. Weisburd and L. Sherman (eds), 153–196. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Mastrofski, S. D. and Ritti, R. R. 1999. *Patterns of Community Policing: A View from Newspapers in the United States* [COPS Working Paper #2]. Washington, DC: Community Oriented Policing Services.

Meyer, M. W. 1979. "Organizational structure as signaling". *Pacific Sociological Review* 22: 481–500.

Moore, M. H. 1992. "Problem solving and community policing". In *Modern Policing*, M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds), 99–159. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. 1968. *Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders*. New York: Bantam Books.

Nohria, N. and Eccles, R. G. 1992. *Networks and Organizations: Structure, Form, and Action*. Boston: Harvard Business School.

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. 1967. *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society*. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Redlinger, L. 1994. "Community policing and changes in the organizational structure". *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 10: 36–58.

Reed, W. E. 1999. *The Politics of Community Policing: The Case of Seattle*. New York: Garland.

Reiss, A. J. Jr. 1971. *The Police and the Public*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Reiss, A. J. Jr. 1992. "Police organization in the twentieth century". In *Modern Policing*, M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds), 51–97. Chicago: University of Chicago.

Reiss, A. J. Jr. and Bordua, D. J. 1967. "Environment and organization: A perspective on the police." In *The Police: Six Sociological Essays*, D. J. Bordua (ed.), 25–55. New York: Wiley.

Reiter, M. S. 1999. "Empowerment policing". *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin* 68: 7–11.

Rogers, E. M. 1988. "Information technologies: How organizations are changing". In *Handbook of Organizational Communication*, G. M. Goldhaber and G. A. Barnett (eds), 437–453. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Rosenbaum, D. P., Yeh, S., and Wilkinson, D. L. 1994. "Impact of Community Policing on Police Personnel: A Quasi-Experimental Test". *Crime and Delinquency*, 40: 331–353.

Sabo, L. O. and Kuykendall, J. L. 1978. "Matrix organization — Applications to a police organization". *The Police Chief* 45: 70–72.

Sadd, S. and Grinc, R. 1994. "Innovative Neighborhood Oriented Policing: An Evaluation of Community Policing Programs in Eight Cities." In *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the promises*, D. P. Rosenbaum (ed.), 27–52. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Scott, W. R. 1992. *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems*, 3rd Edition. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Sherman, L. W., Milton, C. H. and Kelly, T. V. 1973. *Team Policing: Seven case studies*. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Skogan, W. G. and Hartnett, S. M. 1997. *Community Policing, Chicago Style*. New York: Oxford.

Skolnick, J. H. and Bayley, D. H. 1986. *The New Blue Line: Police Innovation in Six American Cities*. New York: The Free Press.

Skolnick, J. H. and McCoy, C. 1985. "Police accountability and the media". In *Police Leadership in America*, W. A. Geller (ed.), 102–135. New York: American Bar Foundation.

Sparrow, M. K., Moore, M. H., and Kennedy, D. M. 1990. *Beyond 911: A New Era for Policing*. New York: Basic Books.

Stark, R. 1972. *Police Riots: Collective violence and law enforcement*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Strecher, V. 1991. "Revising the histories and futures of policing". Reprinted in *The Police and Society: Touchstone Readings* (1995), V. Kappeler (ed.), 66–80. Prospects Heights, IL: Waveland.

Sutcliffe, K. M. 2001. "Organizational environments and organizational information processing". In *The New Handbook of Organizational Communication: Advances in Theory, Research, and Methods*, F. M. Jablin and L. L. Putman (eds), 197–230. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wadman, R. C. 1998. *Organizing for the Prevention of Crime*. Doctoral dissertation, Idaho State University (May).

Walker, S. 1980. *Popular Justice*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Walker, S. 1984. "Broken windows and fractured history: The use and misuse of history in recent police patrol analysis". *Justice Quarterly* 1: 75–90.

Walker, S. 1993. "Does anyone remember team policing? Lessons of the team policing experience for community policing". *American Journal of Police* 12: 33–55.

Washington Post. 2001. "Findings near on Cincinnati shooting". May 7: A02.

Weiss, A. 1997. "The communication of innovation in American policing". *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* 20: 292–310.

Westley, W. A. 1970. *Violence and the Police: A sociological study of law, custom, and morality*. Boston: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Wilson, J. Q. and Kelling, G. L. 1982. "Broken windows". *The Atlantic Monthly* March: 29–38.

Wood, R. L. 1998. "Creating a Culture of Community Policing: Police Cultures and Organizational Independence". Paper presented at the National Conference on Community Policing, Alexandria, VA: November 9.

Worrall, J. L. 2001. *Civil Lawsuits, Citizen Complaints, and Policing Innovations*. New York: LFB Scholarly Publishing.

Wycoff, M. A. 1994. *Community Policing Strategies*. Final report submitted to the National Institute of Justice. Washington, DC: NIJ.

Wycoff, M. A. and Skogan, W. G. 1994. "The Effect of a Community Policing Management Style on Officers' Attitudes." *Crime and Delinquency*, 40: 371–383.

Zhao, J. 1996. *Why Police Organizations Change: A Study of Community Oriented Policing*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Zhao, J., He, N. and Lovrich, N. 1998. "Individual value preferences among American police officers: The Rokeach theory of human values revisited". *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* 21: 22–37.

Zhao, J., He, N. and Lovrich, N. 1999. "Value change among police officers at a time of organizational change: A follow-up study using Rokeach values". *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* 22: 152–170.

CHAPTER 3

Attitudes, culture and emotion in police talk

Keith Tuffin
Massey University, New Zealand

This chapter begins with some questions about modern police work. Broadly speaking, these questions come from the psychology of policing, and are concerned with fundamental aspects of how the police manage their work. More specifically, these questions focus on gaining an intimate and detailed inside view of a variety of issues relevant to policing. These issues include the unique pressures which have to be managed when dealing with members of the public, attitudes police hold with respect to certain groups in society, the emotional reactions associated with dealing with trauma or danger, and the internal workings of police culture. Each of these issues represents an important aspect of working in law enforcement, and as such are likely to impact on the daily interactions between officers as they conduct the important business for which they are responsible. This chapter aims to introduce readers to the discursive study of these issues.

Let us consider some of these questions more directly. How do police deal with the tension of having to maintain credibility in the eyes of the public, while also having the task of policing that same public? What do police officers think about having gay cops as partners on the job ? How important is the reputation of the police force in the eyes of the public? In the often dangerous and traumatic work which the police must routinely deal with, how do cops deal with their personal reactions to these events? What emotions are associated with this type of work and how are these managed by officers ? How powerful an influence is the culture of the police ? To what extent does the internal workings of police culture hinder or assist officers in the daily conduct of their duties ?

These questions are relevant to the day-to-day work which individual officers undertake, and in this regard have very practical consequences. However, they are also important to researchers who are interested in studying the

Law Enforcement, Communication and Community

Edited by

Howard Giles

Center on Police Practices and Community
University of California, Santa Barbara
and Santa Barbara Police Department

Dedicated to the Uniformed Heroes of September 11, 2001 and to
Jane and Robbie who always live through the fear of tragic
outcomes every time I go out on patrol.