

**COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE GROUPS:
BRINGING THE COMMUNITY INTO POLICING**

by

Lesley Margaret Bain

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF
MASTER OF ARTS

in the School

of

Criminology

© Lesley Margaret Bain 1996

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

April 1996

All rights reserved. This work may not be reproduced
in whole or in part, by photocopy or other means,
without the permission of the author.



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-16782-8

Canada

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant to Simon Fraser University the right to lend my thesis, project or extended essay (the title of which is shown below) to users of the Simon Fraser University Library, and to make partial or single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or other educational institution, on its own behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for multiple copying of this work for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or the Dean of Graduate Studies. It is understood that copying or publication of this work for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/~~Project~~/~~Extended Essay~~

Community Consultative Groups: Bringing the Community into Policing

Author:

(signature)

Lesley Margaret Bain

(name)

96.04.17

(date)

APPROVAL

Name: Lesley Margaret Bain
Degree: Master of Arts
Title of Thesis: Community Consultative Groups:
Bringing the Community into Policing
Examining Committee:
Chair: Joan Brockman, LL.M.

Patricia Bryantingham, Ph.D.
Professor
Senior Supervisor

Raymond R. Corrado, Ph.D.
Professor

David Edgar LL.B.
External Examiner
British Columbia Police Commission
Retired

Date Approved:

April 10 196

ABSTRACT

Policing in Canada has been governed by a reactive style of service delivery which emphasizes centralized dispatch and rapid response to calls for service. Police methods have been incident-driven, thus lacking in the analysis of the underlying problems which precipitate the complaint. The ineffectiveness of this approach in controlling crime and disorder, coupled with the distancing of police from a more informed, culturally diverse society has persuaded Canadian police managers to seek out community policing as a new approach to police service delivery. The community policing philosophy tries to facilitate a partnership between the police and the community, granting average citizens the opportunity to participate in the police process, in return for their support and input. The purpose of this thesis is to study and assess the implementation of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police's policy governing the establishment of community consultative groups and their role in community policing.

The analysis takes the form of a case study based on the practices of the RCMP's Langley Detachment situated in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia using an action research methodology. Attendance at the Langley City community consultative group's meetings, over one year and five months, provides the backdrop from which this thesis examines the potential for establishing a viable community/police partnership.

This study illustrates the difficulties of implementing a vaguely worded centralized policy directive at a time when the community policing philosophy (the driving force of community consultation) was not yet grounded in a rationale or implementation plan.

The application of organizational theory illustrates the RCMP's need to move away from the bureaucratic principles governing daily organizational and managerial practices to facilitate the successful implementation of the community policing philosophy.

This study concludes that community consultative committees are a recent innovation and as such, it is premature to reach definitive conclusions about their impact. Participants, both the community and the police, are still learning their role in the process, seeking examples and looking for best practices.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to a number of individuals who enabled me to complete this thesis,

To my supervisory committee, especially my senior supervisor Pat Brantingham who constantly provided inspiration, guidance, and kindness, and to Raymond Corrado who throughout the course of my studies, has encouraged and focused my efforts.

To the Royal Canadian Mounted Police who fully supported this research. In particular I would like to thank Superintendent McMartin and Constable Wright of the Langley RCMP Detachment who gave me the opportunity to conduct this study. To Superintendent Yard, Inspector Graham, Staff Sergeant Eakins, and Sergeant LePage of the North Vancouver RCMP Detachment for their continued support and interest.

To Jayne Seagrave for her enthusiasm, knowledge and encouragement.

And most importantly, to my family.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
<u>CHAPTER 1</u>	
INTRODUCTION	1
Research Objective	3
Operational Definitions	5
<u>CHAPTER 2</u>	
THE RCMP IN THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA	10
Overview	10
Police Services	12
<u>CHAPTER 3</u>	
COMMUNITY POLICING: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	15
Historical Developments	15
Community Policing	19
The Origin of Community Policing	23
Community Policing Defined	25
Rhetorical	26
Philosophy	27
Program	30
Control Mechanism	30
Imprecise	31
<u>CHAPTER 4</u>	
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION	33
Community Consultative Groups in Britain	34
Statutory Obligation	35
The Rationale Behind the Consultative Process	36
Police/Community Consultative Committees	37
Police/Community Consultation in Practice	39
Comments and Criticisms	40
Community Consultative Groups in Canada	42
<u>CHAPTER 5</u>	
THE BROKEN WINDOWS THEORY	44
<u>CHAPTER 6</u>	
ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY	48
The Classical Police Theory	49
The Behavioral Police Theory	52
The Contemporary Police Theory	54

<u>CHAPTER 7</u>	
A CASE STUDY/ACTION RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	57
Case Study Methodology	57
Participatory Action Research Methodology	60
Research Strategy	61
<u>CHAPTER 8</u>	
RCMP POLICY GOVERNING COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE GROUPS	63
The Policy	65
Discussion	67
<u>CHAPTER 9</u>	
THE EVOLUTION OF THE LANGLEY CITY CONSULTATIVE GROUP	70
From Policy into Practice	71
Community Consultative Group Meeting # 1	72
Community Consultative Group Meeting # 2	73
Meeting with the OIC	75
Community Consultative Group Meeting # 3	76
The Survey Administration	78
Community Consultative Group Meeting # 4	79
Meeting: Coding of Survey Results	81
Survey Analysis	82
Survey Findings	83
Survey Sample Demographics	83
Section A: Offence	85
Section B: Concerns	88
Section C: Crime Prevention Programs	89
Section D: Service	89
Community Consultative Group Meeting # 5	90
Community Consultative Group Meeting # 6	92
Community Consultative Group Meeting # 7	93
Community Consultative Group Meeting # 8	94
Community Consultative Group Meeting # 9	94
Summary	95
<u>CHAPTER 10</u>	
INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS	97
Summary of Findings	97
Implications for Policy	97
The Langley City Community Consultative Group	98
Conclusion	104
APPENDIX A	107
APPENDIX B	113
APPENDIX C	118
REFERENCES	174

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Policing in Canada has been governed by a reactive style of service delivery which emphasizes centralized dispatch and rapid response to calls for service. Police methods have been incident-driven, thus lacking in the analysis of the underlying problems which precipitate the complaint. Patrol officers have experienced limited positive citizen contact (Oppal, 1994), and a "narrow view of the police role means that the response to problems tends to be limited to standard law enforcement strategies" (Ministry of the Solicitor General, 1991, p.2). Police operations have been based on the operational objectives of the law enforcement agency, with limited input from the community.

Limited resources and a more informed, culturally diverse society has caused police organizations to reassess their role, authority and mandate, and to begin to evaluate their organizational structure and services provided. As a result, many police agencies are embracing the philosophy of community policing. The Royal Canadian Mounted Police's (RCMP) adoption of the community policing philosophy as the model of service-delivery was an executive decision "based on the knowledge that the professional model had had little effect on crime and social disorder over the long term" (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1995(a), p.3.).

The RCMP defines community policing as "a philosophy of policing and a method of service delivery which acknowledges the interactive process between the police and the community in mutually identifying and resolving community problems, sharing

in the delivery of police services" (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1992). Simply put, community policing tries to form a partnership between the police and the community, granting average citizens the opportunity to participate in the police process, in return for their support and input. The philosophy rests "on the belief that contemporary community problems require a new decentralized and personalized police approach, one that involves people in the process of policing themselves" (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990, p.ix). Murphy (1988, p.177) suggests that by increasing involvement by both the police and the public in neighbourhood problems, "public policing will more efficiently and effectively control crime, enhance public order, reduce crime fear, and increase neighbourhood safety".

The community policing philosophy encourages police agencies to address the serious crime problems identified by the police, and in addition those identified by the community as being of significant concern. In essence, community policing tries to facilitate a partnership between the community and the police in problem solving. The police work with the community to solve the problems of concern to the community, and in turn, the citizens assist in addressing the problems of concern to the police. To date however, Canadian police agencies have "conservatively interpreted" community policing's "endorsement of broad community involvement, accountability, and participation in police policy" (Murphy, 1988, p.184).

While many police forces may work hard to promote community involvement into police managed crime prevention programs, (eg. Neighbourhood Watch), this participation rarely translates into community involvement into policy and accountability issues (Murphy, 1988). If one accepts the philosophy of community policing, efficient

and effective policing requires "the adoption of policing methods which ... command the support of the community" (Scarman, 1985, as cited in Morgan, 1986, p.83). One means of obtaining community involvement into the identification of policing concerns is through the establishment a formal community consultative structure which brings together local persons who potentially have direct contact with the police. According to a Report entitled Effective Models of Police Community Committees prepared for the Ministry of the Solicitor General, Race Relations and Policing Unit (1991), community consultative groups should be more than a forum for the sharing of information between the police and the community. Rather, an effective consultative group "involves a body that represents and advocates for the community, proposes responses to specific issues, participates in planning long-term responses, and plays a role in influencing the way police services are delivered" (p.xiii). As such, community consultative groups serve as vehicles for obtaining public opinion on the planning and management of police services in their area, and as a forum for raising community concerns.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVE

The purpose of this thesis is to explore the Langley RCMP Detachment's implementation of the RCMP's policy governing the establishment of community consultative committees and seeks to assess the groups's role in community policing. Specifically, this thesis questions whether or not the policy governing community consultative groups (as currently written) can be successfully implemented and whether the community consultative mechanism can successfully translate the community policing philosophy into practice. The analysis will take the form of a case study based on the

practices of the RCMP's Langley Detachment situated in the Lower Mainland of British Columbia using an action research methodology. This detachment was chosen for pragmatic reasons. Firstly, the Officer in Charge of the Detachment was receptive to academic input, and secondly, it was one of the few in the process of implementing a community consultative group within the projected time period.

Through the use of organizational theory, this thesis will explore the functioning of a community consultative group and assess whether it supports the RCMP's definition of community policing. This study will include both a review of the relevant literature addressing community policing and community consultative groups and interpret the RCMP's policy directives governing community consultation. Community policing is a relatively new approach to policing in Canada. As such, this case study is a first step towards providing a comprehensive understanding of how one RCMP detachment implemented the policy governing community consultative groups and the role of the group in community policing.

To describe how the action research study of the community consultative group in Langley City will be done, one must first have a clear understanding of what is meant by the term "action research". Action research is "a process of systematically collecting research data about an ongoing system" (Cunningham, 1993, p.9). In this case, the "ongoing system" encompasses both the Langley RCMP Detachment and the Langley City community consultative group. The purpose of this study is to "develop (and)/or discover aspects of the system's operation which can lead to improvement and change" (Cunningham, 1993, p.9) by the writer participating in, and experiencing the evolution of the community consultative group and its interaction with the Langley RCMP

Detachment. Thus, the research objective is two fold. Firstly, this research will discuss the RCMP's role in policing: the philosophy of community policing; and the history of the establishment of community consultative groups. Secondly, through action research, this writer will describe the formation of the Langley City community consultative group; observe how the Langley RCMP and the consultative group define problem areas and identify what they see are solutions; observe how the RCMP and the community consultative group apply and modify these solutions; and finally, assess their interaction and the actions taken. Organizational theory will aid in the analysis of the information gathered.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

The same word can mean different things to different people. As a result, it is important to clearly define many of the fundamental terms employed in this discussion. The following are brief definitions and meanings within the RCMP. A more complete conceptual and operational understanding of these terms will be provided in the subsequent chapters.

Community:

There are many definitions of this word. As Langley City provides the geographical backdrop for this thesis, **community** will be defined on a geographical basis.

Community Policing:

The term **community policing** has many interpretations. Some police managers believe that they are practising community policing because they have bike patrols or foot patrol officers. Although these are community policing initiatives, there is more to community policing than simply employing a single tactic which draws officers into the community. Community policing is "a philosophy of policing and a method of service delivery ... which acknowledges the interactive process between the police and the community in mutually identifying and resolving community problems" (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1992). As the RCMP is the focal organization of this thesis, their definition will be employed.

Professional Policing:

According to Wilson and McLaren (1977) **professional policing** is typified in the "fundamental" administrative principles which are aimed at achieving an efficient crime control police department. They are:

- 1) grouping of similar tasks according to function, time and place;
- 2) hierarchy of authority;
- 3) specialization based on need;
- 4) chain of command;
- 5) unity of command (ie. employees must receive orders from only one supervisor);
- 6) span of control (ie. supervisor should be responsible for a limited number of employees);
- 7) common sense in using the principles
(Wilson and McLaren, 1977, as cited in Roberg & Kuykendall, 1994, p.95).

The RCMP is a prime example of **professional policing**. The centralized authority of the RCMP is in Headquarters, Ottawa, Canada. Standardized policy directives governing police procedure are disseminated from Ottawa to each

detachment/unit across Canada. Each province also has a Headquarters which further circumscribes the actions of officers. The provincial Headquarters then has sub-divisions scattered throughout the province which can add additional rules and regulations to police operations. Within Headquarters/Sub-divisions/Detachments/Units, there exists a traditional hierarchy of command which further regulates the actions of police officers.

The centralized authority, be it Ottawa or the provincial Headquarters/Subdivision, informs the community of police priorities and procedures in their area, and directs how policy will be implemented.

Organization:

Organization refers to the "structure, ... management processes, and culture" of the police agency (Kelling & Moore, 1988, p.5).

This thesis will focus on the structure, management processes and culture of the RCMP as it helps/hinders the implementation of community policing and the functioning of the community consultative group. As previously outlined, the RCMP is a centralized agency with several levels of management between the front line officer and the Commissioner. Those in managerial positions are charged with "the planning, programming, rewarding and disciplining, and accounting and budgeting systems of the organization" (Keeling & Moore, 1988, p.5).

To embrace the community policing philosophy, this writer agrees that the RCMP and its members will have to alter their focus "from central to local alliances, from hierarchical control to member autonomy, from adherence to organizational objectives to a commitment to local authority interests" (Oppal, 1994, p.J-5). This writer contends

that this shift cannot be achieved until the culture of the organization undergoes significant change. An organization's culture is comprised of "the myths and beliefs of the organization, its informal patterns of communications and expected roles, personal values, attitudes and beliefs about why things happen, and how decisions are made" (Kelling & Moore, 1988, p.5). Before community policing can be achieved members at all levels of the RCMP organizational structure must be committed to this new philosophy and reflect this commitment in their patterns of communication, values, attitudes and beliefs.

Mission:

"A set of principles that defines the nature and ultimate purpose of an organization, clarifying its fundamental direction. It provides some tangible organizational goals as well as the means to achieve them" (Normandeau & Leighton, 1990, p.v). The RCMP's mission, outlined in the organization's Strategic Action Plan, illustrates its commitment to community policing.

RCMP Community Policing is...

a partnership between the police and the community, sharing in the delivery of police services.

With this valuable community cooperation, the RCMP pledges to...

Uphold the principles of the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms;

Provide a professional standard of service;

Ensure all policing services are provided courteously and impartially;

Work with the community and other agencies to prevent or resolve problems that affect the community's safety and quality of life.

Act with the Canadian justice system to address community problems;

Promote a creative and responsible environment to allow all RCMP members to deliver community policing services

(Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1992, p.6).

Community Consultative Group:

Community consultative groups are established by the police and are made up of police and community members. Ideally, the Group is comprised of a representative cross-section of those living in the community. The RCMP Operational Manual I.1 states that the aim of the Group is to:

1. enhance interaction between police and the community,
2. provide the public with input into the RCMP planning process
3. ensure that minority concerns are addressed, and
4. solicit feedback and assistance respecting ... various initiatives including recruiting.
(RCMP Operational Manual, I.1)

In addition to these four points, community consultative groups aid in "identifying the underlying causes of problems, analyze and explore solutions, and take appropriate action" (Weiler, 1992, p.5). Their role is strictly advisory.

CHAPTER 2

THE RCMP IN THE PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

OVERVIEW

In Canada, the federal and provincial governments share jurisdiction over legal matters. "The Constitution Act of 1867, the British North America Act, which is still in force, gives the federal Parliament (Ottawa) the authority to legislate 'criminal law, including procedure in criminal matters', pursuant to subsection 91(27); however, pursuant to subsection 92(14), the ten provinces are responsible for the 'administration of justice'" (Normandeau & Leighton, 1990, p.7).

The Canadian federal government has exclusive jurisdiction over the legal, administrative, and financial aspects of Canada's largest police force, the RCMP (RCMP Act, RSC 1986, c R-9 and regulations). Specifically, the RCMP is governed by the RCMP Act, and policing services are guided by the Commissioner, who, "under the direction of the Solicitor General of Canada, ... control(s) and manag(es) the Force and all matters connected therewith" (Royal Canadian Mounted Police 1995(b), p.2).

The Royal Canadian Mounted Police enforces the laws authorized by Canadian Parliament (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1995(b)). On a national level, the RCMP is responsible for: enforcing federal statutes (eg., Food and Drug Act, Immigration Act, Narcotic Control Act) in conjunction with other federal governmental departments; providing security and protective services to Canadian and foreign dignitaries; and for providing security services at Canada's international airports.

On a provincial level, the RCMP provides policing services for cities and rural areas, on a contractual basis to eight of the ten provinces (Quebec and Ontario have their own provincial police agencies) and two territories. Thus, the RCMP is divided into 13 divisions. A Commanding Officer governs each division which has an alphabetical designation. "Divisions roughly approximate provincial boundaries with their headquarters located in their respective provincial or territorial capitals (except "A", Ottawa; "C", Montreal; and "E" Vancouver) (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1995(b)). Provincially and territorially, it is the responsibility of the RCMP to enforce the Criminal Code and federal, provincial/territorial statutes. Municipally, the RCMP has been contracted to enforce municipal by-laws under the authority of individual agreements made with 191 Canadian municipalities (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1995(b)).

Prior to 1950, the province of British Columbia was policed by its own provincial police force -- The British Columbia Provincial Police. In 1950, the RCMP assumed the province's policing responsibilities. This arrangement continues today, with the RCMP being responsible for policing 71 per cent of British Columbia's population (Oppal, 1994). The services provided by the RCMP in "E" division are managed by a Deputy Commissioner who is the Commanding Officer of the Division (Province). The Commanding Officer is directly accountable to the Commissioner of the RCMP. "Policing of the province is provided through 131 detachments comprising provincial detachments, municipal detachments and those which have a combined provincial/municipal responsibility" (Oppal, 1994, p.J-2). RCMP services in British Columbia are contracted to 52 municipalities.

POLICE SERVICES

The majority of policing services within British Columbia are provided by the RCMP under contract to the Federal Government of Canada. Generally speaking, "the internal management including administration and application of professional police procedures, remain under the control of the federal government"(Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1995(b), p.25). Under the direction of the Solicitor General, Ottawa, the Commissioner of the RCMP is assigned the control and management of the Force. This responsibility is prescribed by the RCMP Act which specifies the "control and accountability limits" of the Force (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1995(b), p.25). At the provincial level, it is recognized that the Ministry of the Attorney General in BC is authorized to direct the RCMP in its enforcement efforts relating to the Criminal Code, provincial statutes and municipal by-laws. Along with responsibility to direct policing services, the Attorney General also determines the province's policing priorities, objectives and goals.

The relationship between the Divisional Commanding Officer and the Ministry of the Attorney General is complex. At the divisional level, the Commanding Officer is responsible for the delivery of policing services and is "directly and at all times accountable" to the Commissioner of the RCMP for the delivery of policing services in the province (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1995(b), p.25). The Commissioner of the Force is, in turn, "under the direction of the Solicitor General of Canada" (Royal Canadian Mounted Police 1995(b), p.25). In addition to the Commanding Officer's accountability to the Commissioner, the Divisional Commanding Officer must also "act generally under the direction of the Attorney General in the administration of justice,

including the implementation of provincial policing objectives, priorities and goals" (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1995(b), p.25).

The policing priorities, objectives, and goals of the Force are developed at the national and provincial levels. On the national level, standardized policy directives governing administrative and operational police procedures, are disseminated to "E" Division Headquarters in Vancouver, and in turn sent to each sub-division/detachment/unit within the province. At the provincial level, critics question the extent to which the RCMP takes direction from the Ministry of the Attorney General when defining the organizations operational priorities/goals and objectives for the province (Oppal, 1994).

For example, the setting of priorities and objectives for the provincial agency is developed by the RCMP based on the agency's perception of the provincial issues and the commissioner's priorities. RCMP objectives are often established prior to the development of the minister's (Attorney General) priorities and have accordingly become the government's goals. These objectives are then issued from the minister's office and circulated through the RCMP hierarchy to each detachment. Ottawa's priorities then become BC's priorities (Oppal, 1994, p.J-8).

The Oppal Commission Inquiry determined that fifty percent of those RCMP members surveyed "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that Ottawa had a significant influence over local policing (Oppal, 1994).

If Ottawa plays a significant role in guiding the RCMP's priorities, goals, and objectives, one must question whether the philosophy of community policing can be implemented as a successful means of service delivery. By definition, community policing seeks to achieve an "interactive process between the police and the community in mutually identifying and resolving community problems" (Royal Canadian Mounted

Police, 1992) and as such, service delivery methods must reflect the needs of the local jurisdiction, not the nation. Recently, the Commission of Inquiry into Policing in British Columbia acknowledged that the RCMP must accommodate the needs of the province's communities. Specifically, Mr. Justice Oppal recommended that:

The RCMP must make fundamental changes and be more responsive to the needs of British Columbian's communities. The force simply must be more accountable to local needs and allow more participation by local government (Oppal, 1994. p.xxxiii).

CHAPTER 3

COMMUNITY POLICING: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENTS

Policing services in Canada have gradually evolved over the years as a result of both British and American influence (Minister of the Solicitor General, Ottawa, 1991; Chacko & Nancoo, 1993; Normandeau & Leighton, 1990).

The British influence is most evident in today's continued efforts to uphold the principles of Sir Robert Peel, the founding father of the London Metropolitan Police Force in 1829 (Chacko & Nancoo, 1993; Inkster, 1992). Peel's principles stress public accountability and involvement with the police. According to Norman Inkster, the then-Commissioner of the R.C.M.P., "by relating police functions to public acceptance rather than to the law, Peel's principles emphasized for the newly appointed police their origin in the responsibility of the community to manage its own affairs, their dependence on the community for their legitimacy and their objective to enhance the well-being of the community" (Inkster, 1992, p.52). Inkster (1992) believes that Peel's principles are, in fact, the essence of community policing.

Early in this century, Sir Robert Peel's principles were in place which stressed public accountability and involvement with the police. Police constables patrolled their beat on foot, knew who lived and worked in their area and relied on the "public's assistance in controlling local crime and order" (Ministry of the Solicitor General, Ottawa, 1991, p.1; Chacko & Nancoo, 1993, p.6).

In the United States, during the early 1900's, researchers have suggested that governmental reform, coupled with a nationwide move toward police professionalization, resulted in the separation of the police from the community (Kelling and Moore 1992, pp.107-108). Police managers assigned patrol officers to rotating shifts, in various geographical locations, in hopes of thwarting corruptive relationships between the police and local politicians. Police managers further established a policy of centralized control, which instituted standardized operational procedures.

Technological advances further distanced the police from the public and significantly altered how police services were delivered. Foot patrols were replaced with preventive vehicular patrols. Sophisticated communications and computer technology have permitted rapid response for calls for service. Broad police interaction with the community has become severely limited. "Statistics, rather than the types of service provided or the service recipients, became the focus for officers and managers" (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994, p.6).

Randomizing patrol routes, a tactic used to encounter crimes in progress, contributed to the deterioration of police/community relations. Officers continually altered their routes in an effort to deter criminal activity. It was hypothesized that "vigilant patrol officers moving rapidly through city streets would happen upon criminals in action and be able to apprehend them" (Kelling & Moore, 1992, p.110). With the emphasis on random, preventative patrols, citizens could no longer predict when they might encounter their local police officer (Normandeau & Leighton, 1990). The patrol car represented "mobility, power, conspicuous presence, control of officers, and professional distance from citizens" (Kelling & Moore, 1992, p.111).

With some exceptions, "canadian policing is typically a modified response to, or copy of, U.S. police ideology and practice" (Murphy, 1988, p.178). As such, it is not surprising that Canadian police agencies adopted the "professional" or "traditional" model of policing services which emphasise centralized chain of command, narrow span of control, close supervision, and paramilitary organizational structure (Ministry of the Solicitor General Ontario, 1991; Chacko & Nancoo, 1993).

The "traditional" model of policing is characterized by the following service delivery strategies:

Incident orientation: the primary operational focus of the force is to respond to particular incidents, calls, or events - not to related calls or incidents or the deeper problems that they represent.

Reactive orientation: the operation of the force is primarily mobilized and oriented to responding to events as they arise. Response capacity and capability are emphasized; little time and few resources are devoted to proactive or preventive measures.

Limited analysis: as response and officer availability are given operational priority, analysis and information gathering is limited to specific events, not broader analysis of the problems which precipitated the event.

Limited response: a narrow view of the police role means that the response to problems tends to be limited to standard law enforcement strategies.

Means over ends: an emphasis on response efficiency has the inevitable result that little emphasis is placed on designing policing strategies to prevent, reduce or eliminate the problem. In other words, efficiency over effectiveness. This approach to policing forms the basis of most current police operations in North America (Murphy, 1990, as cited in Ministry of the Solicitor General Ontario, 1991, p.2; Chacko et al., 1993, p.7).

Although this "traditional" model of policing characterizes most police organizations within the United States and Canada, research indicates that this model is not the most effective means of providing policing services.

Random motorized patrol has not been found to deter potential criminals, reduce crime, provide a greater likelihood of apprehending offenders, or reduce the fear of crime. Moreover, random or preventive patrol intercepts only a small fraction of crimes in progress (Normandeau & Leighton, 1990, p.42; Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977; Rosenbaum, 1994; Kelling, Pate, Dieckman, & Brown, 1974; Spelman & Brown, 1984).

Rapid response to all calls for service is an inappropriate basis for organizing an entire police force when life-threatening incidents or events in progress are routinely less than 4% of calls for service. Most victims call someone else first and most delay reporting the incident to the police on average for about 20 minutes. Consequently, shorter response times are unlikely to result in an increase in the number of offenders apprehended during the commission of their offenses (Normandeau & Leighton, 1990, p.42; Rosenbaum, 1994; Greenwood, Chaiken & Petersilia, 1977; Kelling, Pate, Dieckman, & Brown, 1974; Spelman & Brown, 1984).

Regardless of how police effectiveness in dealing with crime was measured, police failed to substantially improve their record. During the 1960's, crime began to rise. Despite large increases in the size of police departments and in expenditures on new forms of equipment (911 systems, computer-aided dispatch, etc.), police failed to meet their own or public expectations about their capacity to control crime or prevent its increase. Moreover, research conducted during the 1970's on preventive patrol and rapid response to calls for service suggested that neither was an effective crime control or apprehension tactic (Kelling & Moore, 1992, p 111; Kelling, Pate, Dieckman, & Brown, 1974 et al., 1974; Spelman & Brown, 1984).

The concept of professional policing encourages distance between the police and the community in the interests of ensuring impartiality and avoiding corruption. That distance, useful as it is in pursuing these values, comes at a price. The police lose their intimate link to the communities. This hurts their crime-fighting capability because it cuts them off from valuable information about the people and conditions that are causing crimes (Moore & Trojanowicz, 1992, p.154; Skogan & Antunes, 1979; Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994).

The ineffectiveness of the professional model in controlling crime, coupled with the distancing of police from the community, are two factors which have persuaded Canadian police managers to seek out a new approach to policing (Normandeau & Leighton, 1993; Murphy & Muir, 1985; Sadd & Grinc, 1994; Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994). A third factor influencing this decision is profound societal change (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1990). In the words of the then-Commissioner of the RCMP,

People of different races, cultures and languages are coming into closer contact with each other and enormous demands are being made on their understanding and tolerance.... North America is faced with uncertain economies, overburdened social services and declining educational standards at a time when increasingly complex technology demands greater knowledge and sophistication. There are widening class divisions, more broken families and homelessness and, growing anger on the part of the disadvantaged... (Inkster, 1992, p.52).

To maintain neighbourhood peace, order and security, police services in the 1990's are encouraged to balance the often competing and sometimes conflicting interests of the community (Morgan, 1987; Smith, 1987; Willmott, 1987). Police officers must be "educated, thoughtful, articulate, culturally sensitive and knowledgeable in several disciplines" (Inkster, 1992, p.52). Police officers must "consult with their clients on the planning, design and delivery of services" (Inkster, 1992, p.52). This collaborative approach encourages the mutual identification and resolution of neighbourhood problems thereby increasing the overall sense of community. The focus of police service delivery shifts from crime fighting to crime and social disorder problem-solving (Inkster, 1992; Goldstein, 1992; Skogan, 1990).

COMMUNITY POLICING

HOW DO WE DEFINE COMMUNITY?

Community policing is defined as "a philosophy of policing and a method of service delivery ... which acknowledges the interactive process between the police and the community in mutually identifying and resolving community problems (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1992). But, what exactly is meant by "community"? This term warrants clarification as the configurations of people designated as a "community" vary a great deal.

A review of the literature addressing the concept of community reveals, that despite the numerous studies of community over the past two hundred years, there has yet to be developed a satisfactory definition of what community is (Bell & Newby, 1974). "Every sociologist, it seems, has possessed his own notion of what community

consists of, frequently reflecting his ideas of what community *should* consist of" (Bell & Newby, 1972, p.27).

In his book, Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft, Tonnies conducted a theoretical analysis of the term "community". In it, Tonnies compared life in small agrarian communities (Gemeinschaft) with that of large industrial societies (Gesellschaft) and portrayed the less sophisticated communities as a better world, as the good life never to be recaptured. Since this time, "the use of the term community has remained to some extent associated with the hope and the wish of reviving once more the closer, warmer, more harmonious type of bonds between people vaguely attribute to past ages" (Bell & Newby, 1974, p.xiii; Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). Thus, Cohen (1985, p.116) argues that "almost anything can appear under the heading of community and almost anything can be justified if this prefix is used".

In the 1920s, Chicago School sociologists (Park and Burgess), defined the concept of community through an examination of "the effect of the land on social relations and social boundaries" (Meenaghan, 1972, p.95). The Chicago School adopted an ecological model which, according to sociologist Thomas A. Meenaghan, defined community as "a group of people living in a specific geographic area and conditioned by the subcultural or life processes of competition, cooperation, assimilation, and conflict. The unplanned life processes created so-called natural areas that not only had a defined territorial frame, but also shared special or unique cultural and social characteristics" (Meenaghan, 1972, p.95).

Simply, this means that people become members of a community just by living in it and that the community heavily influences what people think, feel, and believe. From this perspective, the Chicago sociologists maintained that "people do not make a conscious decision to take on the colorations and nuances of their communities, but instead this occurs as a natural outgrowth of living in the community and bumping up against the behaviour and attitudes of other community members in the routine course of daily life" (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990, p.81).

By the early 1950s, there were numerous definitions of community which caused George A. Hillery Jr. to examine ninety-four different definitions for commonalities. In his paper "Definitions of Community: Areas of Agreement", Hillery found that the only consensus that could be reached was that most theorists were "...in basic agreement that community consists of persons in social interaction within a geographic area and having one or more common ties" (Hillery, 1955, as cited in Meenaghan, 1972, p.94).

Consistent with Hillery's findings, is Willmott's belief that there are three types of community, all of which may overlap. Willmott distinguishes between the *territorial community*, defined by a geographical area in which people live; the *interest community*, a group of people who share a common interest other than the area in which they live (eg. the native community, gay community, jewish community); and the *attachment community*, where the attachment to people or place establishes a "sense of community" (Willmott, 1987). Thus, different communities can live within the same area, and not necessarily share the same attachment to the area in which they live, the people they live near, or share the same priorities. As Willmott argues, "the distinction may also put us on our guard against the warm, almost mystical, feelings that can be stirred by the word

community" (Willmott, 1987, p.2). Willmott further cautions that the promotion of any new initiative (in this case community policing), often includes the community to promote it, without clarification of which community the initiative seeks to address, or in what sense it will likely affect the community (Willmott, 1987).

The RCMP Community Policing Strategic Plan shares Willmott's definition of community. According to the Strategic Plan, community is defined as "a group of people who share certain elements: geographic location, cultural or racial background, socioeconomic status, common interests and goals, or concerns with the same crime and social issues" (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1995(a), p.4). It is possible that a detachment area will have any number of these communities. Thus, the challenge for police officers engaging in community policing, is to identify the different communities within their jurisdiction, address their specific needs and establish a partnership based on goodwill and trust. In this respect, Willmott argues that it will be difficult for the police to establish a trusting relationship with the public as the police "have to deal not with one community but with several and almost inevitably impinge on those communities in different ways" (Willmott, 1987, p.4; Skogan, 1990). Bittner (1990, p.305) expands upon this point:

It cannot be denied that opening police work to input from all segments of the community contains the risk of putting it in an impossible situation, requiring it to bend to different influences, while being driven into inactivity and ineffectiveness in this storm of conflicting demands. But this risk can be easily contained if it is kept in mind that being responsive to community needs and demands does not involve bargaining away the police mandate. In fact, because openness is a two-way street, the risk will become an opportunity for citizens to understand and respect the police mandate in society.

The Langley RCMP provides policing services to both the City of Langley and Langley Township. The City of Langley has a total land area of 10.2 square kilometres and falls under the political realm of City Council. The Langley RCMP has defined

community on a geographical basis for the establishment of its community consultative group, thus this thesis will adopt the same parameter from which to work.

THE ORIGIN OF COMMUNITY POLICING

RCMP officers are sworn to uphold "the mandate and traditional mission" (Normandeau & Leighton, 1990, p.7) of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act.

It is the duty of members... to perform all duties that are assigned to peace officers in relation to the preservation of peace, the prevention of crime, and of offenses against the laws of Canada and the laws in force in any province in which they may be employed, and the apprehension of criminals and offenders and others who may be lawfully taken into custody (RSC 1986, c R-9, s 18(a)).

Under the traditional model of police service delivery, RCMP officers have focused their efforts on "the apprehension of criminals and offenders and others who may be lawfully taken into custody". However, in response to an increasingly diverse society which demands relevant and accountable policing services, the RCMP has been obliged to revise its philosophy and service delivery style to incorporate the voice of the community. The result has been for then-Commissioner Inkster to call for a return to community policing (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1992).

Consensus has not been reached on the origin of community policing. Some writers believe that community policing is simply the re-emergence of the principles upon which Sir Robert Peel built the London Metropolitan Police Department in 1892 (Braiden, 1987, p.2; Normandeau & Leighton, 1990, p.43); while others propose that community policing is a "remnant of traditional 'village' policing" where police officers patrolled "stable integrated communities, with active police-citizen contacts, decentralized

management, responsible police services, and community accountability" (Murphy, 1988, p.180).

The majority of writers however, believe that community policing is a relatively new philosophy which has emerged in response to a "rapid and ever-changing environment" (Oettmeier & Brown, 1988, p.121) influenced by social, political, economic and demographic factors (Kelling & Moore, 1988, p.6; Green & Taylor, 1988, p.195; Murphy, 1988, p.178; Friedmann, 1992, p.100; Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1992; Gabelmann, 1994, p.1994). Still others (Murphy, 1988, p.178; Friedmann 1992, p.99) believe that Canada cannot escape the influence of U.S. "police ideology, research and technology".

Leighton (1994), in his article describing *Policing in Canada*, states that it is not apparent why Canadian police agencies have been so intent on adopting community policing as there has been no crisis to serve as a catalyst for change. He argues that by embracing Community Policing, the RCMP are simply returning to their 19th century roots which are found with Sir Robert Peel. Leighton believes that the RCMP, as the dominant Canadian police force, has always engaged, to some extent, in community policing. The RCMP has "retained much of (it's) original features, ... instead of completely adopting the professional model by imitating US-tested and proven police innovations" (Leighton, 1994, p.211).

Regardless of the origin of community policing, the philosophy has gained popularity within Canada. This may be because community policing is consistent with the efforts of other public service agencies who are also striving to be more fiscally responsible, and provide more relevant and accountable services. Secondly, Leighton

(1994) notes that community policing is also compatible with the reemergence in popularity of crime prevention programs which were introduced in the early 1970s. "The more recent version of crime prevention is, however, driven by the fiscal crisis of the state, which fosters the downloading of responsibility (and costs) for individual protection and public safety from public institutions to individuals and local communities" (Leighton, 1994, p.212). Leighton considers this trend, coupled with the United States influence, as what is currently shaping policing in Canada.

COMMUNITY POLICING DEFINED

In 1989, the Commissioner of the R.C.M.P. called for the nation-wide implementation of community based policing. However, the definition and its practical application were conspicuously absent. The result has been for police officers, regardless of rank, to formulate their own definition. This lack of clarity is also reflected in the community policing literature where proponents emphasize different aspects while employing the same terminology (Eck & Rosenbaum, 1994).

There are numerous definitions of community based policing which caused Seagrave (1995) to examine the different definitions for commonalities. In her paper *Changing the Organizational Culture: Community Policing in British Columbia*, Seagrave found that definitions of community policing can be grouped into five broad categories:

- i) a meaningless rhetorical term including every and any initiative;
 - ii) a philosophy focusing on the police and community working together to [mutually identify and resolve community problems];
 - iii) a particular crime prevention program;
 - iv) a form of increased social control;
 - v) an imprecise notion, impossible to define.
- (Seagrave, 1995, p.116-117)

As the following discussion will reveal, community policing has come to mean different things to different people. The RCMP's definition will be utilized throughout this thesis as it is consistent with the operational definitions of other writers, and the RCMP provides the backdrop for this study. Thus, community policing is defined as: "a philosophy of policing and a method of service delivery ... which acknowledges the interactive process between the police and the community in mutually identifying and resolving community problems" (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1992).

Rhetorical

Weatheritt (1988; 1987) perceives community policing as a vague term used by proponents to incorporate a wide variety of often conflicting police activities. Weatheritt argues that, on the whole, advocates have failed to acknowledge or address the practical and constitutional limits of the police. Advocates have simply "wished away" the combative and adversarial aspects of the police role as though they cease to exist (1988, p.173). For Weatheritt, community policing is nothing more than a term that "at one level has become little more than a consensual rally cry, used to convey a sense of nostalgia and of exhortation.... it summons up a world we have lost, a golden age of consensual policing which is contrasted, implicitly or explicitly, with an undesirable present and which stands as inspiration for a better future" (1987, p.7).

Manning (1988) suggests that community policing is an all encompassing strategy which appeals to a wide variety of people. Like Weatheritt, Manning believes that community policing is designed to fail as it does not take into account the disparate and often conflicting activities of police.

From this perspective, community policing is viewed as little more than a flexible and innovative term which lacks practical application and, in many respects, may be nothing more than rhetoric.

Philosophy

Proponents believe that community policing is a philosophy which governs how policing services are delivered within a community (Oettmeier & Brown, 1988; Taylor & Green, 1988; Normandeau & Leighton, 1990). Opinions vary, however, when it comes to defining the "essential" elements which comprise the community policing philosophy.

Skolnick & Bayley (1986), Wycoff (1988), and Skogan (1990) all consolidate the community policing philosophy into four key elements. For Skolnick & Bayley (1986, p.212) community policing is: i) police-community reciprocity; ii) areal decentralization of command; iii) reorientation of patrol; and iv) civilianization. For Wycoff (1989, p.107), community policing encourages the police to: i) listen to citizens, including those who are neither victims nor perpetrators of crimes; ii) take seriously citizens' definitions of their problems, even when the problems they define might differ from ones the police would identify for them; iii) solve the problems that have been identified; and iv) work together with their citizens to solve problems. Lastly, Skogan (1990, pp.91-92) suggests that the principles guiding community policing are: i) community policing assumes a commitment to broadly focused, problem-oriented policing; ii) community policing relies upon organizational decentralization and a reorientation of patrol tactics to open informal, two-way channels of communication between police and citizens; iii) community policing

requires that police be responsible to citizen demands when they decide what local problems are, and set their priorities; iv) community policing implies a commitment to helping neighbourhoods help themselves, by serving as a catalyst for local organizing and education efforts.

Murphy (1985) expands the operational definition by describing the five key principles of community policing to be that: i) the community plays an important role in police decision making; ii) the objectives of policing are broad and community defined; iii) the diverse functions that the police perform are legitimate elements of the police role; iv) community based policing is based on a shared responsibility between the police and the community; and v) community based policing advocates proactive involvement with the community.

Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994) expand the above points, and set out ten principles which they believe should guide all community based policing policies, procedures, and practices: i) a philosophy and organizational strategy which allows the police and the community to work together; ii) commitment to community empowerment; iii) decentralized and personalized policing; iv) immediate and long term proactive problem solving; v) ethics, legality, responsibility, and trust; vi) expanding the police mandate; vii) helping those with special needs; viii) grass roots creativity and support; ix) internal change; and x) building for the future.

The R.C.M.P. has defined community policing as "a philosophy of policing and a method of service delivery ... which acknowledges the interactive process between the police and the community in mutually identifying and resolving community problems"

(Royal Canadian Mounted Police 1990; 1992). For the RCMP, there are twelve essential elements of community policing. Operationally, police officers must: i) identify the community, or communities, present in an area; ii) work with the community; iii) identify common problems and concerns; iv) resolve the identified problems; v) empower police officers to make decisions and take action; vi) support the general duty officer; and vii) make patrol, enforcement and investigation work effective and directed. Administratively, management must i) decentralize; ii) use modern management concepts; iii) create an enhanced generalist career path; iv) reduce paper burden; and v) evaluate effectiveness through citizen satisfaction surveys (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1992).

As the literature in general illustrates, consensus has not been reached concerning what components actually define the community based policing philosophy. The tie which binds each definition is the underlying theme of the community (not defined) and the police establishing a "partnership" and working together to identify problems and implement solutions. Although this concept has wide-spread appeal on paper, one wonders how easy it will be for police officers to strike a partnership based on mutual goals and objectives with an elusive counterpart.

As community based policing in the R.C.M.P. is the focus of this discussion, its definition and "essential elements" will be adopted for the purpose of this discussion.

Program

The RCMP Strategic Action Plan states that "community policing is not a distinct program or collection of programs added on to existing police programs" (p.1). However, this message has not been adequately disseminated throughout the organization. Through the personal communication with various police officers, this writer is left with the impression that many officers define community policing as an "add on" program/tactic, integrated into the existing police organizational structure, which does not apply to their daily duties. Thus impeding the department-wide implementation of the community policing philosophy. This sentiment is supported by Leighton (1990, p.47) who believes that this "mind-set" impedes community policing's progression. "By placing an emphasis on a particular tactic,... (there is a) risk of community policing being regarded as an "add on" program that is just another specialized unit rather than being seen as a department-wide program with implications for most policing operations".

Control Mechanism

Some critics perceive community policing as a new social control mechanism. Manning (1988, p.28) argues that community policing seeks to control the public by a "reduction in social distance, a merging of communal and police interests, and a service and crime control isomorphism". Community policing is deemed a new tool for shaping public opinion and community control.

Klockars (1988) expands on this notion by describing the role of police in modern society. Klockars believes that the only reason police forces remain in modern society is to ensure that persons are available to bring certain situations under control through the use of the "virtually unrestricted right to use violent and, when necessary, lethal means" (p.257), which Klockars finds "fundamentally offensive" (p.257). In order for modern society to reconcile itself to its police, Klockars maintains that, modern society must "wrap itself in concealments and circumlocutions that sponsor the appearance that the police are either something other than what they are or are principally engaged in doing something else" (1988, p.257). Thus, from Klockars perspective (1988), the movement towards community policing is seen as shrouding the police in powerfully, unquestionably good aspirations and values of community, cooperation and crime prevention, that are compatible with the core values of modern society.

Imprecise

Numerous scholars have sought to find one definition for "community" and "community policing" with negative results. Both, are elusive terms. Critics of community policing maintain that it is very difficult to implement a service delivery style which lacks clear meaning.

Manning (1989) criticizes community policing for being vague and misleading, and argues that its assumptions are discordant, ideologically based, and wishful.

Hunter and Barker (1993, p.157) agree and believe that community policing seeks to be "all things to all people under the umbrella of community involvement". They perceive community/police problem solving partnerships as "naive" and unworkable

because police agencies don't "really seems to know whether it is a program, a philosophy or both".

Murphy (1988) suggests that "the ambiguous rhetoric and vague theorizing that dominates much of the academic and programmatic literature too often causes considerable confusion and conflict about the basic assumptions and implicit values inherent in community policing" (p.185). Murphy (1988) wonders how so many people with diverse political and institutional affiliations seem to be in agreement about community policing's basic assumptions and values. He suggests that they could be in agreement about very different things.

To summarize, a review of the literature suggests that definitions of community policing can be grouped into the following five broad categories:

- i) a meaningless rhetorical term including every and any initiative;
- ii) a philosophy focusing on the police and community working together to [mutually identify and resolve community problems];
- iii) a particular crime prevention program;
- iv) a form of increased social control;
- v) an imprecise notion, impossible to define.
(Seagrave, 1995, p.116-117)

This thesis will focus on the second category thereby defining community policing as a philosophy focusing on the police and community working together to mutually identify and resolve community problems.

CHAPTER 4

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The R.C.M.P. has defined community policing as "a philosophy of policing and a method of service delivery ... which acknowledges the interactive process between the police and the community in mutually identifying and resolving community problems"(Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1990; 1992). Essential elements of this definition include: i) the identification of the community, or communities, present in an area; ii) working with the community; iii) identifying common problems and concerns; iv) and resolving the identified problems. A review of the literature supports this interpretation and cites the central tenet of community policing as, the police and the community working together to define and develop solutions to community problems.

If one accepts this definition, the community policing philosophy requires "the adoption of policing methods which ... command the support of the community" (Scarman, 1985, as cited in Morgan, 1986, p.83). One means of determining or obtaining support of policing methods is through the establishment of community consultative groups. According to a Report entitled Effective Models of Police Community Committees prepared for the Ministry of the Solicitor General, Race Relations and Policing Unit (1991), community consultative groups should be more than a forum for the sharing of information between the police and the community. Rather, an effective consultative group "involves a body that represents and advocates for the community, proposes responses to specific issues, participates in planning long-term responses, and plays a role in influencing the way police services are delivered" (p.xiii).

As such, community consultative groups serve as vehicles for obtaining public opinion on the planning and management of police services in their area, and as a forum for raising community concerns.

The literature addressing community consultation with the police is limited. As the following discussion will illustrate, that which does exist, offers varied opinions concerning the viability of community consultative groups.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE GROUPS IN BRITAIN

During the early part of 1981, civil unrest in Britain culminated in a series of violent riots spurred by the belief that the police had allegedly "failed... to investigate adequately a tragic fire which claimed the lives of thirteen young black people" (Benyon, 1984, p.3).

The violence of these disorders (particularly that of April 10-12 in Brixton) led to Lord Scarman's inquiry into the events. Scarman found that many young people "had become indignant and resentful against the police, suspicious of everything they did" (Scarman, 1981, as cited in Benyon, 1984, p.99).

Whatever the reason for this loss of confidence, and whether the police were to blame for it or not, it produced the attitudes and beliefs which underlay the disturbances, providing the tinder ready to blaze into violence on the least provocation, fancied or real, offered by the police (Scarman, 1981, as cited in Benyon, p.99).

Scarman concluded that the riots represented anger and resentment on the part of young blacks against the police due, in part, to the adoption of policing methods which did not command community support (Morgan, 1986). To remedy the deficiencies in police-

community relations, Scarman called for the development of police-community liaison mechanisms in the form of police/community consultative committees. (The other recommendations put forth in the Scarman Report are beyond the scope of this thesis).

Statutory Obligation

Police-community consultative committees were established in the wake of the Scarman report and were given statutory backing on January 1st 1985, when s. 106 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 came into effect. Section 106 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act requires that "arrangements ... be made in each police area for obtaining the views of people in that area about matters concerning the policing of the area and for obtaining their cooperation with the police in preventing crime in the area" (as cited in Morgan, 1986, p.83).

Morgan (1986, p.84) argues that the section's terminology is vague and subject to interpretation. "There is no specification as to what the consultation 'arrangements' shall comprise; how 'the views of the people' shall be obtained; what 'matters concerning the policing of the area' should or can be discussed; or how the 'cooperation' of the people should be enlisted".

These matters, and their interpretation, fall within the jurisdiction of the Police Authorities (who are statutorily responsible for arrangements) and their chief constables (on whose co-operation the arrangements substantially depend).

Goodson (1984, p.145) opposes the statutory imposition of community consultation as reflected in the following statement --- "I do not believe that the law is

a suitable instrument to persuade people to get round a table and talk". Goodson would prefer to see consultative arrangements develop at the community level and be built upon existing informal arrangements, which already target actual problems.

The Rationale Behind the Consultative Process

The rationale for local consultation, outlined in the Scarman Report, "is that police *efficiency* is dependent on police and public notions of police *effectiveness* being congruent" (as cited in Morgan, 1987, p.32). Thus, the argument is that the community consultative process will: i) ensure that the police are aware of community concerns and expectations; ii) serve as a mechanism for the sharing of important information between the public and the police; iii) educate the public as to the police services offered; and, iv) encourage community mobilization to assist the police with mutual concerns (Morgan, 1987).

Critics on both the Right and the Left of the political spectrum share the belief that efficient and effective policing is contingent on the police and the public working together with a common purpose. However, both groups support the consultative process, for fundamentally different reasons. For the Right, the police/community consultative process was introduced to complement the existing framework of police autonomy --- consultation without power and formal political accountability (Morgan, 1987). In contrast, those on the Left seek to bring the police/community consultative process under the control of locally-elected officials who have authority over police policy (Morgan, 1987; Savage, 1984). According to Savage (1984, p.50), "the basic thrust of such demands is an attack on the principle of the 'independence' of the police

as an obstacle in the way of accountability". Morgan (1987) and Savage & Wilson (1987) comment that many left wing critics reject the current police/community consultative arrangements as nothing more than a public relations exercise. In contrast, Keith (1988, p.69) notes that the view held by Islington Council, supported by the 'left realist' school of criminology, was that it was possible to "subvert the apparently powerless status of the new consultative groups by forcing senior officers to account for themselves in a public forum".

Police/Community Consultative Committees

Although there are variations in the interpretation of Section 106 of the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 throughout Britain, Morgan (1987, p.33) has put forth several generalizations typifying most police/community consultative committees. Morgan has observed, that the vast majority of police authorities throughout England and Wales have established consultative committees with "force-wide constitutions and terms of reference". These committees are typically based on police sub-divisions rather than local authority areas which, Morgan notes, place an emphasis on "police local administration rather than the political accountability of local government".

Morgan (1987) describes the committees as meeting quarterly, with typically 15 to 25 members, *appointed* partially or wholly by the police authority, in attendance. (To ensure political accountability, Morgan believes that committee members should be *elected*). The committee membership typically includes "representatives of county district and parish councils; the principal statutory services (invariably education and youth services, sometimes social services, housing, leisure, probation, etc.); the

churches; trades councils and/or chamber of commerce; ethnic minority organizations; residents' and tenants' associations; neighbourhood action groups; and voluntary service organizations, particularly those for the aged" (Morgan, 1987, p.33). The police, if not actual members, are usually represented by the sub-divisional superintendent who attends as of right.

The meetings are held in local authority or neighbourhood premises and chaired by elected members of the police authority. Provisions are made to have the general public attend parts of meetings, or have the occasional meeting open to the public. Morgan (1987) has observed that the publicity for meetings is generally poor.

Morgan notes (1987, p.33) that committee members are seldom under the age of 30 and are typically the active, 'respectable' community members.

They represent one organization and are usually involved in others. Generally speaking, they are not the sort of people who have previously had much contact with the police (except possibly socially) and though they know little of the police, are invariably well-disposed towards them. They are not generally people who have been in conflict with the police or have had adverse personal experiences with them.

Morgan queries whether those serving on the consultative committees are truly representative of the people they are supposed to serve. Morgan observes (1987; 1987b) that some community members --- the young, the ethnic minorities, the economically disadvantaged --- are conspicuously absent from the consultative process. Further, important community groups, and groups hostile to the police often refuse to become involved, dismissing the consultative process as a powerless public relations ploy.

Police/Community Consultation in Practice

In his article *Political Control or Community Liaison?*, Savage (1984), expressed cautious optimism towards the police/community consultative process, and its potential enhancement of police accountability. Savage believes that the consultative scheme might actually influence police policy in accordance with local priorities, however, to date, "there is little evidence that such a potential has been realized" (Savage & Wilson, 1987, p.259). Firstly, Savage and Wilson (1987, p.259) have observed that consultative group meetings typically revolve around issues of "self-definition" and "planning for the future", with very little attention being given to "police-community" or simply "policing issues". Savage and Wilson (1987, p.259) report one frustrated member stating, "We've spent years trying to find out why we're here, but we haven't really *done* anything"

Secondly, when policing and police-community issues have been discussed, Savage and Wilson note that the dialogue does not incorporate "community involvement in the policy and operations of policing" (Scarman Report, 1982, as cited in Savage and Wilson, 1987, p.260). Thus, they conclude that it is the "*legitimacy* ... function of consultation which figures most prominently" (p.260). Morgan (1987, p.34-35) shares this belief, and describes police personnel as delivering two messages which legitimate their function.

First, that the demands made on the police are outstripping the resources available to them. Crime is rising, the bureaucratic requirements growing ever more burdensome, public expectations of the police expanding and, thus, the need to ration what the police do becoming ever more imperative.

Secondly, insofar as officers talk about a particular aspect of the demands placed on them, it is the growing incidence of serious crime. If statistics are produced they are invariably of burglary and violent crime.

Savage & Wilson (1987) and Morgan (1987) have observed that this type of "legitimacy" presentation has stimulated an increase in support for police practices and sympathy towards police problems. Savage & Wilson (1987, p.260) note that "in all the meetings so far observed,... it is apparent that community representatives are disinclined or at least have found it difficult to respond with any presentations of their own problems, criticisms or concerns". Thus Savage & Wilson (1987, p.260) believe that the "legitimacy" presentation of the police, serves a "predominantly one-way agenda-setting function".

Because they do not have enough information or professional advice, the consultative groups, are not able to engage in an intelligent discussion on equal terms with local police managers about policing policy and practice. As a result, the discussion tends to be ritualistic --- the meetings generally become a means whereby the police confer legitimacy on the policies and practices they have decided to adopt (Smith, 1987, p.60).

Comments and Criticism

Morgan (1987) suggests that the police-community consultative process can promote local problems and develop practical solutions, however he contends that the establishment of the hoped-for partnership between the police and the public has not been realized. Morgan suggests various explanations for this failure: "confusion and ignorance" on the part of committee members (p.41); the lack of education to help committee members in their role; the negative response to the police and the committees from certain groups in the community; and the reluctance of police forces to provide adequate information to the committees or to treat them as much more than a public relations forum.

Morgan (1987) & Smith (1987) raise the following critical dilemmas: First, most of the functions of the police are "adversarial" (Smith, 1987, p.62) and therefore, cannot easily be reconciled through the creation of consensus. Secondly, it is difficult to establish goodwill because in any community the police have to deal with more than one interest group, and action acceptable to one group inevitably impinges on other groups in different ways. Morgan (1987) maintains that the consultative committees do not represent "community", regardless of how the concept is defined.

Willmott (1987) expands on the notion of community consensus by observing that some sections of the local community will have different population mixes, different interests, and different relations with the police. The role of each group in the consultative process should be clearly defined to ensure that a specific group is not dictating police action. Within a heterogeneous community, each group must have a voice and each group's interests must be taken into consideration. Additionally, the extent to which the community is heterogeneous will also directly influence the problems the police will face, and the conflict they will encounter within that community.

It has to be recognized that there are sometimes deep-seated conflicts of interest between different sets of people in a locality, and important differences in their respective relationships with police... There needs to be some machinery in place which can make it possible for negotiation to take place where necessary between the different interests and the police (Willmott, 1987, p.5).

As the previous community policing literature review has shown, consensus has not been reached concerning the definition community policing. The common thread which ties each definition is the underlying theme of the community and the police establishing a partnership and working together to identify problems and implement

solutions. Although this concept sounds appealing, it does not address how one achieves community policing when there are conflicting community interests. Thus, Smith (1987) argues that these are fundamental problems which prevent police from developing a better relationship with the community --- problems which have not been faced by community policing proponents.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE GROUPS IN CANADA

The introduction of police/community consultative groups within Canada and the R.C.M.P., has not followed the same path as their British counterparts. There have been no critical incidents to facilitate change, and as yet, police agencies are under no statutory obligation to ensure that consultative mechanisms are in place.

The establishment of community consultative groups within the RCMP was the direct result of a force wide directive by the Commissioner of the RCMP in 1989. In his annual Directional Statement on policy, the Commissioner instructed RCMP officers serving in a detachment of 12 or more in size, to establish community advisory committees. Leighton (1993) notes, "that this directive was not yet grounded in a rationale or plan to implement community policing did not seem to detract from its impact". This writer believes that this directive lacked direction thus, contributing to the cautious evolution of community consultative committees within the R.C.M.P.. The full potential of these mechanisms are yet to be realized.

Several Canadian authors (Normandeau & Leighton, 1990; Ministry of the Attorney General, 1993; Leighton, 1993; Weiler, 1993; and RCMP, 1995) believe that consultative committees are a viable means of obtaining community input into police practices.

Leighton (1993) regards community consultative committees as one of the most useful community policing strategies when applied to a particular community or client group. For Leighton, the consultative process provides an opportunity for the police to create a sustainable partnership with the community in addressing local crime and disorder problems. In practice, this means obtaining community input into:

- i) identifying local crime and disorder problems;
- ii) setting police priorities;
- iii) developing tactics to solve, reduce or prevent crime and disorder problems; and
- iv) allocating resources against those problems
(Leighton, 1993, p.248).

Although, there are several articles outlining the perceived benefits of the community consultative process (Normandeau & Leighton, 1990; Ministry of the Attorney General, 1993; Leighton, 1993; Weiler, 1993; and RCMP, 1995), there is a paucity of literature providing an in depth analysis of the Canadian experience. This thesis will endeavour to further this discussion.

CHAPTER 5

THE BROKEN WINDOWS THEORY

There are few theoretical interpretations of community policing. In part, this may be the result of the nebulous terminology surrounding community policing, or it may be that policy practices and principles require further development before a theoretical interpretation can emerge.

The "Broken Windows" or "Incivilities" thesis of Wilson and Kelling (1982) is the most frequently applied theoretical explanation of the community policing philosophy because it gives some "attention to the relations between police and actors in the community" (Greene & Taylor, 1988, p.198). Wilson and Kelling propose that police officers must protect individuals as well as the communities in which the residents live. They suggest that as physical and social incivilities increase and/or are more intense, community members will make fewer attempts to exert informal social control over one another and fear among community residents will increase.

If the first broken window in a building is not repaired, then people who like breaking windows will assume that no one cares about the building and more windows will be broken. Soon the building will have no windows. Like-wise, when disorderly behaviour -- say, rude remarks by loitering youths -- is left unchallenged, the signal given is that no one cares. The disorder escalates, possibly to serious crime (Wilson & Kelling, 1992, p.288).

According to Wilson and Kelling, police officers need to place emphasis on order maintenance duties (ie., disorderly behaviour, public drunkenness) which, in turn, will eliminate the disorderly behaviours "presumed to play a key role in making communities ripe for criminal invasion" (Greene & Taylor, 1988, p.198). It is expected that through community policing initiatives, residents will feel safer because police officers are addressing the disorders that inspire fear.

Grinc (1994) notes that Greene & Taylor (1988) in their examination of the "Broken Window's Theory", found little or no evidence in existing research to support the theory. "The association between incivility and fear of crime seems to be confined to neighbourhoods that are neither exceptionally poor and disorganized nor those that are particularly well to do" (p.466). Further,

The model mistakenly assumes that citizens desire closer interpersonal contact with the police and that such contact will reduce fear of crime. It may also be erroneous to assume that police officers can function as agents of informal social control, and even if that were possible, the amount of training required to assure effective community responsiveness has not been demonstrated (Greene & Taylor, 1988, p.206).

Skogan (1990) expands on the "Broken Window's" thesis by stating that community residents can play an important role in influencing neighbourhood disorder problems by participating in a two stage process. Each step must work for long term benefits to be realized.

First, the community group (in this case the community consultative group) must identify the "root solution" for disorder problems; the community group must focus their efforts on developing strategies which will "suppress social disorder and reverse the process of physical decay" (Skogan, 1990, p.127). The "root solution" for crime and disorder problems can be both social and political (Skogan, 1990). Social solutions focus on the importance of community standards of behaviour and the communal ability to enforce conformity. Community groups typically "focus on developing neighbourliness, watchfulness and a sense of territorial responsibility, and norms about public conduct" (Skogan, 1990, p.127). On the other hand, political strategies focus on public and private organizations which are considered to have sufficient concentrated power to affect

change. "Groups pursuing political strategies typically focus on the lending policies of local banks, on municipal land use and economic development policies, and on decisions in Housing Court about building abandonment" (Skogan, 1990, p.127).

The second phase is composed of "identifying how organized efforts can set those social and political solutions in motion, and keep them moving over the long haul" (Skogan, 1990, p.127). Skogan notes that particular attention must be paid to assumptions about how community groups can assist in reorganizing neighbourhood social processes. Typically, community efforts focus on the formation of neighbourhood watch, citizen patrols and programs for teens (Skogan, 1990). According to Skogan, these social strategies have nostalgic appeal because they promise the return of small town harmony to twentieth century communities. However, Skogan (1990, p.127) cautions that social strategies involve "interpersonal relationships that are powerfully affected by other factors, including the family organization of the community, the age of residents, and the area's physical layout". Thus, the ease with which social strategies can be introduced is dependent upon the community's economic and social stability, and its homogeneity of class and race.

Skogan believes that the key social factor determining whether a community can control crime and disorder is its *intervention capacity*. This means that it is very important for community members to take ownership of their "territory", and be willing to intervene and problem solve if events warrant. For intervention to work successfully, residents must be aware of their surroundings and be willing to either contact the police or challenge those who are acting suspiciously in their neighbourhood. Skogan maintains that neighbourhood residents will take territorial responsibility in those neighbourhoods which are stable, ones where residents know one another and converse freely.

Political solutions, on the other hand, involve the organization determining its political position. Accordingly, it is imperative that the group identify "the forces and actors inside and outside the community that lie at the heart of their problems, forces that they think they can successfully counter; thereby they must develop a political agenda" (Skogan, 1990, p.127). Skogan notes that political "root" solutions "involve property and land use, and take on a political cast when decisions are closely held by politicians and large corporate actors" (Skogan, 1990, p.129).

This thesis will seek to determine whether the Langley City community consultative group defines its role as developing a community/police problem-solving partnership which "actually affect(s) the factors that stimulate or retard disorder" (Skogan, 1990, p.127) or sees itself as a forum for police policies to be considered for approval.

CHAPTER 6

ORGANIZATIONAL THEORY

The theoretical analysis of community policing and the community consultative group would not be complete unless the organizational structure of the RCMP were studied. To provide a greater understanding of the implementation process of the RCMP's policy governing the establishment of community consultative groups and their role in community policing, one must turn to organizational theory.

The RCMP is a centralized federal police organization whose traditional style of service delivery has been governed by "centralized management policies and standard operational procedures which in many ways minimize local community influence" (Murphy, 1988, p.181). At the local level, the Officer in Charge (OIC) of a Detachment, is able to affect administrative changes within the detachment (ie., office reorganization, streamlining paperwork, computerization) however, must adhere to the centralized management policies and operational directives put forth by the Division's Headquarters and Ottawa. Such adherence may impede Detachment Commander autonomy and may create barriers to local community input into how policing services are delivered in that detachment area. The challenge to the RCMP organization, at the federal level, is to integrate and expand on existing policies and establish and implement new organizational mechanisms which are amenable to community participation. To fully understand the complexity of this task, one must obtain a theoretical understanding of the police organization.

The literature addressing the police organization identifies three main theories: The Classical Police Theory; The Behavioral Police Theory; and The Contemporary Police Theory. Each will be addressed in turn.

The Classical Police Theory

Initially, the literature addressing police management outlined classical principles of the police organization which were deemed to be universal in nature and applicable to all police organizations. These principles stressed a rigid hierarchical structure, strong centralized control, and authoritarian leadership (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1994).

By stressing these classic principles, it was hoped that a more professional police organization would emerge, which emphasized the importance of crime-control and managerial practices intent on improving law enforcement procedures. According to Goldstein (1992, p.72), "efforts to improve policing in this country [United States] concentrated almost exclusively on internal management: streamlining the operation, upgrading personnel, modernizing equipment, and establishing more businesslike operating procedures".

The most influential work governing police organizations and their management is believed to be O.W. Wilson's *Police Administration* (1950) (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1994, p.95). Touted as the "bible" of police administration, Wilson's work (and later with McLaren) advises police organizations on how to achieve an effective crime control mandate through the use of organizational and managerial practices "similar to those of military and industrial organizations" (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1994, p.95). The authors

identify "fundamental" administrative principles aimed at achieving an efficient crime control police department. They are:

grouping of similar tasks according to function, time and place; hierarchy of authority; specialization based on need; chain of command; unity of command (ie. employees must receive orders from only one supervisor); span of control (ie. supervisor should be responsible for a limited number of employees); and common sense in using the principles (Wilson and McLaren, 1977, as cited in Roberg & Kuykendall, 1994, p.95).

These "fundamental" administrative principles are very similar to those used by Weber (1936) to define the term bureaucracy. Historically, this term was associated with governmental administration, however, "sociologists regard it as a form of administration that is found in organizations pursuing a wide variety of goals" (Abercrombie, Hill & Turner, 1984, p.22). Weber's definition of bureaucracy incorporates various principles which have traditionally governed the administration of police agencies. These principles include:

a high degree of specialization and a clearly defined division of labour, with tasks distributed as official duties; a hierarchical structure of authority with clearly circumscribed areas of command and responsibility; the establishment of a formal body of rules to govern the operation of the organization; administration based on written documents; impersonal relationships between organizational members and with clients; long-term employment, promotion on the basis of seniority or merit; and a fixed salary (Abercrombie, Hill & Turner, 1984, p.22).

Coupled with the bureaucratic approach to police work came an increased focus on law enforcement as the primary function of police. According to Roberg & Kuykendall (1994, p.95) "this led to the police being judged primarily on their crime-control capabilities; that is, their effectiveness was measured in terms of arrests made and whether the crime rate was increasing or decreasing at the time".

Critics note that this theory, as a prescription for "effective management", has resulted in the emergence of "invisible, indirectly available, impersonal, specialist

officers" who focus on "crime as a legal infraction and are disinterested in 'community work' as not truly 'police work'" (Manning, 1988, p.31). With police managers focusing on a centralized span of control and equity in enforcement, police-community relations have become hierarchical, distant and authoritative. Thus, Manning (1984, p.206) believes that community policing is a "metaphor based on a yearning and the wish for personalization of service which contrasts with bureaucratic/professional policing".

Although Manning (1988) writes of the American experience, it is important to note that centralization plays a very strong role in the policing services provided by the RCMP. Specifically, the centralized authority of the RCMP is in Headquarters, Ottawa, Canada. Standardized policy directives governing police administrative and operational procedures are disseminated from Ottawa to each subdivision/detachment/unit across Canada. Each province also has a Headquarters which further circumscribes the actions of officers. The provincial Headquarters then has sub-divisions scattered throughout the province which can add additional rules and regulations to police operations. Within headquarters/sub-divisions/detachments/units, there exists a traditional hierarchy of command which further regulates the actions of police officers.

Traditionally, it has been the centralized authority, be it Ottawa or the provincial Headquarters/Subdivision, who informs line officers and the community of police priorities and procedures in their area, and directs how policy will be implemented (Oppal, 1994). Today, the challenge to the RCMP organization, at the federal level, is to integrate and expand on existing policies and establish and implement new organizational mechanisms which are consistent with the community policing philosophy.

The Behavioral Police Theory

By the 1960s, behavioral researchers recognized that police work entailed more than strictly crime control. Contrary to the classical police theorists before them, behavioral theorists recognized that police departments had to incorporate order-maintenance and social service functions into their police practices to be effective. In short, "effective policing required qualified personnel who could use discretion wisely to deal with a broad range of complex situations and problems" (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1994, p.96). Thus, behavioral theorists believed that flexible organizational structures would permit police officers to function more effectively (Langworthy, 1986; Roberg & Kuykendall, 1994).

In 1971, Angell proposed a "democratic" model of policing, which sought to replace the classical bureaucratic model of police organization. His model attempted to "develop a flexible, participatory, science-based structure that would accommodate change ... (which) is democratic in that it requires and facilitates the involvement of citizens and employees in its process" (as cited in Roberg & Kuykendall, 1994, p.96). Angell envisioned an organizational structure that is flat, with few levels of command, which provides police officers the requisite flexibility to creatively problem solve with the community.

Angell's model of police organization is characterized as "an attempt to develop a flexible, participatory, science-based structure that will accommodate change....(which) is designed for effectiveness in serving needs of citizens rather than autocratic rationality of operation" (Angell, 1971, as cited in Langworthy, 1986, p.22). Angell's

interpretation of the police role is broader in scope than bureaucratic theorists would have one believe. His suggestion that the provision of service be decentralized is "intended to make police able to respond to the local situation in a manner prescribed, at least in part, by the citizens of the community" (Langworthy, 1986, p.22). Central to this "community control model" (Langworthy, 1986, p.22), is the notion of the police officer as a public servant as opposed to the narrowly circumscribed law enforcement officer preferred by bureaucratic theorists.

Murphy & Muir (1984) maintain that community policing can be realized through a decentralized organizational structure. While formal decision-making responsibilities have traditionally been a function of rank within a hierarchical structure, a decentralized approach encourages the delegation of decision making authority to front line peace officers. Such delegation, according to Murphy & Muir (1984, p.141), "insures a level of decision making flexibility at the operational level that can address the specific needs of a particular community environment".

The community policing philosophy focuses on the police and the community working together to mutually identify and resolve community problems.

Communities that have been policed by highly-centralized police organizations [eg., the RCMP]... often complain that standard organizational policies or internal organizational decisions fail to take into account the particular problems, concerns or mores of the 'local' community. Without authority to respond quickly and sensitively to immediate community problems, centralized police departments often appear closed, unnecessarily bureaucratic and uncaring (Murphy & Muir, 1984, p.142).

Thus, to successfully deliver police services consistent with the community policing philosophy, the RCMP may have to seek organizational and managerial reform in order to provide community-specific policing and accommodate local citizen input.

The Contemporary Police Theory

The findings put forth by the behavioral researchers, led to the development of the systems and contingency theories of the police organization.

System theorists maintain that "all parts of system (e.g., an organization) are interrelated and dependent on one another" (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1994, p.97). Roberg & Kuykendall explain that it is very important for police managers to think of their organization as a "system" because changes to one unit will directly impact other units. For example, by the R.C.M.P. structuring all courses around the community-based policing philosophy at the Training Academy, this change may have a direct impact on how recruits deliver policing services once out in the field. Those already in the field may not have the same basic understanding of the community-based policing philosophy. Consequently, it is important for all personnel to communicate with one another in order to coordinate the expected level of recruit performance.

Roberg & Kuykendall note that police organizations should be viewed and managed from an open-systems perspective. This means that the police organization interacts and adapts to the changing needs of the community thereby bolstering police-community relations. However, they caution (as did Morgan, 1987; Smith, 1987; Willmott, 1987) that:

although police interaction with the community is important, a complicating factor in this interaction is that a "single" community or constituency does not exist. Instead, in any particular jurisdiction served by the police, there are generally many different "communities"; people of varying minority, ethnic, religious, class, or sexual-orientation backgrounds. Each community will undoubtedly have different and sometimes conflicting expectations concerning the police (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1994, p.98).

Each community may have different, often conflicting concerns they wish to raise with their police organization. As a result, the police may have to approach the same issues differently within the same jurisdiction.

In the late 1970s, Roberg developed the contingency approach as an extension of systems theory. This approach acknowledges that an organization is shaped by many internal and external influences, which vary according to circumstance. As a result, there is no one best way to organize and manage a police agency.

Roberg encourages police managers to recognize "the complex nature of the police role, the increasing levels of education of those entering the field, and the unstable nature of the police environment (i.e., changing laws, heterogeneous populations, political influences), which must be considered in attempting to determine the most effective managerial practices" (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1994, p.99). Thus, Roberg suggests that the following principles define the contingency approach:

Organic, low-structure, non-bureaucratic type designs are most effective when:

- Individuals have relatively high skill, and are widely distributed.
- Individuals have high self-esteem and strong needs for achievement, autonomy, and self-actualization.
- The technology is rapidly changing, nonroutine, and involves many non-programmable tasks.

Mechanistic, high structured, more bureaucratic designs are most effective when:

- Individuals are relatively inexperienced and unskilled.
- Individuals have strong needs for security and stability.
- The technology is relatively stable and involves standardized materials and programmable tasks.
- The environment is fairly calm and relatively stable.
(as cited in Langworthy, 1986, p.29).

From this perspective, the task for contingency managers is to determine which technique/method/organizational structure will be the most effective in a constantly

changing environment. Roberg acknowledges that "a variety of managerial practices and organizational structures may be necessary, depending on the particular situation at hand... in its ideal state, it [the contingency approach] is analytical, responsive, and flexible and is not committed to any particular managerial approach" (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1994, p.99).

Although the principles of Bureaucratic Theory date back to 1950, it is believed by this writer that these principles are still employed in the daily organizational and managerial practices of the RCMP today. It is believed that it is to this theoretical orientation that community policing initiatives (ie. community consultative groups) have been introduced and it is from this theoretical orientation that new organizational policies must be developed. Further, it is believed by this writer that "because police work is complex, nonroutine, and performed in an unstable environment, the (RCMP) could benefit from a shift from the dominant mechanistic (bureaucratic) type of organization to a more organic (democratic) form" (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1980 as cited in Langworthy, 1986, p.30).

This thesis will explore whether or not changes need to be made to the present organizational structure (bureaucratic) of the RCMP, in order for the community consultative mechanism to be effective. Specifically, given the traditionally bureaucratic organizational structure of the RCMP (which typically depicts a hierarchical structure of authority; the establishment of a formal rules governing operations; administration based on written documents; and impersonal relationships between organizational members and the community), can a productive community/police partnership be established? If it can, what role will the community consultative group play in that partnership?

CHAPTER 7

A CASE STUDY/ ACTION RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This thesis is an exploratory case study of the Langley Detachment's implementation of the RCMP's policy governing community consultative groups and seeks to assess the groups' role in community policing. Specifically, this thesis questions whether or not the policy governing community consultative groups (as currently written) can be successfully implemented and whether the community consultative mechanism can successfully translate the community policing philosophy into practice. The participatory action research paradigm provides the overall methodological strategy for this discussion.

Case Study Methodology

A case study is an "empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context ... relying on multiple sources of evidence" (Yin, 1994, p.13). The case study provides the researcher with the opportunity to experience contextual conditions which may be pertinent to the phenomenon of study, and employs different sources of information which guide data collection and analysis. In this respect, the case study will afford the researcher the opportunity to experience the dynamics of the community consultative process as it unfolds naturally.

Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg (1991, p.6-7) suggest that there are several fundamental lessons that can be conveyed by the case study:

1. It permits the grounding of observations and concepts about social action and social structures in natural settings studied at close hand.

2. It provides information from a number of sources and over a period of time, thus permitting a more holistic study of complex social networks and of complexes of social action and social meanings.
3. It can furnish the dimension of time and history to the study of social life thereby enabling the investigator to examine continuity and change in life world pattern.
4. It encourages and facilitates, in practice, theoretical innovation and generalization.

Yin (1994. p.1) maintains that "case study methodologies are preferred when 'how' or 'why' questions are posed, when the investigator has little control over events, and when the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within real-life context". These aspects are present in this study which will explore how the Langley Detachment implements the RCMP's policy governing community consultative groups. By documenting the decisions and actions of those RCMP personnel and community consultative members participating in the process, it is hoped that two questions will be answered: Can the policy governing community consultative groups (as currently written) be successfully implemented?; Can the community consultative mechanism successfully translate the community policing philosophy into practice?

This study seeks to document, within the real-life context, how the Langley Detachment chooses to interpret the current policy governing the community consultative process and the subsequent implementation of the policy and evolution of the consultative group. It is recognized that by working directly with the Langley Detachment members on the various aspects of this study, the information gathered may have influenced their decisions, however, this writer did not have control over events.

Case studies employ qualitative research procedures which seek to understand social action "at a greater richness and depth and, hence, seek to record such action through a more complex, nuanced, and subtle sets of interpretive categories" (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991, p.17). These research procedures however, have been criticized by mainstream quantitative researchers for lacking reliability and validity.

Reliability is usually defined as "the ability to replicate the original study using the same research instrument and to get the same results" (Feagin, Orum, & Sjoberg, 1991, p.17). As Yin (1994) notes, the emphasis is on doing the same case study over again, not on applying the same results to another case study. Accordingly "the general way of approaching the reliability problem is to make as many steps as operational as possible and to conduct research so that another researcher can repeat the procedures and arrive at the same results" (Yin, 1994, p.37),.

In regards to validity of observations, Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg (1991) maintain that the case study provides a clear advantage over other research methods. "Although the case study must rely on a good deal of judgement exercised by the observer, the great strength of this form of research is that it does permit the observer to assemble complementary and overlapping measures of the same phenomena" (i.e., documents, artifacts, observation, and interviews), which lend credence to the researcher's observations and conclusions. This case study is based on information from the following sources:

- The RCMP's directives/policy governing community consultative committees;
- Correspondence from the OIC of the Langley Detachment to the community consultative group members;

- Observations and notes taken during the community consultative committee meetings;
- Conversations with the RCMP member tasked with the implementation of the community consultative committee;
- Interviews with Superintendent R. McMartin, the OIC of the Langley Detachment, concerning the initial establishment of the community consultative committee;
- Findings of the telephone survey designed to obtain the views and opinions of Langley City residents concerning their community and the police services provided.

Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg (1991, p.39) state that the advantage of case studies is that "researchers who utilize them can deal with the reality behind appearances, with contradictions and the dialectical nature of social life, as well as with a whole that is more than the sum of its parts". It is this writer's belief that the case study approach will permit an examination of the relationships and patterns of behaviour between RCMP officers, committee members, and the interaction between both. It is hoped that by adopting the case study approach, "fundamental sociological knowledge" of human agents [the RCMP/Committee Members], communities [Langley City], and organizations [the community consultative group/RCMP] will be gained" (Feagin, Orum & Sjoberg, 1991, p.39).

Participatory Action Research Methodology

The participatory action research paradigm provides the overall methodological strategy for this thesis. Whyte (1991, p.5) defines participatory action research as "a strategy whereby the researcher goes beyond treating the members of the organization studied as gatekeepers and passive informants in order to involve some of them as *active* participants in the research process". According to Whyte this means, involving the

organizations members in all stages of the research process (i.e., from research design to data gathering, data analysis, and report writing) in addition to seeking to apply the implications of the research findings. Accordingly, the Langley RCMP Detachment members tasked with the implementation of the policy governing the community consultative process will be involved in the research process.

By adopting this methodological approach I will be able to systematically collect research data about an ongoing system. In this case, the "ongoing system" is the process in which the policy governing community consultative committees is implemented in Langley City. Therefore I will focus my research efforts on the Langley RCMP members tasked with implementing the policy governing community consultation and the establishment of the Langley City community consultative group. By directly observing how the policy is applied in practice, I hope to develop and/or discover aspects of the system's procedures which can lead to improvement or change. This will be accomplished through experiencing and participating in the community consultative process and interacting with those Langley RCMP Detachment members tasked with the policy's implementation.

Research Strategy

This case study provides a first step in understanding whether or not the policy governing community consultative groups (as currently written) can be successfully implemented and whether the community consultative mechanism can successfully translate the community policing philosophy into practice. The research procedures

adopted by this writer in cooperation with the RCMP were designed to triangulate information from the following data sources:

1. Literature Review: Community Policing; Organizational Theories; Community Consultative Groups;
2. Analysis of the RCMP's policy statements/directives on community consultative groups.
3. Observe how the policy is interpreted and implemented by the RCMP.
4. Attend and observe the Langley City community consultative group meetings to determine:
 - who the community consultative group is representing. Is it representing those in the community who are in *need* of police services, or are they representing the *average* person in the community. It is this writer's belief that the community consultative group should represent the *average* citizen in the community.
 - how are the members selected - by the RCMP? or public forum?
 - what role the RCMP plays in the community consultative group.
 - what role the community consultative group plays in contributing to the community policing philosophy. (Is the community consultative group a public relations strategy, or does it serve a valuable purpose?)
5. Aid in the formulation and analysis of surveys administered to Langley Residents concerning their community and the police services provided.
6. Record the steps taken by the community consultative group once community policing concerns are identified. Who suggests/proposes solutions? Are solutions implemented?
7. By combining the results of the above, assess if the policy governing community consultative groups (as currently written) can be successfully implemented and determine whether the community consultative mechanism can successfully translate the community policing philosophy into practice.

CHAPTER 8

RCMP POLICY GOVERNING COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE GROUPS

The R.C.M.P. has defined community policing as "a philosophy of policing and a method of service delivery ... which acknowledges the interactive process between the police and the community in mutually identifying and resolving community problems"(RCMP 1990;1992). Thus, efficient and effective policing requires "the adoption of policing methods which ... command the support of the community" (Scarman, 1985, as cited in Morgan, 1986, p.83). One method of estimating the support or disapproval of police procedures is thought to be through the establishment of community consultative groups. Community consultative groups may serve as vehicles for obtaining public opinion on the planning and management of police services in their area and as a forum for raising community concerns.

In 1989, the then-Commissioner of the RCMP directed the force-wide development and implementation of community consultative groups. In his directional statement, then-Commissioner Inkster stated:

I wish to remind members on detachment that better policing is achieved by participation and partnership with citizens and communities in identifying social problems and finding solutions to them. To this end, I support increased participation, visibility and the formulation of 'citizen advisory groups' to allow us to know how the public views us (RCMP 1989).

The RCMP's Strategic Action Plan 1990/91 - 1992/93 outlines the implementation of community policing in the RCMP. This document states that community policing is an "interactive process between the police and the community to mutually identify and

resolve community problems" (p.1). According to the Action Plan (which delineates 14 key characteristics of the community policing philosophy), there are three core principles which require integration into policing services to achieve a partnership between the police and the community. They are:

- i) values that recognize that communities have a legitimate role to play in police decision-making and that influence both the attitudes of members and the organization of detachment affairs to make a true partnership possible;
- ii) direct accountability to the community for dealing with their concerns and developing good communication;
- iii) power-sharing that allows citizens an active participation in policing efforts (p.1-2).

If a policy can contribute to the organization's specified goals and objectives, it will be deemed of value. The following discussion will outline the RCMP's policy governing community consultative committees and consider its ability to affect a true partnership between the police and the community.

The Policy

The implementation of community consultative committees within the R.C.M.P. is governed by the following Operational Policy directive (R.C.M.P. Operations Manual I.1.L.).

L.1. **General**

L.1.a. Community Consultative Groups are a community-based policing initiative for all detachments in contract divisions. In non-contract divisions, the groups are client-based and established on a S/Div. basis. [The focus of this study will revolve around this initiative in a contract division -- "E" Division].

L.2. **Aim**

L.2.a. The aim of the program is to:

1. enhance interaction between police and the community,
2. provide the public with input into the RCMP planning process,
3. ensure that minority concerns are addressed, and
4. solicit feedback and assistance respecting our various initiatives including recruiting.

L.2.b. These aims will be achieved through:

1. encouraging participation in the Community Consultative Groups by a truly representative cross-section of the community;
2. encouraging chaired and participatory Community Consultative Group meetings;
3. the taking of notes in any strategy discussions of important issues; and
4. taking into consideration the Group's views when any detachment, S/Div. or div. planning is effected.

L.3. **Role**

L.3. a. The Community Consultative Groups role is only advisory.

L.4. **Composition**

L.4. a. In communities with a sizable aboriginal population, commanders and community leaders should, if possible, establish a specifically native Community Consultative Group in addition to groups formed from a cross-section of the community.

L.4. b. Due to the geographic size or social makeup of a detachment areas, it may be necessary for some detachments to have more than one Community Consultative Group.

- L.4. c. All sectors of a community (including the poor, visible minorities, youth, the elderly, professionals, merchants, etc.) are to be invited to participate in the Community Consultative Groups.

L.5. Organization and Meetings

- L.5. a. Detachment commanders will meet with Community Consultative Groups as directed by division policy. (*Note: there is currently no division policy for British Columbia*).
- L.5. b. As part of the division audit process, S/Div. Commanders should meet annually with at least one Community Consultative Group at each detachment.
- L.5. c. As part of the division audit process, and depending on the size of the division, divisional commanders should meet with each Community Consultative Group or S/Div. Group once a year.
 - 1. The S/Div Group will be composed of a representative of each detachment's Community Consultative Group and will be organized along the same lines as a Detachment Group.
- L.5. d. It is not necessary to take detailed minutes. Handwritten notes on strategy or important issues will suffice.

L.6. Program Costs

- L.6. a. There will be no overtime incurred to facilitate travel to and from, and attendance at Community Consultative Group meetings
- L.6. b. Meetings are to be held in facilities such as church halls, schools, detachment facilities, council chambers, etc., where no costs are incurred for the rental of facilities.

Discussion

This writer would like to draw attention to several questions raised by the policy governing community consultative groups.

Firstly, *all* contract division detachments have been called upon to implement community consultative groups. This directive does not take into consideration those detachments which already have informal consultative mechanisms in place. The imposition of formal consultative mechanisms may be redundant.

Secondly, the policy states that through the participation of a truly representative cross-section of the community, the program will aim to:

1. enhance interaction between police and the community,
2. provide the public with input into the RCMP planning process,
3. ensure that minority concerns are addressed, and
4. solicit feedback and assistance respecting our various initiatives including recruiting.

However, the RCMP has defined community policing as an "interactive process between the police and the community in mutually *identifying and resolving community problems*", yet this aspect is not included within the aim of the program as stated in current policy. Additionally, this writer would argue that the goal of the program (as stated in policy) differs from the perspective put forth by Leighton (1993). According to Leighton, community consultative committees are deemed one of the most useful community policing strategies when applied to a particular community or client group. From Leighton's perspective, the consultative process is therefore seen as an opportunity for the police to create a sustainable partnership with the community in addressing local crime and disorder problems. In practice, this means obtaining community input into:

- i) identifying local crime and disorder problems;
- ii) setting police priorities [in addressing the local crime and disorder problems];
- iii) developing tactics to solve, reduce or prevent crime and disorder problems; and
- iv) allocating resources against those problems
(Leighton, 1993, p.248).

The writer is of the opinion that there is a fundamental difference between current policy which advocates for a community consultative committee that meets to provide input into the RCMP planning process, minority concerns and, various initiatives including recruiting *versus* the police creating a sustainable partnership with a particular community or client group in addressing local crime and disorder problems. The aim of the community consultative process requires clarity and definition --- Is the objective to create community ownership through the development of strategies to address local problems (which is consistent with the RCMP's definition of community policing) or is the objective to have community members participate in the setting of police service priorities and decision making (which is consistent with the RCMP's policy governing community consultation)?

Thirdly, the aims of the program (as outlined in L.2.a.) are to be achieved through: encouraging participation in the community consultative groups by a truly representative cross-section of the community; encouraging chaired and participatory community consultative group meetings; the taking of notes in any strategy discussions of important issues; and taking into consideration the Group's views when any detachment, S/Div. or div. planning is effected. This writer would like to pose the following questions: How is the term "community" operationalized; What is deemed a *truly* representative cross-section of the "community"? How do we "encourage" participation? Will community consultative groups receive sufficient information or

professional advice to be able to engage in a discussion on equal terms with detachment personnel about detachment policy, practice and planning issues? (If that is in fact the aim of the group).

Fourthly, if the role of the group is "only advisory", will their voice be heard?

Fifthly, if a detachment area has more than one community consultative group, how will the often conflicting and competing interests of the groups be reconciled? In the same vein, how can those participating in a consultative group be deemed a true representation of a community if, as was seen in Britain, some sectors of the community do not wish to participate?

It is believed that these questions require attention and clarification before the community consultative process can work successfully. Like Leighton (1993), this writer believes that the community consultative concept was introduced at a time when the community policing philosophy was not grounded in a rationale or implementation plan, thus ensuring the cautious evolution of community consultative groups across Canada.

CHAPTER 9

THE EVOLUTION OF THE LANGLEY CITY COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE GROUP

The Langley Detachment is responsible for providing police services to the municipality of Langley. This large municipality has a diverse composition. The Township of Langley has a total land area of 303 square kilometres and is one of the major agricultural production areas in Greater Vancouver. In 1991, the township of Langley had a population base of 66,040 persons. The township is predominantly a single family area with single family dwellings comprising 78.8% of the housing stock at the end of 1991. The City of Langley, on the other hand, has a total land area of 10.2 square kilometres and is maturing with multi-family units replacing single family dwellings near the downtown core. The downtown core is primarily a commercial area which encourages pedestrian-oriented shopping. There are a number of licensed premises located in the downtown core -- three cabarets which are open from 7pm until 2am; two hotels (with licensed lounges); and one neighbourhood pub. In 1991, the City of Langley had an estimated population base of 19,765 persons residing within 10.2 square kilometres, 31% of whom were 45 years of age and over (Statistics Canada, 1991). According to the Ministry of the Attorney General (1995), Langley City had the highest crime rate per Capita in the Greater Vancouver Regional District for 1994.

Clearly, the problems and issues faced by those living in these areas may be quite diverse, causing the police officer tasked with establishing the community consultative group to divide these communities into distinct areas. The Langley RCMP has divided the municipality into 4 separate communities based on geographical boundaries. They are:

- Langley City
- Brookwood
- Walnut Grove
- Aldergrove

Thus, the term community is defined on a geographical basis.

It was decided by the Officer In Charge (OIC) of Langley detachment to establish one "trial" group in Langley City as opposed to establishing community consultative groups in all locations simultaneously. According to Seagrave (1994), the benefit of this approach is that the detachment can learn from its experience with the "trial" group, ensuring that any problems encountered are not repeated. It is also easier to manage, monitor and evaluate one group.

From Policy into Practice

During the month of January 1994, the Corporal in charge of the detachment's Crime Prevention Unit was tasked with putting the policy governing the community consultative process into practice. As I had not joined the project until after the community consultative group had been selected and had had their first meeting, I can only describe this process from what I have learned from those directly involved.

The Langley Detachment chose to select representatives of local agencies and organizations to take part in the community consultative process. To this end, the Crime Prevention officer approached several active members of the community (Langley City), and invited them to join the community consultative group. Those who agreed were members of the following community organizations: the Rotary (1 male); the Seniors

Resource Centre (1 male); the Local Business Association (2 males); the Real Estate community (1 male); Mental Health outreach (1 female); the Chamber of Commerce (1 male); High School students (1 male, 1 female); the Hotel Association (1 male) and Crime Prevention Programs (2 females). These persons were all favourably pre-disposed to the police.

Community Consultative Group Meeting #1 - January 11, 1994

The group was brought together on the evening of January 11, 1994 at the RCMP Crime Prevention Office Conference Room at the Langley Detachment. At this meeting, the newly appointed OIC of the Detachment held an unstructured, "free-wheeling" meeting to explain community policing and the role of the community consultative group. Consistent with the definition provided in the RCMP's *Strategic Action Plan* the OIC explained community policing as the police and the community working "in partnership to address the problems/concerns of the City of Langley from a policing perspective" (Correspondence from the OIC to Consultative group members after the meeting - dated January 24, 1994). The group's role and aim were defined.

The **Aim** of the group is:

- to *advise* the OIC of the Langley Detachment on "community concerns as opposed to individual concerns";
- for the "police and the community (to) be in partnership to address problem/concerns of the City of Langley from a policing perspective"; and
- to serve as a forum for the community to "inform the police of the problems/concerns and then become involved in the possible solutions" (Personal communication and restated in correspondence from the OIC to community consultative group members, dated January 24, 1994).

Those interested in the community consultative process were invited to attend the next meeting, February 22, 1994 at 07:00pm at the Detachment's Crime Prevention Office Conference Room.

Community Consultative Group Meeting #2 - February 8, 1994

Seven committee members and I attended the next meeting. The meeting was chaired by the OIC of the Langley Detachment accompanied by the OIC of Detachment Operations and the Crime Prevention Officer. I was introduced to the group and my purpose was explained (ie., I was a S.F.U. student undertaking a Masters degree in Criminology and was studying the community consultative process). The group was assured that I would generally describe the findings of this study without identifying Group members. It was hoped that by preserving anonymity, I would be privy to the true feelings and reactions of the Committee members. The group agreed that I could study their proceedings.

In response to several questions and concerns raised at the group's initial meeting, the OIC invited a Crown Counsel representative to attend and review the *Young Offenders Act*. Most committee members stated that they had limited knowledge of the Act and gained much of their information from the various media sources. Committee members expressed their frustration with the Act's limited deterrent effect on youth behaviour, and directed questions to the Crown counsel representative.

The Crown's presentation concluded and the OIC turned the conversation to identifying community concerns. The OIC asked the committee members the following questions: What do you think are the problems in the community? How are we, as a

group, going to identify community problems? How are we going to target and address these problems? How should we prioritize identified problems? The group decided that these questions could be answered three ways -- by asking their peers within their respective groups what they perceived to be problem/concerns; through a telephone survey of Langley City residents and businesses; and by encouraging community members to write the Committee of their concerns. Members felt that these methods would help them identify and target problems specific to individual groups and the community at large. It was believed that the media could publicize the group's existence and stimulate community involvement.

The OIC advised participants that a telephone survey would be prepared by his office and sent out for comments prior to the next meeting (committee members were not invited to participate in the initial draft of the survey, nor did committee members did not indicate a desire to become involved in the process). The group discussed the benefits of a telephone survey, namely, that it could be conducted by community policing volunteers with minimal cost (thereby stimulating community involvement); it could reach a large number of people in the target population; and the information could be gathered relatively quickly.

Although there was very little casual conversation between group members, all appeared actively interested in participating in the problem solving process. The meeting stayed on topic, with the OIC directing the agenda. The meeting lasted for approximately 2 1/2 hours.

Meeting with the OIC - March 7, 1994

On March 7, 1994 I met with the OIC of the Langley Detachment, the OIC of Detachment Operation and the Corporal in Charge of the Crime Prevention Unit. The four of us sat down with three different surveys which had already been conducted in British Columbia and in England. Specifically, the surveys came from the Home Office in London, the Vancouver City Police, and the Langley RCMP Crime Prevention office. I had brought these surveys (with the expectation of the one conducted in Langley) as examples of those conducted by other police agencies. As the OIC had been recently appointed to the Langley Detachment, he hoped that the survey would meet two primary objectives. First, it was hoped that the survey would provide an indication of how Langley City residents perceived policing services in their immediate area. Secondly, it was hoped that the survey would give the community consultative committee an idea of where to focus their efforts. The Corporal in Charge of the Crime Prevention Unit also stated that he hoped to obtain feed-back from the community regarding his Unit's programs. Thus, the survey instrument (Appendix A) was drafted containing 50 questions, modified from the three sample surveys. It was organized into four sections:

- Section A dealt with policing priorities. Each respondent was asked to give their opinion on the priority that should be placed on investigating a variety of different offenses.
- Section B addressed fear of crime and the areas in which persons did not feel safe walking at night.
- Section C sought to determine how familiar the residents of Langley City were with the various crime prevention programs and community service organizations available to residents in the City (The Corporal in Charge of the Crime Prevention Unit wanted this section to provide community feed-back into his unit's programs).

- Section D dealt with how satisfied the residents of Langley City were with the delivery of police services.

The survey was designed to take approximately five minutes to complete.

The OIC, Inspector in Charge of Operations and the Corporal decided that the survey would be given to the community consultative committee members to review as a group at their next meeting.

The Corporal in Charge of the Crime Prevention Unit advised that he would have community volunteers, already working with the police, administer the survey and code the results. It was hoped that by including the volunteers in this process, they would become stakeholders in the project. The Corporal advised that he would provide the requisite training and support to the volunteers for the administration of the survey, and I would provide direction with respect to the coding of results.

Community Consultative Group Meeting #3 - April 13 1994

I met the seven community consultative committee members at the new Community Policing Station in Langley City. The Corporal in Charge of the Crime Prevention Unit chaired the meeting and introduced the group to the Constable in Charge of the Community Policing Station. The OIC had recommended that the Constable be the RCMP representative at each Committee meeting. The appropriate introductions were made. The Corporal explained that both he and the OIC were available to the group, if requested.

The RCMP had invited three members of the Langley Youth and Family Services Organization to attend and explain their role and services available to youth/families residing in the City of Langley. In summary, the RCMP can refer troubled youth/families to this organization for assistance. Committee members expressed their interest in the program, however, asked few questions.

The survey was given to each member and reviewed as a group. The Corporal asked members if they wished to change any aspect of the survey. There was limited discussion about the survey, resulting in no changes. The Corporal in Charge of the Crime Prevention Unit requested that the group take one week to consult with their various community organizations and solicit comments regarding whether the survey met its objective (ie., provide an indication of how Langley City residents perceived policing services; provide the community consultative committee an idea of where to focus their efforts). The Corporal explained that comments and criticisms would be welcomed so that changes could be made prior to the administration of the survey.

The Corporal was clearly in charge of this meeting with Committee members providing limited input into the proceedings -- very few unsolicited comments were made. To stimulate group participation and interest, the Corporal encouraged Committee members to speak to their peers and find out what problems/concerns community members were experiencing. These concerns/problems would be the focus of discussion at the next meeting.

The meeting lasted for approximately 2 hours.

The Survey Administration

The community consultative group members did not seek to change any of the survey questions. This raises a very important point in regards to the survey development. Specifically, the survey did not contain any input from the community at large nor the community consultative group. If community policing strives for a partnership between the community and the police in the identification of problems, it would have been beneficial for the community consultative group to have played a larger role in the development of the survey. Granted, the group was given ample opportunity to make any necessary changes to the survey, however, this point highlights the difficulty of stimulating participation when individuals do not wish to speak out. Or on the other hand, perhaps the lack of committee input can be explained by the group lacking proficiency in the area of questionnaire design thereby deferring to the perceived expertise of the police.

The Corporal in Charge of the Crime Prevention Unit had the Community Police Office volunteers administer the survey under his supervision throughout the months of May and June, 1994. He provided the necessary training and support. The surveys were conducted during the Community Policing Office's operational hours --- times when many sectors of the community may have been at work, or out of the home.

The Langley City telephone directory was used to "randomly" select respondents. After a community consultative group meeting, one group member explained to me that they chose the first last name for each letter of the alphabet until they reached "Z" and then started over again until a total of 500 persons had been contacted. From this description respondents were not randomly selected. Palys (1992, p.410) states that "in

order for a sample to be considered random, each sampling unit must have an equal probability of being selected". If respondents were selected as described, then each resident in the City of Langley who had a telephone, did not have an equal probability of being selected to participate in the survey. There are not an equal number of names under each letter of the alphabet thus, the sample is biased towards rare letters. The volunteers contacted 408 persons, 94 declined participation resulting in a survey sample of 314 persons.

Community Consultative Group Meeting #4 - June 29, 1994

I met the seven community consultative group members at the Langley City Community Policing Office. Again the meeting was called and Chaired by the RCMP Constable. The Constable had arranged for representatives from the Community Dispute Resolution Program to speak and explain their role and services. In sum, this group provides mediation services designed to help those in conflict work together to settle their differences through the help of an impartial third party. The group spoke for roughly 40 minutes and then departed, leaving pamphlets for those present.

The next item on the agenda was the community survey. Several of the Committee members had helped administer the survey. They wished to identify 3 questions which they found posed problems:

A. Section A Offence

Problem: It was believed that the list of offenses should have included B&E and Theft of Bicycles.

B. Section B Concerns

Question: Do you feel safe walking at night in the City of Langley?

Problem: Respondents automatically presumed that this meant walking at night in the downtown core, not their own neighbourhood.

C. Section D Service

Question: Have you ever had an occasion to contact the police?
Problem: The question does not specify the Langley RCMP, thus respondents could interpret this to mean contact with any police force.

All present agreed that these were valid concerns and that these issues should be clarified if the survey was administered in the future.

Very little casual conversation or interaction took place between group members at this meeting. The bulk of the proceedings were directed by the Constable in Charge of the Community Policing Station, who tried to stimulate group involvement and discussion. The committee members passively let the Constable chair the meeting. One committee member questioned the validity of the speed limit on a major Langley Street -- a stretch of road from the Fraser Highway leading to Highway 1. He believed that the speed limit was too low and that people are justifiably upset when they receive a speeding ticket. Discussion ensued with several members stating that the speed limit was reasonable. The committee decided that this complaint did not warrant action. The Constable tried to encourage the group to identify other problem areas however, the group sought to await the outcome of the surveys to help focus their problem solving efforts. One member explained that he/she did not feel comfortable making a decision for the community when he/she did not feel that one person could adequately speak for an entire community. Once again group members were encouraged to speak with their peers to find out what problems/concerns community members were experiencing.

I picked up the completed surveys.

Meeting: Coding of survey results - July 13, 1994

The surveys were not coded prior to administration, therefore, I created the coding scheme. Cognizant of the fact that "the general way of approaching the reliability problem is to make as many steps as operational as possible and to conduct research so that another researcher can repeat the procedures and arrive at the same results" (Yin, 1994, p.37), I drafted step by step instructions on how to code the survey (Appendix B). On a sample survey, I numbered each question, and on a separate piece of paper, provided a code for each possible response. There were four open-ended questions which required content analysis. This was achieved by randomly selecting and reviewing 25 completed surveys, and finding that the answers fell into a variety of broad categories. The 25 completed surveys were then given to an independent party who was requested to identify possible content themes for each of the open-ended questions. As the responses were fairly straight forward, it was not surprising that we chose to categorize the possible responses in the same manner.

On the 13th of July, I met with the Constable in Charge of the Community Policing Station and one member of the community consultative committee to discuss the coding process. Guided by the coding instructions, I took the constable and the volunteer through the coding process and answered all questions. They each completed one survey under my supervision. There were no problems. The constable and the volunteer were going to train others, and the coded sheets returned to me. I left the constable and the volunteer with the surveys, coding instructions, graph paper and my telephone contact numbers, both at work and at home.

Approximately six weeks later, I received the coded sheets and the completed surveys.

Survey Analysis

I chose a random sample of ten surveys and checked to make sure they had been coded properly by the volunteers. They had not. I chose ten more and found more errors. It became evident that in some cases, codes had been recorded that did not exist, and in several instances, codes had been incorrectly recorded. I therefore reviewed all of the surveys, re-coded where necessary, and entered the survey results on the computer. A statistical computer program was utilized.

I had spoken with the RCMP and community consultative group members and it had been decided to use basic statistical methods to summarize the data. The rationale behind this decision was that basic statistical methods (ie., frequency distributions and cross-tabulations) could be easily understood by all parties involved, and would describe, in conceptual terms, opinions towards police services. I was in agreement because quantitative analysis was not the primary focus of my research as I was primarily concerned with what the Committee did with the information after they received it.

The following discussion provides an overview of the survey sample demographics and summarizes the results of the four survey sections. Appendix C provides the complete results package.

SURVEY FINDINGS

Survey Sample Demographics

The 1991 Census states that the City of Langley has a population base of 19,765 persons. Of that total, 9,495 (48%) are male; 10,270 (52%) are female. The survey was able to reach four hundred and eight residents and business owners from Langley City (2.1% of target population). These persons were contacted by telephone and asked whether or not they would like to participate in a survey identifying policing concerns in their community. Of those contacted, 94 declined participation, resulting in a survey sample of 314 persons (1.6% of the target population). Table 1 provides participant response rates by sex.

TABLE 1

PARTICIPANT RESPONSE RATES BY SEX

SEX	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
FEMALE	179	57.0
MALE	96	30.6
NO RECORD	39	12.4
TOTAL	314	100.0

Very little information was available concerning those who did not wish to respond to the survey. What is known is that 18 were male, 38 female, and in 38 instances, no sex was recorded.

The 1991 Census states that Langley City has a total population of 6,200 persons aged 45 years and over (31% of its population). Table 2 illustrates that over one half of the respondents were 45 years of age or older.

TABLE 2
PARTICIPANT RESPONSE RATES BY AGE

AGE	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
UNDER 16	5	1.6
16 YRS - 24 YRS	34	10.8
25 YRS - 34 YRS	49	15.6
35 YRS - 44 YRS	59	18.8
45 YRS - 59 YRS	74	23.6
OVER 60 YRS	85	27.1
NO RESPONSE	8	2.5
TOTAL	314	100.0

Table 3 provides insight into respondent age and sex.

TABLE 3
PARTICIPANT AGE BY SEX

AGE	NUMBER FEMALE	NUMBER MALE	NO RESPONSE
UNDER 16	3	1	1
16 YRS - 24 YRS	16	15	3
25 YRS - 34 YRS	32	11	6
35 YRS - 44 YRS	43	12	4
45 YRS - 59 YRS	43	25	6
OVER 60 YRS	40	32	13
NO RESPONSE	2	0	6
TOTAL	179	96	39

When compared to the 1991 Census information for the City of Langley, it becomes evident that the survey sample is not truly representative of the community at large, thus, the survey results cannot be generalized to all persons residing in the City of Langley. This conclusion is drawn from the 1991 Census information which reports Langley City's population as being 48% male and 52% female. This contrasts with the survey sample which is 31% male and 57% female. The Census data also reflects approximately 31% of the population being 45 years of age and older in comparison to this survey's sample of 52% in that same category. Additionally, all contacts were made during the office hours of the Community Policing Station (10:00hrs and 18:00hrs), times when many sectors of the community may have been at work or out of the home. This may explain why there is an over representation of older people participating in this survey. Thus, the survey results are by no means conclusive.

Section A: Offence

In order for the community consultative advisory committee to offer meaningful suggestions to the Police in regards to policing priorities, respondents were asked to determine what priority they felt should be placed on investigating a number of offenses. Respondents were asked to use a four-point scale from 1=a great deal, to 4=not at all, to rate a number of offenses.

By looking at the answer to each question, and determining how many people believed that the police should spend a "great deal of time" investigating each offense, the following list of priorities emerges. Table 4(a) provides a rank ordering of the specified offenses.

**TABLE 4(a)
OFFENSES PRIORITIZED**

SPEND "GREAT DEAL OF TIME"	NUMBER RESPONDING	%
SEXUAL ASSAULT	270	86.0
DRINKING AND DRIVING	269	85.7
ROBBERY WITH VIOLENCE	265	84.4
USE OF DRUGS	196	62.4
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	183	58.3
VANDALISM TO PRIVATE PROPERTY	178	56.7
VANDALISM TO PUBLIC PROPERTY	163	51.9
THEFT OF AUTO	129	41.1
THEFT FROM AUTO	123	39.2
SPEEDING	118	37.6
DISOBEY TRAFFIC LIGHTS AND SIGNS	118	37.6
CAUSING DISTURB CONV. STORE	105	33.4
PURSE SNATCHING	90	28.7
CAUSING DISTURB PARK	60	19.1
TRAFFIC EXCESSIVE NOISE	42	13.4
NOISY PUBLIC PARTIES	37	11.8
NOISY PRIVATE PARTIES	31	9.9

By looking at each table and combining the categories of "a great deal" and a "fair amount", public priorities change. Table 4(b) provides the combined rank ordering of specified offenses.

**TABLE 4(b)
OFFENSES PRIORITIZED**

SPEND "GREAT DEAL" AND "FAIR AMOUNT" OF TIME	NUMBER RESPONDING	%
DRINKING AND DRIVING	295	94.0
SEXUAL ASSAULT	290	92.4
ROBBERY WITH VIOLENCE	285	90.8
VANDALISM TO PRIVATE PROPERTY	277	88.2
VANDALISM TO PUBLIC PROPERTY	277	88.2
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	265	84.4
USE OF DRUGS	258	82.1
THEFT OF AUTO	237	75.5
DISOBEY TRAFFIC LIGHTS AND SIGNS	230	73.3
CAUSING DISTURB CONV. STORE	228	72.6
SPEEDING	225	71.7
THEFT FROM AUTO	222	70.7
PURSE SNATCHING	214	68.2
CAUSING DISTURB PARK	172	54.8
NOISY PUBLIC PARTIES	126	40.1
NOISY PRIVATE PARTIES	124	39.5
TRAFFIC EXCESSIVE NOISE	108	34.4

NOTE: Tables 4(a) & (b), indicate that respondents place a higher priority on traditional crime control policing services, than the order maintenance duties characteristic of the community policing philosophy.

Section B: Concerns

Section B addressed fear of crime and the areas in which persons did not feel safe walking at night. It was found that the majority of respondents did not feel safe walking in the City of Langley at night.

**TABLE 5
"FEEL SAFE WALKING AT NIGHT"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	114	36.3
NO	192	61.1
NO RESPONSE	8	2.5
TOTAL	314	100.0

Of the 114 respondents who feel safe walking at night in the City of Langley, 34 (30%) were female, 65 (57%) were male, 15 (13%) did not indicate their sex. Of the 192 respondents who stated that they do not feel safe walking at night, 142 (74%) were women, 26 (14%) were men, and 24 (13%) did not indicate their sex.

Respondents were then asked whether or not there were any places that they would avoid when walking in the City of Langley at night. They were given five choices: Alleys; Convenience Stores; Side Streets; Walkways; and Main Roadways.

Table 6 rank orders these choices.

**TABLE 6
"PLACES TO AVOID SUMMARIZED"**

PLACES TO AVOID	NUMBER/314 WHO WOULD AVOID AREA	% RESPONDING
ALLEYS	206	65.6
CONVENIENCE STORES	175	55.7
SIDE STREETS	175	55.7
WALKWAYS	125	39.8
MAIN ROADWAYS	111	35.5

Section C: Crime Prevention Programs

Section C sought to determine how familiar the residents of Langley City were with 12 crime prevention programs/community service organizations available in the City, namely, *Block Watch*; *Counterattack: Block Parents*; *Operation Identification*; *Lock it and Pocket*; *Drug Awareness in Schools*; *Lady Beware*; *Langley Family Services*; *RCMP Victim Services*; *Citizen Crime Patrol Watch*; *Community Dispute Resolution Program*; and *Langley Youth and Family Services*. Of those surveyed, there were only three programs that respondents were not familiar with. These programs were *Lock it and Pocket*; *Lady Beware*; and *Community Dispute Resolution*.

Section D: Service

Section D dealt with how satisfied the residents of Langley City were with the delivery of police services. The respondents were asked whether or not they had had occasion to contact the police. The problem with this question, as identified by one of the community consultative group members, was that the question did not specify the Langley RCMP, thus respondents could have interpreted this to mean contact with any police agency. Of the 314 survey participants, 41% or 129 respondents had not had occasion to contact the police, which reduced the survey sample to a total of 185 respondents.

The majority of respondents were satisfied with the policing services offered, however, they had not been kept up to date with the progress or outcome of the investigation.

Community Consultative Group Meeting #5 - November 30, 1994

The Constable in Charge of the Community Policing Office called a meeting of the community consultative group. Attendance was disappointing. The Corporal in Charge of the Crime Prevention Unit, myself and four Committee members were in attendance, with the Constable serving as the Chair once again. I gave each person a complete copy of the survey results and reviewed the results in their entirety. As the results are self explanatory, questions were few and discussion minimal. The Corporal asked the group to discuss the survey results amongst their peer group in an effort stimulate problem identification and community input. Copies of the survey results were also provided to the OIC of the Detachment and to the OIC of Detachment Operation.

In attendance at the meeting was a representative from the Halifax City Police Advisory Group. He was presently living in Langley due to a work exchange program. He had asked the Constable in Charge of the Community Policing Office if he could talk to the group about the role of the Halifax Advisory Group and detailed the group's purpose and problems encountered. The Halifax representative explained that his group's purpose was to: i) facilitate communication between the community and police; ii) give the public a voice; and iii) obtain a further understanding of the policing profession. The group, however, had encountered the following problems: i) maintaining attendance and interest; ii) member frustration that enough wasn't being done -- more chatting than action; iii) members of the group using the forum as a "soap box" (ie. promotion of personal interests).

The group related to the problems of maintaining attendance and interest as the Langley group's numbers had dwindled to four members. The RCMP Chair sought input

from the group concerning how to increase participation and maintain interest. The Committee felt that the RCMP member should recruit new representatives from the target organizations. The Committee did not have any immediate ideas on how to maintain interest. They would ponder these issues and discuss them again at the next meeting. One committee member stated that it was difficult to target a problem and implement a course of action because the member did not believe his/her opinion was representative of those residing in Langley City. The member did not know how to resolve this issue. Other members echoed this concern. The Chair and I suggested (again) that they canvass their peer group and/or persons encountered through volunteer efforts. These contacts would provide an indication of community opinions. The Committee could then discuss their findings at the next meeting. It was also suggested the survey results be reviewed.

The same committee member reiterated the concern with speeding on a major Langley roadway. The member wanted to know how the police could justify traffic enforcement on this stretch of road when there was limited enforcement in residential sub-divisions. The Committee member wanted to have the group campaign and change the target enforcement areas. The Committee did not concur.

Very little casual social communication took place over the course of the meeting, with group members soliciting topics of discussion from the Constable. It became clear that the group had silently appointed the Constable as the group's chair and were looking to him for direction.

Community Consultative Group Meeting #6 - February 8, 1995

The Constable in Charge of the Community Policing Office called a meeting of the community consultative group, six members were in attendance -- two of which were new members recruited by the RCMP constable. The Chair (the RCMP Constable) had arranged for Retired Superintendent A. OOSTHOEK, a private consultant specializing in the improvement of police service delivery methods, to attend the meeting. The Chair hoped that the retired Superintendent could help the group focus their efforts. The Committee expressed frustration and dissatisfaction with its lack of progress and believed that definitive goals and objectives (provided by the police) would help direct its efforts. The Constable explained that the community consultative group was their group and that the responsibility of chairing the meetings should, ideally, be passed on to a community member. The consultative group members agreed, however, no candidates were nominated. The group stated that they hoped to solve problems however, they could not find any problems to target and solve. (This is surprising considering Langley City had one of the highest crime rates per capita in the Greater Vancouver Regional District for 1994). They also raised the issue of representation, stating that they were not sure that it was possible to present themselves as a representative sample of the community. The group (upon the direction of OOSTHOEK) decided that they should draft a Mission Statement and a Vision of how their goals would be achieved. (No one offered to take responsibility for these tasks). The group decided that they wanted to: i) facilitate interaction between the police and the community (idea conceptualized - not operationalized); and ii) provide the OIC of the Detachment with a venue to discuss *his* ideas and obtain feedback.

A Committee member suggested that the meetings be held once a month to stimulate interest. All members agreed that it was difficult to maintain interest with long gaps between meetings. I felt that this was a very encouraging meeting. Group members chatted without prompting, and appeared genuinely interested in the consultative process. I left feeling as though the group finally had an idea of what it was trying to achieve.

Community Consultative Group Meeting #7 - March 8, 1995

The Constable in Charge of the Community Policing Office called, and Chaired the community consultative group meeting. The objective was to put the ideas brought up in the previous meeting into practice. The Constable tried to stimulate discussion revolving around the appointment of a Committee Chair person; drafting a Mission Statement and Vision. Committee members could not make any decisions regarding these aspects. Members of the Committee did decide to draft a letter to the local newspaper to notify the community of their formation and to request the community identify local problems/concerns. The drafted letter will be reviewed at the next meeting.

Once again there was limited casual social conversation between group members. Even after 6 meetings, it appeared as though members did not want to get to know one another on anything more than a superficial level. The responsibility for Chairing the meeting, was again, left to the RCMP Constable. The group dynamics were disappointing since the previous meeting had held so much promise.

Community Consultative Group Meeting #8 - April 4, 1995

Unfortunately, I was unable to attend this meeting. Through speaking with the Constable in Charge of the Community Policing Office and from reviewing his Monthly Report, I learned that the Traffic Sergeant attended the meeting and discussed City traffic concerns. The RCMP constable called and chaired this meeting.

The press release was brought to this meeting, and reviewed. It was subsequently submitted to the *Langley Times* and printed on May 6, 1995. The article quotes the Constable in Charge of the Community Policing Station as saying "The purpose of the committee is to advise the police about problems and concerns in the community we are most interested in hearing from anyone in the City of Langley who has a policing concern or suggestions for the committee". This article was written in such a way as to lead the reader to believe that the community consultative group was a RCMP run program as opposed to a community forum. The article did not stimulate any input from those residing or working in the City of Langley.

Community Consultative Group Meeting #9 - May 10, 1995

The Constable in Charge of the Community Policing Office called a meeting of the community consultative group. Only two members attended. At my suggestion, The Chair (the RCMP Constable) had arranged for the Inspector of Operations to attend and provide information concerning RCMP operations. It was hoped that this information would stimulate interest and perhaps help give the group direction.

The Committee was disappointed with the low turnout, and felt that they were unable to take on any type of project in the absence of the rest of the group. The Chair

put forth three ideas: i) perhaps the group should think about bringing in new people due to the dwindling interest in the program; ii) the group should decide how they are going to identify problems; iii) perhaps a pin-map could help the group identify "hot spots" and solutions could be sought for these problem areas.

The same committee member reiterated dissatisfaction with the current speed limits.

Everyone at the meeting felt that the attendance was disappointing and wondered if there was enough interest to maintain the program. Once again, there was minimal casual conversation, and discussion topics were dependent upon the agenda set by the Constable. The disappointing attendance set the mood for the meeting which lasted roughly 1 hour. This was the last meeting of the group.

Summary

In sum, I attended seven of the nine community consultative group meetings over one year and five months. The responsibility for calling and Chairing the meetings always fell upon the shoulders of the RCMP Constable in Charge of the Langley City Community Policing Station. Initially, these meetings were well attended with the group seeking to identify and solve community concerns/problems. This however, was easier said than done because the group was unable to focus and direct its efforts. Initially, the group chose not to identify community concerns/problems because they wanted to obtain the survey results before taking action. The results, however, were not discussed after their initial review. By the fifth meeting, interest began to dwindle. The group lacked direction and struggled with defining their role in the community policing partnership.

According to Phillips (1970), a small group (eg., a community consultative group) normally comes together in a defined space to deal with a specific agenda that states a defined goal, for example problem solving. Each group member, usually has a personal interest in the problem solving process and stands to gain or lose by the outcome. In the case of the Langley City community consultative group, participants did not have a vested interest in the problem solving process as no "burning issues" were ever identified. Each participant had the opportunity to develop some sort of relationship with others present, however, these relationships were on a relatively superficial level.

Phillips (1970) in his description of small groups, describes group members as having the opportunity to adopt distinct role(s) and responsibilities which will either help or hinder the development of the group. According to Shaw (1981) the role of the group leader is one of the most important roles associated to the group's structure and functioning.

The effective functioning of the group depends in large part on the degree to which the activities of group members are coordinated and directed towards achievement of group goals. Although such coordination is possible without a formal group leader, it is probable that effective group action seldom occurs unless someone in the group directs the various activities of group members (Shaw, 1981, p.315).

In the case of the Langley City community consultative group, the role of leader was foisted upon the Constable who valiantly tried to shift this responsibility over to a community member. No one accepted his offer. The constable also tried to guide the committee towards drafting their own goals and objectives, however, this was not done. It would have been very easy for the Constable to dictate the actions of the group, however, he was aware that this would not achieve the elusive community partnership consistent with the community policing philosophy.

The following chapter will endeavour to interpret these research findings.

CHAPTER 10

INTERPRETATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This thesis questions whether or not the policy governing community consultative groups (as currently written) can be successfully implemented and whether the community consultative mechanism can successfully translate the community policing philosophy into practice. The following discussion will endeavour to begin to answer these questions.

Implications for Policy

Although community policing is touted as a philosophy which "acknowledges the interactive process between the police and the community in mutually identifying and resolving community problems" (Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1992), the RCMP remains a centralized federal police organization whose traditional style of service delivery is governed by "centralized management policies and standard operational procedures" (Murphy, 1988, p.181).

The RCMP's policy governing the establishment of community consultative committees states that "community consultative groups are a community-based policing initiative for *all* detachments in contract divisions ... [The group's existence and input will become] part of the division audit process" (RCMP Operations Manual, I.1.L.). In British Columbia, this policy has compelled Detachment Commanders to institute a

formalized community consultative group, even in locations where there is an absence of a demonstrated need, and regardless of the informal consultative mechanisms already in place. The Detachment Commander must establish the group to comply with policy audit standards. According to one RCMP report, the policy directive calling for the establishment of community consultative groups at all detachments was perceived by RCMP officers as "just another example of a headquarters directive with no apparent consideration for the demographics and culture of individual communities" (RCMP, 1994, p.6).

Policy makers failed to consider that the community policing philosophy (the driving force of community consultation) was not yet grounded in a rationale or implementation plan. The result was that the police officers tasked with the policy's implementation, were not given the requisite tools (ie., education) to translate the policy into practice. The policy governing the community consultative process is written in such a vague manner that it does not offer pragmatic suggestions on how to establish/foster a viable community/police partnership.

These points are illustrated in the Langley City community consultative process.

The Langley City Community Consultative Group

The RCMP's policy governing the implementation of community consultative committees states that the aim of the program is to:

1. enhance interaction between police and the community,
2. provide the public with input into the RCMP planning process,
3. ensure that minority concerns are addressed, and
4. solicit feedback and assistance respecting our [the RCMP's] various initiatives including recruiting (RCMP Operations Manual I.1.L.2.a.).

These objectives are to be achieved through:

1. encouraging participation in the Community Consultative Groups by a truly representative cross-section of the community;
2. encouraging chaired and participatory Community Consultative Group meetings;
3. the taking of notes in any strategy discussions of important issues; and
4. taking into consideration the Group's views when any detachment, S/Div. or div. planning is effected (RCMP Operational Manual I.1.L.2.b.).

The RCMP's Operations policy states that the objective of the group is to "provide the public with input into the RCMP planning process; ensure that minority concerns are addressed; and solicit feedback and assistance respecting the RCMP's various initiatives including recruiting" (RCMP Operations Manual I.1.L.2.a.). I do not believe that the Langley City community consultative group was formed with these specific objectives in mind.

The intent of the group, as originally stated at the meeting on January 11, 1994, was to: i) *advise* the OIC of the Langley Detachment on "community concerns as opposed to individual concerns"; ii) for the "police and the community (to) be in partnership to address problem/concerns of the City of Langley from a policing perspective"; and iii) to serve as a forum for the community to "inform the police of the problems/concerns and then become involved in the possible solutions" (Personal communication and restated in correspondence from the OIC to community consultative group members, dated January 24, 1994). I believe that these objectives are consistent with the RCMP's definition of community policing, which states that community policing is an interactive process between the police and the community in mutually *identifying and resolving community problems*, but differ significantly from the policy objectives which seek to solicit the community's participation in the setting of police service

priorities and decision making. It is believed that the OIC of the Langley Detachment endeavoured to create a sustainable partnership with the community in addressing local crime and disorder problems as opposed to forming a group to meet for the purpose of providing input into the RCMP planning process, and various initiatives including recruiting.

Initially, group members were enthusiastic and interested in participating in the consultative process however, over the months interest and attendance dwindled. One possible explanation could be that the group did not have a clear understanding of their role in the consultative process nor the goal of the process. Shaw (1981) notes that without clearly defined group goals, effective group action is seldom realized.

At the first meeting, the OIC of the Langley Detachment clearly chaired the meetings and explained the group's role however, as time progressed, it became evident that the group lacked direction and leadership and was not certain how to effect a sustainable police/community partnership. There may be several reasons for this. I will address each in turn.

Firstly, two different RCMP officers were responsible for the consultative group. The first, the Corporal in Charge of the Crime Prevention Unit, selected persons he knew (or knew of) to participate in the process and in conjunction with the OIC of the Detachment, explained the objectives of the consultative group at the first meeting. The Corporal attended two more meetings, and at the fourth, the responsibility for the group was turned over to the constable in charge of the Langley City Community Policing Station. The constable did not have the benefit of attending any of the prior meeting,

and was left to interpret previous events. It may have helped the Constable to have been involved with the group prior to its responsibility being transferred to him.

Secondly, as there is a lack of literature addressing the consultative process, one tasked with the implementation of a community consultative groups is at a distinct disadvantage. This, coupled with the fact that the Langley RCMP had not undergone community policing training (ie., having the community policing philosophy and ramifications explained) left the constable (and subsequently the group) trying to define and determine how to achieve a sustainable community/police problem solving partnership. (The Langley RCMP Detachment members underwent community policing training in the Fall of 1995).

At one level, the Langley City community consultative group did serve to enhance interaction between the police and the community representatives. Community members met with the police nine times over an 18 month period to discuss police/community issues. However, there is a possibility that this interaction would have taken place informally as the majority of those involved in the Group had had positive involvement with the police in the past and were active members within the community. Thus, I believe that it would be beneficial to encourage the participation of those representing a variety of community interests in the consultative process. This belief is based on the sentiments expressed by many of the Group members who stated that they did not feel that their opinion was representative of the community. To remedy this, the community consultative group tried to solicit the views of the average citizen residing within Langley City and obtain suggestions and input into the problem solving process, through the use of the media. The Group did not receive any response to their article in the *Langley Times*.

The constable in charge of the community consultative group encouraged, chaired and participated in the community consultative group meetings. On several occasions the constable suggested that the leadership and administrative responsibilities be transferred to the community members. Each time the issue was discussed but never resolved. The Constable was forced to continue calling and chairing the meetings. Discussion topics were always put forth by the RCMP constable in an effort to stimulate interest, conversation, and input. Group members rarely introduced discussion topics, but when a topic was raised (eg., speeding concerns), group members believed that the issue reflected a personal interest rather than a community concern and therefore the topic was disregarded. It is interesting to note that when a date had not been set for the next meeting, no one from the group would contact the constable and inquire into the group's next meeting date.

In light of the above, it would be helpful to determine if the Langley City community consultative group would be interested in participating in an educational workshop addressing the RCMP's move towards the community policing philosophy and the establishment of the community consultative process. This workshop would have as its goals the drafting of the group's "terms of reference" and provide an understanding of the possible directions the group could take. One of the first priorities of the group might be to help draft some objective means of identifying and selecting subsequent members. It would be beneficial to have practical suggestions put forth by all participants which would detail how the group can achieve its goals. At this stage, it may be necessary for the workshop leader to provide an example problem and help the group work through it. This type of exercise may help the group gain the confidence needed to problem-solve on their own.

To help foster the belief that the community consultative group is a community based venture rather than an RCMP run program, it may be worthwhile to change the meeting venue to a community facility. This change of venue may encourage community ownership of the project.

Thirdly, it is possible that the consultative group members were not aware of any significant police/community issues to stimulate action and involvement. To increase vibrant community input it may be necessary to restructure the group (ie., select/encourage input from a variety of persons, not just those well-disposed towards the police) and solicit input from particular communities of interest or client groups. The objective would be for any community of interest or client group to bring forth its specific problem and work with the consultative group to develop and implement possible solutions.

I believe for the group to effect change the RCMP member serving on the committee must be of sufficient *rank* and carry enough *power* to respond to the suggestions put forth. I believe that this would demonstrate, to the community, the RCMP's commitment to the consultative process.

CONCLUSION

The traditional model of policing, characterized by rapid response to calls for service and a crime control mandate, still predominate the RCMP's policing services (RCMP, 1994). While individual police officers and individual detachments may promote the community policing principles and philosophy, the approach has not been "uniformly adopted across the Force [RCMP], nor have the necessary organizational changes yet been made to support a Force-wide community policing approach" (Royal Canadian Mounted Police 1990).

Leighton (1994) suggests that a lack of practical guidelines for use at the operational level may contribute to the cautious Force-wide adoption of the community policing philosophy. In a similar vein, the successful establishment and evolution of the community consultative process can only benefit from the requisite organizational changes the community policing philosophy will bring. Specifically, organizational change will require a move away from the bureaucratic principles which govern the daily organizational and managerial practices of the RCMP today. It is believed by this writer that "because police work is complex, nonroutine, and performed in an unstable environment, the (RCMP) could benefit from a shift from the dominant mechanistic (bureaucratic) type of organization to a more organic (democratic) form" (Roberg & Kuykendall, 1980, as cited in Langworthy, 1986, p.30).

This case study of the Langley City community consultative group illustrates the difficulties of implementing a centralized policy directive without the requisite educational foundation to provide guidance. The policy was implemented at a time when

the community policing philosophy (the driving force of community consultation) was not yet grounded in a rationale or implementation plan.

According to Normandeau & Leighton (1990) one of the main objectives of a community consultative group is to help the police identify their short-term priorities when addressing community crime and disorder problems. In a complimentary fashion, the community consultative groups can be a valuable forum for community members to raise concerns and promote "practical cooperative solutions" (Willmott, 1987, p.3). Neither of these objectives are captured within the current policy governing the establishment of community consultative groups. The role and mandate of the group (as stated in policy) warrants clarity and definition.

The central tenet of community policing acknowledges the interactive process between the police and the community in mutually identifying and resolving community problems. The one main weakness is that the policy does not address how to achieve this goal. In June 1995, RCMP members throughout British Columbia began to receive community policing training through formal standardized training workshops. It is projected that the training sessions will reach all members within the next three years. I believe that policy makers failed to acknowledge the magnitude and the ramifications the community policing philosophy would have on the organization when community policing was first introduced in 1989. Without accompanying such a directive with the requisite training, it is not surprising that the full potential of the community policing philosophy has not yet been fully realized.

As with any single case study, these results are not conclusive. To facilitate a greater understanding of the community consultative process, comparative case studies could be conducted and results evaluated. Community consultative committees are a recent innovation and as such, it is premature to reach definitive conclusions about their impact. Participants, both the community and the police, are still learning their role in the process, seeking examples and looking for good practices.

APPENDIX A

LANGLEY CITY COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE GROUP POLICE SURVEY

1994 LANGLEY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE POLICE SURVEY

Interviewer _____ Time of call 4 5 Date 6
 Gender of respondent (circle one) female male AGE 8

Hello my name is _____ I am calling from the Langley Police Office. We are conducting a survey in your community to identify policing concerns. The information is being gathered in order to guide decision making.

The questions will only take five minutes and your answers will be kept strictly confidential.

Your name will NOT be included in the survey results. We would appreciate it if you could spend five minutes to answer these questions. (pause) Is that all right?

(if answer is NO thank the person for their time and terminate the call. The No response must be counted on the "STAT SHEET".

If YES: Continue

Could we begin now?

Section A: OFFENCE

In order for the community advisory committee to offer meaningful suggestions to the Police in regards to Policing priorities, we would like to have your view on the priority that should be placed on investigating the following offence.

Using a four-point scale from 1=a great deal, to 4=not at all how would you answer the following questions. Again the scale is 1=a great deal, to 4=not at all.

(circle the response)

	a great deal	a fair amount	not very much	not at all	don't know	MISSING
	1	2	3	4	Y(5)	9
a. Causing a disturbance						
Parks	1	2	3	4	Y	9 <input type="checkbox"/>
Convenience Stores	1	2	3	4	Y	10 <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Drinking Driving	1	2	3	4	Y	11 <input type="checkbox"/>

(2)

	a great deal 1	a fair amount 2	not very much 3	not at all 4	don't know Y	
c. Sexual Assault	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 12
d. Domestic Violence	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 13
e. Purse Snatching	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 14
f. Robberies with violence	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 15
g. Traffic						
Speeding	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 16
Disobey traffic signs & lights	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 17
Excessive Noise	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 18
h. Theft of Automobile	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 19
i. Theft from Automobile	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 20
j. Use of Drugs	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 21
k. Vandalism						
Public Property	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 22
Private Property	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 23
l. Noisy Parties						
Public parties	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 24
Private parties	1	2	3	4	Y	<input type="checkbox"/> 25

Apart from these, are there any other offences that happen quite often in the city of Langley that are of concern to you?

26

Section B: Concerns

Do you feel safe walking at night in the City of Langley? YES ___ NO ___ ²⁷

When walking in the City of Langley at night are there any places that you would avoid (check off responses)

- ²⁸ Convenience stores
- ²⁹ Side streets
- ³⁰ Alleys
- ³¹ Main Roadways
- ³² Walkways
- other ³³

Section C: Crime Prevention Programs

There are a number of crime prevention programs and community service organization available in the City of Langley

	Take a moment & think if any come to mind	Have you heard of any of the following	Have you had a chance to participate in any
a) Block Watch	()	()	() <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 34
b) Counter Attack	()	()	() <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 35
c) Block Parents	()	()	() <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 36
d) Operation Identification	()	()	() <input type="checkbox"/> 37
e) Lock it and pocket	()	()	() <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 38
f) Drug awareness in schools	()	()	() <input type="checkbox"/> 39
g) Lady Beware	()	()	() <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 40
h) Langley Family Services	()	()	() <input type="checkbox"/> 41
i) RCMP Victim Services	()	()	() <input type="checkbox"/> 42
j) Citizen Crime Watch Patrol	()	()	() <input type="checkbox"/> 43
k) Community Dispute Resolution Program	()	()	() <input type="checkbox"/> 44
l) Langley Youth & Family Services	()	()	() <input type="checkbox"/> 45
m) Other _____	()	()	() <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 46

Section D: Service

Have you ever had an occasion to contact the police Yes ___ No ___
(if yes continue) (if no thank the person for their cooperation and end
the survey)

47

1. When you phoned the police to make your report, were you
satisfied with the way the police department operator handled you call?

() yes () No - If no why not? ⁴⁸

2. In your opinion, was this initial investigation (read
categories)

- 1. Very satisfactory
- 2. Satisfactory
- 3. Neither satisfactory nor unsatisfactory
- 4. Unsatisfactory
- 5. Very unsatisfactory

⁴⁹

3. Did the police provide you with a name and phone number to allow you to
contact them once they left?

- () yes
- () no
- () don't know

⁵⁰

4. Did the police provide you with information about the
progress or outcome of the investigation at a later time?

- () yes
- () no
- () don't know

⁵¹

5. How good a job did the police do in keeping you informed of the
progress or outcome of the investigation. (read categories)

- 1. very good
- 2. good
- 3. average
- 4. poor
- 5. very Poor

⁵²

6. Did you attempt to contact the investigating officer(s) after the
initial investigation?

- () yes
- () no IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 9

⁵³

7. Were you successful?

- () yes
- () no IF NO, GO TO QUESTION 9

⁵⁴

APPENDIX B

LANGLEY CITY COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE GROUP POLICE SURVEY

CODING INSTRUCTIONS

1994 LANGLEY COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE: POLICE SURVEY

Please read this instruction sheet in conjunction with a completed survey. A **PENCIL** is required to complete this exercise. Each survey response is going to be coded with a number which will be written down on the graph paper provided.

On the top right hand corner each survey is numbered. Working from left to right, these three numbers will go in the first three boxes.

INTRODUCTION:

TIME OF CALL: Take the time to the closest hour on the 24 hour clock. If the time is before the half hour, take back to the previous hour (ie. if the time states 10:15 record 10). If at or after the half hour take to the next hour (ie. if the time states 15:30 record 16). If the time is left blank (the data is missing), record 9.

DATE: Refer to a calendar and determine which **DAY** the questionnaire was completed on. Each **DAY** has been given a number:

Monday	1	
Tuesday	2	
Wednesday	3	
Thursday	4	
Friday	5	
Saturday	6	
Sunday	7	
Missing	9	(The blank is empty)

SEX: Record

female	1	
male	2	
both	3	
missing	9	(The blank is empty)

AGE: Please indicate which category the respondents age falls into:

under 16	1	
16 - 24	2	
25 - 34	3	
35 - 44	4	
45 - 59	5	
over 60	6	
missing	9	(The blank is empty)

SECTION A: OFFENCE

Record the appropriate number as indicated on the questionnaire.

DON'T KNOW	5
Missing	9

In response to the question "Apart from these, are there any other offenses that happen quite often in the city of Langley that are of concern to you?"

Which of the following categories does the response best fall into:

Assault	1
Reckless Driving	2
Drugs	3
Youth	4
Break & Enter	5
Other	6
Missing	9

SECTION B: CONCERNS

In response to the question "Do you feel safe walking at night in the City of Langley?"

Yes	1
No	2
Missing	9

In response to the question "When walking in the City of Langley at night are there any places that you would avoid (check off responses)."

A check mark (Yes)	1
Space left empty (No)	2

Other - which of the following categories does the response best fall into:

Parks	1
Unlit Areas	2
Malls	3
Movies	4
Don't go out	5
Other	6
Empty (No)	7

SECTION C: CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS

"There are a number of crime prevention programs and community service organizations available in the City of Langley". Record the check mark which is closest to the right hand side of the page:

Come to mind	1
Heard of any of the following	2
Participated in	3
Empty ()/No	4

For the blank indicating (m) other, which of the following categories does the response best fall into:

Kid find	1
Community Policing	2
Counselling Programs	3
Other	4
Empty ()/No	5

SECTION D: SERVICE

"Have you ever had an occasion to contact the police?"

Yes	1
No	2

If this question has not been checked in, please make an effort to ask the interviewer whether or not this means that he/she did not ask the question (in which case you would record a 9) or whether or not the person answered NO but he/she omitted to complete place a check mark in the appropriate box (NO=2). If this question has been answered NO, please place a 9 in each box in response to each question that is left blank.

1. "When you phoned the police to make your report, were you satisfied with the way the police department operator handled your call?"

Yes	1
No	2

If the respondent has indicated NO and has given a reason, code the reason instead of NO (2)

Why not? Failed to respond	3
Other reason provided	4
Not Applicable	5
Missing	9

2. Record the number which has been circled on the questionnaire.
- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Not Applicable | 6 |
| Missing | 9 |
3. Yes 1
No 2
Don't Know 3
Not Applicable 4
Missing 9
4. Yes 1
No 2
Don't Know 3
Not Applicable 4
Missing 9
5. Record the number which has been circled on the questionnaire.
- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Not Applicable | 6 |
| Missing | 9 |
6. Yes 1
No 2
Not Applicable 3
Missing 9
7. Yes 1
No 2
Not Applicable 3
Missing 9
8. Put in the appropriate number
Missing 9
9. Record the number which has been circled on the questionnaire.
- | | |
|----------------|---|
| Not Applicable | 6 |
| Missing | 9 |
10. Which of the following categories does the response best fall into:
- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----|
| Generally satisfied with the police | 01 |
| Generally dissatisfied with police | 02 |
| Need more police | 03 |
| Focus on youth | 04 |
| Other | 05 |
| Missing | 99 |

APPENDIX C

LANGLEY CITY COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE GROUP POLICE SURVEY RESULTS

**LANGLEY CITY
COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE GROUP
POLICE SURVEY**

RESULTS

PREPARED BY:

**LESLEY M. BAIN
SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF CRIMINOLOGY
NOVEMBER, 1994**

SURVEY RESULTS

SURVEY SAMPLE

The 1991 Census states that the City of Langley has a population base of 19,765 persons. Of that total, 9,495 (48%) are male; 10,270 (52%) are female. The survey was able to reach four hundred and eight residents and business owners from Langley City. These persons were randomly contacted by telephone and asked whether or not they would like to participate in a survey identifying policing concerns in their community. Of those contacted, 94 declined participation, resulting in a survey sample of 314 persons. Table 1 provides participant response rates by sex.

TABLE 1
PARTICIPANT RESPONSE RATES BY SEX

SEX	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
FEMALE	179	57.0
MALE	96	30.6
NO RESPONSE	39	12.4
TOTAL	314	100.0

Very little information was available concerning those who did not wish to respond to the survey. What is known is that 18 were male, 38 female, and in 38 instances, no sex was recorded.

Table 2 illustrates that over one half of the respondents were 45 years of age or older.

TABLE 2
PARTICIPANT RESPONSE RATES BY AGE

AGE	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
UNDER 16	5	1.6
16 YRS - 24 YRS	34	10.8
25 YRS - 34 YRS	49	15.6
35 YRS - 44 YRS	59	18.8
45 YRS - 59 YRS	74	23.6
OVER 60 YRS	85	27.1
NO RESPONSE	8	2.5
TOTAL	314	100.0

Table 3 provides insight into respondent age and sex.

TABLE 3
PARTICIPANT AGE BY SEX

AGE	NUMBER FEMALE	NUMBER MALE	NO RESPONSE
UNDER 16	3	1	1
16 YRS - 24 YRS	16	15	3
25 YRS - 34 YRS	32	11	6
35 YRS - 44 YRS	43	12	4
45 YRS - 59 YRS	43	25	6
OVER 60 YRS	40	32	13
NO RESPONSE	2	0	6
TOTAL	179	96	39

The following results represent the opinions of those who participated in the survey.

FINDINGS

SECTION A: OFFENCE:

In order for the community consultative advisory committee to offer meaningful suggestions to the Police in regards to policing priorities, respondents were asked to determine what priority they felt should be placed on investigating a number of offenses. Respondents were asked to use a four-point scale from 1 = a great deal, to 4 = not at all, to rate the following offenses.

A(a). Causing a disturbance in parks.

Fifty five percent of respondents felt that police should spend "a fair amount" to a "great deal of time" investigating these complaints. Table 4 illustrates how participants rank this offence.

TABLE 4

PARTICIPANT RANKS "CAUSING A DISTURBANCE - PARKS"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	60	19.1
A FAIR AMOUNT	112	35.7
NOT VERY MUCH	97	30.9
NOT AT ALL	28	8.9
DON'T KNOW	15	4.8
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

A(b). Causing a disturbance in Convenience Stores.

Almost three quarters of respondents felt that the police should take the time to investigate the complaint of "causing a disturbance in convenience stores". Table 5 provides a breakdown of each respondent's opinion.

TABLE 5

PARTICIPANT RANKS "CAUSING A DISTURBANCE - CONVENIENCE STORE"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	105	33.4
A FAIR AMOUNT	123	39.2
NOT VERY MUCH	41	13.1
NOT AT ALL	20	6.4
DON'T KNOW	16	5.1
NO RESPONSE	9	2.9
TOTAL	314	100.0

B. Drinking and Driving.

The majority of those surveyed felt that the Police should spend "a great deal" of time investigating drinking and driving offenses. Table 6 illustrates that 86% of respondents place a high priority on this offence.

TABLE 6
PARTICIPANT RANKS "DRINKING AND DRIVING"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	269	85.7
A FAIR AMOUNT	26	8.3
NOT VERY MUCH	7	2.2
NOT AT ALL	8	2.5
DON'T KNOW	3	1.0
NO RESPONSE	1	.3
TOTAL	314	100.0

C. Sexual Assault.

The majority of respondents (86%) believed that the police should spend a "a great deal" of time investigating sexual assaults. Table 7 provides a break down of these attitudes.

TABLE 7
PARTICIPANT RANKS "SEXUAL ASSAULT"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	270	86.0
A FAIR AMOUNT	20	6.4
NOT VERY MUCH	11	3.5
NOT AT ALL	5	1.6
DON'T KNOW	4	1.3
NO RESPONSE	4	1.3
TOTAL	314	100.0

D. Domestic Violence.

Eighty four percent of respondents felt that the police should spend "a great deal" to a "fair amount" of time investigating domestic violence. Table 8 illustrates how participants rank this offence.

TABLE 8
PARTICIPANT RANKS "DOMESTIC VIOLENCE"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	183	58.3
A FAIR AMOUNT	82	26.1
NOT VERY MUCH	30	9.6
NOT AT ALL	11	3.5
DON'T KNOW	7	2.2
NO RESPONSE	1	.3
TOTAL	314	100.0

E. Purse Snatching.

Sixty eight percent of those surveyed felt that the police should spend "a great deal" to "a fair amount" of time investigating the offence of purse snatching. Table 9 provides the break down of respondent opinion.

TABLE 9
PARTICIPANT RANKS "PURSE SNATCHING"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	90	28.7
A FAIR AMOUNT	124	39.5
NOT VERY MUCH	71	22.6
NOT AT ALL	15	4.8
DON'T KNOW	9	2.9
NO RESPONSE	5	1.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

F. Robberies With Violence.

Table 10 illustrates that 84% of those surveyed believed that the police should spend "a great deal" of time on robberies with violence.

TABLE 10

PARTICIPANT RANKS "ROBBERIES WITH VIOLENCE"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	265	84.4
A FAIR AMOUNT	20	6.4
NOT VERY MUCH	16	5.1
NOT AT ALL	4	1.3
DON'T KNOW	4	1.3
NO RESPONSE	5	1.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

G(a). Traffic - Speeding.

Seventy two percent of those surveyed felt that the police should spend "a great deal" to "a fair amount" of time investigating speeding. Table 11 provides the break down of respondent opinion.

TABLE 11
PARTICIPANT RANKS "SPEEDING"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	118	37.6
A FAIR AMOUNT	107	34.1
NOT VERY MUCH	73	23.2
NOT AT ALL	13	4.1
DON'T KNOW	1	.3
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

G(b). Traffic - Disobey Traffic Lights and Signs.

Table 12 illustrates that 73% of respondents believed that the police should spend "a great deal" to "a fair amount" of time investigating these complaints.

TABLE 12

PARTICIPANT RANKS "DISOBEY TRAFFIC LIGHTS AND SIGNS"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	118	37.6
A FAIR AMOUNT	112	35.7
NOT VERY MUCH	67	21.3
NOT AT ALL	12	3.8
DON'T KNOW	1	.3
NO RESPONSE	4	1.3
TOTAL	314	100.0

G(c). Traffic - Excessive Noise.

Respondents (62%) did not believe that the police should place a priority on traffic related excessive noise. As Table 13 illustrates, 20% of respondents believed that "no time" should be spent on this complaint.

TABLE 13
PARTICIPANT RANKS "TRAFFIC - EXCESSIVE NOISE"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	42	13.4
A FAIR AMOUNT	66	21.0
NOT VERY MUCH	132	42.0
NOT AT ALL	65	20.7
DON'T KNOW	3	1.0
NO RESPONSE	6	1.9
TOTAL	314	100.0

H. Theft of Auto.

Seventy five percent of those surveyed believed that the police should spend "a great deal" to "a fair amount" of time addressing this offence.

TABLE 14

PARTICIPANT RANKS "THEFT OF AUTO"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	129	41.1
A FAIR AMOUNT	108	34.4
NOT VERY MUCH	53	16.9
NOT AT ALL	9	2.9
DON'T KNOW	6	1.9
NO RESPONSE	9	2.9
TOTAL	314	100.0

I. Theft from Automobile.

Table 15 illustrates that 70% of those surveyed believed that the police should spend "a great deal" to a "fair amount" of time on theft from automobile.

TABLE 15

PARTICIPANT RANKS "THEFT FROM AUTOMOBILE"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	123	39.2
A FAIR AMOUNT	99	31.5
NOT VERY MUCH	67	21.3
NOT AT ALL	13	4.1
DON'T KNOW	6	1.9
NO RESPONSE	6	1.9
TOTAL	314	100.0

J. Use of Drugs.

Those surveyed believe that the police should spend "a great deal" to "a fair amount" of time on the use of drugs. Table 16 provides the breakdown of respondent opinion.

TABLE 16
PARTICIPANT RANKS "USE OF DRUGS"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	196	62.4
A FAIR AMOUNT	62	19.7
NOT VERY MUCH	32	10.2
NOT AT ALL	12	3.8
DON'T KNOW	7	2.2
NO RESPONSE	5	1.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

K(a). Vandalism to Public Property.

A large proportion (88%) of those surveyed believed that the police should spend "a great deal" to "a fair amount" of time investigating complaints of vandalism to public property. Table 17 provides the breakdown of respondent opinion.

TABLE 17

PARTICIPANT RANKS "VANDALISM TO PUBLIC PROPERTY"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	163	51.9
A FAIR AMOUNT	114	36.3
NOT VERY MUCH	26	8.3
NOT AT ALL	8	2.5
DON'T KNOW	1	.3
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

K(b). Vandalism to Private Property.

A large proportion (88%) of those surveyed believe that the police should spend "a great deal" to "a fair amount" of time on investigating complaints of vandalism to private property.

Table 18 provides the breakdown of respondent opinion.

TABLE 18

PARTICIPANT RANKS "VANDALISM TO PRIVATE PROPERTY"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	178	56.7
A FAIR AMOUNT	99	31.5
NOT VERY MUCH	20	6.4
NOT AT ALL	11	3.5
DON'T KNOW	2	.6
NO RESPONSE	4	1.3
TOTAL	314	100.0

L(a). Noisy Public Parties.

Respondents did not place a high priority on the investigation of noisy public parties.

Table 19 provides the breakdown of respondent opinion.

TABLE 19
PARTICIPANT RANKS "NOISY PUBLIC PARTIES"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	37	11.8
A FAIR AMOUNT	89	28.3
NOT VERY MUCH	118	37.6
NOT AT ALL	49	15.6
DON'T KNOW	16	5.1
NO RESPONSE	5	1.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

L(b). Noisy Private Parties.

Respondents did not place a high priority on the investigation of noisy private parties.

Table 20 provides the breakdown of respondent opinion.

TABLE 20
PARTICIPANT RANKS "NOISY PRIVATE PARTIES"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
A GREAT DEAL	31	9.9
A FAIR AMOUNT	93	29.6
NOT VERY MUCH	126	40.1
NOT AT ALL	46	14.6
DON'T KNOW	11	3.5
NO RESPONSE	7	2.2
TOTAL	314	100.0

M. Other Offenses of Concern.

At the conclusion of the above list of offenses, the respondents were asked whether there were any other offenses, that happen quite often in the City of Langley, that were of concern.

Table 21 lists the offenses of concern.

TABLE 21
PARTICIPANT LISTS "OTHER OFFENSES OF CONCERN"

OTHER OFFENSES OF CONCERN	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
ASSAULT	5	1.6
RECKLESS DRIVING	10	3.2
DRUGS	4	1.3
YOUTH	33	10.5
BREAK AND ENTER	21	6.7
OTHER	29	9.2
NO RESPONSE	212	67.5
TOTAL	314	100.0

N. Offenses A to L Prioritized.

Respondents were asked to determine what priority they felt should be placed on investigating offenses A through L (section M is not included in this summary as the rating method is not consistent with the other sections). By looking at each table and determining how many people believed that the police should spend a "great deal of time" investigating each offense, the following list of priorities emerges. Table 22(a) provides a rank ordering of offenses A through L.

By looking at each table and combining the categories of "a great deal" and a "fair amount", public priorities change. Table 22(b) provides the combined rank ordering of offenses A through L.

**TABLE 22(a)
OFFENSES "A" THROUGH "L" PRIORITIZED**

SPEND "GREAT DEAL OF TIME"	NUMBER RESPONDING	%
SEXUAL ASSAULT	270	86.0
DRINKING AND DRIVING	269	85.7
ROBBERY WITH VIOLENCE	265	84.4
USE OF DRUGS	196	62.4
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	183	58.3
VANDALISM TO PRIVATE PROPERTY	178	56.7
VANDALISM TO PUBLIC PROPERTY	163	51.9
THEFT OF AUTO	129	41.1
THEFT FROM AUTO	123	39.2
SPEEDING	118	37.6
DISOBEY TRAFFIC LIGHTS AND SIGNS	118	37.6
CAUSING DISTURB CONV. STORE	105	33.4
PURSE SNATCHING	90	28.7
CAUSING DISTURB PARK	60	19.1
TRAFFIC EXCESSIVE NOISE	42	13.4
NOISY PUBLIC PARTIES	37	11.8
NOISY PRIVATE PARTIES	31	9.9

TABLE 22(b)
OFFENSES "A" THROUGH "L" PRIORITIZED

SPEND "GREAT DEAL" AND "FAIR AMOUNT" OF TIME	NUMBER RESPONDING	%
DRINKING AND DRIVING	295	94.0
SEXUAL ASSAULT	290	92.4
ROBBERY WITH VIOLENCE	285	90.8
VANDALISM TO PRIVATE PROPERTY	277	88.2
VANDALISM TO PUBLIC PROPERTY	277	88.2
DOMESTIC VIOLENCE	265	84.4
USE OF DRUGS	258	82.1
THEFT OF AUTO	237	75.5
DISOBEY TRAFFIC LIGHTS AND SIGNS	230	73.3
CAUSING DISTURB CONV. STORE	228	72.6
SPEEDING	225	71.7
THEFT FROM AUTO	222	70.7
PURSE SNATCHING	214	68.2
CAUSING DISTURB PARK	172	54.8
NOISY PUBLIC PARTIES	126	40.1
NOISY PRIVATE PARTIES	124	39.5
TRAFFIC EXCESSIVE NOISE	108	34.4

SECTION B: CONCERNS:

A. Feel Safe Walking in the City?

Respondents were asked whether or not they felt safe walking in the City of Langley at night. As Table 23 illustrates, the majority of respondents do not feel safe walking in the City at night.

TABLE 23

"FEEL SAFE WALKING AT NIGHT"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	114	36.3
NO	192	61.1
NO RESPONSE	8	2.5
TOTAL	314	100.0

Of the 114 respondents who feel safe walking at night in the City of Langley, 34 (30%) were female, 65 (57%) were male, 15 (13%) did not provide their sex. Of the 192 respondents who stated that they do not feel safe walking at night, 142 (74%) were women, 26 (14%) were men, and 24 (13%) did not indicate their sex.

Of the 114 respondents who feel safe walking at night in the City of Langley, 4 (4%) were under the age of sixteen; 19 (17%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 22 (19%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 20 (17%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 29 (25%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 18 (16%) were over age 60; and 2 (2%) respondents failed to provide their age. Of the 192 respondents who do not feel safe walking at night, 1 (1%) was under the age of sixteen; 15 (8%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 26 (13%)

were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 38 (20%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 41 (21%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 65 (34%) were over age 60; and 6 (3%) respondents failed to provide their age.

B. Any places to Avoid?.

Respondents were asked whether or not there were any places that they would avoid when walking in the City of Langley at night. Respondents were given six choices: i) Convenience Stores ii) Side Streets iii) Alleys iv) Main Roadways v) Walkways vi) Other. Tables 24-30 provide the results.

i) Convenience Stores.

Table 24 illustrates that over one half of respondents would avoid Langley City convenience stores at night.

TABLE 24
"AVOID CONVENIENCE STORES"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	175	55.7
NO	135	43.0
NO RESPONSE	4	1.3
TOTAL	314	100.0

Of the 175 respondents who stated that they **would avoid** Langley City **convenience stores** at night, 111 (63%) were female, 35 (20%) were male, and 29 (17%) respondents failed to provide their sex. Of the 135 respondents who stated that they **would not avoid** Langley City **convenience stores** at night, 67 (50%) were female, 58 (43%) were male, and 10 (7%) respondents failed to provide their sex.

Of the 175 respondents who **would avoid** Langley City **convenience stores** at night, 2 (1%) were under the age of sixteen; 12 (7%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 26 (15%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 30 (17%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 37 (21%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 60 (34%) were over age 60; and 8 (5%) respondents failed to provide their age. Of the 135 respondents who **would not avoid** Langley City **convenience stores** at night, 3 (2%) were under the age of sixteen; 22 (16%) were between

the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 22 (16%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 29 (22%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 35 (26%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 24 (18%) were over age 60.

ii) Side Streets.

Table 25 illustrates that just over one half of respondents would avoid Langley City side streets at night.

TABLE 25
"AVOID SIDE STREETS"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	175	55.7
NO	135	43.0
NO RESPONSE	4	1.3
TOTAL	314	100.0

Of the 175 respondents who stated that they **would avoid** Langley City side streets at night, 122 (70%) were female, 27 (15%) were male, and 26 (15%) respondents failed to provide their sex. Of the 135 respondents who stated that they **would not avoid** Langley City side streets at night, 56 (41%) were female, 66 (49%) were male, and 13 (10%) respondents failed to provide their sex.

Of the 175 respondents who **would avoid** Langley City **side streets** at night, 2 (1%) were under the age of sixteen; 15 (9%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 26 (15%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 30 (17%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 33 (19%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 63 (36%) were over age 60; and 6 (3%) respondents failed to provide their age. Of the 135 respondents who **would not avoid** Langley City **side streets** at night, 3 (2%) were under the age of sixteen; 19 (14%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 22 (16%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 29 (21%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 39 (29%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 21 (16%) were over age 60, and 2 (2%) failed to provide their age.

iii) Alleys.

Table 26 illustrates that over two thirds of respondents would avoid Langley City alleys at night.

**TABLE 26
"AVOID ALLEYS"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	206	65.6
NO	104	33.1
NO RESPONSE	4	1.3
TOTAL	314	100.0

Of the 206 respondents who stated that they **would avoid** Langley City alleys at night, 137 (66%) were female, 39 (19%) were male, and 30 (15%) respondents failed to provide their sex. Of the 104 respondents who stated that they **would not avoid** Langley City alleys at night, 41 (39%) were female, 54 (52%) were male, and 9 (9%) respondents failed to provide their sex.

Of the 206 respondents who **would avoid** Langley City alleys at night, 4 (2%) were under the age of sixteen; 17 (8%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 29 (14%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 38 (18%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 44 (22%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 67 (33%) were over age 60; and 7 (3%) respondents failed to provide their age. Of the 104 respondents who **would not avoid** Langley City alleys at night, 1 (1%) was under the age of sixteen; 17 (16%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 19 (19%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 21 (20%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 28 (27%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 17 (16%) were over age 60, and 1 (1%) failed to provide his/her age.

iv) Main Roadways.

Table 27 illustrates that 63% of respondents would not avoid the main roadways of Langley City.

**TABLE 27
"AVOID MAIN ROADWAYS"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	111	35.4
NO	199	63.4
NO RESPONSE	4	1.3
TOTAL	314	100.0

Of the 111 respondents who stated that they would avoid Langley City main roadways at night, 84 (76%) were female, 15 (13%) were male, and 12 (11%) respondents failed to provide their sex. Of the 199 respondents who stated that they would not avoid Langley City main roadways at night, 94 (47%) were female, 78 (39%) were male, and 27 (14%) respondents failed to provide their sex.

Of the 111 respondents who would avoid Langley City main roadways at night, 2 (2%) were under the age of sixteen; 8 (7%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 16 (14%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 23 (21%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 17 (15%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 42 (38%) were over age 60; and 3 (3%) respondents failed to provide their age. Of the 199 respondents who would not avoid Langley City main roadways at night, 3 (2%) were under the age of sixteen; 26 (13%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 32 (16%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 36 (18%) were between the

age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 55 (28%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 42 (21%) were over age 60, and 5 (2%) failed to provide their age.

v) Walkways.

Table 28 illustrates that 60% of those surveyed would not avoid the walkways of Langley City.

**TABLE 28
"AVOID WALKWAYS"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	125	39.8
NO	185	58.9
NO RESPONSE	4	1.3
TOTAL	314	100.0

Of the 125 respondents who stated that they would avoid Langley City walkways at night, 93 (75%) were female, 18 (14%) were male, and 14 (11%) respondents failed to provide their sex. Of the 185 respondents who stated that they would not avoid Langley City walkways at night, 85 (46%) were female, 75 (41%) were male, and 25 (13%) respondents failed to provide their sex.

Of the 125 respondents who would avoid Langley City walkways at night, 2 (2%) were under the age of sixteen; 10 (8%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 17 (13%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 27 (21%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 20 (16%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 45 (36%) were over age 60; and 4 (3%) respondents

failed to provide their age. Of the 185 respondents who **would not avoid** Langley City **walkways** at night, 3 (2%) were under the age of sixteen; 24 (13%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 31 (17%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 32 (17%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 52 (28%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 39 (21%) were over age 60, and 4 (2%) failed to provide their age.

vi) Avoid Other Area.

Table 29 provides the breakdown of any "other" area of concern to the respondent. Over one half believed that the survey had covered any area that they would avoid.

**TABLE 29
"AVOID OTHER"**

PLACES TO AVOID	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
PARKS	51	16.2
UNLIT AREAS	17	5.4
MALLS	2	.6
MOVIES	1	.3
DON'T GO OUT	25	8.0
OTHER	50	15.9
EMPTY (NO)	164	52.2
NO RESPONSE	4	1.3
TOTAL	314	100.0

Of the 51 respondents who stated that they **would avoid** Langley City **parks** at night, 34 (67%) were female, 9 (18%) were male, and 8 (15%) respondents failed to provide their sex. Of the 17 respondents who stated that they **would avoid** Langley City **unlit areas** at night, 14 (82%) were female, and 3 (18%) were male. Two female respondents stated that they **would avoid** Langley City **malls** at night. One male stated that he **would avoid** going to **movies** in Langley City at night. Of the 25 respondents who stated that they **did not go out**, 18 (72%) were female, 5 (20%) were male, and 2 (8%) respondents failed to provide their sex. Of the 50 respondents who raised **other** concerns, 33 (66%) were female, 13 (26%) were male, and 4 (8%) failed to provide their sex. Of the 164 persons who did not have any **other area of concern**, 77 (47%) were women, 62 (38%) were male, and 25 (15%) failed to provide their sex.

Of the 51 respondents who stated that they **would avoid** Langley City **parks** at night, 2 (4%) were under the age of sixteen; 6 (12%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 5 (10%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 10 (20%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 11 (21%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 17 (33%) were over age 60. Of the 17 respondents who stated that they **would avoid** Langley City **unlit areas** at night, 1 (6%) was between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 4 (23%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 3 (18%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 8 (47%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 1 (6%) were over age 60. Of the 2 people who stated that they **would avoid** Langley City **malls** at night, one was between the age of 25 to 34 yrs and the other was over 60 years of age. The one male who stated that he **would avoid** going to **movies** in Langley City at night was over 60 years of age. Of the 25 respondents who stated that they **did not go out**, 1 (4%) was between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 1 (4%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 5 (20%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 1 (4%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 17

(68%) were over age 60. Of the 50 respondents who raised **other** concerns 1 (2%) was under the age of 16yrs; 7 (14%) were between the age of 16yrs to 24yrs; 13 (26%) were between the age of 25yrs to 34yrs; 9 (18%) were between the age of 35yrs to 44yrs; 11 (22%) were between the age of 45yrs to 59yrs; 7 (14%) were over age 60 and 2 (4%) respondents failed to provide their age.

vii) Places to Avoid i) to v) Summarized.

Table 30 rank orders the places that respondents stated they would avoid when walking in the City of Langley at night (section vi is not included in this summary as the rating method is not consistent with the other sections).

**TABLE 30
"PLACES TO AVOID SUMMARIZED"**

PLACES TO AVOID	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
ALLEYS	206	65.6
CONVENIENCE STORES	175	55.7
SIDE STREETS	175	55.7
WALKWAYS	125	39.8
MAIN ROADWAYS	111	35.5

SECTION C: CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS:

There are a number of crime prevention programs and community organizations available in the City of Langley. Respondents were asked whether or not these programs: a) came to mind; b) whether or not they had heard of them; or c) whether or not they had had a chance to participate in any of them. Respondents were able to answer yes to any or all of these questions. For result purposes, only one response was recorded per survey. It was reasoned that if a person checked "yes" to (a) and (b) then (b) would be recorded --- for a person to have "heard of" the program then it would have to "come to mind". Similarly, if the person checked "yes" to (a) (b) and (c) then (c) would be recorded --- for a person to have "participated in" the program , they would have had to have "heard of" it and the program would "come to mind".

a) Block Watch.

Table 31 illustrates that 95% of those surveyed were familiar with Block Watch. Sixteen percent had participated in the program.

TABLE 31
"BLOCK WATCH"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
COME TO MIND	71	22.6
HEARD OF ANY	180	57.3
PARTICIPATE IN	49	15.6
EMPTY (NO)	12	3.8
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

b) Counter Attack.

Table 32 illustrates that almost three quarters of those surveyed were familiar with the Counter Attack program.

**TABLE 32
"COUNTER ATTACK"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
COME TO MIND	7	2.2
HEARD OF ANY	213	67.8
PARTICIPATE IN	9	2.9
EMPTY (NO)	83	26.4
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

c) Block Parents.

Table 33 illustrates that over 90% of those surveyed were familiar with the Block Parents program.

**TABLE 33
"BLOCK PARENTS"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
COME TO MIND	34	10.8
HEARD OF ANY	218	69.4
PARTICIPATE IN	38	12.1
EMPTY (NO)	22	7.0
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

d) Operation Identification.

Table 34 illustrates that over 60% of those surveyed were familiar with Operation Identification.

**TABLE 34
"OPERATION IDENTIFICATION"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
COME TO MIND	9	2.9
HEARD OF ANY	166	52.9
PARTICIPATE IN	24	7.6
EMPTY (NO)	113	36.0
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

e) Lock it and Pocket.

Table 35 illustrates that very few respondents had heard of this program.

**TABLE 35
"LOCK IT AND POCKET"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
COME TO MIND	4	1.3
HEARD OF ANY	47	15.0
PARTICIPATE IN	3	1.0
EMPTY (NO)	258	82.2
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

f) Drug Awareness in Schools.

Table 36 illustrates that over 50% of those surveyed had heard of drug awareness programs in schools.

**TABLE 36
"DRUG AWARENESS IN SCHOOLS"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
COME TO MIND	3	1.0
HEARD OF ANY	182	58.0
PARTICIPATE IN	9	2.9
EMPTY (NO)	118	37.6
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

g) Lady Beware.

Table 37 illustrates that few respondents had heard of or participated in this program.

**TABLE 37
"LADY BEWARE"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
COME TO MIND	5	1.6
HEARD OF ANY	59	18.8
PARTICIPATE IN	6	1.9
EMPTY (NO)	242	77.1
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

h) Langley Family Services.

Table 38 illustrates that the majority of respondents were familiar with Langley Family Services.

**TABLE 38
"LANGLEY FAMILY SERVICES"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
COME TO MIND	9	2.9
HEARD OF ANY	226	72.0
PARTICIPATE IN	21	6.7
EMPTY (NO)	56	17.8
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

i) RCMP Victim Services.

Table 39 illustrates that over 50% of respondents were familiar with RCMP Victim Services.

**TABLE 39
"RCMP VICTIM SERVICES"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
COME TO MIND	12	3.8
HEARD OF ANY	170	54.1
PARTICIPATE IN	3	1.0
EMPTY (NO)	127	40.4
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

j) Citizen Crime Patrol Watch.

Table 40 illustrates that 60% of respondents were familiar with this program.

**TABLE 40
"CITIZEN CRIME PATROL WATCH"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
COME TO MIND	25	8.0
HEARD OF ANY	159	50.6
PARTICIPATE IN	5	1.6
EMPTY (NO)	123	39.2
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

k) Community Dispute Resolution Program.

Table 41 illustrates that the majority of respondents were not familiar with this program.

**TABLE 41
"COMMUNITY DISPUTE RESOLUTION PROGRAM"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
COME TO MIND	1	.3
HEARD OF ANY	28	8.9
PARTICIPATE IN	4	1.3
EMPTY (NO)	279	88.9
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

l) Langley Youth and Family Services.

Table 42 illustrates that 65% of those surveyed were familiar with Langley Youth and Family Services.

TABLE 42

"LANGLEY YOUTH AND FAMILY SERVICES"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
COME TO MIND	7	2.2
HEARD OF ANY	186	59.2
PARTICIPATE IN	12	3.8
EMPTY (NO)	107	34.1
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

m) Other Crime Prevention Programs.

Table 43 outlines several crime prevention programs which respondents were familiar with, however did not appear on the survey.

TABLE 43

"OTHER CRIME PREVENTION PROGRAMS"

PROGRAM	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
KID FIND	2	.6
COMMUNITY POLICING	13	4.1
COUNSELLING PROG.	5	1.6
OTHER	22	7.0
EMPTY (NO)	270	86.0
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

SECTION D: SERVICE:

Respondents were asked whether or not they had occasion to contact the police. The question did not specifically state the RCMP Langley Detachment therefore, we cannot conclude that the respondent is satisfied/dissatisfied with the Langley Detachment's method of service delivery. If the respondent had had occasion to contact the police, respondents were asked to answer several questions concerning the quality of police service they had received. If respondents had not contacted the police, respondents were thanked for their cooperation and asked to answer one final question (x). Those who had not had occasion to contact the police (129 respondents) are not reflected in the survey sample for questions (i) through (ix). Those in the response category of "NO RESPONSE" chose not to answer specific questions.

Question:

"Have you ever had an occasion to contact the police?"

Almost 60% of those surveyed had occasion to contact the police.

TABLE 44
"EVER CONTACT THE POLICE?"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	183	58.3
NO	129	41.1
NO RESPONSE	2	.6
TOTAL	314	100.0

Question i:

"When you phoned the police to make your report, were you satisfied with the way the police department operator handled your call?"

Eighty three percent of respondents were satisfied with the way the police department operator handled their complaint. Table 45 provides a breakdown of respondent opinion.

**TABLE 45
PARTICIPANT RATES "OPERATOR"**

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	154	83
NO	11	6
POLICE FAILED TO RESPOND	9	5
OTHER REASON GIVEN	6	3
NO RESPONSE	5	3
TOTAL	185	100.0

Question ii:

"In your opinion was this initial investigation: a) very satisfactory; b) satisfactory; c) neither satisfactory nor unsatisfactory; d) unsatisfactory; e) very unsatisfactory?"

The majority of respondents were satisfied, to varying degrees, with the initial investigation.

TABLE 46

PARTICIPANT RATES "INITIAL INVESTIGATION"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
VERY SATISFACTORY	53	29
SATISFACTORY	86	47
NEITHER SATISFACTORY NOR UNSATISFACTORY	10	5
UNSATISFACTORY	13	7
VERY UNSATISFACTORY	10	5
NO RESPONSE	13	7
TOTAL	185	100

Question iii:

"Did the police provide you with a name and phone number to allow you to contact them once they left?"

Almost two thirds of those surveyed were given the name of the attending police officer and a phone number for future use.

TABLE 47

RESPONDENT RECEIVE "POLICE OFFICER NAME AND PHONE NUMBER?"

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	114	62
NO	40	22
DONT KNOW	9	5
NOT APPLICABLE	3	1
NO RESPONSE	19	10
TOTAL	185	100

Question iv:

"Did the police provide you with information about the progress or outcome of the investigation at a later time?"

The majority of respondents had not been kept up to date with the progress or outcome of the investigation.

TABLE 48

DID THE POLICE PROVIDE PROGRESS OF INVESTIGATION?

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	55	30
NO	100	54
DONT KNOW	8	4
NOT APPLICABLE	2	1
NO RESPONSE	20	11
TOTAL	185	100

Question v:

"How good a job did the police do in keeping you informed of the progress or outcome of the investigation?"

The reactions to this question were varied. Table 49 provides a breakdown of participant opinion.

TABLE 49
HOW WELL DID THE POLICE PROVIDE PROGRESS?

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
VERY GOOD	23	12
GOOD	32	17
AVERAGE	28	15
POOR	35	19
VERY POOR	29	16
NOT APPLICABLE	9	5
NO RESPONSE	29	16
TOTAL	185	100

Question vi:

"Did you attempt to contact the investigating officer(s) after the initial investigation?"

The majority of respondents had not attempted to contact the investigating officer(s) after the initial investigation.

TABLE 50

DID THE RESPONDENT CONTACT THE INVESTIGATING OFFICER?

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	47	26
NO	108	58
NOT APPLICABLE	2	1
NO RESPONSE	28	15
TOTAL	185	100

Question vii:

"Were you successful?"

The majority of those who responded to this question, were successful in contacting the investigating officer(s) after the initial investigation.

TABLE 51

WAS THE RESPONDENT SUCCESSFUL IN CONTACTING THE OFFICER?

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
YES	42	23
NO	7	4
NOT APPLICABLE	2	1
NO RESPONSE	134	72
TOTAL	185	100.0

Question viii:

"How many times did you attempt to contact the officers before making contact?"

Over one half of those who responded to this question, were able to contact the officer in the first instance.

TABLE 52

TIMES IT TOOK TO CONTACT THE OFFICER

NUMBER OF CALLS	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
ONE	24	13.0
TWO	11	6.0
THREE	8	4.0
FOUR	1	.5
OVER TEN	1	.5
NO RESPONSE	140	76.0
TOTAL	185	100.0

Question ix:

"Overall, what sort of job did the police do in handling the incident?"

The majority of respondents believed that the police did a "very good" to average job in handling the incident.

TABLE 53

HOW WELL DID THE POLICE HANDLE THE INCIDENT?

OPINION	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
VERY GOOD	50	27
GOOD	57	31
AVERAGE	35	19
POOR	9	5
VERY POOR	10	5
NO RESPONSE	24	13
TOTAL	185	100.0

Question x:

"Are there any general comments you would like to add in regards to Police Services?"

There were several different responses to this question. Table 54 illustrates the general categories that the responses fall under. The sample population is made up of a possible 314 respondents.

**TABLE 54
GENERAL COMMENTS**

GENERAL COMMENTS	NUMBER RESPONDING	% RESPONDING
GENERALLY SATISFIED	75	23.9
GENERALLY DISSATISFIED	15	4.8
NEED MORE POLICE	28	8.9
FOCUS ON YOUTH	12	3.8
OTHER	45	14.3
NO RESPONSE	139	44.3
TOTAL	314	100.0

REFERENCES

- Abercrombie, N., Hill, S., and Turner, B.
Dictionary of Sociology. England: Penguin Books, 1994.
- Bell, C. & Newby, H.
Community Studies: An introduction of the sociology of the local community.
New York: Praeger Publishers, 1972.
- Bell, C. & Newby, H. (eds).
The Sociology of Community: A Selection of Readings. London: Frank Cass and
Company Limited, 1974.
- Benyon, J. (ed).
Scarman and After: Essays reflecting on Lord Scarman's Report, the riots and
their aftermath. Toronto: Pergamon Press, 1984.
- Bittner, E.
Aspects of Police Work. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 1990.
- Braiden, C.
"Community Policing: Nothing new under the sun". Edmonton Police
Department, (December) 1987.
- Bureau of Justice Assistance.
Understanding Community Policing: A Framework for Action. Washington: U.S.
Department of Justice, (August) 1994.
- Chacko, J. and Nancoo, E. (eds).
Community Policing in Canada. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc., 1993.
- Cohen, S.
Visions of Social Control. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1985.
- Cunningham, J.
Action Research and Organizational Development. Connecticut: Praeger
Publishers. 1993.
- Eck J. & Rosenbaum, D.
"The New Police Order: Effectiveness, Equity, and Efficiency in
Community Policing". In D. Rosenbaum, 1988.
- Feagin, J. and Orum, A. and Sjoberg, G. (eds).
A Case for the Case Study. The University of North Carolina Press, 1991.

Friedmann, R.

Community Policing: Comparative perspectives and prospects. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1992.

Gabelmann, C.

"1994-95 Provincial Policing Priorities", unpublished correspondence, Attorney General of British Columbia, (April) 1994.

Goldstein, H.

"Improving Policing: A Problem-Oriented Approach", In International City Management Association, 1992.

Goodson, A.

"Police and the Public", In Benyon, J. 1984.

Greene, J. and Mastrofski, S. (eds).

Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1988.

Greene, J. and Taylor, R.

"Community-Based Policing and Foot Patrol: Issues of Theory and Evaluation". In J. Greene and S. Mastrofski, 1988.

Greenwood, P.W., Chaiken, J.M. and Petersilia, J.

The Criminal Investigation Process. Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath, 1977.

Grinc, R.M.

"Angles in Marble: Problems in Stimulating Community Involvement in Community Policing". Crime & Delinquency, Vol. 40, No.3, July 1994, pp.437-468.

Hunter, R. and Barker, T.

"BS and Buzzwords: The New Police Operational Style". American Journal of Police, Vol. 12, No.3, 1993, pp. 157-168.

Inkster, N.

"The Essence of Community Policing", In International City Management Association, 1992.

International City Management Association.

Source Book: Community Oriented Policing: An Alternative Strategy. Washington D.C.: United States Department of Justice, 1992.

The Home Office.

Joint Consultative Committee: Operational Policing Review. Surrey: Joint Consultative Committee, Police Federation, 1990.

- Keith, M.
 "Squaring Circles? Consultation and 'inner city' policing. New Community. 15(1), (October) 1988, pp.63-77
- Kelling, G. and Moore, M.
 "From Political to Reform to Community: The evolving strategy of Police". In J. Greene and S. Mastrofski, 1988.
- Kelling, G. and Moore, M.
 "The Evolving Strategy of Policing". In International City Management Association, 1992.
- Kelling, G., Pate, A., Dieckman D., and Brown, C.
The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A Technical Report. Washington D.C.: Police Foundation, 1974.
- Klockars, C.
 "The Rhetoric of Community Policing". In J. Greene and S. Mastrofski, 1988.
- Langworthy, R.
The Structure of Police Organizations. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1986.
- Leighton, B.
 "Community-Based Policing and Police/Community Relations". In Chacko, J. and E. Nancoo, 1993.
- Leighton, B.
 "Community Policing in Canada". In D. Rosenbaum, 1994.
- Manning, P.
 "Community Policing". American Journal of Police, Vol. III, No. II. 1984, pp.205-227.
- Manning, P.
 "Community Policing as a Drama of Control". In J. Greene and S. Mastrofski, 1988.
- Meenaghan, T.
 "That means 'Community'?" Social Work, 17(10), 1972, pp. 94-98.
- Ministry of the Solicitor General.
 "Community Policing: An introduction to the community policing philosophy and principles". Ontario: Queen's Printer for Ontario, 1991.
- Ministry of the Attorney General: Province of British Columbia.
 "Community Policing Advisory Committee Report". British Columbia, 1993.

- Ministry of the Attorney General: Province of British Columbia.
"Greater Vancouver Municipal Police Forces: 1994 Data Sorted Highest to Lowest Cost per Capita". British Columbia, 1995.
- Moore, M and Trojanowicz, R.
"Corporate Strategies for Policing". In International City Management Association, 1992.
- Morgan, R.
"Police Consultative Groups". The Political Quarterly, Vol.57, No.1 (January-March), 1986, pp.83-88.
- Morgan, R.
"The Local Determinants of Policing Policy". In Willmott, 1987.
- Morgan, R.
"Police Accountability: Developing the local infrastructure". The British Journal of Criminology. Vol 27, No. 1 (Winter) 1987b, pp.87-96.
- Murphy, C.
"The Development, Impact, and Implications of Community Policing in Canada". In J. Greene and S. Mastrofski, 1988.
- Normandeau, A. & Leighton, B.
A Vision of the Future of Policing in Canada: Police Challenge 2000. Ottawa: Ministry of Solicitor General Canada, 1990.
- Normandeau, A. & Leighton, B.
"A Growing Canadian consensus: Community Policing". In J. Chacko and S. Nancoo, 1993.
- Oettmeier, T. & Brown, L.
"Developing a Neighbourhood-oriented policing style". In J. Greene and S. Mastrofski, 1988.
- Oppal, W.
Policing in British Columbia Commission of Inquiry -- Closing the Gap: Policing in the Community. British Columbia: Government of British Columbia, 1994.
- Palys, T.
Research Decisions: Quantitative and Qualitative Perspectives. Toronto: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Canada Inc., 1992
- Partners in Equality,
"Effective Models of Police Community Committees: A Report to The Ministry of the Solicitor General Race Relations and Policing Unit". Toronto, 1991.

- Phillips, G.
Interpersonal Dynamics in the Small Group. New York: Randon House, 1970.
- Roberg, R. & Kuykendall, J.
Police and Society. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1994.
- Rosenbaum, D. (ed).
The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises. London: Sage Publications, 1994.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police Act. Ottawa: Government of Canada, 1986.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police.
Commissioner's Directional Statement. Ottawa: Government of Canada, 1989.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police.
RCMP Fact Sheets 1995. Ottawa: Public Affairs and Information Directorate of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 1995(b).
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police.
RCMP Community Policing: Strategic Action Plan Update. Ottawa: Government of Canada, 1992.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police.
Strategic Action Plan: Implementation of Community-Based Policing in the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. Ottawa: Government of Canada, 1990.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police
Community Policing Review. Ottawa: Government of Canada, January 1995(a).
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police.
Operational Manual. I.1.L.
- Sadd S., and Grinc R.,
 "Innovative Neighbourhood Oriented Policing: An evaluation of Community Policing Programs in Eight Cities". In Rosenbaum, 1994.
- Savage, S.
 "Political Control or Community Liaison? Two Strategies in the Reform of Police Accountability". Political Quarterly. Vol. 55, No.1, (January - March), 1984, pp.48-59.
- Savage, S. and Wilson, C.
 "Ask a Policeman: Community Consultation in Practice". Social Policy and Administration. Vol. 21, No. 3, (Autumn), 1987, pp. 252-263.

- Seagrave, J.
"Obtaining Information for the Corporate Strategy: The Vancouver Police Telephone Survey", unpublished, School of Criminology, Simon Fraser University.
- Seagrave, J.
Changing the Organizational Culture: Community Policing in British Columbia. Burnaby: Simon Fraser University Press, 1995.
- Seagrave, J.
"Community Consultative Groups: Practical Guidelines". RCMP Gazette. Vol. 56, No. 10, 1994.
- Shaw, M.
Group Dynamics. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1981.
- Skogan, W.
Disorder and Decline. New York: The Free Press, 1990.
- Skogan, W., and Antunes G.,
"Information, Apprehension, and Deterrence: Exploring the Limits of Police Productivity". Journal of Criminal Justice. Vol. 7, 1979, pp.217-242.
- Skolnick, J. and Bayley, D.
"Theme and Variation in Community Policing". In Tonry, M. and Morris, N. 1988.
- Skolnick, J. and Bayley, D.
The New Blue Line. New York: The Free Press, 1986.
- Smith, D.
"Research, Community, and the Police". In Willmott, 1987.
- Spelman, W., and Brown, D.K.
Calling the Police: Citizen reporting of serious crime. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1984.
- Statistics Canada, Census Information, 1991.
- Taylor, I.
Crime, Capitalism and Community. Toronto: Butterworth & Co. (Canada) Ltd., 1983.
- Tonnies, F.
Community and Association (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1955.

- Tonry, M. and Morris, N. (eds).
Crime and Justice: A review of Research. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1988.
- Trojanowicz, R. and Bucqueroux, B.
Community Policing: A contemporary Perspective. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co., 1990.
- Trojanowicz, R. and Bucqueroux, B.
Community Policing: How to Get Started. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co., 1994.
- Weatheritt, M.
 "Community Policing Now". In Willmott, 1987.
- Weatheritt, M.
 "Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?" In J. Greene and S. Mastrofski, 1988.
- Weiler, R.
Community Consultative Committee and the RCMP. Ottawa: Government of Canada, 1992
- Whyte, W.
Social Theory for Action: How individuals and organizations learn to change. California: Sage Publications, 1991.
- Willmott, P.
Policing and the Community. PSI Discussion Paper No.16, London: Policy Studies Institute, 1987.
- Wilson, J. and Kelling, G.
 "Making Neighbourhoods Safe". In International City Management Association, 1992.
- Wycoff, M.
 "The Benefits of Community Policing: Evidence and Conjecture". In J. Greene and S. Mastrofski, 1988.
- Yin, R.
Case Study Research: Design and Methods. California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1994.