

**A STUDY ON A COMMUNITY POLICING INITIATIVE:
POLICE-COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES**

by

**Janice Gillis
1996**

**Submitted to the Department of Criminology, University of
Ottawa, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Arts**



**Janice Gillis
Ottawa, Canada, 1996**



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 0-612-19964-9

Canada



UNIVERSITÉ D'OTTAWA
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are several people that must be thanked for helping me make this thesis a reality. Many thanks to my thesis advisor, Dr. Ronald Melchers, for your advice throughout this endeavor. Your words of encouragement as I neared the end of this project were very appreciated. I also thank my employer, the Department of Human Resources Development, for their continued support of my educational pursuits.

Many thanks to the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service for their time, for their assistance with the distribution of the questionnaires, and for their interest in this project. I also wish to sincerely thank those members of the consultative committees who participated in this study. Your time and effort is greatly appreciated. Finally, I wish to thank my mother, Mary, whose constant reassurance and support served to be my inspiration throughout this project. I could not have done it without you.

I dedicate this thesis to my parents, Mary, and my late father, Dougald, who would have loved to have been here to celebrate this moment with me. Thanks to you both for everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
Chapter 1: Introduction	1
Chapter 2: Literature Review	6
i) Introduction	6
ii) Historical Trends	8
iii) Major Elements of Community Policing	14
iv) Background of Consultative Committees	16
v) Theoretical Premises	18
vi) Consultation: Proposed blueprint and perceived benefits	24
vii) Consultation in Practice	28
viii) Discussion and Conclusion	38
Chapter 3: Methodology	43
i) Research Questions	45
ii) Operational Definitions	46
iii) Sample	53
iv) Questionnaire construction	57
v) Formal interviews	64
vi) Construction of Secondary Variables	65
Chapter 4: Description of the Data	68
A) Description of results of community questionnaire	69
Demographic information	69
Committee involvement	70
Capacity of consultation	70
Views on the local police service	73
Committee dynamics	75
Accountability	78
Impact	83
Mandate	84
B) Description of results of police questionnaire	90
Committee dynamics	91
Accountability	92
Impact	93

Mandate	95
Flow of information	99
Role of police	101
Structure recommendations	103
(C) Interviews with Consultative Committee Chairs	106
(D) Minutes of Meetings	115
(E) Interview with Project Coordinator, OCRPS	116
(F) Interview with a member of the Police Services Board	120
Chapter 5: Analysis	123
Is there a sharing of power between the police and community?	124
Is there two-way constructive dialogue between the community members and police?	127
Have community members been able to identify problems in their community or have problems been identified for them by the police representatives?	131
Do members feel that the police representatives take into account the community's identified problems and concerns?	134
Are the committee members representative of the communities they purport to represent?	135
What do members expect to achieve from consultation?	140
Are the police committed to the community policing philosophy and ready to accept a broader social role? Are consultative committees accepted by the police as an important part of realizing community policing philosophy?	147
Chapter 6: Conclusions and Recommendations	151
References	161
Appendix - I: Principles of Sir Robert Peel, 1829	1
Appendix - II: Informed Consent	3
Appendix - III: Information Sheet	5

Appendix - IV:	Community Questionnaire	7
Appendix - V:	Police Questionnaire	21
Appendix - VI:	List of Questions - Committee Chair	31
Appendix - VII:	List of Questions - Project Coordinator, Community Policing, OCRPS	33
Appendix - VIII:	List of Questions - Police Services Board	35
Appendix - IX:	Construction of Secondary Variables	36
Appendix - X:	Secondary Variables - Results	41
Appendix - XI:	Univariate Tables - Community Questionnaire	44
Appendix - XII:	Questions Requiring Divisions	65
Appendix - XIII:	Results of Divisions	67
Appendix - XIV:	Tabulation of Police Questionnaire	70

ABSTRACT

Police—community consultative committees illustrate the enhanced community responsibility and participation in policing efforts. The primary objectives of these groups are to increase communication between the police and the community, to improve police/community relations, and serve as a forum where the community and police can share information and mutually identify concerns (Seagrave, 1993:14).

While the development of the committees may be considered a positive step towards recognizing that the police is a public service that must be accountable to the community that it serves, and that communities have a legitimate role to play in police decision-making, recent research on these committees has found them to be lacking in community representativeness, commitment, and power (Morgan, 1989). Many authors argue that these committees are simply public relations exercises that serve to make it appear as if something is being done to include community input in policing matters, where in reality, the police maintain their autonomy and power, and conduct 'business as usual' (see Scruton, 1985; Spencer, 1985; Cox, 1986; Morgan, 1987). Others argue that the creation of consultative committees is for the co-optation of the community into policing, and an attempt at the surveillance and

control of communities by the police (Gordon, 1984; Cohen, 1985).

In this study, the emergence of police-community consultative committees in Ottawa-Carleton is examined within the context of police partnerships. This thesis focuses on five police community consultative committees in the Ottawa-Carleton region. The study was conducted during the summer of 1995. It consists of both qualitative and quantitative data-gathering methods.

The findings suggest that police representatives on the committees have made commendable efforts to establish partnerships between the police and the community, but obstacles appear to hinder the process. These obstacles include a perception among many of the police representatives that there is a lack of organizational support for community policing, that committee members may not be clear as to their roles and responsibilities on consultative committees, and that committees may not be representative of the community they represent.

Results of the study suggest that there may be a need to reconsider the mandate of these committees, the roles and responsibilities of committee members must be clear and concise, and that the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service must determine what they expect to achieve from consultative committees. Also, the police and the community should be educated on the philosophy of community

control of communities by the police (Gordon, 1984; Cohen, 1985).

In this study, the emergence of police-community consultative committees in Ottawa-Carleton is examined within the context of police partnerships. This thesis focuses on five police community consultative committees in the Ottawa-Carleton region. The study was conducted during the summer of 1995. It consists of both qualitative and quantitative data-gathering methods.

The findings suggest that police representatives on the committees have made commendable efforts to establish partnerships between the police and the community, but obstacles appear to hinder the process. These obstacles include a perception among many of the police representatives that there is a lack of organizational support for community policing, that committee members may not be clear as to their roles and responsibilities on consultative committees, and that committees may not be representative of the community they represent.

Results of the study suggest that there may be a need to reconsider the mandate of these committees, the roles and responsibilities of committee members must be clear and concise, and that the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service must determine what they expect to achieve from consultative committees. Also, the police and the community should be educated on the philosophy of community

Chapter 1 - Introduction

“Community policing is the new philosophy of professional law enforcement in the world’s industrial democracies” (Bayley, 1988:225). According to proponents, it represents progress and innovation, as community policing is professed to enhance public security and lower crime rates, reduce the fear of crime and make the public feel less helpless, reconnect the police with alienated publics, and make the police more accountable. Indeed, “community policing has emerged as the major strategic alternative to traditional practices that are now widely regarded as having failed” (ibid).

A review of the community policing literature finds that its central ingredient is a partnership between the police and the community (Bayley, 1988; Greene and Mastrofski, 1988; Leighton, 1991). This partnership reflects the increasing accountability of the police to the public, both directly and indirectly, through various legal and political mechanisms, as well as the growing involvement of the public and elected officials in setting the agenda of policing. Indeed, the movement towards community policing has gained momentum in recent years, and police organizations are currently devising strategies to implement community policing in their respective districts.

The Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service has been active in implementing a community policing philosophy in its organization. Police-community consultative committees have been developed in the Ottawa-Carleton region to facilitate this police-community partnership. A goal of these committees is to ensure that the police and public work together to identify and prioritize local crime and disorder problems, and arrive at appropriate solutions, while increasing public satisfaction with police services. The committees should be representative of the community in order to capture all local problems (Community Policing Program Coordinator - interview notes).

The objective of this thesis is to explore police-community consultative committees as one means of forming partnerships between the police and the community. Data was gathered from both police and community representatives on various consultative committees in the Ottawa-Carleton region. Also, a Community Policing Program Coordinator from the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service and a member of the Police Services Board were interviewed regarding the development of consultative committees in the region.

While a partnership between the police and the community may be the desired outcome of consultative committees, it may not be a simple task to achieve. This thesis explores the development of partnerships in light of three alternative

hypotheses which critique the dominant ideology of the function of consultative committees. These alternative hypotheses are legitimization, marginalization, and penetration (Morgan, 1989). Historically, police organizations have been closed, autonomous, institutions which sought little input from the community on police policy and procedures. Such a well-established culture presents a definite challenge to the development of consultative committees since, under a community policing philosophy, the police must encourage input from the community on local problems. Ideally, these committees signify an organizational and philosophical shift from an isolated, professionalized institution to one where the police are the public and the public are the police. Indeed, an issue explored in this thesis is whether the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service has made progress in changing the culture of the organization. Is there evidence that the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service encourages the advice of the community in policing matters and considers this advice in the development of their policies, or do committees simply legitimize the existing police practices? Indeed, are consultative committees an effective means to implement community policing in the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service?

Police have had trouble communicating with members of socially and culturally diverse communities they serve (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994:6). In

some communities, an attitude of “us verses them” prevails between police and community members. Such a relationship may impede the consultative process since certain groups may refuse to participate on these committees because of past negative experiences with police. Further, some may feel that the committee functions to penetrate the community and serve as another means of informal social control. This perceived function may not appeal to some members of the community, particularly groups who have had past adverse experience with the police. In essence, it may be difficult for consultative committees to be truly representative of the community they are supposed to represent. Certain groups may be marginalized by this community policing strategy, which may result in the absence of their input on local problems and solutions. Accordingly, the types of participants found on consultative committees in this study will be explored to determine if certain groups appear to be left out of the consultative process.

Community policing implies more than simply increasing community involvement in policing issues. Ideally, consultative committees provide a means to empower the community to participate ‘as an equal rather than as a client’ (Buerger, 1993) in policing matters as the committees are to focus on advising the police on police priorities, policies, and programs (Weiler, 1993). This somewhat contentious area is explored in this thesis by examining the activities of the committees as well

as the Police Service's commitment to consultative committees within the organization. Indeed, the role of the community in policing must be clearly understood by both the police and the community in order to effectively implement a community policing strategy such as a consultative committee.

Chapter 2 - Literature Review

Let the people think they govern, and they will be governed.

William Penn

i) Introduction:

One approach to achieving enhanced community responsibility and participation in policing efforts is to implement the introduction of police–community consultative committees. The primary objectives of these groups are to increase communication between the police and the community, to improve police/community relations, and serve as a forum where the community and police can share information and mutually identify concerns (Seagrave, 1993:14).

While the development of the committees may be considered a positive step towards recognizing that policing is a public service that must be accountable to the community that it serves, and that communities have a legitimate role to play in police decision–making, recent research on these committees has found them to be lacking in community representativeness, commitment, and power (Morgan, 1989). Many authors argue that these committees are simply public relations exercises that serve to make it appear as if something is being done to include community input in policing matters, where in reality, the police maintain their autonomy and power,

and conduct 'business as usual' (see Scruton, 1985; Spencer, 1985; Cox, 1986; Morgan, 1987). Others argue that the creation of consultative committees is for the co-optation of the community into policing, and an attempt at the surveillance and control of communities by the police (Gordon, 1984; Cohen, 1985).

This chapter will critically explore the issues surrounding consultative committees. In doing so, the community policing ingredients of partnerships and problem-solving will be examined in light of the discourses surrounding the establishment of consultative committees. In contrast, alternative hypotheses proposed by Morgan (1989) will also be discussed which critique the dominant ideology of the function of consultative committees. He investigates whether committees are operating to marginalize particular groups in the community, to co-opt the community and legitimize existing/planned police methods, or serve as a greater means of social control of communities.

The goals of the committees and the benefits that could accrue from active committees will be explored as well as what is considered required to have a successful committee in place. In addition, an analysis of research conducted on consultative committees will be presented in order to determine whether the consultative groups seem to be achieving the goal of partnerships or whether Morgan's hypotheses represent the reality of consultative groups. A brief discussion

of the findings and some implications of the research will conclude this chapter.

In order to understand why police organizations such as the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service are moving towards a community policing philosophy, it is necessary to look at the historical patterns of policing to comprehend current patterns of change.

ii) Historical Trends:

Kelling and Moore (1988) refer to three eras of police history, each of which is based on the dominance of a particular strategy of policing.

The *political* era, so named because of the close ties between police and politics, dated from the introduction of the police into municipalities during the 1840's, continued through the Progressive period, and ended during the early 1900's. The *reform* era developed in reaction to the political. It took hold during the late 1930's, thrived during the 1950's and 1960's, began to erode during the late 1970's. The reform era now seems to be giving way to an era emphasizing *community problem solving* (ibid.:2, emphasis added).

- **Political era:**

The political era was characterized by the police being integrated into neighborhoods where they had the support of citizens, particularly the support of the dominant and political interests of the community. However, this closeness to political leaders, along with a decentralized organizational structure which was

inept in providing supervision of officers, gave rise to police corruption (ibid.:4).

- **Reform era:**

The 1930's through the 1960's saw a series of reforms such as civil service, police commissions, life tenure for police chiefs, and prohibition of officers living in the beats they patrolled (Robinson et al. 1994). Such reforms sought to end the close ties between local political leaders and police in order to minimize political influence and corruption (Kelling and Moore, 1988). In essence, their function was narrowed to "crime control and criminal apprehension....Activities that drew the police into solving other kinds of community problems and relied on other kinds of responses were identified as 'social work'" (Kelling and Moore, 1988:5-6).

In addition, a particular model or style of policing referred to as "professionalism" developed (Brodeur, 1992). Often cited as 'traditional policing', it is characterized by a hierarchically structured police service, with strong centralized control developed to ensure compliance with standard operating procedures (Sunahara, 1991). An incident-driven police service came to dominate in the form of preventive police patrol, with an emphasis on rapid response to calls for service. Moreover, the proper relationship between the police and citizens was redefined to be impartial, professionally neutral, and impersonal. Indeed, the role

assigned to the citizen was that of an "impassive recipient of professional services" (Robinson et al, 1994:137). Moreover, the police marketed this crime-fighting role in order to gain public support and legitimacy, and also to rationalize the huge resources which it claimed to require in order to effectively fight crime.

This reform in policing practices and procedures was to serve particular functions: to minimize the possibility of corruption by removing much of the independence from the constables' job; to eliminate discretion and variation by enforcing standardized procedures as well as close supervision and control by line managers; and to minimize the influence of outside forces (Sunahara, 1991).

- **Decline of Reform Era:**

In spite of this growth and 'improvement' in police resources during the 1960's and 1970's, crime continued to rise. The effectiveness of preventive patrol and other crime control methods were evaluated such as the renowned Kansas City Preventive Patrol Study conducted by Kelling in 1974. This study concluded that preventive patrol does little to reduce crime or the level of fear of crime in citizens. Indeed, it was recognized that a serious reduction in crime rates could only be accomplished by attacking the social causes of crime such as poverty and unemployment.

The 1970's reflected the perception that the police role should be more broadly conceived. The stereotype of the crime-fighter was directly challenged by research activities (see Reiner, 1992; Shearing and Leon, 1992) and it was recognized that community service and order maintenance activities made up the bulk of the police officer's workload. In fact, the label of 'law enforcement' officer may be considered a misnomer, since police mainly operate as peace keepers and provide order maintenance. According to these studies, very little of the officer's time is actually spent enforcing the law and making arrests. Indeed, most police decisions are not directly related to criminal law (Ericson, 1992:186), the police have little effect on the crime rate and less than 10 percent of their effort is devoted to traditional criminal law matters (Bittner, 1974).

Furthermore, in the 1970's, fear of crime rose, many minority citizens believed that they were being unfairly treated by the police, and the civil rights and antiwar movements questioned the legitimacy of the police. In addition, research showed that line officers were being limited to routinized and standardized work (Robinson et al, 1994:137).

Kelling and Moore (1988) argue that the reform strategy was unable to adjust to these changing social circumstances of the 1960's and 1970's. According to Stenson (1993:375), the incident-driven style of policing

increased the social distance between police and people and indeed other governing agencies like the youth service, schools, and social work; and fostered the development of inward looking, secretive, macho, racist and sexist professional cultures. It was argued that these developments diminished the supply of information about crime and offenders which is dependent on trust and friendly contact and placed an exaggerated focus on immediate crime control and arrest rates. This is viewed as operating at the expense of the major responsibility of policing, which is crime prevention and the fostering of civilized, self-regulated conduct among citizens.

In effect, these social changes in the community, along with the research showing the limits of the reform strategy and the limited ability of the police to solve problems they faced in the 1980's, have influenced the advocacy of community policing (Robinson et al. 1994:139).

- **Quality of Service Movement:**

The corporate community has also influenced the growth and popularity of community policing. Indeed, principles such as quality of service, empowerment, decentralization, efficiency, and cost-effectiveness reflect the service delivery model prevalent in today's financial and social institutions. These principles are associated with total quality or participatory management theory (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994:11) and many police managers have begun to adopt these principles by recognizing that police officers should have input into decisions about their work; and that the community, as consumers of policing activities, should have input into how police services are being delivered in their community.

In fact, the assumption inherent in this theory is that service recipients should have the right to be actively involved in identifying and prioritizing areas of concern in their community. The establishment of police community consultative committees is an attempt to involve the community in the identification of, and development of solutions to local problems. Indeed, it is a goal of this thesis to explore whether specific consultative committees established in the Ottawa-Carleton area are accomplishing this objective.

The community policing style suggests a service or customer-oriented police which is responsive to the community and proactive in identifying and solving community problems. A simplistic example of this direction is the renaming of a police organization from a *'force'* to designating it a *'service'*. Indeed, it appears that community policing has become so attractive to politicians and police managers that they are jumping on the 'community policing' bandwagon and promoting the label so as to generate a positive image of the police. Just as financial institutions vie for the patronage of customers in the 'quality of service' domain, many police managers believe that they, too, must have the support of their customers, the community, in order to maintain their occupation and generate a perception that the police are approachable, trustworthy, and accountable. Indeed, police see quality of service to their clients as a priority in order to maintain support at the grassroots

level.

Furthermore, faced with doing more with less, police organizations today must be cost-effective and accountable for the distribution of available resources. And despite the prevailing economic conditions, the public still demands a certain level of service from police. Police managers must meet these demands with more effective strategies to optimize staff and resources. By sharing policing responsibilities with the community, police growth may be limited and it also allows the police to draw on non police resources such as local agencies and volunteers.

iii) Major Elements of Community Policing:

In order to understand the concept of community policing, the major elements of this strategy will be reviewed. Community policing is often referred to as a re-emergence or revitalization of a former approach to urban policing developed in 1829 in Metropolitan London by Sir Robert Peel and his associates (Leighton, 1991). Peel's principles of policing included public accountability and public involvement with the police, "to recognize always that the power of the police to fulfil their functions and duties is dependent on public approval of their existence, actions and behavior, and on their ability to secure and maintain respect" (Appendix - 1).

Hence, the concept of community policing, although nebulous and difficult to define (Leighton, 1991; Bayley, 1988; Murphy, 1988a; Weisheit et al. 1994), is said to include: (1) community-based crime prevention; (2) proactive servicing as opposed to emergency response; (3) public participation in the planning and supervision of police operations; and (4) shifting of command responsibility to lower rank levels (Bayley, 1988). Leighton (1991) notes that the central principle underlying community policing is a full partnership between the community and their police in identifying and ameliorating local crime and disorder problems. Hence, the police and the community are co-producers of order and civility (Murphy and Muir, 1984). This relationship contrasts with the 'traditional' or 'professional' model of policing where modern police have removed themselves both philosophically, organizationally, and operationally from the community (Moore and Kelling, 1983).

Herman Goldstein (1987) noted several conceptual elements which are common to community policing programs: the mission of the police is broadened beyond law enforcement and order maintenance; to incorporate concern with promoting the common welfare by also being proactive in resolving community problems. The traditional response-driven method of handling calls or complaints is balanced by a problem-driven and preventive approach, which focuses on the

underlying causal forces associated with crime and disorder.

In their problem-solving role, rank-and-file police officers are to be given wider latitude in decision-making to facilitate problem identification and to generate solutions to community problems (Greene and Mastrofski, 1988). The partnership between the citizen and police contributes to this cooperation and responsiveness to the community.

What also becomes obvious from the literature on community policing is that community policing means many things to many people. "It is at once an ideology, an organizing framework for many police activities, and a set of individual programs" (Greene and Mastrofski, 1988: xiii). In fact, Greene and Mastrofski contend that most community policing programs are still primitive in design, implementation, and assessment. "They must make many assumptions about the role of the police in a democratic society, about how police services should (and can) be delivered, and about the public's willingness to become an active partner in producing public order" (ibid.:xiii).

iv) Background of Consultative Committees:

In response to the Directional Statement made by the RCMP Commissioner in 1989, all detachments over 12 members in size were directed to establish

Community Advisory Committees (Leighton, 1994). In addition, the Ontario Provincial Police have made consultation with communities an integral part of their Mission Statement, and consequently, numerous consultative committees have been established (Leighton, 1994).

Community consultative committees exist in other countries such as England and Wales, Australia, and Northern Ireland. In England and Wales, consultative committees were required by Home Office policy as a result of inner city rioting in 1981 in Brixton. The Scarman Report (1981), which followed the 1981 riots, recommended community consultation in policing matters. Consequently, the Police and Criminal Evidence Act of 1984 required that arrangements be made in each police area for obtaining the views of the people regarding policing concerns (Morgan, 1987). Although not contained specifically in the Police Act in Northern Ireland, the Home Office followed suit in implementing Scarman's recommendations.

Whereas consultative committees in England were established in response to a 'policing crisis' in areas where race relations between the police and community had eroded, no such crisis existed in Canada (Bayley, 1992). Despite the varied reasons for the emergence of these committees in these areas, the objectives or purposes of the committees themselves are similar and, therefore, their outcomes

can be reasonably compared and analyzed.

v) Theoretical premises:

There are competing explanations of the function of police community consultative committees. The community policing philosophy emphasizes establishing **partnerships** between the police and the community by establishing consultative committees.

On the other hand, other authors claim that partnerships cannot be easily established, if at all, because of particular interests and circumstances that interfere with its desired goals. Morgan (1989) has proposed three hypotheses to explain the functions of consultative committees: **marginalization**, **legitimation**, and **penetration**. Partnerships, as well as Morgan's hypotheses, will be discussed below.

- **Partnerships:**

Community policing proponents argue that community participation is needed in order to achieve the common goals of crime control and order maintenance. Indeed, community policing necessitates a “full *partnership between the community and their police* in identifying and ameliorating local crime and

disorder problems... Underlying this partnership principle is the core assumption that the level of crime, disorder, and fearfulness in a community is inversely related to the level of public participation in policing. That is, public participation breathes life into the partnership principle" (Leighton, 1991:487).

In essence, under a community policing model, the police and the community become partners in policing, as co— producers of order and civility (Murphy and Muir, 1984). The community is to be empowered to contribute to problem identification and prioritization, problem—solving, decisions regarding resource allocation, police policy, as well as the evaluation of such practices and policies. This process is to foster an accountable police service that bases its priorities on the needs of the community and consequently tries to meet these needs by the appropriate allocation of resources and personnel. This will facilitate effective and efficient policing in which police priorities and methods are congruent with community values and interests.

According to community policing advocates, community consultative committees are a means by which police and the community can form partnerships. They provide a forum where police and the community can meet to discuss the issues that are of most concern to them, where the police can listen to ‘grassroots’ representatives and adjust their policies in accordance with public opinion. Implied

in this model is the notion of power-sharing, as the community's input should help guide policing policies and programs.

Alternative hypotheses:

Rod Morgan (1989) offers a more complex framework for evaluating the efficacy of consultative committees. He examined different 'substantive' and 'symbolic' purposes and outcomes of these committees and arrived at three hypotheses which may explain the functions and objectives of consultative committees:

- **Marginalization hypothesis:**

This hypothesis suggests that only those who are advantaged by the consultative committees or have sympathies with the police participate in committees. Those who do not participate, and who are critical of the police, can then tend to be progressively closed out of the consultative process (Mitchell, 1992; see also Scruton, 1985).

Further, this hypothesis contends that those who will participate in committees will tend to: 1) be socially and economically advantaged; 2) have little adverse experience with the police and generally hold pro-police attitudes; 3) be

dependent on the police for information regarding problems in their area; and 4) become more sympathetic to the police viewpoint and discount criticisms of the police by non-participants to whom they have little or no attachment (Morgan, 1989).

Clearly, this hypothesis suggests that the committee members will not be representative of the community . In many cases, those with some vested interest in participating in the committee will attend. For instance, local activists or advocacy groups will have their own particular concerns they want to address or voice. Indeed, it also suggests that poor, minority or disenfranchised residents will not want to participate, perhaps because of past conflicts or tensions with the police, or feelings of powerlessness or intimidation by the process.

In effect, the result is that the consent of the ‘community’ regarding policing practices is manufactured by the select few that purport to represent the community. In this way, the conferring of local consent is merely a “masking of vested interests” (Leighton, 1991:515).

As a result, this ‘consent’ may serve to marginalize these unrepresented groups even further if the committee members support policing practices which may subjugate these populations. As committee members and those they represent may benefit from the outcome of meetings at the expense of other groups, the

“marginalization of groups critical of policing policy therefore serves to consolidate the interests of the relatively powerful: policing is made even more inequitable in its impact” (Morgan, 1989).

- **Legitimation hypothesis:**

This hypothesis suggests that when the members of the community who attend meetings begin to learn about the operation of the police, they adopt the ideals of the police force and legitimate existing/planned practices (see Savage, 1984; Savage, 1987; Spencer, 1985).

In this instance, the discussion at committee meetings tends to be a one-way ‘police-view’ approach where the police representatives present to the committee an account of police force development and structure, information on police patrols, the duties of the police, and everyday police administrative constraints. These items tend to dominate the agenda and govern what operational policies the consultative committees wish to see implemented (Mitchell, 1992:293). This is typically accomplished by setting the scene in terms of limitations and constraints on police operations particularly because of lack of resources and the growing incidence of crime (Morgan, 1987).

Consequently, the consultative committee will serve to legitimize the

police–selected policing policies, and very little independent critical response to these policies will surface as the representatives are persuaded the police are doing the best they can with limited resources. Being better informed of what the police do and the constraints they face, community members will sympathize with police and be willing to help however they can. In practical terms, these members have very little impact or power in influencing police policies and priorities, besides offering support for the police point of view. Therefore, the vested interests of the police are being met as they receive the backing for their policies and practices by the community and maintain ‘business as usual’.

- **Penetration hypothesis:**

This hypothesis argues that the operation of consultative committees creates a progressive blurring of the distinction between formal and informal policing, with the committees beginning to be associated with the day–to–day policing of the local area (Cohen, 1985; Gordon, 1987). It follows, therefore, that the existence of these committees is yet another example of increasing state control. Police have access to communities and information that otherwise would not be available to them, as citizens are enlisted to carry out police surveillance of the local population. They become the ‘eyes and ears’ of the police in schemes such as Neighborhood Watch

and other crime prevention initiatives. This also results in a “net increase in police activity and police penetration of the community” (Morgan, 1989:226).

Consultative committees serve the interests of the state in that they are contained along the continuum “of the increasing disciplining of society by the state” (Gordon, 1985:56). The blurred boundary of formal and informal social control allows the extension of the degree to which there is policing of the community rather than for the community (Morgan, 1989:225).

vi) Consultation: Proposed blueprint and perceived benefits:

The following describes the proposed structure of the committees and the benefits they purport to achieve.

Blueprint:

It is generally argued that membership should represent the community in terms of age, ethnicity, gender, and socio– economic status (Weiler, 1993; see also Morgan and Maggs, 1984; Fyfe, 1987). This process is to ensure that the entire community is given a voice in policing issues. In addition, it is also argued that a public and objective means of identifying and selecting community members be devised (Weiler, 1993:8) in order to facilitate representativeness and prevent biases

in the selection process.

Of course, it is anticipated that the police can mobilize citizens to participate in the committees, and a joint effort will lead to the identification of problems in the community. Community consensus will guide police response to crime and order problems identified by the committee. Indeed, consultation should provide a meaningful dialogue where the community can have an impact on police policy and practices.

Partnerships evolve as a result of the sharing of power and a commitment by the police and the community to engage in the co- production of order and civility. Such a process involves a broader social role for the police, where the police are seen as members of the community and not separate or superior to the community. This will help facilitate mutual trust and promote positive relations between police and the public.

Benefits:

The introduction of consultation arrangements is said to be a concrete expression of the recognition of the importance of local interests, needs, and feelings in relation to policing (Lustgarten, 1986:93). There are many benefits that are said to accrue from implementing a police-community consultative committee.

These benefits include the ventilation of local problems by the community into the police agency that serves their community (Leighton, 1993; Weatheritt, 1988; Morgan, 1987), promoting cooperation between the police and the community (Weatheritt, 1988) and providing arenas for exchanging information and encouraging participation in crime control (Savage, 1984:58). Indeed, "mutual suspicion between the police and the public would thus be eroded, and a police force shown to be willing to respond to the wishes of the local community might receive, in turn, a response from the public to co-operate in the social task of controlling crime" (ibid.:59).

Mastrofski and Greene (1993) remark on the potential of community involvement to improve police legality and community relations since the discussion of tactics and strategies at committee meetings will provide time to consider potentially negative impacts of these proposed tactics. Moreover, such a public discussion forces the police to rethink their strategies, not only in terms of the legality of the police methods, but also in terms of whether they are the most appropriate means of handling the problems. In effect the existence of an active and effective committee encourages accountable, equitable and bias-free policing services (Leighton, 1993).

One of the major advantages of locally based community liaison put forth by

Savage (1984) is that community members would be in direct contact with those police officers who are actually responsible for policing their community. Citizens would then be able to present their views and opinions on what is most important to their locality, and have an influence on what police methods are to be utilized in responding to local concerns.

At the same time, a neighborhood engaged in dialogue with its police may come to a better understanding and appreciation of the constraints and limitations placed on police officers (Mastrofski & Greene, 1993) and dialogue encourages an understanding of the problem from the police point of view. As a result, the relationship becomes one of co-operation rather than imposition (Savage, 1984).

The next section of this chapter will discuss the research findings of a number of studies that have been conducted on consultative committees. The hoped for or intended goals of consultative arrangements will be assessed against the findings of the studies. I will draw upon the philosophies of partnerships, marginalization, legitimation, and penetration to determine what seems to be the current functioning of consultative committees.



vii) Consultation in practice:

There have been just a handful of studies conducted on consultative committees, with most efforts coming from England and Wales (see Savage, 1984; Morgan and Maggs, 1985; Morgan, 1985; Spencer, 1985; Morgan 1986; Morgan, 1987; Fyfe, 1989; Morgan 1989; Stratta, 1990; Fyfe, 1992; Mitchell, 1992; Bull and Stratta, 1994). One study from New South Wales, Australia (Bull and Stratta, 1994) and one from Northern Ireland (Weitzer, 1992) was located. In Canada, a general review of over 150 committees was conducted by Richard Weiler (1993) under the auspices of the Solicitor General of Canada and the Solicitor General of Ontario. In addition, a recent study (1995) on community consultative groups was conducted by the research branch of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

The findings of these studies revealed very similar results. Overall, partnerships did not appear to be fully established as a result of the formation of the committee. Indeed, there was substantial support for the legitimization and marginalization hypotheses proposed by Morgan (1989).

- **Representativeness:**

Most of the studies reviewed demonstrated the lack of representativeness in committee membership. A study of Northern Ireland's police liaison committees

found that the committees typically consist of “small groups of elected elites...who are neither broad-based nor ‘anchored’ in the community...Only 5 [committees] include lay members of the community and few of these members genuinely represent grass-roots opinion” (Weitzer, 1992:236).

Morgan (1989:229) noted that consultative group members in his England study were disproportionately male, middle-class, middle-aged, and ‘involved’ members of the community. Few of the members in his study had any adversarial experience of the police and members were generally pro-police and ignorant of day-to-day policing methods and procedures. Even when efforts to involve youth and ethnic minority representatives in the committee were made, they were met with little success (p. 229).

Mitchell (1992), in his study of the Lambeth Consultative Committee, found similar results. Representatives tended to be male, middle-aged and ‘involved’ members of the community, and Black minority members had minimal involvement with the committee. Mitchell noted that Black youth appeared marginalized and that they believed the committees were focused around police, and not community needs. Thus, they felt that they had nothing to gain from participating. Similarly, Savage (1987) reported that youth were ‘glaringly absent’ from the consultative process in one large county in southern England.

In a study of two consultative committees by Stratta (1990), the majority of members were male, white, over forty years of age, and the unofficial criteria for membership appeared to be whether they were supportive of the police. In their detailed analysis of the operations of two committees in England and one in New South Wales, Bull and Stratta (1994) found that the membership in the committees from England (whose community members were appointed by the police) tended to contain those 'supportive' of police with few minority representations. A similar finding was noted by Fyfe (1992) in his study of two other English committees. Further, the 1995 RCMP study found that groups were not always representative of the community at large and many participants were either friends of individual members of the service, or were recruited by the detachment commander (1995:6).

In New South Wales, however, the committee was elected as a consequence of a meeting initiated by the police where police invited representatives from schools, welfare agencies, local branches of political parties, and local utilities to participate in the consultative committee (Bull and Stratta, 1994:244). In this case, the authors noted that there was a belief in the need to establish committees in an open and democratic manner. Although the Canadian literature states that openness and objectivity are important in membership selection (Weiler, 1993; Seagrave, 1994) there is no data on the actual composition of Canadian committees (Seagrave,

1993).

Overall, there seems to be evidence of the marginalization hypothesis advanced by Morgan (1989). It is clear that in these committees, particularly in the United Kingdom, members are not representative of the community, as they tend to be drawn from the 'great and good' of the local area (Morgan, 1987).

However, these findings are not necessarily surprising considering that earlier efforts by police to involve the community in policing matters such as crime prevention have been met with difficulty (Rosenbaum, 1986). Indeed, the 'failure to thrive' phenomenon has been documented as a recurring theme in community organizations (Buerger, 1993:112).

A study of urban and suburban police departments in the U.S. which established neighborhood-oriented policing programs concluded that the most perplexing implementation problem was the inability of the police departments to organize and maintain active community involvement in their projects (Grinc, 1994). The author attributed this problem particularly to the historically negative relationship between the police and poor/minority groups and the traditional role of police as professional crime fighter, where community participation has traditionally been discouraged.

In essence, the support found for the marginalization hypothesis may be more

as a result of existing social relations and cultural factors than by police design.

- **Constructive dialogue and community impact:**

Considering the lack of representativeness that seems to characterize consultative committees, and that most of the committee members hold pro-police attitudes, are hand picked by the police, and that few have had any adverse experience with the police, it is not surprising that, in these studies, the dialogue tended to be one-directional. Typically, the agenda was controlled by the police who used the committee meetings to inform or educate the community representatives on the local and national crime rate, the problems in the area, and the lack of resources to address these problems (see Savage, 1987; Morgan, 1987; Morgan, 1989; Stratta, 1990; Mitchell, 1992; Fyfe, 1992).

Indeed, Stratta (1990:544) reports that her “observation of the police interaction on the committee showed that their knowledge and expertise, their access to resources and their consensus in public, enabled them to maintain control of the discussions”. Such asymmetrical power relations served to suppress any debate on allocation of resources or police policy. Consultation was seen “as merely a reinforcement, rather than an exploration and questioning, of the police point of view” (ibid.). Similarly, Savage (1987) found that community representatives grew

to support police endeavors and had sympathy for the constraints they faced.

Community members rarely responded with any presentations of their own problems, criticisms, or concerns. Moreover, Fyfe (1992: 322) found that “the perceived interests of some community participants appeared to be gradually altered so as to coincide with those of the police”.

An alternative hypothesis which could explain the lack of problem identification and problem-solving capacities of the committees may be that the groups lack problem-solving skills (see Weiler, 1993) or that they feel intimidated by the process and care not to argue or contribute to the meeting. It may be more plausible, however, that the community's lack of knowledge of their role and their uncertainty as to what to expect from consultative committees (Morgan and Maggs, 1985; Savage, 1987) provided an avenue for the police to co-opt the community more easily.

On the whole, therefore, it appeared that a consensus of sorts was reached as a result of minimal criticism or concerns put forth by community representatives; this served to legitimize their existing/planned practices and strategies. Under a partnership model, the police are to take the community's identified problems and concerns into consideration when establishing their own priorities for delivering police services (Leighton, 1993:247). Evidence on whether the community has any

such influence or power to direct the police in terms of priorities and programs is minimal, at best.

Savage (1987) did not find any real evidence that consultative committees have resulted in any significant increase of public influence over policing policy. This assessment has been reiterated by Morgan (1989), Stratta (1990), Mitchell, (1992) and Weitzer (1992). A similar finding was reported in Mawby's (1990) study which showed that the role attributed to the community has been that of aides to the police, rather than involving any transfer of power. The 1995 Canadian study revealed similar results. In fact, it was found that in the majority of detachments, "consultative groups are not involved in the operational planning and priority setting...planning is still considered to be dictated from the top down and internally orchestrated" (p 5).

Fyfe's (1992) study found the police were generally unresponsive to community demands. He observed that in one committee, only one joint police-community initiative emerged over the study period (p 324). As Bull and Stratta (1994) conclude on their study of two committees in England, it appears that consultation may exist in appearance only.

In essence, there seems to be considerable support for the legitimization hypothesis proposed by Morgan (1989). The lack of power-sharing and two-way

dialogue, and the weighty role of the police as educators rather than as partners attributes to the lack of real influence or impact that community representatives have on the functioning of the committee. There seemed to be more evidence of consultative committees serving as 'talking shops' rather than as a means where community representatives could participate in major decisions that govern policing.

- **Police Role:**

The community policing philosophy demands a redefinition of the role of police. Whereas traditional policing is characterized by the reactive, professionalized, 'thin blue line' approach to addressing crime and disorder problems, community policing emphasizes a proactive, generalist, and integrated approach to policing. Police commitment to a broader social role should enhance partnerships and bridge-building.

Recent policing literature reveals that the role of the police appears to remain within a crime fighting, law enforcement orientation. In Mawby's 1990 comparative analysis of the police role in Canada, United Kingdom, United States, and the Netherlands, he found that "police work is defined primarily in terms of action, excitement, work on the streets and with the goal of making an arrest...police work

is evaluated in terms of crime clearance rather than neighborhood service” (p. 180).

In essence, “the central features of police work remain untouched by community-oriented philosophies” (ibid.:177). The recent Canadian study (1995) also found that performance is still primarily measured by the members’ ability to solve crimes and bring offenders before the criminal justice system. In effect, this absence of a qualitative performance measurement makes it unlikely that members will accept additional responsibilities or change their orientation to their work (RCMP, 1995:12).

The RCMP study also found that professional policing still persists. Indeed, many members are not yet convinced that community policing is the better way to deliver police services (ibid:7). “In fact, community policing is seen by senior members, many of whom are detachment commanders with 21 years or more of service, as ‘soft on crime’ and ‘overrated’ as an effective approach to delivering policing services” (ibid:8). It is their view that community policing diverts scarce resources away from their first responsibility of crime control and law enforcement.

Hence, such a finding places a police organization’s alleged commitment to redefining their role under some serious doubt. In effect, community meetings may be used to make community sentiments known to officials, but the daily decisions as to how the community will be policed will be left to the rank-and-file officer in

the community who perceives his/her role as crime fighter, and not within a social service capacity. Indeed, while consultative committees may operate in the community, the essential core of the organization remains unchanged, leaving the committees to exist as isolated police tactics. It is not surprising, therefore, that consultative committees are considered by many as public relations exercises (for instance, see Scraton, 1985; Spencer, 1985) or 'cozy ritualistic affairs' (Morgan, 1989; Weitzer, 1992).

Kinsey et al (1986:133) contend that "the norms and traditions of the police service may make it very difficult for officers at a local level to participate in anything that resembles a 'debate', within even restricted sections of local communities". Moreover, if the police values, philosophy, and organizational structure have not changed to accommodate a true community consultation process, one must question whether co-operation and partnerships can be established on the basis of an isolated tactic. As long as the police maintain a professionalized role, the expectation that consultative committees can foster partnerships and problem-solving, could remain unmet and unobtainable. In fact, it is argued that "professionalization militates against proper consultation" (Benyon, 1986:50).

If consultative committees are to have any chance of success, they must be strongly supported by both the top and bottom of the organization. Success depends

on the attitudes of those taking part, especially the police (Savage, 1984; Cox, 1986). Indeed, the consultative machinery may fall into disuse if the lack of police commitment to a broader social role continues.

viii) Discussion and conclusion:

In the ideal, consultation is a means of measuring consumer demand. It provides a mechanism by which the police can obtain the views of the community as to what constitutes crime and disorder, and the community can offer advice on solutions to these problems. Consultation is about dialogue between the police and the community. It can help partnerships evolve, yield increased cooperation and trust between the partners, and contribute to a more efficient and effective police service.

The evidence of partnerships and true dialogue is weak according to the studies reviewed. More likely the reality is the co-optation of the community by the police, in order to maintain the status quo, their independence, and autonomy. There was no indication that any power-sharing was taking place; in contrast, the power and control of the police seems to be maintained and, perhaps stronger in some cases, such as where the committee serves as the 'eyes and ears of the police' as the penetration hypothesis proposes.

Although there was no cited indication from these studies that these committees operated to further penetrate state control into communities, it must also be said that such a contention is difficult to 'prove' because of the subtleness involved. Consultative committees may be soft-end approaches to community control that are masked by the seemingly good intentions of police officials and other claims-makers who stress the need to include the community in policing matters to ensure that police practices are in line with community values. Such claims serve as an ideological tool to focus on the benefits that will be derived from consultative committees (e.g. a safer, peaceful community), and thus legitimate the existence of such committees, and divert the attention away from the state's benefit of increased community control. The evidence seems to suggest that the benefits to community members are not being realized (e.g. partnerships, influence on problem identification and police policy) while the state stands at a greater chance of accomplishing greater community control.

Morgan's (1989) hypotheses of legitimation and marginalization can be found in virtually all of the studies reviewed. The studies seem to concede that the building of partnerships was hampered by both the 'types' of participants that were found on the committees and the apparent lack of commitment by the police organization to share decision-making power and control over proceedings.

Another problem that surfaced was the size of the community that the committee was said to represent. According to Morgan (1987:42), consultative committees seem to “operate in the stratosphere” as far as neighborhoods are concerned. It is recommended by Morgan and others that consultative committees must be more localized in order to reach all the ‘subcommunities’ that exist in any defined geographical locality (see Willmott, 1987; Seagrave, 1994).

The issue of problem-solving is also highly contentious. The community and the police may often not agree on the existing or planned means to solve an identified problem. This may be the case in complex, heterogeneous communities where such a diverse array of interests may be expressed. Mastrofski and Greene (1993) argue that conflicting interests that surface in community organizations should be perceived as perhaps a good thing in that it “may provide the basis from which consensus or compromise is reached...it may highlight the important issues that fragment the neighborhood, thus helping external authorities, such as the police, decide what to do” (p.92). However, these authors fail to suggest a plan or method by which conflicting interests can converge and form a consensus. This very notion highlights the problems inherent in prioritizing problems, and arriving at mutually agreed upon solutions to these problems, a process which fosters a true partnership between the police and community.

Community consultative committees operate on the assumption that the community will want to participate in close liaison with the police. The evidence that committees are generally unrepresentative of the local community may reflect the possibility that the community is not ready to join hands with the police in this fashion. The community has been conditioned to initiate police contact only in a request for a specific service. Police normally initiate contact with citizens on an adversarial basis. Therefore, perhaps more work has to be done to integrate the police in the community (since this is the goal of community policing) before the community will participate in policing.

At the same time, there seems to be a lack of commitment on the part of the police service to integrating into the community and complementing community policing strategies. The findings by Mawby (1990) illustrate the rank-and-file resistance to innovation, and the strength of the police subculture. 'Real police work' is still considered by most police as fighting crime, patrolling the streets, and responding to calls for service, not neighborhood-oriented programs and committees under the guise of community policing. Indeed, Fyfe (1992) observed the gulf that exists between what is said at committee meetings and what happens on the streets. Constables in his study felt that these committees 'don't have anything to do with my job' (p. 322).

This examination of recent studies on consultative committees has provided the basis of the present research. The research will be outlined in the next chapter.

Chapter 3 - Methodology

A review of the literature has shown that four hypotheses have emerged which purport to explain how these committees are functioning. In the first instance, community policing advocates contend that police community consultative committees facilitate a *partnership* between the police and the community (for instance see Leighton, 1991; Solicitor General of Ontario, 1993), whereby the police and the community are coproducers of order and civility (Murphy and Muir, 1985).

Alternatively, Morgan (1989) contends that these committees function to *marginalize* certain groups from the consultative process; to *legitimize* existing or planned policing practices and maintain 'business as usual' (simply 'talking shops'); or to *penetrate* the community and serve as an informal means of social control.

This thesis sought to investigate these hypotheses within a Canadian context. Because the consultative committees under study are relatively new and early in their development, it was not considered feasible to focus this study specifically on determining which hypothesis(es) appears to be operating in each particular committee under study. However, it is viable to look at how the committees are

presently developing and compare these findings to the characteristics of a particular hypothesis. In this way, one can reasonably discern in what direction the committees appear to be developing. Therefore, this study should serve as an informative and pertinent piece of research for the committees and the police organization.

This research involves both quantitative and qualitative components. Questionnaires were distributed to members of five police community consultative committees in the Ottawa-Carleton area. (Two separate questionnaires were distributed - one to community representatives and another to police representatives. A more detailed description of the sample population and data collection will follow.) In addition, both informal and formal interviews were conducted with various individuals involved in the consultative process. Clearly, a variety of data sources are beneficial to any study in the hopes that certain deficiencies inherent in one type of data-gathering tool will be compensated for or overcome by simultaneous use of alternative data-gathering tools. Such triangulation increases explanatory value (reliability) and may serve to provide stronger ground for verification of the hypotheses under examination.

Research problem

The goal of this research is to contribute to an understanding of the functions of police community consultative committees. To do so, I chose to explore existing consultative committees within the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service. More specifically, this research focuses on the committee members' perceptions of the operation of these committees, particularly with respect to the members' roles and responsibilities as well as the committees' goals and objectives, while keeping in mind the four hypotheses: *partnership, marginalization, legitimation, and penetration*. My purpose is to contribute to the growing body of literature on consultative committees by exploring and highlighting those issues which appear most relevant to consultative committees. It is these issues which must be given serious consideration by police organizations that wish to establish consultative committees and/or evaluate existing committees.

i) Research questions

To examine the functions of consultative committees, several research questions were generated from the review of the literature. It was necessary to explore the existing literature to draw out the major research questions that would form the basis of this thesis. These questions were used as a basis for the

questionnaires that were distributed to the members of the committees as well as for the questions asked during interviews.

The main research questions that were formulated were:

- 1) *Is there a sharing of power among the community and the police?*
- 2) *Is there two-way constructive dialogue between the community members and police?*
- 3) *Have community members been able to identify problems in their community or have problems been identified for them by the police representatives?*
- 4) *Do members feel that the police representatives take into account the communities' identified problems and concerns?*
- 5) *Are the committee members representative of the communities they purport to represent?*
- 6) *What do members expect to get out of consultation?*
- 7) *Are the police committed to the community policing philosophy and ready to accept a broader social role? Are consultative committees accepted by the police as an important part of realizing community policing philosophy?*

These research questions helped me to focus my thesis on the particular hypotheses under examination.

ii) Operational Definitions

As these research questions were formulated, particular concepts emerged which required precise definition. The following concepts were considered the most

important to be explored:

- consultation
- partnership
- accountability
- community

What is meant by consultation?

According to Webster's dictionary, consultation means 'to seek guidance or information from' or 'to have regard for in making plans; consider'. Community policing philosophy emphasizes the need of the police to involve the community in deciding its policing needs. Consultation, therefore, may be seen as a means to obtain community input on the community's needs and priorities.

Much of the existing literature on consultative committees criticizes the police organization's attempts at involving the community in deciding its policing needs by referring to the consultative committees as public relations efforts (see Spencer, 1985; Scruton, 1988; Morgan, 1989) as committees were seen as not having the power to influence policing practices. In essence, consultative committees were considered merely 'talking shops' which had little to no decision-making capacity and only served to reinforce existing or planned policing

practices.

Many of the questions in the questionnaire were designed to provide the researcher with committee members' perceptions of what consultation meant to them and what they expected to achieve from the consultative process. This strategy was important, considering the various connotations that may be attached to this concept, particularly with regard to decision-making capacity. The ambiguity was demonstrated by the literature review in the previous chapter. Furthermore, an exploration of the members' and Police Service's perceptions of consultation would be interesting and, indeed, beneficial to this study as it could be reasonably discerned whether the police and the community were clear on what their role is on the committee and what the committee intended to accomplish. Both the questionnaires and the interview questions were designed to capture these perceptions.

What is meant by partnership?

According to community policing literature, partnership refers to the police working with the community as coproducers of safety and security of the community (e.g. Murphy and Muir, 1985; Leighton, 1994). Leighton (1993:247) states that partnership

means that *the community, through one means or another, has an equal say in the definition of what constitutes crime and disorder problems in their community. As well, the police will take these problems and concerns into consideration* when establishing their own priorities for delivering policing services (emphasis added).

In essence, partnership refers to a sharing of power between the police and the community, where the community has a say in deciding its own policing needs and priorities. Indeed, the community is empowered to participate in problem identification, problem-solving, and setting police priorities. This empowerment involves shared decision-making, both in determining the kinds of problems and activities for police to be involved in and identifying specific strategies by which the community and police can address particular problems.

The goal of a partnership is an accountable police service that bases its priorities on the needs, values and concerns of the community. It is held that this process develops trust between the police and the community, which will encourage the flow of “valuable information from the community that could lead to the solution and prevention of crimes, will engender support for needed crime control measures, and will provide an opportunity for officers to establish a working relationship with the community” (Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994: 16).

What is meant by accountability?

In general, accountability takes on various connotations including explanations, justifications and checks of police intervention. Within the community policing philosophy, it is the participation of the community in deciding its own policing needs that is emphasized as an indicator of accountability. As Skolnick and Bayley claim, an accountable police service “bases its priorities on the needs of the community” (1988: 72). Indeed, much community policing literature stresses the need to assess consumer opinion about police services and invite the public to play “an influential role in the development of policy, the design of policing strategies and when appropriate, participate actively in the implementation of those strategies” (Solicitor General of Canada and Solicitor General of Ontario, 1993:5).

Accountability, therefore, involves the police inviting the public to offer their input on the methods and practices of policing, and to engage in the development of policing policy. Under this philosophy, the police are held to account for their organizational practices and they must adapt their policies to meet the community’s needs. In essence, the stated values of the police department - the standards by which all policies, tactics, and actions are developed and judged - must reflect their belief in and commitment to community policing philosophy.

Spencer (1985:104) makes the distinction between accountability and

consultation:

the police are accountable to a committee if they are *obliged* to inform that committee about their activities *and* the committee can apply some sanction against the officers responsible if it does not approve of their actions. Consultation between the police and that committee, however, means only that the police listen to the committee's views and vice versa. There is no obligation on either side to act on what the other has said. Consultation is not, therefore, a form of accountability. Under such arrangements, the police are not obliged to tell the committee anything, and if committee members do not like what they are told they are powerless to do anything about it.

It is important to make this distinction between accountability and consultation because these concepts have significantly different meanings, and one does not necessarily guarantee the existence of the other. This distinction is also important in the discussion of the results of the research, particularly with the notion of partnerships and equality of the partners.

What is meant by community?

First, and foremost, the concept of community must be recognized as having a multitude of meanings, and that the conceptualization of the community concept lies largely in the eye of the beholder. Leighton (1988) argues that “‘community’ is not a unitary phenomenon but is characterized by many varieties of local and extra-local organizational forms...a satisfactory, usable formulation of the concept has yet to be developed that is applicable to the variety of community forms”

(p.352).

Trojanowicz (1988) recognizes the problematic usage of the traditional definition of community. He argues that when community is seen as some cohesive group within a geographic area, this picture disregards the issues of crime, disorder, and fear of crime, the very issues that “provide modern communities and the police with a mutual community of interest that can allow for meaningful interaction” (1988: 13).

It follows, therefore, that there is a distinct difference between a geographic community and a community of interests. As Trojanowicz (1988:1) explains,

(t)his has particular relevance to the use of community in community policing...because crime, disorder, and fear of crime can help create a community of interests within a geographic community...The community of interest generated by crime, disorder, and fear of crime becomes the goal to allow community policing officers an entre into the geographic community. Then the officer and the residents can develop new structures and tactics designed to improve the overall quality of life, allowing a renewed community spirit to build and flourish.

It is appropriate that, for the purposes of this research, both a geographic community, and a community of interests were attributed to the meaning of community. Preliminary groundwork on the police community consultative committees in the Ottawa-Carleton region revealed that each committee is attached to a Community Police Centre. The Community Police Centre is located in a particular geographic police district. In fact, the area served by the Centre is also the

area served by the committee. In addition, it was presumed at the outset of this research that many of those who participate on these committees can be said to have a common or shared goal of improving the overall quality of life in their area and have an interest in working with the police to accomplish this goal.

iii) Sample

A significant amount of groundwork had to be accomplished before a sample of police community consultative committees could be determined. The Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service was contacted in May, 1995 and an interview was arranged with an Inspector who was responsible for addressing community policing issues including police community consultative committees. During this meeting, basic information was gathered on the Police Service in general, as well as specifics regarding consultative committees in the Ottawa-Carleton area. Ten Community Police Centres were in operation at that time and several consultative committees had developed in conjunction with the Centres.

A list of existing Community Police Centres in the Ottawa-Carleton area was obtained. Each Community Police Centre is located in a particular police division. There are three police divisions in the Ottawa-Carleton region: Ottawa (composed of five police districts), Nepean (composed of four zones), and Gloucester

(composed of seven zones). These zones and districts are based on specific geographic boundaries which have been established by the Police Service.

Attempts were made to contact the Inspector of each district in the city of Ottawa to determine whether his or her district had a consultative committee in place. In some cases, the Inspector was unavailable; therefore, the officer who worked at the Community Police Centre in that district was contacted. The officers in charge of the Community Police Centres in Nepean and Gloucester were also contacted and informal interviews were arranged between myself and the officers. Initially, the intent was to determine whether each Community Police Centre had a consultative committee. The next step was to determine whether the committee fell within the purview of consultative committees for the purposes of this study.

There were particular criteria used to determine whether or not the particular committee under discussion was indeed a committee to include in this study. This determination was crucial in order to prevent contamination of the data obtained from committees. Indeed, most Centres had a committee in place to support the work of the Community Police Centre, but this study is particularly interested in committees whose main responsibility seems to be identifying and solving crime and disorder problems in the community. Furthermore, it was my view that some consultative committees in the Ottawa-Carleton area did not meet this criterion as

these committees were mostly operating in an administrative fashion; they generally focused on the Centre and ways to financially maintain it with little to no problem identification or problem-solving. These committees were omitted from this study.

After reviewing the information gathered from the Inspectors and officers from the Centres, it was concluded that five committees in the Ottawa-Carleton area met the criteria of police-community consultative committees for the purposes of this study. From these five committees, one out of the five police districts in the city of Ottawa was represented, two Nepean police zones were represented, and two Gloucester police zones were represented. In total, the population size for this study consisted of 53 consultative committee members - 46 community representatives (31 are male and 15 are female) and 7 police representatives (all 7 are male).

Once the committees for study were determined, members were recruited to participate in the study. As required by the University of Ottawa Ethics Review Committee, an informed consent form (Appendix - 2) and an information sheet (Appendix - 3) were designed which would be read to potential participants of the study and which would also be mailed along with the questionnaire to the members of the committee. The approval from the Ethics Review Committee was obtained on the 12 June, 1995.

After Ethics approval was received, I informally interviewed the police

representatives on each of the five committees to obtain basic information about the committees such as the date each committee was established, the number of participants on each committee, and the circumstances surrounding the establishment of the committee. Following these interviews, I attended a meeting of three of the five committees under study during June and July of 1995. I was invited to attend a meeting of a fourth committee, but the committee did not hold meetings during the summer months. I was not invited to attend a meeting by the fifth committee.

The benefits of attending actual meetings were two-fold. First, attending meetings allowed for firsthand experience and knowledge of the committees, and this is especially important since these committees are new and in various stages of development. It was particularly interesting to see the dynamics involved and the processes utilized during committee meetings. Second, attending the meetings gave me the opportunity to speak with members of the committee about the meeting itself, but also about my project and the importance of it for myself as a student, and also the benefits they may gain from this research. Furthermore, such interaction should increase the response rate of the questionnaires.

iv) Questionnaire construction

Data for this study were gathered by means of informal interviews initially, but the primary method of data gathering consisted of a questionnaire for distribution to the members of the committees. One questionnaire was designed for the community members of the committees (Appendix - 4) and another for the police representatives on the committees (Appendix - 5).

The construction of the questionnaires proved to be an arduous task indeed. Several books on survey construction were reviewed and were of some benefit. The key to constructing the questionnaires, however, was my continual reference to the research questions mentioned earlier in this chapter. These research questions kept the questionnaire focused on the specific issues under investigation, and also prevented the inclusion of items which did not contribute to the exploration of the hypotheses.

It was recognized that consultation, accountability, community and partnerships were concepts that needed to be operationalized in order to examine the hypotheses in question. Indeed, the questionnaires represented the move from the conceptual level to the empirical level in this research. The following will outline the questions asked in the community questionnaire (Appendix - 4) in terms of which variable is being measured, and/or which hypothesis is being explored.

Community questionnaire:

marginalization hypothesis: questions 1-8, 14-15, 31, 32, 35, 37, 41, 47, 48, 52, 59, 61

legitimation hypothesis: questions 15, 26-30, 34-36, 38-41, 44, 47, 49, 53, 56, 57, 59, 63-65, 68

penetration hypothesis: questions 33, 37, 40, 59

partnership: questions 25-30, 34-36, 38, 42-46, 48, 52, 54, 55-58, 60, 61, 63, 66, 67, 69-71

community: questions 1-14, 16-24

consultation: questions 7, 25, 26, 30, 32, 35, 36, 42, 44, 47, 55, 57, 58, 60, 61, 69, 70

accountability: questions 22, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 47, 61, 65, 69

After several drafts, a pretest of the community members' questionnaire was performed. I met with a group of individuals who are members of the Board of a voluntary organization in the Ottawa-Carleton area. This organization was considered an appropriate pretest population because they deal with issues similar to those discussed by the committees in this study, and the members themselves were thought to have similar characteristics to the members of police community consultative committees (for instance: age, education, socioeconomic status, participation in other voluntary organizations). This population provided insightful

and valuable input on the items on the questionnaire, and revisions were made in accordance with this input.

In addition to this pretest population, the survey was reviewed by a specialist in criminal justice as well as several individuals who have been involved in voluntary organizations and hold occupations similar to those members of the consultative committees (for instance, teachers, government employees, social service workers, a general service worker and an unemployed individual). The feedback received was very useful and it served as an important assessment of the survey prior to its distribution to the sample population.

The instrument used in this research is considered a valid one. That is, the questions contained in the questionnaire appear to measure the committee members' perceptions of consultative committees. The questionnaire is an original piece of work and has not been used by any other researcher. Therefore, it was important to have a pretest population assess the content of the questionnaire as it relates to partnerships, representation, consultation and sharing of power. As there was agreement among the pretest participants that the questionnaire seemed to measure or at the very least explore these areas, it was contended that the questionnaire did not lack face validity and that it measures the concepts being explored.

Furthermore, because of the vast amount of research conducted on

community policing and consultative committees prior to the construction of the questionnaire, it was considered that this questionnaire also had sampling validity. It was necessary to become familiar with the issues surrounding community policing in order to understand what consultative committees are intended to accomplish. This familiarity enabled the design of questionnaires which focused on the issues concerning the population under study.

However, the small number of respondents prevents the generalization of results to other members of the consultative committees, and to other consultative committees in general. For this reason, the data presented will be mostly descriptive and in univariate table form (Appendix - 11, 13). However, some cross tabulations were done which produced bivariate tables; those crosstabulations which produced statistically significant results will be described. On the other hand, most bivariate tables which were created produced statistically insignificant results when the chi square test was utilized. This may be attributed to the small sample size, and not that such weak and statistically insignificant results are indeed reflective of the real relationships. One cannot ignore the possibility that these relationships are indeed significant and strong, but that the research failed to record them as such due to the sampling problems.

Police questionnaire:

The questionnaire that was distributed to the police representatives contained many questions found on the community members' questionnaire. I felt reasonably assured that these questions were properly constructed, and therefore, acceptable for the police survey.

There were many questions on the community members' survey which were considered inappropriate to ask the police representatives, such as demographic information (questions 1-11; 13-14), opinions on crime in general (questions 16-24), as well as questions relating to their work which, in all probability, would not discriminate responses or result in a high plausibility of split views. It was felt that many of these questions would be answered in accordance with what was expected of them as per their position as community police officers, particularly because there were only seven police officers sent a questionnaire. These types of questions on the community members' questionnaire that were omitted from the police survey were questions 28-30, 38, 40, 47, 48, 51, and 64.

Questions 31-47 and 49-54 on the police questionnaire relate specifically to the police officers' views on what they believe should be the elements required for consultative committees and their perceptions of the process of public consultation within the police organization. This information is important to gather in order to

explore what role consultation has and the importance attached to the committees within the police organization.

The results of the police questionnaire will be described from the tabulation of the results (Appendix - 14). Because only five officers responded to the questionnaire, the sample cannot be said to be representative of officers in the Ottawa-Carleton area, or officers from other areas who preside over consultative committees. The results are specific to those who responded. As well, cross tabulations were inappropriate for this research because of the small sample size. However, the overall results cannot be dismissed as insignificant just because of the small numbers as the research is exploratory and any information which is produced from the questionnaire may be beneficial for the police organization and community. This exploration increases the participants' awareness of the perceptions of consultation and presents an opportunity for further discussion of issues which may have arisen from the data.

Distribution of questionnaires:

The community questionnaires were sent in the mail to the committee members on 25 July, 1995 while the questionnaires distributed to the police representatives were sent on 11 August, 1995. A brief description of the study was

enclosed with the questionnaire (Appendix - 3). In addition, two informed consent forms (Appendix - 2) were given to each participant, one of which the participant would enclose with the completed questionnaire.

The questionnaire did not provide a space for the respondent's name in order to protect the identity of the respondent. However, each questionnaire was given a code to correspond with his or her name which was contained on a master list. This codification proved very beneficial as I was able to determine who responded to the questionnaires. Initially, three weeks was the time limit given to participants to complete and return the questionnaire. However, the summer months proved be an inopportune time to conduct a survey, as many people tend to take holidays during this time. In fact, the initial response rate of the questionnaires was under 50%. Consequently, after the three week time limitation elapsed, I determined who did not return the questionnaire by the codes attached to those questionnaires returned and attempts were made to contact those who did not respond.

The time limit for completion of the surveys was extended to the 7th of September, 1995. The total number of people who responded was 29 or 55% of the total number sent a questionnaire. At this time, the master list containing the names of respondents with the corresponding code was destroyed.

v) **Formal interviews:**

- ***committee chairs:***

During the month of August, 1995, the chair of each of the five committees under study was formally interviewed. Each interview lasted approximately one and a half hours, and a list of questions was prepared prior to the interview (Appendix -6). The same questions were asked of each chair to ensure a high degree of interviewer control and enhanced reliability and validity of the data. Interviews were also considered to be important to this study in order to obtain information not acquired via questionnaires, and interviews can provide a means to clarify statements or questions for the respondent.

- ***Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police:***

The Project Coordinator of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service was interviewed in August, 1995 (see Appendix - 7 for list of questions). This Inspector was responsible for reviewing the issue of consultative committees within the Police Service and also for making recommendations regarding consultation structures and strategies within a community policing model.

- ***Police Services Board:***

A member of the Police Services Board was interviewed in August, 1995. The Police Services Board is responsible for police policy and, at the time of this interview, was active in organizing consultative committees for the local Ontario Provincial Police detachments. The purpose of this interview was to gain insight into how the Police Services Board perceives the function(s) of consultative committees and to assess how much involvement the consultative committees will have with the Board, particularly at the policy-making level. An interview protocol was developed prior to the interview to ensure specific points were covered (Appendix -8).

vi) Construction of Secondary Variables

A secondary variable in this study is a variable which is measurable by utilizing several questions in the questionnaire and constructing an arbitrary scale to measure the relative degree of the presence of the concept or variable. These questions were chosen on the basis that they are considered indicators of the variable being measured. As such, the scales are based primarily on face validity and professional judgment. Each question was accorded a certain numerical weight; some questions were considered more important than others in terms of measuring

The following secondary variables were created:

- propolice attitude
- accountability: < police to community
 <community representatives to the community as a whole
- constructive dialogue
- community readiness to identify and solve problems
- mutual identification and resolution of problems
- quality of life
- consultation
- mandate
- penetration

The actual construction of the secondary variables can be located in Appendix - 9. The construction of these variables was useful to this research, considering the difficulties in measuring concepts in general. Indeed, combining the questions which seem to indicate the presence or absence of the concept provides a more reliable portrayal of the situation at hand.

After the time limit allowed for the return of the questionnaires had expired, the responses were coded on a computer generated spreadsheet. The responses were then tabulated in aggregate form; a description and analysis of the results are found in the next two chapters of this study.

Chapter 4 - Description of the Data

¹The following chapter outlines the results of the surveys distributed to the members of the consultative committees as well as the interviews conducted with particular individuals involved in the consultative process. Some analysis of the data may also be found, where appropriate. In total, 46 community members were sent a questionnaire, and 24 or 52% of the members responded. 7 police representatives were mailed a questionnaire, and 5 or 71% of the officers responded. The results of the questionnaires were coded in aggregate form; therefore, no one committee will be described.

The small sample size prevents any conclusive explanations of the data. The results of the community questionnaire will be described from the raw values which were totaled and constructed in table form (Appendix - 11). In addition, many questions such as employment status and education level were divided into two categories for easier description of the data, and for crosstabbing with various secondary variables created. The questions requiring divisions may be found in

¹ *Questions 16-21 were omitted from consideration in this study. Because 25% of the respondents do not live in the area served by the committee, it was felt that the responses may be distorted as it was not clear on the questionnaire which "community/neighborhood" each question referred to. However, this omission should not affect the quality of the thesis as the questions provide only a minor contribution to the hypotheses under investigation.

Appendix - 12 while the results are located in Appendix - 13.

The results of the police questionnaire will be described based on the computer generated spreadsheet which tabulated the responses of the officers (Appendix - 14). It was not considered feasible to generate actual univariate tables because of the small number of respondents.

The methodology chapter outlined the design of the secondary variables (propolice attitude, constructive dialogue, etc.) and the construction procedures can be found in Appendix - 9. while the results can be found in Appendix - 10

A. Description of results of community questionnaire:

Demographic information

Of the 24 community members who responded to the questionnaire, 16 are male and 8 are female. This represents a similar response rate for both men and women on the committees (16 out of 31 men responded - 52% response rate; 8 out of 15 women responded - 53% response rate). 70.8% of the respondents are employed, 66.7% are university graduates, and 75% of those who replied are married. 70.8% of the respondents reported having a total family income of \$50,000 or more.

Also, over half of the community members (58.3%) are between the ages of

25-44, and only one respondent is under the age of 25. Furthermore, 90.9% of those who replied to the questionnaire do not define themselves as a member of a visible minority group.

Committee involvement

The majority of community respondents (70.8%) state that they attend committee meetings each time a meeting is held and 75% state that they belong to at least one other voluntary organization. 70.8% of the community representatives report residing at their current address for more than 5 years, and 75% reside in the area served by the committee on which they participate.

All 5 committees under study have been in operation less than 4 years. Indeed, 3 out of 5 committees were established in 1995. Just over half of the members (54.2%) who responded to the questionnaire have been participants on the consultative committee for 6 months or less.

Capacity of consultation

The following is a profile of the variety of persons involved in the consultative process:

- elected municipal official - 3/24 or 14% of total respondents

- retired person - 3/24 or 14% of total respondents
- student - 1/24 or 4% of total respondents
- representative of the business community - 5/24 or 21% of the total respondents
- health and social service sector - 0/24; no respondents represent this sector
- education sector - 2/24 or 8% of the total respondents
- member of an association - 10/24 or 42% of the total respondents
- member of a cultural community - 0/24; no respondents represent this sector
- member of a church - 1/24 or 4% of the total respondents
- resident of the community - 10/24 or 42% of the total respondents
- other - 2/24 or 8% of the total respondents

In sum, it appears that there is a mix of individuals involved in the consultative process, but there is significant representation from those involved in other associations in their community. Also, there is comparable representation from individuals who participate on the committee as residents of the community. Notably absent from this population is a representative from a cultural community; however, this may be anticipated since only 9.1% of the respondents define themselves as members of a visible minority group.

Furthermore, when asked whether the committee members believe that membership should include individuals who have been in conflict with the law

(Appendix 4, question 15), just over half (52.4%) of the 21 members who responded to this question do not consider it appropriate to include these individuals as members of a consultative committee. Comments from some community members who believe that such persons should be excluded from the consultative process:

I cannot think of any particular benefit that would be derived from having such people on this committee.

Each and every person volunteering with the Police Center are checked through CPIC; any person with a serious connection are excluded. Many of our programs involve confidential information on businesses, dealing with children and seniors who are vulnerable. Participation by community members is based on trust...

Comments from some community members who believe they should be included:

It is equally important to see 'both' sides when attempting to understand crime control or in any debate.

They can provide insight into what factors led them to engage in criminal activities. They can participate in building safer communities.

In essence, it seems that there is considerable support to include individuals who have been in conflict with the law as members on the consultative committees. However, as noted by one member above, most committees invoke a security check on persons interested in joining the consultative committee. Those with a criminal record are generally not permitted to join the committee . Therefore, this may be an issue for future discussion between police and community members if there is

support for having such persons participate on the committee. The task for consideration could be to look at both the benefits and costs of such participation and decisions could be made regarding membership according to this dialogue.

Views on the local police service

Results of the questionnaires indicate that, in general, respondents have had little adversarial experience with the police. While 20 of the respondents reported having contact with a police officer prior to his/her participation on the committee, only 2 members reported the experience to be a negative one. Indeed, no one reported the circumstances of the most recent contact as a victim of crime nor as a witness to crime. The most consistent response pertaining to the most recent contact with a police officer was as a friend or relative, or he/she met the officer socially.

Overall, community members appear to be quite satisfied with the local police service in providing various services to the public. 91.7% of the members reported that the local police service does a good to average job in enforcing the laws; 83.3% reported that the local police service does a good to average job in promptly responding to calls; 70.8% state that the service does a good job in being easily approachable and easy to talk to while the remaining 29.2% believe that the police does an average job with the same; 91.7% believe that the service does a

good to average job supplying information to the public on ways to reduce crime while only 2 respondents or 8.3% reported the police do a poor job in supplying such information.

Accordingly, it seems that members have a positive and supportive opinion of the local police service in both services they provide and their personal contact with officers. It was recognized in the preliminary review of the data that this opinion seemed to be a trend emanating from the surveys, and from interviews with the chairs of the consultative committees. Therefore, a secondary variable, *propolice attitude*, was created by weighing several questions from the survey as described in the methodology chapter. The results of this weighing support a finding that members of the community seem to demonstrate a propolice attitude. 75% of the study population scored in the medium to high range on the propolice attitude scale.

In addition, most respondents (91.7%) do not believe that the relationship between the police and the community is deteriorating. Indeed, 16 of the 22 community representatives who responded to the question, “how is the relationship between the police and the public likely to change in the next four years”, believe that this relationship will see some to much improvement.

Committee Dynamics

- *constructive dialogue*

Many questions in the survey were designed to see how the committee members perceive their ability to be effective participants in the consultative process. Constructive dialogue refers to productive and useful discussions among all participants of the committee. Results of the questionnaires denote a medium to high level of constructive dialogue as indicated by the scaling outcome of the secondary variable, *constructive dialogue*.

91.7% of the respondents believe that everyone has his/her chance to be heard at committee meetings while all members believe that their views are given just as much consideration as other members of the committee. However, 8 members reported that they believe an individual's stature in the community influences how seriously his or her views are taken. Respondents also indicated that the police do not make most of the decisions during committee meetings, which suggests the regular participation of community members in the discussions held.

Further, most of the respondents believe that the committee has helped to improve police services as well as the quality of life in the community. This indicates that the discussions appear to be constructive and beneficial to the community.

Constructive dialogue involves not only the sharing of views, but also some exchange of challenging others' views. Results of the questionnaire indicate that committee members generally agree with police views on community problems, but the majority of the respondents (77.3%) do not believe that the police are the experts in addressing community problems. Nor do any of the members believe that only the police can identify the problems in their neighborhoods.

Indeed, when the secondary variable, *community readiness to identify and resolve problems*, was designed, the results of the weighing suggest that the community is ready and willing to be involved in problem identification and resolution, and respondents feel it is within their responsibility to do so. This is a significant finding since the principal underlying consultative communities and community policing in general is the involvement of the community in identifying crime and disorder problems in the community, and to participate in rectifying these problems.

- ***consultation***

Consultation is defined by the Webster's Dictionary as "to seek guidance or information from" or "to have regard for in making plans; consider". The questionnaire was designed to extract the community representatives' perceptions of

what consultation meant to them and what they expected to achieve from the consultative process. Results of the survey suggest that consultation means more than merely providing input on the community's problems. Indeed, when asked if consultation means that the police just listen to the community's views (Appendix 4, question 57), 91.3% of the respondents disagreed with this statement. In fact, 91.3% of the community representatives believe that the public should have a say in police decision-making. Further, 73.9% of the respondents do not believe that only the police can decide how an area should be policed.

Accordingly, it seems that consultation involves the active participation from both the community and the police, and that most respondents seem to want some decision-making capacity. Indeed, decision-making appears to be shared among the participants as results suggest that the police do not make most of the decisions during committee meetings. This finding suggests some sharing of power, and that the police do not necessarily control the proceedings of the committee. Indeed, three of the five committees are chaired by a community representative and most of the community representatives (87.5%) report that an objective of the committee is to provide input into what and how police services should be delivered in the community.

The secondary variable, *consultation*, was created from weighing questions

designed to measure the degree of presence or absence of the concept. Results of this process indicate a medium range of the presence of consultation during committee meetings. Since consultation is the essence of the committee, it appears that there is good dialogue occurring during meetings, and that cooperation and mutual respect and trust may also flow from the committee, particularly since the group under study responded overwhelmingly positive in regards to the local police service and the sharing of decision-making during committee meetings.

Accountability

- ***police to community***

Much of the community policing literature stresses the need to assess consumer opinion about police services and invite the public to play a role in the development of policy and the design of policing strategies. In this way, the police are held to account for their organizational practices and they are to adapt their policies to meet the community's needs.

In this study, such accountability was explored and it appears that some accountability is present. However, it seems most committees are lax in involving the community in discussions on policing policy and the allocation of resources.

While members appear to be supportive of the local police service, many

respondents appear to be lacking knowledge of police procedures and methods. 15 out of 24 members reported that they do not have a good understanding of current Ottawa-Carleton police procedures and policies. Furthermore, when members were asked to rank issues from the most often discussed at committee meetings to the least often discussed, 10 out of the 24 community representatives omitted police procedures in their ranking of the issues. Of the 10 members who did include police procedures, 9 members felt that it was discussed very little as they gave the issue a ranking of 6th, 7th, or 8th out of a possible 8 issues to choose from. Moreover, only one respondent included police procedures as one of the three most important things that should be discussed at committee meetings.

Similar results were found pertaining to discussions on policing resources. Of the 20 members who included resources for policing as an issue which has been discussed at committee meetings, only 6 members felt the issue was among the top four issues discussed at meetings. Moreover, only 3 members felt that resources for policing should be among the three most important issues to be discussed at committee meetings.

In essence, therefore, it appears that policing methods and resources are not being emphasized as important issues to be discussed, although this may be attributed to the early development of some of the committees. However, such a

finding cannot be ignored, and this omission should be further explored to determine why such issues are not regularly discussed. These matters, according to the community policing literature, are an integral part of community policing dogma, and changes cannot be recommended regarding policing practices if the community is not aware of the current policies, nor can the community concur with current practices if they are unaware of what they are.

A secondary variable, *police accountability*, was created to assess how the community feels about police accountability. Overall, it appears that the community believes the police are generally accountable to the community. Most respondents fell in the medium to high range on the accountability scale.

In particular, community members were asked whether they believe that the police address the problems which are considered by their community as the most crucial. 62.5% believe that the police do address the most crucial problems. On an individual basis, members (95.2%) seem satisfied that the police address their particular problems that they raised during committee meetings. As mentioned previously, most members reported that they are satisfied with the local police service with the various services they provide, and this gives further indication to suggest that the community members feel the police are accountable to the community in providing services they demand.

- *community representatives to the community as a whole*

Since consultative committees theoretically represent the entire community, it is important to explore whether the committee members are indeed reflective of the community as a whole, and whether the members are accountable to those they represent. Overall, the results of the secondary variable scaling indicated that there is, indeed, a moderate level of accountability that committee members hold to the community. However, the data raises some questions regarding the existence of the committees themselves and the amount and quality of input being given by the community on the whole.

As indicated earlier stated in the description of the demographic information, the respondents are underrepresented in many areas such as youths under 25 years of age, visible minorities, women, and are mostly represented by local associations and as residents of the community. As such, it is conceivable that not all sectors of the community are represented at committee meetings, and this may result in these sectors being left out of the consultative process.

Indeed, the community's knowledge of the existence of the consultative committee was explored to assess the awareness of the community of their opportunity to provide input into local policing services. The majority of the members (83.3%) believe that the community is not aware that a consultative

community exists in the community. It is not surprising, then, that 68.2% of the respondents stated that individuals in his/her community seldom to never ask about the discussions held during committee meetings. Furthermore, over half of the respondents (54.5%) reported that his/her committee does not have a process in place to obtain input from all sectors of the community on their policing needs. However, 82.6% of the respondents believe that it is vital that the committee has a formal mechanism in place for asking members of the community for information on their policing needs and/or specific problems.

Most respondents (90.9%) believe that it is the responsibility of the committee members to report back to those they represent with a summary of the committee meeting, while over half of the respondents (65.2%) stated that they do keep those they represent on the committee informed of committee discussions. However, the majority of members do not believe that is the responsibility of committee members to consult with those they represent prior to making any decisions at committee meetings.

In essence, it appears that members who serve on consultative committees believe that it is important to obtain input from all sectors of the community on their policing needs and that they believe it is essential that those they represent be apprised of the discussions held during committee meetings. Accordingly, most

members fell in the medium range on the accountability scale. However, it appears that some attention must be given to ensure that a process is put in place to obtain input from all sectors of the community as problems or concerns, specific to these sectors which may be left out of the consultative process, may not be brought to the attention of the police service.

Impact

It must be recognized that three of the five committees under study were established in 1995. Therefore, it is doubtful that these committees have had a significant impact on their respective communities. However, it would be useful to the members of the committees to consider whether the committees are indeed a productive and worthwhile endeavor as eagerness and enthusiasm may be encouraged if the committees are perceived to be productive and valuable. Such enthusiasm maintains the longevity of the committee as well as the interest of its members.

Overall, members seem very satisfied with the outcome of the committees. On the secondary variable scale, most members fell in the medium to high range which suggests that members consider the committees to be productive and beneficial to the community. It also suggests that the committees may have an

influence on the quality of life in the community as well as the relationship between the police and the community.

In particular, 91.7% of the respondents believe that the committee has helped to improve police services in the community. In addition, 95.7% of the members believe that the committee has helped to improve the quality of life in the neighborhood served by the committee.

Most members have also stated that they do not believe that the relationship between the police and the community is deteriorating and that the relationship will improve in the next four years. Hence, it is possible that the formation and functioning of the committees have served to reinforce a positive relationship between the police and the members of the committee. (Since the general public was not part of the study population, one cannot say whether the committees have had an impact on the community in general. This point may be an issue for future research.)

Mandate

- ***mutual identification and resolution of crime and disorder problems***

One of the ways to determine whether a committee is operating the way it was originally planned to function is to look at what the committee members

perceive is the principal directive or mandate of the committee. Community policing literature emphasizes that the principal role of the committee is that the community and police mutually identify crime and disorder problems in the community and devise appropriate solutions to rectify such problems. Therefore, several questions were designed to explore whether the members regarded these functions as the mandate of the committee.

The results of the survey signify a low to medium indication of problem identification and resolution as the perceived mandate of the committee. In fact, 72.7% of the respondents did not agree with the statement that the most important functions of the committee are identifying and solving crime and disorder problems in the community. However, when asked to rank items from the most often discussed issue to the least often discussed, 19 out of 21 members felt identifying local problems was among the top three issues discussed at committee meetings. Indeed, identifying local problems was ranked within the top three issues discussed more often than any other issue listed.

Similarly, 15 members felt that identifying local problems should be the number one issue to be discussed at committee meetings. In total, 21 people ranked this issue among the top three issues that should be on the agenda. Overall, identifying local problems was named most often as one of the top three issues for

discussion.

Furthermore, of the 18 people who ranked solving local problems as an issue discussed at committee meetings, 12 of them ranked it in the top three issues discussed during meetings. Solving local problems, along with crime prevention programs, were just behind identifying local problems in terms of the number of members who ranked the issue in the top three issues discussed at committee meetings. In addition, 14 members identified solving local problems as among the three most important issues that should be discussed during meetings. Notably, 18 members identified crime prevention programs as among the three most important issues that should be discussed.

In summary, it appears that identifying local problems is the most important issue that members would like to see addressed during committee meetings. The data also suggests that this issue is, in fact, the concern most often discussed at the meetings. Also, the questionnaires indicate that solving local problems is a priority for the members, and according to the data, this issue is the second most often discussed matter at the meetings. Crime prevention programs also ranked second in terms of issues discussed, but it stood alone in second place in terms of the areas that community members felt should be discussed at committee meetings. Solving local problems ranked third in this component.

In essence, it seems that identifying and solving crime and disorder problems in the community may be the principal issues that are discussed at committee meetings according to some of the responses. On the other hand, many respondents stated that they did not see it as a principal function of the committee when asked outright in question 46. The differences in responses may be attributed to a misunderstanding of the questions asked, or uncertainty on the part of the respondents as to what exactly is the principal role of consultative committees.

- ***participation in the development of policing policies and strategies***

As mentioned previously, consultative committees are tools to enable the community to participate in developing police policy and, where appropriate, strategies to implement these policies. The results of the questionnaires indicate that the community members welcome the opportunity to participate in such a process. In fact, 23 members agree that one of the goals of the committee is to enable the public to play an influential part in the development of policing policies and strategies. Also, most of the members (87.5%) also state that an objective of the committee is to provide input into what and how police services should be delivered in the community.

- *fundraising*

During the initial investigation of the consultative committees under study, it appeared that for some committees, committee time was being spent on fundraising activities. Most of the consultative committee are attached to a Community Police Centre and the community is responsible for raising funds to keep the Centre maintained.

Consequently, it was felt that particular questions should be asked regarding the importance of fundraising as a committee objective. 62.5% of the members did not agree that fundraising must be a principal goal of the committee. On the other hand, 4 members felt that fundraising was the issue most often discussed at committee meetings. Overall, 8 people placed fundraising in the top three issues discussed at meetings. Only 2 members ranked this issue as one of the three most important issues that should be discussed during meetings.

Hence, it appears that time has been spent on fundraising activities for the Centres and, to some members, it must be a principal objective of the committee. Because the Centres are relatively new and rely on the community for support, perhaps it is not surprising that fundraising has been a topic of importance for the members. It may be worthy of exploring at a future date whether the committees will continue to highlight fundraising or if this is part of the process of initially

establishing a Centre and consultative committee, but which dissipates as an agenda item in order to focus on problem identification and resolution.

- ***informal social control***

One of the hypotheses that Morgan describes which contends to explain how consultative committees function is the penetration hypothesis. This hypothesis is that the community functions as the eyes and ears of the police, and police then have access to information that otherwise would not be available to them. This results in increasing informal social control and police penetration of the community.

This hypothesis was explored in the questionnaire, but it must be recognized that a comprehensive investigation would require much more than asking a few questions on a questionnaire such as an analysis of police activity in the area to determine whether it has increased since the commencement of the committee. However, questions were devised in order to obtain some indication of whether members feel that providing police with information on community residents should be a goal of the committee.

Over half of the members (68.2%) do not believe that one of the goals of the committee is to provide the police with information on community residents who

are committing criminal acts in the community. Indeed, 90.9% of the members reported that citizens or groups who feel antagonistic toward police should be considered for membership on the committee.

Overall, there appears to be little indication that members consider their function on the committee as a means of policing the community. All respondents fell in the low range when the secondary variable, *penetration*, was devised.

B. Description of results of police questionnaire

Five police officers responded to the questionnaire. All five officers are male. Two of the officers have been members of their respective consultative committee for just over a year while the remaining three officers have been participants on their committees for under one year. Many of the questions relate to the internal functioning of the committee, but of key interest to this research is the responses to the questions concerning the police organization's commitment to consultative committees and community policing in general. These perceptions reflect an exploration into the broader police role that community policing necessitates.

Because of the small number of respondents, the results were tabulated manually from a computer generated spreadsheet that was produced from the raw data. This spreadsheet can be found in appendix - 14.

Committee dynamics

- *constructive dialogue and consultation*

Overall, it appears that the police representatives believe that constructive dialogue is taking place during committee meetings. All five officers reported that during committee meetings, the community representatives identify problems in the community, and that in their respective committees, community priorities and needs are identified.

In addition, the officers agreed that everyone has his/her chance to be heard at committee meetings, that generally all members participate in the meeting, and that the officers' views are given just as much consideration as other members of the committee. Four of the five officers do not believe that when certain individuals on the committee present their concerns to the committee, they are taken more seriously because of their stature in the community.

The results of the questionnaire also indicate the presence of consultation. All five officers disagreed with the statement that the community should go along with the recommendations made by the police representative(s) during committee meetings. One officer added, "The officer is not always right; it should be a committee recommendation." This suggests that the officers welcome the opportunity to hear from the community, and that they will take into account the

input received from them when addressing issues that arise during committee meetings. Indeed, four of the five officers believe that the public should have a say in police decision-making and all the officers believe that there is more to consultation than just listening to the community's views. However, most of the officers (4/5) believe that the police are not obligated to act upon the advice of the committee. This suggests that some of the decision-making power rests solely with the police officers, and this is perhaps understandable considering the types of decisions that may arise such as those which involve the legality of an activity.

In essence, it seems that the officers perceive consultation as an effort to involve the community in discussions as to the community's needs, priorities, and problems, including some decision-making capacity. There is an indication that the police will not only listen to these concerns, but will act upon them in some way. That is, the officer may go along with the recommendations made by the community, or they may disagree with the community as they are not obligated to do what the community demands.

Accountability

Community policing authorities contend that an accountable police service bases its priorities on the needs of the community, and the participation of the

community in deciding its own policing needs is an indicator of accountability. As indicated above, the officers contend that their committees actively engage in setting community priorities and identifying needs, and most of the officers report that the community should be involved in police decision-making.

Four of the five officers report that their committees have a process in place to obtain input from all sectors of the community on their policing needs. Most of the officers also feel that the committee members should report back to those they represent with a summary of the committee discussion. However, only one officer feels that the committee member should consult with those he/she represents before making any decisions at committee meetings.

Impact

The results of the questionnaire indicate that community needs, priorities, and problems are being identified by the committee. In addition, most of the officers believe that their committees have helped to improve police services in their communities, but none of the officers say that an indication of committee effectiveness is the number of Neighbourhood Watch programs that exist in the community. This suggests that the police officers may expect more from consultative committees than the establishment of crime prevention programs.

It is generally hoped that consultative committees will engender a sense of trust and cooperation between the police and the community. The officers all believe that the relationship between the police and the community is likely to see some to much improvement in the next four years. This belief is supported by their statements that the relationship between the police and the community is not deteriorating.

Although there is no empirical evidence from this study to suggest that each or any consultative committee has had an impact on the relationship between the police and the community, many of the officers reported that they believe such a committee has the capacity to improve relations between the police and the community. For instance, one officer states,

We are just starting community based policing. It is hard to determine, but with the programs and community involvement, it has to help the relationship between the police and the public.

Another officer noted,

The police are getting the community more involved in dealing with issues that effect the police. I feel by getting people and organizations more involved with the police in dealing with community problems that effect the police it will greatly improve the relationship between the police and the public.

It is recognized that further research must be conducted to determine the public's opinion of whether the consultative committee actually has an impact on the relationship between the police and the community.

Mandate

95

It was considered important to explore the officers' perceptions of what they consider is the mandate of their respective consultative committee. This exploration was expected to provide insight into the direction the committees seem to be developing, to identify what issues are being emphasized, and which areas are minimized. As all of the officers state that they have a clear understanding of their role and responsibilities as a member of the committee, the following description of what seems to be taking place at committee meetings should be informative and useful information for this study.

- *mutual identification and resolution of community problems*

A review of the officers' responses indicate that problem identification and resolution are considered important functions of the consultative committees, but in some cases, they are not the principal objectives of the committees. Only two respondents regarded the most important functions of the committee as identifying and solving crime and disorder problems in the community (Appendix - 5, question 16). Yet, when asked to rank what they consider the most important issues to be discussed, these same two respondents reported that youth crime is the most important issue to be addressed. Further, the remaining three respondents

considered identifying crime and disorder problems in the community as the most important issue to discuss. These same three respondents reported solving crime and disorder problems as the second most important issue to be discussed. However, these three respondents did not indicate on question 16 that these issues were the most important functions of the committee. Some possibilities for the discrepancies may be that question 16 was misunderstood by the respondents, or that they changed their minds by the end of the questionnaire.

Furthermore, two of the respondents stated that identification of community problems was the issue most often discussed at committee meetings, while two other respondents indicated that youth crime was most often discussed. Solving problems was considered the second most often discussed issue by two respondents, and fundraising was regarded by two other respondents as the second most often discussed issue. Crime prevention was cited as the third most often discussed issue by two respondents.

In sum, it appears from the ranking that the majority of officers believe that problem identification and resolution should be the main focus of consultative committees, while youth crime and crime prevention programs are also important according to some of the officers. It also appears that some of the committees are, indeed, operating on the assumption that problem identification and resolution are

the main goals of consultation.

- *participation in the development of policing policies and strategies*

When questioned about the participation of the community in the development of policing policies and strategies, there was a lack of consensus among the officers regarding the public's participation in this activity. Indeed, two of the five respondents do not feel that one of the goals of the committee is to enable the public to play an influential part in the development of policing policies and strategies. Moreover, only one respondent included resources for policing as one of the three most important issues to be discussed, while no one included police procedures among the most important issues.

As for the actual discussions held during committee meetings, policing methods and resources for policing were consistently reported by the officers as the least often discussed issues.

- *fundraising*

Fundraising has been noted as a frequent topic of discussion by four of the five police respondents. In fact, two of these respondents believe that fundraising should be a principal goal of the committee. However, when asked to rank a set of

issues according to the three most important issues that should be discussed at committee meetings, no officer reported fundraising as among the top issues to be addressed.

In general, it appears that fundraising is important to some of the officers and, indeed, is a frequent issue discussed during committee meetings. However, one must keep in mind the newness of the committees and the Community Police Centres which may be a contributing factor to the many discussions regarding fundraising.

- *informal social control*

The results of the police questionnaire indicate that the officers do not consider that a goal of the committee is to provide the police with information on community residents who are committing criminal acts in the community. In fact, three of the five respondents would be willing to include individuals who have been in conflict with the law as members of the committee. In effect, there is no indication from the questionnaires that the committees operate to increase informal social control of the communities.

In sum, there appears to be a variety of areas at the focal point of consultative committees. This reflects not only the flexibility of committees in deciding what is

important to them for discussion, but it also suggests some ambiguity as to the principal role of consultative committees.

Flow of Information

The consultative committee is said to be the conduit between the police and the community to facilitate the process of information exchange on matters of mutual concern. Hence, an area of interest to this research is the flow of the information and recommendations that result from the dialogue between the police and the community.

Four of the five officers reported that they always keep their supervisors informed of committee discussions, while the fifth officer advised he frequently apprises his supervisor of committee issues. On the other hand, two of the officers reported that their respective supervisors seldom ask them about the discussions held during meetings, while the other three respondents indicated often to frequent communication with their supervisors. Furthermore, the majority of officers state that police officers in their divisions never inquire about the issues raised at committee meetings.

In addition, three respondents reported that they frequently sent senior police members a summary of the main points raised at committee meetings, while one

officer stated he never sends such information to superiors. Indeed, three officers do not believe that the main points raised at meetings should be forwarded to senior police members for their consideration. This belief may reflect the desire to be empowered whereby, under a community policing model, decision-making occurs at the lowest possible level in order that issues can be effectively identified and resolved. However, as most of the members indicate that they keep their supervisors informed of committee discussions, this may also be attributed to a lack of empowerment as members may not feel comfortable with such empowerment, or that they do not believe they are empowered to the extent that community policing requires. Another possibility of course is that such contact may also reflect a genuine desire to keep the communication lines open with senior members.

In sum, it appears that some senior members are aware of the committees, either through the initiation of the officer on the committee, or the questioning by the senior members themselves. However, there appears to be little communication with the police officers in the divisions, perhaps because they are unaware of the committee or that they do not believe consultative committees are an important part of the respondents' jobs as the questionnaire data suggests.

Role of police

Under the community policing philosophy, the police role is broadened to include a wider range of activities, not solely crime-fighting. Participation on consultative committees is one activity that the police can take part to facilitate a closer relationship with the community. Such a broadened police role also necessitates a change in the police culture, a culture which has traditionally isolated the police from the community and emphasized crime control as the principal function of the police.

The majority of respondents do not believe that the most important role of the police is crime-fighting. Indeed, most of the officers provided comments at the end of the questionnaire emphasizing the importance of involving the community in policing issues and building relationships between the police and the public.

However, all five officers believe that there is a need to educate all police officers on the philosophy of community policing. In fact, only two of the five respondents stated that most police officers in their divisions believe that consultative committees are an important part of their job. One officer commented that patrol officers have not accepted community policing as it deprives them of one more officer on the road.

In addition, the majority of respondents report that they feel there is an

overall lack of organizational support for their committees. Indeed, one officer replied on the questionnaire that community policing officers need a full commitment from the police administration, and that many officers are skeptical that this is happening. The research also revealed that there is a lack of a qualitative performance appraisal for community policing officers and that this is attributed to the overall lack of organizational support for community policing.

Three of the five respondents disagreed with the statement that “my work on this committee is not considered ‘real’ police work by my colleagues” (Appendix - 5, question 37). Interestingly enough, only these officers reported that most police officers in their division know that the consultative committee actually exists. These statements suggest that those officers who do not appear to have the support of their colleagues are participating on committees which their colleagues know very little about. This seeming lack of support suggests that there is a need to educate police officers on roles of consultative committees, and this education may result in greater commitment to the community policing philosophy in general and to consultative committees in particular. Indeed, all the officers recognize the need to educate police officers on the philosophy of community policing.

Structure recommendations

Since the respondents are, or have been, actively involved in consultative committees, it was considered worthwhile to explore what they believe should be attached to the structure of consultative committees. These recommendations involve representation, mandate, some identified needs, and committee existence in general.

- ***representation***

The majority of respondents believe that community representatives on the committee must be supportive of the police. However, when this issue was approached in a slightly different way, the response was somewhat different. That is, all respondents indicated that those who feel antagonistic towards police should be considered for membership on the committee. The discrepancies in responses could relate to a misunderstanding of either of the agree/disagree statements, or it could reflect some mixed feelings on the part of the officers. The possibility of mixed feelings regarding such membership is reflected by many of the statements made by the respondents when asked if committee membership should include individuals who have been in conflict with the law. Three of the five members stated that such individuals should be considered for membership, but with specific

conditions. Some comments from respondents are noted:

The type of conflict will have to be considered, ie, serious criminal offender may not be a proper member. But where an individual may have had an incident in the past but is now well respected he should be considered.

You should not have any criminal background for security purposes. It has been known that people with criminal backgrounds have infiltrated the police environment in order to get or see valuable sensitive material.

People who have been on the other side have a unique look at problems, but I stress past involvement.

Thus, it appears that some of the officers would be willing to accept persons with a criminal background as long as this involvement took place in the distant past and he/she is a respected member of the community. However, others do not see any benefit to be derived from including such individuals in the consultative process.

- ***mandate***

The majority of respondents do not believe that all consultative committees should have the same mandate. However, most of the officers believe that the mandate of the consultative committee should be the same as the mandate of the Community Police Centre. Further, most respondents indicate that the committee mandate should be determined by both the police and the community.

- ***identified needs***

In accordance with the responses of the officers, four needs were identified in the review of the data:

- (1) There is a need to educate all police officers on the philosophy of community policing.
- (2) There is a need to train public members of any new consultative committee in the areas of law and police practices.
- (3) There is a need for representatives from all areas of police work to regularly participate in committee meetings.
- (4) It must be first determined whether the community/neighborhood actually requires a consultative committee.

- ***general committee existence***

Most respondents believe that there should be a consultative committee attached to each Community Police Centre, and most indicate that the committee should be established prior to or as soon as a Community Police Centre is open to the public.

In addition, four of the five respondents state that the chairperson should be a representative of the community, but the majority of the officers do not feel that the chairperson of the committee should be elected by both the community and the police representative(s). Some officers indicated that the chairperson should be

elected by the community members only.

C. Interviews with Consultative Committee Chairs

Each of the five committee chairs were interviewed and a list of questions were prepared prior to the interviews (Appendix - 6). The objective of the interviews was to obtain the chairs' perceptions of the role of consultative committees. Indeed, the interviews provided an opportunity to delve into specific areas that were of particular interest to the committee chair.

Of the five chairs interviewed, three of them are community representatives while two are police members. During the description of the interviews, the names of the chairs will not be given since the results of the questionnaires have been reported in aggregate form.

- **committee composition**

The size of the committees ranges from five members to sixteen members. Four of the committees represent a large geographic area with a population of over 27,000; indeed, one of these committees represents as many as 80,000 residents.

In four of the five committees, the community representatives were selected by the police. Some police divisions held public meetings regarding the

implementation of community policing and either chose individuals from these meetings who appeared interested in community policing, or asked for volunteers to work with them in establishing a Community Police Centre or committee. In the fifth committee, the police held a public meeting whereby the groups who attended had to choose a representative from their particular sector to represent them on the consultative committee.

Most of the community representatives had a security check through the Ottawa-Carleton Police Service, and in two of the committees, it is clearly written in the Constitution of the Community Police Centre that committee members cannot have a criminal record. Also, in these two committees, volunteers at the Centre cannot be members of the consultative committee as per the Constitution.

- **objective**

According to the committee chairs, it appears that the objectives of the committees are to address the concerns of the community and improve the quality of life of its residents. However, the tools used to achieve these objectives vary somewhat. Some committees emphasize the implementation of crime prevention programs as their *raison d'être* whereas other committees stress the importance of fundraising as their immediate concern. In fact, one committee is a registered

non-profit charitable organization while two others are in the process of obtaining this status. All committees include fundraising as a committee function.

As well, all chairs regard problem identification and resolution as important committee endeavors and stress that the committee mandate must be flexible in order to meet the needs of the particular communities since problems may vary from one community to another. Further, the committee mandate is in written form in four of the committees, and in three of them the committee mandate is the same as the Community Police Centre's mandate. The roles and responsibilities are also written in these four committees. As for the fifth committee, the chair feels that the members are well aware that their responsibility is to address the concerns of the community, and a written description of their reason for being is not necessary. This particular committee works in conjunction with the Community Police Centre, but was not formed as a direct result of the opening of the Centre. This committee was established as a result of a recognized need by the police officer in charge of the Centre to gather the major stakeholders in order to effectively utilize the resources in the community.

- **accountability**

All five of the committee chairs believe that the committee will make the

police more accountable to the community, but for most chairs, this accountability is limited to the police officer(s) in charge of the Community Police Centre. Indeed, one chair noted that the officer in the Centre is visible to the area residents every day and this officer must be prepared to address questions or concerns of residents and “defend his actions for doing what he does”. In this way, the officer is accountable, but most chairs feel that the police organization on the whole is too large for the committee to have any significant influence on the accountability of the police organization.

This contention is supported by the fact that minutes of the meetings are sent to police superiors, but according to committee chairs, the committees rarely hear any feedback from these superiors. One chair commented that it is up to the officers on the committee to handle the tasks that arise from committee meetings. Another chair stated that this overall lack of feedback may reflect a lack of commitment from the police organization in implementing community policing initiatives.

None of the committees have been assessed or evaluated by the police organization, although several chairs stated that their committee was too early in its development to be assessed. However, all of the chairs noted that they can generally determine whether the committee is having any impact by the feedback they receive from the community via the Community Police Centre. They see the Community

Police Centre as the focal point of community policing in their area, and largely depend on the input they receive from residents regarding programs implemented to know whether they are a positive influence in the area.

All of the chairs also stated that they depend on the individual members on the committee to obtain input from the sector they represent regarding their needs or concerns. One chair stressed the importance of the volunteers in gathering this information. In general, there is no formal process in place to obtain this input although two committees indicated that public forums or surveys to the residents of the community may be done at a future date. Moreover, there did not appear to be any systematic procedure in place in any of the committees to prioritize issues that are brought before the committees.

Of further note is that all committees take minutes of committee meetings, and each member is given a copy of the minutes. For most of the committees, copies of the minutes are kept in the Community Police Centre, but the minutes are not posted for the public to see. The public is permitted to see the minutes, if they request them although none of the chairs were aware of this happening. However, two of the chairs stated that some of the events/programs that were initiated by the committee were publicized via newsletters, and local newspaper articles.

- **indicators of a successful committee**

All of the chairs expressed the belief that a successful committee was one in which a true partnership exists between the police and the community. That is, they hope to see officers and citizens working together as a team towards a common goal - the improvement of the quality of life of the public.

Particular indicators of success that were raised by the chairs include the notion that volunteers must feel comfortable with the police, and that "we can't think of volunteers as being less because they are volunteers and not officers." In addition, three of the chairs stated that the key to a successful committee is membership involvement and commitment. Some chairs expressed a concern that sporadic attendance of some the members on the committee impeded the consultative process as continuity of issues raised was disrupted. They stressed that members must be motivated to participate on the committee, and provide agenda items to be addressed. Indeed, many chairs indicated that the agenda was mostly police/chair driven while the rest of the members contributed little to the agenda.

Another indicator of a successful committee raised by a chair is the utilization of non-policing strategies in addressing community issues. These strategies represent the cooperation and mutual trust between the police and the community that partnerships hope to engender in the community. Community

policing suggests a sharing of responsibilities of crime control and order maintenance : therefore, the implementation of non-policing strategies signifies this sharing of responsibilities.

- **Community Consultative Committees - Ministry of Solicitor General of Canada, Report by Richard Weiler, 1993**

In 1993, this report was distributed by the Ministry of Solicitor General of Canada to police chiefs across Canada to facilitate the establishment of consultative committees in their divisions. Only one committee chair reported following this document while establishing the consultative committee. Three of the chairs were interested in reading this document for suggestions on organizing their committees.

- **influence on policy**

The committee chairs differed in their responses regarding the influence the committee may have on police policy and strategies. Some chairs asserted that they are in a consultative capacity only and the committee is a sounding board only for the Community Police Centre and the officer in charge of the Centre. For these chairs, it was not clear what influence they could have on police policy. Further, it was stated by one chair that “the committee will go along with what the police say despite equal standing.” Indeed, the role of the committee in police policy was

considered minimal as they “have no direct power.”

On the other hand, another committee chair advised that their committee was not a ‘consultative’ committee, but an ‘advisory’ committee because they make actual decisions during committee meetings. For example, they make decisions regarding programs for the community. It was stressed that this particular committee *advises*, not *consults*, and that the focus of the committee is implementing programs for the community. They do not focus on major issues such as sexual assault or vandalism, as they wish to focus on making the public aware of the programs they initiate. Accordingly, this chair felt that implications for police policy are uncertain.

According to another chair, the only area the committee wants to be involved in regarding policy is crime prevention and fear of crime. For this committee, the chair indicates that they wish to supplement police services via the implementation of crime prevention programs. In essence, it appears that they may influence police strategies by supplementing law enforcement, but the chair’s comments regarding the influence on policy are vague.

According to another chair, it would be somewhat difficult to influence policy because “the way that policies are now is that they are so rigid it is difficult to deviate from them.” By inference, it can be said that this chair is skeptical about

any influence the committee may have on a higher level such as policy making.

In sum, it appears that the chairs are not clear on what role the committee plays in influencing police policy or strategies. This suggests that there has not been any direction from the police organization regarding how the committee should influence policy.

- **Comments**

Two of the committee chairs stressed the need to ensure the suitability of the Community Police Officer. To these chairs, it is imperative to have an officer who has interpersonal and communication skills in order to achieve a positive relationship between the police and the community. According to these chairs, the community must feel comfortable with the officer on the committee (who is also in charge of the Community Police Centre) in order to break down barriers that may exist with particular individuals or groups in the community. One chair stressed that a positive relationship between the police and the community must be established even before the committee is up and running in order to ensure cooperation, trust and respect among the members of the committee and with the community as a whole.

Also of interest is that two chairs stressed the importance of having a small

committee in order to facilitate decision-making and accountability. In a large committee (over 9 members), these chairs state that it is difficult to make timely decisions because of the different interests/agendas involved, and the long discussions which could ensue. In addition, with smaller numbers on the committee, attendance may be enhanced because there will be more 'pressure' on the members to attend.

Another point that was raised is that the committee must represent a small geographic area or naturally defined territory. To this committee chair, it is inconceivable to expect one committee to represent the interests of every individual/group if the area the committee represents is too large. "Problems differ from one end of the street to the other, let alone one neighbourhood to another."

D. Minutes of meetings

Four of the five committees provided the minutes of their meetings. Because the committees are so new, there is not a sufficient amount of information to make any conclusive remarks on the progress of the meetings. However, it can be said that in some of the committees, most of their time has been spent on formalizing a Constitution for the Community Police Centre and the consultative committee connected to it. Indeed, the minutes were mostly reflective of administrative

decisions/recommendations and fundraising. The other committees, however, seemed to engage in a notable amount of problem identification and resolution; indeed, these committees were involved in organizing activities for youths (the problem identified was the lack of things to do for youth in the area which, in turn, led to order problems in the area), improving lighting in parks, and establishing a number of programs such as Child Print, Crime Analysis, and a program which involves dealing with park issues such as littering, graffiti, and vandalism.

E. Interview with Project Coordinator, Ottawa-Carleton Police Service

The following will outline the discussions held with an Inspector of the Ottawa-Carleton Police Service regarding the consultative process. This Inspector has been Project Coordinator with the Ottawa-Carleton Police Service since the end of February, 1995. His duties include conducting a community policing literature review, determining what is currently happening in the Ottawa-Carleton area with respect to community policing initiatives and formulating recommendations, or creating a model consultative committee which would include structures or strategies that appear to be the most appropriate for the Ottawa-Carleton Police Service.

The Inspector states that the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police has chosen to

incorporate consultative committees into their operations in order to provide the community with a means to provide input regarding police service delivery and policing strategies. In this way, they will be able to work with the police in identifying problems and prioritizing them. The committees do not need the approval of the Police Services Board to exist. Indeed, many committees have been established on the initiative of the officer in the community. However, the police service wishes to look at how the existing committees work now and how they contribute to the overall policing service delivery. The Inspector states he is directly involved in this process.

According to him, there are no standard ways of operating consultative committees. Indeed, “there is currently no one overall principle for guiding them.” The existing committees are localized in terms of their mandate, but he believes that the committees should be operating as a problem identification/problem solving group where the community provides the police with input on what they perceive are the problems in the community and recommend ways to solve these problems. The desired goal is to have a consensus among the community and the police in regards to the problems identified and the strategies to be utilized to resolve the problems. However, he states that the police must still have control over the strategies implemented to address these problems, particularly because of certain

conditions which may limit what can be implemented such as the legality of actions recommended, or lack of resources. He added that it is the responsibility of the police to advise the community of the reasons for not acting on the recommendations from the community. The police are accountable to the community in this way.

He also stressed that it has to be recognized that the contribution by police in maintaining order and security in communities should be the same in all areas. That is, "what happens in a community above and beyond the standard level of service by police is community-driven". In this way, the community, along with the police, is responsible for improving the quality of life in the community, and addressing community concerns.

At the present time, there is no standard process in place to evaluate the committees, particularly since there is no one objective which covers all the committees in operation at the present time. He believes that a model committee must be designed to ensure mandate consistency across all committees, and from this, develop an evaluative mechanism. The Police Service is currently working on this model. At the present time, the committees are operating without a written direction by the Police Services Board or the Police Service.

In addition, he states that the officers on these committees have not been

trained on problem-oriented policing, but that this training for all officers must be a priority as he sees the Police Service developing towards a problem-oriented policing philosophy in the next four to five years. He states that the officers hired to date to work at the Community Police Centres have been viewed as positive, people-oriented individuals who were considered to have some sense of community policing philosophy. Indeed, there was no training or direction given to these officers as to what is expected of them in their capacity as community policing officers. However, he states that the Police Service is currently putting together a training package as the Service recognizes that the officer must know what his/her role is because a lack of knowledge eventually affects the police service delivery.

The Inspector states that the expectations of consultative committees by the Police Service have not been clearly laid out, and that this is a necessary step in order to have effective committees. He states that these expectations must be determined in order to ensure that the committees are operating in accordance with the Police Service's intentions since they are a police initiative. He explains that the confusion arising from what is consultative as opposed to advisory exemplifies this lack of clear expectations of consultative committees.

Moreover, he states that it is up to the Police Service to decide what level of authority is to be given to consultative committees. Again, he stresses that the

expectations of consultative committees in policy-making must be clear, and admits that this issue should have been addressed before the committees began. He stresses that there must be a formal structure in place to enable the community and police know exactly what to do with the discussions arising from the committee meetings. To date, it has not been determined exactly where this input should go, and the Inspector feels that this must be addressed by the Police Service immediately.

He offered additional recommendations regarding the implementation of consultative committees. He believes that the mandate should be the same in all committees to ensure consistency and enable the development of an assessment mechanism. He also believes that there should be a formal mechanism in place to allow pertinent information arising from meetings to flow to the policy level. He suggests that someone be named responsible for this information, whether it be within the Police Service or the Police Services Board. This will ensure that the input does not remain with the committees themselves. Furthermore, he proposes that public forums or public surveys should be utilized to complement the committees in order to reach those segments of the population who are not represented on the committees.

F. Interview with a member of the Police Services Board

The following is a summary of the interview with a member of the Police Services Board. A principle function of the Police Services Board is to direct police policy and resources. These views are particular to this member of the Board and may not reflect the opinions of the other members of the Police Services Board.

This member would like to see these committees community-driven. They should be demographically representative of the community they represent, and she sees the possibility of one-issue committees to address particular areas such as women, bias crime and discrimination.

She sees the role of the committees as mainly operational. That is, the committee should work in conjunction with the police in areas considered within their jurisdiction such as program implementation, but she also sees a recommendation function on areas that are not within their jurisdiction such as budgets and the overall administration of the police organization. She also sees the committees making recommendations on policies such as whether the current policies are meeting the needs of the community or if there is a need for new ones. To date, there has not been any actual flow of information from the committee level to the Board level. She hopes that with time and expertise, the Board will hear from the committees, but this process has not been worked out as yet.

She sees the need for community input in areas of concern for the

community, and argues that many in the community are the specialists in addressing how to deal with particular problems. The role of the community in addressing community concerns must be emphasized, and therefore, the community must feel they are in a position to offer this input. Indeed, the police and politicians should not control these committees by considering themselves as the experts in addressing community problems.

This Board member also stressed the need to be proactive, and to make attempts to include the entire community in providing input and actively participating in making their community safe and peaceful. Therefore, what is necessary is getting out and talking to the community by holding public meetings on a regular basis so that issues can be brought forth. This participation is essential to ensure an efficient and effective committee.

The need to train all police staff on community policing is also imperative. This education must be accomplished from the top level down in order for police superiors to accept and support the changes that community policing requires. She admits that this change will develop over time, and that she sees progress has been made in several areas. Indeed, she feels that consultative committees have great potential in addressing those issues which are of utmost concern to citizens.

Chapter 5 - Analysis

This thesis focused on several research questions derived from the literature review conducted on community consultative committees. These research questions directed the construction of the questionnaires and interview questions which were utilized to examine consultative committees in the Ottawa-Carleton region. In addition, these questions also represent an exploration of the hypotheses of partnerships, marginalization, legitimation, and penetration. The questions are:

- Is there a sharing of power between the community and the police? (partnerships or legitimation?)
- Is there two-way constructive dialogue between the community members and police? (partnerships or legitimation?)
- Have community members been able to identify problems in their community (partnerships) or have problems been identified for them by the police representative? (legitimation?)
- Do members feel that the police representatives take into account the community's identified problems and concerns? (partnerships or legitimation?)
- Are the committee members representative of the communities they purport to represent? (partnerships or marginalization?)
- What do members expect to achieve from consultation? (partnerships or legitimation?)
- Are the police committed to the community policing philosophy and ready to accept a broader social role? Are consultative committees accepted by the police as an important part of realizing community policing philosophy? (partnerships

or legitimation?)

This chapter will analyze the data from the questionnaires and the interviews, and the results will be analyzed in terms of the hypotheses of partnerships, marginalization, legitimation, and penetration.

1) Is there a sharing of power between the police and the community?

First of all, a sharing of power refers to an ingredient of partnerships where, ideally, the community has an equal say in the definition of what constitutes crime and disorder problems in their community. In this way, the community has a say in deciding its own policing needs and priorities.

According to the community questionnaires, there seems to be little problem identification and resolution between the police and the community. Of those committees which provided the minutes of their meetings, only two committees appeared to be involved regularly in these activities. There was no indication that there was a formal, or consistent process in place to prioritize the issues identified in any of the committees in the study.

According to Leighton (1993:247), the police and the community have *equal* say as to what constitutes crime and disorder problems. Although the research did not result in a definitive answer to this question, the results do seem to suggest that

at the very least, the police representatives on the some committees seem to be willing to provide the community with the opportunity to give their opinion on crime and disorder problems, and that they do not necessarily expect the community to go along with recommendations made by the police just because they are the police. Indeed, four of the five police respondents believe that the public should have a say in police decision-making.

On the other hand, many of the community members admit that they generally agree with police views on community problems. There is also some evidence to suggest that some committees may be operating on the assumption that they are a recommending body only, and the final decision on issues rests with the police representative. Indeed, one chair stated that if the community members on the committee want to concentrate on Neighbourhood Watch and the police want to concentrate on other things, "the committee will go with what the police say despite all equal standing."

Furthermore, a sharing of power between the police and the community also pertains to the empowerment of the community in deciding its own policing needs and priorities. Results of the community questionnaire indicate that most of the respondents believe that an objective of the committee is to provide input into what and how police services should be delivered in the community. At the same time,

the majority of respondents appear to be lack knowledge of police procedures and methods. In fact, police procedures and police resources are rarely discussed by both the community and police respondents. These issues were given little priority by either the community or police respondents with regards to discussions they would like to have at committee meetings..

Although this lack of discussion of both policing methods and priorities may be attributed to the early development of some of the committees, it cannot be ignored since these matters are considered to be an integral part of the community policing initiative. The Police Services Board member interviewed for this research stated that she would like to see the committees explore police policies and procedures in order to assess whether the current policies are meeting the needs of the community; she feels the committees should be able to recommend new policies. Whereas the views of the other members of the Police Service Board were not collected for this research, the evaluation of police policies and procedures as encouraged by this member of the Board may still be considered a potential function of the consultative committees. On the other hand, two of the five police respondents do not feel that one of the goals of the committee is to enable the public to play an influential part in the development of policing policies and strategies. It seems that police representatives may not be clear as to the committees' role in

policy development. Another possibility is that these respondents do not believe that the public should be participating in the development of policies and strategies. This is common within the traditional police culture where the belief is that the police institution alone should control its activities.

Whether the committees have any capacity to influence police priorities or practices is questionable. The evidence to suggest that they do have this potential is minimal at best, and, in effect, consultation may be merely a reinforcement rather than an exploration and questioning of current policing practices. This is further supported by the fact that there has been no written direction from the Police Service or from other political bodies as to what authority these committees have. In this way, police representatives may be reluctant to provide the committee with any opportunity for serious discussion regarding policing policies and strategies.

In sum, these findings suggest that there is some question as to whether there is a sharing of power between the police and the community. This claim is supported by the statement made by Inspector Crosby that the Police Service has yet to determine what level of authority consultative committees will be given. In fact, he admits this decision should have been made prior to the establishment of consultative committees in the Ottawa-Carleton region.

Community members seem to have a lack of knowledge regarding their

decision making capacity. This contention is supported by a chair's comment that "people are not sure what they can do...people are not fully comfortable with their role". It seems that most of the community members are ready and willing to work with the police to identify and resolve crime and disorder problems, but the lack of clarification as to their role in this regard is also evident.

The police respondents also seem willing to work with the community in some decision-making capacity, but there seems to be some ambivalence on the part of some officers in discussing policies and procedures with the community. It must be recognized that such discussions with the public are new to the police organization since they have traditionally been a closed institution, having little interest in advice from the community. This new involvement which community policing encourages also reflects the empowerment of officers that community policing offers. Hence, this apparent apprehension on the part of some officers to actively engage in discussions on the development of policing policies and strategies may reflect some uncertainty as to how empowered they actually are, and perhaps some unwillingness to take risks for fear of reprisal.

In any event, these differences in perceptions of the officers as to the role of consultative committees also reflect an overall lack of direction from the police organization as to what the officers are to accomplish. Consultative committees are

police initiatives so it is incumbent upon the Police Service to provide its officers with direction and training on what is expected of them in their role as committee members. In essence, it appears that some work has to be done towards a sharing of power within a partnership framework.

2) Is there two-way constructive dialogue between the community members and police?

Constructive dialogue is an essential element in facilitating a partnership between the police and the community. Overall, this element appears to be present during committee meetings. The results of both the police and the community representatives' questionnaires reflect good communication and cooperation among the participants. Both parties seem willing to work together towards an overall common goal of improving the quality of life in their communities. Discussions with the chairs of the committees as well as the written comments received from some participants indicate a positive working relationship, and an enthusiasm and interest in participating on the committee.

Constructive dialogue may be nourished by an overall positive view of the police by community representatives. Overall, respondents have had little adversarial experience with the police and are quite satisfied with the local police in various services they provide. Respondents appear generally supportive of the local

police and see the relationship between the police and the community improving in the years to come. It may not be surprising that both the police and the community members perceive constructive dialogue taking place during committee meetings since their association seems so positive and promising.

Interestingly enough, when the secondary variable, consultation, was crosstabbed with question 5 (marital status), it produced statistically significant results. This means that the resulting chi square value is less than 0.05. Statistical significance means that in all likelihood, a relationship between two variables is not due to chance. Nor is the relationship considered a causal relationship. In effect, Table 1 shows that members who are married are more likely to participate in constructive dialogue than those who are not married.

Table 1
Marital status(Q5) x constructive dialogue

Q5	Constructive dialogue			Total
	low	med	hi	
other	4	1	1	6
married	1	8	9	18
Total	5	9	10	24
<u>Statistic</u>	DF	Value	Prob	
Chi-square	2	10.193	0.006	

Since most of the cell values are less than five, the chi square may not be a valid test. Nevertheless, the results may be described for interest purposes, but the relationship can hardly stand alone; indeed, this is not to suggest that membership should include only married people for their likelihood in engaging in constructive dialogue.

3) Have community members been able to identify problems in their community or have problems been identified for them by the police representative?

Within the partnership principle is the empowerment of the community to participate in the identification of local problems. If the problems are identified for them by the police, the public then has little influence on police priorities or strategies, nor the delivery or evaluation of these strategies. Indeed, this results in the reinforcement, rather than a questioning or exploration of the police point of view. Morgan (1987) refers to this situation as legitimizing the existing or planned police practices.

There seems to be some support for the legitimization hypothesis proposed by Morgan. The results of the research show that while some community members may identify problems in the community during committee discussions, there is also indication that in many cases, the agenda is driven by the police representative and

members rely on the police to provide them with issues for discussion.

Interestingly, all of the community and police respondents agreed with the statement that “During committee meetings, the community representatives identify problems in the community.” Indeed, no community member agreed that only the police can determine what the problems are in the neighbourhood.

Nevertheless, interviews with the committee chairs revealed some interesting details in that one chair noted that the committee chair and/or police representative usually produce the agenda, with little input from the rest of the members. Another chair indicated that the police representative generates the agenda and presents the information on the area to the committee - “not much new flows from the community members themselves.” These statements suggest that some community members may be lax in providing input on issues of concern in the community, and instead rely on other members such as the police representative or the chair to bring the issues forward. It is possible, therefore, that in some cases, the problems are being identified by the police representatives alone. This occurrence may not be by police design, but due to the lack of commitment or interest of other committee members. Indeed, some individuals may hesitate to raise issues of concern because they do not feel comfortable in their role, or they are intimidated by the attendance of persons in official capacities such as police officers or city counselors.

The Police Services Board member interviewed for this study stresses the need to have these committees community-driven, and to discourage the police or politicians from assuming control of the proceedings. In this way, the valuable human resources that are available in the community will be utilized to address problem areas. Although the committees seem to be displaying some mutual identification of problems, attention must be paid to the possibility that the agenda may be driven by the police, and not the community members.

One way to facilitate a community-driven committee is to have the committee chaired by a community member. In fact, most of the police respondents agreed that the committee chair should be a member of the community. This supports the claim that the police representatives seem interested in engaging in dialogue and working with the community in addressing areas of concern to them.

Although the consultative committees are police initiatives, they represent a means by which communities can achieve greater order, security, and quality of life. According to the research data, it appears that the police representatives are willing to let the community identify community problems, but the amount and quality of input received from the community largely depends on the interest, motivation, and determination of the individual member. Mobilizing the committee members may truly be one of the consultative committees' greatest challenges.

4) Do members feel that the police representatives take into account the community's identified problems and concerns?

Partnerships demand that the police consider the input of the community when addressing problems raised, as well as in the development and evaluation of police practices and policies. A lack of accountability to the community results in a legitimization of police practices since these practices are not responsive to community input.

Results of the research indicate that there may be some support for the legitimization theory. It appears that current policies and practices are not being critically explored by the community. Indeed, such areas are rarely discussed at committee meetings. Also, there seems to be some reluctance on the part of the community members to believe that the committee could have any influence on the police organization, but that the committees make the community policing officer more accountable because of his accessibility and visibility.

According to the results of the community questionnaires, 95.2% of the respondents indicate that a problem they raised at committee meetings was addressed by the police representative. However, there is some question as to whether these identified problems or concerns are directed to the higher ranks within the police organization. Indeed, it is not clear whether the Police Service

wants this information to go any further than the police representatives and their supervisors. The Community Policing Project Coordinator of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service admits that this process has not been worked out by the Police Service as it has not been determined how much authority the committees should be given.

This uncertainty surrounding the role of consultative committees is reflected in some of the committee chairs' comments on the lack of accountability at the organizational level. It seems that some community members have accepted that their committee will not influence the police organization, but will enable the community to hold the local police officer at the Centre accountable for services and programs in the community. Indeed, while the community respondents seem satisfied that the police take into account the problems they raise at committee meetings, the Police Service should be determining whether they want these committees to have any influence on the overall police organization, and if so, in what capacity.

5) Are the committee members representative of the communities they purport to represent?

According to community policing literature, police community consultative committees should contain members who are representative of the community. This

representation is necessary to ensure that all segments of the area have the opportunity to participate in problem identification and resolution. On the other hand, a lack of representation on the committee, according to Morgan (1987), marginalizes certain segments of the population, typically the poor, minority or disenfranchised groups in the community. Morgan contends that these groups are regularly left out of the consultative process, while white, middle-aged, middle-class men who are pro-police are typically the types of people who are found on consultative committees. The results of the research indicate that there is some support for Morgan's marginalization hypothesis.

Of those members who responded to the questionnaire, 16 are male and 8 are female. Indeed, when considering the total number of community representatives who were sent a questionnaire, 31/46 or two-thirds of the members are male. There is clearly an overrepresentation of men on the committees in this study.

In addition, it appears that the majority of respondents are socially and economically advantaged, middle-aged and involved members of the community. Very few respondents are minority representatives, youths or seniors.

Most of the respondents have not had any adversarial experience with the police, and members appear generally pro-police with little knowledge of the day-to-day policing methods and procedures of the Ottawa-Carleton Regional

Police Service.

Individuals who do not pass the security clearance inspection by the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police are not considered for membership on the committees. Indeed, the majority of police respondents believe that community representatives should be supportive of the police, although there is some indication that some officers believe it would be acceptable to include individuals with past criminal involvement as long as this activity is not recent and/or the individual is now respected by the community.

Interviews with the committee chairs revealed that the majority of community representatives were asked to participate by the Police Service. In only one committee was there any degree of democratic process for membership as the organizations who were invited to attend a general meeting by the Police Service had to choose one (in some cases, two) individuals among the group to represent them. The number of members on each committee varies from four to sixteen community members. The committee with four members represents as many as 80,000 citizens in that community. It is highly questionable whether the entire community is represented on this committee. The other committees represent over 20,000 citizens and it may not be reasonable to assume that all segments of the community are represented due to the large population size. The considerable

heterogeneity is inherent in such large populations, and it is reasonable to assume that representativeness is minimal.

Although the low number of respondents prevents any generalization of findings to the five committees under study, there is some reason to suggest that at least some of the committees may be lacking in representativeness. Overall, there seems to be some indication that the committees tend to draw the 'great and good' of the local area, and that certain groups are prevented from participating in the consultative process, perhaps because they are not considered acceptable representatives of their community, and are therefore not asked to participate. Of course some groups may not want to participate in this process, possibly because of lack of interest, or because of negative relationship between themselves and the police.

In any event, if the goal of the Police Service is to have consultative groups representative of the community, attention must be paid to the process of choosing individuals to participate, as well as the types of individuals that they want on these committees. For example, there seems to be some support from both community and police respondents to have individuals who have been in conflict with the law participate on the committees since they can offer valuable information on motivations and opportunities to partake in criminal or disorderly behavior. Indeed,

these persons may have unique concerns or issues to raise at the committee level regarding policing policies and procedures since they have had experience with some of the procedures used by the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service. Including such persons in the consultative process may also demonstrate to the community that the Police Service is willing to work with the entire community, and not just those who are supportive of them. Such membership may be something that the Police Service could consider when they determine what kind of structure or model consultative committee they want to put in place for the Ottawa-Carleton area.

Another point that must be raised when considering the questionable representativeness of the committees members is that these members are responsible for obtaining input from the community regarding their problems and concerns. Results of the questionnaires reveal that most members do not believe the community is even aware that the consultative committee exists in their area. This lack of awareness may make it all the more important to have members who represent the community on the committee since many segments of the community may be otherwise left out of the consultative process. Furthermore, there does not seem to be any formal process in place to obtain the input of the community as the responsibility for obtaining community input rests with the individual members

themselves. Consequently, if the members are not representative of the community, there would be some question as to the quality and quantity of input being provided at committee meetings since there could be many concerns and issues from other sectors of the geographic area or the social community represented by the committee that are not being heard or addressed.

In addition, there does not seem to be any attention given to the resources that are necessary for members of consultative committees to obtain input from their community. Members are to gather this information, but many members may not have the resources to do so. This may serve to further marginalize those segments of the community that lack the resources to actively and effectively participate in the consultative process.

6) What do members expect to achieve from consultation?

The results of both the questionnaires and the interviews indicate that the expectations of committee members vary from the identification and resolution of community problems, to programming, and fundraising. In addition, the research showed very little evidence to suggest that the committee members expect these committees to serve as the eyes and ears of the community. Indeed, the penetration

hypothesis proposed by Morgan (1987) received little support by the findings.

Both the community and the police expect consultation to provide the community with an opportunity to bring forward community issues which they feel are affecting the quality of life of its residents. Indeed, it appears that, in general, community members expect that the police representatives will listen to their concerns and identified problems, and participate with the community in resolving these issues.

However, there are other expectations that have surfaced from the research. For many members, there is an expectation that the outcome of consultation will result in the implementation of crime prevention programs or programs to reduce the fear of crime in the community. Indeed, for two committees, these are the principal goals according to the committee chairs. This exclusive concentration on programming may prevent committees from focusing on identifying and prioritizing crime and disorder problems, and coming up with appropriate solutions. An unintended consequence of this is that the police can carry on business as usual, legitimize existing practices and policies, and limit their involvement to a few programs.

In effect, this study submits that committees have not adopted a comprehensive community policing perspective in their work. This suggests there is

a need for training committee members on community policing, including problem-solving skills to ensure the long term success of consultative committees in realizing community policing.

The same can be said of the apparent emphasis on fundraising as an objective of the committees. Fundraising has consistently been raised by most of the community members and police representatives as a fundamental initiative that must be undertaken by the committee. A review of the available minutes supports this statement. While it is recognized that the Community Police Centre requires regular fundraising initiatives to keep the Centre in operation as well as to establish and maintain the programs that the Centre runs, this very situation may actually be an obstacle which may prevent consultative committees from adopting a comprehensive community police perspective in their work.

The committees under study are connected to the local Community Police Centre. Three of the committees have developed their own Constitution which, in fact, is the same Constitution which has been designed for the Community Police Centre. For these committees, the Board of Directors of the Community Policing Centre are the members on the consultative committee.

During interviews with these chairs regarding the mandate of their committees, it was often difficult to distinguish whether the chair was referring to

the mandate of the committee or the mandate of the Centre. Further discussions revealed that for these three committees, the mandate for the consultative committee was the same as that of the Centre. Indeed, the results of the police questionnaires indicate that most police representatives believe this approach is appropriate.

It can be argued that this situation presents some obstacles to the development of successful consultative committees. Fundraising can be a time-consuming, laborious job that requires a lot of commitment and motivation on the part of the volunteers. If the members of consultative committees are tasked with the job of regularly initiating and implementing fundraising events in the community, it may be very difficult to find the time during committee meetings, and in general, to discuss the identification and prioritization of crime and disorder problems in the community.

Fundraising and community policing issues are two distinct areas which require a lot of time and thought to effectively address both areas. Perhaps it is not feasible to expect consultative committees to focus on both of these areas. Indeed, one area may suffer neglect at the expense of the other, and committee members may not stay motivated to remain on the committee if they are not clear as to what areas they should be focusing on most. It may be worthwhile to consider having the volunteers in the Community Police Centre take on the responsibility of fundraising

completely. Indeed, a group separate to the committee such as a small Board of Directors or steering committee for the Centre can manage the funds. If need be, the consultative committee can ask this Board for monies if necessary for implementation of strategies to resolve problems identified by the group.

It is contended, therefore, that fundraising is not sufficiently connected to the principal focus of consultative committees, and this added responsibility may ultimately prevent the development of successful consultative groups. It follows, then, that it may not be appropriate for the mandate of the committee to be the same as that of the Community Police Centre since the activities of the Centre are much broader based as opposed to the committees. With too many responsibilities imposed on a committee, the underlying purposes get lost in the struggle to do everything on its plate. This may ultimately lead to the disbandment of the committee.

As mentioned previously, there was minimal support for Morgan's penetration hypothesis which proposes that consultative committees function to enable the police to further penetrate the community and increase social control. Interestingly enough, when the secondary variable, penetration, was crosstabbed with question 2 on the questionnaire (employment status) (Table 2), and question 4 (age) (Table 3), the results were statistically significant. That is, the chi square

values were less than 0.05.

Statistical significance means that in all likelihood, the relationship between the two variables is not due to chance. This does not, however, represent a causal relationship between the two variables. Therefore, it may be said that there is some support for the hypothesis that those who are employed are more likely to believe that the committee does not serve as a means of penetration into the community (Table 2).

Table 2
employment status(Q2) x penetration

Q2	Penetration			
	low	med	hi	Total
employed	14	2	1	17
unemployed	2	0	5	7
Total	16	2	6	24
<u>Statistic</u>	DF	Value	Prob	
Chi-square	2	11.496	0.003	

In addition, Table 3 suggests that those members between the ages of 25-44 are more likely to believe that the committees do not serve as a means of penetration into the community.

Table 3
age(Q4) x penetration

Q4	Penetration			Total
	low	med	hi	
under 25	0	0	1	1
25 to 44	14	0	0	14
over 44	2	0	5	9
Total	16	2	6	24
<u>Statistic</u>	DF	Value	Prob	
Chi-square	2	18.111	0.001	

Because most of the individual cell values are less than 5, the chi square value may not be valid. However, it is still useful to describe these tables, and present the hypothesis that committee members who are middle-aged and employed are likely to believe that the committee does not function as a means of increasing social control of the community. One reason for this contention may be that these groups are more interested in improving their community as they may have a lot at stake (eg. children, home owner) and therefore, are more interested in identifying and solving problems than being the neighbourhood informer. This is one possibility only, but certainly a very feasible one.

7) Are the police committed to the community policing philosophy and ready to

accept a broader social role? Are consultative committees accepted by the police as an important part of realizing community policing philosophy?

Traditional police work is defined primarily in terms of work on the streets with the goal of making an arrest, while customary evaluation of police work is in terms of the officers' ability to investigate offenses and enforce laws. Community policing, on the other hand, requires a broadened, generalist police role where the general duty constable is empowered to identify and resolve crime and social disorder problems. Empowerment involves allowing the officers to take risks, to be creative, and to encourage new and innovative approaches to resolve problems. Consultative committees can provide a means by which officers can realize these community policing goals.

The results of the police questionnaires indicate that these respondents seem willing to accept a broader social role. Indeed, interviews with the officers as well as the comments that some provided at the end of the questionnaire demonstrate these officers' interest and enthusiasm in working with the community to develop programs and services which meet the needs of the community. However, there seems to be some indication that these efforts may be hampered by a lack of overall organizational commitment to community policing as well as a lack of a performance appraisal system that is designed to measure qualitative results of

performance.

Some police respondents believe that many other officers have not bought into the notion of community policing. Some of their colleagues see community policing as a threat to their jobs, while others see it as creating a decrease in the number of officers on the road. It seems that for these officers, real policing still lies in crime control and law enforcement and not in a Community Policing Centre. In fact, most committee chairs commented that other police officers rarely drop into the Centre, or ask about the committee discussions.

One would think that patrol officers would be interested in the discussions held during committee meetings since identifying and resolving crime and disorder problems are supposed to be the main functions of the committee according to the Community Policing Project Coordinator. However, the research shows that many police officers may not be aware of the existence of the committees, which suggests that not much attention has been paid on publicizing the committees, their roles, or their importance within a community policing organization. The need to promote consultative committees as an integral part of the police organization is highlighted by the finding that police respondents who felt support from their colleagues regarding their work on the committees also stated that most police officers in their division are aware of the committees. This suggests that once officers are educated

on the role of consultative committees, they may accept them as part of the new way of doing police business.

This study indicates that there is a significant need to educate all police personnel on the underlying principles of community policing and how consultative committees play a part in the overall police service delivery. Indeed, all of the police respondents as well as Community Policing Project Coordinator and the Police Services Board member stated the need to educate all police officers on community policing is immediate and imperative. Such education may encourage the acceptance of community policing as the overall organizational philosophy, and facilitate the implementation of the generalist constable role that is the focal point in a community policing environment. Furthermore, there is also a need to provide generalists with a performance appraisal system based on qualitative measures. This is necessary in order for officers to know what is expected of them in their role, as well as to facilitate greater job satisfaction, commitment and motivation as their efforts in innovation, creativity, problem-solving, and consultation will be recognized and rewarded.

If education and evaluation is not given immediate attention, the professional model of policing may continue to be the standard operating procedure and consultative committees may be considered an add-on program which, in time, will

dissipate like other tactics have in the past. Indeed, as the 1995 RCMP study so aptly states:

Much of the confusion among members stems from the fact that the role of generalist is deemed to be an integral part of community policing. The RCMP has said, in fact, that community policing is every member's responsibility. On the other hand, we have created a Community Policing Officer position in some locations, wither as coordinator in a sub-division or in larger detachments, and this member now becomes a specialist whose specialty is to be a generalist. This may explain why many members still see community policing as an add-on program and not their responsibility. Unfortunately, this only serves to compound the problem and rationalize the continuance of "business as usual" for everyone else who is not in a dedicated position.

The Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police has also created a Community Police Liaison Officer position within their organization. The Police Service should give some consideration as to how they wish to achieve a commitment from police officers on the philosophy of community policing if they plan on specifying particular individuals as community policing officers and others as regular police personnel.

Chapter 6 - Conclusions and Recommendations

The results of the research revealed some interesting points about the current functioning of some consultative committees in the Ottawa-Carleton area. As the results were reported in aggregate form, they do not necessarily represent the exact state of existence of any of the committees studied. Nevertheless, the findings may contribute to an overall understanding of the issues facing the establishment and operation of consultative committees.

Based on the findings of this research, it is reasonable to state that there has been some effort on the part of the officers on the committees to establish a partnership between the police and the community. The officers seem very willing to involve the community in discussions concerning community problems, and are actively involved in assisting the community in implementing programs in the community which could improve the quality of life in their areas. At the same time, the community members on the committee seem interested in establishing a partnership with the police, and many seem encouraged that such partnerships will improve the quality of life in their areas.

However, there also seems to be some obstacles that may interfere with a true and complete partnership between the police and the community. These obstacles

pertain to the lack of clarification as to the main purpose of consultative committees, as well as the perceived lack of organizational commitment that many of the officers expressed. These obstacles will be discussed briefly and recommendations will follow.

Clarification of Mandate

Perhaps the most important issue that has been highlighted by the study is the question surrounding the mandate or the principal focus of the committee. The research showed that a lot of committee discussions pertained to fundraising and the implementation of crime prevention programs, with little to no discussion on police priorities or policies. While fundraising and programming are important issues that must be addressed by the Police Service and community, one must question whether these should be the responsibility of the consultative committee. One must also question whether there is a common understanding of the purpose of consultative committees.

Fundraising and implementing programming strategies require time and considerable human resources to effectively achieve desired results. As a result, the main goal of consultative committees, the identification, prioritization, and recommendation of solutions of crime and social disorder problems, may not be

given the importance and attention they require. Indeed, consultative committees were initially created to assist the police in addressing community concerns because it was recognized that the police cannot control crime or be expected to know community concerns if they remain isolated from the community. They need the help of the community to address crime and social disorder problems, and consultative committees are supposed to be a means of achieving this aim. If it has been recognized that the police cannot address these issues effectively on their own, it is also reasonable to expect that committees have a substantial mandate that requires an exclusive focus on this goal.

Indeed, it is recommended that multi-functional roles should not be pursued at the expense of developing comprehensive community policing strategies. In the first instance, fundraising may be initiated by a group separate from the consultative committee. In addition, care must be taken that the committee does not develop into solely a crime prevention committee.

It follows, therefore, that it may not be appropriate to have the mandate of the committee the same as the Community Police Centre. Keeping a Centre in operation requires multi-functional roles in the mandate of the Centre because of the range of activities that is required to operate a Centre. On the other hand, the purpose of a committee is to focus on a certain area with a specific goal in mind. Therefore, a

consultative committee should not have too many roles as the underlying objectives may be neglected.

It is also suggested that the Police Service consider the intended role of consultative committees and offer some written direction as to the principal objective of the committees and what type of issues or areas fall within the purview of the committees. Keeping in mind that committees may be flexible because of the different natures of communities, some uniformity among all consultative committees would be useful to all involved.

Clarification of Committee Members' Roles and Responsibilities

Keeping the above in mind, it is recommended that the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service advise committee members exactly what is expected of them in their capacity as members of the committee. For the officers charged with the responsibility of establishing the committee, it is important that roles and responsibilities of members are clear and concise. The reality is that community members have other priorities and interests that will eventually take precedence unless their mandate and roles are clearly defined and they begin to see the results of their efforts.

The capacities and capabilities of the committees must be determined. There

should be boundaries set as to what issues should be addressed in consultative committees to ensure some consistency and uniformity. Indeed, as Inspector Crosby states, the bottom line is “How much authority are we going to give them?” It is suggested that immediate attention be paid to this very question as findings suggest that some members are not clear as to how much power they have. In effect, the committee will tend to be run by the police representative instead of the committee being community-driven.

In addition, the Police Service may be reminded that consultative committees are to focus on advising the police and the community on police priorities, policies and programs. Therefore, it is essential that the Police Service determine how these committees will influence these areas, and explore the design of a communication process to ensure that the community input on policies and practices gets forwarded to the Police Services Board as it is clear that the Board is encouraging the flow of such information to the policy level.

Performance Appraisal System

Findings of the research indicate that the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service lacks a comprehensive performance appraisal system based on qualitative performance. Many indications of the success of consultative committees are

intangible (for instance, innovation, creativity, quality of interaction with community members). Therefore, there is a need to devise a system whereby these indicators are considered in the assessment process. In this way, the new work of police, such as members of consultative committees, is considered by both the police and community as 'real police work.' Such an assessment process legitimizes the community policing philosophy which the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Services contends to be operating under.

Representativeness on Committees

There was some evidence to suggest the existence of Morgan's hypotheses of marginalization. In the first instance, the study suggests that committee membership may not reflect the demographics of the community, and as Morgan points out, consultative committees often operate 'in the stratosphere' because they are put in place to represent a large geographic area. Only a few localized concerns are brought forward because of the large area represented. This seems to be the case of the committees in this study since each committee represents as many as 20,000 people (one committee represents as many as 80,000 residents). Indeed, many groups may be marginalized and left out of the consultation process.

Moreover, it is quite plausible that, in general, members of the committees in

this study reflect the 'great and good' in the communities since most of the respondents of the questionnaires are white, middle-class, middle-aged, and have had little adversarial experience with the police. It appears that many individuals who may have serious concerns about the police and the well being of their community are not involved in the consultation process, namely, minority groups and youth. Although these groups may not want to participate in consultation, some consideration must be given by the Police Service as to how their input can be solicited.

While it is recognized that no one committee may be entirely representative of the community it represents, efforts must be made to reach those segments of the population who are not involved in the consultative process. It is suggested that community surveys or public forums be initiated on a biannual or yearly basis in order to obtain the input of those who are not participating in the formal consultative process. In addition, some thought may be given to reducing the range of area that the committees represent. Committees which represent smaller areas may prove to be more manageable and effective since membership stands a greater chance of being representative of the community.

Education

The findings of the research indicate that there may be an overall lack of

organizational support for community policing. This lack of support was perceived by some of the officers in regards to both officers on the streets and management. There seems to be a need to educate all officers on the philosophy of community policing in order to ensure that the philosophy is accepted and supported by all in the police organization. Without this support, community policing initiatives such as consultative committees will be considered add-on programs that have little to do with the general operation of the police institution.

Police officers must be trained on problem-solving approaches and incorporate these skills in their everyday functions as the broadened social role which community policing demands requires innovation, empowerment, and an ability to proactively address underlying causes of crime and disorder, instead of reacting to them as has been traditionally done.

It is suggested that committee members be apprised of current police policies and strategies in order to educate them on the police organization, but also to allow constructive input on these strategies and policies. Recommendations on these areas cannot be made if members are ignorant of the day-to-day functions of the police.

Lastly, it is recommended that the Ottawa-Carleton Regional Police Service develop a community policing education package in order to provide the public with information on its philosophy, including the role of consultative committees.

There is a need to publicize the existence of these committees as the findings reveal that the community in general may not know of their existence. With only certain groups (particularly propolice individuals) involved in the consultative process, chances are that the everyday police policies and practices will remain essentially unchanged or constant. All citizens should be provided with an opportunity to give their opinions on priorities, practices and policies since policing is a public service which must be accountable to the entire community.

Creating true police-community partnerships by means of consultative committees require a significant amount of effort and clarity on the part of both police and community. What seems missing from the attempts to establish partnerships by the committees in this study is a clear understanding, by both the Police Service and the community, of the role the community is to play in policing. It was apparent that the Police Service had not determined how much decision-making authority these groups would be given, nor were these committees given guidelines to follow in order to ensure they are meeting the needs of the Police Service.

There does not seem to be any structural process in place to deal with or direct the input once received from the community, nor any impact evaluation mechanism to assess the impact of decisions made as a result of the input. In effect,

these committees generally serve to legitimize the existing policing operations.

Community policing explicitly places the community at the centre of its program and policy planning. Consultative committees are to focus on police policies and priorities (Weiler, 1993), but it is evident from this research that the committees have not developed to incorporate this function, thus legitimation of existing practices is inevitable.

In assessing the data gathered in this research, it can be said that as the committees presently exist, the experience of establishing consultative committees to implement community policing in the Ottawa-Carleton area is weak. The above recommendations may assist the Police Service in moving towards a more effective means to achieving partnerships and community policing in general.

REFERENCES

- Alderson, John. (1989). "The Future of Policing: Learning From History." in Donald Loree (Ed.) Future Issues in Policing: Symposium Proceedings. Ottawa: Canadian Police College.
- Bayley, David H. (1983) "Accountability and Control of Police: Lessons for Britain" in T. Bennett (ed.) The Future of Policing. Cambridge: Cambridge Institute of Criminology.
- Bayley, David (1988) "Community Policing: A Report From The Devil's Advocate" in J.R. Greene and S.D. Mastrofski (eds.), Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New York: Praeger.
- Belknap, Joanne, Merry Morash, and Robert Trojanowicz "Implementing a Community Policing Model For Work With Juveniles: An Exploratory Study", Criminal Justice and Behavior, 14, 2:211-245.
- Benyon, John (1986) "Policing in the Limelight: Citizens, Constables and Controversy" in John Benyon and Colin Bourn (eds.) The Police: Powers, Procedures and Proprieties. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Best, Joel (1990) Threatened Children: Rhetoric and Concern about Child-Victims. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bittner, Egon. (1970). The Functions of the Police in Modern Society. NIMH: Washington, D.C.
- Bittner, Egon. (1974). "Florence Nightingale in pursuit of Willie Sutton: A theory of the police." in Herbert Jacob (Ed.) The Potential for Reform of Criminal Justice. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Black, Donald (1980) The Manners and Customs of the Police. New York: Free Press.
- Blake, J.A. (1981). "The role of police in society." in William T. McGrath and M.P. Mitchell (Eds.) The Police Function in Canada. Toronto: Methuen.

Boaden, N., Goldsmith, M., Hampton, W., and Stringer, P. (1982) Public Participation in Local Services. London: Longman.

Brodeur, Jean-Paul (1992) Managing Diversity and Change: A Training Strategy. Presentation to the Police Educator's Conference Board of Canada, Regina: May 25-29.

Buerger, Michael E. (1993). "The Challenge of Reinventing Police and Community." in D. Weisburd and C. Ichida (Eds.) Police Innovation and Control of the Police. New York: Springer-Verlag.

Bull, David and Stratta, Erica (1994) "Police Community Consultation: An Examination of its Practice in Selected Constabularies in England and New South Wales, Australia", The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 25, 4:392-410.

Bureau of Justice Assistance (1994) Understanding Community Policing: A Framework for Action. Washington, D.C.: Monograph.

Chacko, James and Nancoo, Stephen (1993) Community Policing in Canada. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.

Clairmont, Don (1991) "Community-based Policing: Implementation and Impact", Canadian Journal of Criminology, July-October, 469-484.

Cohen, Stanley (1985) Visions of Social Control. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Cox, Gabrielle (1986) "Openness and accountability" in John Benyon and Colin Bourn (eds.) The Police: Powers, Procedures and Proprieties. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Deakin, Nicholas (1986) "Formal Structures and their Relationship to Community" in P. Willmott (ed.) The Debate About Community: Papers From a Seminar on 'Community in Social Policy. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Eck, John E. (1993). "Alternative Futures for Policing." in D. Weisburd and C. Uchida (Eds.) Police Innovation and Control of the Police. New York: Springer-Verlag.

- Ekblom, Paul (1986) "Community Policing: Obstacles and Issues" in P. Willmott (ed.) The Debate About Community: Papers From a Seminar on 'Community in Social Policy'. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Ericson, Richard V. "The Police as Reproducers of Order." in K. McCormick and L. Visano (Eds.) Understanding Policing. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Fowler, Floyd J. and Mangione, Thomas W. (1986) "A Three-Pronged Effort to Reduce Crime and Fear of Crime: The Hartford Experiment" in D. Rosenbaum (ed.) Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work? Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage.
- Fyfe, N. (1989) "Contesting Consultation: the Political Geography of Police/Community Consultation in London". in D. Evans and D. Herbert (eds.), The Geography of Crime. London: Routledge.
- Fyfe, N. (1992) "Towards Locally Sensitive Policing? Politics, Participation and Power in Community/Police Consultation" in David J. Evans, Nicholas R. Fyfe and David T. Hebert (eds.) Crime, Policing and Place. London: Routledge.
- Goldstein, Herman. (1977). Policing a Free Society. Cambridge, Mass.: Ballinger.
- Goldstein, Herman (1987) "Toward Community-Oriented Policing: Potential, Basic Requirements, and Threshold Questions". Crime and Delinquency, 33, 1:6-30.
- Goldstein, Herman (1990) Problem-Oriented Policing. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gordon, Paul (1984) "Community Policing: Towards The Local Police State?" Critical Social Policy, 10:39-58.
- Greaves, George (1986) "The Police and their Public" in John Benyon and Colin Bourn (eds.) The Police: Powers, Procedures, and Proprieties. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

- Grinc, Randolph (1994) "Angels in Marble: Problems in Stimulating Community Involvement in Community Policing", Crime and Delinquency, 40(3):437-468.
- Gusfield, Joseph (1981) The Culture of Public Problems. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Hunter, Ronald D. and Barker, Thomas (1993) "Bs and Buzzwords: The New Police Operational Style", American Journal of Police, 12(3):157-168.
- Johnson, Rebecca A (1994) Community Policing and the RCMP: A Status Report. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police.
- Keith, Michael (1988) "Squaring Circles? Consultation and 'InnerCity' Policing", New Community, 15(1):63-77.
- Kelling, George L. and Mark Moore. (1988). "From political to reform to community: The evolving strategy of police." in J.R. Greene and S.D. Mastrofski (Eds.) Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New York: Praeger.
- Kinsey, Richard et al. (1986) Losing the Fight Against Crime. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Klockars, Carl B. (1985). The Idea of the Police. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Klockars, Carl B. (1988) "The Rhetoric of Community Policing", in J.R. Greene and S. Mastrofski (eds.), Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?. New York: Praeger.
- Lea, J and Young, J. (1984) What is to be Done About Law and Order? Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Leighton, Barry (1988) "The Community Concept In Criminology: Toward A Social Network Approach", Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 25, 4:351-374.

- Leighton, Barry (1991) "Visions of Community Policing: Rhetoric and Reality in Canada". Canadian Journal of Criminology. (July-October):485-522.
- Leighton, Barry (1993) "Community-based Policing and Police/Community Relations" in James Chacko and Stephen E. Nancoo (eds.), Community Policing in Canada. Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press Inc.
- Lewis, Dan, Jane Grant, and Dennis Rosenbaum (1988) The Social Construction of Reform, Crime Prevention and Community Organizations. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Books.
- Lurigio, Arthur and Rosenbaum, D. (1986) "Evaluation Research in Community Crime Prevention: A Critical Look at the Field" in D. Rosenbaum (ed.) Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work? Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage.
- Manning, Peter (1984) "Community Policing". American Journal of Police. 3:205-227.
- Manning, Peter (1988) "Community Policing As A Drama of Control" in J.R. Greene and S. Mastrofski (eds.), Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality? New York: Praeger.
- Mawby, R.I. (1990) Comparative Policing Issues: The British and American Experience in International Perspective. London:Unwin Hyman Ltd.
- McDougall, Allan K. (1988). Policing: The Evolution of a Mandate. Ottawa: Canadian Police College.
- Mitchell, David (1992) "Initiatives in Policing London's Brixton Since the 1981 Riots" in David J. Evans, Nicholas R. Fyfe and David T. Hebert (eds.), Crime, Policing and Place. London: Routledge.
- Moore, M. and G. Kelling (1983) "To Serve and Protect: Learning From Police History", Public Interest, 70:49-65.
- Morgan, Rod (1985) Setting the P.A.C.E.: Police Community Consultation Arrangements in England and Wales. Bath, U.K.: University of Bath, Centre for the Analysis of Social Policy.

- Morgan, Rod (1986) "Police Consultative Groups: the Implications for the Governance of the Police". Political Quarterly, (Jan-Mar.):83-87.
- Morgan, Rod (1987a) "The Local Determinants of Policing Policy". in P. Willmott (ed.), Policing and the Community. London: Policy Studies.
- Morgan, Rod (1987b) "Police Accountability - Developing the Local Infrastructure", British Journal of Criminology, 27, 1(Winter):87-96.
- Morgan, Rod (1989) "Policing by Consent: Legitimizing the Doctrine" in R. Morgan and D.J. Smith (eds.), Coming to Terms With Policing: Perspectives on Policy. London: Routledge.
- Morgan, Rod (1989) "Police Accountability: Current Developments and Future Prospects". in M. Weatheritt (ed.) Police Research: Some Future Prospects. Aldershot: Gower Publishing.
- Morgan, Rod and Maggs, Christopher (1985) "Police/Community Dialogues: Consultative Groups in Action" in A. Brown (ed.), Models of Police/Public Consultation in Europe. Cranfield Wolfson Colloquium 1984, Cranfield Institute of Technology.
- Murphy, Christopher (1988a) "Community Problems, Problem Communities, and Community Policing in Toronto", Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 25, 4:392-410.
- Murphy, Christopher (1988b) "The Development, Impact, and Implications of Community Policing in Canada" in J.R. Greene and S. Mastrofski (eds.) Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?. New York: Praeger.
- Murphy, Christopher (1992) Problem-Oriented Policing. Ottawa: Ministry of Solicitor General Canada.
- Murphy, Christopher and Graham Muir (1984) Community-Based Policing: A Review of the Critical Issues. Ottawa: Ministry of Solicitor General Canada.
- Oliver, Ian (1987) Police, Government and Accountability. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

- Reiner, Robert. (1992). The Politics of the Police (2nd. edn.). Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Reiner, Robert. (1994). "What should the police be doing?" Policing Vol 10, No 3:151-157.
- Riechers, Lisa M and Roy Roberg (1990) "Community Policing: A Critical Review of Underlying Assumptions", Journal of Police Science and Administration, 17:105-114.
- Robinson, Cyril, Richard Scaglione, and Michael Olivero (1994) Police in Contradiction: The Evolution of the Police Function in Society. Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Rosenbaum, Dennis (1986) "The Problem of Crime Control", in D. Rosenbaum (ed.) Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work? Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage.
- Rosenbaum, D., Lewis, D., and Grant, J.. (1986) "Neighborhood-based Crime Prevention: Assessing the Efficacy of Community Organizing in Chicago" in D. Rosenbaum (ed.) Community Crime Prevention: Does It Work? Beverly Hills, CA.: Sage.
- Royal Canadian Mounted Police (1995) Community Policing Review Report. Ottawa: Royal Canadian Mounted Police: Audit, Evaluation and Corporate Services Directorate .
- Savage, Stephen (1984) "Political Control or Community Liason?", Political Quarterly, 55, 1(Jan-Mar):48-59.
- Savage, Stephen and Wilson, Charles (1987) "'Ask a Policeman':Community Consultation in Practice", Social Policy and Administration, 21, 3(Autumn):252-263.
- Scruton, Phil (1985) The State of the Police. London: Pluto Press.
- Seagrave, Jayne (1994) "Community Consultative Groups: Practical Guidelines", RCMP Gazette, 56(10):17-20.

- Shearing, Clifford D. and Jeffrey S. Leon. (1992). "Reconsidering the Police Role: A Challenge to a Challenge of a Popular Conception." in K. McCormick and L. Visano (Eds.) Understanding Policing. Toronto: Canadian Scholars Press.
- Skolnick, J and D. Bayley (1986) The New Blue Line. New York: Free Press.
- Skolnick, Jerome and Bayley, David (1988) "Theme and Variation in Community Policing" in Michael Tonry and Norval Morris (eds.) Crime and Justice: A Review of Research. Vol. 10, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Smith, David (1987) "The Police and the Idea of Community" in P. Willmott (ed.) Policing and the Community. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Sparrow, Malcolm, Mark Moore, and David Kennedy (1990) Beyond 911: A New Era for Policing. New York: Basic Books.
- Spector, Malcolm and John Kitsuse (1977) Constructing Social Problems. Menlo Park: Cummings Publishing Inc.
- Spencer, Sarah (1985) Called to Account: The Case for Police Accountability in England & Wales. London: National Council for Civil Liberties.
- Stenson, Kevin (1993) "Community Policing as a Governmental Technology", Economy and Society, 22, 3:373-389.
- Stratta, Erica (1990) "A Lack of Consultation?" Policing, Vol 6, (Autumn):523-547.
- Sunahara, D.F. (1991) "Implementing Community Policing", in D. Ogle (ed.), Strategic Planning For Police. Ottawa: Canadian Police College.
- Taylor, Ian (1986) "Martyrdom and Surveillance", Crime and Social Justice, 26:60-78.
- Trojanowicz, R. and B. Bucqueroux (1990) Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective. Cincinnati: Anderson Publications.

- Ward, R.H. (1970). "The police role: A case of diversity." in Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science. 61: 580-586.
- Weatheritt, Mollie (1987) "Community Policing Now" in P. Willmott (ed.), Policing and the Community. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Weatheritt, Mollie (1988) "Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?" in J.R. Greene and S. Mastrofski (eds.) in Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?, New York: Praeger.
- Weiler, Richard (1993) Community Consultative Committees. Ottawa: Ministry of Solicitor General of Canada.
- Weisheit, Ralph, Edward Wells and David Falcone (1994) "Community olicing in Small Town and Rural America" Crime and Delinquency, 40, 4:549-567.
- Weitzer, R. (1992) "Northern Ireland's Police Liaison Committees", Policing and Society, 2(3):233-243.
- Willmott, Peter (1984) Community in Social Policy, Discussion Paper No. 9, London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Willmott, Peter, ed. (1987) Policing and the Community. London: Policy Studies Institute.

APPENDIX - I**PRINCIPLES OF SIR ROBERT PEEL, 1829**

1. To prevent crime and disorder as an alternative to their repression by military force and by severity of legal punishment.
2. To recognize always that the power of the police to fulfil their functions and duties is dependent on public approval of their existence, actions and behavior, and on their ability to secure and maintain public respect.
3. To recognize always that to secure and maintain the respect and approval of the public means also the securing of the willing cooperation of the public in the task of securing observance of the laws.
4. To recognize always that the extent to which the co-operation of the public can be secured diminishes, proportionately, the necessity of the use of physical force and compulsion for achieving police objectives.
5. To seek and preserve public favor, not by pandering to public opinion, but by constantly demonstrating absolute impartial service to law, in complete independence of police, and without regard to the justice or injustice of the substance of individual laws; by ready offering of individual service and friendship to all members of the public without regard to their wealth or social standing; by ready exercise of courtesy and friendly good humor; and by ready offering of individual sacrifice in protecting and preserving life.
6. To use physical force only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient to obtain public co-operation to an extent necessary to secure observance of law or to use the minimum degree of force which is necessary on any particular occasion for achieving a police objective.
7. To maintain at all times a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full-time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen, in the interests of the community welfare and existence.
8. To recognize always the need for strict adherence to police-executive functions, and to refrain from even seeming to usurp the powers of the judiciary or avenging individuals or the state, and of authoritatively judging

fault and punishing the guilty.

2

9. To recognize always that the test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder, and not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with these problems.

APPENDIX - II**INFORMED CONSENT FORM**

Name of researcher: Janice Gillis
Telephone number: 565-3594
Name of thesis supervisor: Dr. Ronald Melchers
Telephone number: 564-5711
Institution: University of Ottawa

I, _____, am interested in collaborating in the study on police/community consultative committees conducted by Janice Gillis, and under the supervision of Dr. Ronald Melchers, of the Department of Criminology at the University of Ottawa. The purpose of the study is to identify the issues and concerns regarding police-community consultation that appear most significant to members of police/community consultative committees.

If I agree to participate, my participation will consist essentially of completing a questionnaire which will be mailed to my home address. I am aware that I have three weeks to complete the questionnaire. I understand that I may be contacted at a later date for an interview which will last approximately 45 minutes to clarify or expand on issues that I raised on my questionnaire. I also understand that the contents will be used only for the purposes of this study and that my confidentiality will be respected.

I am free to withdraw from the project at any time, refuse to participate, and refuse to answer questions on the questionnaire or during the interview.

I have received assurance from the researchers that the information I will share will remain strictly confidential. I have been assured that the responses from all participants will be summarized in aggregate statistical form so that no one will learn of my individual answers to the questions. I also understand that no details that may identify me will be reported, and others will not be able to associate particular responses with my participation.

I, in turn, assure other participants that I will treat in the same confidential way any information I may obtain in the context of this project.

I have been assured by the researchers that my anonymity will be protected. I understand that the questionnaire will be numbered only, and that I do not have to provide my name on the questionnaire. I also understand that the master list containing my name and the corresponding questionnaire number will be used for control purposes only and that it will be destroyed after the study is completed.

Any information requests or complaints about the ethical conduct of the project may be addressed to the University Human Research Ethics Committee by calling the Secretary of the Committee (613-564-4297).

There are two copies of the consent form, one of which I may keep.

If I have any questions, I may contact Professor Ronald Melchers, Department of Criminology, University of Ottawa, at 564-5711.

Participant's signature: _____ Date: _____

Researcher's signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX - III**INFORMATION SHEET**

Dear participant:

I am requesting your voluntary participation in a project which I am undertaking as a partial requirement for the degree of Master of Arts in Criminology at the University of Ottawa. The focus of my thesis is police/community consultative committees and I am looking specifically at consultative committees in operation in the Ottawa-Carleton area. Therefore, I would like to employ your committee as part of my case study.

The purpose of this project is to identify the concerns and issues regarding police/community consultation that appear most relevant to members of these committees. I am particularly interested in looking at the perceptions of the members of the committee in regards to the functioning of the committee, its desired outcomes, and whether the committee is meeting its goals and objectives. On the basis of these findings, this researcher will provide suggestions and recommendations, where applicable, on various issues raised by the members of the committees.

Indeed, this project should be of benefit to the committees in that the concerns and issues raised by the members may provide meaningful and informative views that the committees under study may wish to address. Moreover, being aware of the issues may facilitate constructive dialogue and a healthy, proficient committee.

As a participant in this research project, you are asked to complete a questionnaire. I will be sending you the questionnaire to your home address and I ask that you complete the questionnaire within three weeks from the date you receive the questionnaire. It will take you approximately 30 minutes to complete it. I will provide a self-addressed stamped envelope for your convenience. If I have not received your completed questionnaire by three weeks after its distribution, I will assume that you have chosen not to participate in this study.

Upon review of the completed questionnaire, I may be contacting you for a personal interview (to last approximately 45 minutes). The purpose of this interview is to further explore issues that you raise in your questionnaire.

To achieve the goal of this research project, your consent to participate in this project is appreciated. Your participation in the project is entirely voluntary. You may withdraw from the study at any time and/or refuse to answer any questions you are asked.

No identifiable information will be used in the project, the information that you share will remain strictly confidential, and your anonymity will be assured. The questionnaire will be numbered only, and no space will be provided for the name of the participant. I will keep the master list containing the participant's name and the corresponding questionnaire number in

order to contact particular individuals for subsequent interviews. After the study is completed, I will destroy the master list. I will, however, keep your signed consent forms.

Please be assured that the opinions that you share will be protected and held in confidence. The responses will be summarized in aggregate statistical form so that no one will learn of your individual answers. I will not report any details that may identify you, or enable others to associate particular responses with your participation in this study.

A copy of the completed thesis will be available at the University of Ottawa, Morisset Library, and also at the National Library of Canada (microfilm) for your consultation.

My supervisor and I will be available to discuss and clarify any concerns or questions you may have regarding this project. My phone number is 565-3594. Dr. Ronald Melchers' telephone number is 564-5711.

I will provide two copies of the consent form with the questionnaire, one of which you may keep. I ask that should you decide to participate in this study, that you read the consent form, date and sign your name, and return the consent form with the completed questionnaire.

Your support and contribution to this project will be greatly appreciated.

Janice Gillis
Researcher, University of Ottawa

APPENDIX - IV**COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE**

Information in this section is used to create a profile of the group of persons consulted. Please use a checkmark () to indicate your response.

1. Are you...
☐ female
☐ male

2. Are you presently...
☐ employed/self-employed
☐ retired
☐ homemaker
☐ student
☐ looking for work
☐ unable to work

3. What is the highest level of formal education you obtained?
☐ elementary school
☐ some high school
☐ high school graduate
☐ some college
☐ college graduate
☐ some university
☐ university graduate
☐ graduate/post graduate degree

4. Please indicate your age bracket:
☐ under 18
☐ 18 - 24
☐ 25 - 44
☐ 45 - 64
☐ 65 and over

5. Are you...

- ☐ single
- ☐ married or common law
- ☐ widowed
- ☐ separated
- ☐ divorced

6. In which of the following ranges did your total family income fall, for the calendar year 1994? Include all income, before taxes and deductions, of all members of your household.

- ☐ less than \$30,000
- ☐ \$30,000 - \$49,999
- ☐ \$50,000 - \$89,999
- ☐ \$90,000+
- ☐ don't know

7. In what capacity are you being consulted? (Please place a checkmark beside each situation which applies to you.)

- ☐ Elected municipal official
- ☐ Retired person
- ☐ Student
- ☐ Representative of the Business Community
- ☐ Health and Social Services sector
- ☐ Education sector
- ☐ Member of an association
- ☐ Member of a cultural community
- ☐ Member of a church
- ☐ Resident of the community
- ☐ Other

8. Would you define yourself as a member of a visible minority group?

- ☐ yes (*Please specify*) _____
- ☐ no

9. How long have you been residing at your current address?

_____ less than two years
_____ 2 - 5 years
_____ more than 5 years

10. Do you reside in the area served by this committee?

_____ yes
_____ no

11. Do you have children under the age of 16 years residing with you?

_____ yes
_____ no

12. In what month and year did you join this committee?

Month: _____ Year: _____

13. How often do you attend committee meetings?

_____ each time a meeting is held
_____ most of the time
_____ half of the time
_____ seldom
_____ never

14. What voluntary organizations other than the committee under study do you belong to?

15. Do you believe that committee membership should include individuals who have been in conflict with the law?

_____ yes (*Please elaborate*) _____

_____ no (Please elaborate) _____

This section asks for your opinions on crime in general. Please place a checkmark () on the line that best represents your views.

16. My neighbourhood is an area with...
- _____ a high amount of crime
- _____ an average amount of crime
- _____ a low amount of crime
- _____ don't know

17. In the last year or two, in my neighbourhood, crime has
- _____ increased
- _____ decreased
- _____ remained the same
- _____ don't know

18. In Ottawa-Carleton, crime has...
- _____ increased
- _____ decreased
- _____ remained the same
- _____ don't know

19. How do you think your neighbourhood compares with the rest of the Ottawa-Carleton region in terms of the amount of crime? Would you say your neighbourhood has...
- _____ much more crime?
- _____ more crime?
- _____ about the same?
- _____ less crime?
- _____ much less crime?
- _____ don't know

20. Do you think there is a serious crime problem in your neighbourhood?

_____ yes

_____ no

| Go to Question # 22

_____ don't know |

21. What is the most serious problem in your neighbourhood?

_____ personal safety (robbery, assault, etc.)

_____ property loss (break-in, theft, etc.)

_____ vandalism

_____ disturbing the peace (noisy parties, etc.)

_____ drugs, alcohol

_____ prostitution

_____ speeding on residential streets

_____ illegal parking

_____ other (*specify*) _____

22. How does the local police service do in...

	Good job	Average job	Poor job	Don't know
1. Enforcing the laws?....	_____	_____	_____	_____
2. Promptly responding to calls?.....	_____	_____	_____	_____
3. Being approachable and easy to talk to?....	_____	_____	_____	_____
4. Supplying information to the public on ways to reduce crime?....	_____	_____	_____	_____

23. In the year prior to your participation on this committee, did you talk to or were you in contact with a police officer for any reason?

_____ yes

_____ no (Go to question # 25)

24. What were the circumstances of the **most recent contact** during that year?

- ☐ traffic accident
☐ traffic violation
☐ friend or relative is a police officer or met
 officer(s) socially
☐ victim of crime
☐ witness to crime
☐ to obtain information from police
☐ to attend crime prevention sessions given by police
☐ other (*specify*) _____

Would you consider this contact with the police a positive or negative experience?

☐ positive (*Please elaborate*) _____

☐ negative (*Please elaborate*) _____

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements by placing a checkmark () in the appropriate box.

25. Most residents in my community are aware that this consultative committee exists in our community.

☐ agree

 ☐ disagree

26. The problems which are seen as most crucial by my community are being communicated to the police.

☐ agree

 ☐ disagree

27. The police address the problems which are considered by my community as the most crucial.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
28. The police are the experts in addressing community problems.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
29. A problem that I raised during a committee meeting was satisfactorily addressed by the police.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
30. The police make most of the decisions during committee meetings.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
31. It is the responsibility of the committee members to report back to those they represent with a summary of the committee meeting.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
32. It is the responsibility of the committee members to consult with those they represent prior to making any decisions at committee meetings.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
33. One of the goals of this committee is to provide the police with information on community residents who are committing criminal acts in the community.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
34. I believe that the community should abide by the recommendations made by the police representative(s).
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree

35. Everyone has his/her chance to be heard at committee meetings.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
36. During committee meetings, the community representatives identify problems in the community.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
37. Citizens or groups who feel antagonistic toward police should not be considered for membership on the committee.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
38. Only the police can tell us what the problems are in our neighbourhood.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
39. The relationship between the police and the community is deteriorating.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
40. The police have too much power.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
41. Two or three members of the committee tend to do all the talking.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
42. One of the goals of this committee is to enable the public to play an influential part in the development of policing policies and strategies.
☐ agree ☐ disagree

43. My committee identifies community priorities and needs.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
44. My views are given just as much consideration as other members of the committee.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
45. This committee has helped to improve police services in the community.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
46. The most important functions of the committee are identifying and solving crime and disorder problems in the community.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
47. It is vital that this committee has a formal mechanism for asking members of the community for information on their policing needs and/or specific problems.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
48. When police respond to a call for service, they behave differently if the victim or alleged offender is a member of a visible minority community.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
49. One way to determine whether this committee is effective is to count the number of Neighbourhood Watch programs that exist in the community.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
50. Fundraising must be a principal goal of the committee.
☐ agree ☐ disagree

51. Police/community consultative committees are a permanent part of this region's police organization.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

52. When certain individuals on the committee present their concerns to the committee, they are taken more seriously because of their stature in the community.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

53. The most important role of the police is crime-fighting.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

54. This committee has helped to improve the quality of life in the neighbourhood served by this committee.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

55. An objective of this committee is to provide input into what and how police services should be delivered in the community.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

56. I have a clear understanding of my responsibilities as a member of this committee.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

57. Consultation means that the police just listen to the community's views.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

58. The public should have a say in police decision-making.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

59. Community representatives on this committee must be supportive of the police.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
60. Only the police can decide how an area should be policed.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
61. My committee has a process in place to obtain input from all sectors of the community on their policing needs.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
62. There should be a consultative committee attached to each Community Police Centre.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
63. Committee members generally agree with police views on community problems.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
64. I have a good understanding of current Ottawa-Carleton police procedures and policies.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
65. The police are not obliged to act upon the advice of the community.
☐ agree ☐ disagree

66. Rank the following items **from the most often discussed** issue at your committee meetings **to the least often discussed**.

(Place a 1 beside the item which is the most often discussed issue, a 2 beside the item which is the next most often discussed issue, and so on. If it has not been a topic of discussion at your meetings, please leave the item blank.)

identifying local problems.....
 solving local problems.....
 crime prevention programs.....
 aid to crime victims.....
 fundraising.....
 youth crime.....
 police procedures.....
 resources for policing.....

67. Identify the **three most important things** you believe **should be discussed** at committee meetings.

(Place a 1 beside the most important one; a 2 beside the next most important one; and a 3 beside the next most important one).

identifying local problems.....
 solving local problems.....
 crime prevention programs.....
 aid to crime victims.....
 fundraising.....
 youth crime.....
 police procedures.....
 resources for policing.....
 other (*specify*).....

68. Rank the seriousness of each of the following problems.

(Place a 1 beside the item you believe is the most serious issue, a 2 beside the next most serious issue, a 3 beside the next most serious one, and so on.)

rising cost of living.....
 racism.....
 tax increases.....
 government debt.....
 crime.....
 poverty.....
 rising cost of education.....
 unemployment.....
 pollution of the environment.....

For the following items, please place a checkmark
 () along the scale to indicate your response.

69. I keep those that I represent on the committee informed of committee discussions.

--	--	--	--	--

Always Not at
all

70. Individuals in my community ask me about the discussions held during committee meetings.

--	--	--	--	--

Very Never
Frequently

71. In your opinion, in the next four years, how is the relationship between the police and the public likely to change?

_____	_____
Much	Much
Improvement	Worsening

Comments on question #71: _____

I would be interested to read your comments or elaboration on any issue that was raised in this questionnaire. Please continue on the back of this page if required.

Thank-you very much for your participation in this study. It is greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX - V**POLICE QUESTIONNAIRE**

1. In what month and year did you join this committee?

Month: _____ Year: _____

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements by placing a checkmark () in the appropriate box.

2. During committee meetings, the community representatives identify problems in the community.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
3. The problems which are identified by community members on the committee reflect the main problems which exist in the community at large.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
4. It is the responsibility of the committee members to report back to those they represent with a summary of the committee meeting.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
5. It is the responsibility of the committee members to consult with those they represent prior to making any decisions at committee meetings.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
6. One of the goals of this committee is to provide the police with information on community residents who are committing criminal acts in the community.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree

7. I believe that the community should go along with the recommendations made by the police representative(s) during committee meetings.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
8. Everyone has his/her chance to be heard at committee meetings.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
9. Citizens or groups who feel antagonistic toward police should not be considered for membership on the committee.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
10. The relationship between the police and the community is deteriorating.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
11. One of the goals of this committee is to enable the public to play an influential part in the development of policing policies and strategies.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
12. My committee identifies community priorities and needs.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
13. My views are given just as much consideration as other members of the committee.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
14. The focus of the committee meetings is mainly the **policing** of the community that the committee represents.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree

15. This committee has helped to improve police services in the community
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
16. The most important functions of the committee are identifying and solving crime and disorder problems in the community.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
17. One way to determine whether this committee is effective is to count the number of Neighbourhood Watch programs that exist in the community.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
18. Fundraising must be a principal goal of the committee.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
19. When certain individuals on the committee present their concerns to the committee, they are taken more seriously because of their stature in the community.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
20. The most important role of the police is crime-fighting.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
21. This committee has helped to improve the quality of life in the neighbourhood served by this committee.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
22. An objective of this committee is to provide input into what and how police services should be delivered in the community.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree

23. I do not have a clear understanding of my responsibilities as a member of this committee.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
24. Consultation means that the police just listen to the community's views.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
25. The public should have a say in police decision-making.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
26. Community representatives on this committee must be supportive of the police.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
27. My committee has a process in place to obtain input from all sectors of the community on their policing needs.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
28. Two or three members of the committee tend to do all the talking.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
29. Committee members generally agree with the police views on community problems.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
30. The police are not obligated to act upon the advice of the committee.
☐ agree ☐ disagree
31. The committee chairperson should be a representative of the community.
☐ agree ☐ disagree

32. The chairperson of the committee should be elected by both the community and police representatives
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
33. Most police officers in my division know that this consultative committee exists
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
34. Most police officers in my division believe that consultative committees are an important part of my job.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
35. There is a need to educate all police officers on the philosophy of community policing.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
36. Not all neighbourhoods require consultative committees.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
37. My work on this committee is not considered "real" police work by my colleagues.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
38. There is an overall lack of organizational support for the committee.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree
39. Representatives from all areas of police work should regularly participate in committee meetings.
- ☐ agree ☐ disagree

40. In general, there is a need to train public members of any new consultative committee in the areas of law and police practices.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

41. The mandate of the consultative committee should be the same as the mandate of the Community Police Centre.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

42. A consultative committee should be established as soon as a Community Police Centre is open to the public.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

43. It is up to the police to determine the committee's mandate.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

44. All consultative committees should have the same mandate.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

45. There should be a consultative committee attached to each Community Police Centre.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

46. The main points raised at committee meetings should be forwarded to senior police members for their consideration.

☐ agree ☐ disagree

47. Do you believe that committee membership should include individuals who have been in conflict with the law?

_____ yes (please elaborate) _____

47. (Continued)

_____ no (please elaborate) _____

48. Please rank the following items in order from the most often discussed issue at your committee meetings to the least often discussed.

(Place a 1 beside the item which is the most often discussed issue, a 2 beside the item which is the next most often discussed issue, and so on. If it has not been a topic of discussion at your meetings, please leave the item blank.)

identifying local problems..... _____

solving local problems..... _____

crime prevention programs..... _____

aid to victims..... _____

fundraising..... _____

youth crime..... _____

police procedures..... _____

resources for policing..... _____

49. Rank the **three most important things** you believe **should be discussed** at committee meetings.

(Place a 1 beside the most important one; a 2 beside the next most important one; and a 3 beside the next most important one).

identifying local problems..... _____
 solving local problems..... _____
 crime prevention programs..... _____
 aid to victims..... _____
 fundraising..... _____
 youth crime..... _____
 police procedures..... _____
 resources for policing..... _____

For the following items, please place a checkmark () along the scale to indicate your response.

50. I keep my supervisor informed of committee discussions.

--	--	--	--	--

Always Not at all

51. My supervisor asks me about the discussions held during committee meetings.

--	--	--	--	--

Very Never
Frequently

52. Police officers in my division inquire about the discussions held during committee meetings.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
 Very Frequently Never

53. Notes of the main points raised at the meetings are sent to senior police members.

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
 Always Not at all

54. In your opinion, in the next four years, how is the relationship between the police and the public is likely change?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
 Much Improvement Much Worsening

Comments on No. 54: _____

I would be interested to read your comments or elaboration on any issue that was raised in this questionnaire. Please feel free to continue on additional sheets if required.

Thank-you very much for your participation in this study. It is greatly appreciated.

APPENDIX - VI**LIST OF QUESTIONS - COMMITTEE CHAIR**

1. What is the overall objective of your committee?
2. How do you know whether your committee is meeting its objectives?
3. What is the mandate of the committee?
4. How is this committee evaluated or assessed by the Police Service?
5. What type of mechanism do you have in place to obtain input from members of the community regarding the identification of problems in the area served by the committee?
6. Do any of the discussions held during committee meetings go any further than the committee members? For instance, do the main points of the discussions get circulated in the community for their consideration? Does anyone else in the police organization besides the police representatives on the committee see the minutes? Do you know whether they act upon them or not?
7. What do you feel is the main role of community members on this committee?
8. How does the committee set priorities on what they chose to address?
9. Are the roles and responsibilities of all committee members in written form?
10. Do you feel that there should be some consistency across all committees regarding the mandate of the committee?
11. What decision making authority does your committee have? In other words, what kinds of decisions are made, if any?
12. What is your perception of a successful consultative committee?
13. Do you feel members have a clear understanding of their responsibilities as members of the committee?
14. How were the members chosen to participate on this committee?

15. What is your reaction to this statement:

'The partnership principles of community policing recognize the crucial role of the community in the business of policing. In this model, the public plays an influential part in the development of policy, the design of policing strategies, and when appropriate, participates actively in the implementation of those strategies' (Ministry of Solicitor General of Ontario, 1993:5).

(ie. How does your consultative committee contribute to the development of policy and the design of policing strategies?)

16. Do consultative committees make the police more accountable to the community?

17. Is there anything you would like to see changed regarding the process of establishing the consultative committee? (e.g. more direction from the police representative, a formal set of instructions to follow, including a statement of mandate, etc.)

18. Have you heard of the report on Community Consultative Committees by Dick Weiler, 1993 - Ministries of the Solicitor General of Ontario and Canada? Were you given any literature to read on consultative committees or were you left to go on your own the best way you knew how? Do you think that such literature may have helped you when you began this committee?

19. Any comments?

APPENDIX - VII**LIST OF QUESTIONS - PROJECT COORDINATOR, COMMUNITY POLICING
OTTAWA-CARLETON REGIONAL POLICE SERVICE**

1. Why has the Police Service chosen to incorporate these committees into their operations?
2. Whose decision was it to establish these committees in the first place?
3. What is the overall objective of police/community consultative committees?
4. Is there any one or any way to determine whether these committees are achieving their objectives?
5. How are these committees being monitored?
6. How are these committees being evaluated or assessed by the Police Service?
7. What makes these committees any different than past attempts to build better relations between the police and the community?
8. What type of feedback is provided from the committee to the Police Service management?
9. Where does the information go? To a certain area, person, etc.?
10. What is meant by consultative as opposed to advisory?
11. Is there anything in written form that sets the mandate of these committees so that there is consistency across all divisions and also to ensure that the members of the committee are fully aware of the role and objectives of the committee?
12. Keeping in mind that the goal of partnerships in community policing philosophy is to involve the community in setting police policy and to ensure that it bases its priorities on the needs of the community, how much influence do you think that consultative committees will have on the setting of policies and priorities?
13. Are there certain areas that are open to community influence (eg. crime prevention programs) and other areas which are not (e.g. crime identification and problem-solving which both involve police policies, methods, and priorities)?

14. Have the rank-and-file police officers been educated as to the role that consultative committees have in community policing efforts?
15. What type of training did the officers who are on these committees receive in order to effectively consult with the public?
16. What type of training do you feel is needed for members of the public to enable them to serve on this committee?
17. What is your perception of a successful consultative committee?
18. What is the role of the public on these committees?
19. What is your reaction to this statement:
"The partnership principles of community policing recognize the crucial role of the community in the business of policing. In this model, the public plays an influential part in the development of policy, the design of policing strategies and when appropriate, participates actively in the implementation of those strategies" (Ministry of Solicitor General of Ontario, 1993:5).
20. Much of the British literature on consultative committees contend that these committees do not increase or influence police accountability to the public because the input may be received from the public, but the police does not have to act upon it because it is consultation only. The police are not obliged to act upon the wishes of the community. What is your reaction to this statement?
(ie: where does accountability factor into this initiative?)

APPENDIX - VIII**LIST OF QUESTIONS - MEMBER OF POLICE SERVICES BOARD**

1. What is meant by police/community advisory groups?
2. Why has the Police Services Board chosen to incorporate these committees into police operations?
3. What is the overall objective or goal that the Police Services Board sees consultative or advisory committees will hope to achieve?
4. The words 'advisory' and 'consultative' tend to be used interchangeably despite the different connotations connected with each term. What does the Board see as the appropriate label to describe these groups and why?
5. What does the Police Services Board expect from these groups?
6. How much and what type of decision-making authority should these groups have?
7. What types of issues should be discussed at meetings?
8. What role should these groups have at the policy level?
9. What areas of the consultative process deserve or demand the most attention when trying to implement such a strategy?

APPENDIX - IX

CONSTRUCTION OF SECONDARY VARIABLES

The following will provide the questions from the survey which were used to develop the secondary variable, the weight given to each question, and the scale constructed to indicate the degree of presence of the variable:

- **propolice attitude**

	score	
q22a	0.5 (good job = 1)	0.25 (average job = 2)
q22b	0.5 (good job = 1)	0.25 (average job = 2)
q22c	0.5 (good job = 1)	0.25 (average job = 2)
q22d	0.5 (good job = 1)	0.25 (average job = 2)
q24b	0.5 (if response = 1)	
q34	0.25 (if response = 1)	
q38	0.25 (if response = 1)	
q39	0.25 (if response = 0)	
q48	0.25 (if response = 0)	
q60	0.25 (if response = 0)	
q63	0.25 (if response = 1)	

SCALE:

0.0 - 2.0 = low - little to no indication of propolice attitude
 2.25 - 2.75 = medium - some indication of propolice attitude
 3.0 - 4.0 = high - significant indication of propolice attitude

- **accountability**
police to community

	score
q27	1 (if response = 1)
q29	1 (if response = 1)

q65	1 (if response = 1)
q22a	0.5 (if response = 1; 0.25 if response = 2)
q22b	0.5 (same as above)
q22c	0.5 (same as above)
q22d	0.5 (same as above)

SCALE:

0.0 - 2.75 = low - little to no indication of accountability

3.0 - 3.75 = medium - some indication of accountability

4.0 - 5.0 = high - significant indication of accountability

community representatives to community as a whole:

	score:
q26	0.5 (if response = 1)
q31	1.0 (if response = 1)
q32	1.0 (if response = 1)
q47	0.5 (if response = 1)
q61	1.0 (if response = 1)
q69	1.0 (if response = 1; 0.5 if response = 2)

SCALE:

0.0 - 2.5 = low - little to no indication of accountability

3.0 - 3.5 = medium - some indication of accountability

4.0 - 5.0 = high - significant indication of accountability

- **Constructive dialogue**

	score:
q30	1 (if response = 0)
q35	1 (if response = 1)
q41	1 (if response = 0)
q44	1 (if response = 1)
q52	1 (if response = 0)

SCALE:

0 - 3 = low - little to no indication of two-way constructive dialogue

4 - 4 = medium - some indication of constructive dialogue

5 - 5 = high - significant indication of constructive dialogue

• **Community readiness to identify and solve problems**

	score
q38	1 (if response = 0)
q42	1 (if response = 1)
q46	1 (if response = 1)
q55	1 (if response = 1)
q58	1 (if response = 1)
q60	1 (if response = 0)

SCALE:

0 - 3	low - little to no indication of a readiness to identify and solve problems
4 - 5	medium - some indication of a readiness to identify and solve problems
6 - 6	high - significant indication of a readiness to identify and solve problems

• **mutual identification and resolution of problems**

	score
q 25	0.5 (if response = 1)
q26	1.0 (if response = 1)
q27	1.0 (if response = 1)
q29	1.0 (if response = 1)
q30	1.0 (if response = 0)
q36	1.0 (if response = 1)
q38	1.0 (if response = 0)
q42	1.0 (if response = 1)
q43	1.0 (if response = 1)
q57	0.5 (if response = 0)
q58	1.0 (if response = 1)
q60	1.0 (if response = 0)
q63	1.0 (if response = 0)
q66a	1.0 (if response = 1; 0.5 if response = 2; 0.25 if = 3) *other responses = 0
q66b	1.0 (if response = 1; 0.5 if response = 2; 0.25 if = 3) *other responses = 0

SCALE:

0.0 - 9.25	= low - little to no indication of mutual identification and resolution
9.50 - 11.50	= medium - some indication of mutual identification and resolution
11.75 - 14.0	= high- significant indication of mutual identification and resolution

• **committee influence on quality of life in community and relationship with the police**

	score
q39	1.0 (if response = 0)
q45	1.0 (if response = 1)
q54	1.0 (if response = 1)
q71	1.0 (if response = 1; 0.5 if response = 2; rest = 0)

SCALE:

0.0 - 3.25 = low - little to no indication of quality of life

2.0 - 2.5 = med - some indication of quality of life

3.0 - 4.0 = high - significant indication of quality of life

• **Consultation**

	score
q25	1.0 (if response = 1)
q26	1.0 (if response = 1)
q30	1.0 (if response = 0)
q31	1.0 (if response = 1)
q32	0.5 (if response = 1)
q35	1.0 (if response = 1)
q36	1.0 (if response = 1)
q42	1.0 (if response = 1)
q44	0.5 (if response = 1)
q47	1.0 (if response = 1)
q57	0.5 (if response = 0)
q58	1.0 (if response = 1)
q60	0.5 (if response = 0)
q61	1.0 (if response = 1)
q65	1.0 (if response = 1)
q69	1.0 (if response = 1; 0.5 if response = 2; 0.25 if = 3)
q70	1.0 (if response = 1; 0.5 if response = 2; 0.25 if = 3)

SCALE:

0.0 - 6.0 = low - little to no indication of consultation

6.5 - 7.0 = medium - some indication of consultation

7.5 - 15.0 = high - significant indication of consultation

- **Mandate (presence of mandate as principally identification and resolution of community problems)**

	score
q42	1.0 (if response = 1)
q46	1.0 (if response = 1)
q49	1.0 (if response = 0)
q50	1.0 (if response = 0)
q55	1.0 (if response = 1)
q66a	1.0 (if response = 1; 0.5 if response= 2; 0.25 if = 3)
q66b	1.0 (if response = 1; 0.5 if response= 2; 0.25 if = 3)

SCALE:

0.0 - 3.25 = low - little to no indication of mandate

3.5 - 5.75 medium - some indication of mandate

6.0 - 7.0 high - significant indication of mandate

- **Penetration**

	score:
q33	1.0 (if response = 1)
q37	0.5 (if response = 1)
q40	0.5 (if response = 1)
q59	1.0 (if response = 1)

SCALE:

0.0 - 1.0 = low - little to no indication of penetration

1.5 - 2.0 = medium - some indication of penetration

2.5 - 3.0 = high - significant indication of penetration

APPENDIX - X**SECONDARY VARIABLES - RESULTS**

- propolice attitude (PROPOL)
- accountability: < police to community (POLICE ACCT)
 <community representatives to the community as a whole
 (COMREP)
- constructive dialogue (CONDIA)
- community readiness to identify and solve problems (COREAD)
- mutual identification and resolution of problems (MUTIDENT)
- quality of life (QUALIFE)
- consultation (CONSULT)
- mandate (MANDATE)
- penetration (PENETR)

PROPOL	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
low	6	25.0	6	25.0
med	9	37.5	15	62.5
hi	9	37.5	24	100.0

POLICE ACCT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
low	6	25.0	6	25.0
med	9	37.5	15	62.5
hi	9	37.5	24	100.0

COMREP	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
low	6	25.0	6	25.0
med	11	45.8	17	70.8
hi	7	29.2	24	100.0

CONDIA	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
low	5	20.8	5	20.8
med	9	37.5	14	58.3
hi	10	41.7	24	100.0

COREAD	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
low	3	12.5	3	12.5
med	15	62.5	18	75.0
hi	6	25.0	24	100.0

MUTIDENT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
low	5	20.8	5	20.8
med	13	54.2	18	75.0
hi	6	25.0	24	100.0

QUALIFE	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
low	5	20.8	5	20.8
med	8	33.3	13	54.2
hi	11	45.8	24	100.0

CONSULT	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
low	6	25.0	6	25.0
med	10	41.7	16	66.7
hi	8	33.3	24	100.0

MANDATE	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
low	2	8.3	2	8.3
med	22	91.7	24	100.0

PENETR	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
low	16	66.7	16	66.7
med	2	8.3	18	75.0
hi	6	25.0	24	100.0

APPENDIX - XI**UNIVARIATE TABLES - COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE**

Q1	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
F	8	33.3	8	33.3
M	16	66.7	24	100.0

Q2	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	17	70.8	17	70.8
2	4	16.7	21	87.5
3	1	4.2	22	91.7
4	1	4.2	23	95.8
5	1	4.2	24	100.0

Q3	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	1	4.2	1	4.2
2	1	4.2	2	8.3
3	1	4.2	3	12.5
4	2	8.3	5	20.8
5	2	8.3	7	29.2
6	1	4.2	8	33.3
7	12	50.0	20	83.3
8	4	16.7	24	100.0

Q4	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
2	1	4.2	1	4.2
3	14	58.3	15	62.5
4	8	33.3	23	95.8
5	1	4.2	24	100.0

Q5	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	3	12.5	3	12.5
2	18	75.0	21	87.5
3	1	4.2	22	91.7
5	2	8.3	24	100.0

Q6	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	1	4.2	1	4.2
2	4	16.7	5	20.8
3	9	37.5	14	58.3
4	8	33.3	22	91.7
5	2	8.3	24	100.0

Q7A	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	3	100.0	3	100.0

Frequency Missing = 21

Q7B	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	3	100.0	3	100.0

Frequency Missing = 21

Q7C	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	1	100.0	1	100.0

Frequency Missing = 23

Q7D	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	5	100.0	5	100.0

Frequency Missing = 19

Q7F	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	2	100.0	2	100.0

Frequency Missing = 22

Q7G	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	10	100.0	10	100.0

Frequency Missing = 14

Q7I	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	1	100.0	1	100.0

Frequency Missing = 23

Q7J	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	10	100.0	10	100.0

Frequency Missing = 14

Q7K	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	2	100.0	2	100.0

Frequency Missing = 22

Q8	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	20	90.9	20	90.9
1	2	9.1	22	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

Q9	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	2	8.3	2	8.3
2	5	20.8	7	29.2
3	17	70.8	24	100.0

Q10	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	6	25.0	6	25.0
1	18	75.0	24	100.0

Q11	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	13	54.2	13	54.2
1	11	45.8	24	100.0

Q12	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Apr95	2	8.3	2	8.3
Dec94	1	4.2	3	12.5
Feb95	1	4.2	4	16.7
Jan95	2	8.3	6	25.0
Jun94	1	4.2	7	29.2
Jun95	3	12.5	10	41.7
Mar90	1	4.2	11	45.8
Mar95	3	12.5	14	58.3
May91	1	4.2	15	62.5
May95	4	16.7	19	79.2
Oct93	1	4.2	20	83.3
Oct95	1	4.2	21	87.5
Sep94	3	12.5	24	100.0

Q13	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	17	70.8	17	70.8
2	6	25.0	23	95.8
4	1	4.2	24	100.0

Q14	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	6	25.0	6	25.0
1	18	75.0	24	100.0

Q15	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	11	52.4	11	52.4
1	10	47.6	21	100.0

Frequency Missing = 3

Q16	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	1	4.2	1	4.2
2	7	29.2	8	33.3
3	16	66.7	24	100.0

Q17	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	7	29.2	7	29.2
2	2	8.3	9	37.5
3	10	41.7	19	79.2
4	5	20.8	24	100.0

Q18	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	8	33.3	8	33.3
2	3	12.5	11	45.8
3	7	29.2	18	75.0
4	6	25.0	24	100.0

Q19	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
2	3	12.5	3	12.5
3	5	20.8	8	33.3
4	9	37.5	17	70.8

5	3	12.5	20	83.3
6	4	16.7	24	100.0

Q20	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	19	90.5	19	90.5
1	2	9.5	21	100.0

Frequency Missing = 3

Q21	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	1	16.7	1	16.7
2	5	83.3	6	100.0

Frequency Missing = 18

Q22A	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	12	50.0	12	50.0
2	10	41.7	22	91.7
4	2	8.3	24	100.0

Q22B	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	8	33.3	8	33.3
2	12	50.0	20	83.3
3	2	8.3	22	91.7
4	2	8.3	24	100.0

Q22C	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	17	70.8	17	70.8
2	7	29.2	24	100.0

Q22D	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	12	50.0	12	50.0
2	10	41.7	22	91.7
3	2	8.3	24	100.0

Q23	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	3	13.0	3	13.0
1	20	87.0	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q24A	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	3	20.0	3	20.0
3	4	26.7	7	46.7
6	1	6.7	8	53.3
7	1	6.7	9	60.0
8	6	40.0	15	100.0

Frequency Missing = 9

Q24B	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	2	11.8	2	11.8
1	15	88.2	17	100.0

Frequency Missing = 7

Q25	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	20	83.3	20	83.3
1	4	16.7	24	100.0

Q26	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	5	20.8	5	20.8
1	19	79.2	24	100.0

Q27	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	9	37.5	9	37.5
1	15	62.5	24	100.0

Q28	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	17	77.3	17	77.3
1	5	22.7	22	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

Q29	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	1	4.8	1	4.8
1	20	95.2	21	100.0

Frequency Missing = 3

Q30	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	21	91.3	21	91.3
1	2	8.7	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q31	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	2	9.1	2	9.1
1	20	90.9	22	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

Q32	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	8	34.8	8	34.8
1	15	65.2	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q33	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	15	68.2	15	68.2
1	7	31.8	22	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

Q34	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	11	52.4	11	52.4
1	10	47.6	21	100.0

Frequency Missing = 3

Q35	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	2	8.3	2	8.3
1	22	91.7	24	100.0

Q36	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	24	100.0	24	100.0

Q37	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	20	90.9	20	90.9
1	2	9.1	22	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

Q38	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	24	100.0	24	100.0

Q39	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	22	91.7	22	91.7
1	2	8.3	24	100.0

Q40	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	22	95.7	22	95.7
1	1	4.3	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q41	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	19	79.2	19	79.2
1	5	20.8	24	100.0

Q42	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	23	100.0	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q43	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	2	8.3	2	8.3
1	22	91.7	24	100.0

Q44	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	24	100.0	24	100.0

Q45	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	2	8.3	2	8.3
1	22	91.7	24	100.0

Q46	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	16	72.7	16	72.7
1	6	27.3	22	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

Q47	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	4	17.4	4	17.4
1	19	82.6	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q48	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	12	70.6	12	70.6
1	5	29.4	17	100.0

Frequency Missing = 7

Q49	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	22	91.7	22	91.7
1	2	8.3	24	100.0

Q50	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	15	62.5	15	62.5
1	9	37.5	24	100.0

Q51	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	4	18.2	4	18.2
1	18	81.8	22	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

Q52	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	15	65.2	15	65.2
1	8	34.8	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q53	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	14	60.9	14	60.9
1	9	39.1	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q54	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	1	4.3	1	4.3
1	22	95.7	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q55	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	3	12.5	3	12.5
1	21	87.5	24	100.0

Q56	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	2	8.3	2	8.3
1	22	91.7	24	100.0

Q57	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	21	91.3	21	91.3
1	2	8.7	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q58	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	2	8.7	2	8.7
1	21	91.3	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q59	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	9	37.5	9	37.5
1	15	62.5	24	100.0

Q60	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	17	73.9	17	73.9
1	6	26.1	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q61	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	12	54.5	12	54.5
1	10	45.5	22	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

Q62	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	1	4.2	1	4.2
1	23	95.8	24	100.0

Q63	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	11	45.8	11	45.8
1	13	54.2	24	100.0

Q64	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	15	62.5	15	62.5
1	9	37.5	24	100.0

Q65	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
0	6	25.0	6	25.0
1	18	75.0	24	100.0

Q66A	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	9	42.9	9	42.9
2	5	23.8	14	66.7
3	5	23.8	19	90.5
4	2	9.5	21	100.0

Frequency Missing = 3

Q66B	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	1	5.6	1	5.6
2	3	16.7	4	22.2
3	8	44.4	12	66.7
4	3	16.7	15	83.3
5	3	16.7	18	100.0

Frequency Missing = 6

Q66C	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	6	31.6	6	31.6
2	4	21.1	10	52.6
3	3	15.8	13	68.4
4	4	21.1	17	89.5
5	2	10.5	19	100.0

Frequency Missing = 5

Q66D	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
6	3	27.3	3	27.3
7	4	36.4	7	63.6
8	4	36.4	11	100.0

Frequency Missing = 13

Q66E	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	4	21.1	4	21.1
2	1	5.3	5	26.3
3	3	15.8	8	42.1
4	5	26.3	13	68.4
6	2	10.5	15	78.9
8	4	21.1	19	100.0

Frequency Missing = 5

Q66F	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	3	15.8	3	15.8
2	2	10.5	5	26.3
3	1	5.3	6	31.6
4	5	26.3	11	57.9
5	6	31.6	17	89.5
6	1	5.3	18	94.7
7	1	5.3	19	100.0

Frequency Missing = 5

Q66G	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
2	1	7.1	1	7.1
5	4	28.6	5	35.7
6	3	21.4	8	57.1
7	3	21.4	11	78.6
8	3	21.4	14	100.0

Frequency Missing = 10

Q66H	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
2	3	15.0	3	15.0
3	2	10.0	5	25.0
4	1	5.0	6	30.0
5	4	20.0	10	50.0
6	5	25.0	15	75.0
7	5	25.0	20	100.0

Frequency Missing = 4

Q67A	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	15	71.4	15	71.4
2	5	23.8	20	95.2
3	1	4.8	21	100.0

Frequency Missing = 3

Q67B	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
2	7	50.0	7	50.0
3	7	50.0	14	100.0

Frequency Missing = 10

Q67C	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	6	33.3	6	33.3
2	7	38.9	13	72.2
3	5	27.8	18	100.0

Frequency Missing = 6

Q67D	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
3	1	100.0	1	100.0

Frequency Missing = 23

Q67E	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
2	1	50.0	1	50.0
3	1	50.0	2	100.0

Frequency Missing = 22

Q67F	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	2	25.0	2	25.0
2	1	12.5	3	37.5
3	5	62.5	8	100.0

Frequency Missing = 16

Q67G	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
3	1	100.0	1	100.0

Frequency Missing = 23

Q67H	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
2	2	66.7	2	66.7
3	1	33.3	3	100.0

Frequency Missing = 21

Q67I	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
3	1	100.0	1	100.0

Frequency Missing = 23

Q68A	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
2	4	21.1	4	21.1
4	2	10.5	6	31.6
5	4	21.1	10	52.6
6	1	5.3	11	57.9
7	4	21.1	15	78.9
9	4	21.1	19	100.0

Frequency Missing = 5

Q68B	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
2	1	4.8	1	4.8
3	3	14.3	4	19.0
4	3	14.3	7	33.3
5	2	9.5	9	42.9
6	4	19.0	13	61.9
7	1	4.8	14	66.7
8	6	28.6	20	95.2
9	1	4.8	21	100.0

Frequency Missing = 3

Q68C	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	2	10.0	2	10.0
2	4	20.0	6	30.0
3	4	20.0	10	50.0
4	4	20.0	14	70.0
6	1	5.0	15	75.0
7	3	15.0	18	90.0
8	2	10.0	20	100.0

Frequency Missing = 4

Q68D	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	5	26.3	5	26.3
2	1	5.3	6	31.6
3	3	15.8	9	47.4
4	2	10.5	11	57.9

5	1	5.3	12	63.2
6	3	15.8	15	78.9
8	1	5.3	16	84.2
9	3	15.8	19	100.0

Frequency Missing = 5

Q68E	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	3	15.0	3	15.0
2	4	20.0	7	35.0
3	3	15.0	10	50.0
4	4	20.0	14	70.0
5	3	15.0	17	85.0
6	2	10.0	19	95.0
7	1	5.0	20	100.0

Frequency Missing = 4

Q68F	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	2	9.5	2	9.5
2	4	19.0	6	28.6
3	3	14.3	9	42.9
4	2	9.5	11	52.4
5	3	14.3	14	66.7
6	4	19.0	18	85.7
7	2	9.5	20	95.2
8	1	4.8	21	100.0

Frequency Missing = 3

Q68G	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
2	1	5.3	1	5.3
3	2	10.5	3	15.8
5	1	5.3	4	21.1
6	1	5.3	5	26.3
7	4	21.1	9	47.4
8	7	36.8	16	84.2
9	3	15.8	19	100.0

Frequency Missing = 5

Q68H	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	10	47.6	10	47.6
2	2	9.5	12	57.1
3	4	19.0	16	76.2
4	1	4.8	17	81.0
5	2	9.5	19	90.5
7	1	4.8	20	95.2
8	1	4.8	21	100.0

Frequency Missing = 3

Q68I	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
2	1	5.6	1	5.6
4	1	5.6	2	11.1
5	3	16.7	5	27.8
6	3	16.7	8	44.4
7	3	16.7	11	61.1
8	1	5.6	12	66.7
9	6	33.3	18	100.0

Frequency Missing = 6

Q69	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	10	43.5	10	43.5
2	5	21.7	15	65.2
3	3	13.0	18	78.3
4	3	13.0	21	91.3
5	2	8.7	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q70	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	1	4.5	1	4.5
2	1	4.5	2	9.1
3	5	22.7	7	31.8
4	7	31.8	14	63.6
5	8	36.4	22	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

Q71	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
1	3	13.6	3	13.6
2	13	59.1	16	72.7
3	6	27.3	22	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

APPENDIX - XII**QUESTIONS REQUIRING DIVISIONS - COMMUNITY QUESTIONNAIRE**

Question 2:

1 = employed; 2-5 = not employed

Question 3:

1-6 = elementary to some university; 7-8 = university to post graduate

Question 4:

2 = age 18-24, 3 = age 25-44; 4-5 = over 44

Question 5:

2 = married; 1, 3-5 = other

Question 6:

1-2 = \$49,999 and under; 3-4 = \$50,000 and above

Question 9:

1-2 = 5 years or less

3 = more than 5 years

Question 13:

1 = attend meetings each time; 2 = most of the time

Question 22a:

1 = good job; 2 = average (no one responded 3 - poor job)

Question 22b:

1-2 = average to good job; 3 = poor job

Question 22c:

1 = good job; 2 = average (no one responded 3 - poor job)

Question 22d:

1-2 = average to good job; 3 = poor job

Question 69:

1-2 = usually to always inform the community; 3-5 = sometimes to never inform

Question 70:

1-3 = very frequently to sometimes; 4-5 = seldom to never

Question 71:

1-2 = much improvement to some improvement; 3 = no change

APPENDIX - XIII**RESULTS OF DIVISIONS**

Q2	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
employ	17	70.8	17	70.8
unempl	7	29.2	24	100.0

Q3	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
elemuniv	8	33.3	8	33.3
univplus	16	66.7	24	100.0

Q4	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
under25	1	4.2	1	4.2
25to44	14	58.3	15	62.5
over44	9	37.5	24	100.0

Q5	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
other	6	25.0	6	25.0
married	18	75.0	24	100.0

Q6	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
under50k	5	20.8	5	20.8
50kover	17	70.8	22	91.7
dont't know	2	8.3	24	100.0

Q9	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
Sorless	7	29.2	7	29.2
moreth5	17	70.8	24	100.0

Q13	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
alltime	17	70.8	17	70.8
mostime	6	25.0	23	95.8
don't know	1	4.2	24	100.0

Q22A	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
goodjob	12	50.0	12	50.0
avejob	10	41.7	22	91.7
don't know	2	8.3	24	100.0

Q22B	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
avegood	20	83.3	20	83.3
poorjob	2	8.3	22	91.7
don't know	2	8.3	24	100.0

Q22C	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
goodjob	17	70.8	17	70.8
avejob	7	29.2	24	100.0

Q22D	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
avegood	22	91.7	22	91.7
poorjob	2	8.3	24	100.0
			Cumulative	Cumulative

Q69	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
usualw	15	65.2	15	65.2
somenev	8	34.8	23	100.0

Frequency Missing = 1

Q70	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
freqsome	7	31.8	7	31.8
seldnev	15	68.2	22	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

Q71	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency	Cumulative Percent
muchsom	16	72.7	16	72.7
nochange	6	27.3	22	100.0

Frequency Missing = 2

APPENDIX - XIV
TABULATION OF POLICE RESPONSES

POLICE COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

1. JANICE GILLIS :

GROUP F6

QUESTION #	2	2	3	3	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	8	9	9	10	10	11	11	12
SURVEY #	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A
F6	1		1		1		1		1		1	1			1		1	1	1		1
F5	1		1		1		1		1		1	1			1		1	1	1		1
F4	1		1		1		1		1		1	1			1		1		1		1
F2	1			1	1		1		1		1	1			1		1		1		1
F1	1		1		1		1		1		1	1			1		1	1	1		1
TOTAL RESPONSES	5	0	4	1	4	1	1	4	0	5	0	5	5	0	0	5	0	5	3	2	5

POLICE COMMUNITY CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEES

JANICE GILLIS

GROUP F6

QUESTION #	2	2	3	3	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	8	9	9	10	10	11	11	12
SURVEY #	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A	D	A
F6	1		1		1			1		1		1	1			1		1	1		1
F5	1		1		1		1			1		1	1			1		1	1		1
F4	1		1			1		1		1		1	1			1		1		1	1
F2	1			1	1			1		1		1	1			1		1		1	1
F1	1		1		1			1		1		1	1			1		1	1		1
TOTAL RESPONSES	5	0	4	1	4	1	1	4	0	5	0	5	5	0	0	5	0	5	3	2	5

26	26	27	27	28	28	29	29	30	30	31	31	32	32	33	33	34	34	35	35	36	36	37	37	38	38	39
A	D																									
1		1		1	1			1		1		1	1			1		1		1		1		1	1	1
	1	1		1	1			1	1			1	1			1		1		1		1		1	1	1
1		1		1	1			1			1	1		1		1		1		1	1		1		1	1
1			1	1		1	1	1		1		1		1		1	1	1		1		1		1	1	1
	1	1		1		1	1	1		1		1		1		1	1	1		1		1		1	1	1
3	2	4	1	0	5	3	2	4	1	4	1	2	3	3	2	2	3	5	0	4	1	2	3	2	3	4

39	40	40	41	41	42	42	43	43	44	44	45	45	46	46	47	QUESTION 48										QUES		
																I	S	C	A	F	Y	P	R		I	S	C	
	1		1		1		1		1		1		1	1	7	4	3	5	2	1	6	8			2			
	1		1		1			1	1		1		1	1	7	4	3	5	2	1	6	8			2			
1	1		1		1		1	1		1		1	2	1	2	4	7	3	6	8	5		1	2				
	1		1		1		1	1		1		1	2	6	2	1	3	4	5	7	8		1	2	3			
		1		1	1		1		1		1	1	1	1	3	2	8	7	6	5	4		1	2	3			
1	4	1	4	1	3	2	1	4	2	3	4	1	2	3	7	22	15	13	28	18	19	32	33	3	6	10		

TION 49

QUESTION 50

QUESTION 51

QUESTION 52

QUESTION 53

QUE

A	F	Y	P	R	AL	FR	O	S	N	AL	FR	O	S	N	AL	FR	O	S	N	AL	FR	O	S	N	AL	FR
3	1				1					1					1					1					1	
3	1				1					1					1					1					1	
				3	1								1						1					1		
					1								1						1					1		
						1																				
							1																			
6	0	2	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	3	1	0	1	2	3