

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION STUDY

by

**Justine H. Lovig
Wesley G. Skogan**

The Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium is located at the Institute for Policy Research, Northwestern University. It also includes faculty and students from Loyola University of Chicago, DePaul University and the University of Illinois-Chicago. It is supported by grants from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, the Chicago Community Trust, and the National Institute of Justice, US Department of Justice.

16 February 1995

ORGANIZATIONAL INVOLVEMENT IN COMMUNITY POLICING

While there has been a great deal of interest in the police role in community policing, much less attention has been paid to the community side of the equation. Across the country, groups are agitating for a role in determining how the crime problems facing their neighborhood are defined and prioritized, and for a clearly defined role in influencing how police will work with them to solve those problems. The rhetoric of community policing is that community groups must have such a role, for without the active participation of groups as partners in the enterprise, community policing will fail. The co-production perspective that dominates both community crime prevention theory and the thinking of many about community policing assumes that voluntary action by neighborhood residents can play an important role in maintaining order in a cost-effective and constitutional manner. However, despite the frequent use of strong language to this effect, there has been remarkably little research on the role that civilian organizations have actually played in any policing effort.

Chicago's community policing effort shares this rhetoric of community involvement. The department's mission statement notes,

"... the Department and the rest of the community must establish new ways of actually working together. New methods must be put in place to jointly identify problems, propose solutions, and implement changes. The Department's ultimate goal should be community empowerment" (Chicago Police Department, 1994: 16).

Chicago's experiment with community policing began in five prototype areas of the city. The program, dubbed "CAPS" (Chicago's Alternative Policing Strategy) represents a transition from incident-driven to community-oriented policing.

Officers in the prototype police districts were reorganized into beat teams and rapid response teams, so that the former could be freed from 911 calls in order to devote significant periods to turf-based problem solving under the supervision of their sergeants. All of the prototype officers received some special training. The program was closely linked with the delivery of city services, through special service request forms.

While community policing was a new concept in Chicago, community organizations prepared for its arrival far in advance of the formal announcement of CAPS. Then they began jockeying for influence over its operation. Citywide umbrella organizations such as CANS (Chicago Alliance for Neighborhood Safety, an umbrella group with Alinsky roots) agitated for community policing for several years. CANS representatives visited several cities to observe active community policing programs. The Citywide Task Force on Community Policing represents 70 organizations pressing for the program. Local foundations have also funded technical assistance for organizations to help get them involved in community policing.

This study examined the role of community organizations in CAPS during its first year. It is based on survey interviews with hundreds of organizational informants on the roles that their organizations were playing in Chicago's community policing program. One goal of the project was to determine to what degree community organizations in the five prototype districts were involved in CAPS during its first year of implementation. The survey was designed to capture information on differences in CAPS involvement between various types of organizations, and between the five prototype districts in which it was being tested. The study thus documents how they mobilized to influence the shape of community policing in the city's five prototype areas.

This report first describes these levels of involvement, and then it advances some explanations for organizational involvement in CAPS and differences in the extent of mobilization around CAPS in the five prototype districts. The general analytic model guiding this analysis is presented in Figure 1. It proposes that the type and extent of involvement of organizations in community policing is directly responsive to features of the organizations themselves. These include the goals of the organizations, how they are organized to meet them, and the scope of their territorial involvement and relationships with other organizations. In turn, those organizational factors are related to the constituencies that they serve. In this context, differences in race and class are related to the kinds of organizations that they are, for different constituencies have different needs that their organizations fulfill. We anticipated that variations in the extent of organizational involvement in community policing across police districts would primarily be explained by differences from place to place in the kinds of organizations that are active there, and thus the kinds of needs that are being served in the different districts.

COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

In this study, an "organization" was a turf-based group with a name. Their size, structure, activity, and longevity were variables, and not part of the definition of an organization. Sample organizations also had to be turf-based; that is, they had to define their scope geographically, at least in part. The sample was composed of named, turf-based organizations.

This definition encompassed a wide variety of organizations. In Chicago parlance, the basic organizational unit of a residential neighborhood is a *block club*. This encompasses a small expanse of turf, typically three to four square blocks, and usually it is named after streets or intersections, or it has an adopted local neighborhood name. *Umbrella organizations* are federations of organizations,

mostly block groups. While they often are sparked by individual activists, their membership base is primarily other organizations. We also found that a surprising number of *client serving organizations* were active in CAPS. Supported by grants and contracts or fees for service, they were service-providing rather than membership-based organizations. *Churches* fell within our net if they engaged in identifiable political, social, or economic development activities. Local *merchants' associations* typically represent small businesses clustered at the intersection of major arterials or spread along four to five block arterial strips, and they fell into our sample as well.

THE ORGANIZATION SURVEY

After a thorough pilot test, interviews were conducted with knowledgeable informants representing 253 organizations active in the five prototype districts.¹ The interviews were carried out between May and September, 1994. A variety of approaches were used to develop a sample of organizations and informants that was diverse and inclusive. Lists of organizations were contributed by other area researchers, local knowledgeable, and police commanders and neighborhood relations officers. We listed contacts we made at a host of community meetings, and each time we conducted an interview with an organizational informant we asked about other organizations that they had encountered. We also culled local news articles and newsletters to locate additional organizations and named contacts to add to the list. Finally, during the survey respondents were asked to share the names of other community organizations, knowledgeable contacts and phone numbers. While it is not really appropriate to characterize the collection of organizations

¹ A complete description of the survey methodology can be found in Lovig and VanStedum, 1995.

assembled as a "sample" of a bounded universe of units, nor to assume any of the distributional characteristics that come with random sampling, it is unlikely that we overlooked any important organizations that were active in the prototype areas.

Whenever possible, data was gathered from two respondents representing each organization, so that the results might transcend some of the errors introduced by the use of a single organizational informant. Generally, when two respondents were interviewed, they held different positions within the organization, so they were able to bring different - though not necessarily better or more complete - knowledge and experience to the survey data. For the most part, when two people were interviewed about an organization, responses to a question were consistent. However, respondents tended to agree less often when asked to make subjective assessments, such as ratings of the quality of police service or the impact of CAPS on the community. Depending on the measure being developed, pairs of responses to the same survey measures were combined to create organization-level measures. The aim was always to capitalize on the heterogeneity of two respondents' knowledge when possible. Altogether, 476 interviews were conducted; two respondents were interviewed concerning 222 organizations, while only one respondent could be interviewed about 28 organizations.

The survey instrument was developed to answer the following questions:

- What were the organizations doing regarding CAPS?
- Were there differences between the districts in organizational involvement in CAPS, and how can these differences be explained?

Items in the questionnaire ranged from questions on organizational missions and goals to organizational activities and involvement in CAPS-related efforts. Information was also gathered on organizational variables, such as their structure,

funding, staffing, and alliances with other organizations. In addition to the individual items in the questionnaire, analytic measures combining responses to several questions were developed to more fully answer the primary research questions.

ORGANIZATIONAL INVOLVEMENT IN CAPS

One of the questions explored in the survey was what community organizations were doing in regards to CAPS. The questionnaire gathered information on organizations' involvement with CAPS in the past year. Respondents were asked a number of questions about their organization's activities (e.g., do they hold general public meetings, do fund raising, etc.). After they described their activities, they were asked as a follow-up whether each activity was CAPS-related. This section was followed by a sequence of questions explicitly probing for CAPS-related activities, such as "encouraging people to attend CAPS-related meetings?" Responses to these two sets of items were used to score each organization in terms of its type and intensity of involvement in CAPS.

A factor analysis using oblimin rotation (which allowed the factors to be correlated) clustered 14 of the 18 involvement items into three categories of organizational involvement in CAPS activities. The three factors were labeled: Participation in CAPS, Promotion of CAPS, and Turf-based CAPS Activity.

Participation in CAPS

The first of these activity clusters, Participating in CAPS, included items identifying organizations making use of or taking part in the most frequent CAPS-related activities. The items included in this cluster were:

Has your group been working directly with beat officers?

Has your group been encouraging people to make CAPS service requests?

Has your group been having someone attend CAPS-related meetings?

Has your group been encouraging people to attend CAPS-related meetings?

Has your group been hosting CAPS-related meetings?

Has your group been holding general, public [CAPS-related] meetings?

Has your group been distributing [CAPS-related] newsletters or flyers?

Every district had groups that were involved in all seven of these activities, including both the most powerful civic associations in the community and some of the smallest block clubs. The most active organizations included the Edgewater Community Council and the Arthur Avenue Neighbors (24th District); the Roseland Coalition for Community Control and the 1100/1200 West 95th Street Block Club (22nd); the Austin People's Action Center and the Phoenix Society (15th); the United Neighborhood Organization (UNO) and Our Lady of Tepeyac Church (10th); and the Association of Communities Organizing for Reform Now (ACORN) and St. Benedict the African Parish (7th).

The Edgewater Community Council provided a professional organizer to spearhead CAPS organizing in the area it served. It located church basements for holding beat meetings, advertised them in the Council's monthly newsletter, built a network of block representatives to distribute flyers, supported the involvement of block clubs with beat teams, and fostered the creation of a special committee of local activists who met with beat team members on a monthly basis to analyze local problems. The Council's organizer played a significant role in conducting beat meetings until local leadership could emerge and kept beat activists informed about citywide community policing efforts.

Activities in this category often involved only a moderate level of investment in CAPS, for in many instances they made use of the newly-created

CAPS infrastructure, including police beat teams, public beat meetings, District Advisory Committees, and CAPS city services request forms. In these cases, organizational participation was a matter of referring people to or hosting scheduled meetings, or distributing existing flyers or brochures.

Table 1 presents the percentage of organizations that reported involvement in each of the 18 survey measures. The activities that were reported the most frequently in the Participation in CAPS cluster were "attending meetings" (75 percent); "encouraging people to attend (CAPS-related meetings)" (71 percent); and "working directly with beat officers" (70 percent). The activities that were reported the least frequently were "hosting CAPS meetings" (33 percent); "distributing flyers" (45 percent); and "holding CAPS-related meetings" (46 percent). In general, the activities that were reported more frequently were those requiring less organizational initiative; it was easier to attend a meeting that was already arranged, or to encourage others to do so, or simply work with beat officers, than to take on the responsibility of hosting a meeting or even distributing flyers.

Promoting CAPS

The second activity cluster included measures indicating that organizations had taken the initiative to become involved in promoting CAPS. High levels of participation on these items indicate a more intense level of involvement in CAPS, because the component items required more extensive outreach effort. The items in this group were:

Has your group been doing any CAPS-related training?

Has your group formed a group or started a CAPS-related program?

Has [your group] received any gifts or funding because of CAPS?

Has your group contacted the media [for a reason relating to CAPS]?

Has your group been picketing, or having a march or vigil [related to CAPS]?

Responses to the last question in the list also clustered to some extent with the third factor, Turf-Based Activity, but is included here.

Organization UNO, a loose affiliation of Hispanic leaders, provides a good example of CAPS promotion. Organization Uno began working with police to increase Hispanic involvement in CAPS. They drew a Spanish-language radio station into their meetings, and the station agreed to air a one-hour talk show about the program each month. The show, which featured Spanish-speaking police officers, informed listeners about the program, beat meetings, and crime prevention (Whelan, 1995).

The activities in this cluster that were reported least frequently were "[procuring] CAPS-related funding" (8 percent), and "[CAPS-related] Picketing" (12 percent). The most frequently reported efforts were "doing CAPS training" (26 percent), and "forming a CAPS group or program" (20 percent).

Turf-Based CAPS Activity

The third involvement cluster included two neighborhood-based activities.

The questions were:

Has your group started or supported a [CAPS-related] neighborhood patrol?

Has your group started or supported a [CAPS-related] neighborhood block watch?

Overall, 44 percent of the organizations we surveyed reported one or more of these turf-based activities. The most frequent activity in this cluster was "neighborhood block watch," which was reported by 42 percent of the organizations. "Neighborhood patrol" activity was claimed by 35 percent of them. The list of

organizations that were heavily involved in these activities was weighted toward block clubs. Both patrol and block watch efforts were reported by the Crime Stoppers C.B. Patrol in Englewood, Por Un Barrio Mejor in Marquette, the Island Civic Association in Austin, the 1700 West 89th Street Block Club in the Morgan Park district, and the Jargowood Block Club in Rogers Park.

Other Activities

Finally, there were four involvement measures which did not cluster with the others in the survey. These were:

Has your group held [CAPS-related] community activist meetings?

Has your group contacted governmental service agencies [for a reason related to CAPS]?

Has your group developed a new service [related to CAPS]?

Has your group done anything else [related to CAPS]?

Responses to these four questions did not correspond to those in the clusters described above, but pointed to other distinctive CAPS-related efforts. Twenty-six percent of the organizations reported holding community activist meetings regarding CAPS, and 33 percent contacted government service agencies; 9 percent developed a service of their own.

Because reports of these activities clustered together, it was also useful to develop summary measures of the extent to which organizations participated in CAPS, promoted it, and engaged in neighborhood patrols or block watch programs. Each organization was scored by the percentage of the activities in each grouping that they were involved in. For example, an organization that was involved in all seven Participation activities would receive a score of "100" (41 actually did), while organizations that did not do any of them received a "zero" (36 fell in this category). Only eight organization were involved in all five Promotional activities, but 82

organizations were linked to both neighborhood patrols and block watch efforts, giving them a score of "100" on that measure.

These summary scores enable us to summarize the general level of CAPS involvement by groups in each prototype district. The results are presented in Figure 2. Organizations active in the Morgan Park district and Rogers Park were the most involved in CAPS. In both districts, the average level of organizational participation stood at 70 percent. Many fewer organizations were involved in Promoting CAPS, but in Rogers Park the average group was involved in more than one-quarter of those activities. In both areas organizations scored an average of almost 50 percent on the Turf-Based Activities index. Organizations in Englewood also stood out. They engaged in almost 60 percent of the Participation activities, and their level of turf-based involvement almost equaled Morgan Park and Rogers Park. Organizations in Austin (which closely resembles Englewood in terms of demography) came next on every measure, while those in Marquette reported the lowest levels of involvement in every case.

This consistent variation across the five districts suggests that there are factors that systematically affect levels of CAPS involvement, and that these factors in turn vary across districts. In the next section, we will describe selected characteristics of the organizations active in the prototype districts, and explore the connection between these factors and the level of organizational involvement in CAPS.

PATTERNS OF ORGANIZATION INVOLVEMENT

This section first describes the characteristics of the organizations that were active in the prototype areas, including their goals and how they were organized to achieve them. Then it examines the relationship between these characteristics and the extent to which the organizations were involved in various CAPS-related activities.

Organizational Mission

The informant questionnaire gathered information on a number of key organizational characteristics. From these, analytic measures were developed describing their purpose. An open-ended question asked respondents to "briefly describe your organization's overall mission." It produced a variety of responses. Each informant was allowed to describe these missions in their own terms. In practice the purposes of their organizations were often closely intertwined with descriptions of their major programmatic activities; in people's minds, what they do is their mission. The mission descriptions contributed by each pair of informants were combined after coding and eliminating duplicate mentions, so that a mission mentioned by either informant was attributed to the organization. Their verbal descriptions were grouped into 35 detailed categories. We allowed each organization to be described by up to seven missions, and an average of 2.7 discrete, codeable missions were mentioned per organization. For this analysis these 35 detailed mission codes were further collapsed into six general mission categories: Crime Prevention, Cultural or Religious, Economic, Family, Neighborhood, and Social Service. Those general mission categories are used here to describe the purposes of the organizations active in the five prototype areas. Even at the level of their general mission these organizations frequently pursued more than one purpose, so they fall into overlapping rather than exclusive categories in all of the analyses presented below.

Crime Prevention Mission. Organizations that reported promoting programs or activities that were specifically geared to preventing crime are grouped together in this category. Also included here are organizations mentioning their goal was to foster anti-crime patrols and neighborhood watches, as well as those citing crime prevention programs for youths, (anti-) gang-related youth programs, and substance abuse education programs for youths. There were 66 organizations in this category

(26 percent of the organizations). An example of an organization with a crime prevention mission is the Coalition for a Crime Free Rogers Park. One informant described the mission of the five-year-old organization as a "collaboration of community groups reducing crime with constructive strategies;" the other said the organization's mission was to help "bring groups together to work on public safety issues."

Organizations that were dedicated to assisting ex-offenders or high-risk individuals were not included in this category, but instead were included with other social service organizations. There may be some overlap between these two categories, but we separated organizations providing programming for individuals from those included in the crime prevention category because most of the organizations in the former group reported involvement in providing other social services.

Cultural and/or Religious Mission. The cultural and/or religious mission category primarily encompasses organizations reporting that they serve or promote ethnic or general spiritual needs. The kinds of responses that were included in this mission category ranged from providing services targeted only at specific ethnic groups (e.g., immigration counseling for Hispanics), to promoting church, religious, or spiritual development. There were 42 organizations in this category (17 percent of the organizations). One organization in this category is Fiesta de Educativa, founded in 1984 in the Marquette district. As described by one informant, the group's mission is "to serve as an advocacy and training center for Latinos and persons with disabilities and their families." Another reported the organization was dedicated to assisting "Latinos with disabilities." The St. Benedict African Parish in Englewood was reported to provide "religious services and respond to the human needs of the community." Another informant indicated that St. Benedict's mission

was "to work with the community and church to combat the negative aspects in the Englewood area."

Economic Mission. The economic mission category primarily encompasses organizations reporting they wanted to promote business or economic development. Included in this mission category were comments like "advertising the area," or being involved with or promoting chambers of commerce or merchant associations. References to programs that were individually oriented, such as employment for youths, were included in the social services category. There were 31 organizations in this category (12 percent of the organizations). Habilitative Systems, established in 1978 in the Austin area, is an example of an organization with an economic mission. An informant said that one of the organization's missions was "to improve the quality of life of clients using economic development."

Family Mission. The family mission category primarily encompasses organizations reporting they offer family or child oriented services or programs. Included in this category were organizations dedicated to enhancing parenting skills, child development, family health, youth services and youth education. Mentioned less often were youth recreational programs. There were 74 organizations in this category (30 percent of the organizations). The Newberry Association/Community Center in Marquette, which was established in 1883, was described as having as its mission the provision of social services in support of families, including child care, counseling, housing, and recreation (this group was also classified as a service providing organization).

Neighborhood Mission. The neighborhood mission category encompasses organizations reporting wanting to improve their immediate community, or those developing or refining neighbor-

hood-based activities. The most frequent organization missions in this category described efforts to improve the quality of neighborhood life. The category also included missions ranging from holding block parties or other social activities to cleaning up the community and dealing with vacant buildings, or fighting discrimination in awarding local housing loans or insurance. There were 143 organizations in this category (57 percent of the organizations). The 18th Street Development Center, founded in 1976 in the Marquette district, is a good example of an organization dedicated to a neighborhood mission. An informant reported that the organization's mission was to provide housing-related services that were "aimed at improving [residents of Pilsen's] quality of life in their neighborhood." The Morse Avenue Neighbors Association in Rogers Park is dedicated "to improving our neighborhood in terms of safety, and community feeling and efforts."

Service Mission. Finally, the service mission category encompasses organizations reporting they existed to provide services for individuals. The specific service needs they referred to were diverse. Most often mentioned were adult education programs, Treatment Alternatives to Street Crime drug programs, programs for low income individuals, job referral programs, or offering people "a general range of services." Other organizations included here are those providing mental health counseling, services for victims of domestic violence, youth employment counseling, legal advice, programs for senior citizens, referral programs of diverse types, and support for ex-offenders. Some described their role as one of helping individuals find services appropriate to their particular problems. There were 125 organizations in this category (50 percent of the organizations). Homeowners and Tenants United to Save Englewood was described as acting "as liaison for community services." The Korean-American Association of Rogers Park was established in 1962 "to provide human services."

Because organizations are purposive bodies, it will not be surprising that their mission was the factor that was most strongly related to their involvement in CAPS.

Organizational Structure

Several structural features of these organizations proved to be important as well. These included the extent to which they were formally organized, whether they were formed around a membership base or a client base, and if they used volunteers to carry out their mission.

The "formality" of each organization's structure was represented by a score combining the results of several informant questions. The scores were based on whether or not an organization had: external funding, office space, its own telephone number, any part-time paid staff, and any full-time paid staff. The presence of each of those elements was given equal weight in the calculation of a measure of the extent to which each organization was formally structured. The funding component of this measure was itself an amalgam giving each organization a higher score if it had a diverse funding base, one encompassing both public and private grants and contracts, or gifts. The analysis used both the organizational formalism score and a categorical measure broken into three categories, ranging from "formal" to "informal." Three categories were used because the continuous score clustered heavily at three points. There were 63 informal organizations (25 percent), 128 formal organizations (51 percent), and 59 mixed organizations (24 percent). One formal organization that we examined was the Boys and Girls Club of Chicago, active in the Marquette area. That organization was reported to receive gifts and external funding from private foundation and government agencies, have office space and phone lines, and employ both full-time and part-time paid staff.

Another structural feature of the organizations examined here is their relationship with the public. Questions in the survey allowed us to classify them as "client based" (138 organizations, or 58 percent), "membership based" (58

organizations, or 24 percent), or both (43 organizations, or 18 percent). Clients were described in the questionnaire as people "... your organization provides specific service to. For example, giving job referrals, providing child care, or health services." Membership was measured by a question about the number of individual members that belonged to the organization. The median group with individual members had 55 of them. The client-based organizations typically fell into service-providing mission categories, while membership organizations more typically served neighborhoods. Introspect Youth Services in Austin is a good example of a client based organization. Informants indicated that it had no individual members, but they reported it served an average of 3,700 clients. Its mission was "to provide inner-city students with options and knowledge."

The third structural feature of these organization was whether or not they used volunteers. Most did; in all, 90 percent of the organizations surveyed used volunteers, and at the median they had 18 of them.

Scope

These organizations also varied in the extent to which they were linked to other organizations active in the community, and in the size of the "catchment area" that they served. In the survey, informants were asked, "What geographic area does your organization serve?" For analysis purposes their open-ended responses were grouped into two categories: organizations having a local or neighborhood focus (138 organizations, or 54 percent), versus those serving the city as a whole or wide swaths of it, the county, or the nation. Organizations classified as having a local focus are those serving a police district, a community area, or other named patches of local turf.

The linkages that these organizations had with others was measured by asking the informants if their organization had any close affiliations with other

community groups. Fully 85 percent indicated that they did, and organizations that were networked to others were also more likely to become involved in CAPS.

Churches

Churches were one of our separate analytic focuses because of the wide-ranging involvement of church organizations in the life of several of the prototype districts. In Englewood, the Pastor's Subcommittee of the police District Advisory Committee claimed the participation of more than 50 churches. This category also includes affiliated organizations that were founded by and remain closely tied to individual churches. There were a total of 52 organizations in this category, or 21 percent. All indicated that they had religious goals, but in addition 96 percent had another mission as well. Churches most often shared service-providing missions (65 percent), neighborhood missions (53 percent), or family-oriented missions (35 percent). Fewer than 10 percent had a crime prevention mission. In Englewood, however, local churches became involved in coordinating participation in organized marches against violence; one church there established the times and locations of marches, and transported residents to and from the scene (Whelan, 1995).

Organizational Factors and Involvement

All of these factors were related to one or more of the CAPS involvement measures. The nature of these linkages is illustrated in Figure 3, which focuses on the Participation Index; detailed data are presented in Table A-1, in an appendix. Figure 3 depicts how variations in organization scope, structure, and mission influenced how involved they were in community policing in the prototype districts. For example, organizations with a local orientation were involved in an average of 69 percent of the CAPS Participation activities, while those with a larger scope were involved in an average of 45 percent of them; the difference between

these two proportions was highly significant ($p < .01$), as were all of the relationships illustrated in Figure 3.

As Figure 3 indicates, locally-oriented organizations that were networked with others; those with an informal, membership and volunteer structure, and secular organizations pursuing crime prevention, neighborhood, and economic development goals, all were more involved in CAPS. Groups with other missions were significantly less involved. In particular, groups with a cultural or spiritual mission and those that focused on delivering services of a variety of kinds to individual clients had little to do with community policing during its first year in Chicago's prototype districts.

As Table 1 documented, many fewer organizations were involved in promoting CAPS than in using the avenues for participation that it created. However, the pattern of relationships depicted in Figure 3 persisted in that case as well. With the exception of the formality or informality of an organization's structure, all of the other factors in Figure 3 were significantly related to levels of involvement in promoting CAPS. Turf-based CAPS activity was more common than working to promote the program, but interest in promoting neighborhood patrols or block watch programs was somewhat less linked to structural features of these organizations. It was more frequent among local, membership-based organizations with crime prevention or neighborhood-oriented goals. All of these relationships are also detailed in appendix Table A-1.

Table 2 draws together all of the organizational measures, and examines their joint impact on involvement in CAPS. It presents a multiple regression analysis of each of the three involvement measures, using the organizational factors described above as explanatory factors.

Table 2 presents two columns of information for each involvement measure: a standardized regression coefficient, which indicates the relative impact of each

independent (row) variable, and its statistical significance (or, the likelihood that its impact was greater than zero). By convention a significance value is expected to be less than .05 (i.e. the coefficient is likely to actually be zero only 5 times in a hundred), but because this is an exploratory study with a relatively small sample we will use a significance level of less than .10 (i.e. 10 times in a hundred) to discipline our discussion of what is "important" in these data. Significant coefficients are underlined in Table 2, using this standard.

Not surprisingly, because these are purposive organizations, the most consistent predictors of organizational involvement in CAPS were their missions. The analysis summarized in Table 2 employed dichotomous measures of the three missions that were most often found among organizations involved in CAPS — crime prevention, neighborhood, and economic development — and contrasted their effect against those of the other missions espoused by the organizations in this study. The high level of activism among organizations reporting a crime prevention mission doubtless reflects the fact that CAPS was easily seen as a vehicle to further their goals. Economic development organizations (often involving area merchants and property owners) are also extremely concerned about crime, which erodes the value of their real estate and threatens their customer base. CAPS' turf-based approach to policing and the avenues for participation in problem solving at the neighborhood level created by beat meetings apparently appealed to organizations with a strong neighborhood focus. Other multivariate analyses (not presented here) confirmed the disposition of groups that primarily delivered individual services to clients, or pursued family-oriented or cultural goals, to remain relatively uninvolved in CAPS. The limited involvement of churches and closely affiliated groups reflected the relatively small stake they had in the program, once other goals they may have adopted were taken into account.

The remaining organizational factors were linked to CAPS involvement in varied ways. In general, organizations that were likely to have high involvement with CAPS tended to have a grass-roots structure; in the main, they were locally oriented and membership based. In two of three instances they were networked with other organizations. These factors were associated with locally oriented missions such as addressing crime, neighborhood, or economic development, and these kinds of organizations tended not to be oriented toward serving individuals or their family needs. Interestingly, the only significant effect of being an informally, versus a more formally, organized group was that the latter were more involved in promoting CAPS. This kind of "process" rather than "substantive" involvement in the program was adopted more often by groups with staff, funding, offices and other bureaucratic features.

CONSTITUENCY FACTORS AND ORGANIZATIONAL INVOLVEMENT

To measure constituency factors we asked our organizational informants a series of questions, prefaced by the statement that we would "... like to get a more detailed picture of the kinds of people who currently use or are members of your organization." We asked them "... to give me an approximate percentage breakdown of your (members and/or clients) for each of the following categories." They were then asked about the age, sex, race, and income distribution of their constituents, using a few sub-categories. The interviewers were ready to help them with the arithmetic, if necessary, and helped them break their constituents down into pre-established demographic categories (e.g., "over 60 years old"). For this analyses we examined the percentages of constituents who were reported to be white, African-American, and Hispanic (treating these in Chicago parlance as distinct racial categories), and the percentage of each organization's constituents whose approximate household income was less than \$20,000 per year. Like the other

measures in this study, each organization's score was calculated by averaging the responses of both informants. They were in very high agreement about the racial background of their constituents; for example, the correlation between their reports of the percentages of their constituents who were African-American was $+0.93$. They were in less agreement about the incomes of their constituents; the correlation between the two reports of the income measure employed here was $+0.38$.

Constituency and Organization Factors

Using these measures, the relationship between constituency and organizational factors was strong. On several measures, organizations serving largely white constituencies were the kinds that were particularly likely to be heavily involved in CAPS. Those serving African-Americans and (especially) Hispanics were the kinds of organizations that were less likely to be involved in the program. The most consistent relationships, however, were between organization factors and poverty. Groups serving the poor were, almost across the board, the kinds of groups that were least likely to be involved in community policing.

The magnitude of these differences is illustrated in Figure 4, which plots the race and income correlates of membership, locally oriented, and service-providing organizations. Organizations serving white and better-off constituents were more likely to be locally oriented, membership based, and not in the business of providing services to individual clients. There were virtually no membership-based groups serving Hispanics, and less than 5 percent of those serving the poor fell in this category. Both Hispanics and African-Americans were much more likely to be the constituents of service-providing organizations.

A fuller accounting of the relationship between constituents and their organizations is presented in the upper section of Table 3. It reports the correlation between each variable employed in the analysis of organization involvement in CAPS presented above and the three constituency measures. As it indicates, in

addition to the factors depicted in Figure 4, whites and better-off people were more likely to be involved in informally organized groups. Organizations serving the poor were more often directed toward family, cultural, religious, and service providing missions - all purposes that were linked to lower participation in CAPS. The poor were significantly less likely to be served by organizations pursuing neighborhood or economic development goals - missions linked to higher levels of CAPS involvement. Crime prevention goals were less often espoused by groups serving Hispanics.

Constituency and Involvement in CAPS

The constituency factors examined in Table 3 could also be correlated with the type and extent of involvement in CAPS. This was, in fact, one of the original ideas guiding this research. We anticipated that fewer organizations would be involved in community policing in poorer, African-American, and Hispanic areas of the city. Past research suggested that there should be a strong "class bias" in involvement in community policing:

- Voluntary participation is not easily initiated or sustained in poorer neighborhoods; rather, community organizations focusing on crime problems are disproportionately concentrated in better-off areas of cities.
- Involvement in community policing could be lower in higher crime areas. Studies of high-crime neighborhoods find that crime and fear undermine support for the police and stimulate withdrawal from community life. In crime-ridden neighborhoods, mutual distrust and hostility are often rampant, and antipathy between newcomers and long-term residents prevails. Residents of higher crime areas tend to view each other with suspicion, and programs requiring social contact and neighborhood cooperation are less often successful in areas with high levels of fear. Crime is corrosive.
- Residents of poor and minority neighborhoods with serious crime problems too often have antagonistic relationships with the police. The police frequently are perceived to be arrogant, brutal, racist, and corrupt. More and more intensive policing in these areas could seem as likely to generate new complaints about harassment, indiscriminate searches, and

conflicts between police and area youths as it is likely to solve serious crime problems.

- Since their constituents often fear the police, groups in poor and minority areas are more likely to be involved in monitoring police misconduct and pressing for greater police accountability to civilians than to be involved in coordinated action with police. If they are involved in community policing, they frequently will adopt an "outsider," critical stance.

These propositions turned out to be supported only weakly, for the effects of race and class were "indirect" rather than "direct".

The lower section of Table 3 documented the consistent but relatively weak linkage between constituency factors and the extent to which organizations were involved in CAPS. As anticipated, there was a positive correlation between "percent white" and the extent of each type of organizational involvement, and negative correlations between the indicators of poverty, minority status, and involvement. However, only two of those correlations were significant, both associated with participation in CAPS. They were weak in part because the effects of constituency factors on involvement were indirect ones; race and class differences affected involvement in CAPS only through their relationship with the goals, structure and scope of the organizations we examined. This was suggested by Chart 1, which showed organization factors standing between constituency characteristics and CAPS involvement.

This causal chain can be tested statistically: when the organization characteristics summarized in Table 3 are controlled for, correlations between constituency factors and CAPS involvement measures drop virtually to zero. Their influence came from their relationship to features of organizational life in their communities, which in turn shaped the agendas of the groups that served them.

EXPLAINING DISTRICT INVOLVEMENT IN CAPS

Figure 2 documented substantial differences in levels of involvement in CAPS across the five prototype districts. Participation was almost twice as frequent among organizations in Morgan Park and Rogers Park than it was in Marquette. Organizations in Englewood were consistently more involved in CAPS than those from Austin, despite the close demographic match of the two communities.

One goal of this research was to explain these differences in involvement. Figure 5 displays the district-level findings again, this time in comparison to levels of involvement that were predicted by the organization factors described above. Multiple regression was used to make these predictions. The predicted level of involvement in each district is displayed using narrow, dark bars, in contrast to levels of involvement uncovered by the surveys, which are displayed using broader bars. The more closely the heights of the bars match, the more accurately the organizational mix featured by each district predicts levels of involvement there. Because the race and class constituency measures did not add significantly to this prediction once organizational factors were taken into account, they were not used in this analysis. The overall accuracy of the predictions were described at the bottom of Table 2; the "R Squared" row indicates that levels of participation were most fully explained by organization factors, and this can be observed in the close fit of the two sets of bars in Figure 5.

As we have noted, some of the prototype districts were endowed with an organizational life that meshed with the structure and mission of CAPS. In those areas, organizations found it easy to support the program, to promote it, and to engage in neighborhood patrols and other turf-based efforts that took advantage of its visibility and credibility in the community. This was most clearly the case in Morgan Park and Rogers Park, where CAPS involvement was highest. There, many more organizations were membership based, locally oriented, networked to others,

informally organized, secular in their roots, and focused on crime, neighborhood, or economic development issues. Levels of participation and turf-based involvement were particularly accurately predicted by the mix of organizations active in those areas.

On the other hand, the organizational milieu in Englewood, Austin, and Marquette did not mesh quite so easily with the new policing program. Organizations there had other agendas. They were in the business of serving clients, not representing a participatory membership. Their services were often supported by grants and contracts from foundations and government agencies. They also pursued cultural or religious goals, especially if they had constituents who were poor. As a consequence, they were more often formally organized, blessed with staff members and office space. However, CAPS seemed relatively irrelevant to many more of these kinds of organizations, and levels of participation in the program were much lower there as a consequence. These factors explained levels of CAPS participation in Englewood and Austin particularly well.

THE IMPACT OF CAPS: A VIEW FROM THE TRENCHES

This section examines our informants' impressions of CAPS, and the impact they think it is having on the community. Not surprisingly, districts where activists report that CAPS is having a positive impact are those where levels of involvement in CAPS are higher.

The informant survey included several questions probing our informants' judgements about CAPS. Two items focused on the relationship between police and their organization. Respondents were asked if their organization's relationship with the police had become more or less satisfactory, or remained about the same, since CAPS was implemented. Another asked if they felt their organizations'

interactions with police had become more or less frequent, or remained the same, since CAPS was implemented.

There were also five questions asking informants to assess the impact that "... the CAPS project is having on the community." Informants were asked if they felt CAPS was having an impact on:

- Reducing fear
- Increasing willingness to participate
- Increasing citizens' belief they can make a change in their neighborhood
- Decreasing crime
- Improving the community's relationships with police

To capture the positions of the 253 organizations we examined, the average responses of each pair of informants to these judgmental questions were calculated. It is important to note that there was less agreement on these issues among the informants representing each organization than there was on descriptive or factual matters concerning the structure of the organizations, so the averages harbor a great deal of variation that could somewhat weaken the results of the statistical analysis.

Table 4 presents the percentage of organizations reporting that CAPS was having a positive impact. It presents both district-level data and averages for all organizations. In Table 4, CAPS was defined as having a "positive impact" when organizations reported it was having either some or a large impact, rather than no impact.

Overall, CAPS was seen as having the largest impact on police-community relations; 72 percent of the organizations rated CAPS a success on that dimension. At the low end, 48 percent of organizations thought CAPS had had an impact on

crime. The five districts varied somewhat in their ratings, but there was a great deal of consistency in this pattern.

Organizations in the Morgan Park district were the most positive about CAPS. Their ratings ranged from a high of 91 percent for "Improved community relationships with police," to a low of 71 percent for "decrease in crime." Morgan Park's organizations were 2 to 14 percentage points more positive than those in the second-highest district, Rogers Park. Ratings there ranged from a high of 79 percent for improved relationships with police, to a low of 59 percent for combatting crime. Rogers Park was followed by Englewood, where those percentages ranged from 75 percent to a low of 50 percent, for the extent of their organization's interaction with the police.

Respondents representing organizations in Austin and Marquette were less positive about the program. Those from Austin ranked 4th on most of the measures, and came in last in terms of their organizations' relationships with the police. Organizations in Marquette reported the lowest ratings of CAPS impact on six of seven items.

These assessments were also linked to the characteristics of the organizations, their constituencies, and their involvement in CAPS. Every assessment item summarized in Table 4 was significantly related to CAPS involvement on all three dimensions; the more involved groups were, the more positive their representatives were about the program. Organizations interested in crime prevention and neighborhood problems were also quite positive about most assessments they made of the program. Representatives of local and informal organizations were more consistently positive than others about CAPS. On the other hand, constituent poverty — but not race — was also linked to these assessments; across the board, groups representing the poorest constituencies in this study were the least positive about community policing.

DISCUSSION

The organization survey revealed that there was a great deal of variation in levels of involvement in CAPS-related activities in the five prototype districts, and almost as much variation in the impressions that organization activists had of the impact of CAPS in their communities. Organizations in Morgan Park and Rogers Park scored highly on both dimensions, while those in Marquette scored lowest. Englewood and Austin fell somewhere in-between.

Many organizational factors were related to levels of CAPS involvement. Local organizations with a crime prevention mission or a focus on neighborhood or economic development issues, and that were membership based and used volunteers, tended to be much more involved than their counterparts with a city-wide focus, a client-oriented social service orientation, or cultural or religious goals. Secular organizations were more involved than churches or those with close religious ties.

The five prototype districts featured varying mixes of organizational life that as a consequence facilitated or inhibited levels of involvement in CAPS. Organizations active in Morgan Park shared factors that predicted high levels of involvement in CAPS, followed by Rogers Park. At the other extreme, organizations in Marquette fell the most consistently into a profile associated with low levels of CAPS involvement. These results were consistent with our informants' judgments about the impact of CAPS on their organizations and on the community.

CITATIONS

Chicago Police Department. 1993. Together We Can: A Strategic Plan for Reinventing the Chicago Police Department. Chicago.

Lovig, Justine H. and Robert VanStedum. 1995. Community Organization Survey Methods Report. Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium Project Paper No. 11.

Whelan, Dominique. 1995. Partnerships in Action. Chicago Community Policing Evaluation Consortium Project Paper No. 10.

Table 1
Organizational Activity Around CAPS

Related Activities	All Areas	Percent Involved in Each Activity			
		Englewood	Marquette	Austin	Moreno Valley
<i>Participation in CAPS</i>					
work directly with beat officers	70	73	49	67	8
encourage CAPS service requests	66	64	49	55	8
attend CAPS-related meetings	75	73	58	64	8
encourage attendance at meetings	71	71	51	67	8
host CAPS-related meeting	33	25	24	31	2
hold general public meetings	46	52	28	40	5
distribute newsletters or flyers	45	44	8	43	6
<i>Promote CAPS</i>					
conduct CAPS-related training	26	29	13	12	2
form groups or start programs	20	23	8	17	2
received CAPS-related gifts/funding	8	12	0	7	0
contact media about CAPS	16	23	0	12	1
informational picketing	12	17	2	17	1
<i>Turf-Based CAPS Activity</i>					
neighborhood patrol	35	40	23	26	3
neighborhood block watch	42	46	26	33	5
<i>Other Activities</i>					
hold activist meetings	26	29	11	29	2
contact agencies	33	48	9	26	3
develop a new service	9	14	2	7	1
other activities	30	42	19	21	2
Number of Cases	253	53	53	43	4

APPENDIX

Table A-1
Mean Differences in Involvement Scores by Organization Factors

	Participation	Promotion	Turf-Based
Local orientation			
no	45	12	29
yes	69	20	46
(sigf.)	(.00)	(.01)	(.00)
Networked to others			
no	47	8	33
yes	60	18	39
(sigf.)	(.04)	(.03)	(.48)
Membership base			
no	54	14	34
yes	70	24	52
(sigf.)	(.00)	(.01)	(.01)
Use volunteers			
no	35	5	33
yes	61	18	39
(sigf.)	(.00)	(.02)	(.50)
Informal structure			
no	54	17	36
yes	68	14	44
(sigf.)	(.02)	(.42)	(.21)
Secular organization			
no	46	9	26
yes	61	18	41
(sigf.)	(.00)	(.02)	(.03)
Organization mission ^a			
crime	63	19	42
neighborhood	69	22	48
economic development	70	26	50
service provision	52	13	30
family	51	13	33
cultural/religious	38	6	25

a. Note missions are not mutually exclusive.

Table 2
Regression Analysis of Involvement in CAPS

	Participation coeff. sigf.	Promotion coeff sigf.	Turf-Based coeff. sigf.
Local orientation	<u>.24</u> <u>.00</u>	<u>.14</u> <u>.03</u>	<u>.11</u> <u>.10</u>
Networked to others	<u>.17</u> <u>.00</u>	<u>.10</u> <u>.10</u>	.04 .51
Membership base	.09 .12	<u>.17</u> <u>.01</u>	<u>.12</u> <u>.07</u>
Use volunteers	<u>.12</u> <u>.03</u>	.07 .26	-.04 .55
Informal structure	.01 .84	<u>-.22</u> <u>.00</u>	-.08 .29
Secular organization	<u>.13</u> <u>.01</u>	<u>.13</u> <u>.03</u>	<u>.11</u> <u>.07</u>
Mission			
crime prevention	<u>.28</u> <u>.00</u>	<u>.16</u> <u>.01</u>	<u>.17</u> <u>.01</u>
neighborhood	<u>.18</u> <u>.00</u>	<u>.20</u> <u>.00</u>	<u>.19</u> <u>.00</u>
economic development	<u>.12</u> <u>.02</u>	<u>.11</u> <u>.07</u>	.07 .22
Multiple R	.61	.46	.38
R Squared	.38	.21	.14

NOTE: "coeff." is standardized regression coefficient; "sigf." is statistical significance of the coefficient. Significant coefficients (p < .10) are underlined.

Table 3
 Constituency Correlates of Organization Characteristics
 and CAPS Involvement

Organization Characteristics	Constituency Characteristics				
	Percent White	Percent Black	Percent Hispanic	Percent Poor	
Local orientation		<u>.24</u>	-.05	<u>-.20</u>	<u>-.42</u>
Networked to others		-.13	.02	.10	.19
Membership base		<u>.32</u>	-.13	<u>-.22</u>	<u>-.51</u>
Use volunteers		.13	<u>-.20</u>	.11	-.08
Informal structure		<u>.35</u>	<u>-.16</u>	<u>-.19</u>	<u>-.60</u>
Secular organization		.01	-.06	.06	<u>-.25</u>
Crime prevention mission		.04	.11	<u>-.19</u>	-.09
Neighborhood mission		.11	-.04	-.07	<u>-.29</u>
Economic development		.11	-.04	-.08	<u>-.17</u>
Cultural/religious mission		.01	-.10	.17	<u>.19</u>
Service providing mission		<u>-.31</u>	<u>.26</u>	-.00	<u>.39</u>
Family mission		<u>-.25</u>	.16	.12	<u>.26</u>
Participation in CAPS		<u>.17</u>	-.07	-.12	<u>-.34</u>
Promoting CAPS		.08	-.01	-.11	-.12
Turf-Based Action		.04	-.02	-.02	-.07
Number of Cases		238	238	238	204

NOTE: significant coefficients (p .05) are underlined.

Table 4
Assessments of the Impact of CAPS

Assessments of CAPS' Impact	Total	Percent Some or Large Impact				
		Englewood	Marquette	Austin Park	Morgan Park	Rogers
Improved relationship between community and police	72	75	55	57	91	79
Increase in participation	62	62	42	60	82	69
Increase in citizen's belief they can make a change	62	60	43	55	76	74
Increase in interaction with police	57	50	36	48	80	71
Impact on reducing fear	56	62	36	50	73	62
Organization's relationship with police	56	56	45	38	76	62
Decrease in crime	48	52	26	29	71	59
Number of Cases	253	53	53	43	45	59