Perceptions of Police in Neighborhoods Receiving Community-Oriented Policing Services: Community Survey Results from the Restore Rundberg Initiative

Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education is a refereed journal concerned with publishing scholarly and relevant articles on continuing education, professional development, and training in the field of social welfare. The aims of the journal are to advance the science of professional development and continuing social work education, to foster understanding among educators, practitioners, and researchers, and to promote discussion that represents a broad spectrum of interests in the field. The opinions expressed in this journal are solely those of the contributors and do not necessarily reflect the policy positions of The University of Texas at Austin's Steve Hicks School of Social Work.

Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education is published two times a year (Spring and Winter) by the Center for Social and Behavioral Research at 1923 San Jacinto, D3500 Austin, TX 78712. Our website at www.profdevjournal.org contains additional information regarding submission of publications and subscriptions.

URL: www.profdevjournal.org   **Email: www.profdevjournal.org/contact**

Perceptions of Police in Neighborhoods Receiving Community-Oriented Policing Services: Community Survey Results from the Restore Rundberg Initiative

Yuma, Pitzer, Castro, Addo, Whitt and Springer

Abstract

The purpose of this survey study was to assess perceptions of police following a community policing intervention as part of a larger revitalization initiative known as Restore Rundberg. A total of 611 surveys were completed by respondents who identified as 58% Latinx, 65% female and 64% as renting their homes. Among the 408 respondents who provided home location data, results of the linear model demonstrated perceptions of police scores were significantly higher among the recipients of the intervention than the comparison group (by + 0.83; $F = 6.303$, $p = 0.013$), while controlling for race ($F = 1.42$, $p = 0.237$), age ($F = 2.84$, $p = 0.037$), homeownership ($F = 2.067$, $p = 0.152$), social control ($F = 0.63$, $p = 0.43$), and neighborhood attachment ($F = 23.57$, $p < 0.001$). The model had an $R2$ of 0.120, a small to medium effect size ($R = 0.346$). This study is the result of a community, police, and academic partnership.

Introduction

One approach to collaboration between communities and law enforcement agencies is known as *community policing*, defined by the U.S. Department of Justice as "a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime (2014, p. 2)." Community policing relies on cooperative problem solving and collaborative partnerships between law enforcement agencies and community stakeholders such as residents, schools, social services, and local businesses, among others (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015). Community policing has the potential to build confidence and trust in local law enforcement and improve multiple social dimensions of neighborhoods. Relationship-building strategies implemented within a community policing framework are invaluable to efforts of police officers and communities to make their neighborhoods safe through improving social processes that are directly related to crime. Establishing and strengthening partnerships between police and communities can provide a foundation for relationships of mutual trust and cooperation, which enhance social cohesion, improve neighborhood economies, and ultimately build a community's resilience to crime.

Community Policing and the Restore Rundberg Community Revitalization Initiative

The current study explores community responses to a collaborative community policing-focused revitalization initiative known as *Restore Rundberg*. The launch of the Restore Rundberg Community Revitalization Initiative was previously described in a special edition of *Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education* (Springer, Lauderdale, Fitzgerald, & Baker, 2016). In summary, the Rundberg area is a culturally diverse collection of neighborhoods in the northern region of Austin, Texas. Data from the Austin Police Department showed the area experienced higher proportions of crime than would be expected for its 5% of city residents from 2005 to 2012, including 11% of Austin's

Paula Yuma, MPH, PhD, is an Assistant Professor at Colorado State University.
Reuben Addo, MSSA, PhD, is an Assistant Professor at The University of Southern Maine.
Kyle Pitzer, MSSW, is a Doctoral Candidate at Washington University in St. Louis.
Davis Springer, MSW, PhD, is a Professor and Director at The University of Texas at Austin.
Yessenia Castro, BS, MS, PhD, is an Associate Professor at The University of Texas at Austin.
Ahmed Whitt, PhD, is an Assistant Professor at The University of Texas at Austin.

violent crime, 7% of property crime, 34% of prostitution incidents, and 9% of property crimes citywide (City of Austin, 2012). In 2012, within the Rundberg area, a majority of adult residents were not able to vote due to their citizenship status, and approximately 64% of the population spoke a language other than English. Nearly all of the children enrolled in public school were considered economically disadvantaged (95%), 59% had limited English proficiency, and 75% were identified as at-risk for dropping out.

To address the burden of crime in the Rundberg area, the City of Austin and the Austin Police Department were funded by the Department of Justice through the Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Program to reduce crime through community building and revitalization, an effort known as *Restore Rundberg*. The School of Social Work at the University of Texas at Austin was engaged in partnership to assist with evidence-based recommendations, evaluation, and other supports, including meeting support and coordination of volunteer social work student involvement. A community policing intervention was a primary focus of the revitalization efforts. In addition to community policing, the *Restore Rundberg* initiative included efforts to strengthen partnerships with youth and area schools, reduce disorder in the physical environment, build community involvement and capacity through a collaborative board of community stakeholders (known as the "Revitalization Team"), provide resources and navigation services to community members, enforce building codes, and a number of other formal and informal efforts.

The record of community policing in the United States in terms of effectiveness is mixed, indicating uncertainty about which strategies to prioritize. With declining levels of confidence in police across a variety of communities, understanding how community policing impacts perceptions of police is critical to advancing its implementation and success in generating positive relationships and subsequently reducing crime. To better understand links between community policing interventions and processes within communities that can serve to influence perceptions of police and stem crime, this study

examines differences between Rundberg-area residents living in areas receiving a community policing intervention and residents living in comparison areas on perceived neighborhood safety, neighborhood attachment, social control, and perceptions of police.

Communities and Crime: Theoretical Foundations and Empirical Evidence

Theoretical orientations related to communities and crime that can inform community policing include social ecological frameworks, social disorganization theory, and specific social processes that account for connections between these larger constructs. Social ecological frameworks support the idea that individuals exist within, and are affected by, the built and social environments and policies of their surroundings (Bronfenbrenner, 1986; McLeroy, Bibeau, Steckler, & Glanz, 1988). Ecological approaches illustrate how changes in environments produce changes in individuals, and in reverse, that individuals are essential to creating changes to their environments. Social disorganization theory posits that characteristics such as community poverty, high mobility, ethnic heterogeneity, and weak social cohesion create social disorganization, which hinders a neighborhood's capacity to control undesirable behavior and increases the likelihood of crime (Kubrin & Weitzer, 2003). Specific neighborhood social processes that affect crime are also important for understanding the role of community policing, such as collective efficacy, social networks and interactions, and legal cynicism (Sampson, Morenoff, & Gannon-Rowley, 2002).

Several studies have demonstrated the relationship between social interactions, ties, and networks and crime. Bellair (1997) found that social interaction between neighbors once per year mediated some of the effect of neighborhood characteristics such as socioeconomic status, racial heterogeneity, and residential stability on various crime rates, such as burglary, motor vehicle theft, and robbery. Other studies have found that local friendship networks mediate the

effects of residential stability on street robbery and that social ties negatively affect assault rates, although the effect for assault only held for majority white neighborhoods and was non-significant in communities of color or racially mixed communities (Sampson & Groves, 1989; Warner & Rountree, 1997). Lastly, informal social control, which is hypothesized to be generated from social ties and networks, has been shown to have a negative effect on juvenile delinquency specifically (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997).

There is also evidence that collective efficacy, which is a combination of informal social control and social cohesion, serves as an important mediator between neighborhood structural characteristics and violent crime (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997). Further, other studies have confirmed this independent effect of collective efficacy on crime (Kirk & Papachristos, 2011; Morenoff, Sampson, & Raudenbush, 2001). In addition to direct effects, Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush (2001) found that collective efficacy also mediated the effect of local institutions and social ties, while Kirk and Papachristos (2011) found that it mediated the effect of beliefs that law enforcement is illegitimate and unresponsive, or legal cynicism. These studies suggest that collective efficacy is critical to both directly affecting crime given the cohesion and informal social control it provides and mediating the effects of other important social resources and processes as well.

Community Policing Framework and Approaches

Community policing emerged as an alternative to the way professional policing was conducted, increasing the importance of community-police relationships in not only reducing crime, but preventing crimes and reducing fear in communities (Moore, 1999). It has been defined as a philosophical orientation or framework, rather than a specific strategy initiated to target crime (Trojanowicz & Carter, 1988). Beyond enforcing laws, this orientation emphasized problem solving and partnerships with

communities and other government agencies (Moore & Poethig, 1999). These emphases of community policing are still retained in the more recent key characteristics defined by the U.S. Department of Justice (2014): collaborative community partnerships; organizational transformation on the part of the law enforcement agency; and proactive, systematic problem solving. Collaborative community partnerships are relationships between police and individuals and organizations that contribute to problem solving and increasing trust. Organizational transformation consists of the changes made to "management, structure, and personnel, and information systems to support community partnerships and problem-solving" (p. 1). Finally, problem solving is the development and evaluation of effective responses to community problems.

While community policing as a framework has particular characteristics, strategies for community policing vary across law enforcement agencies and communities. Cordner (2014) identifies four dimensions of community policing and the strategies within each: a) the philosophical dimension, which includes citizen input, broad functioning of police to include safety promotion and citizen education in addition to law enforcement, and a personal service model, whereby citizens are able to get to know and call upon "their" officer for help; b) the strategic dimension, which involves reoriented police operations emphasizing face-to-face interactions, a focus on prevention of crime, and utilizing a geographic location to establish officer-neighborhood bonds; c) the tactical dimension, which stresses positive interactions, active partnerships between officers, citizens and agencies, and problem solving, and d) the organizational dimension, which is the revision of law enforcement agency priorities in structure (e.g., decentralization, team approaches), management that supports development of community officers, and evaluative information to support community policing activities, focused on the quality, not quantity, of interactions. Based on both the framework and strategies of community policing, it is clear that building

relationships between police agencies and communities is an important factor in terms of whether community policing can function effectively. Therefore, in evaluating the effectiveness of community policing, community perceptions of police should also be considered.

Effectiveness of Community Policing

Given the complexity and vast differences in community policing approaches, community characteristics, differences in the types and motivations for crime, and variety of measures used to evaluate success (Cordner, 2014; Robin, 2000), it is perhaps unsurprising that community policing interventions have demonstrated inconsistent success. A 2014 meta-analysis of 37 community policing pre-post evaluation analyses found limited effects on crime, with significant positive effects on citizen satisfaction with police, perceptions of disorder, and police legitimacy (Gill, Weisburd, Telep, Vitter, & Bennett, 2014). These non-crime effects are essential to community safety; as demonstrated in a survey of over 2000 Chicagoans, positive routine encounters contribute greatly to citizen satisfaction with the police and are integral in building the trust needed for citizens to feel safe contacting police when their assistance is needed (Skogan, 2005).

An additional explanation for why effectiveness of community policing is inconsistent in existing research could be the general lack of confidence in police across the country. Confidence in the police in America is at the lowest point in over two decades (Jones, 2015). Confidence in police is particularly compromised among individuals and communities of color and in neighborhoods with lower socioeconomic status (Weitzer & Tuch, 2006). This lack of confidence in police results in a lack of engagement even in times of need; for instance, after a highly publicized incident of police-inflicted violence, calls for service made by Black community members in Milwaukee declined substantially (Desmond, Papachristos, & Kirk, 2016). Confidence in police among Latinx communities is also compromised. Latinx

individuals are less likely to call for police assistance due to fear the police may investigate the immigration status of themselves or their families (Theodore & Habans, 2016), and violent crimes with Latinx victims are severely underreported (Rennison, 2010). These figures regarding the effectiveness of community policing and confidence in police suggest that if implementation of a community policing intervention does not strategically focus on and affect confidence in police, then the benefits of such an approach may be limited.

The Austin Police Department based their community policing approach on Sherman's (2013) refined Triple-T strategy of policing, involving three key components:

"(1) Targeting: Police should conduct and apply good research to target their scarce resources on predictable concentrations of harm from crime and disorder; (2) Testing: Once they choose their high-priority targets, police should review or conduct tests of police methods to help choose what works best to reduce harm; (3) Tracking: Once police agencies use research to target their tested practices, they should generate and use internal evidence to track the daily delivery and effects of those practices, including the publicly-perceived legitimacy of policing (Sherman, 2013, p. 5)."

Using Triple-T principles, the Austin Police Department created a community policing strategy called "Operation Mobile Walking Beat (OMWB)." OMWB operations typically consisted of 6 to 8 officers and one sergeant, with the ability to target multiple hot spots for crime during one shift or one hot spot for a longer period of time. Officers assigned to district representative, metro tactical, patrol, and other sworn units were scheduled for these overtime and regular-duty assignments, up to four 6-hour shifts per week. Additional personnel were added for transportation purposes as needed. One advantage of the OMWB's mobility was that the walking beat could move from one hot spot to another, or into surrounding areas, based on the needs of the moment. Such tactics gave the impression of a larger force and provided more

visibility.

The Austin Police Department reasoned that increasing community members' positive interactions with the police would increase citizens' trust in the police and citizen satisfaction with police and would reduce fear of crime. The purpose of the current study was to determine how these variables were impacted by the Austin Police Department's community policing initiative, as part of the larger Restore Rundberg effort in the uniquely diverse Rundberg-area neighborhoods. This study is novel in that it examines community policing as a part of a larger community revitalization initiative, rather than as a stand-alone intervention.

Methods

The Restore Rundberg neighborhoods were spread over a 6-square mile area. This entire area was targeted for revitalization, an effort which involved many community agencies, residents, and city partners. Within the Restore Rundberg area, three "hotspots" for crime were identified through the use of seven years of crime data collected by the Austin Police Department. These three hotspots were the targets of the community policing intervention, described by the Austin Police Department as "Operation Mobile Walking Beat" (OMWB). To assess the community's perceptions of their neighborhoods and of the OMWB, cross-sectional surveys were conducted across the entire Rundberg area. This survey study was reviewed by the University of Texas at Austin's Institutional Review Board (IRB) and considered "exempt" due to minimal risk to participants; it was also reviewed and approved by the Austin Independent School District IRB.

Sampling

Purposive sampling was used to engage participants door-to-door, online, and at community events. Surveys were also sent home with all kindergarten, first, and second grade students attending Austin Independent School District elementary schools within the Restore Rundberg grant area. All of the door-to-door surveys were administered within the three hot

spots receiving the OMWB community policing intervention.

Survey Design

The survey included demographic questions and measures of the dependent variables of interest: perceived neighborhood safety; neighborhood attachment; collective efficacy, which includes the concepts of informal social control and social cohesion; and perceptions of police;. All items in each scale were measured on a 4-point Likert scale and were scored so that higher numbers indicated more favorable responses. Some items were drawn from other surveys, and some were developed by the research team in partnership with the Austin Police Department. Internal consistency reliability of each scale was assessed using Cronbach's coefficient alpha. A scale is said to be reliable to the extent that it performs consistently, and the coefficient alpha is the most frequently used method to estimate reliability (Abell, Springer, & Kamata, 2009). It is generally accepted that a Cronbach's coefficient alpha of 0.70 or higher is acceptable; all scales used in this survey study exceeded that criteria.

Perceived Neighborhood Safety. Three items measured on a scale were used to measure participants' feelings of safety in their neighborhoods. General perceived safety ("I feel safe in my neighborhood") and perceived safety walking during the day as well as at night were assessed and the items in the scale were totaled (range: 3 to 12). Internal consistency reliability for perceived neighborhood safety was 0.84 in the study sample.

Neighborhood Attachment. Three items were used to assess participants' neighborhood attachment. These items measured participants' desire to move or stay in the neighborhood by asking for agreement on these statements: "I would like to move out of my neighborhood" (this item was reverse coded); "I like my neighborhood"; and, "If I had to move, I would miss the neighborhood I currently live in." The three items were totaled to create a scale

score with a range of 3 to 12. Internal consistency reliability for the neighborhood attachment scale was 0.79 in the study sample.

Collective Efficacy: Social Cohesion and Social Control. The construct of neighborhood collective efficacy, or the shared willingness to intervene for the public good (Sampson, Morenoff, & Gannon-Rowley, 2002), is made up of the combined concepts of social cohesion and social control. Five items were used to measure social cohesion: "This is a close-knit neighborhood"; "People around here are willing to help their neighbors"; "People in this neighborhood generally get along with each other"; "People in this neighborhood can be trusted"; and, "People in this neighborhood share the same values." The social cohesion items demonstrated internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = 0.85$) and were totaled to create a scale score ranging from 5 to 20. One item was used to measure social control by asking if respondents believed neighbors would be likely to take action on the closing of a local fire station (range 1 to 4). The social cohesion and social control items were drawn from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (Sampson et al., 1997). The collective efficacy measure was reduced from the original 5-item measure at the request of local community partners and the school district.

Perceptions of Police. Four items measured agreement with statements about the police; they were totaled to create a score ranging from 4 to 16 and had acceptable internal consistency reliability ($\alpha = 0.75$) One item on the response of police to neighborhood concerns, "The police are doing a good job in dealing with problems that really concern people in this neighborhood," was drawn from the Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (Sampson et al., 1997). The other items measured visibility of police ("The police are noticeably present/highly visible in my neighborhood"), response to police presence ("I like seeing police officers in my neighborhood"), and satisfaction with police officers ("I am satisfied with the police officers

who serve my neighborhood").

Survey Development

A draft version of the survey was piloted by administering the survey for a limited period of time at a frequently used community agency (a YMCA located in the grant area). The survey was revised following the pilot phase. The final survey was translated to Spanish and back-translated to English by native Spanish speakers from Central Texas. Respondents were asked to provide the nearest intersection to their home, which was used to determine if they lived within a crime hotspot receiving Operation Mobile Walking Beat (OMWB).

Survey Administration

The Rundberg Community Survey was administered in English and Spanish to residents who lived and/or worked in the community by three methods: online, in-person, and on paper forms. Online surveys were sent to neighborhood association email lists, made available at computer workstations and the library and YMCA, and distributed electronically to community agencies. In-person administration of the survey was conducted by members of the research team and Master's level students from School of Social Work at The University of Texas at Austin, many of whom were able to administer the survey in English and Spanish. In-person surveys were administered at community events, and researchers went door-to-door within the OMWB hotspots; respondents were given the choice of filling out the survey themselves or having it read to them. Paper form surveys were sent home with elementary school students in kindergarten through second grade in the grant area.

Data Analysis

Descriptive analyses were used to describe and compare the sample and intervention groups on relevant demographics using chi-square analyses and independent samples t-tests. Independent samples t-tests were also used to determine significant differences between the intervention and comparison groups on the measures of

interest. To determine whether individuals who received the OMWB intervention scored higher on the dependent variable of interest, perceptions of police, than those who did not, a linear model was fit using SPSS. In the model, OMWB status was the independent variable and race/ethnicity (Latino/a, White, Black, and Other), age (18-29, 30-49, 50-69, and 70+), homeownership (owns home vs. does not own home), perceptions of social control, and neighborhood attachment were the covariates. The covariates were chosen because the OMWB areas had significantly higher percentages of participants identifying as Latino/a and significantly lower percentages of homeowners. Additionally, age was included as a covariate because the non-OMWB areas had higher percentages of older respondents; previous studies have indicated that older participants report higher levels of satisfaction with police (McCluskey, McCluskey, & Enriquez, 2008). Participants in the OMWB hotspots expressed significantly lower scores on social control and neighborhood attachment, so these scores were also included as covariates.

Results

A total of 611 surveys were completed. Survey participants identified as 57.4% Latino/a, 26.8% White, 5.4% Black, and 10.2% other race/ethnicity (Table 1). Participants were 64.6% female. The majority of the participants reported renting their homes (64.3%). The majority reported living in the Rundberg area (n = 559, 91.5%), while the remaining participants reported working in the Rundberg area (n = 17, 2.8%), or living and working in the Rundberg area (n = 35, 5.7%). Participants reported living in the Rundberg area for an average of 9 years (SD = 9.6 years, range 0 to 46 years).

Two-thirds (n = 408, 66.8%) of the participants provided enough information about the nearest intersection to their home for their location to be coded as either within the OMWB boundaries or not within the boundaries. Of these, 165 (40.4%) resided in crime hot spots that received OMWB. The remaining 243 lived in the

grant area but did not receive the OMWB intervention.

Participants who received the OMWB intervention were demographically different than those who did not, as shown in Table 1. Compared to participants who did not live in the OMWB boundaries, participants who received the OMWB intervention were significantly more likely to identify as non-white, chose to complete the survey in Spanish much more often, and were more likely to rent their homes (Table 1).

The highest proportion of the surveys were collected through paper forms sent home with students in area elementary schools (39.3%, n = 240). The remainder were collected online (20.8%, n = 127), door-to-door in the hot spots (19.8%, n = 121), and at community events (20.1%, n = 123). Over one-third of the surveys were completed in Spanish (n = 235, 38.5%). Most participants in the OMWB hotspots completed surveys in door-to-door interactions (71.5%) or via the school-based take home surveys (16.4%), while the non-OMWB residents and those who did not provide location completed their surveys online (39.9%), at community events (37.0%), or through the school-based take home surveys (22.6%).

Residents of the *Restore Rundberg* revitalization area scored slightly above the scale midpoint for all four of the survey scales: social cohesion, perceived neighborhood safety, neighborhood attachment, and perceptions of police (Table 1). Among the 408 respondents who provided enough home location data to be coded as having received the OMWB community policing intervention or not, independent sample t-tests showed that residents who received the intervention had significantly lower neighborhood attachment (-0.28) and lower social control (-0.28; Table 2). There was also a significant difference in terms of perceptions of police. In bivariate t-tests, the residents who received the OMWB scored approximately 1 point higher (9.03% higher), than the non-OMWB group. Results of the linear model demonstrated perceptions of police scores were significantly higher among the recipients of the OMWB intervention compared to the non-OMWB group

(by + 0.83; F = 6.303, p = 0.013), while controlling for the demographic characteristics of race (F = 1.42, p = 0.237), age (F = 2.84, p = 0.037) and homeownership (F = 2.067, p = 0.152), as well as perceptions of social control (F = 0.63, p = 0.43) and neighborhood attachment (F = 23.57, p < 0.001). The model had an R2 of 0.120, indicating a small to medium effect size according to Cohen's criteria (R = 0.346).

Discussion

The findings of our bivariate analyses indicate that even residents who are dissatisfied with their neighborhood conditions can have positive perceptions of police when community policing strategies are in place. Crime is associated with lower ratings of variables measuring perceived neighborhood quality, and that relationship was illustrated here, as residents of hotspots scored significantly lower on neighborhood attachment and social control. Despite lower ratings of neighborhood attachment and social control in the high crime areas that were selected to receive the OMWB intervention, respondents rated their perceptions of police significantly higher than those who did not receive the OMWB intervention. Hotspot residents were nearly equal to the respondents who did not reside in hotspots, in terms of their perceptions of neighborhood safety and social cohesion, suggesting that the OMWB may have had a protective effect for these variables. The linear model further supports this conclusion, in that while controlling for neighborhood attachment and perception of social control, as well as race and homeownership, individuals in the intervention group, on average, had a more positive perception of police when compared to individuals in the comparison group.

Taken as a whole, this study links existing theoretical and empirical work regarding communities and crime with applied work related to community policing and provides implications for community policing interventions. This study suggests that despite perceived deterioration of social dimensions of neighborhoods that are related to crime, such as neighborhood attachment

and social control, community policing interventions can potentially counteract vulnerability to crime through increasing positive perceptions of police. Based on previous studies, positively influencing perceptions of police can theoretically lead to greater collaboration with and reporting by community residents, which is important to sanctioning, and ultimately reducing crime (Kirk & Matsuda, 2011; Kirk & Papachristos, 2011). Finally, this study suggests that the mobile walking beat intervention, specifically, is an effective strategy to incorporate into a comprehensive community policing initiative as it can directly address issues with poor perceptions of police and potentially curb crime as a result.

Social Work Partnerships

This study came about as part of a partnership between the Austin Police Department, the *Restore Rundberg* stakeholders, and the School of Social Work at the University of Texas at Austin. Based on the results of the community policing initiative, demonstrated in this and other forthcoming publications, we recommend that other cities consider such collaborative partnerships. Social workers and Schools of Social Work are well-equipped to assist police departments with the design, implementation, and study of community policing. In the case of *Restore Rundberg,* social work faculty helped the police department and Rundberg community plan interventions and events; designed a multi-faceted evaluation in partnership with the police department; and made regular presentations to the community on crime statistics, process milestones, and preliminary survey results. Social work students gained valuable experience by engaging with the Rundberg community in survey administration and service projects. Such interdisciplinary partnerships leverage resources and expertise from many parties and create collective impact (Kania & Kramer, 2011).

Limitations

The results of this cross-sectional survey

sample should be considered in light of the study's limitations. First, this study cannot meet the criteria for establishing a causal link between the OMWB community policing intervention and the differences on the dependent variables, as we cannot establish a pre- to post-intervention degree of change. Practical barriers relating to the timing of the research team's involvement in Restore Rundberg prevented a pre-post design. The community survey is further limited by purposive sampling. While the research team worked to recruit a diverse and representative sample, we cannot ensure that the sample is representative, and we could not offer the survey in every language spoken in the area. It is notable that about one-third of participants did not provide enough information about the nearest intersection to their home for their location to be coded, and therefore those participants could not be included in the intervention/non-intervention comparisons. Additionally, our measure of social control was limited to a single question, as some additional social control questions were removed due to the requests of stakeholders. Other community researchers may want to consider social control measures such as the intergenerational closure and social control scale employed by Browning, Burrington, Leventhal, and Brooks-Gunn (2008), drawn from Project on Human Development in Chicago Neighborhoods (Sampson, Morenoff, & Earls, 1999).

Conclusion

Community policing in its current form represents an alternative to traditional professional policing in the United States. This approach emphasizes problem solving, community-police collaboration, and organizational transformation. Although evaluations of its effectiveness in terms of reducing crime have varied, its effect on perceptions of police remains consistent. With confidence in police declining, improving perceptions of police must become an important priority for police departments hoping to improve their relationships with communities as a strategy to reduce crime. Conclusions stemming from the findings presented here suggest that community policing can help to strengthen community-police partnerships and improve perceptions of police, even among communities where residents' neighborhood attachment and social cohesion are not particularly strong. This study also lends support to the idea that introducing a mobile walking beat strategy in the context of a community policing initiative can specifically address community-police relationships. Finally, successful implementation of this survey and the overall *Restore Rundberg* effort indicates that Schools of Social Work are well positioned to support police departments in developing community-police partnerships within a broader community policing intervention.

Table 1. Participant Characteristics

	Received OMWB (n = 165, 27.0%)		Did Not Receive OMWB (n = 243, 39.8%)		Location not coded (n = 203, 33.2%)	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Race/ethnicity[a]						
Latino/a	126	76.4%	71	29.2%	154	75.9%
White	19	11.5%	133	54.7%	12	5.9%
Black	13	7.9%	7	2.9%	13	6.4%
Other	5	3.0%	31	12.8%	19	9.4%
Missing	2	1.2%	1	0.4%	5	2.5%
Home ownership[b]						
Owns home	14	8.5%	150	61.7%	33	16.3%
Rents home	144	87.3%	89	36.6%	160	78.8%
Other	7	4.2%	4	1.6%	3	1.5%
Missing	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	7	3.4%
Age[c]						
18-29	60	36.4%	30	12.3%	65	32.0%
30-49	81	49.1%	120	49.4%	113	55.7%
50-69	16	9.7%	70	28.8%	16	7.9%
70+	4	2.4%	23	9.5%	2	1.0%
Female	91	55.2%	156	64.2%	148	72.9%
Surveyed in Spanish[d]	101	61.2%	28	11.5%	106	52.2%

[a]Participants who received OMWB more likely to identify as Latino/a [$\chi^2(1, N = 405) = 189.69$, $p < 0.001$)] or Black/ AA [$\chi^2(1, N = 405) = 5.36$, p=0.02] than those who did not

[b] Participants who received OMWB more likely to own their homes than those who did not, $\chi^2(4, N = 408) = 116.24$, $p < 0.001$

[c] Participants who received OMWB significantly younger than those who did not, t(402) = -7.83, p < .001

[d] Participants who received OMWB more likely to select Spanish language survey administration than those who did not, $\chi^2(1, N = 408) = 112.22$, $p < 0.001$

Table 2. Independent samples t-tests comparing scores for residents of OMWB Hotspots to those who did not receive OMWB

	No OMWB M (SD)	OMWB Hotspot M (SD)	*t (df)*
Perceptions of Police	11.24 (2.43)	12.26 (2.40)	-3.99 (371)*
Neighborhood Attachment	8.36 (2.22)	7.59 (2.36)	3.23 (384)*
Social Cohesion	13.71 (2.73)	13.31 (3.24)	1.28 (374)
Perceived Neighborhood Safety	8.21 (1.98)	8.09 (2.19)	0.60 (398)
Social Control	2.72 (0.96)	2.44 (1.08)	2.72 (387)*

*p $\leq$ 0.01

References

Abell, N., Springer, D. W., & Kamata, A. (2009). *Developing and validating rapid assessment instruments.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Bellair, P. E. (1997). Social interaction and community crime: Examining the importance of neighbor networks. *Criminology, 35*(4), 677–703. Retrieved from http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1997.tb01235.x

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology, 22*(6), 723.

Browning, C. R., Burrington, L. A., Leventhal, T., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2008). Neighborhood structural inequality, collective efficacy, and sexual risk behavior among urban youth. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 49*(3), 269-285.

City of Austin, Austin Police Department (2012). City of Austin Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Program Narrative. (p. 20). Retrieved from: https://www.austintexas.gov/sites/default/files/files COA_BCJI_Attachment_2_Narrative.pdf

Cordner, G. (2014). Community policing. In Reisig & Kane (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of police and policing* (pp.148-171). New York, NY: Oxford University Press

Desmond, M., Papachristos, A. V., & Kirk, D. S. (2016). Police violence and citizen crime reporting in the black community. *American Sociological Review, 81*(5), 857-876.

Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 10*(4), 399-428. doi:10.1007/s11292-014-9210-y

Jones, J. M. (2015). *In US, confidence in police lowest in 22 years*. Retrieved from http://news.gallup.com/poll/183704/confidence-police-lowest-years.aspx

Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective impact. *Stanford Social Innovation Review, 9* (1). Retrieved from: https://ssir.org/issue/winter_2011

Kirk, D. S., & Matsuda, M. (2011). Legal cynicism, collective efficacy, and the ecology of arrest. *Criminology, 49*(2), 443-472.

Kirk, D. S., & Papachristos, A. V. (2011). Cultural mechanisms and the persistence of neighborhood violence. *American Journal of Sociology, 116*(4), 1190-1233

Kubrin, C. E., & Weitzer, R. (2003). New directions in social disorganization theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 40*(4), 374-402.

McCluskey, J. D., McCluskey, C. P., & Enriquez, R. (2008). A comparison of Latino and White citizen satisfaction with police. *Journal of*

Criminal Justice, 36(6), 471-477.

McLeroy, K. R., Bibeau, D., Steckler, A., & Glanz, K. (1988). An ecological perspective on health promotion programs. *Health Education & Behavior, 15*(4), 351-377.

Moore, M. H., & Poethig, M. (1999). The police as an agency of municipal government: Implications for measuring police effectiveness. In Langworthy, R. (Ed.), Measuring what matters*: Proceedings from the Policing Research Institute meetings* (pp. 151-176).

Morenoff, J. D., Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2001). Neighborhood inequality, collective efficacy, and the spatial dynamics of urban violence. *Criminology, 39*(3), 517-558.

President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing.* Washington, DC. Retrieved from: https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/taskforce/taskforce_finalreport.pdf

Rennison, C. M. (2010). An investigation of reporting violence to the police: A focus on Hispanic victims. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 38*(4), 390-399. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.04.007

Robin, G. D. (2000). *Community policing: Origins, elements, implementation, assessment:.* New York, NY: E. Mellen Press.

Sampson, R. J., & Groves, W. B. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology, 94*(4), 774-802.

Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Earls, F. (1999). Beyond social capital: Spatial dynamics of collective efficacy for children. *American Sociological Review, 64*(5), 633-660.

Sampson, R. J., Morenoff, J. D., & Gannon-Rowley, T. (2002). Assessing "neighborhood effects": Social processes and new directions in research. *Annual Review of Sociology, 28*(1), 443-478.

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science, 277*(5328), 918-924.

Sherman, L. W. (2013). The rise of evidence-based policing: Targeting, testing, and tracking. *Crime and Justice, 42*(1), 377-451.

Skogan, W. G. (2005). Citizen satisfaction with police encounters. *Police Quarterly, 8*(3), 298-321. doi:10.1177/1098611104271086

Springer, D. W., Lauderdale, M., Fitzgerald, K., & Baker, D. (2016). Restoring Rundberg: A community-research partnership. *Professional Development: The International Journal of Continuing Social Work Education, 19*(1), 5-9.

Theodore, N., & Habans, R. (2016). Policing immigrant communities: Latino perceptions of police involvement in immigration enforcement. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 42*(6), 970-988. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2015.1126090

Trojanowicz, R. C., & Carter, D. (1988). *The philosophy and role of community policing.* East Lansing, MI: National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center, School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University.

U.S. Department of Justice. (2014). *Community policing defined.* Retrieved from https://cops.usdoj.gov/pdf/vets-to-cops/e030917193-CP-Defined.pdf

Warner, B. D., & Rountree, P. W. (1997). Local social ties in a community and crime model: Questioning the systemic nature of informal social control. *Social Problems, 44*(4), 520-536.

Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (2006). *Race and policing in America: conflict and reform.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.