10-14-2016

# The New Community Policing: Developing a Partnership-Based Theoretical Foundation

Adam J. McKee
*University of Arkansas-Monticello*

Andre' L. Lewis
*University of Arkansas-Monticello*

Follow this and additional works at: http://pubs.lib.umn.edu/ijps

# THE NEW COMMUNITY POLICING: DEVELOPING A PARTNERSHIP-BASED THEORETICAL FOUNDATION

Adam J. McKee PhD

Andre' L. Lewis MSW, LCSW

**Abstract**

This paper presents a Partnership Model of Community Policing based on Partnership concepts developed by Riane Eisler and undergirded by Cultural Transformation Theory as a guiding principle (1987, 2010, 2013). This model is more reflective of the daily lived experiences of community police officers.  It is culturally relevant and based on the whole of the police officer's relationship with the community within the context in which the interactions occur. This "New Community Policing" is an extension of Riane Eisler's Cultural Transformation Theory and is an attempt to answer her call for a movement towards a partnership model of social organization. Ultimately, "8 Pillars of the New Community Policing" are developed to aid in defining and implementing community policing.

## Background

The phrases "community policing" and "community oriented policing" (COP) have been used in the political arena since the 1980s.  Many police departments have some mention of the concept as part of their mission statement.  Skogan (2005) suggested that the harsh reality is that the overwhelming majority of these agencies did not, in fact, implement community policing in any meaningful way. It may be politically correct to mention community policing in the department's mission statement, but

without further details, the concept lacks ability to shape behavior. Paying "lip service" to the idea has weakened its credibility as a bona fide strategy for police reform. As journalist Terrell Jermaine Starr (2015) stated, "Politicians from President Obama to Chris Christie have been touting community policing. But it's a distraction from the real problem." He goes on to assert that the real issue is a lack of *accountability*. In response to the mistaken view that community policing necessitates more officers on the street, he states that "… [I]n communities like mine, the predominately black Bedford-Stuyvesant neighborhood of Brooklyn, putting more officers on patrol doesn't lessen the chance of police brutality — it worsens it. As long as police know their badges empower them to operate with near-impunity, we don't need more encounters with them; we need fewer."

To combat this rift between police and communities, President Barack Obama issued an executive order appointing an 11-member Task Force on 21st Century Policing to respond "to a number of serious incidents between law enforcement and the communities they serve and protect." According to the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS Office) the President wanted a quick but thorough response that would begin the process of healing and restore community trust" (COPS Office, p. 1). The objectives of the Task Force were made clear by the President: "The task force shall, consistent with applicable law, identify best practices and otherwise make recommendations to the President on how policing practices can promote effective crime reduction while building public trust" (COPS Office, 2015, p. 1).

The task force did an impressive job of identifying specific issues and practices that were problematic, and made a total of 59 recommendations with 92 accompanying action items. According to the *Implementation Guide* published shortly after the Task Force's final report was released, "The task force insisted that the recommendations be anchored in measurable and behavioral change and not in abstract theory around policing" (COPS Office, 2015, p. 1). We believe that this insistence was well-intentioned but ultimately misguided. While the underlying logic is not detailed in the report or the implementation guide, we consider that this may have been a backlash against previous theoretical perspectives that failed to garner any evidence of empirical validity. Such theories misdirected police efforts for years, squandered many millions of dollars, tied up a vast amount of human resources, and were used to justify unethical practices in the name of fixing broken windows. Wilson and Kelling (1982) used broken windows as a metaphor for disorder within communities, linking disorder and incivility to subsequent occurrences of serious crime. McKee (2002) found that there are vestiges of broken windows rhetoric in the Task Force's final recommendations.

The implementation guide begins with underlying themes (COPS Office, 2015, p. 2). First among these is, "Change the culture of policing." We concur. We do, however, take issue with doing so with a nonsystematic set of loosely connected recommendations. We agree with most of the Task Force's recommendations, but wish to take those recommendations further in many instances, and organize them around a theoretical framework that redefines community policing and defines the

only valid form of policing in contemporary society as community policing. The implementation guide states that the police culture must change, but speaks only to the philosophical values of "protect[ing] the dignity and human rights of all, to be protectors and champions of the constitution" (p. 2). There is also a quote from Plato:

> In a republic that honors the core of democracy—the greatest amount of power is given to those called Guardians. Only those with the most impeccable character are chosen to bear the responsibility of protecting the democracy. (p.2)

There is a self-concept among many police officers that involves closely identifying with a warrior ethos (Grossman, 2014). The idea of police as "warriors" is often taken by the public to mean something synonymous with "paramilitary force." This conception has underscored the view of police as an occupying army rather than as guardians of the public peace and welfare. We suggest that the "warrior" mentality of many police officers needs to be exchanged for a "guardian" mentality in which virtuous protection of the public is paramount, but force may still be used when necessary.

Despite an understandable concern about being mired in macro level theoretical perspectives, which are difficult to translate into actionable items, we believe it was a mistake for the Task Force to abandon all attempts to develop a theoretical foundation for community policing. The lack of foundational theories and the

presence of overly abstract and/or empirically invalid theories have plagued policing for many years. When community policing is painted with the broad brush strokes of a philosophical perspective, it can quickly morph into "anything goes." It is also easy to insert those philosophical points into mission statements and move forward with "business as usual." The community policing philosophy can also spawn unintended consequences, such as a rise in the number of arrests and citations that are encountered when the number of officers in a particular geographical area is increased, but the number of tools in their toolbox remains limited to arrest and citation. These are the dangers of not developing a well-reasoned theoretical perspective to guide conceptualization, implementation, and maintenance.

In the past, community policing has been defined 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" (COPS Office, 2014, p. 1). As we will demonstrate, this overly broad definition does not go far enough in fostering authentic partnerships between police, citizens, and communites. We further argue that when the community policing concept is infused with cultural transformation theory, it can accomplish its objectives.

We wish to underscore the importance of the idea of the Task Force's mandate to "change the culture of policing." The dominant culture in policing today (though we acknowledge several beacons of progressive change) is a vestigial remnant of a

bygone era when average citizens "knew their place" and deference to authority was mostly automatic and absolute.  The Civil Rights revolution has produced an America that has an entirely different view of power, especially police power.  Domination models simply do not work today (as they once did), yet the traditional model of policing takes the functioning of those models of civil behavior for granted.  This, we speculate, is the root cause of most conflicts between citizens and the police.  The idea of deference to power is part of a police culture that is characterized by machismo and force. This ethos gives rise to the sense of entitlement that so many citizens have lashed out against, resulting in the current "crisis of legitimacy" in American policing.  If we are to move forward with any real change, that change must be from the bottom up.  Superficial changes to traditional police structures and culture will be doomed to failure, like the attempts made to install community policing as the dominant model of policing during the Clinton Administration. America must change the culture of policing but it will be a Herculean task (Skogan, 2008). Our focus is on defining what the characteristics of a new police culture should be.  To do this,  we must consider what we expect of police.

## THE ROLE OF THE POLICE IN SOCIETY

Many aspects of the police culture are laudable and should be retained for the benefit of officers and citizens alike.  The self-image of officers as relentless warriors fighting crime is too narrow and must be greatly expanded; catching bad guys at all costs is the underlying belief about the role of police held by a majority of officers (Crank,

2004). When contemporary policing is viewed through the lens of cultural transformation theory, it becomes apparent that policing agencies must adapt to increasingly diverse communities by choosing a model that carefully weighs legitimate police goals against the high social costs of using force. The current state dictates that violence must often be countered with violence. Force is a part of the police mandate to protect and serve. However, the current response is often extreme, and force is too frequently relied upon.

We suggest, based on the tenets of cultural transformation theory, that the pinnacle of these police goals and objectives is *to maintain a community where community members and their property are safe and secure by design*. A corollary of this is that citizens *feel* safe and secure, in addition to the reality of being that way. Eliminating fear of crime is a traditional goal of community policing, and should be retained. This arrangement of priorities seems odd to those steeped in the traditional model of policing; the enforcement of criminal codes (i.e., "law enforcement") has always been the primary focus of policing in the United States. We suggest that the new police culture should value the authority to enforce criminal codes using traditional legalistic (code based) approaches (such as making arrests and issuing citations) as merely one small set of tools among many, and that violence should be used as a last resort to ensure the public safety, security, and welfare. Like the limiting term "warrior", the term "law enforcement" in the police lexicon should also be challenged. Referring to policing as "law enforcement" is extremely limiting; internalizing that "crime fighter" mentality is a major facet of the police culture that must be

dismantled.  Defining a police officer as a "law enforcement officer" has the same lack of logic and breadth as defining a parent as a "child disciplinarian."  Code enforcement may be integral to officers' professional duties, but (we argue) it is not the defining characteristic.  Indeed, we can point to the progressive naming of the Irish police, *An Garda Síochána* (literally, "Guardian of the Peace") as an example of a lexicon that reflects the defining values that we suggest.

## CULTURAL TRANSFORMATION THEORY

To understand the need for and process of transforming the current police culture, we use Riane Eisler's cultural transformation theory (Eisler, 1987). Cultural transformation theory was developed in response to Eisler's need to understand the domination side of the social organization she encountered as a young child.  Her personal experience with the domination model of social organization led her to seek understanding of fairness and peace and how it could be obtained.  Therefore, she embarked on a life of research into prehistory and human history.  As her understanding of fairness and peace grew, she gained insight into structures that are applied to social organizations.  This idea led her to conclude that organizations need to re-evaluate things using a holistic lens. In the instance of policing, that would mean seeing police organizations as complete systems rather than seeing them as individual parts.  In employing a holistic lens, she was able to see alternative views to the conquest, the pursuit of supremacy, and the assumption that humans are innately violent (Frimoth, 2013).

This understanding ultimately led to the development of a theory that provides a way to transcend traditional social categories that lead to binary choices such as us/them, right/left, and police/citizens. To this end, cultural transformation theory is about the two primary ways in which societies tend to be organized, domination or partnership. In recognizing that societies tend toward domination or partnership models, it was possible to ascertain which communities were on the domination side of the spectrum, maintained through fear and control, and which ones were on the partnership side of the spectrum, based on mutual respect, accountability, and shared beliefs. The current police culture is primarily based on a domination model; therefore, we recommend moving towards a partnership model that is more culturally relevant and attuned to America's increasingly diverse communities.

We believe that a partnership model of policing is a promising model and provides a holistic way to understand Community Policing. It requires new ways of organizing and provides a means to understand the importance of culture and genuine community problems while focusing on the way situations are framed, and the impact those frames have on defining a situation. It underscores the interconnectedness of things and situations while acknowledging limits, thereby establishing boundaries that are critical to understanding different communities. In short, we believe that users of a partnership model of policing should be capable of:

1. Understanding situations in context (both current and historical);

2. Appreciating multiple stakeholders and thus perspectives;

3.  Addressing and clarifying questions of purpose;

4.  Distinguishing what constitutes problems in communities, how communities define themselves, and why police intervention is needed

5.  Facilitating action that is purposeful and which can be judged as systemically desirable and culturally feasible;

6.  Developing a means to orchestrate understandings and practices across space and time in a manner that continues to address public safety concerns when it is unclear at the start as to what would constitute an improvement (i.e., adaptively manage a co-evolutionary dynamic); and

7.  Institutionalizing on-going use of the approach in a manner that does not trivialize the premises on which it is built (adapted from Ison, 2010).

## DOMINATION MODEL OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

Eisler (1987, 2013) used the term *domination model* to describe societies that orient toward domination. She stated that such societies are maintained using authoritarian control in both the family and the state or tribe. They rank males over females, and rank stereotypically "masculine" traits and activities such as control and conquest higher than stereotypically "feminine" ones such as nurture and nonviolence. These societies are further characterized by a high level of socially accepted, even idealized, abuse and violence to maintain rigid rankings, be they man/woman, man/man, race/race, religion/religion, humans/nature, or police/community (Eisler, 1987; 2014). This model places police over the community and expects a certain

amount of violence to occur. In doing so, it ignores communities' historical contributions, and celebrates police conquest over communities or outside groups, proclaims dominion over nature, and declares men as kings of countries and rulers of the home.

Eisler's (1987) description of domination societies has also been applied to organizations using force and coercion, and justifying their use throughout the organization. In a domination system, there are many dimensions of aggressive actions, from individual acts of violence to terrorism or war. Under the domination paradigm, violence is seen as natural, even divinely ordained (Frimoth 2013). Ultimately, in this belief system, there are two options: You either dominate or you are dominated. Therefore, the war between the sexes, or between police and community, is inevitable. The central belief is there is no alternative (Eisler 2013).

## PARTNERSHIP MODEL OF SOCIAL ORGANIZATION

The partnership model represents societies that exhibit democracy in both the family and the state or tribe and equality of males and females, and place high value on stereotypically "feminine" traits and activities such as empathy and caregiving in both females and males. There is a low level of socially accepted abuse and violence, because they are not needed to maintain rigid top-down rankings of domination (Eisler 2002). Overall, partnership societies are more concerned with linking rather than ranking. They use hierarchies, but what Eisler (1987) calls "hierarchies of

actualization" (p. 106) instead of hierarchies of domination. In hierarchies of actualization, accountability, respect, and benefits flow from the bottom up as well as from the top down, and power is used to empower rather than to disempower (Potter 2010).

The partnership model consists of four interactive, mutually supporting components:

- Democratic and egalitarian structures, with flexible hierarchies in which power is viewed not as power over but as power to and power with: the kind of power that is empowering rather than disempowering, as inspiring and supportive rather than controlling.

- An equal partnership between men and women, police and communities. This requires that qualities and behaviors in both men and women, police and the community, that are non-violent, nurturing and caregiving in nature, and that are considered "unmanly" in the dominator model, be assigned high value.

- No cultural acceptance of Abuse and Violence. This does mean that they do not exist, but it does mean taking away the institutional approval and seeking alternative solutions to force and violence as means to police communities.

- Beliefs about human nature that support empathic and mutually respectful relations; this means recognizing that violence and cruelty are human possibilities but are not considered inevitable and normal, much less moral.

Eisler noted that cultures that orient toward the partnership end of the partnership/domination continuum also transcend conventional categories such as religious/secular and police/community (Eisler, 2013).

According to Eisler (1987), cultures are on a continuum between pure domination and pure partnership; additionally, they may move closer to one or the other extreme in response to forces in history. Eisler believed that looking at cultural evolution through the lens of the partnership/domination continuum provided promise for a more equitable and peaceful future, making it possible to see that we are surrounded by movement toward family and social structures that are closer to a partnership template in spite of significant resistance (Eisler 2013).

Furthermore, cultural transformation theory offers a conceptual framework that is not unilinear (containing one path to societal change), moving from primitive to civilized, but instead multilinear (multiple paths to societal change), which recognizes that things do not always progress in an orderly fashion. Instead, it accepts that systems evolve in their way by adapting to diverse environments. Specifically, it posits that the partnership model and domination model are two primary attractors for social systems; that movement from one to the other does not happen in a linear fashion; and that times of disequilibrium offer an opportunity for fundamental cultural transformation. In fact, the current unrest in policing in America represents an example of an opportunity brought on by disequilibrium. Because there are clear problems in community policing and a pervasive lack of trust of police in African-

American communities, there is a need to move law enforcement administration's thinking from domination to partnership when engaging in community policing.

This article provides a way for law enforcement to shift toward a multilinear policing paradigm and to train officers to assess the communities they patrol from a partnership perspective, understanding that the way to evolve in their relationships with African Americans in their communities is by adapting to more diverse environmental factors.

## THE EIGHT PILLARS OF THE NEW COMMUNITY POLICING

Based on the theoretical perspective described above, we have expanded the Four Cornerstones of Community Transformation Theory (Eisler, 2010) into what we call the Eight Pillars of the New Community Policing:

1. Partnerships

2. Problem Solving

3. Procedural Fairness

4. Proscribed Scope

5. Protection

6. Professionalism

7. Purpose

8. Principles

The genesis of the idea of recasting the theory for a particular application was the work of De Azevedo Hanks (2015) in which she developed "The 8 C's of the Partnership Model of Family Organization." Our restatement leaves the substance of her theory intact, but customizes its tenets for application to policing. We wish to note that what follows is built on previous work. The glaring deficiencies in the initial formulation of community policing were mostly addressed by the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing in both the *Final Report* (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing 2015) and the *Implementation Guide* (COPS Office 2015). Our contribution to the field is to provide a theoretical foundation and a structural framework that rest on that theoretical base.

## 1. Partnerships

This pillar is the core element of traditional community policing, and is the core of the theoretical perspective applied to the new, expanded definition of community policing suggested herein. This first pillar dictates that police departments must foster trust within their communities. As the President's task force (2015) suggests, "Building trust and nurturing legitimacy on both sides of the police/citizen divide is the foundational principle underlying the nature of relations between law enforcement agencies and the communities they serve" (p. 1). The Task Force points out that decades of social scientific research supports the premise that people obey the laws more readily when they perceive that those enforcing the law have legitimate authority (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing 2015, 1). To achieve compliance with police directives without coercion and force, the best

strategy for police to employ is to form authentic partnerships based on mutual trust and understanding within communities. Perhaps the most important facet of building the trust of police among communities is the perception of procedural fairness. That is, police follow procedures that treat everyone with equity, dignity, and respect. Building this understanding within many disenfranchised communities may be a long and arduous process. Obviously, building relationships is worth doing for ethical reasons. It is the right thing to do. It has key practical advantages as well: If voluntary compliance can be gained without resorting to force, then fewer officers will be injured in the line of duty, fewer citizens will be harmed, and fewer "use of force" complaints and lawsuits will be filed. This element is fundamental to community building; thus we have made it one of the "8 Ps of the New Community Policing."

## 2. Problem Solving

To move policing from a philosophical and theoretical perspective to practices applied within America's communities, specific *actions* must be taken. The essence of the myriad tasks assigned to police by tradition and policy mandate have a common thread: They are problems that citizens want to be solved. The idea of police problem solving is closely associated with the scholar Herman Goldstein. Goldstein's (1990) Problem-oriented Policing (POP) concept was seized upon early on by the advocates of Community Policing. The real role of police, Goldstein argued, was to deal with the "residual problems of society." He proposed that this should be done through "systematic inquiry" in a way that essentially mirrors the scientific method. A

major impediment to implementing a problem-solving model was the fact that most departments failed to reward officers for problem-solving. Officers are (in most jurisdictions) graded on easy-to-measure variables that build strife rather than trust: citations issued and arrests made. As the American Bar Association (1986) noted, "Control over police practice should, insofar as possible, be positive, creating inducements to perform properly rather than concentrating solely upon penalizing improper conduct. Among the ways this can be accomplished are...inducements to police officers in terms of status, compensation, and promotion, on the basis of criteria that are related as directly as possible to the police function and police goals."(American Bar Association, Standard 1.5.2) If the police are there primarily to solve community problems, then this is what must be measured and rewarded. In the POP context, this means devising systems that reward officers for solving community problems, not for issuing citations and making arrests.

A vital aspect of problem solving is the evaluation phase. Goldstein admonished that feel-good stories are not sufficient, but his warnings often went unheeded. Performance data must be collected and analyzed. This principle of gathering and analyzing empirical evidence is valid for specific problem-resolution strategies, as well as providing a general gauge of the health of the relationship between citizens and police. The President's task force (2015) recommends that "law enforcement agencies...track and analyze the level of trust communities have in police just as they measure changes in crime" (p. 2). We suggest that, at present, most police departments in the United States (the vast majority of which are very small) do

neither. Instead, we recommend employing the partnership model to solving problems from the bottom up, and empowering citizens in the communities being policed to share in the problem-solving process.

## 3. Procedural Fairness

This seemingly simple concept is very complex in both its legal and ethical connotations. A significant element of the legal landscape that increases its complexity for officers is the dynamic nature of the law of police procedure. Courts are in the business of balancing the larger social control objectives of the criminal law with the civil rights protections guaranteed by the Constitution. This balancing act is further complicated by the winds of political and social change and advances in technology. The complexities of constitutional and procedural law strongly suggest the need for higher education in law enforcement (as we advocate further in the Professionalism pillar). They also suggest a curricular alignment with both law and social scientific theory and methods, rather than choosing one or the other as an emphasis, as most programs do as an artifact of the development of criminal justice as an independent academic discipline. A major facet of procedural fairness that the traditional model of policing entirely overlooks is that "police are to carry out their responsibilities according to established policies" and that those policies "must reflect community values" (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing 2015). The emphasis of police procedure has always been legal, relying almost exclusively on constitutional rules established by court cases. This suggests that policing must optimally exist within a legal framework that police officers understand, but must

also be circumscribed by community values. In other words, police must learn that just because a particular strategy is legal does not mean it is the best course of action.

Both fundamental fairness and effectiveness in the performance of these diverse duties of community police officers demand broad discretion, as does effectively devising solutions to community problems. Modification and expansion of procedural rules in an effort to restore legitimacy to police within communities will ultimately fail. That is, creating more abundant and precise procedural rules will solve nothing. Formal policies and guidance documents are valuable tools, but a dedication to ethical principles and a departmental culture amenable to the formation of meaningful partnerships are the most promising solutions in the long term. We believe that the President's task force (2015) relies too heavily on "policy and oversight" in fostering change. Systems of officer accountability must be improved, but policy alone is too limited to effect such change.

## 4. Proscribed Scope

The President's task force (2015) suggests, "Law enforcement agencies should also promote public trust by initiating positive non-enforcement activities to engage communities that typically have high rates of investigative and enforcement involvement with government agencies" (p. 2). We suggest extreme caution in interpreting this advice. While the new community policing paradigm suggests that police are community problem solvers, the police role must not be expanded such

that police resources are diluted to the point where efficacy is lost.  What this means in practice will vary dramatically from community to community, based on community resources in general, and resources allocated to policing specifically.  We advise extreme caution in planning police efforts.  Past theoretical perspectives (most notably Broken Windows) have been used to justify police programs that diluted resources and made whole departments less efficacious.  This fact underscores the need for a theoretical position such as the one advocated herein.  Unity of purpose and efficacy can be lost when planning and action within police departments are not guided by a theoretical perspective.

A tragic example of good intentions leading to negative unintended consequences can be seen in some School Resource Officer (SRO) programs.  The idea of SROs was a good one; we believe that putting police officers in public schools to work for community building, education, safety, and crime prevention is meritorious. Problems arose when the SRO concept was not coupled with community policing. Without a  culture of partnership, and hobbled by the severely limited tools of traditional policing, SROs resorted to making arrests to solve school discipline problems, and youths were ushered into the formal juvenile justice system in increasing numbers (American Civil Liberties Union, 2008).  Rather than performing the community policing function that advocates of the SRO idea intended, traditional police officers resorted to traditional tactics, so that problems grew rather than diminished.  School discipline is an education problem unless it reaches the level of dangerous criminal activity. Individuals who bring firearms into schools call for police

to be involved in their enforcement capacity; a student's refusing to stand up when ordered to do so and other such minor incivilities are not law enforcement issues. In other words, these minor infractions are beyond the scope of police practice and thus should be proscribed from police intervention.

## 5. Protection

Because the American system of laws grants police the legitimate use of force, the protection of life falls squarely within the scope of police duties. With this power comes great responsibility and the need for a correspondingly high degree of personal and professional accountability. Officers must be given sufficient education and training to accurately assess when deadly force is appropriate and when it is not. The other pillars we suggest collectively circumscribe the use of deadly force as well as the use of less than lethal force. That is, when an officer must resort to force, then all other efforts, for example communication and de-escalation, have failed. The use of force by police often suggests a failure to consider a much broader spectrum of conflict resolution options than officers have employed in a given circumstance. All levels of government and all people must make a concerted effort to reduce violence by rejecting the culture of violence in our society. Of course, the mandate to protect the life and welfare of citizens also extends to their property. Thefts and burglaries are among the most common crimes in America today (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2015, p. 2).

## 6. Professionalism

By the nature of the public trust given to police, officers are natural role models. Departments must strive for a high degree of professionalism at all times, and this goal must be achieved not only through the development of policy, but by embedding professionalism into the very culture of the department.

It must be acknowledged by governments, citizens, and police themselves that policing is not merely a "job" or "trade." Policing is a *profession*. Cox (2010) defines a profession as follows: "a profession is defined by: (1) a body of knowledge, (2) ethical guidelines, and (3) a professional organization with a growing set of published papers and best practices" (p. 7). This definition suggests that quality police training is necessary and prudent, and that America should allocate more resources to that noble cause. It also suggests a broad swath of knowledge and skills that are not amenable to the *training* environment. Both *training* and *education* are required for the demanding profession of policing.

University education for police should include: appreciation for diversity, a well-developed set of written and verbal communication skills (including conflict resolution), and an in-depth knowledge of criminal and procedural law. Most Americans would be appalled at the suggestion that nurses be allowed to practice without a formal education; the stakes are too high, and doing the job incorrectly can result in pain, misery, and death. That same society is inexplicably comfortable with giving a staggering amount of authority and power (along with firearms and other weapons) to police officers without the benefit of a college education. We call for a

heightened standard of police education that would ultimately require that all police officers be college educated. By "college educated," we mean a broad-based liberal education, not a technical education that focuses on traditional law enforcement procedures and tactics. In addition, we also call upon the criminal justice higher education community to revise the curriculum to achieve uniform standards that include cognate areas of study outside of what have traditionally been considered "criminal justice courses." We are not so bold as to suggest a model curriculum, but will identify communication, diversity, social welfare, technology, data analysis, systems thinking, and second languages as areas in which police officers would benefit greatly. Academics have asked police officers to "think outside of the box" for decades; it is time some educators think outside of their course offerings and expand their "box" to cognate areas that will make officers safer and more competent on the street. Many criminal justice programs are already doing much in this arena. However, there remains a large swath of police programs that focus on tactical and procedural application without due concern for the cognate areas identified above. To this end, we suggest that a national body such as the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences develop best practices that expand university criminal justice curricula beyond the criminal justice core.

## 7. Purpose

To be effective in the long term, officers must maintain a high level of morale and purpose in performing their duties. If officers "burn out," they may engage in their duties much like a factory worker who watches the clock on Friday afternoon. Most

officers begin their careers filled with drive and enthusiasm but wind up disenchanted. As the President's Task Force (2015) suggested, the mental and physical health of officers should be a top priority for every department. The public's expectation of police places officers in a stressful work environment. Public understanding of the limitations of police capabilities to deal with community problems would serve as an inoculant to disillusionment by officers. Such community understanding and support are much more likely under a partnership model than they are under a traditional domination model.

## 8. Principles

As previously stated, officers are role models in the community, or at least they *should* be. Ethics should guide every aspect of departmental operations. This principle should begin with recruit selection and include a careful vetting process to determine the ethical nature of the recruit. Simple criminal history checks are insufficient. Thorough background investigations should be conducted on all police recruits. Ethics must become a shared cultural value of policing and not be limited to a few hours of academy training. At all levels of government, serious ethical misconduct should result in the decertification of police officers such that they are no longer allowed to serve as officers in any agency within the United States. We laud the President's Task Force (2015) recommendation to establish a National Register of Decertified Officers, with the goal of covering all agencies within the United States and its territories.

Thus far, we have examined some of the core principles of community policing through an ethical lens. There are other principles which, while not widely acknowledged as moral principles per se, are nevertheless necessary to a successful transformation of a police department from the traditional model to a true community policing model. As the President's task force (2015) suggests, transformation within a police department is developed by "establish[ing] a culture of transparency and accountability to build public trust and legitimacy" (p.1). The underlying logic is that trust develops when community members understand the purpose of police policies, procedures, and actions, and judge them to be legitimate. There will be no respect for police authority as long as disenfranchised sectors of American society are mistrustful and fearful of what is perceived to be illegitimate power. This mistrust and fear have spawned anger and outrage in many communities.

In a time of heightened racial tensions, it is common to frame police problems with equity and equality in terms of race. There are some shameful examples of all-white police departments serving communities of color, but these are becoming rare.

The most prominent problem with diversity in American policing is the gender gap. Women are underrepresented in nearly every police department in the United States today. According to FBI (2013) statistics, women make up only about 12% of American police officers. We speculate that women are at once the victims of and the solution to the problematic machismo character of the traditional police culture. Most police departments are genuinely concerned with achieving ethnic diversity; we call upon all

American police departments to demonstrate the same level of dedication to gender equality.

## CONCLUSION

Community Policing is a philosophy that appeals to the American ethos of democracy, equity, and justice.  The success of community policing has been limited by police cultural values that do not fully align with the values that underlie the community policing philosophy.  Many of the problems with community policing have to do with vagueness, lack of specificity, and lack of widespread police support.  Our purpose in writing this paper was not to denigrate the community policing philosophy, but rather to expand and clarify its basic tenets.  Most of these values were always there, implicit in the spirit of the philosophy.  We merely seek to systematize and organize these ideas into a theoretical framework that makes them explicit.  Volumes have been written about issues among ranks of police officers that block the implementation of police reforms.  Solutions to those problems will be highly political, and will take both community and political action to eliminate.  Because communities differ significantly from one another, the political contours of those communities will also vary substantially.  Universal prescriptions for the transformation of police culture are thus very difficult, and we do not attempt to make them.  This paper ultimately seeks to address the issues of philosophical vagueness and lack of specificity by providing a theoretical foundation that bridges the chasm between community policing as a philosophy and the application of the

philosophy in the routine activities of police officers. As an intermediate step, we have developed the 8 Pillars of the New Community Policing to guide communities in the implementation of the model. We acknowledge that this is merely a starting point, and much theoretical work remains to be done.

If police-community relations are to improve, police culture must undergo dramatic change. Disenfranchised communities are jaded, and mistrust runs deep. A skeptical public will quickly and summarily dismiss a whitewashing of the traditional paradigm with flashy new programs and media spin. Ultimately, real and enduring change requires that America's police forces redefine the police culture as one of partnership rather than domination: a culture that inspires and supports communities.

References

American Bar Association. (1986). *Standards on Urban Police Function.* Retrieved November 11, 2013, from American Bar Association Site: http://www.americanbar.org/publications/criminal_justice_section_archive/crimjust_standards _urbanpolice.html

American Civil Liberties Union. (2008). *Hard Lessons School Resource Officer Programs and Schoo-Based Arrests in Three Connecticut Town.* New York: ACLU.

COPS Office. (2014). *Community Policing Defined.* Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

COPS Office. (2015). *President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing Implementation Guide: Moving from Recommendations to Action. .* Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Cox, L. (2010). *Creating a profession and a body of knowledge for product supportability.* Doctoral Dissertation. Retrieved from ABI-Information Database

Crank, J. P. (2004). *Understanding Police Cutlure (2nd.ed).* Colorado Springs, CO: Anderson.

De Azevedo Hanks, J. (2015). Bringing Partnership Home: A Model of Family Transformation. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership Studies, 2*(1).

Eisler, R. (1987). *The Chalice and the Blade: Our history, our future.* San Fransisco: Harper & Row.

Eisler, R. (2002). *The power of partnership: Seven relationships that will change your life.* Novato, CA: New World Library.

Eisler, R. (2008). *Building Cultures of Partnerhip and Peace*. Retrieved from Riane Eisler: http://rianeeisler.com/building-cultures-of-partnership-and-peace/

Eisler, R. (2008). *The real wealth of nations: Creating a caring economics.* San Fransisco: Berrer-Koehler.

Eisler, R. (2013). Building a caring economy and society: Beyond capitalism, socialism, and other old isms. *Cadmus, 2*(6), 50-65.

Eisler, R. (2013). Human possibilities: An integrated systems approach. *Jouirnal of Global Education, 69*, 269-289.

Eisler, R., & Loye, D. (1990). *The partnership way: New tools for living & learning practical companion for the Chalice and the blade healing our families and communities, and our world.* San Fransisco : Harper.

Eisler, R., Loye, D., & Norgaard, K. (1995). *Gender equality and the quality of life: A global survey and analysis .* Pacific Grove, CA: Center for Partnership Studies.

FBI. (2013). *Full-time Law Enforcement Employees*. Retrieved from FBI Uniform Crime Reports: https://ucr.fbi.gov/crime-in-the-u.s/2013/crime-in-the-u.s.-2013/tables/table-74

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (2015). *FBI Releases 2014 Crime Statistics from the National Incident-Based Reporting System.* Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice.

Frimoth, M. R. (2013). *A partnership model of international safety for child survivors of sexual abuse.* (Doctoral Dissertation California Institute of Integral Studies).

Goldstein, H. (1990). *Problem-oriented Policing .* New York: McGraw Hill.

Grossman, D. (2004). *Arm Combat, The Psychology and Physiology of Deadly Conflict in War and Peace.* Milstadt, IL: PPCT Research Group.

Ison, R. (2010). *How to act in a climate-change world.* New York: Springer.

McKee, A. J. (2002). Broken Window Theory. In D. Levison, *Encyclopedia of Crime and Punishment.* Sage: Los Angeles.

Potter, T. M. (2010). *Reconstructing a new story of nursing: A critical analysis of nursing textbooks using Riane Eisler's Partnership Paradigm .* (Doctoral Dissertation California Institute of Integral Studies).

President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. (1967). *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society.* Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office.

President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing.* Washington, D.C.: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Skogan, W. G. (2005). Community Policing: Common impediments to sucess. In L. Fridell, & M. A. Wycoff, *Community Policing: The Past Present and Future.* Washignton, D.C.: The Annie E. Casey Foundation & The Police Executive Research Forum.

Skogan, W. G. (2008, March). Why Reforms Fail. *Policing and Society, 18*(1), pp. 23-34.

Starr, T. J. (2015, November 3). *Community policing is not the solution to police brutality. It makes it worse.* Retrieved from Washington Post: https://www.washingtonpost.com/posteverything/wp/2015/11/03/community-policing-is-not-the-solution-to-police-brutality-it-makes-it-worse/#comments

Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). Broken windows. *Critical issues in policing: Contemporary readings*, 395-407.

---

**Adam J. McKee** is a criminal justice educator with a long-standing interest in community policing.  He began conducting research into this area with his Master's Thesis at the University of Southern Mississippi in 1999.  His dissertation involved an empirical test of Broken Windows Theory, which is considered by many to be the theoretical backbone of community policing.  Aside from teaching and

research, he served as an auxiliary deputy sheriff for ten years. He currently lives in Monticello, Arkansas where he teaches criminal justice at the University of Arkansas at Monticello.

**Andre' L. Lewis** is Assistant Professor and Director of Social Work at University of Arkansas at Monticello. He is currently completing his dissertation in Marriage and Family Therapy (Creative Systemic Studies) at the University of Louisiana-Monroe. He is a Licensed Certified Social Worker in the state of Arkansas where he has extensive practice experience in medical and behavioral health. His research is centered on creative ways to engage in partnerships for fatherhood, families and communities.

Correspondence about this article should be addressed to Adam McKee PhD at mckee@uamont.edu