

2017

# Community-Oriented Policing and Crime Rates and Crime Clearance Rates in North Carolina

Elizabeth Wrenn Johnson  
*Walden University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations>

 Part of the [Public Administration Commons](#), and the [Public Policy Commons](#)

---

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu](mailto:ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu).

# Walden University

College of Social and Behavioral Sciences

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Elizabeth Johnson

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,  
and that any and all revisions required by  
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee

Dr. Heather Mbaye, Committee Chairperson,  
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Mi Young Lee, Committee Member,  
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Dr. Tanya Settles, University Reviewer,  
Public Policy and Administration Faculty

Chief Academic Officer  
Eric Riedel, Ph.D.

Walden University  
2017

Abstract

Community-Oriented Policing and Crime and Crime Clearance Rates in North Carolina

by

Elizabeth Wrenn Johnson

M.A., Central Michigan University, 1997

B.A., North Carolina Wesleyan College, 1993

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

May 2017

## Abstract

While community-oriented policing was touted as a new paradigm in American policing, little data reflects its success in reducing crime and/or increasing crime clearance rates. Researchers have failed to definitively describe community policing as a successful style of policing, leaving much more research to be done on its effectiveness as a crime reduction method. Using Trojanowicz's seminal conceptualization of community-oriented policing as the foundation, the purpose of this correlational study was to determine whether there are statistically significant associations between community-oriented policing, crime rates, and crime clearance rates for the 9 municipalities of Carteret County, North Carolina. Data for community-oriented policing methods were collected from the police agencies via personal contact with an agency representative, while data for violent crime, property crime, violent crime clearance rates, and property crime clearance rates were obtained from the State Bureau of Investigation and the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Report. The results of Spearman's rho and a chi-square test for independence indicated that there was a statistically significant relationship between community-oriented policing and the violent crime rate ( $p = .03$ ), the violent crime clearance rate ( $p = .03$ ) and the property crime clearance rate ( $p = .009$ ). This study may enhance positive social change for police agencies in North Carolina by providing specific recommendations to better implement successful community policing strategies in their communities.

Community-Oriented Policing and Crime Rates and

Crime Clearance Rates in North Carolina

by

Elizabeth Wrenn Johnson

M.A., Central Michigan University, 1997

B.A., North Carolina Wesleyan College, 1993

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Public Policy and Administration

Walden University

February 2017

## Dedication

I would like to dedicate this project to everyone that has ever doubted that they were smart enough, had enough money, support, or time to realize their dream. You are smart enough. Never give money the power to stop you from doing anything you want to do. Support is nice, but not necessary. Time goes on with or without you.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank all those that supported, helped, encouraged, or challenged me to begin and complete this project. Specifically, I would like to thank Dr. MBaye, Dr. Lee, and Dr. Settles for their willingness to serve on the committee and for accepting the challenge of seeing student projects through to completion. I owe a great debt to the friends and co-workers that supported this project and encouraged me to complete it, and especially those that seemed to struggle and rejoice with me through each part of the process. My family has always been supportive, even on days when they did not understand the need to continue my education. To those that challenged me prior to, during, and in the future to reach the top of every mountain, words cannot express the gratitude felt. Not every person that challenged me was my friend, but each one contributed to my success.

## Table of Contents

|                                             |    |
|---------------------------------------------|----|
| List of Tables .....                        | iv |
| Chapter 1: Introduction.....                | 1  |
| Introduction.....                           | 1  |
| Community-Oriented Policing Services.....   | 1  |
| Data and Problem Solving.....               | 3  |
| Defining Community-Oriented Policing.....   | 4  |
| Problem Statement.....                      | 7  |
| Purpose Statement.....                      | 8  |
| Research Questions and Hypotheses .....     | 8  |
| Theoretical Framework.....                  | 13 |
| Scope of the Study .....                    | 14 |
| Assumptions.....                            | 14 |
| Limitations .....                           | 15 |
| Delimitations.....                          | 16 |
| Significance of the Study.....              | 16 |
| Definitions of Terms.....                   | 18 |
| Summary.....                                | 20 |
| Organization of the Remaining Chapters..... | 20 |
| Chapter 2: Literature Review .....          | 22 |
| Introduction.....                           | 22 |
| The Foundation of Community Policing .....  | 22 |
| Defining Community-Oriented Policing.....   | 28 |

|                                                  |    |
|--------------------------------------------------|----|
| Building Trust .....                             | 34 |
| Researching North Carolina Law Enforcement ..... | 35 |
| Organizational Support .....                     | 37 |
| Police Officer Attitudes .....                   | 39 |
| Implementing Community Policing.....             | 43 |
| Community Policing Training .....                | 44 |
| Police Culture.....                              | 45 |
| Job Satisfaction .....                           | 48 |
| Measuring Attitude .....                         | 49 |
| Modern Policing.....                             | 52 |
| Ethics and Responsibility.....                   | 56 |
| A Different View .....                           | 56 |
| Conclusion .....                                 | 57 |
| Chapter 3: Methodology.....                      | 61 |
| Introduction.....                                | 61 |
| Research Design.....                             | 61 |
| Research Questions and Hypotheses .....          | 62 |
| Sample Population .....                          | 66 |
| Data Collection .....                            | 68 |
| Instrumentation and Operationalization.....      | 69 |
| Data Analysis .....                              | 72 |
| Ethical Consideration.....                       | 73 |
| Internal Review Board .....                      | 73 |

|                                                       |     |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Reliability and Validity Issues .....                 | 74  |
| Summary.....                                          | 74  |
| Chapter 4: Data Analysis.....                         | 76  |
| Introduction.....                                     | 76  |
| Description of the Sample.....                        | 76  |
| Tests for Normality of Distribution of Variables..... | 79  |
| Summary.....                                          | 92  |
| Chapter 5: Discussion of the Findings.....            | 94  |
| Introduction.....                                     | 94  |
| Summary of the Findings.....                          | 94  |
| Interpretation of the Findings.....                   | 96  |
| Implications of the Findings .....                    | 98  |
| Education.....                                        | 98  |
| Practice.....                                         | 98  |
| Policy.....                                           | 99  |
| Limitations of the Study .....                        | 99  |
| Recommendations for Future Research.....              | 100 |
| Summary and Conclusions .....                         | 101 |
| References.....                                       | 102 |

## List of Tables

|                                                                                                                             |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Table 1. Cities by Agency Size and CALEA Accreditation Status .....                                                         | 77 |
| Table 2. Cities by Poverty and Minority Population Rate .....                                                               | 77 |
| Table 3. Cities by Property Crime Rate and Property Crime Clearance Rate .....                                              | 79 |
| Table 4. Cities by Violent Crime Rate and Violent Crime Clearance Rate.....                                                 | 79 |
| Table 5. Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Normality .....                                                                        | 80 |
| Table 6. Spearman’s Rho for Commitment to Community Policing, Violent Crime Rate<br>and Violent Crime Clearance Rate.....   | 82 |
| Table 7. Chi Square for Community Policing Methods and Violent Crime Rate .....                                             | 83 |
| Table 8. Chi Square for Community Policing Methods and Violent Crime Clearance<br>Rates.....                                | 85 |
| Table 9. Spearman’s Rho for Commitment to Community Policing, Property Crime Rate<br>and Property Crime Clearance Rate..... | 87 |
| Table 10. Chi Square for Community Policing Methods and Property Crime Rate.....                                            | 89 |
| Table 11. Community Policing Methods and Property Crime Clearance Rates.....                                                | 91 |

## Chapter 1: Introduction

### **Introduction**

Community-oriented policing is difficult to describe because it has a different meaning for almost every police agency and community that supports it (Summer, 2009; Trojanowicz, Kappeler, Gaines, Bucquereoux, and Sluder, 1998). Generally, community policing is a collection of programs aimed at preventing and solving crime falling under the pretext of a singular program (National Institute of Justice, n.d.). The Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services (COPS) of the United States Department of Justice describes community policing as a compilation of three key components that include community partnerships, organizational transformation, and problem solving (COPS, 2012). Community-oriented policing was the first major change in American policing in more than 50 years, and changed the face of policing heading into the 21st century (Trojanowicz et al., 1998). While community-oriented policing was publicized as a new paradigm in American policing, there is little evidence that reflects the success of this policing style on reducing crime and improving crime clearance rates. Researchers have failed to definitively describe community policing as a successful style of policing, leaving much more research to be done on its effectiveness as a crime reduction method (Yero, Othman, Abu Samah, D'Silva, & Sulaiman, 2012; Telep & Weisburd, 2012).

### **Community-Oriented Policing Services**

COPS was established in 1994 through the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act, and was designed to assist police departments in implementing community-oriented policing (U.S. Department of Justice, 1994). The COPS office has

clearly defined community policing by the three components of community partnerships, organizational transformation, and problem solving, and has further outlined each component to give law enforcement agencies a foundation for individual programs.

Community partnerships are efforts between law enforcement agencies and non-law enforcement agencies to work together to address specific community problems (COPS, 2012). For example, advocacy groups focused on at-risk children work well with law enforcement in providing a stable environment for children after school. Often, law enforcement agencies will assign officers to work with those groups to enable them to develop positive relationships with community children (Morehead City Police, 2014; Cary Police Department, 2014).

Private businesses, media, community service organizations such as Rotary International, government agencies associated with planning and inspections, and many other non-profit groups collaborate with law enforcement agencies in an effort to fight crime (Bureau of Justice Assistance, n.d.; In the paradigm of community policing, it is important that law enforcement agencies use every available tool and resource to solve community problems by working within the community (COPS, 2012). For example, in order to improve housing in an impoverished neighborhood, it may be necessary to work with the planning and zoning departments to force landlords and/or government housing agents to improve standards (Krieger & Higgins, 2009). Empowering citizens to reduce crime and improve living conditions requires collaboration between those with a vested interest in success (Rinehart, Laszlo, Anna, & Briscoe, 2001).

### **Data and Problem Solving**

One important cog in the organizational transformation is the officers' ability to access crime statistics and to use that data further efforts to improve conditions (COPS, 2014). Data is only as effective as the officer's ability to use it to the advantage of those in the community. For example, if a rookie police officer has access to robbery data and is able to detect a pattern but cannot effectively use the information to prevent the next robbery, then the data is useless to both the officer and the citizen. However, if the officer has that information and is given the leeway to communicate effectively with the right group of citizens, he or she can make a positive impact on the lives of those being affected by local robberies. That is, in a community-oriented policing framework, officers can use data to prevent property crimes and crimes of violence (COPS, 2012).

Data-driven problem solving is also vital to citizens and communities seeking peace in their neighborhoods. If an officer is granted the flexibility to work with partners to solve crime or problems that cause crime, community policing works (Bichler & Gaines, 2005). If that same officer uses data gathered from citizens to help them solve their own problems, then empowerment of an entire community takes place (Glazer & Denhardt, 2010). This progression allows communities to form a positive identity, and brings them closer to the government designed to protect them. Problem solving requires both initiative and commitment from the police officers and his or her supervisors. Commitment from both and involvement from the community embodies the principles of community-oriented policing (Trojanowicz & Bucquereaux, 1994).

## **Defining Community-Oriented Policing**

The definition of community-oriented policing is important to this study, because while most agree that it marks a philosophical change in policing, many do not agree on the method of change or implementation. There is no template for design or consistency in the method of delivery (Lord & Friday, 2008). Discrepancies in implementation leads me to wonder about acceptance of the change by the police officers working the streets. For example, if police officers are committed to community-oriented policing and get support from first-line supervisors, mid-level managers, and command staff, the program is likely to be successful (Mastrofski, Willis, & Kochel, 2007). However, if one or more of those pieces is missing, then the officer on the street is most likely to doubt the ability of community policing to work to reduce crime.

Some researchers believe that community policing has become a process that allows diverse groups of employees and officers to participate in organizational decision making, creating organizational change (Lord & Friday, 2008). Lord and Friday (2008), for instance, have contended that community-policing programs are successful because of participation by the line officers that have personal investment in the program.

Popularity of the program with local government officials and funding from the federal government provides incentive for participation from line officers (Lord & Friday, 2008).

Academics and practitioners have heralded community policing as the answer to crime problems, and the federal government has funneled millions of dollars into community policing programs since the 1990s (Chappelle, 2009; Yero et al., 2012). Zhao, Scheider, and Thurman (2002) looked at the federally funded and heavily touted

COPS program, and made a case for the program and the need for additional officers, while also noting the need for a philosophical change to incorporate community-oriented policing into individual departments. Lord and Friday (2008) found that negative views of police officers related to community policing come from a failure on the part of management to change the work environment. However, not everyone agrees with this assessment, and questions remain both inside and outside law enforcement.

The federally funded COPS program was originally designed to put 100,000 police officers on the streets and to support this style of policing. It is difficult to determine whether community policing was the reason crime was reduced across the country or whether it was related to the 100,000 additional police officers on the street. The program began during the Clinton administration, and although the funding has been substantially lessened, COPS continues to fund community-policing programs 25 years after its inception (COPS, 2014).

Acceptance of the fact that community-oriented policing means many things to many people is not as difficult as recognizing what it is not. According to several studies completed by Rohe, Adams, and Arcury (1996), community policing is not soft on crime, a top down method of policing, risk free, or a quick fix to community problems. Many critics of community policing believe that the style of policing prevents officers from making arrests and therefore allows criminals to remain free. Rohe et al. (1996) conducted research in North Carolina and determined that community policing is not soft on crime and is as effective as traditional policing.

Traditional policing is rank-oriented, structure determines policies and procedures at all times, and the style of policing relies on statistics such as numbers of arrest as measures of success (Xu, Fielder, & Flaming, 2005). Community-oriented policing is different because it allows street officers to make decisions based on the needs of the community, thus partially decentralizing the decision making processes that characterize traditional policing (COPS, 2014). Giving the power of decision making to street level officers can be risky for police administrators, and he or she must rely on and trust the training provided to the officers (Rohe et al., 1996). Community-oriented policing requires officers to think for him or herself and work with a group of citizens from various areas of the community to solve problems and prevent crime. If they are not properly trained or if community programs fail, it can be costly for the administrators on many levels.

Community-oriented policing is not a quick fix to community problems or crime in local, state, or federal jurisdictions (Rohe, Adams, & Arcury, 1996). However, while motor patrols have proven ineffective in reducing crime, some early studies have shown that community-oriented policing reduces crime (Zhao, He, & Lovich, 2003). There remains a gap in literature concerning the effectiveness of community-oriented policing on crime reduction. However, several researchers have refer to the benefits of community policing including political support for police, reduced fear of crime, and improved community relations (Rohe et al. 1997; Zhao et al., 2003; Wycoff & Skogan 1994).

## **Problem Statement**

The problem addressed in this study is that while community-oriented policing has been touted as a new paradigm in American policing, little data reflects the success of the style of policing on reducing crime or increasing crime clearance rates (Moore, 1992; Skogan & Frydl, 2004; Weisburd & Eck, 2004 as cited in Reisig & Kane, 2014). Researchers have failed to definitively describe community policing as a successful style of policing, leaving much more research to be done on its effectiveness as a crime reduction method (Yero et al., 2012; Telep, & Weisburd, 2012). The fact that academics and law enforcement leaders struggle to define and implement community-oriented policing makes it difficult to determine the relationship between community policing, crime, and crime clearance rates (Reisig & Kane, 2014). There is a lack of consistency across police departments and academics regarding the purpose, implementation, effectiveness, and definition of community policing (Reisig & Kane, 2014).

My charge in this dissertation was to investigate the relationships between community-oriented policing, crime reduction, and crime clearance rates in Carteret County, North Carolina to either validate or call into question previous studies on the effectiveness of community-oriented policing. Studies addressing the relationship between community policing and crime reduction and clearance rates have failed to give a conclusive answer to whether community policing has an effect on either crime reduction or clearance rates, specifically in Carteret County, North Carolina. In this study, I attempted to measure the success of community policing at reducing crime and increasing clearance rates in North Carolina.

### **Purpose Statement**

The purpose of this quantitative correlational non-experimental study was to examine the relationships between the implementation methods of community-oriented policing services, crime rates, and crime clearance rates in Carteret County, North Carolina. My intent was to evaluate whether a statistical relationship existed between the independent variable *community-oriented policing*, which was gauged by the commitment to community-oriented policing (measured as a percentage of community policing officers or the number of officers assigned to work community policing compared to the total number of officers), community policing policies, community policing training, mission statements including community policing, problem solving activities, community partnerships, and the dependent variables *violent and property crime* and *clearance rates* in Carteret County, North Carolina.

### **Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The following research questions and the corresponding hypotheses guided this study:

RQ1: Is there a statistically significant relationship between the commitment to community-oriented policing, violent crime, and violent crime clearance rates?

$H_01$ : There is no statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and the violent crime.

$H_{a1}$ : There is a statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and the violent crime rate.

H<sub>0</sub>2: There is no statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and violent crime clearance rates.

H<sub>a</sub>2: There is a statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and violent crime clearance rates.

RQ2: Is there a statistically significant association between community policing policies, community policing training, mission statements including community policing, problem solving activities, community partnerships, violent crime rate and violent crime clearance rates?

H<sub>0</sub>3: Community policing policies and the violent crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>3: Community policing policies and the violent crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>4: Community policing policies and the violent crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>4: Community policing policies and violent crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>5: Community policing training and the violent crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>5: Community policing training and the violent crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>6: Community policing training and violent crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>6: Community policing training and violent crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>7: Mission statements including community policing and the violent crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>7: Mission statements including community policing and the violent crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>8: Mission statements including community policing and violent crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>8: Mission statements including community policing and violent crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>9: Problem solving activities and the violent crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>9: Problem solving activities and the violent crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>10: Problem solving activities and violent crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>10: Problem solving activities and violent crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>11: Community partnerships and the violent crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>11: Community partnerships and the violent crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>12: Community partnerships and violent crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>12: Community partnerships and violent crime clearance rates are not independent.

RQ3: Is there a statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing, property crime, and property crime clearance rates?

H<sub>0</sub>13: There is no statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and the property crime rate.

H<sub>a</sub>13: There is a statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and the property crime rate.

H<sub>0</sub>14: There is no statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and property crime clearance rates.

H<sub>a</sub>14: There is a statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and property crime clearance rates.

RQ4: Is there a statistically significant association between community policing policies, community policing training, mission statements including community policing, problem solving activities, community partnerships, property crime rates, and property crime clearance rates?

H<sub>0</sub>15: Community policing policies and the property crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>15: Community policing policies and the property crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>16: Community policing policies and the property crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>16: Community policing policies and property crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>17: Community policing training and the property crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>17: Community policing training and the property crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>18: Community policing training and property crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>18: Community policing training and property crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>19: Mission statements including community policing and the property crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>19: Mission statements including community policing and the property crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>20: Mission statements including community policing and property crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>20: Mission statements including community policing and property crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>21: Problem solving activities and the property crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>21: Problem solving activities and the property crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>22: Problem solving activities and property crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>22: Problem solving activities and property crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>23: Community partnerships and the property crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>23: Community partnerships and the property crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>24: Community partnerships and property crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>24: Community partnerships and property crime clearance rates are not independent.

### **Theoretical Framework**

The theoretical framework for this study was based on Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux's (1990) community policing theory. This theory holds that police departments should work together with law-abiding private citizens to create original methods that help solve community problems including crime, social and physical disorder, and neighborhood decay. It is through this collaboration between police agencies and private citizens that the focus of police work shifts to solving community problems and improving the over-all quality of life for the community. Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux's (1990) argued that addressing quality of life issues would lead to less citizen fear and an increase in informal social control, which would eventually lead to a decrease in crime. In order to investigate Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux's (1990) community policing philosophy, I collected numerical data to gain an empirical understanding of the relationships between community-oriented policing, crime rates, and crime clearance rates. Outcomes based on the crime and clearance rates were tentatively examined.

I obtained numerical data for this study from crime statistics provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Report (UCR), the North Carolina State Bureau of Investigation's Summary Based Reporting System, departmental central records management systems, and departmentally developed materials such as mission statements, organizational charts, and policies. All sources of information are considered public record information, are available upon public information records request by any

member of the public (N.C. Public Record Law, 2014), and were thus readily available to me.

### **Scope of the Study**

This was a quantitative correlational non-experimental study designed to investigate the impact of community-oriented policing services on crime rates and crime clearance rates in Carteret County, North Carolina. There are nine individual jurisdictions located in the county, each with its own department, chief or sheriff, and set of policies. The nature of this study required the analysis of secondary data from public records of community-oriented policing services, crime statistics, and crime clearance rates. The study was non-experimental and used a Spearman's rho and chi-square test for independence to determine the relationships between community-oriented policing services, violent and property crime, and clearance rates. I also used descriptive statistics such as frequencies, percentages, and means to define the sample profile. I used correlational analysis to measure the association of community-oriented policing on each variable, and gauged the magnitude of the association of community policing, crime, and clearance rates. Continuous and nominal scales were used to evaluate the level of officer support for community-oriented policing services.

### **Assumptions**

There were several assumptions associated with this project. I assumed:

- That all participating agencies submitted accurate, unbiased, and up to date statistical data to the data-collecting agencies.

- That all census and demographic data collected was accurate and up to date, and was submitted without bias.
- That all criminal data collected from the state and/or cities was accurate as reported by officers and departments.
- That all data was coded correctly and reported in a timely manner.
- That all criminal statistical data was made available at no charge to me based on North Carolina General Statute 132.1 (N.C.G.S. 132.1, 2013).
- A result was deemed statistically significant if  $p < .05$ .

### **Limitations**

The research project had the following limitations:

- Resistance on the part of police agencies to release demographic and/or budgetary information in a timely manner.
- Data collected from public record data bases was coded and computed differently depending on individual jurisdictions and may affect statistical outcomes.
- Limited ability of census bureau to record accurate and stable information.
- Differing opinions among police administrators on the definition of community policing, community policing officers, community policing training, and mission statements.
- Access to police officers was limited by time, administration, and access to electronic copies of a survey.

- The statistical test selected for this study may limit the conclusions that can be drawn from this research. While it serves to determine significant relationships and provides information on the magnitude of those relationships, it is limited in that it does not determine causality between the variables of community policing, crime rates and clearance rates.

### **Delimitations**

The research project had the following delimitations:

- Each participating department received explicit instructions and explanations of the purpose of the research and survey.
- Each participating city received instructions for participation as well as explanatory notes on the purpose of the research project.
- All data collected as part of this study was verifiable through the office of the North Carolina State Bureau of Investigation upon written request.
- Since the focus of this study was on community-oriented policing services, I did not consider external factors associated with crime and clearance rates such as community crime prevention efforts.

### **Significance of the Study**

Community-oriented policing has been heralded as the new era of American policing (Trojanowicz & Bucqueureaux, 1994). While most policing agencies now participate, there are lingering doubts about its effectiveness as a crime prevention tool (Xu, et al., 2005). Thoughts that community-oriented policing is more of a public relations tool than a crime prevention tool still prevail among street level officers (Walker

& Katz, 2005). There are also those who believe that community policing has been forced on departments, creating little commitment from street level officers. (Zhao, Lovrich, & Robinson, 2001). However, there are others who believe that community policing has evolved into more than partnerships, and that it provides a diverse group of decision makers working to improve quality of life issues (Lord & Friday, 2008).

These factors, along with the wide variety of community policing programs across the county of Carteret, reveal a gap in literature and a definitive description of community policing. This study provides additional knowledge associated with the success of community policing as it relates directly to crime prevention and reduction. Community policing, by definition, is designed to fit the needs of individual communities. To determine whether it has an effect on crime rates and crime clearance rates, it is necessary to study individual jurisdictions. Carteret County is located on the eastern coast of North Carolina and has several barrier islands located within its borders.

If no relationship exists between community policing and crime reduction and clearance rates, agencies should immediately address the style of policing. More than \$18 billion have been spent since the introduction of community policing as a nationwide project (Yero et al., 2012). Community policing is designed to reduce crime and disorder, and to improve police and community relations (Chapelle, 2009). If no relationship exists, the implication is that valuable tax dollars are being ill spent. Programs such as the much heralded DARE (Drug Abuse Resistance Education), Neighborhood Watch, community meetings, and other programs designed as part of agency community policing efforts have not been proven to prevent crime (Santos, 2014;

Telep & Weisburd, 2012). If there is a relationship between community policing as a philosophy and crime rates and/or clearance rates (either positive or negative), then law enforcement leaders must analyze implementation, participation, training, and effectiveness of individual programs and share effective methods while discontinuing ineffective methods to meet the task of reducing crime.

Carteret County has a growing population that is quickly becoming more diverse (North Carolina Census, 2000 - 2010). This study can potentially impact policing in the county, and across the state and country. This study fills a gap in research that currently exists concerning the success of community policing. If academics are correct that citizens are as concerned by how they are treated by the police as they are by crime reduction, then tax dollars can be better spent on hiring and training than on community policing programs (Yero, et al., 2012; Lord, Kuhns, & Friday, 2009; Hamilton-Smith, Mackenzie, Henry, & Davidones, 2014). Carteret County has one agency that is internationally accredited and two that are in the self-assessment phase of that process. The other five agencies are not accredited. This range of accreditation gave me a more diverse set of data because of the difference in policies, training requirements, and administrative requirements.

### **Definitions of Terms**

*Community-oriented policing.* A policing philosophy and strategy aimed at achieving more effective and efficient crime control, reduced fear of crime, improved quality of life, improved police services, and police legitimacy through a proactive reliance on community resources that seek to change crime-causing conditions. This

assumes a need for greater accountability of police, greater public share in decision-making, and greater concern for civil rights and liberties (Friedmann, 1992).

*Community-oriented policing officer.* A police officer whose duty assignment includes working within the community to further public safety and the mission of the police department (Morehead City Police Department, 2014).

*Community policing training.* Police training designed to familiarize law enforcement officers and other personnel with the philosophies and concepts of community-oriented and problem solving policing (North Carolina Justice Academy, 2013).

*Crime rate.* The rate of occurrence for a particular crime or group of crimes as reported by the law enforcement agency and collected by the State Bureau of Investigation Division of Criminal Investigation (NC State Bureau of Investigation, 2014).

*County.* The state of North Carolina has 100 counties listed in N.C.G.S. 152A-10 that are designated by borders.

*Decentralization.* Distribution of administrative powers or functions of a law enforcement agency to smaller, more autonomous units.

*Field training office.* A senior member of a department responsible for training and evaluation of a junior or probationary officer. The term is used almost exclusively in public safety organizations such as police, fire, and rescue (Morehead City Police Department Manual, 2014).

*Law enforcement officer.* A member of a law enforcement agency that is certified by the state and sworn by the individual department to uphold and enforce the laws of the land (North Carolina Training and Standards, 2014).

*Mission statement.* A declaration of organizational purpose (Bryson, 2011).

*Property crime.* Crimes such as larceny, vehicle theft, and burglary.

*Violent crime.* Crimes such as rape, robbery, murder, and aggravated assault.

### **Summary**

Community-oriented policing is based on the premise that police alone cannot prevent crime or prevent disorderly conduct by citizens (Fridell, 2004). It is also said to promote quality of life issues among both police and citizen groups (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990). While community-oriented policing has been touted as a new paradigm in American policing, little data reflects the success of the style of policing in reducing crime or increasing crime clearance. Hence, my goal in this quantitative correlational non-experimental study was to examine the relationships between the implementation methods of community-oriented policing services, crime rates, and crime clearance rates in Carteret County, North Carolina. A post-positivist paradigm enabled my use of correlational analyses to examine the associations among the variables of this study. I obtained numerical data for this study from crime statistics from public sources that are available upon request.

### **Organization of the Remaining Chapters**

The remaining chapters of this dissertation begin with an extensive review of literature related to community policing, police attitudes toward community policing,

limitations and assumptions associated with community policing, and crime statistics related to community policing. I review findings both for and against community policing in an effort to find and relay a realistic view of the relationship between community policing on crime and clearance rates in Carteret County, North Carolina. In Chapter 3, I detail the methodology and analytical strategy I used for the study, and in Chapter 4 I present the results of these analytical methods. Finally, in Chapter 5 I offer a more in-depth discussion of the findings and relate them to the need for future research. I also discuss the implications of the findings for the law enforcement community in North Carolina, and across the country.

## Chapter 2: Literature Review

### **Introduction**

A study on the topic of community policing, regardless of the study type or goal, must start with the foundation. Community policing is based on simple, common sense principles put in writing in the 19<sup>th</sup> century by Sir Robert Peele (Peak & Glensor, 1999). Sir Peel developed a set of nine principles known as the “Peelian Principles” that have been adopted as the foundation of community-oriented policing (Lewis, 2011; Jones, 2004, Meese III & Ortmeier, 2004).

The purpose of this review is to provide a foundation for my research on the relationship between community-oriented policing, crime rates, and crime clearance rates. The review shows a gap in literature regarding this relationship. My review of previous research shows that no clear definition of community-oriented policing exists (Lord & Friday, 2008; Santos, 2014). It also shows that each agency involved in or implementing community-oriented policing has its own method for doing so (Santos, 2014). These facts established the need for this study on community policing as it relates to crime reduction and clearance rates in communities in one county in the state of North Carolina.

### **The Foundation of Community Policing**

The first of Sir Peel’s nine principles is that the police exist to prevent the use of military power and force by preventing crime (Metropolitan Police Act, 1829; Jones, 2004; Meese & Ortmeier, 2004). Simply stated, the first and most important task of the police is to prevent crime (Gowri, 2003; Meese & Ortmeier, 2004; Peak & Glensor,

1999). If it is true that the purpose of the police is to prevent crime, then the most logical method for measuring the success of the police is to measure crime. In the ninth principle, Peel describes the most effective method of measuring police effectiveness as the absence of crime (May, 2012). Peelian principles, while not based on theoretical background, are by all accounts are the foundation on which modern American policing is based.

Peel and the British bobbies were tasked with gaining and securing the support of the public to complete their mission of preventing crime (Williams, 2003). This is a primary premise for modern community policing (Meese & Ortmeier, 2004). The second Peelian principle calls for the police to recognize that it is necessary to gain the respect of the public, and that the public gives the police the power to enforce laws and prevent crime (Meese & Ortmeier, 2004; Jones, 2004). Without this power, the police are helpless to prevent crime and enforce the laws of the land. This is clearly noticeable in modern day community policing, as police agencies across the country work with community leaders including educational leaders, politicians, citizens, business leaders, and a wide variety of stakeholders in the community to prevent crime (Wasilewski & Olson, 2012).

However, Peel also noted that it is not enough to gain the respect and approval of the public, and that the police must also gain the cooperation of the public in order to successfully prevent crime (Wasilewski & Olson, 2012). In modern day policing, law enforcement and educational leaders across the country have recognized that in order to reduce crime, it is necessary to draw upon the resources of the community. Many

communities offer academies and support programs such as Crime Stoppers, Community Watch, and Citizen Police Academies to further police crime reduction efforts (Morehead City Police Department, 2014; Cary Police Department, 2014). Throughout Peel's nine principles of policing, it is evident that the normative sponsorship theory is relevant to the foundation of both community policing and this particular study. The theory decrees that it is necessary for the community to accept the police as part of the day-to-day normality before support can be garnered.

Police departments across the world have engaged the public for ideas concerning crime prevention and have used the public as their "eyes and ears," enforcing Peel's conclusion that the public must cooperate with police to prevent crime (Meese & Ortmeier, 2004). Many police departments incorporate this principle in mission statements, strategic planning, and budget sessions to work toward a safer community (Morehead City Police, 2013; Fayetteville Police Department, 2014).

Sir Peel believed that citizen support diminishes with acts of violence by police, and modern media reports support this conclusion by reporting on citizen uprisings against police brutality (Lyman, 1964). There are hundreds of sites aimed at recording and reporting police misconduct. The New York Times has a page dedicated to reporting police brutality, and a quick review shows hundreds of reports of police misconduct in New York alone (New York Times, 2014). The Cato Institute's National Police Misconduct Reporting Project is likewise aimed at collecting data about police brutality. While not all reports of misconduct are substantiated, such reports show distrust in police

that is not consistent with the goals of community-oriented policing and/or Sir Peel's third principle of minimizing police violence to gain support (Williams, 2003).

Police departments report and record incidents involving force that includes a variety of uses and definitions of force. For example, in Morehead City, North Carolina it is required that officers report all uses of force including drawing and pointing a weapon, all hands-on contact with citizens, all take-down maneuvers, and any incident that could result in citizen or officer injury whether or not an injury occurred (Morehead City Police, 2014). Use of force reports vary depending on departments, individual officers, and each of their interpretations of force. For example, it may not be considered a use of force if a weapon is drawn but not fired in some cities. However, the drawing and pointing of a weapon can have a drastic effect on a citizen and his or her perception of the police. The Commission for Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA, 2003) requires that all incidents involving force, however slight, be documented and reviewed for policy validation.

Sir Peel's principles state the need for police to prevent military force, that police power comes from citizen approval, and that citizen cooperation is necessary to prevent crime (Jones, 2004). His assertions that citizens play a vital role in policing our communities are the foundation of community-oriented policing (Lewis, 2011). Peel's fifth principle implores police to seek the favor of citizens by treating them all the same regardless of wealth or class (Lewis, 2011; Meese & Ortmeier, 2004). To successfully implement and maintain community-oriented policing, it is necessary to solicit input from

all citizens in a particular neighborhood or community, not only the wealthy, the educated, or the most vocal (Wasilewski & Olson, 2012).

It is important to note that military action against United States citizens must be sanctioned by the governor of the state, or by the president of the United States. The National Defense Act of 1990 allowed military equipment owned by the Department of Defense to be transferred to state and federal law enforcement agencies. This act has come into question many times in recent years, and recently following shooting incidents in Ferguson, Missouri. Community policing infers the absence of military action, thus placing the militarization of American police in conflict with Peel's principles and the mission statements of modern police departments (Morehead City Police, 2014).

The definition of community-oriented policing differs between police jurisdictions and even between departments within a single agency (U.S. Department of Justice, 2014; Scheider, Chapman, & Shapiro, 2009). Applying Peel's principle to treat each member of a community or society the same without regard to wealth, education, or status in the community can be a difficult but defining moment in an agency's effort to implement community-oriented policing (Scheider et al., 2009). In this study, I measured efforts to accomplish this by assessing controlled variables associated with poverty.

Peel's seventh principle is another often-cited principle in police mission statements. It holds that police officers are merely citizens paid on a full-time basis to prevent crime and solve crimes (Morehead City Police, 2014; Jones, 2004). The fact that police officers are citizens paid to prevent and/or solve crime is often overlooked in community-oriented policing, which may contribute to a distrust of the police. It is noted

by scholars and government officials alike that police officers are representatives of the government, but rarely noted that they are regular citizens paid to fulfilling a job task like any other citizen.

Peel's seventh principle could be considered as conflicting with Black's theory of law, a conflict that may evince differences between traditional policing and community-oriented policing. Black's theory of law describes police officers as agents of the government and supposes that the government gains control through the use of laws (Schulenburg, 2010). Black's theory that the government gains and maintains social control through police differs from Peel's view that police are part of the community, and represents a distinctly different view of government application of crime reduction practices (Taylor, 2008). Peelian principles and Black's theory of law both have interesting ideas that directly relate to policing in the 21st century in general, and the principle of community-oriented policing, in particular. Sower, Holland, Tiedke, & Freeman (1957) asserted in the normative sponsorship theory that only those programs considered normal within the everyday environment of a community will be supported by the community. This seems to agree with Peel's belief that police power comes from the citizens.

Understanding the foundation of community-oriented policing and Peel's nine principles leads to a better understanding of the need for modernization of police concepts toward crime reduction. If as Peel contends, crime prevention is the primary duty of the police and success should be measured by the lack of crime, then it is necessary to look at how that is accomplished (Dixon, 2005). It is also necessary to

determine how or if the change from traditional to community-oriented policing has an effect on crime reduction and/or crime clearance rates.

### **Defining Community-Oriented Policing**

Community policing emphasizes community relationships developed between the police and stakeholder. Indeed, a strong relationship with the community is one common theme in numerous definitions of community policing (Nalla & Boke, 2011).

Relationships between the police and the community can create a bond of trust that assists the police in working within the community to prevent crime and/or solve those already committed. This is one of the Peelian principles that marks the need for police to seek cooperation with the citizens served (Lewis, 2011; Jones, 2004). Amadi (2004) considers community policing a clear method of improving police and citizen relationships.

COPS is the federal government office responsible for defining community-oriented policing and providing support for shifts in policing practices. This office simplifies the definition of community-oriented policing by dividing it into three key components working in unison. Those components are community partnerships, organization transformation, and problem solving (U.S. Department of Justice, 2014). The COPS office further defines each component of the definition giving guidance to police departments across the country in their effort.

Researchers have repeatedly confirmed the need for partnership, decentralization, and problem solving, indicating a wide scholarly agreement with the definition (Amadi, 2004; Burrus & Giblin, 2009; Fridell, 2004). Community partnerships might include the

police working with non-profits, local businesses, media, and other community groups or programs to prevent crime (U.S. Department of Justice, 2014). Examples of this might include police working with a school to offer afterschool tutoring programs, or working with neighborhood groups to offer assistance in a specific neighborhood (Morehead City After School Tutoring Program, 2010). There are many examples of community partnerships such as Crime Stoppers, missing children associations, and others that illustrate the partnering of a government agency with local agencies or businesses to better a community (Cary Police Department Project PHOENIX, 2014; Fayetteville Police Community Wellness Public Safety Committee, 2014).

The second component of community-oriented policing is organizational transformation. There has been talk of the changing of police culture inside the agencies for many years. The COPS office refers to leadership, the creation of policies, decentralization, and other efforts of police agencies as key to transforming from traditional policing to community-oriented policing (U.S. Department of Justice, 2014). Strategic Planning is also important in the transformation of law enforcement and providing guidance for stakeholders both inside and outside the agency (Bryson, 2011). Glazer and Denhart (2010) describe community policing as both policy and organizational change and believes that it has become a battle for the minds of patrol officers.

The third component of community-oriented policing according the COPS office (2014) is problem solving. While this is not necessarily new to policing or segregate from traditional policing, it differs in community-oriented policing because individual

officers are given the opportunity to solve problems independent from the normal paramilitary structure (U.S. Department of Justice, 2014). The COPS office guides agencies in the SARA model of problem solving using scanning, analysis, response, and assessment. This model allows patrol officers at the street level to engage in problem solving by using a variety of methods directed at individual neighborhoods. Muniz (2012) and Bichler and Gaines (2005) study the ability and willingness of police to recognize and solve problems in the specific communities.

An earlier but similar definition of community-oriented policing describes it as a philosophy and strategy aimed at achieving more effective and efficient crime control, reduced fear of crime, improved quality of life, improved police services and police legitimacy through a proactive reliance on community resources that seeks to change crime causing conditions (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1994). This assumes a need for greater accountability of police, greater public share in decision-making, and greater concern for civil rights and liberties (Friedmann, 1992). This definition concurs with the more recent one given by the COPS office calling for use of all resources within the reach of both the police and the citizens.

Studies aimed at defining community-oriented policing often cite a need to define the expectations of the citizenry, expectations of the police, and the expectations of government to prevent and/or reduce crime (Nalla & Boke, 2011). In a study aimed at comparing policing in the United States and Turkey, the authors compared police cultures and defined the goal of police. Nalla and Boke (2011) cite the goal of police as maintaining the rule of law and defending human rights. It is an interesting concept to

include the protection of human rights into the mission of the police as one often assumes that human rights are the very essence of government. However, it is clear that human rights are not always the focus but are assumed and therefore can become lost in the mission of law enforcers (Nalla & Boke, 2011).

It is important to note that many definitions of community policing include the words culture, duties, service, conduct, and order maintenance. Nalla and Boke, (2011) when comparing community policing in America to community policing in Turkey make several important citations concerning police. First, the authors noted that police work often requires officers to differ from organizational policies. This is important because it makes reference to the fact that police officers deal with situations that require immediate reaction by a human to actions of another. There is little time to consult a policy manual or remember principles when facing a life-threatening situation. Policies are often written with liability issues in mind and intended as a guide to the employee. Policies rarely serve as a sole source of knowledge for the officer facing situations in real time (Fayetteville Police Department Policy Manual, 2014).

It is during these times that police officers draw from training and organization culture (Nalla & Boke, 2011). If the culture is consistent with citizen expectations and police training, officers will react to the best of his or her ability within organizational policy (Schulenburg, 2010). In every society, citizen distrust of government and police is evident in its willingness, or lack of willingness to cooperate and accept responsibility in solving its own problems. Community policing is the ultimate test of Peelian Principles and the Normative Sponsorship Theory as it studies both the assumption that police rely

on the public's approval and cooperation to give them power and success. The theory that the government maintains control over the citizenry through laws is also tested with community policing (Taylor, 2008; Hawdon and Ryan, 2003).

Given that the public expects the police to maintain a low crime rate and a safe community, it is important to pose the question of the importance of crime prevention to that public (Harris, 2009). It is clear that Sir Robert Peel believed that the primary mission of the police is to prevent crime (Meese and Ortmeier, 2004). It is also clear that police departments exist to prevent crime through a variety of crime prevention methods (Morehead City Police Manual, 2014; Fayetteville Police Manual, 2014). What was not clear in many jurisdictions was what that service was worth to the public and what each community was willing to accept as normal within the community. Many American cities struggle daily with gang related crime associated with and thriving within certain communities. Gang members are thought to devalue human beings as a means to an end, thus adding to fear and discontent in many inner city communities (Alleyne, Fernandes, & Pritchard, 2014). The question of what is accepted as normal behavior within a community is often put to the test with community policing.

In recent years, the United States has suffered through a budget crisis causing many jurisdictions to question government expenditures and goals. In an article titled "What's a Crime Prevention Officer Worth" author Patrick Harris (2009) discussed the value of fighting crime through prevention efforts. Citing headlines such as "Crime Unit Dismantled" and "Budget Cuts May Take a Bite Out of Crime", Harris discusses the fact that government entities often cut at the heart of what police agencies are meant to do.

Dixon, (2005) questions why police do not stop crime and wonders out loud whether tactics of police work and calls for more research on the topic.

Crime prevention is accomplished by many methods, most of which occur through focused efforts to reduce certain crimes. Harris (2009) noted a 59 percent drop in gas drive offs from 2005 through 2006 because of pay-at-the-pump initiatives. This specific example did not occur by accident but by a concerted effort of crime prevention specialists to reduce one particular crime. A 59 percent drop in any crime is a major accomplishment especially to those directly affected by the particular crime. In this case, to gas station owners and police departments tasked with the responsibility to respond to, take reports of the incident, and to track, arrest, and prosecute the perpetrator the crime prevention efforts was inestimable. However, to the average citizen this particular statistic may seem trivial or insignificant because he or she does not equate that to a serious crime affecting mainstream America.

Harris (2009) also notes that crime prevention efforts reduce crime in neighborhoods that support community watch programs, crime stopper programs, and other notable prevention programs. The purpose of the police is to prevent crime and community-oriented policing creates a culture of crime prevention (Nalla & Boke, 2011). Crime prevention and community-oriented policing, while not synonymous are similar by definition and further the argument that police and citizens must work together to protect communities from criminal activity and those that perpetrate against others (Reith, 1956; Summer, 2009).

### **Building Trust**

Many studies have shown that there is little trust in the police and many have been left to wonder why we should consider the thoughts or perceptions of citizens (Fagan, 2012). It is the experts that know what is best for the citizens, right? Based on studies conducted over several decades, minorities trust the police less than their counterparts and overall less than one in three non-minorities have trust in the legitimacy of the police (Fagan, 2012). What does this tell us about the principle of citizen support or the need for it in modern policing? Hamilton-Smith et al. (2013) state that confidence in police relates less to performance but more to convergence of order. They also discuss the importance of treating people with respect.

Reith (1956) notes the need for legitimacy in policing based on studies conducted on the basic principle of citizen trust. There are studies on public perception of the police and while many support the need for trust and legitimacy of the police, there are those that wonder why it is so important (Glazer and Denhardt, 2010). Answers may fall within the scope of Black's Theory of Law and associate police response with government control. Law enforcement officers are taught that they are seen as agents of the government, which supports the theory and public perception (North Carolina Basic Law Enforcement Training Manual, 2013). Answers may also fall within the scope of the Peelian Principles that associate the police as being part of the public and dependent on public approval for authority (Lewis, 2011).

### **Researching North Carolina Law Enforcement**

There is confusion among law enforcement leaders, officers, and educators as the struggle continues to change the public's opinion from one extreme to the other. For instance, in North Carolina police trainees are taught that he or she will be seen as an agent of the government and to be prepared for that reaction (North Carolina Basic Law Enforcement Training Manual, 2013). In a later section, that same trainee is taught about the principles and practices of community-oriented policing (North Carolina Basic Law Enforcement Training, 2013). In order to fully understand the job of a police officer, the trainee must understand the difference and similarities of being a part of the community and also an agent of the government. Peel's principles declare that police are simply members of the public paid to perform a job, thus cementing the training that police are both representatives of the government and a part of the community (Metropolitan Police Act of , 1829).

Dr. William Rohe and various associates of his have conducted several studies on police attitudes toward community-oriented policing and implementing the change from traditional policing to community-oriented policing. In an article titled "Implementing Community-oriented Policing: Organization Change and Street Officer Attitudes", Drs. Rohe, and Arcury (2002) discuss the transformation from traditional to community policing. They assert that the change has not been easy nor has every officer or agency head accepted it. There are notable problems with implementation that need to be addressed 25 years after its inception (Poor, 2008; Santos, 2014).

Rohe, et al. (2002) discussed the fact that evaluations of programs have been mixed as to the success of the program. Questioning why assessments of the program have yielded mixed results caused researchers to search for answers related to crime reduction. If, Sir Robert Peel's definition of the primary function of the police is correct, then we must measure the success of both the police and community policing by the lack of crime in a community. Drs. Rohe et al. (2002) questioned whether community policing reduces crime or simply moves it to another community that is not as willing to cooperate in its own public safety effort.

In a previous study, Dr. Rohe et al. (1996) studied officer attitudes in six North Carolina police departments to determine whether community-policing officers acted differently than traditional police officers. The study focused on employees of six departments that differ in geographic location, size of department, and more importantly the level and definition of community policing within each department. Similar studies conducted by Chapelle, (2009) Johnson (2009), Poor (2008), and Lord and Friday (2008) cite similar results.

The study provided an early indication of the level of commitment to the change in policing style and philosophy and descriptions of successful or effective programs used by various departments (Rohe, et al., 1996). The importance of this study for my research is that it provides a basic starting point to include crime rates for comparison purposes. A search for literature related to this particular topic continues to show a gap in literature and a need for this research project.

Dr. Rohe and his associates determined that in order to implement community-oriented policing it was necessary to change organizational culture including changes in the role of the officers (Rohe, et al., 1996). This study, and others measured the impacts of community-oriented policing on officer satisfaction and found that officers participating in community policing generally are more satisfied with his or her job than those participating in traditional policing (Lord & Friday, 2008; Johnson, 2009). The study conducted by Rohe et al. (1996) found that citizens felt that police protection had improved in each jurisdiction studied which parlays to a general feeling of success or support of community-oriented policing. The importance of these findings to this study is that the percentage of community policing officers, the training received by those officers, and the mission statement that guides them all serve as independent variables in measuring crime rates and clearance rates.

### **Organizational Support**

The study presented by Drs. Rohe et al. (1996) showed a great deal of support for community-oriented policing by the police officers, the citizens, and law enforcement and governmental leaders in the six jurisdictions studies. However, when looking at crime reduction rates in each jurisdiction only one showed a long-term drop in crime. Two of the largest cities participating in the study showed a leveling off or reduction in the most recent year prior to the study (Rohe, et al., 1996). The study noted that it was not clear whether crime in the other communities was displaced or reduced as a result of community-oriented policing and therefore did not conclusively show that community policing could be related to crime reduction (Rohe et al., 1996).

The significance of this study for North Carolina law enforcement and especially those departments studied is that it showed a need for change and more importantly a need for additional research. The goal of my research is to replicate this study as it relates to community policing in an attempt to determine whether the shift has had an effect on crime reduction and clearance rates. The six accredited jurisdictions used for this study were Asheville Police, Forsythe County Sheriff, Greensboro Police, Lumberton Police, Whiteville Police, and the Morehead City Police. It is the intent of this research project to look at Carteret County, North Carolina law enforcement agencies to determine the relationship between community policing on crime and clearance rates.

Studying the relationship between community-oriented policing is difficult without first studying the ability to define community-oriented policing (Scheider et al., 2009). It is also necessary to determine whether a department has participated in community relations programs and/or changed the culture inside the agency to one that promotes community involvement and embraces the community as part of the public safety network (Chappelle, 2009). Chappelle (2009) relegated the definition of community-oriented policing to the measurement of police attitudes toward policing the community. The author conducted a qualitative study on police attitudes toward community policing and found several interesting answers to questions related to attitudes. For the purposes of this study, the definition of community policing given by the Community-oriented Policing Services (COPS, 2012) division of the federal government was used as a guide. However, the variety of definitions used is noted throughout the review.

### **Police Officer Attitudes**

John Locke (1976) defined job satisfaction as a positive feeling or emotional state based on one's job or job experience. Based on this often cited definition of job satisfaction one would assume that a positive satisfaction level would produce employees that work hard, produce results, and work to carry out the mission of the agency. On the contrary, job dissatisfaction can be defined as low productivity, less efficiency, and not effectively using time, resources, or abilities (More, Wegener, Vito, and Walsh, 2006). Using both these definitions, it is easy to see why job satisfaction could possibly impact the effectiveness of community-oriented policing. Several researchers have shown positive relationship between community policing on job satisfaction but very few have related that to the success or failure of community policing's ability to be an effective method of policing.

Chappelle, (2009) found that among officers chosen to participate in ride along with students assisting in the study, 48 percent of them believed in or had positive attitudes toward community policing. In a 10-hour ride-a-long however, only 19 percent were observed using problem solving or community policing techniques. More than 75 percent of the time officers observed during the ride-a-long were observed reacting to calls for service (Chappelle, 2009). The statistical data provided by the author was not surprising and noted a lack of resources as the reason for the lack of community policing efforts by the officers observed. Chappelle's research was somewhat supported by a similar study by Lord et al. (2009) that noted several variables exists impacting the ability of community policing to reduce crime.

Chappelle's research (2009) noted that zones were large and there was a lack of clearly defined communities for the officers to police. Officers noted a lack of time to devote to the philosophy and student notes reflect a notation that officers supporting community policing seem to be able to find time to participate in community policing efforts. Chappelle (2009) concluded that community policing is more likely a philosophy rather than an operation approach to policing. Comparing Chappelle's comments about community policing to the definition given by the COPS office could lead us to believe that there is still confusion about the principles of community policing. Long after its acceptance by American law enforcement agencies, community policing remains difficult to define (Scheider et al., 2009).

Chappelle's study made several important observations that are heard and seen throughout the country. Police officers feel that they do not have the time or the staff to participate in community-oriented policing (Chappelle, 2009). Reasons given by officers for resisting including conflict between officers and management and a lack of understanding among officers show a lack of consensus on an effective method of implementation.

Police officer attitudes are important not only in the implementation and operational effectiveness of community-oriented policing but also in the perception of and trust of the community. To study crime rates, it is reasonable to effectively study the attitudes of the police toward the community, law enforcement management, and the style or philosophy of policing used in that jurisdiction (Santos, 2014; Connell, Miggins, & McGloin, 2009). Chappelle (2009) learned that attitudes of officers are often not what

management believes them to be. Thus, the quandary faced by many in realizing positive relationship from community policing. There seems to be a disconnect between policies, training, commitment, and support for the style of policing (Rosenberg, Segler, & Lewis, 2008).

The importance of studying police officer attitudes can be ascribed to the number of studies conducted on the topic in recent years. Literature available on police officer attitudes is not arduous to obtain. However, attitudes toward community-oriented policing have not been adequately measured as it relates to crime reduction. Chappelle, (2009) cited several previous studies that were completed early in the change from traditional to community-oriented policing. Bueermann (2012) wrote that future officers would be known as facilitators of community action. Faith in that statement implies that attitudes of officers are paramount in the success of community policing and its ability to effectively prevent crime.

In a publication conducted by the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill Center for Urban and Regional Studies and authored by Rohe, et al. (1997) the authors suggested that the major benefits of community policing are likely to be in the area of police/community relations and increased officer job satisfaction. The publication noted that it is not likely based on surveys, crime rate analysis, mission statements, and implementation data used by the authors that community policing will have a drastic effect on crime rates. Rohe et al. (1997) note throughout their publication that more research needs to be done. It is also worth noting that this study was conducted in the

beginning stages of community policing and much more data exists today on crime rates and clearance rates after the inception of community policing.

A similar study using police managers, Ercikti, Vito, Welsh, & Higgins (2011) found similar results related to attitudes toward policing and community policing using police managers to gather information. The authors state what could be considered a common fact that managers have a higher level of job satisfaction than line officers. The authors gathered data from police managers using a data set that was 80 percent white and 85 percent male with an average age of 40. The data set had an average time in service of 15 years and displayed an overall level of satisfaction that was considered by the authors to be high. Ercikti, et al. (2011) determined as have others that participation in community policing and/or Compstat increases the level of job satisfaction. One interesting note in this particular study made by the authors was that organizational variables such as promotional processes and rank structures also play a significant role in job satisfaction.

In a study on the link between organizational and strategy commitment and the link between community policing and officer satisfaction, Ford, Weissbein, and Plamondon (2003) discovered that officer's commitment to community policing was significantly related to organizational commitment. However, they also found that commitment to community policing was significantly related to community policing behaviors. In other words, officers were committed to community policing when they and the department participated in activities related to community policing. It is interesting

that the authors found that officer commitment to community policing was only weakly related to job satisfaction.

Ford, et al. (2003) lists several factors as being important to community policing and the ability of officers to support the change from traditional to community policing. For example, teamwork, technology, autonomy, and the division of labor were important to the change. Job satisfaction related to community policing, according to the authors depended on issues such as participatory management styles, job experience, and his or her ability to participate in daily community policing activities. The study related job satisfaction to organizational commitment as being significant.

### **Implementing Community Policing**

As opposed to the previous study using students to ride-a-long with police officers for a period of 10 hours, Poor (2008) conducted a study on the barriers to accepting community policing in a large city. Poor (2008) replicated a study in Houston, Texas and conducted a quantitative study with a sample population of more than four thousand police officers. The study began with the understanding that integrating community-oriented policing into police agencies has been difficult and multifarious. There are many definitions and methods of implementation adding to the demanding task of beginning and maintaining the change to community policing (Scheider et al., 2009). In fact, Yero et al. (2012) believe that finding a single definition of community policing is a “fleeting illusion.”

Title One of the 1994 Crime Control Act encouraged American police departments to adopt and implement community-oriented policing (Poor, 2008).

Community-oriented policing is considered proactive rather than reactive in response to community needs and highly supported by the government on a national level. Poor (2008) cited the Flint Michigan study and the Kansas City study in setting a benchmark for success in implementation. In contrast, the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS) was also cited in the study as an alternative method of addressing crime.

Professional policing models, alternative policing models, traditional models, and any model of policing that is reactive to crime is simpler to administer and measure. Remembering that a lack of crime or criminal activity is the measure of success for police, a reactive method of policing shows a lack of community involvement and a lack of commitment to crime reduction (Thinbault, Lynch, & McBride, 2004). Poor (2008) discusses the need for agencies to provide service to citizens and notes that community-oriented policing addresses those needs. However, the study points out several barriers to implementation and educating managers and supervisors to those barriers is key to future success. Bichler & Gaines (2005) believe that police are satisfied with the implementation phase of community policing and need to refocus on what it can do in the future.

### **Community Policing Training**

Community policing training of both police officers and ranking members of the department is key to the success of the program shift (Rohe et al. 2002). Using training as an independent variable in my study allows me to consider training as an integral part of the success or failure of community policing to effectively reduce crime or assist in crime clearance. Combining community policing training, flexibility among patrol officers, and

a focus on community may work to overcome some of the barriers discussed (Poor, 2008; Rohe, et al., 2002).

Poor (2008) cited the Normative Sponsorship Theory that assumes that most common citizens, being of good will tend to cooperate with others to facilitate the building of consensus. The Normative Sponsorship Theory addresses the Peelian Principle that police need the approval and cooperation of the public to successfully prevent crime (Jackson, Bradford, Stanford, & Hohl, 2012). Poor (2008) noted in her conclusion that challenges to change in law enforcement communities are almost insurmountable. She cites the fact that police officers tend to have an “us against them” attitude toward members of the community. Summer (2009) uses the Normative Sponsorship Theory to describe the ability of the police to create a better social environment.

The importance of the Houston study conducted by Poor (2008) is that it begins to show a trend toward doubt that community-oriented policing is being measured and/or implemented properly or effectively. Poor (2008) uses a simple theory describing the normal reaction of citizens when presented with authority. The use of Evaluative Research Method to determine whether a program or way of doing something is working is applicable to this study because it shows that community policing both works and needs work.

### **Police Culture**

Poor's (2008) use of the Socialization Theory that individuals learn acceptable behavior from his or her social group applies both to the police officers as well as

citizens. Police officers learn acceptable behavior by reading policies, participating and successfully completing field-training programs, and by watching both fellow officers and management and team leaders (Morehead City Police, 2014; Fayetteville Police Department, 2014). Nalla and Boke (2011) also looked at cultural factors involved in implementation of community-oriented policing and found that police culture is difficult to measure and more difficult to change. This is somewhat contradictory to previously cited work by Drs. Adams, Rohe, and Arcury (2002).

Studying police attitudes and job satisfaction, while problematic is vital in understanding the implementation of community-oriented policing and in measuring the philosophy on crime reduction. There have been several studies attempting to link attitudes toward certain successes or failures in policing and many endeavoring to further look at the differences in gender, race, nationality, and other variables in successes or failures (Rohe et al., 2002; Bichler & Gaines, 2005). One such study looked at gender differences in Slovakian police attitudes. The study conducted by Ivan Sun and Gabriela Wasileski in 2010 studied changes in Slovakian policing after the fall of communism in 1989.

Several problems existed following the change and one notable problem was that there was a lack of trust between the police and the community (Sun & Wasileski, 2010). The authors cited the efforts by the United States in developing a Code of Ethics for Slovakian police and the study attempted to look at differences in female and male police officers (Sun & Wasileski, 2010). The authors looked at several different aspects of

policing in the Slovakian nation and specifically differences in gender differences related to Community Policing, Traditional Policing, Order Maintenance, and Family Balance.

The sample population was police officers working during the calendar year 2008 and the authors received responses from 264 out of 300 possible participants. One might imply that an 88 percent return rate either indicates a great deal of support for the study or a mandated response. The study results were interesting but not surprising in that the study showed a distinction between genders related to work evaluations, family balance, and promotions. It did not show a difference in community policing, traditional policing, or order maintenance which is somewhat surprising but not if you consider the impact of the Socialization Theory (Poor, 2008; Summer, 2009).

The implication of this study is that there is no difference between male and female officers related to attitudes toward community-oriented policing versus traditional policing. There is a traditional difference in family balance indicating that female officers continue to struggle with work related issues. The surprise in the study related to family balance is that female officers did not show a difference or positive relationship to community-oriented policing. If female officers struggle with family balance issues as noted by Sun & Wasileski (2010), it would appear that they would relate more closely with community-oriented policing because the style of policing favors community involvement. However, there was no difference shown in the study and leaves this reader wondering whether socialization inside the police department influences attitudes regardless of gender. This question gives great authority to the Normative Sponsorship Theory and the ability of police agencies to either effect or prevent change.

### **Job Satisfaction**

Johnson (2012) discussed the need for job satisfaction and the ability of disgruntled police officers to create difficulties for law enforcement managers. Again, Poor's use of the socialization theory comes to mind as police culture asserts its influence on officers' attitudes toward the job (Poor, 2008). Implementing community-oriented policing can be an arduous task for the most committed law enforcement leader and officer retention plays a role in that success (Rohe et al., 1996). However, implementation is not the end of the process as noted by Bichler and Gaines (2005) and that fact may also affect retention of trained officers.

Meta-analysis conducted by Johnson (2012) consistently showed a link between low job satisfaction rates and high turnover rates. The link also addressed lost work, productivity rates, and a lack of organizational commitment. Johnson (2012) repeatedly refers to the challenge to law enforcement leadership when dealing with police officer attitudes and the impact on the organization.

Johnson (2012) looked at the relationship between job satisfaction and five variables including challenge, accomplishment, opportunity, enjoyment, and likeability of the work. Each officer surveyed had the opportunity to rank his or her agreement with organizational policies, supervisor and peer support, and individual value to the organization. Not surprisingly to this veteran police officer, the results show a significant relationship between organization characteristics such as supervisor feedback and support, organizational support, and culture to job satisfaction. It is important that officers feel supported by the organization if the organization wants to be supported by

the officers (Rohe et al., 2002). Johnson (2012) concludes his research project by expressing a need for future research.

Relating current research such as Johnson's (2012) to the Peelian Principles shows a relationship between organizational environment and culture and job satisfaction. Peel (1829) wrote that police officers are a part of the community and in Johnson's (2012) study he shows that organizational support is more important to job satisfaction than community participation. Peel (1829) expresses a need to participate in community activities as a part of the community but studies show that organizational culture dictates that participation. For example, Sun and Wasileski (2010) demonstrate that there is no difference in male and female officer's attitudes toward community policing, which is surprising based on the natural order of socialization theory. It is implied that police culture is a stronger influence on officer attitudes than community social groups.

### **Measuring Attitude**

Several studies measuring officer attitudes toward policing and those measuring attitudes toward community verses traditional policing could be compared and contrasted to Peel's Principles. In an article written by Glazer and Denhardt (2010) 500 officers in a mid-western town were surveyed to gain an understanding of the officer's perception of him or herself. Glazer and Denhardt (2010) describe community-oriented policing as a battle for the minds of officers in an attempt by management to change the culture of the organization. This particular study showed the struggle between being a police officer and individual citizens indicating that officers had a difficult time being pulled in two

separate directions. Again, showing a contradiction between the two and contributing to the difficulty in transitioning from traditional policing to community-oriented policing. Peel believed that officers were citizens paid to do a job (Lewis, 2011) and Poor (2008) described the pull between the two groups.

Glazer and Denhardt (2010) show a bond between police officers but not between police officers and citizens. This, in a sense describes the difficulty between accepting Peel's principle that police officers are a part of the community and in implementation of community-oriented policing. If the officers accept Peel's principle, then it is natural to assume that that principles of community policing are acceptable to each officer and that organizational change should follow suit.

Using the definition given by the COPS office (2012), one would tend to rely on relationships between police officers and community partners to successfully implement community policing. However, studies such as the ones conducted by Glazer and Denhardt (2010) and Poor (2008) seem to show that relationships either do not exist or are difficult at best to define. Given the nature of community policing to encompass several groups of stakeholders in the process of reducing and clearing crime, it is unfortunate that the transition is slow in developing.

The study conducted by Glazer and Denhardt (2010) took place over a seven-year period and the purpose of the study was to assess officer perceptions about and commitment to community-oriented policing. Again, as in the study conducted by Sun and Wasileski (2010), the authors had more than an 85 percent return from potential participants with 522 of 613 surveys returned. The two studies show a clear discrepancy

to studies previously done by Rohe et al. (2002) that indicate or imply that training can overcome negative attitudes.

The most interesting point retained from the study done by Glazer and Denhardt (2010) was that 80.3 percent of participants expressed doubts that community-oriented policing acts for citizens in the community. The study concluded that officers did believe that community-oriented policing works to create a neighborhood identity and that it uses government resources to help individual neighborhoods (Glazer and Denhardt, 2010). The authors concluded that officers felt confident that community policing brings police, government officials, and citizens together to reduce crime. Finally, the study concluded that there was only moderate commitment from officers to the concept of community policing. No mention or relationship to crime rates or clearance rates was used in the study showing a need for additional research.

This particular study left more questions than answers specifically related to the contradiction that there was moderate commitment but officers believed that community-oriented policing was working to bring people and organizations together to reduce crime (Glazer & Denhardt) 2010. The study left with questions related to the given definition of community-oriented policing and whether the agency or agencies participating had identifiable goals. If community-oriented policing is to be successful, the agency and the community must both express expectations and give officers measurable goals to work toward (COPS, 2014). This study shows the turmoil in the law enforcement community in attempting to transition from traditional to community-oriented policing.

Measuring crime rates and crime clearance rates without the control variables of agency size, percentage of people living in poverty, and percentage of minorities residing in the jurisdiction would be quite simple. It is a simple task to determine whether crime is up or down in a given period of time and whether crimes are being solved at an increasing rate. However, information cited in many studies imply that minorities trust the police less than non-minorities (Van Craen & Skogan, 2014), that there is a relationship between poverty and crime (Cullen & Gendreau, 2001; Ferguson, 2013), and that manpower and time management are extremely important in community policing involvement (Chappelle, 2009).

### **Modern Policing**

Rufai and Adigun (2011) begin their review of modern policing by describing the failures of police to control crime. The high crime rates in urban and rural areas seem to confirm the authors' desire to research the relationship between community policing. The authors define community policing as the interdependence and shared responsibility of police and community to ensure safe and secure environments (Rufai & Adigun, 2011). This definition is similar to others used in previously reviewed studies on community policing but gives a more common sense or layperson's definition. The definition leaves out the component of other, less obvious stakeholders such as non-profit groups, other government agencies, and business and civic groups (COPS, 2014; Rohe et al., 2002).

Rufai and Adigun (2011) use survey questions and suggest future research that give the reader a premise for research into the four topics of research used in this study.

Service orientation, problem solving, empowerment, and accountability are the focus of the study and the results indicate a need for future research. The purpose of the study is to take a serious look at urban crime rates and the ability of modern policing to control crime. The four issues being studied are related to community-oriented policing and are not easily measured (Rufai & Adigun, 2011).

Service orientation is the basic principle of community policing and according to Peel's Principles providing for the needs of the community based on combined evaluations is a necessity for police. Problem solving is difficult to measure but is a principle of community-oriented policing that is focused on communities (Rafai & Adigun, 2011). Each individual community has specific problems that need to be addressed to prevent crime. For example, crime-ridden neighborhoods suffer from similar problems such as empty houses, transient populations, or low-income property. However, each differs in what it will take to solve the problems of that neighborhood and it is the goal of the community-oriented policing officer to identify the problems and determine the best methods of solving the problem (COPS, 2014). Muniz (2012) argues that community policing and the broken windows theory can work together to solve crime.

Empowerment is also difficult to define but is the ability to take control of actions and decisions to reduce and prevent crime. Empowering police officers to make decisions related to crime prevention in his or her area of responsibility allows innovative thinking and has been effective in reducing crime (Trojanowicz et al. (1998). Empowering citizens to become involved in decisions affecting their safety and the safety

of their children gives the power to the people. Peel (1829) described the ability of people to trust the police once he or she understands that the police officer is part of the community. Empowerment is a basic concept of community-oriented policing (Rafai & Adigun, 2011).

The final component measured by Rafai and Adigun (2011) is accountability or the act of taking responsibility for your actions or inactions leading to certain events. In the case of crime prevention, holding the citizens accountable for safety in his or her neighborhood also serves to empower the neighborhood. Requiring citizens to participate in crime prevention avoids a passive role by individuals and allows open dialogue between community groups and authorities (Muniz, 2012).

Holding police accountable for crime reduction is also a premise of community policing and another measurable objective that police agencies struggle with. Accountability allows both police and community members to take responsibility for crime prevention and community-oriented policing provides a means of combining both efforts. J. Scott Thomson (2012) in an article titled “A Back to the Future Paradox” referred to his belief that law enforcement will return to Peel’s basic principle of crime fighting through problem solving. Referencing Peel’s principle once again that policing is the responsibility of the police and the community as one thus placing responsibility and accountability on both to reduce crime.

Summer (2009) conducted a case study of a small police department’s community-oriented policing program. The intent of the study was to look at one specific police department to determine what programs were established and how the

department uses the concept of community-oriented policing to prevent crime and provide a safe environment for its citizens. Summer (2009) also used the Normative Sponsorship Theory as the foundation of the study citing the belief that the community will only sponsor the program if it falls within established standards.

Summer (2009) cited work done by Trojanowicz and Bucquereaux (1994) on ten principles of community-oriented policing. Like Peel, Trojanowicz and Bucquereaux (1994) believed that people need to be aware of what the police are faced with. In essence, citizens deserve to know what problems are plaguing his or her neighborhood and those in the jurisdiction. Empowerment is a word often associated with community-oriented policing and used in this study to illustrate the need to allow both citizens and police officers to seek out, address, and overcome problems on their own (Summer, 2009).

Trojanowicz and Bucquereaux (1994) describe a style of policing that decentralizes operations allowing officers to directly work with citizens. The Morehead City Police Department implemented this style of policing and declared that each neighborhood would work with a “personal policing officer” (Morehead City Police, 1994). In this particular version of a decentralized operations system, the police department allowed officers to take ownership in communities within his or her patrol zone and expected the officer to remain available by pager to speak with citizens even while off duty (Morehead City Police, 1994).

### **Ethics and Responsibility**

Ethics and responsibility are also words used to describe community policing and while community policing delegates a great deal of freedom to the officers, it also requires a great deal of responsibility. Officers, some of which may be inexperienced officers are forced to solve problems previously assigned to a much more experienced officer or detective (Trojanowicz & Bucquereaux, 1994). Community-oriented policing also requires officers to educate citizens about the benefit of working with the police to solve problems. Great efforts have been made to educate citizen groups and on an individual basis on the benefits of community policing (COPS, 2014).

Zhao et al. (2001) discuss the pressure placed on local police departments to participate in community-oriented policing. The pressure comes from the fact that local, state, and federal governments are funding police departments based on community support (Worrall & Zhao, 2003). Peel's principle that police exist and are successful because of community approval is a foundation for this pressure (Lewis, 2011). Police departments need to work to gain the confidence of citizens and convince citizens that the police are working toward a common goal and not creating a police state within the community.

### **A Different View**

It should be noted that not all literature is favorable concerning the concept of community policing. Summer (2009), like many others noted throughout his research that additional research should be done on the topic because while much has been written about the value of the change, not much has been proven about the value. Walker and

Katz (2005) are not alone when they write that community policing is little more than rhetoric and is not a valuable principle. Several cite a need for additional research while others proclaim that community policing does not change crime or fear of crime (Lord & Khuns, 2009; Connell et al., 2008; Santos, 2014).

### **Conclusion**

It has been nearly 25 years since American policing has changed and developed into what it is today. The early writers and researchers such as Trojanowicz, Rohe, and Bucquerueax all embraced the concept of police working together with citizens to solve problems unique or specific to individual communities. There has been much written and much said about the benefits and/or shortcomings of community-oriented policing.

In Carteret County, North Carolina where there are nine separate law enforcement agencies there is a distinct difference in policing styles. Several of the agencies in Carteret County have received federal monies to enhance policing activities from the COPS grant program (COPS, 2011). There are differences in programs aimed at helping children navigate through difficult times such as D.A.R.E., G.R.E.A.T., ASP (after-school program) and many others that some agencies participate in and others do not. Those differences give the study a varied set of programs, training, and policies to compare the crime rates and crime clearance rates against for success or failure of the change in policing style. It will be of interest to determine the satisfaction and/or confidence level of officers in a variety of departments toward community policing given the fact that they work in close proximity of the others.

As Polite (2010) discusses in research designed to differentiate between traditional and community policing, there are similarities and differences between the two, but it seems that police remain conflicted on the best policies. Peel's principles designate crime prevention as the number one goal of the police and list public support as the primary giver of power to the police (Lewis, 2011). However, there remain severe gaps in literature concerning the benefits of community-oriented policing as it relates to crime prevention and reduction.

MacDonald (2002) attempted to determine if there was a causal relationship between the decline in crime rates in 2002 and two strategies of policing, that of community policing or that of proactive policing. The study found that community policing had little effect on the control or decline in violent crime. However, the study also noted that most urban police departments do not implement the strategies of community policing sufficiently making the data less than conclusive.

Macdonald's finding was contradicted by a more recent study by Sozer and Merlo (2013) that utilized three major data-sets consisting of Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics 2003, two waves of Uniform Crime Report data, and the US Census 2000 data to examine whether the relationship between community policing and crime differs based on the agency size. The multiple-regression analyses indicated that all dimensions of community policing had a significant relationship to crime rates in small agencies; whereas, in large agencies, only problem-solving partnership had a significant positive association

with property and violent crime rates. It concluded that the level of implementation of problem-solving partnership dimension had a positive effect on both small and large agencies, but this effect is more prominent for small agencies.

Summer (2009), Fridell (1994), and many others describe a need for additional research. Police agencies can define community policing programs that each participate in but defining community-oriented policing is more difficult. There are those that question whether community-oriented policing is a program or a policing style and whether it actually reduces crime or simply moves it to another neighborhood or jurisdiction (Santos, 2014).

Harris (2009) asks the question “what is a crime prevention officer worth” in an article written to discuss budget cuts facing American law enforcement agencies across the country. Asking that question may lead to answers about community-oriented policing related to success of the change in policing styles. If we are to work together to solve problems unique to communities as the philosophy of community policing suggests, what is it worth to the neighborhood to accomplish that? What is it worth to law enforcement agencies to accomplish that goal? Is it worth completely changing the way law enforcement is done or is it simply worth creating a few programs to work within the communities in the name of community policing? The overwhelming question for law enforcement to answer is whether the philosophy change is real or perceived and whether community policing alone is enough (Muniz, 20102).

On a local level, the question of what a crime prevention officer is worth is an important question as taxpayers struggle to fund schools, equipment, and other public

works projects. In Carteret County, as in every county there are events and requests from citizens that cost a great deal of money. Community policing is designed to address crime prevention as one of the most basic missions of the police. If that is the case, it would be the obvious answer to say that crime prevention effects quality of life on many levels therefore making a crime prevention officer invaluable to the community. A study on the relationship between community policing on crime rates and crime clearance rates will address this particular issue on a local level.

This project examines the relationship between community policing and crime reduction and crime clearance rates. If the philosophy is not reducing and/or preventing crime then what is community-oriented policing accomplishing? Is the cost of community policing justified if it only serves to better police-community relations? These questions provide fuel for additional research and hopefully by addressing the gap in literature, answers to lingering questions will become clear.

## Chapter 3: Methodology

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this quantitative correlational non-experimental study was to examine the relationships between the implementation methods of community-oriented policing services, crime rates, and crime clearance rates in Carteret County, North Carolina. In this chapter, I discuss the details of the research design, sample population, and instrumentation that I used in this study. Following the discussion of data collection methods, I present the data analysis procedures and ethical considerations.

### **Research Design**

This correlational non-experimental study was a quantitative inquiry into the relationships between the independent variable *community-oriented policing* and the dependent variables *violent and property crime* and *clearance rates* in Carteret County, North Carolina.

I did not aim to study the effect of an intervention on a sample; hence, this study was non-experimental in nature. The non-experimental design allowed me to draw conclusions whether or not the variables tended to occur in significant ratios relative to the other variables within the research. Moreover, the non-experimental design was easier to implement. I used correlational analyses to assess the relationships between community-oriented policing, crime rates, and crime clearance rates. Convenience sampling, which is a non-probability sampling technique, entails data collection from sources that are readily available. It is useful especially when randomization is impossible like when the population is very large (Ilker, Sulaiman & Rukayya, 2015,

abstract). In order to manage time and resources effectively, I focused on the cities within Carteret County, North Carolina. Data on the nine agencies was collected from state and federal databases housing public records.

### **Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The following research questions and the corresponding hypotheses guided the focus of this research:

RQ1: Is there a statistically significant relationship between the commitment to community-oriented policing, violent crime and violent crime clearance rates?

H<sub>0</sub>1: There is no statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and the violent crime.

H<sub>a</sub>1: There is a statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and the violent crime rate.

H<sub>0</sub>2: There is no statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and violent crime clearance rates.

H<sub>a</sub>2: There is a statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and violent crime clearance rates.

RQ2: Is there a statistically significant association between community policing policies, community policing training, mission statements including community policing, problem solving activities, community partnerships, violent crime rate and violent crime clearance rates?

H<sub>0</sub>3: Community policing policies and the violent crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>3: Community policing policies and the violent crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>4: Community policing policies and the violent crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>4: Community policing policies and violent crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>5: Community policing training and the violent crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>5: Community policing training and the violent crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>6: Community policing training and violent crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>6: Community policing training and violent crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>7: Mission statements including community policing and the violent crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>7: Mission statements including community policing and the violent crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>8: Mission statements including community policing and violent crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>8: Mission statements including community policing and violent crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>9: Problem solving activities and the violent crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>9: Problem solving activities and the violent crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>10: Problem solving activities and violent crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>10: Problem solving activities and violent crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>11: Community partnerships and the violent crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>11: Community partnerships and the violent crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>12: Community partnerships and violent crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>12: Community partnerships and violent crime clearance rates are not independent.

RQ3: Is there a statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing, property crime and property crime clearance rates?

H<sub>0</sub>13: There is no statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and the property crime rate.

H<sub>a</sub>13: There is a statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and the property crime rate.

H<sub>0</sub>14: There is no statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and property crime clearance rates.

H<sub>a</sub>14: There is a statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing and property crime clearance rates.

RQ4: Is there a statistically significant association between community policing policies, community policing training, mission statements including community policing, problem solving activities, community partnerships, property crime rate and property crime clearance rates?

H<sub>0</sub>15: Community policing policies and the property crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>15: Community policing policies and the property crime rate are not.

Independent.

H<sub>0</sub>16: Community policing policies and the property crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>16: Community policing policies and property crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>17: Community policing training and the property crime rate are independent

H<sub>a</sub>17: Community policing training and the property crime rate are not.

Independent.

H<sub>0</sub>18: Community policing training and property crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>18: Community policing training and property crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>19: Mission statements including community policing and the property crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>19: Mission statements including community policing and the property crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>20: Mission statements including community policing and property crime clearance rates are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>20: Mission statements including community policing and property crime clearance rates are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>21: Problem solving activities and the property crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>21: Problem solving activities and the property crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>22: Problem solving activities and property crime clearance rates are

Independent.

H<sub>a</sub>22: Problem solving activities and property crime clearance rates are not

independent.

H<sub>0</sub>23: Community partnerships and the property crime rate are independent.

H<sub>a</sub>23: Community partnerships and the property crime rate are not independent.

H<sub>0</sub>24: Community partnerships and property crime clearance rates are

Independent.

H<sub>a</sub>24: Community partnerships and property crime clearance rates are not independent.

### **Sample Population**

Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias (2008) defined a sample as any subset of sampling units from a population, and any combination that does not include the entire set of units. For this study, I examined nine Carteret County law enforcement agencies currently serving either a municipal or rural jurisdiction. All nine agencies included in the study provide crime prevention and law enforcement services. The agencies not included have crime scene and/or forensic responsibilities, training facilities, or are 911 dispatch centers and could provide no useful data for this study. Each agency is required to abide by all state and federal laws, and each accredited agency has similar departmental policies based on interpretation of Commission for Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies (CALEA) accreditation standards. The purpose of noting those that are currently CALEA accredited or are seeking accreditation is that each agency had

directives focused on adherence to standards, is audited by CALEA for adherence to standards related to data submission records, and is accredited based on adherence to policy and procedure, indicating that the agency was trustworthy in providing accurate data. This allowed for comparison between accredited and non-accredited agencies and provided an additional control variable.

In the state of North Carolina, there are 100 sheriff's departments responsible for law enforcement services in non-incorporated areas of the counties. Incorporated municipalities provide law enforcement services, and are given that authority by the North Carolina General Statutes (N.C.G.S.160A-281). The state also employs several law enforcement agencies designated to perform specific duties including the State Bureau of Investigation which is tasked with law enforcement duties, collection and dissemination of criminal statistical data, facilitation of the state's crime lab, and assisting other law enforcement agencies. There are nine Carteret County agencies that report measurable incidents to the SBI, in compliance with North Carolina General Statute 114-10.

The size and geographical districts of the agencies vary to encompass small- and medium-sized departments, with the number of officers ranging from five to 40 sworn officers. The agencies cover jurisdictions designated as small towns and rural areas of the county, all located on the coast of North Carolina. This area of the state is unique because of the deep-water access to the Atlantic Ocean, and the fact that large sections of the county are considered islands and accessible by bridges and/or water. There is one main highway into and out of the county limiting access to the county for industrial

purposes to primarily shipping. There are state and federal agencies housed inside the borders of Carteret County because of the North Carolina Port and University outposts, but none that perform crime prevention duties that would benefit this study.

### **Data Collection**

I collected data on the nine cities located within Carteret County, North Carolina, from several sources including the nationally accredited and non-accredited law enforcement agencies in Carteret County, those in the self-assessment phase of accreditation, police officers from all nine agencies, and state and federal databases housing public record information.

I collected data from the agencies via personal contact with an agency representative for the independent variable *community-oriented policing methods*, which was comprised of the commitment to community policing, community policing policies, community policing training, mission statements, and accreditation status.

I obtained data from the State Bureau of Investigation and the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Report for the dependent variables of *violent crime*, *property crime*, *violent crime clearance rates*, and *property crime clearance rates*. The Uniform Crime Report published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation collects and disseminates statistical data on crime and rates of occurrence for murder, assault, aggravated assault, rape, and robbery (FBI, 2014). The rates of occurrence are calculated by rate and volume per 100,000 citizens. Rape, robbery, murder, and aggravated assault are considered as violent crimes, while larceny, vehicle theft, and burglary, are considered as property crime.

Statistical data related to crime rates and clearance rates is public record, and was accessible to me with no special permission needed or requested. The North Carolina Incident Based Report uses the same categories for reporting as the Uniform Crime Report with no differentiation of definitions (NC Incident Based Report, 2008). For purposes of this research, I used a time frame of 2008-2012 to gather crime and clearance rates. Demographic data such as agency size, poverty rates, and percentage of minority population were obtained from the individual agencies, or collected from the United States Census Bureau (U.S. Census, 2010). All information related to agency size, organization, training, policies, and other related information is considered public record in North Carolina, and is readily available (N.C. General Statute 132.1, 2014). All data used in this study designating a citizen as a minority or living below poverty level was obtained from the United States Census Bureau, and was originally provided by the resident. Census data provided in 2010 was the most up to date information available for this research project. Per the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Statistical Policy Directive 14 (1978), the Census Bureau uses a set of money income thresholds that vary by family size and composition to determine who is in poverty. The Census Bureau calculates percentages of minorities by determining the number of non-white residents residing in the jurisdiction, and dividing them into Asian, African American, Hispanic, Multi-race, and white demographic groupings.

### **Instrumentation and Operationalization**

The Uniform Crime Report published by the Federal Bureau of Investigation collects and disseminates statistical data on crime and rates of occurrence for murder,

assault, aggravated assault, rape, and robbery (FBI, 2014). The rates of occurrence are calculated by rate and volume per 100,000 citizens. Property crime rates are calculated using the same method, also reported by the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Law enforcement agencies are asked to report all crimes to the North Carolina State Bureau of Investigation (SBI) for statistical purposes, and are calculated based on agency reporting. The SBI then forwards those numbers to the Federal Bureau of Investigation to be used for the Uniform Crime Report (SBI, 2014). Accredited agencies are audited on reporting procedures and strongly critiqued on deficiencies in collection and reporting policies and procedures (CALEA, 2003).

Crime clearance rates are a clear indicator of police performance, and are measured by the number of cases cleared compared to the total number of cases (CALEA, 2003). North Carolina cases are cleared by using one of several disposition codes (NC State Bureau of Investigation, 2004). Cases are considered cleared by the state of North Carolina by one of three closure codes including *cleared by arrest*, *prosecution declined/refused to cooperate*, and *death of offender* (SBI Incident Base Reporting, 2004). A case is cleared by arrest when warrants are obtained or the suspect is in custody. It is cleared as “prosecution declined or victim refused to cooperate” when the victim does not wish to seek prosecution. The case is cleared by “death of offender” when the suspect is deceased and prosecution is not necessary.

In the following section, I describe how the variables were operationalized.

*Commitment to community policing* is a continuous, independent variable that was determined by the number of officers assigned to community policing activities

compared to the total number of agency officers. The commitment to community policing was expressed as a percentage of total number of officers in each agency.

*Community policing policies* is a nominal independent variable that was assessed by examining the community policing policies of each agency. The agencies were given a score of one if it had community policing policies in place and a value of zero if they did not.

*Community policing training* is a nominal independent variable that was assessed by examining whether each agency provided community policing training. The agencies were given a score of one if community policing training was present and a value of zero if it did not.

*Community policing mission statements* is a nominal independent variable that was assessed by examining each agency's mission statement. The agencies were given a score of one if their mission statements included community policing and a value of zero if it did not.

*Community partnerships* is a nominal independent variable that was assessed by examining whether each agency had community policing partnerships with private groups or private citizens. The agencies were given a score of one if it had community partnerships and a value of zero if it did not.

*Community activities* is a nominal independent variable that was assessed by examining if each municipality had community policing activities. Municipalities were given a score of one if it had community policing activities and a value of zero if it did not.

*Violent crime* is a continuous dependent variable that was calculated by the rate and volume per 100,000 citizens.

*Property crime* is a continuous dependent variable that was calculated by the rate and volume per 100,000 citizens.

*Violent crime clearance rate* is a continuous dependent variable calculated by the number of violent crimes cleared compared to the total number of violent crimes.

*Property crime clearance rate* is a continuous dependent variable calculated by the number of property crimes cleared compared to the total number of property crimes

### **Data Analysis**

I utilized descriptive correlational statistics as well as quantitative data were utilized to examine the relationships between community-oriented policing, crime rates and crime clearance rates. I compiled demographic data, and calculated descriptive statistical processing for all demographic measures using SPSS version SPSS 21 for Mac. SPSS 21 for Mac helped develop statistical analysis for this project and is the latest version available to me. I gained experience with SPSS prior to beginning the research, and was sufficient to properly enter, calculate, and analyze the data collected. I used correlational analyses to assess the relationships between community-oriented policing, crime rates and crime clearance rates. Prior to running the correlational analyses, I conducted a test for normality of the data distribution to determine parametric or non-parametric testing. If the variables were normally distributed, I carried out a Pearson Product Moment Correlation, and if they were not normally distributed, I carried out a Spearman's Rho. I used a Chi Square Test for Association to assess the relationships

between variables that are nominal in nature. I deemed a statistically significant result if  $p$  was  $< .05$ .

### **Ethical Consideration**

This study used both public record information and information voluntarily given by anonymous employees of individual agencies. Secondary data was obtained legally and was provided by public agencies regulated by North Carolina general statutes (N.C.G.S. 132.1, 2014). All precautions were taken to ensure that data was collected and calculated accurately and that participants were not identified by personal data. No other ethical concerns were considered for this study. No protection was necessary for public agencies or agency personnel and consent, either formal or informal, did not need to be obtained to gather or use agency data. No data will be collected that is considered private or personal to any member of any agency.

Upon the conclusion of this study, the results of this research will be given to the Chiefs and Sheriff of Carteret County, North Carolina for review and appropriate reflection. The information will also be provided to the North Carolina Justice Academy and the North Carolina Criminal Justice Commission for review. Finally, the information will be provided to the North Carolina Police Executives Association and the Chief's Association.

### **Internal Review Board**

The Internal Review Board (IRB) serves as a critical step in the proposal process to ensure that ethical standards are met. In compliance with Walden University, I sought

approval this research proposal prior to collecting data by submitting a formal IRB application. The IRB granted approval under the number 11-25-15-0351621.

### **Reliability and Validity Issues**

There are no significant validity or reliability issues associated with collecting public record information from municipal, county, or state agencies required to collect and disseminate such data. Reliability determines consistency of the test throughout different and varying tests (Field, 2009). Law enforcement agencies are required to accurately record, collect, and disseminate crime and crime clearance rate data (FBI Uniform Crime Report, 2014; CALEA, 2003). Thus, reliability of the data is expected because the data is consistent regardless of the test. Validity tests determine whether a test measures what it is supposed to measure (Field, 2009). Predictive validity determines the relationship between two variables such as whether total crime rates correlate to the percentage of community policing officers. In this study, all data to be collected uses methods validated by both the State and Federal Bureaus of Investigation and testing used to determine relationships between variables was accurate and appropriate (Field, 2009).

### **Summary**

The purpose of this quantitative correlational non-experimental study was to examine the relationships between the implementation methods of community-oriented policing services, crime rates and crime clearance rates in Carteret County, North Carolina. Convenience sampling enabled the collection of secondary data from sources considered as public records and thus, did not require special permission. Correlational

analyses and statistical processing tools will be used to address the purpose of this research. Chapter 4 presents the results of the research methodologies outlined in this chapter.

## Chapter 4: Data Analysis

### **Introduction**

The purpose of this quantitative correlational non-experimental study was to examine the relationships between the implementation methods of community-oriented policing services, crime rates, and crime clearance rates in Carteret County, North Carolina. I used correlational analyses to determine if there were significant associations between the implementation methods of community policing, crime rates (property crime and violent crime) and crime clearance rates (property crime clearance rates and violent crime clearance rates).

In this chapter I present the results of the correlational statistical analyses outlined in the methodology section of this dissertation. Prior to conducting statistical analyses, I performed tests for normality of distribution to determine parametric or non-parametric testing, and used descriptive statistics to provide the demographic background of the nine cities within Carteret County, North Carolina.

### **Description of the Sample**

The majority (77%) of the cities had between 1 and 20 sworn police officers, while there was only one agency (11.1%) that was accredited with the CALEA. Table 1 shows the cities by agency size and CALEA accreditation status. The average poverty rate and minority population rates are shown in Table 2. The poverty rate in Carteret County ( $M = 9.35$ ,  $SD = 6.32$ ) was considerably lower than the national average of 15.4% for years 2009 to 2013 (US Census Bureau, 2015). However, when considering the variance across the nine cities, some cities had poverty rates approximately similar to

the national poverty rate. The minority population rate in Carteret County was also considerably lower when compared to the national average ( $M = 10.08$ ;  $M = 23.6$ , respectively). However, similar to the poverty rate, the variance across the cities was very wide ( $SD = 6.71$ ).

Table 1

*Cities by Agency Size and CALEA Accreditation Status*

| Agency Size          | Frequency | Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|
| 1-10                 | 4.00      | 44.40   |
| 11-20                | 3.00      | 33.30   |
| 21-30                | 1.00      | 11.10   |
| 31-50                | 1.00      | 11.10   |
| Total                | 9.00      | 100.00  |
| Accreditation Status | Frequency | Percent |
| No                   | 8.00      | 88.90   |
| Yes                  | 1         | 11.1    |
| Total                | 9         | 100     |

Table 2

*Cities by Poverty and Minority Population Rate*

| Demographic Factor       | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| Poverty Rate             | 2.5     | 19.50   | 9.35  | 6.32           |
| Minority Population Rate | 2.7     | 18.80   | 10.08 | 6.71           |

Property crime rates for the nine cities had a wide range, with crime rates as low as 9 incidents (reported per 100,000 residents) to a maximum of 833 incidents ( $SD = 264.23$ ). Consequently, property crime clearance rates also varied widely in that the percentage of cleared property crimes ranged from 4 to 244 ( $SD = 95.42$ ). When compared to property crime and clearance rates, the violent crime and violent crime clearance rates had a narrower range ( $Minimum = 0$ ,  $Maximum = 84$ ;  $Minimum = 0$ ,  $Maximum = 73$ , respectively), and their means were closer in value ( $M = 19.22$ ,  $SD = 28.12$ ;  $M = 16.22$ ,  $SD = 25.47$ , respectively). However, one city had a value of “0” for its violent crime and clearance rates, possibly due to the unavailability of data; nevertheless, data from this city was kept in the analysis due to the small sample size of this study. Table 3 shows the summary statistics for property crime rate and property crime clearance rate, while table 4 shows the summary statistics for the violent crime rate and violent crime clearance rate.

Table 3

*Cities by Property Crime Rate and Property Crime Clearance Rate*

| Variable                      | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Std. Dev. |
|-------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|-----------|
| Property Crime Rate           | 9       | 833     | 219.67 | 264.23    |
| Property Crime Clearance Rate | 4       | 244     | 76.11  | 95.42     |

Table 4

*Cities by Violent Crime Rate and Violent Crime Clearance Rate*

| Variable                     | Minimum | Maximum | Mean   | Std. Deviation |
|------------------------------|---------|---------|--------|----------------|
| Violent Crime Rate           | 0       | 84      | 19.222 | 28.119         |
| Violent Crime Clearance Rate | 0       | 73      | 16.222 | 25.474         |

### **Tests for Normality of Distribution of Variables**

I performed a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test for normality and found that all the variables except for Commitment to Community Policing were not normally distributed,  $p < .05$ . Hence, I decided to utilize a Spearman's rho, which is a non-parametric statistical test for correlational analysis. Table 5 shows the results of the test for normality.

Table 5

*Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test for Normality*

| Variable                               | Property<br>Crime Rate | Violent<br>Crime<br>Rate | Property<br>Clearance<br>Rate | Violent<br>Crime<br>Clearance<br>Rate | Commitment<br>to COP | COP<br>Policies | COP<br>Training | COP<br>Mission<br>Statement | COP<br>Partnerships | COP<br>Activities |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Test                                   | 0.276                  | 0.31                     | 0.33                          | 0.37                                  | 0.17                 | 0.471           | 0.471           |                             | 0.471               | 0.47              |
| Statistic<br>Asymp. Sig.<br>(2-tailed) | .046c                  | .013c                    | .005c                         | .001c                                 | .200c,d              | .000c           | .000c           | e                           | .000c               | .000c             |

Note. The “e” indicates that the distribution has no variance for this variable, and therefore the one-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test could not be performed.

RQ1: Is there a statistically significant relationship between the commitment to community-oriented policing, violent crime and violent crime clearance rates?

A Spearman's Rho was carried out to assess the relationships between violent crime, violent crime clearance rates, and the agency's commitment to community policing, which was measured by the number of officers assigned to community policing. The analysis showed that the violent crime rate ( $r = -.728, p = .03$ ), and violent crime clearance rate ( $r = -.723, p = .03$ ) each had negative relationships with the agency's commitment to community policing. This means that as the number of officers assigned to community policing increases, the violent crime rate and violent crime clearance rate decreases. Since the violent crime clearance rate was computed based on the violent crime rate, it was not surprising that the two had a statistically significant, positive relationship,  $r = .996, p < .001$ . Table 6 shows the results of the Spearman's rho.

Table 6

*Spearman's Rho for Commitment to Community Policing, Violent Crime Rate, and Violent Crime Clearance Rate*

| Variable                     | Statistic       | Violent Crime Rate | Violent Crime Clearance Rate |
|------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| Violent Crime Rate           | Correlation     |                    |                              |
|                              | Coefficient     | 1.00               | .996**                       |
|                              | Sig. (2-tailed) | .                  | .00                          |
| Violent Crime Clearance Rate | Correlation     |                    |                              |
|                              | Coefficient     | .996**             | 1.00                         |
|                              | Sig. (2-tailed) | .00                | .                            |
| Commitment to COP            | Correlation     |                    |                              |
|                              | Coefficient     | -.728*             | -.723*                       |
|                              | Sig. (2-tailed) | .03                | .03                          |

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

RQ2: Is there a statistically significant association between community policing policies, community policing training, mission statements including community policing, problem solving activities, community partnerships, violent crime rate and violent crime clearance rates?

I used the chi-square test for association to assess the associations between the dichotomous variables of community policing policies, community policing training, community policing partnerships, community policing activities, violent crime rate, and

violent crime clearance rate, and found that there was no statistically significant relationship between the study variables,  $p > .05$ . Table 7 shows the test results of the chi-square for community policing methods and violent crime rate, while Table 8 shows the chi-square for community policing implementation methods and violent crime clearance rates.

Table 7  
*Chi Square for Community Policing Methods and Violent Crime Rate*

| COP Policies and Violent Crime Rate |        |    |                         |
|-------------------------------------|--------|----|-------------------------|
| Chi-Square Tests                    |        |    | Asymptotic Significance |
|                                     | Value  | df | (2-sided)               |
| Pearson Chi-Square                  | 9.000a | 8  | 0.342                   |
| Likelihood Ratio                    | 9.535  | 8  | 0.299                   |
| Linear-by-Linear Association        | 6.815  | 1  | 0.009                   |
| N of Valid Cases                    | 9      |    |                         |

(table continues)

## COP Training and Violent Crime Rate

| Chi-Square Tests             | Value  | df | Asymptotic Significance<br>(2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------|----|--------------------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square           | 9.000a | 8  | 0.342                                |
| Likelihood Ratio             | 9.535  | 8  | 0.299                                |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 0.486  | 1  | 0.486                                |
| N of Valid Cases             | 9      |    |                                      |

## COP Partnerships and Violent Crime Rate

| Chi-Square Tests             | Value  | df | Asymptotic Significance<br>(2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------|----|--------------------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square           | 9.000a | 8  | 0.342                                |
| Likelihood Ratio             | 9.535  | 8  | 0.299                                |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.14   | 1  | 0.286                                |
| N of Valid Cases             | 9      |    |                                      |

## COP Activities and Violent Crime Rate

| Chi-Square Tests             | Value  | df | Asymptotic Significance<br>(2-sided) |
|------------------------------|--------|----|--------------------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square           | 9.000a | 8  | 0.342                                |
| Likelihood Ratio             | 9.535  | 8  | 0.299                                |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.762  | 1  | 0.184                                |
| N of Valid Cases             | 9      |    |                                      |

Table 8 *Chi Square for Community Policing Methods and Violent Crime Clearance Rates*

| COP Policies and Violent Clearance Rate |        |    |                                         |
|-----------------------------------------|--------|----|-----------------------------------------|
| Chi-Square Tests                        |        |    | Asymptotic<br>Significance<br>(2-sided) |
|                                         | Value  | df |                                         |
| Pearson Chi-Square                      | 9.000a | 7  | 0.253                                   |
| Likelihood Ratio                        | 9.535  | 7  | 0.217                                   |
| Linear-by-Linear Association            | 7.251  | 1  | 0.007                                   |
| N of Valid Cases                        | 9      |    |                                         |
| COP Training and Violent Clearance Rate |        |    |                                         |
| Chi-Square Tests                        |        |    | Asymptotic<br>Significance<br>(2-sided) |
|                                         | Value  | df |                                         |
| Pearson Chi-Square                      | 9.000a | 7  | 0.253                                   |
| Likelihood Ratio                        | 9.535  | 7  | 0.217                                   |
| Linear-by-Linear Association            | 0.499  | 1  | 0.480                                   |
| N of Valid Cases                        | 9      |    |                                         |

(table continues)

---

| COP Partnerships and Violent Clearance Rate |        |    |                  |
|---------------------------------------------|--------|----|------------------|
| Chi-Square Tests                            |        |    | Asymptotic       |
|                                             | Value  | df | Significance (2- |
|                                             |        |    | sided)           |
| Pearson Chi-Square                          | 6.107a | 7  | 0.527            |
| Likelihood Ratio                            | 6.762  | 7  | 0.454            |
| Linear-by-Linear Association                | 0.979  | 1  | 0.322            |
| N of Valid Cases                            | 9      |    |                  |

---

| COP Activities and Violent Clearance Rate |        |    |              |
|-------------------------------------------|--------|----|--------------|
| Chi-Square Tests                          |        |    | Asymptotic   |
|                                           | Value  | df | Significance |
|                                           |        |    | (2-sided)    |
| Pearson Chi-Square                        | 6.107a | 7  | 0.527        |
| Likelihood Ratio                          | 6.762  | 7  | 0.454        |
| Linear-by-Linear Association              | 1.711  | 1  | 0.191        |
| N of Valid Cases                          | 9      |    |              |

---

RQ3: Is there a statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing, property crime and property crime clearance rates?

I carried out a Spearman's rho to assess the relationship between commitment to community policing, property crime, and property crime clearance rate, and found that there was a statistically significant large, negative relationship between the agency's

commitment to community policing and the property crime clearance rate,  $r = -.803$ ,  $p = .009$ . This means that as the agency's commitment to community policing increases, the property crime clearance rate decreases. Since the property crime clearance rate was computed based on the property crime rate, it was not surprising that the two had a statistically significant, positive relationship,  $r = .900$ ,  $p = .001$ . Table 9 shows the results of the Spearman's rho.

Table 9

*Spearman's Rho for Commitment to Community Policing, Property Crime Rate and Property Crime Clearance Rate*

| Variable                      | Statistic               | Property Crime Clearance Rate | Commitment to COP |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|
| Property Crime Rate           | Correlation Coefficient | .900**                        | -0.644            |
|                               | Sig. (2-tailed)         | 0.001                         | 0.061             |
|                               | N                       | 9                             | 9                 |
| Property Crime Clearance Rate | Correlation Coefficient | 1                             | -.803**           |
|                               | Sig. (2-tailed)         | .                             | 0.009             |
|                               | N                       | 9                             | 9                 |

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

RQ4: Is there a statistically significant association between community policing policies, community policing training, mission statements including community policing,

problem solving activities, community partnerships, property crime rate and property crime clearance rates?

The chi-square test for association was used to assess the associations between the dichotomous variables of community policing policies, community policing training, community policing partnerships and community policing activities, and property crime rate and property crime clearance rate, and I found that there was no statistically significant relationship between the study variables,  $p > .05$ . Table 10 shows test results of the chi-square for community policing implementation methods and property crime rate, while Table 11 shows the chi-square for community policing implementation methods and property crime clearance rates.

Table 10

*Chi Square for Community Policing Methods and Property Crime Rate*

| COP Policies and Property Crime Rate     |       |    |                                      |
|------------------------------------------|-------|----|--------------------------------------|
| Chi-Square Tests                         | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance<br>(2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square                       | 9.000 | 8  | 0.342                                |
| Likelihood Ratio                         | 9.535 | 8  | 0.299                                |
| Linear-by-Linear Association             | 6.292 | 1  | 0.012                                |
| N of Valid Cases                         | 9     |    |                                      |
| COP Training and Property Crime Rate     |       |    |                                      |
| Chi-Square Tests                         | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance<br>(2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square                       | 9.000 | 8  | 0.342                                |
| Likelihood Ratio                         | 9.535 | 8  | 0.299                                |
| Linear-by-Linear Association             | 0.76  | 1  | 0.383                                |
| N of Valid Cases                         | 9     |    |                                      |
| Cop Partnerships and Property Crime Rate |       |    |                                      |
| Chi-Square Tests                         | Value | df | Asymptotic Significance<br>(2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square                       | 9.000 | 8  | 0.342                                |
| Likelihood Ratio                         | 9.535 | 8  | 0.299                                |

(table continues)

|                              |       |   |       |
|------------------------------|-------|---|-------|
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.446 | 1 | 0.229 |
| N of Valid Cases             | 9     |   |       |

---

Cop Activities and Property Crime Rate

| Chi-Square Tests             | Asymptotic Significance |    |           |
|------------------------------|-------------------------|----|-----------|
|                              | Value                   | df | (2-sided) |
| Pearson Chi-Square           | 9.000                   | 8  | 0.342     |
| Likelihood Ratio             | 9.535                   | 8  | 0.299     |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1.684                   | 1  | 0.194     |
| N of Valid Cases             | 9                       |    |           |

---

Table 11

*Community Policing Methods and Property Crime Clearance Rates*

| COP Policies and Property Crime Clearance Rate |        |    |                            |
|------------------------------------------------|--------|----|----------------------------|
| Chi-Square Tests                               |        |    | Asymptotic<br>Significance |
|                                                | Value  | df | (2-sided)                  |
| Pearson Chi-Square                             | 9.000a | 8  | 0.342                      |
| Likelihood Ratio                               | 9.535  | 8  | 0.299                      |
| Linear-by-Linear Association                   | 7.679  | 1  | 0.006                      |
| N of Valid Cases                               | 9      |    |                            |
| COP Training and Property Crime Clearance Rate |        |    |                            |
| Chi-Square Tests                               |        |    | Asymptotic<br>Significance |
|                                                | Value  | df | (2-sided)                  |
| Pearson Chi-Square                             | 9.000a | 8  | 0.342                      |
| Likelihood Ratio                               | 9.535  | 8  | 0.299                      |
| Linear-by-Linear Association                   | 0.454  | 1  | 0.5                        |
| N of Valid Cases                               | 9      |    |                            |

(table continues)

---

| Cop Partnerships and Property Crime Clearance Rate |        |    |                            |
|----------------------------------------------------|--------|----|----------------------------|
| Chi-Square Tests                                   |        |    | Asymptotic<br>Significance |
|                                                    | Value  | df | (2-sided)                  |
| Pearson Chi-Square                                 | 9.000a | 8  | 0.342                      |
| Likelihood Ratio                                   | 9.535  | 8  | 0.299                      |
| Linear-by-Linear Association                       | 1.31   | 1  | 0.252                      |
| N of Valid Cases                                   | 9      |    |                            |

---

| Cop Activities and Property Crime Clearance Rate |        |    |                            |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------|----|----------------------------|
| Chi-Square Tests                                 |        |    | Asymptotic<br>Significance |
|                                                  | Value  | df | (2-sided)                  |
| Pearson Chi-Square                               | 9.000a | 8  | 0.342                      |
| Likelihood Ratio                                 | 9.535  | 8  | 0.299                      |
| Linear-by-Linear Association                     | 0.76   | 1  | 0.383                      |
| N of Valid Cases                                 | 9      |    |                            |

---

### Summary

The data from this study was collated from the nine cities within Carteret County, North Carolina and was obtained from the State Bureau of Investigation and the Federal Bureau of Investigation's Uniform Crime Report. The results of this quantitative

correlational study determined that there were large, inverse associations between the violent crime rate, violent crime clearance rate and property crime clearance rate and the agency's commitment to community policing. No other correlations were found to be statistically significant for the other community policing methods and for both violent crime and clearance rates and property crime and clearance rates. This chapter presented the results of the statistical processing techniques outlined in chapter three of this dissertation and the succeeding chapter will discuss the implications of the findings of this chapter.

## Chapter 5: Discussion of the Findings

### **Introduction**

The problem that I addressed in this study is that while community-oriented policing is touted as a new paradigm in American policing, there is little research that reflects the connections between community policing, crime reduction, and improvement in crime clearance rates, especially in Carteret County, North Carolina. Researchers have failed to definitively describe community policing as a successful style of policing, leaving much more research to be done on its effectiveness as a crime reduction method (Yero et al., 2012; Telep, & Weisburd, 2012). Additionally, there is also a lack of consensus among police departments and academics about the purpose, implementation, effectiveness, or accurate definition of community policing (Adams et al., 2002; Burrus & Giblin, 2009; Poor, 2008).

The purpose of this quantitative correlational non-experimental study was to examine the relationships between the implementation methods of community policing, crime rates, and crime clearance rates in Carteret County, North Carolina. I used correlational analyses to determine if there were significant associations between the implementation methods of community policing crime rates and crime clearance rates

### **Summary of the Findings**

In Research Question 1, I asked: Is there a statistically significant relationship between the commitment to community-oriented policing, violent crime and violent crime clearance rates?

In the analysis, I found that the violent crime rate and violent crime clearance rate had large, negative relationships with the agency's commitment to community policing, which was measured by the number of officers assigned to community policing. This means that as the number of officers assigned to community policing increases, the violent crime rate and violent crime clearance rate decreases. It might seem counterintuitive that as the commitment to community policing increases, the violent crime clearance rate decreases. This may be because the clearance rate was obtained as a percentage of cleared crimes compared to the total number of violent crimes. This method of calculating the violent crime clearance rate means that a decrease in the violent crime rate would also result in a decrease in the violent crime clearance rate. This relationship between the violent crime rate and violent crime clearance rate coincided with the large, positive association between the violent crime and clearance rates.

In Research Question 2, I asked: Is there a statistically significant association between community policing policies, community policing training, mission statements including community policing, problem solving activities, community partnerships, violent crime rate and violent crime clearance rates?

The results indicated that there were no statistically significant associations between community policing policies, community policing training, mission statements including community policing, problem solving activities, community partnerships with either the violent crime rate or the violent crime clearance rate.

In Research Question 3, I asked: Is there a statistically significant relationship between commitment to community-oriented policing, property crime and property crime clearance rates?

The results indicated that there was a statistically significant large, negative relationship between the agency's commitment to community policing and the property crime clearance rate. This means that as the agency's commitment to community policing increases, the property crime clearance rate decreases. Since the property crime clearance rate was computed based on the property crime rate, it was not surprising that the two had a large, positive relationship.

In Research Question 4, I asked: Is there a statistically significant association between community policing policies, community policing training, mission statements including community policing, problem solving activities, community partnerships, property crime rate and property crime clearance rates?

The results indicated that there were no statistically significant associations between community policing policies, community policing training, mission statements including community policing, problem solving activities, and community partnerships with either the property crime rate or the property crime clearance rate.

### **Interpretation of the Findings**

I expected that the commitment to community policing would be correlated with both violent and property crime clearance rates. However, while I found that there was a statistically significant relationship, the negative relationship was not in the direction that I had hypothesized. This may be a result of how the clearance rates were computed, that

is, as a percentage of cleared crimes compared to the total number of crimes committed. This means that a reduction in the crime rate would also mean a reduction in the crime clearance rate.

I expected that the commitment to community policing would be negatively associated with the crime rates for both violent and property crime. However, the results showed that only violent crime had a significant relationship with the agency's commitment to community policing. This indicated that community policing is associated with reducing certain types of crime. However, it was surprising that the property crime clearance rate was found to be associated with the commitment to community policing. This may be explained by some irregularities in the data, which showed that some municipalities had property crime clearance rates above 100%. Ultimately, this variance in the data and the small sample size may have affected the results of this study.

While the findings of this study may have been restricted by the data that were collected, the results indicated that there might be significant correlations between community policing and the type of crime that it curtails. These findings extend research done by Rohe et al. (1996) who found that the association between community policing and crime reduction was inconclusive given that two of the largest cities participating in the study showed a leveling off or reduction in the most recent year prior to the study. Conversely, the results of this study are inconsistent with a more recent study by Sozer (2008) who found that the percentage of community policing officers was significantly associated with greater crime rates. Sozer also found that community policing had the

greatest correlation with property crime rate, and the lowest correlation with the violent crime rate. While the results of my study contradicted the magnitudes of the associations of previous research, they are in agreement that the strength of the associations differs based on the type of crime. This indicated that community policing may prove to be more effective in reducing certain types of crime.

### **Implications of the Findings**

#### **Education**

Previous researchers have shown that no clear definition of community-oriented policing exists (Lord & Friday, 2008; Santos, 2014). They have also shown that each agency involved in or implementing community-oriented policing has its own method of doing so (Santos, 2014). The results of my study may be used in guiding agency administrators and police officers in the best method to define and implement community-oriented policing. This research allows them to formulate strategies and processes that would enable them to improve quality of life issues not only for the citizenry that they protect, but also for police officers themselves. Existing program arrangements such as DARE, Neighborhood Watch, community meetings, and other similar programs could be tailored to community-oriented policing practices geared towards preventing certain types of crime.

#### **Practice**

The results of this study could be used by police departments to better direct their time and efforts on implementing community-oriented policing on the types of crime that are best mitigated by community policing. This direction may also allow them to release

valuable resources that are currently bound in ineffective community-oriented policing systems.

### **Policy**

This research could potentially lead to changes in community-oriented policing not only in Carteret County, North Carolina, but also across the state and the country. This study fills a gap in existing research concerning the success of community policing as a crime reduction method. It has been estimated that more than \$18 billion have been spent since the introduction of community policing as a nationwide project (Yero et al., 2012), and the findings of this study could be used to inform a more effective allocation of financial resources to reducing violent crimes. I hope that the findings of this research will not only benefit the residents of Carteret County, but also the citizens of the country as a whole.

### **Limitations of the Study**

The sample size of this study was patterned after the 1996 study conducted by Rohe et al., who used six North Carolina police departments to evaluate whether community-policing officers acted differently than traditional police officers. Although the sample size of this study was larger than that of Rohe's, it can be said that the sample size may be too small to detect a valid effect. Another limiting factor of this study may be the data that was collected, since some clearance rates indicated that more than 100% of crimes were cleared. Also, there was a city that had a "0" violent crime rate, which may have meant that the data was unavailable. These types of data, which would usually be eliminated from the analyses, could not be removed because of the already small

sample size. The third limiting factor of this study was that I focused solely on the effect of the police agency's community-oriented policing efforts, and did not consider communities' efforts (such as neighborhood watch) to stem crimes. These existing community programs may have ultimately affected the crime and clearance rates.

### **Recommendations for Future Research**

Future researchers studying the relationship of community-oriented policing on crime rates could consider utilizing a larger sample base in order to draw more solid conclusions. Prior to data collection, an *a priori* power analysis can be conducted utilizing G\*Power software using standard parameters for a correlational analysis. The collection of a larger than minimum sample size would allow for the elimination of suspected incorrect data, which would translate to more valid conclusions.

Future researchers could also consider a larger geographic area as the focus of their study. In this study, I focused on Carteret County, North Carolina, but future studies could explore community policing and its effect on crime rates in the state of North Carolina as a whole. Such focus on a larger area could expand the study's generalizability.

Future researchers could also explore the associations with other factors related to crime rates such as the presence of community programs in the cities under study. Instead of a correlational analysis, a regression may be utilized to determine whether a single factor, such as community-oriented policing, or multiple factors, such as community-oriented policing and community efforts to stem crime, could predict the crime rate for both property crime and violent crime.

### **Summary and Conclusions**

In this quantitative correlational non-experimental study, I sought to examine the relationships between the implementation methods of community-oriented policing services, crime rate, and crime clearance rates in Carteret County, North Carolina. I expected that the crime rates for both violent and property crime would be negatively associated with the commitment to community policing. However, the results of this study showed that only violent crime had a significant relationship with the agency's commitment to community policing. I also expected that the crime clearance rates for both violent and property crimes would also be correlated with the commitment to community policing. However, while I found that there was a statistically significant relationship, the negative relationship was not in the direction that I had hypothesized. These results may be explained by the type of data that was obtained and the method that the data was computed. While the results of this study can be criticized, they align with those in previous literature that indicated that community policing may be an effective means to reduce certain types of crime. This chapter concludes this study, and I hope that the findings of this study will be used as the foundation for future studies of the effectiveness of community policing on reducing crime.

## References

- Adams, R., Rohe, W., & Arcury, T. (2002). Implementing community oriented policing: Organizational Change and Street Officer Attitudes. *Crime and Delinquency*, 48(3), 399-430. doi:10.1177/001112870248003003
- Alleyne, E., Fernandes, I., & Pritchard, E. (2014). Denying humanness to victims: How gang members justify violent behavior. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relation*, 17(6), 750-762. doi:10.1177/136843021453606
- Amadi, E. N., (2014). A qualitative analysis of community policing in the United States. *American Journal of Contemporary Research*, 4(1),19-26. Retrieved from: [http://www.aijcrnet.com/journals/Vol\\_4\\_No\\_1\\_January\\_2014/4.pdf](http://www.aijcrnet.com/journals/Vol_4_No_1_January_2014/4.pdf)
- Bichler, G. & Gaines, L. (2005). An examination of police officer insight into problem identification and problem solving. *Crime and Delinquency*, 51(1), 53-74. doi:10.1177/0011128704265936
- Bueermann, J., (2012). Preparing the police for an uncertain future: Four guiding principles. In D. R. Cohen McCoulough & D. L Spence (Eds.), *American policing in 2022: Essays on the future of a profession*. (pp. 17-22). Community Oriented Policing Services, US Department of Justice, Washington, DC. Retrieved from: <https://ric-zai-inc.com/Publications/cops-p235-pub.pdf>
- Bureau of Justice Assistance. (n.d.). *Volunteer Programs: Enhancing Public Safety by Leveraging Resources*. Retrieved from: [https://www.bja.gov/publications/iacp\\_vips\\_resourceguide.pdf](https://www.bja.gov/publications/iacp_vips_resourceguide.pdf)
- Burrus, G., & Giblin, M. (2014). Modeling Isomorphism on Policing Innovation:

The role of institutional pressures in adopting community oriented policing.

*Crime and Delinquency*, 60(3), 331-355. doi:10.1177/0011128709340225.

Bryson, J. (2011). *Strategic planning for public and non-profit organizations*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass. Cary Police Department. (2014). Project Phoenix. Retrieved from

<http://www.townofcary.org/Assets/Boards/Boards+PDFs/prcr/Project+Phoenix+Dec+12+Attachment+1.pdf>

Commission for Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies. (2003). Measuring the Performance of Law Enforcement Agencies, Part I. Issue 83. Retrieved from:

<http://www.calea.org/calea-update-magazine/issue-83/measuring-performance-law-enforcement-agencies-part-1of-2-oart-articl>

Chappelle, A. (2009). A philosophical verses actual adoption of community oriented policing: A case study. *Criminal Justice Review*, 34(1), 5-28.

doi:10.1177/0734016808304246

Community Oriented Policing Services. (2012). *Community Policing Defined*. U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, DC.

Connell, N., Miggins, K., & McGloin, (2008). Can a community policing initiative reduce serious crime? A local evaluation. *Police Quarterly*, 11(2), 127-150.

doi:10.1177/1098611107306276.

Cullen, F., & Gendreau, P. (2001). From Nothing Works to What Works: Changing Professional Ideology in the 21st Century. *Prison Journal*, 81(3), 313-338.

doi:10.1177/0032885501081003002

Dixon, D., (2005). Why don't police stop crime? *Australian and New Zealand Journal Of Criminology*, 38(1), 4-24. Retrieved from:

<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1375/acri.38.1.4>

Fayetteville Police Department, (2014). Community Wellness and Public Safety.

Retrieved from:

[http://www.cityoffayetteville.org/police\\_department/default.aspx?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1](http://www.cityoffayetteville.org/police_department/default.aspx?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1)

Ferguson, R., (2013). Risks, responsibilities, and rights: Reassessing the 'economic causes of crime' thesis in a recession. *Youth Justice*, 13(1) p 31-56.

doi: 10.1177/1365480212474733.

Ford, J. K., Weissbein, D. A., & Plamondon, K. E. (2003). Distinguishing organizational from strategy commitment: Linking officers' commitment to community policing to job behaviors and satisfaction. *Justice Quarterly: JQ*, 20(1), 159-162,164-185.

doi: 10.1080/07418820300095491

Fridell, L., (2004). Community Policing: The Past, Present, and Future, *Community Oriented Policing Services*, US Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Glazer, M., & Denhardt, J., (2010). Community Policing and Community Building – A Case Study of Officer Perceptions. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 40(5), 309-335. doi.: 10.1177/0275074009340050.

Gowri, A. (2003). Community policing is an epicycle. *Policing*, 26(4), 591-611.

Retrieved from

<http://search.proquest.com/docview/211222836?accountid=14872>

- Hamilton-Smith, N., MacKenzie, S., Henry, A., & Davidones, C., (2014). Community policing and reassurance: Three studies, one narrative. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 14(2), 160-178. Retrieved from:  
<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1748895813483762>
- Harris, P. D. (2009). What's a crime prevention officer worth? *Sheriff*, 61(6), 18-19. Retrieved from <http://www.ncpc.org/resources/files/pdf/misc/SH09-6-Harriswlink.pdf>
- Hawdon, J. & Ryan, J., (2009). Social Capital, Social Control, and Changes in Victimization Rates. *Crime and Delinquency*, 54(4), 526-549. Retrieved from:  
<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0011128708325421>
- Hester, Lt. R., (2014). Personal Communication. Morehead City Police Department.
- Etikan, I., Musa, S. A., & Alkassim, R. S. (2016). Comparison of Convenience Sampling and Purposive Sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, 5(1), 1-4. doi: 10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11
- Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Stanko, B., and Hohl, K., *Just Authority? Trust in the Police in England and Wales*. Publisher: London; New York: Routledge.  
Retrieved from: <http://clcjbooks.rutgers.edu/books/just-authority.html>
- Johnson, R., (2009). Police Officer Job Satisfaction: A Multidimensional Analysis. *Police Quarterly*, 15(2), 152-176. doi: 10.1177/109861111244280
- Jones, L., (2004). Sir Robert Peel's Nine Principles: Their Relevance to Campus

Policing in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, *Campus Law Enforcement Journal*, 34(3), 30-32.

Retrieved from:

<https://www.ncjrs.gov/App/abstractdb/AbstractDBDetails.aspx?id=206158>

Krieger, J., & Higgins, D. L. (2009). Housing is an important determinant of health, and substandard housing is a major public health issue. 1 Each year in the United States, 13.5 million nonfatal injuries occur in and around the home, 2 2900 people die in house fires, 3. *Urban Health*, 101.

Lewis, M., (2011). Perspective: Peel's Legacy. FBI Reports and Publication. Retrieved from: [www.fbi.gov/stats-service/publication/law-enforcement-bulletin](http://www.fbi.gov/stats-service/publication/law-enforcement-bulletin)

Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M.D. Dunette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (1247-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lord, V. & Friday, P. (2008). What really influences officer attitudes toward community Policing? The importance of context. *Police Quarterly*, 11(2), 220-238.

Retrieved from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1098611108314569>

Lord, V., Kuhns, J., & Friday, P. (2009). Small town policing and citizen satisfaction, *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 32(4), 574-594. doi:10.1108/13639510911000713.

Lyman, J. L. (1964). The metropolitan police act of 1829: An analysis of certain events influencing the passage and character of the metropolitan police act in England. *The Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology, and Police Science*, 55(1), 141-15. doi: 10.2307/1140471

- MacDonald, J. M. (2002). The effectiveness of community policing in reducing urban violence. *Crime & Delinquency*, 48(4), 592-618. doi: 10.1177/001112802237131
- Mastrofski, S. D., Willis, J. J., and Kochel, T. R. (2007). The challenges of implementing community policing in the United States. *Policing*, 1(2), 223–234. doi: 10.1093/police/pam026
- May, T. (2012). Policing by Consent. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/policing-by-consent>
- Meese III, E., & Ortmeier, P., (2004). *Leadership, Ethics, and Policing for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century*. Pearson Education, Inc. Upper Saddle, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- More, H. W., Wegener, W.F., Vito, G. F. & Walsh, W.F. (2006) *Organizational Behavior and Management in Law Enforcement*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Morehead City Police Department Policy Manual (1994). Town of Morehead City, Morehead City, North Carolina.
- Morehead City Police Department Mission Statement (2014). Town of Morehead City, Morehead City, North Carolina.
- Morehead City Police Department After School Tutoring Program (2010). Town of Morehead City, North Carolina.
- Muniz, A., (2012). Disorderly community partners and broken windows policing. *Ethnography*, 13(1), 330-358. doi: 10.1177/1466138111424982.
- Nachmias-Frankfort, C., & Nachmias, D. (2008). *Research Methods in the Social Sciences* (7<sup>th</sup> ed.). New York, NY: Worth Publishers.
- Nalla, M., & Boke, K. (2011). What's in a Name? Organizational, Environmental, and

Cultural Factors on Support for Community Policing in Turkey and the U.S.

*European Journal On Criminal Policy & Research*, 17(4), 285-303.

doi:10.1007/s10610-011-9152-0

National Institute of Justice. (n.d.) *Problem Oriented Policing*. Retrieved from:

<https://www.crimesolutions.gov/PracticeDetails.aspx?ID=32>

New York Times, (2014). Police Brutality. Retrieved from:

[www.topics.nytimes.com/...police\\_brutality\\_and\\_misconduct](http://www.topics.nytimes.com/...police_brutality_and_misconduct)).

North Carolina Justice Academy, (2013). Basic Law Enforcement Training, North

Carolina Department of Justice, Salemburg, NC.

Peak, K. J., and Glensor, R. W. 1999. Community policing and problem solving:

Strategies and practices. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Polite, R. (2010). A critical analysis of the theoretical and empirical literature comparing

the effects of traditional versus community policing on quality of life, and

associated quality of life issues. (Order No. 3401160, Lynn University). *ProQuest*

*Dissertations and Theses*, 113-n/a. Retrieved from

<https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED514123>

Poor, D. R. (2008). *Barriers to the acceptance of community policing in Houston, TX*.

(Order No. 3329841, Capella University). Retrieved from:

<http://gradworks.umi.com/33/29/3329841.html>

Reith, C. (1956). *New study of police history*. London, UK: Oliver and Boyd.

Rohe, W., Adams, R., and Arcury, T. (1996). *Community Oriented Policing: The North*

- Carolina Experience*. Center for Urban and Regional Studies, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
- Rohe, W., Adams, R., and Arcury, T. (1997). *Community Oriented Policing What It Is – Why It Why It Works – How to Get Started*. Center for Urban and Regional Studies, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Chapel Hill, North Carolina.
- Peel, S. R. (1829). *Principles of Law Enforcement. The Metropolitan Police Act of*.
- Rosenberg, H., Segler, R., & Lewis, S., (2008). Police officer attitudes toward community policing: A case study of the Racine Wisconsin Police Department. *Police Practice and Research: An International Journal*, 9(4), 291-305. doi: 10.1080/15614260802354569
- Rufai, M. M., & Adigun, J. O. (2011). Enhancing Community Policing Using a Virtual Community Model. *International Journal of Computer Science and Information Security*, 9(11), 119-124. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/928762785?accountid=14872>
- Santos, R., (2014). The Effectiveness of Crime Analysis for Crime Reduction & Cure or Diagnosis. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 30(2), 147-168. doi: 10.1177/1043986214525080.
- Scheider, M., Chapman, R., & Shapiro, A., (2009). Toward the unification of policing innovations under community policing. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 32(4), 694-718. Retrieved from: <http://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/13639510911000777>

- Schulenburg, J. L., (2010). Patterns in Police Decision Making with Youth: An Application of Black's Theory of Law. *Crime, Law, and Social Change*. 53(2), 109-129. doi:10.1007/s10811-009-9210-4.
- Sozer, M. A., & Merlo, A. V. (2013). The impact of community policing on crime rates: does the effect of community policing differ in large and small law enforcement agencies?. *Police Practice and Research*, 14(6), 506-521. doi: 10.1080/15614263.2012.661151
- Sower, C., Holland, J., Tiedke, K., & Freeman, W. (1957). *Community involvement*. Glencoe (Ill.): Free Press.
- Summer, G., (2009). *Community Policing: A Critical Analysis of a Small Police Department*. Retrieved from: [https://kucampus.Kaplan.edu/documentstore/docs09/Pdf/picj/vol3/issue1/Community\\_Policing\\_A\\_Critical\\_Analysis](https://kucampus.Kaplan.edu/documentstore/docs09/Pdf/picj/vol3/issue1/Community_Policing_A_Critical_Analysis).
- Sun, I., & Wasileski, G., (2010). Gender Differences in Occupational Attitudes Among Slovak Police. *International Criminal Justice Review*, 20(3), 248-264. doi:10.1177/1057567710368359
- Taylor, R. B. (2008). *Student Guide to Accompany Black's Behavior of Law*. Temple University, Department of Criminal Justice. Unpublished manuscript.
- Telep, C. and Weisburd, D., (2012). What is known about the effectiveness of police practices in reducing crime and disorder. *Police Quarterly*, 15(4). p.331-357. Retrieved from: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1098611112447611>
- Reisig, M.D., & Kane, R.J (Eds). (2014). *The Oxford Handbook of Police and Policing*.

New York, NY : Oxford University Press.

Rinehart, T. A., Laszlo, A.T. & Briscoe, G. O. (2001) *Collaboration Toolkit: How to Build, Fix, and Sustain Productive Partnerships*. Washington, DC: U.S.

Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Thomson, J.S., (2012). A “Back to the Future” Paradox. *American Policing in 2022*. U.S.

Department of Justice, Community Oriented Policing Services. Washington, D. C.

Trojanowicz, R. C., & Bucqueroux, B. (1990). *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Trojanowicz, R. C., & Bucqueroux, B. (1994). *Community policing: How to get started*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Company.

Trojanowicz, R., Kappeler, H., Gaines, L., Bucqueroux, Sluder, R. (1998). *COP: A Contemporary Perspective 2nd Edition*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Company.

U.S. Department of Justice, (2014). *Community Policing Defined*. U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services. Washington, DC.

U.K. Government (2010). *Policing By Consent*. Retrieved from:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/policing-by-consent>

Van Craen, M., & Skogan, W., (2014). Differences and similarities in the explanation of ethnic minority groups’ trust in police. *European Journal of Criminology*, 12(3), 303-323. doi:10.1177/1477370814535375.

Walker, S., & Katz, C. (2005). *The police in America: An introduction*. (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- Williams, K.L., (2003). Peel's Principles and Their Acceptance by American Police: Ending 175 Years of Reinvention, *Police Journal*, 76(2), 97-120. doi: 10.1177/0032258X0307600202
- Worrall, J. L., & Zhao, J. (2003). The role of the COPS office in community policing. *Policing*, 26(1), 64-87. doi: [10.1108/13639510310460305](https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510310460305)
- Wycoff, M., and Skogan, W., (1994). The effect of community policing management style on officer attitudes, *Crime and Delinquency*, 40(3), 371-383. doi: 10.1177/0011128794040003005.
- Xu, Y., Fieldler, M.L., & Flaming, K.H., (2005). Discovering the impact of community policing: The broken windows thesis, collective efficacy, and citizens' judgment. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42(5), 147-186. doi: 10.1177/0022427804266544.
- Yero, A., Othman, J., Abu-Samah, B., D'Silva, J., & Salaiman, A., (2012). Re-Visiting Concept & Theories of Community Policing. *International Journal of Academic Research Part B*, 4(4), 51-55.
- Zhao, J., Lovrich, N. P., & Robinson, H. T., (2001). Community policing: Is it changing the basic functions of policing? Findings from a longitudinal study of 200+ municipal police agencies. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 29(5), 365-377. doi: 10.1016/S0047-2352(01)00102-7
- Zhao, J., Scheider, M. C., & Thurman, Q. (2002). Funding community policing to reduce crime: Have COPS grants made a difference? *Criminology & Public Policy*, 2(1), 7-32. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-9133.2002.tb00104.x