

The Pennsylvania State University

Graduate School

School of Public Affairs

**EXAMINING THE IMPACT OF COMMUNITY POLICING
ACTIVITIES ON CRIME REPORTING IN JEFFERSON COUNTY,
WEST VIRGINIA, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

A Thesis in

Criminal Justice

by

Levent Apaydn

© 2015 Levent Apaydn

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

May 2015

The thesis of Levent Apaydın was reviewed and approved* by the following:

James M. Ruiz

Associate Professor of Criminal Justice

Thesis Advisor

Graduate Program Coordinator

Salih Hakan Can

Associate Professor of Criminal Justice

Jonathan Lee

Associate Professor of Criminal Justice

*Signatures are on file in the Graduate School

ABSTRACT

Police administrators and government officials have agreed that traditional policing strategies cannot reduce the high crime rates in urban and nonurban areas. Thus, police administrations have suggested new policing strategies that would involve community residents in order to reduce crime rates in their neighborhoods. According to many police administrators, communities should be more involved and actively engaged with in the solution of problems within their neighborhoods. In addition, with the help of the government funds, community policing strategy has gained much attention from both the public and the police arenas. However, this new phenomenon has mostly been implemented in urban police departments. Considering that there are also many people who live outside the cities and downtown areas, community policing activities should be conducted by police agencies in nonurban areas. Although many police agencies in rural areas and small towns claim they have long been conducting activities related to community policing, there is a large gap in the literature regarding the implementation of community policing in nonurban areas. The primary purpose of this study is to examine the implementation of community policing in nonurban areas, such as small towns and rural areas, and to measure the influence of community policing on crime reporting.

Keywords: community policing strategies, policing, strategies, crime reporting, small towns, rural, nonurban areas.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| List of Tables | v |
| Acknowledgements..... | vii |
| Chapter 1 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM | 1 |
| What is Community | 1 |
| Community Policing: Definition..... | 2 |
| Chapter 2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES..... | 8 |
| Community Policing Activities and Crime Reporting | 10 |
| Community Policing and the Police Departments | 11 |
| Crime Reporting Variables | 12 |
| Hypotheses | 15 |
| Chapter 3 METHODOLOGY | 17 |
| Participants of the study | 17 |
| Procedures of the study | 18 |
| Data analysis of the study | 19 |
| Limitations of the study | 19 |
| Chapter 4 RESULTS..... | 21 |
| 4.1 DESCRIBING GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE | 21 |
| 4.2 ANALYSES OF HYPOTHESES | 42 |
| 4.2.1 Analysis of Hypothesis 1 for 1997 | 42 |
| 4.2.2 Analysis of Hypothesis 2 for 1997 | 43 |
| 4.2.3 Analysis of Hypothesis 3 for 1997 | 45 |
| 4.2.4 Analysis of Hypothesis 4 for 1997 | 47 |
| 4.2.5 Analysis of Hypothesis 5 for 1997 | 48 |
| 4.2.6 Analysis of Hypothesis 6 for 1997 | 50 |
| 4.2.7 Analysis of Hypothesis 7 for 1997 | 51 |
| 4.2.8 Analysis of Hypothesis 8 for 1997 | 53 |
| 4.2.9 Analysis of Hypothesis 9 for 1997 | 54 |
| Chapter 5 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS..... | 56 |
| Limitations: | 58 |
| REFERENCES..... | 60 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Gender Distribution of Participants..... | 21 |
| Table 2: Marital Status of Participants..... | 22 |
| Table 3: Length of residency of participants..... | 22 |
| Table 4: Rent or Own Their Houses..... | 23 |
| Table 5: Number of Children Living Together with the Participant..... | 23 |
| Table 6: Level of Education of Participants..... | 24 |
| Table 7: Participation in Community Groups or Activities..... | 24 |
| Table 8: Case Processing Summary for Hypothesis 1..... | 25 |
| Table 9: Called-Report Problem to Police-Last 2 Years-Heard Term 'Community Policing' in Past Year Crosstabulation for Hypothesis-1..... | 25 |
| Table 10: Chi-Square Tests for Hypothesis..... | 26 |
| Table 11: Group Statistics for Hypothesis 2..... | 27 |
| Table 12: Independent Samples Test for Hypothesis 2..... | 27 |
| Table 13: Group Statistics for Hypothesis 3..... | 28 |
| Table 14: Independent Samples Test for Hypothesis 3..... | 29 |
| Table 15: Group Statistics for Hypothesis 4..... | 30 |
| Table 16: Independent Samples Test for Hypothesis 4..... | 30 |
| Table 17: Case Processing Summary for Hypothesis 5..... | 31 |
| Table 18: Called-Report Problem to Police-Last 2 Years-Gender Crosstabulation for Hypothesis 5..... | 32 |
| Table 19: Chi-Square Tests for Hypothesis 5..... | 32 |
| Table 20: Group Statistics for Hypothesis 6..... | 33 |
| Table 21: Independent Samples Test for Hypothesis 6..... | 33 |
| Table 22: Case Processing Summary for Hypothesis 7..... | 34 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 23: Called-Report Problem to Police-Last 2 Years-Residence Owned or Rented Crosstabulation for Hypothesis 7..... | 35 |
| Table 24: Chi-Square Tests for Hypothesis 7..... | 35 |
| Table 25: Group Statistics for Hypothesis 8..... | 36 |
| Table 26: Independent Samples Test for Hypothesis 8..... | 36 |
| Table 27: Group Statistics for Hypothesis 9..... | 37 |
| Table 28: Independent Samples Test for Hypothesis 9..... | 38 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express how grateful I am to my country and to all Turkish people who gave me this priceless opportunity. Second, I would like to thank my wife Mefazen and all my family members and friends who supported me during this stressful process. Words cannot express my gratitude for their great support and help. I would like to thank my thesis committee members, Associate Professor James Ruiz, Associate Professor Salih Hakan Can, and Associate Professor Jonathan Lee for serving as my committee members and guiding me in the researching and writing of this thesis. Finally, I hope that I will be able to better serve and contribute many good things to my beautiful country by the gains realized by this educational opportunity that has been given to me.

Chapter 1

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

What is Community

In order to comprehend the goal of community policing, it is exceedingly important to understand the term “community” in a broad manner. There are various definitions of “community.” For example, some definitions stress the importance of sharing the same geographical regions, some stress of common life, and others emphasize groups of people living in a specific town or area (McMillan & Chavis, 1986).

The definition of “community” was fluid and vague during the 1960s. It has gained more labels because of numerous numbers of new policies based on “community,” such as community policing, community care, and community protection (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990). “Community” is used to designate the places where any group of people interact with each other in specific ways and share some common interests (Thurman & McGarrell, 2005). “Community” can also be used for a group of people who live in the same smaller geographical locations, such as neighborhoods, urban areas, or small towns outside the cities. Communities enable people to live together by sharing the same values and interests regardless of their personal characteristics (Moore, 2001). People who live in the same environment begin to share some common values in terms of security, protection, and life expectancy (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). Thus, police officers need to comprehend the shared principles of the communities that they serve and approach citizens accordingly. Although there are various definitions of “community,” police should consider place-based communities because police serve people according to physical and legal boundaries (Thurman & McGarrell, 2005).

Community Policing: Definition

In recent years, American police have been introduced to a new term “community policing.” The idea of community policing has become so widespread throughout the United States that police agencies have changed their structures in order to implement community policing activities. Almost all policing agencies have taken steps to implement this new philosophy of policing in their departments thereby securing funds from the federal government (Weisheit, Wells & Falcone, 1994). Although this new idea has become popular worldwide, an agreement on an exact definition for what constitutes community policing has yet to be reached among scholars. Some police administrators have identified community policing as the reorganization of the police’s perception. According to these administrators, community policing has changed the way police approach problems, from a reactive policing approach to a proactive style of policing (Weisheit et al., 1994). Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994) defined community policing as “a philosophy and an organizational strategy that promotes a new partnership between people and their police. It is based on the premise that both police and community must work together as equal partners to identify, prioritize, and solve contemporary problems such as crime, drugs, fear of crime, social and physical disorder, and overall neighborhood decay, with the goal of improving the overall quality of life in the area” (p. 6).

Community policing is a new policing strategy which emphasizes the importance of communication between the police and the citizens. One of the most important purposes of community policing is to enhance the relationship between the police and the community by increasing the safety with the cooperation of citizens (Giankis and Davis, 1998). Unlike the traditional way of policing, police are supposed to have closer ties with citizens in every phase of solving the problems with the goal of better understanding the interests and concerns of citizens (Kenneth & Ronald, 2004). Police agencies have tried many different ways to cope with violent

crimes, such as increasing the presence of police officers in the streets or engaging more aggressively with criminals. In addition to these efforts, law enforcement agencies have also begun to improve their relationships with citizens in recent years (Goldstein, 1987). Although there are many changes in policing activities in terms of community policing, there is not a commonly accepted definition of this new term. Moreover, it is still uncertain which policing activities should be considered as community policing practices (Eck & Rosenbaum, 1994). Since the main idea of community policing is to eliminate the obstacles dividing the police and the community, it is believed that activities, which are based on uniting the community and the police toward common goals, should be considered as community policing activities. (Trojanowicz & Bucqueroux, 1990). Supporters of community policing stress the fact that community policing is changing the basic structures of law enforcement agencies from reactive to proactive policing. Thus, these changes will result in success in terms of police-community relations (Goldstein, 1987). With the help of these organizational changes in police agencies, police officers will have more ongoing initiatives that will make police departments more flexible and more visible. Although there are many supporters of community policing, who believe radical changes in police organizations will be beneficial for community-police relations, there are also some studies, which have shown that the radical changes in the structure of police agencies have resulted in minimal or no effects on reducing violent crimes (Eck & Maguire, 2000).

According to many scholars and police administrators, it is believed that the main target of community policing activities is big cities and downtowns in order to reduce the high crime rates in those places. However, there are few studies regarding the implementation of community policing in small towns. Moreover, many police chiefs believe that implementing community policing in small towns and rural areas will be a waste of time because these departments lack sufficient resources and/or personnel to implement the policies (As cited in Thurman & McGarrell, 2005). Community policing activities, such as organizing conferences to

inform people about crimes, foot patrols, and bicycle patrols can be considered more suitable activities for downtowns rather than rural or small towns. However, there are many police chiefs, who believe downtown police departments are trying to decentralize and create smaller units by which they can conduct community policing activities more effectively (As cited in Thurman & McGarrell, 2005).

Unlike many scholars, many police chiefs in small towns and rural areas claim their departments are conducting community policing activities in virtually every phase of their duties (As cited in Thurman & McGarrell, 2005). They emphasize that even in their routine duties, police deal with many different problems and successfully resolve those problems as a result of their good relationships with citizens. Many police officers in rural and small town police departments know citizens in their areas personally and interact and talk with them face-to-face many times during the day (Langworthy & Travis, 2003). Thus, it can be stated that rural and small town police departments have been practicing community policing activities for a long time (Weisheit et al., 1994). Researchers could benefit from studying small towns and rural police departments in order to comprehend the implementation of community policing activities in real life situations. Instead of dealing with many variables in urban areas, researchers could better understand the basics of community policing in small towns and rural areas which are already practicing activities directly related to community policing.

The primary objective of this study is to emphasize the effectiveness of community policing activities on crime reporting in small towns and rural areas. As previously mentioned, police agencies in these areas affirm that they have been naturally and routinely conducting community policing related activities for a long time. Although it is possible to focus on the organizational structures of small towns and rural police departments, this study shall attempt to grasp the core principles of community policing in these areas to demonstrate how it affected citizens' crime reporting behavior. Most scholars believe there are many similarities between the

problems in urban and rural areas (Thurman & McGarrell, 2005). Drug-related crimes, domestic violence, burglaries, and juvenile delinquency are among the most common serious problems in both urban and rural areas. However, some small town police departments lack sufficient resources and personnel to deal with these crimes. Moreover, many police departments in rural areas have difficulty instituting community policing in their departments because most of the training programs and funds are designed for urban police departments. Although the organizational structures of police departments in rural areas are suitable for community policing, they lack the support and funding for training from state and federal governments (Weisheit et al., 1994).). For example, according to the results of some studies, most of these police departments have external or internal problems because of inadequate training programs for police officers. Police departments in small towns and rural areas need formal training programs just as those in urban areas in order to better implement community policing activities. Overall, the implementation of community policing can be more successful in rural areas provided that their needs of more formal training programs and professional instructions for officers are met. (Thurman & McGarrell, 2005).

In order to have better results from community policing in rural and small towns, police departments need to find solutions for their internal organizational issues, such as the lack of proper reward systems, financial support for the training, and evaluation systems for officers (Thurman & McGarrell, 2005). In addition to internal organizational issues, there are also external organizational issues in police departments. Although interactions between police and citizens are mostly informal in rural areas, the number of conferences and meetings with citizens is insufficient to satisfy community needs. Because of the inadequate number of patrol officers, police departments have difficulty developing opportunities for contact with the citizens more frequently. Unlike big cities, communication between the police and the community is based on a

more casual basis in rural areas. There are fewer cultural differences in small towns as compared to big cities (Ostrom & Smith, 1976).

According to some studies, the isolation of rural areas from downtowns might be one of the reasons why the frequency of serious crimes is rarer than in big cities (Glaeser & Sacerdote, 1996). Because of the physical characteristics of small towns and rural areas, people have more chances to get to know each other on a more personal basis. When they are faced with problems, police officers try to solve these problems by applying informal methods. Many studies indicate that, unlike the complicated structures of urban areas, small towns and rural areas are more suited for community policing practices (Kenneth & Ronald, 2004). Most community policing research have conducted studies utilizing characteristics of urban areas. Therefore, more research on small towns and rural areas would be beneficial. There is a lack of empirical data on how community policing practices are implemented in rural areas (Weisheit et al., 1994).

Although it is believed that community policing activities have been implemented in small towns and rural areas for a long time, to what level does community policing affect crime reporting is still unknown. Moreover, in order to evaluate a range of community policing in small towns and rural areas, there need to be more systematical examinations based on the perceptions of citizens about community policing. Thus, the purpose of this study is to examine the importance of community policing in small towns and rural areas by evaluating the effectiveness of community policing on crime reporting with the help of a questionnaire.

The questionnaire asks respondents to identify the most frequent crimes, and whether or not they were the victim of a crime. It also includes questions about the background characteristics of the respondents, such as marital status, number of children, race, gender, years spent in the neighborhood, and educational level attained. The study was designed to assess the implementation of community policing in three police departments in Jefferson County, West Virginia. These police departments are the West Virginia State Police, the Ranson Town Police

Department, and Jefferson County's Sheriff's Department. The assessment process of the study was conducted by the Free Our Citizens of Unhealthy Substances Coalition (FOCUS). FOCUS was selected, because it was one of the organizations that had access to almost every group of communities, such as churches, local governments, and law enforcement agencies. The purpose of this study is to find answers to these questions: (1) Does community policing has any measurable impact in rural areas? (2) Do police departments in rural areas fulfill their objectives with funding? (3) What are the reasons for their successes or failures? This study involves surveys to assess the effects of community policing in these rural areas. In January 1996, research assistants conducted a survey in 300 households and tried to evaluate the effectiveness of community policing and the fear of crime in the county. After one year, assistants conducted the same survey to another 300 households in an attempt to determine if there had been any noticeable progress or changes in the citizens' perceptions of community policing and fear of crime. It was thought that any changes would be related to community policing activities that were performed by the police departments. Using the questionnaire, this researcher will evaluate the impact of community policing activities on crime reporting.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES

The main concept of community policing is that the public should be more involved in reducing the crime rates in their neighborhoods. There are various definitions of community policing because community policing activities differ based on the characteristics of the neighborhoods. According to Bayley and Skolnick, the public and the police should be the co-producers of crime prevention strategies (Bayley & Skolnick, 1986). Communities ought to be encouraged to find ways to get involved in this new strategy by police administrations. Community policing can only be implemented by community-based programs designed to encourage the public to participate in these policing activities. In this regard, police agencies should work toward developing new programs that will best suit their communities. For example, as the Homicide Division Commander Ross E. Swope (1998a) suggests that police officers can simply ask people to report any suspected stolen objects. In this way, the public would be involved in catching the thieves and reducing the crime rates of burglary and larceny in their neighborhoods. To increase the level of crime reporting is also among the goals of successful community policing activities. As people begin to feel safer in their neighborhoods, they are more likely to be more interested in what is going on in their areas. Community policing activities would encourage people to report to police any suspicious activities in their neighborhood. As Adams, Rohe and Arcury (Adams, Rohe, & Arcury, 2005) suggested in their studies there is a significant relationship between hearing community policing and crime reporting. Moreover, there is also a significant relationship between the education level of the residents and crime reporting. According to the studies of Schnebly (2008), how police perform their duties in the neighborhood had a significant impact on people's behavior of crime reporting. Likewise, police officers in the Sacramento Police Department propose that public meetings would be a great

opportunity to discuss the local problems and enhance the citizens' perceptions of police (Venegas & Kidd, 1994). According to Calvin Moss from the Atlanta Police Department, one particular community policing activity, might not fit all neighborhoods around the United States (Moss, 1998). This situation might be one of the reasons why there are numerous definitions of community policing. Thus, there can be as many different definitions of community policing as there are the number of neighborhoods. As Glensor and Peak (1998) suggested, police agencies in the United States have realized that the traditional way of policing has not reduced the crime rates. There are many studies that show the ineffective traditional policing tactics, such as, patrolling and rapid response to the incidents (Kelling, Pate, Dieckman, & Brown, 1977). Similarly, Swope also suggested that shorter response times for calls has no significant impact on reducing the crime rates in the long term (Swope, 1998b). Since the 1960s, patrol officers have conducted their duties according to radio dispatch and telephone solicitation. However, because of the type of the crime and the possible delay in the reporting of an incident to the police agencies, patrolling and rapid response to emergency calls have not reduced crime rates as had been expected. Considering that the traditional way of policing has failed to reduce the crime rates, police should find more developed tactics that would include the community in solving the problems (Alpert & Dunham, 1997). In short, police should know more about the communities they serve and seek their cooperation by enhancing the relationships.

Unlike traditional policing strategies, community policing has been acknowledged as a new and right way of policing by many scholars, politicians, and communities in the United States (Maguire, Kuhns, Uchida, & Cox, 1997). It has gained public attention with the help of media coverage, success stories by police departments, and funding opportunities for the implementation of community policing activities. In order to increase the implementation of community participation across the country, The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act (the "Crime Act") was signed into law, in 1994 (Maguire et al., 1997). With the help of the

Crime Act, millions of dollars have been spent for community policing activities in local law enforcement agencies.

Despite the fact that the government is determined to implement community policing activities, there are still many scholars, who believe that the new strategy will end up as a failure just as some of the old policing strategies have. Although there are many proponents of community policing, some politicians and scholars cannot ignore the possibility of failure with this new strategy because of some limitations. One of the most important limitations of community policing is that police agencies have different opinions regarding its definition and implementation (As cited in Maguire et al., 1997). While some police agencies believe that community policing is nothing but bicycle patrolling, others are trying to get closer to the community by establishing public meetings and visiting residents on a regular basis. Moreover, some police agencies have developed new programs to help drug addicts fight and recover from their addictions. Various definitions of community policing have led to confusion among police administrations. Police chiefs have experienced difficulties convincing their officers about the importance of community policing.

Community Policing Activities and Crime Reporting

As stated above, community policing has been one of the major topics of criminal justice for decades. Likewise crime reporting has also garnered great attention from criminal justice researchers in recent years. For many years, researchers have examined the impact of community policing on fear of crime, attitudes towards the police, and crime rates (Thurman, 1995). Researchers have found significant relationships between severity of crime and crime reporting (Baumer, 2002). However, crime reporting has been investigated mostly on the individual level. Furthermore, little research has been conducted regarding the influence of community policing

activities in non-urban areas in terms of crime reporting. Despite the fact that many people know how to report a crime, almost half of all victimizations stay unreported because of many different reasons (Skogan, 1984). Thus, police departments have decided to implement new policies that would increase the willingness of people to report crime. In order to gain the trust of the citizens, there needs to be some kind of organizations or meetings in which citizens and police would have a chance to get closer. Since the purpose of community policing is to establish an environment where citizens can express themselves without pressure, the implementation of community policing activities play an important role in encouraging citizens to report a crime.

Community Policing and the Police Departments

In order to implement a new policy in law enforcement agencies, administrators need to convince their police officers regarding the benefits of possible changes in the structure. Since it will necessitate a great change from traditional policing tactics to community policing initiatives, some police officers might resist changes in their duties. Community policing requires the redesigning of the police departments, such as establishing new branches, implementation of new regulations and launching new training programs for both citizens and police officers. In terms of the internal problems of police departments, some police officers cannot comprehend the need for a change into a new policy (Eck & Rosenbaum, 1994). However, in order to realize a success in community policing, police officers have to support and comprehend the basic ideas of this new strategy. According to Goldstein (1987), if the implementers of the community policing resist changing, community policing activities will fail to realize its purpose. Similarly, as Wilson and Bennett (1994) suggested, the philosophy of community policing is new to both the public and police officers. Thus, the bottom line of any innovative policing strategy should be explained in details to its implementers. Moreover, police officers should be familiar with the basic terms of

community policing in order to contribute effectively to the policies. It is believed that the police officers' manner toward citizens plays a crucial role in the success of community policing. It is also believed that as the community policing activities become successful, then people will feel safer and be more willing to report a crime to police.

Crime Reporting Variables

Defining the variables for crime reporting is extremely difficult because there might be numerous reasons for individuals to decide whether or not report a crime. Skogan (1994) conducted a comparative study of community policing implementations in six different cities across the United States. He found in his studies in Baltimore, Maryland that citizens in the neighborhoods, where police officers spend more time with citizens, arrange programs to reduce juvenile delinquency, and are more polite in regular traffic stops, are more likely to report a crime or a problem to police than were those in the other five cities. He also found in his studies that citizens who own their houses are more likely to cooperate and report crime to police than were citizens who rent. He believed that citizens who own their houses become more interested in community-based activities in their neighborhoods. As a result, they are more likely to report a crime than are citizens who rent.

Despite the fact that the philosophy of community policing has been so popular in the United States, little research has been conducted regarding the impact of this new philosophy on crime reporting as a consequence of its implementation in non-urban areas (Leighton, 1991). Many scholars believe community policing has numerous definitions and implementations based on the communities and police departments (Riechers & Roberg, 1990). Thus, it is extremely difficult to set the criteria for a successful example of community policing strategy. According to Leighton (1991), since the impact of community policing on crime is

vague, experts are not sure about considering fear of crime as a variable in evaluating the effectiveness of community policing. Because of community policing activities, people might begin to feel closer to the police and begin to report any suspicious activity they see in the neighborhood, which would lead to statistically high crime rates (Liou & Savage, 1996). Likewise, people might also evaluate the police performance by taking these statistically high crime rates into consideration. Since police departments might not want to see high crime rates in their responsibility areas, community policing activities would not be a suitable option for these police departments.

Additionally, Scaglione and Condon (1980) suggested that the most important variable in evaluating the effectiveness of community policing on crime reporting might be the perception of the people when they are communicating with police officers. Some studies showed that the quality of police treatment of people has a strong relationship with the effectiveness of community policing activities on crime reporting (As cited in Liou & Savage, 1996). Regarding the police treatment, Campbell and Schuman claimed that black people have lower satisfaction levels than do white people in terms of the new government policies because of bad treatment examples. Nevertheless, there are some experts who propose that despite examples of bad treatment of the public by the police, in general, people still have a positive approach to police (Ren, Cao, Lovrich & Gaffney, 2005). Surveys indicate the pros and cons of a new government policy by posing related questions to the public. According to Cahill (1976), in addition to regular crime statistics and formal records, government agencies also relied on surveys in order to get citizens' perceptions of police services.

For example, in the Reno, Nevada Police Department, administrators conducted a survey about the effectiveness of community policing activities implemented between the years 1987 and 1990 (As cited in Liou & Savage, 1996). According to the results of this study, community policing activities had positive impact on citizens' perceptions of police. A better

quality of a police service, better treatment of citizens by police officers, and safer neighborhood are among the positive impact of community policing. Scholars have mostly conducted studies based on metropolitan police agencies across the United States. Thus, many experts believe that the philosophy of community policing has been suffering from bias because the studies were, essentially, based on big cities. However, with the help of some small town police departments, scholars have shifted their attention from downtowns to rural areas in recent years (Thurman & McGarrell, 2005). Moreover, the federal government provided funding for the implementation of community policing under the 1994 Crime Act. Because of inadequate numbers of studies about community policing in small towns, scholars have been evaluating the community policing practices according to the criteria of the practices in big cities (Maguire et al., 1997).

There are some studies about the patterns and the levels of community policing in rural police departments. According to the study, which was conducted in 28 small town police departments and 46 rural sheriffs' departments, implementation of community policing differs due to the formal or informal definition of this new philosophy (As cited in Maguire et al., 1997). Although many police departments informally practice community policing activities, the number of police departments that have conducted formal practices are extremely low. Another study about community policing activities in small towns was conducted over 795 agencies, which had populations under 50,000 citizens (Worrall & Zhao, 2003).

Considering the huge population of the United States, people living in rural areas constitute only 20% of Americans (Weisheit & Kernes, 1997). It is believed that identifying the variables of crime reporting and community policing in rural areas are extremely difficult. However, race can be considered as an important variable when studying the impact of community policing activities on crime reporting (Snipp, 1996). According to Snipp (1996), perceptions of African-Americans and Whites about the performance of police are significantly different. Because of the bad memories of racial profiling and racial discriminations against

African-Americans, African-Americans are more reluctant to cooperate with police agencies than are Whites (Coulter, 1988). Considering past perceived racial discriminations against African-Americans, it should be expected that the level of African-American's crime reporting rates as a consequence of successful community policing in rural areas would be lower than that of Whites. Moreover, according to some studies, people who live small towns might be under the influence of some criminal groups, such as drug dealers and gangs (Grine, 1994). People might be afraid to report drug dealers or gangs to police because the members of those criminal groups might personally know or be acquainted with the citizens or their families who reported them to the police. Thus, evaluating the impact of community policing on crime reporting behavior in small towns does have obstacles because of subcultural differences and the varied characteristics of the communities. Considering these difficulties, it can easily be realized why there is a huge gap in the literature regarding the impact of community policing in small towns and rural areas. It is believed that this study will contribute toward filling that gap. Data obtained by asking questions of citizens in small towns about their personal characteristics such as race, gender, marital status, number of children, educational level attained, and years spent in the neighborhood enables us to measure the impact of community policing on crime reporting. Thus, this study will include most of the possible variables of measuring the impact of community policing activities on crime reporting in nonurban areas.

Hypotheses

H1- People who know Community Policing (CP) are more likely to report a problem or crime in their communities than are people, who do not.

H2- People who participate in community groups or associations in their counties, are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are people, who do not

H3- People who are satisfied with the manner in which the police handle problems are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are people who are not satisfied with the manner in which police handle problems.

H4- As the level of education goes up, people are more likely to report a problem or crime in their communities.

H5- Female citizens are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are male citizens.

H6- Citizens, who have lived more than five years in the county are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are citizens, who have lived less than five years in the county.

H7- Citizens who own their houses are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are those who rent.

H8- Married citizens are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are single or divorced citizens.

H9- Citizens who have children are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are citizens who do not have children.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY

Participants of the study

Prior to January 1996, community policing had not been implemented in Jefferson County, West Virginia. The Free Our Citizens of Unhealthy Substances Coalition (FOCUS) conducted a telephone-based survey in order to evaluate the citizens' perceptions of community policing activities that resulted in the implementation of community policing practices between the years 1996 and 1997. In early 1996 research assistants selected 300 households and conducted telephonic surveys. The telephone numbers of the citizens were randomly selected from local telephone books. In order to reduce the concerns of the participants, they were informed about FOCUS and the purpose of the survey before questions were asked. If the participants agreed to the terms of the survey, research assistants began asking the survey questions. Survey questions pertained to police performance and citizens' fears of crime. One year after the implementation of community policing, research assistants conducted the same survey to another randomly selected 300 households. It was expected that any change in the responses to police performance or citizens' fear of crime would be significantly related to community policing activities. In order to have a higher response rate, telephone surveys were conducted during evening hours and weekends because there might be some people who were working during the weekdays. The telephone surveys were conducted by three research assistants who had been trained to compare the interviewer's results in order to ensure the quality of the research. In addition, research assistants informed participants about FOCUS, and the phone numbers of FOCUS and the county sheriff's office were provided.

Procedures of the study

The current study used secondary data analysis method by downloading FOCUS data from Inter-University Consortium for Political and Social Research (ICPSR). FOCUS data used survey questions to obtain data about the citizens' perceptions of community policing activities. The original survey was conducted under the name of Evaluation of Community Policing Initiatives in Jefferson County, West Virginia, 1996-1997. However, the researcher is going to benefit from the data for evaluating the impact of community policing activities in non-urban areas. The unit of analysis was individuals. Personal characteristics of the citizens and the characteristics of the communities were independent variables and crime reporting was the dependent variable. Crime reporting was measured by the questions, such as which crime was of most concern to the participants, whether or not the participant would be willing to testify in court regarding the crime, and if whether or not the participant would report a crime that he or she witnessed. The level of concerns of the participants were measured by giving examples about some serious crimes, such as robbery or a sexual attack against the participant or someone they loved. Participation in any community groups or activities was used for operationalizing the community involvement variables. In order to assess police-citizen interaction, participants were asked how many times they had reported problems to the police. In terms of police-citizen interaction, participants were questioned about their levels of satisfaction with police services, if changes were needed within the police department, and whether or not the police department had developed any new programs or policies in the preceding two years. Questions about specific crimes covered whether the crime occurred in the participant's community, whether he or she was a victim, what they thought about the crime level in their communities, whether the participant had considered moving to another community because of the crime rate, and if his or her personal safety had changed in the past two years.

Community policing variables were operationalized by asking the participants whether they had heard of “community policing” or not, what community policing activities they were familiar with, and from what source had they heard about community policing in their neighborhoods. In terms of the demographic variables, participants were asked about his or her racial identity, gender, educational level, job classification, age, length of residency, and town of residence. Consequently, this study will measure the possible relations between crime reporting to police as a positive result of community policing activities in non-urban areas and the characteristics of the community.

Data analysis of the study

Multivariate, descriptive, and bivariate analyses will be conducted to test the hypotheses in the statistical software IBM/SPSS 19. Basically, t-test and chi-square were used in order to measure the hypotheses in the study. First, fifth, and the seventh hypotheses were measured by chi-square. T-test were used for the rest of the hypotheses in the study.

Limitations of the study

The phone books, which were used for the survey, were the most important limitation of the study, because there might have been persons who did not have home phones or who had unpublished telephone numbers or for various reasons previously mentioned were not included in the list. As it was mentioned before, there is not an exact definition of “community policing” in the literature. Thus, the definition of community policing differs according to scholars and communities. Another limitation of the study might be caused by using the community policing variables and the criteria of big cities for small towns or rural areas. Moreover, in addition to the

explained variables of community policing in small towns and rural areas, there might also be more variables related to community policing, crime reporting, and the citizen-police interaction (Snipp, 1996). Since human's crime reporting behavior is the main focus of this study, there might be so many factors that need to be taken into consideration. Variables for both crime reporting and community policing should be extended because community policing can be interpreted in many different ways.

Chapter 4

RESULTS

4.1 DESCRIBING GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE

Table 1 shows the gender frequency in the sample. There are some minor changes in the numbers of male and female participants between the years 1996 and 1997. According to the table, there are more female participants than male participants in both years. However, male participants were also represented in the sample.

Table 1

Gender Distribution of Participants

| | | GENDER | | | | | |
|------|-------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| | | Male | | Female | | Total | |
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| YEAR | 1996 | 118 | 39,3% | 182 | 60,7% | 300 | 100,0% |
| | 1997 | 132 | 44,0% | 168 | 56,0% | 300 | 100,0% |
| | Total | 250 | 41,7% | 350 | 58,3% | 600 | 100,0% |

Table 2 shows marital status of participants. According to the table, the percentage of married participants is greater than the percentage of not-married participants for both years. Interestingly, there is only one participant whose status was unknown.

*Table 2***Marital Status of Participants**

| | | MARRIED STATUS | | | | | | | |
|------|-------|----------------|-------|---------|-------|---------|-----|-------|--------|
| | | Not-married | | Married | | Unknown | | Total | |
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| YEAR | 1996 | 93 | 31,0% | 206 | 68,7% | 1 | ,3% | 300 | 100,0% |
| | 1997 | 106 | 35,3% | 194 | 64,7% | 0 | ,0% | 300 | 100,0% |
| | Total | 199 | 33,2% | 400 | 66,7% | 1 | ,2% | 600 | 100,0% |

Table 3 shows the length of residency of participants. It was believed that there would be a significant relationship between the length of residency and reporting crime as an impact of community policing activities. Table indicates that almost half of the participants were living in the same neighborhood for 10 years or more.

*Table 3***Length of Residency of Participants**

| | | LENGTH OF RESIDENCY (YEARS) | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-----------------------------|------|--------|-------|---------|-------|----------|-------|---------|-------|-------|--------|
| | | 1 or less | | 2 to 5 | | 6 to 10 | | 10 to 25 | | Over 25 | | Total | |
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| YEAR | 1996 | 14 | 5,4% | 63 | 24,3% | 45 | 17,4% | 66 | 25,5% | 71 | 27,4% | 259 | 100,0% |
| | 1997 | 13 | 4,3% | 58 | 19,4% | 53 | 17,7% | 93 | 31,1% | 82 | 27,4% | 299 | 100,0% |
| | Total | 27 | 4,8% | 121 | 21,7% | 98 | 17,6% | 159 | 28,5% | 153 | 27,4% | 558 | 100,0% |

Table 4 indicates if participants rent or own their houses. According to the table, majority of participants own their houses. Only 15.3% of participants rented in 1996 and 17.3% of participants rented in 1997.

Table 4

| | | Residency Status of Participants | | | | | |
|-------|--|---|-------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| | | RESIDENCE OWNED OR RENTED | | | | | |
| | | Owned | | Rented | | Total | |
| YEAR | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| 1996 | | 254 | 84,7% | 46 | 15,3% | 300 | 100,0% |
| 1997 | | 248 | 82,7% | 52 | 17,3% | 300 | 100,0% |
| Total | | 502 | 83,7% | 98 | 16,3% | 600 | 100,0% |

Table 5 indicates the number of children living together at home with the participant. The percentages of participants who had none or only one child living together at home in years 1996 and 1997 are greater than the percentages of participants who had two or more than two children living together at home. According to the results, a huge percentage of participants were living as couples in both years of the study.

Table 5

| | | Number of Children at Home | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|--|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------------|-------|-------|--------|
| | | NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT HOME | | | | | | | | | |
| | | None | | One | | Two | | Three or more | | Total | |
| YEAR | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| 1996 | | 134 | 44,7% | 67 | 22,3% | 67 | 22,3% | 32 | 10,7% | 300 | 100,0% |
| 1997 | | 156 | 52,0% | 53 | 17,7% | 61 | 20,3% | 30 | 10,0% | 300 | 100,0% |
| Total | | 290 | 48,3% | 120 | 20,0% | 128 | 21,3% | 62 | 10,3% | 600 | 100,0% |

Table 6 shows the level of education of participants. As shown on the table, the majority of participants were college educated or had post graduate degree for both years of the study. Thus, it was believed that it is important to assess the impact of community policing activities on crime reporting behavior for people who had college or higher than a college degree. Interestingly, the percentage of participants who had less than high school is only 6.7% in 1997. Thus, participants consisted of highly educated people.

*Table 6***Education Level of Participants**

| | | EDUCATION LEVEL | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-------|-------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--------|----------------------|---|-------|---|
| | | Less than high school | | | | High school diploma | | | | Some college/A.A./tech school | | Bachelor's degree (B.A., B.S.) | | Post graduate degree | | Total | |
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| YEAR | 1996 | 31 | 10,4% | 91 | 30,4% | 70 | 23,4% | 72 | 24,1% | 35 | 11,7% | 299 | 100,0% | | | | |
| | 1997 | 20 | 6,7% | 92 | 30,7% | 75 | 25,0% | 66 | 22,0% | 47 | 15,7% | 300 | 100,0% | | | | |
| | Total | 51 | 8,5% | 183 | 30,6% | 145 | 24,2% | 138 | 23,0% | 82 | 13,7% | 599 | 100,0% | | | | |

Table 7 shows the participation in community policing activities in the neighborhood. It was believed that participation in community groups or activities might play a crucial role in crime reporting. However, according to the results, the percentages of participants who said yes and no to this question were almost the same in both years. This contradicts the general belief.

*Table 7***Participation in Community Groups or Activities**

| | | PARTICIPATE IN COMMUNITY GROUP OR ACTIVITIES | | | | | | | | | |
|------|-------|--|-------|-------|-------|--------------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|--------|
| | | Yes | | No | | Don't know/refused | | Undocumented | | Total | |
| | | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % | Count | % |
| YEAR | 1996 | 167 | 55,7% | 132 | 44,0% | 1 | ,3% | 0 | ,0% | 300 | 100,0% |
| | 1997 | 159 | 53,0% | 140 | 46,7% | 0 | ,0% | 1 | ,3% | 300 | 100,0% |
| | Total | 326 | 54,3% | 272 | 45,3% | 1 | ,2% | 1 | ,2% | 600 | 100,0% |

4.2 ANALYSES OF HYPOTHESES

4.2.1 Analysis of Hypothesis 1 for 1997

H1- People who know Community Policing (CP) are more likely to report a problem or crime in their communities than are people, who do not.

Table 8

| | Case Processing Summary for Hypothesis 1 | | | | | |
|--|--|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| CALLED-REPORT PROB TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS * HEARD TERM 'COMM POLICING' IN PAST YEAR | 300 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 300 | 100,0% |

Table 9

| | | HEARD TERM 'COMM POLICING' IN PAST YEAR | | | | | |
|--|-----|--|----------------|-------|----------------|-------|----------------|
| | | Yes | | No | | Total | |
| | | Count | Expected Count | Count | Expected Count | | |
| CALLED-REPORT PROB TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS | Yes | 67 | 72,2 | 65 | 59,8 | 132 | 132,0 |
| | No | 97 | 91,8 | 71 | 76,2 | 168 | 168,0 |
| Total | | Count | Expected Count | Count | Expected Count | Count | Expected Count |
| | | 164 | 164,0 | 136 | 136,0 | 300 | 300,0 |

*Table 10***Chi-Square Tests for Hypothesis**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2-sided) | Exact Sig. (2- sided) | Exact Sig. (1- sided) | Point Probability |
|------------------------------------|--------------------|----|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | 1,453 ^a | 1 | ,228 | ,244 | ,138 | |
| Continuity Correction ^b | 1,185 | 1 | ,276 | | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | 1,453 | 1 | ,228 | ,244 | ,138 | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | ,244 | ,138 | |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | 1,449 ^c | 1 | ,229 | ,244 | ,138 | ,045 |
| N of Valid Cases | 300 | | | | | |

a. 0 cells (, 0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 59, 84.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

c. The standardized statistic is -1,204.

The 'chi-square test' shows us Pearson Chi-square value, X^2 is 1.453 with 1 degree of freedom. Since p value is greater than 0.05 this relationship is not statistically significant. In other words, there is no association between hearing community policing and report to police. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis at the 5% level and we conclude that there is not a relationship between hearing community policing and report to police.

4.2.2 Analysis of Hypothesis 2 for 1997

H2- People who participate in community groups or associations in their counties, are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are people, who do not.

*Table 11***Group Statistics for Hypothesis 2**

| | PARTICIPATE IN COMM GROUP OR ACTIVITIES | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error |
|--|---|-----|------|----------------|------------|
| | | | | | Mean |
| CALLED-REPORT PROB TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS | Yes | 159 | 1,55 | ,499 | ,040 |
| | No | 140 | 1,58 | ,496 | ,042 |

*Table 12***Independent Samples Test for Hypothesis 2**

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---|------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2- tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower Upper | |
| CALLED- REPORT PROB TO POLICE- LAST 2 YRS | Equal variances assumed | 1,155 | ,283 | -,545 | 297 | ,586 | -,031 | ,058 | -,145 | ,082 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -,545 | 292,771 | ,586 | -,031 | ,058 | -,145 | ,082 |

In this test, the sample was divided into two groups: first, citizens who participated in community activities in their neighborhoods, and second, citizens who did not participate in community activities in their neighborhoods. Accordingly, there were 159 participants in the first group and 140 participants in the second group. According to the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances results, the value in the Sig. column was **.283**. This value was greater than the confidence level (**.05**). Null hypothesis for Levene's Test for Equality of Variances EO is that

there is no difference in the variances between the two groups. The value is greater than the 95% confidence level suggested not to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, T-test for equal variances assumed results can be interpreted. The T-test for Equality of Means' result in first line was interpreted. The T-tests result found the sig. (2 tailed) value as **.586**. This value was greater than the confidence level (**.05**).

4.2.3 Analysis of Hypothesis 3 for 1997

H3- People who think police perform well in their neighborhoods are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are people who do not think police perform well in their neighborhoods.

Table 13

Group Statistics for Hypothesis 3

| HOW WELL POLICE PERFORM DUTIES- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------|-----|------|----------------|-----------------|--|
| | YOUR AREA | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | |
| CALLED-REPORT PROB | Yes | 237 | 1,54 | ,499 | ,032 | |
| TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS | No | 33 | 1,45 | ,506 | ,088 | |

*Table 14***Independent Samples Test for Hypothesis 3**

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|------|------------------------------|--------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|-------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | Df | Sig. (2- tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| CALLED- REPORT PROB TO POLICE- LAST 2 YRS | Equal variances assumed Equal variances not assumed | ,015 | ,904 | ,920 | 268 | ,358 | ,086 | ,093 | -,097 | ,269 |
| | | | | ,912 | 41,182 | ,367 | ,086 | ,094 | -,104 | ,275 |

In this test, the sample was divided into two groups: first, citizens who think the police department perform alright or well in their neighborhoods, and second, citizens who think the police department perform poorly in their neighborhoods. Accordingly, there were 237 participants in the first group and 33 participants in the second group. According to the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances results, the value in the Sig. column was **.904**. This value was greater than the confidence level (**.05**). Null hypothesis for Levene's Test for Equality of Variances EOV is that there is no difference in the variances between the two groups. The value is greater than the 95% confidence level suggested not to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, T-test for equal variances assumed results can be interpreted. The T-test for Equality of Means' result in first line was interpreted. The T-tests result found the sig. (2 tailed) value as **.358**. This value was bigger than the confidence level (**.05**). Thus, there was no statistically significant difference between two groups.

4.2.4 Analysis of Hypothesis 4 for 1997

H4- As the level of education goes up, people are more likely to report a problem or crime in their communities.

Table 15

Group Statistics for Hypothesis 4

| | EDUCATION LEVEL | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|----------------------|---------------------|-----|------|----------------|-----------------|
| CALLED-REPORT PROB | Higher education | 280 | 1,56 | ,498 | ,030 |
| TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS | High School or Less | 20 | 1,60 | ,503 | ,112 |

Table 16

Independent Samples Test for Hypothesis 4

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|--------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|-------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2- tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| CALLED- REPORT PROB TO | Equal variances assumed | ,922 | ,338 | -,372 | 298 | ,710 | -,043 | ,115 | -,270 | ,184 |
| POLICE- LAST 2 YRS | Equal variances not assumed | | | -,369 | 21,746 | ,716 | -,043 | ,116 | -,284 | ,198 |

In this test, the sample was divided into two groups: first, citizens who have college or higher than college degree and second, citizens who have high school or less than high school degree. Accordingly, there were 280 participants in the first group and 20 participants in the second group. According to the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances results, the value in the

Sig. column was **.338**. This value was greater than the confidence level (**.05**). Null hypothesis for Levene's Test for Equality of Variances EOV is that there is no difference in the variances between the two groups. The value is greater than the 95% confidence level suggested not to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, T-test for equal variances assumed results can be interpreted. The T-test for Equality of Means' result in first line was interpreted. The T-tests result found the sig. (2 tailed) value as **.710**. This value was bigger than the confidence level (**.05**). Thus, there was no statistically significant difference between two groups.

4.2.5 Analysis of Hypothesis 5 for 1997

H5- Female citizens are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are male citizens.

Table 17

| | Case Processing Summary for Hypothesis 5 | | | | | |
|--|--|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Cases | | | | | |
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| CALLED-REPORT PROB TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS * GENDER | 300 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 300 | 100,0% |

*Table 18***Called-Report Problem to Police-Last 2 Years-Gender Crosstabulation for****Hypothesis 5**

| | | GENDER | | | |
|--|-----|----------------|-------|--------|-------|
| | | | Male | Female | Total |
| CALLED-REPORT PROB TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS | Yes | Count | 57 | 75 | 132 |
| | | Expected Count | 58,1 | 73,9 | 132,0 |
| | No | Count | 75 | 93 | 168 |
| | | Expected Count | 73,9 | 94,1 | 168,0 |
| Total | | Count | 132 | 168 | 300 |
| | | Expected Count | 132,0 | 168,0 | 300,0 |

*Table 19***Chi-Square Tests for Hypothesis 5**

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2- sided) | Exact Sig. (2- sided) | Exact Sig. (1- sided) |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|----|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | ,064 ^a | 1 | ,800 | | |
| Continuity Correction ^b | ,018 | 1 | ,892 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | ,064 | 1 | ,800 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | ,816 | ,446 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | ,064 | 1 | ,801 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 300 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (, 0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 58, 08.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

The 'chi-square test' shows us Pearson Chi-square value, X^2 is 0.064 with 1 degree of freedom. Since p value is greater than 0.05 this relationship is not statistically significant. In other words, there is no association between gender and report to police. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis at the 5% level and we conclude that there is not a relationship between gender and report to police.

4.2.6 Analysis of Hypothesis 6 for 1997

H6- Citizens, who have lived more than five years in the county are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are citizens, who have lived less than five years in the county.

Table 20

Group Statistics for Hypothesis 6

| LENGTH OF RESIDENCY | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|----------------------|----------------------|-----|------|----------------|-----------------|
| CALLED-REPORT PROB | More than five years | 228 | 1,54 | ,500 | ,033 |
| TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS | Five years or less | 71 | 1,62 | ,489 | ,058 |

Table 21

Independent Samples Test for Hypothesis 6

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|---------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------|---|-------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2-tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| CALLED-REPORT PROB TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS | Equal variances assumed | 7,998 | ,005 | -1,188 | 297 | ,236 | -,080 | ,068 | -,213 | ,053 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -1,201 | 119,031 | ,232 | -,080 | ,067 | -,212 | ,052 |

In this test, the sample was divided into two groups: first, citizens who have lived more than 5 years in their homes, and second, citizens who have lived less than 5 years in their homes. Accordingly, there were 228 participants in the first group and 71 participants in the second

group. According to the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances results, the value in the Sig. column was **.005**. This value was less than the confidence level (**.05**). Null hypothesis for Levene's Test for Equality of Variances EOV is that there is no difference in the variances between the two groups. The value is less than the 95% confidence level suggested to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, T-test for equal variances not assumed results can be interpreted. The T-test for Equality of Means' result in second line was interpreted. The T-tests result found the sig. (2 tailed) value as **.232**. This value was bigger than the confidence level (**.05**). Thus, there was no statistically significant difference between two groups.

4.2.7 Analysis of Hypothesis 7 for 1997

H7- Citizens who own their houses are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are those who rent.

Table 22

Case Processing Summary for Hypothesis 7

| | Cases | | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|---------|---------|-------|---------|
| | Valid | | Missing | | Total | |
| | N | Percent | N | Percent | N | Percent |
| CALLED-REPORT PROB TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS * RESIDENCE OWNED OR RENTED | 300 | 100,0% | 0 | ,0% | 300 | 100,0% |

Table 23

**Called-Report Problem to Police-Last 2 Years-Residence Owned or Rented
Crosstabulation for Hypothesis 7**

| | | RESIDENCE OWNED OR | | | Total |
|--|-----|--------------------|--------|------|-------|
| | | RENTED | | | |
| | | Owned | Rented | | |
| CALLED-REPORT PROB TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS | Yes | Count | 110 | 22 | 132 |
| | | Expected Count | 109,1 | 22,9 | 132,0 |
| | No | Count | 138 | 30 | 168 |
| | | Expected Count | 138,9 | 29,1 | 168,0 |
| Total | | Count | 248 | 52 | 300 |
| | | Expected Count | 248,0 | 52,0 | 300,0 |

Table 24

Chi-Square Tests for Hypothesis 7

| | Value | df | Asymp. Sig. (2- sided) | Exact Sig. (2- sided) | Exact Sig. (1- sided) |
|------------------------------------|-------------------|----|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Pearson Chi-Square | ,073 ^a | 1 | ,787 | | |
| Continuity Correction ^b | ,014 | 1 | ,907 | | |
| Likelihood Ratio | ,073 | 1 | ,787 | | |
| Fisher's Exact Test | | | | ,878 | ,455 |
| Linear-by-Linear Association | ,073 | 1 | ,787 | | |
| N of Valid Cases | 300 | | | | |

a. 0 cells (, 0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 22, 88.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

The 'chi-square test' shows us Pearson Chi-square value, X^2 is 0.073 with 1 degree of freedom. Since p value is greater than 0.05 this relationship is not statistically significant. In other words, there is no association between rent or own a house and report to police. Therefore, we accept the null hypothesis at the 5% level and we conclude that there is not a relationship between rent or own a house and report to police.

4.2.8 Analysis of Hypothesis 8 for 1997

H8- Married citizens are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are not-married citizens.

Table 25

Group Statistics for Hypothesis 8

| | | MARITAL STATUS | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean |
|--|-------------|----------------|-----|------|----------------|--------------------|
| CALLED-REPORT PROB TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS | Married | | 194 | 1,55 | ,499 | ,036 |
| | Not-married | | 106 | 1,58 | ,495 | ,048 |

Table 26

Independent Samples Test for Hypothesis 8

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|---|------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2- tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower Upper | |
| CALLED- REPORT PROB TO POLICE- LAST 2 YRS | Equal variances assumed | 1,807 | ,180 | -,641 | 298 | ,522 | -,039 | ,060 | -,157 | ,080 |
| | Equal variances not assumed | | | -,642 | 217,515 | ,521 | -,039 | ,060 | -,157 | ,080 |

In this test, the sample was divided into two groups: first, citizens who are married, and second, citizens who are single. Accordingly, there were 194 participants in the first group and 106 participants in the second group. According to the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances results, the value in the Sig. column was **.180**. This value was higher than the confidence level

(.05). Null hypothesis for Levene's Test for Equality of Variances EOV is that there is no difference in the variances between the two groups. The value is greater than the 95% confidence level suggested not to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, T-test for equal variances assumed results can be interpreted. The T-test for Equality of Means' result in first line was interpreted. The T-tests result found the sig. (2 tailed) value as **.522**. This value was bigger than the confidence level (.05). Thus, there was no statistically significant difference between two groups.

4.2.9 Analysis of Hypothesis 9 for 1997

H9- Citizens who have more than one child in their homes are more likely to report a problem in their communities than are citizens who have one or less than one child in their homes.

Table 27

Group Statistics for Hypothesis 9

| | NUMBER OF CHILDREN AT HOME | | Std. Error | | |
|---------------------------|----------------------------|-----|------------|----------------|------|
| | | N | Mean | Std. Deviation | Mean |
| CALLED-REPORT | Two or more children | 91 | 1,53 | ,502 | ,053 |
| PROB TO POLICE-LAST 2 YRS | One or no children | 209 | 1,57 | ,496 | ,034 |

Table 28

Independent Samples Test for Hypothesis 9

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--|-------|
| | | F | Sig. | t | df | Sig. (2- tailed) | Mean Difference | Std. Error Difference | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
| | | | | | | | | | Lower | Upper |
| CALLED- REPORT | Equal variances assumed | 1,427 | ,233 | -,747 | 298 | ,456 | -,047 | ,062 | -,170 | ,076 |
| POLICE- LAST 2 YRS | Equal variances not assumed | | | -,743 | 169,410 | ,458 | -,047 | ,063 | -,171 | ,077 |

In this test, the sample was divided into two groups: first, citizens who have more than one child in their homes, and second, citizens who have one or less than one child in their homes. Accordingly, there were 91 participants in the first group and 209 participants in the second group. According to the Levene's Test for Equality of Variances results, the value in the Sig. column was **.233**. This value was greater than the confidence level (**.05**). Null hypothesis for Levene's Test for Equality of Variances EOV is that there is no difference in the variances between the two groups. The value is greater than the 95% confidence level suggested not to reject the null hypothesis. Thus, T-test for equal variances not assumed results can be interpreted. The T-test for Equality of Means' result in first line was interpreted. The T-tests result found the sig. (2 tailed) value as **.456**. This value was bigger than the confidence level (**.05**).

Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This research examined the impact of community policing activities on crime reporting in non-urban areas in the United States. Moreover, some variables of community policing activities were also discussed in the study. A telephone-based survey was conducted during the data collection process. Survey questions were asked of 300 citizens in 1996 and after the implementation of community policing for one year, another 300 citizens were also asked the same questions in 1997. Thus, in order to evaluate the impact of community policing activities on crime reporting in non-urban areas, it is important to evaluate the results of the second year. It was mentioned in the literature review that police performance had a significant impact on citizens' crime reporting behavior. Most of the research regarding community policing activities are based on city-centers. Thus, the scope of police performance in non-urban neighborhoods requires more studies. Previous studies highlighted the relationship between the severity of crime and crime reporting. According to the literature, there is a significant relationship between the severity of crime and crime reporting (Baumer, 2002). Thus, this study will contribute to the literature on crime reporting and community policing activities in non-urban areas. However, this study suggests that community policing activities might not be the enough to increase the crime reporting rates in non-urban areas.

Developing an exact definition of community policing would be beneficial for future studies because it becomes extremely difficult to identify the variables for community policing. In this study, this researcher tried to evaluate the relationship between citizens hearing about or being made aware of community policing and crime reporting. However, community policing might vary by the activities of police departments. Moreover, hearing the term of community policing does not necessarily mean that it would affect citizens' crime reporting behavior because

citizens might have heard the term from many different sources. Past experiences of the residents might also play a crucial role when deciding whether or not to report a crime to police. As discussed in the literature, race can be considered as an important variable for crime reporting (Snipp, 1996). Possible racial discrimination examples might lead people not to report a crime or a problem to police. There needs to be an extended study to see the possible impact of race on crime reporting behavior.

Additionally, reaching the citizens can also be more difficult in non-urban areas than in city centers because of the characteristics of the neighborhoods. Thus, police departments should have a professional structure to respond to the citizens' calls in a short time. However, as mentioned in the study, most of the police departments have been suffering from a lack of personnel (Thurman & McGarrell, 2005). Police departments have been trying to conduct their duties with their limited resources and personnel. Especially in non-urban areas, there needs to be more police officers in order to respond to the calls of the citizens in a shorter time and to conduct community policing activities more effectively. Furthermore, considering the recent technological developments, police departments should use more developed ways to reach citizens. For example, police departments can use social media to spread information easily and quickly. Moreover, police departments should also share their success stories and events with people on the internet and through social media because nowadays, people, especially the younger population use the internet in almost every aspect of their daily lives.

Although there are many studies regarding the relationship between crime and education level, there is a lack of literature on crime reporting and education level of the citizens (Ehrlich, 1975). In this study, the majority of the participants had higher education level. As it was mentioned in the literature review, there is a significant relationship between education level and crime reporting (Adams, Rohe, & Arcury, 2005). Interestingly, only 20 participants had either high school degrees or lesser education levels. As a result, in order to assess the impact of

education on crime reporting, there needs to be more research is needed. Future research should evaluate the impact of education levels on crime reporting thoroughly by including citizens who have only a high school degree or lesser education level.

Positive police behaviors can be considered among the successful community policing activities. As previously mentioned in the literature review, police officers should be familiar with their responsibility areas and be polite when they are dealing with citizens. According to Walker and Katz (2005), community policing is considered as a philosophy rather than a practice. Thus, police departments are not interested in finding ways to develop new strategies. However, practicing community policing activities in neighborhoods have a positive impact on crime reporting in non-urban areas. According to the results, police officers do not practice community policing as defined by Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994). However, police officers believe they practice community policing activities to some degree. A major goal of this study was to try to garner the attention of other researchers to conduct additional studies regarding the community policing activities and its impact on crime reporting in non-urban areas.

Limitations:

This study has some limitations. First of all, the primary limitation of the study is that there is not an exact definition of community policing in the literature. Most of the studies are based on metropolitan areas. Although there are commonly accepted definitions of community policing, they do not fit all police departments, especially those in non-urban areas. Moreover, community policing activities differ from place to place which makes it more difficult to identify the variables. Since there are not many studies conducted in non-urban areas, scholars have mostly benefited from the variables of community policing in city centers. Secondly, the perceptions of the police departments play a crucial role on the effectiveness of the policy.

Another limitation of the study is the difficulty in identifying the variables of crime reporting. Crime reporting can be considered as a separate field from community policing. However, this study showed that there is a strong relationship between a successful community policing activity and crime reporting behavior. It is difficult to measure crime reporting as an outcome of community policing activities and to assess any relationship.

REFERENCES

- Adams, R. E., Rohe, W. M., & Arcury, T. A. (2005). Awareness of community-oriented policing and neighborhood perceptions in five small to midsize cities. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 33*(1), 43-54.
- Alpert, G. P., & Dunham, R. G. (1997). *Policing urban America* (3rd ed.) Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland.
- Bayley, D., & Skolnick, J. (1986). The new blue line: Police innovation in six American cities.
- Baumer, E. P. (2002). Neighborhood disadvantage and police notification by victims of violence. *Criminology, 40*, 579–616.
- Cahill, K. R. (1976). "Citizens and Policemen: Inclusion of Both Parties in the Analysis of Police Service Delivery." MA Thesis. University of North Carolina.
- Coulter, P. (1988). *Political voice*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press.
- Eck, J. E., & Rosenbaum, D. (1994). The new police order: Effectiveness, equity and efficiency in community policing. In D. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *Community policing: Testing the promises* (pp. 3-23). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ehrlich, I. (1975). On the relation between education and crime. In *Education, income, and human behavior* (pp. 313-338). NBER.
- Giankis, Gerasimos A., Davis, G. John "Reinventing or Repackaging public services? The case of community-oriented policing" *Public Administration Review* 59.6 (1998): 485-498
- Glaeser, E. L., & Sacerdote, B. (1996). Why is there more crime in cities? (No. w5430). National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Glensor, R., & Peak, K. (1998). Lasting impact: Maintaining neighborhood order. *FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin, 67*(3), 1-7.

- Goldstein, H. (1987). Toward community-oriented policing: Potential, basic requirements, and threshold questions. *Crime & Delinquency*, 33, 6-30.
- Grine, R. M. (1994). Angels in marble: Problems in stimulating community involvement in community policing. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40, 437-468.
- Kelling, G. L., Pate, T., Dieckman, D., & Brown, C. E. (1977). 22. The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A Summary. *Readings in Evaluation Research*, 323.
- Kenneth, J. P., & Ronald, W. G. (2004). *Community Policing and Problem Solving Strategies and Practices* (fourth ed.). the United States of America: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Langworthy, R.H. and L.F. Travis (2003). *Policing in America: A Balance of Forces*, 3th edition. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Leighton, B. N. (1991). "Visions of Community Policing: Rhetoric and Reality in Canada." *CANADIAN JOURNAL OF CRIMINOLOGY* 33 (July/October):485- 522.
- Liou, K. T., & Savage, E. G. (1996). Citizen perception of community policing impact. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 163-179.
- Maguire, E. R., Kuhns, J. B., Uchida, C. D., & Cox, S. M. (1997). Patterns of community policing in nonurban America. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 34(3), 368-394.
- McMillan, D. W., & Chavis, D. M. (1986). Sense of community: A definition and theory. *Journal of community psychology*, 14(1), 6-23.
- Moore, C. M. (2001). What is community. *Across the Great Divide: Explorations in Collaborative Conservation and the American West*, 71-76.
- Moss, C.W. (1998). Community-based partnerships enhance public safety. *Law and Order*, 46(10), 74-78.
- Ostrom, E., and D. Smith (1976). "On the Fate of 'Lilliputs' in Metropolitan Policing." *Public Administration Review* 36(2):192-200.

- Peak, K. J., & Glensor, R. W. (1999). *Community policing and problem solving: Strategies and practices*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Quint, T. C., & Edmund, M. F. (2003). *Community Policing In A Rural Setting* (2nd b.). Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Ren, L., Cao, L., Lovrich, N., & Gaffney, M. (2005). Linking confidence in the police with the performance of the police: Community policing can make a difference. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(1), 55-66.
- Riechers, Lisa M. and Roy R. Roberg (1990). "Community Policing: A Critical Review of Underlying Assumptions." *JOURNAL OF POLICE SCIENCE AND ADMINISTRATION* 17(2): 105-114.
- Scaglion, R., & Condon, R. G. (1980). Determinants of attitudes toward city police. *Criminology*, 17(4), 485-494. Swope, R. E. (1998a). Community involvement in reducing property crimes. *Law and Order*, 46(6), 102-105.
- Schnebly, S. M. (2008). The Influence of Community-Oriented Policing on Crime-Reporting Behavior*. *Justice Quarterly*, 25(2), 223-251.
- Skogan, W. G. (1984). Reporting crimes to the police: The status of world research. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 21, 113-137.
- Skogan, W. (1994). The impact of community policing on neighborhood residents: A cross-site analysis. In D. Rosenbaum (Ed.), *The challenge of community policing: Testing the promises*. (pp. 167-182). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications, Inc. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781483327006.n9>
- Snipp, M. (1996). Understanding race and ethnicity in rural America. *Rural Sociology*, 61, 123-142.
- Swope, R. E. (1998b). Creating time for new operations. *Law and Order*, 46(8), 112-113.
- Thurman, Q. C. (1995). Community policing: The police as a community resource. In

- P. Adams & K. Nelson (Eds.), *Reinventing human services: Community- and familycentered practice* (pp. 122–145). New York: Aldine De Gruyter.
- Thurman, Q. C., & McGarrell, E. F. (2005). *Community policing in a rural setting*. Elsevier.
- Trojanowicz, R. C., & Bucqueroux, B. (1990). *Community policing: How to get started*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Trojanowicz, R., & Bucqueroux, B. (1994). *Community Policing: How to Get Started*. Second Edition. Anderson Publishing Co. Cincinnati, OH.
- Trojanowicz, R.C. and Bucqueroux, D. (1990). *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*, Anderson Publishing, MI.
- Venegas, A., & Kidd, V.V. (1994). Public meetings provide community forum. *Police Chief*, 61(10), 85-91.
- Weisheit, R. A., Wells, L. E., & Falcone, D. N. (1994). Community policing in small town and rural America. *Crime & Delinquency*, 40(4), 549-567.
- Weisheit R. A., & Kernes, S. T. (1997). Future challenges: The urbanization of rural America. In Q. C. Thurman and E. F. McGarrell (Eds.), *Community policing in a rural setting* (pp. 123-133). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.
- Wilson, D. G., & Bennett, S. F. (1994). Officers' response to community policing: Variations on a theme. *Crime and Delinquency*, 40(3), 354-370.
- Worrall, J. L., & Zhao, J. (2003). The role of the COPS Office in community policing. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 26(1), 64-87.