ABSTRACT

EDWARDS, JAMES THOMAS. Leadership Attitudes and the Implementation of Community Policing in Law Enforcement Agencies in Rural North Carolina. (Under the direction of James Burrow.)

The purpose of the research was to compare characteristics and leadership attitudes of chief administrators of law enforcement agencies that have implemented community policing in rural North Carolina, and those who have not.

A survey questionnaire was used to measure leadership attitudes and professional characteristics of chief law enforcement administrators in North Carolina. The study used data from a survey of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina to examine the correlates of community policing and to determine if there are differences between agencies using community policing and not using it. It was expected that there would be common leadership attitudes among chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies that have implemented community policing and that there would be common characteristics of their departments. It was further expected that there would be common leadership attitudes among chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies that have not implemented community policing and that those departments would have common characteristics. It was also expected that departments with and without community policing grants would differ in the leadership attitudes of their chief administrators and the characteristics of the departments.

The study concluded that there were strong and striking differences between rural law enforcement agencies that have implemented community
policing and those that had not. It also indicated that there were differences among the chief administrators who had implemented community policing. These chief law enforcement administrators scored higher on the Employee-orientation, Differentiation, and LEAD scores than those of departments without a COP grant. Further findings revealed differences in chief administrators having a baccalaureate degree, and having attended a management training course. Those administrators were more likely to have a COP grant.

The test of time will reveal if community policing is an enduring philosophy, a public relations tool, or a fad. As society evolves, so do the methods used to protect that society.
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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of the twentieth century, in an effort to eliminate the corruption of the political spoils system, police departments and police officers tried to establish guidelines for professional agencies and employees. As a result, law enforcement agencies began to model themselves after the military. Local and state law enforcement agencies across the country established a military rank structure and a chain of command for the purpose of control and communication. A “highly centralized military analogy model that became widely adopted and remains today as the dominant force of police organization is technically a bureaucratic structure that has been subjected to a number of criticisms” (Swanson, Territo, and Taylor, 1998, p. 6).

Gellar (1991) stated:

Police departments nationwide had come to embrace an integrated and coherent organizational strategy that sought authority in criminal law; narrowed police function to crime control; emphasized classical organizational forms; relied on preventive patrol, rapid response to calls for service, and criminal investigation as its primary tactics; and measured its success by crime, arrest, and clearance data…. Indeed, with rare exception police defined themselves as professional organizations that should be kept out of the purview of citizens, academics and researchers, and other persons with an interest in police. Police business was just that: police business. (p.7)

During the 1960's and 1970's a full-scale social movement occurred in America. Antiwar protesters, civil rights activists, and other groups demonstrated in order to be heard. Overburdened and poorly prepared, law enforcement came to symbolize what these groups sought to change in their government and
society. Focusing attention on police policies and practices became an effective way to draw attention to the need for wider change. Police became the targets of hostility, which ultimately led police leaders to concerned reflection and analysis of law enforcement operations (Cordner, 1997; Kelling and Moore, 1988).

In this era of protest, citizens began to take a stronger hand in the development of policies and practices that affected their lives. The police force's inability to handle urban unrest in an effective and appropriate manner brought demands by civic leaders and politicians for re-examination of police practices. Between 1968 and 1973, three Presidential Commissions made numerous recommendations for changes in policing (Swanson, Territo, and Taylor, 1998). Agencies of the U.S. Department of Justice, in collaboration with countless police departments throughout the country who were open to research and innovation, played a major role in stimulating, supporting, and disseminating research and technical assistance.

A number of organizations within the policing field became committed to improving policing methods in the 1970's. Among those on the forefront of this movement for constructive change were the Police Foundation, the Police Executive Research Forum, the National Organization of Black Law Enforcement Executives, the Urban Sheriffs' Group of the National Sheriffs' Association, and the International Association of Chiefs of Police. These organizations conducted much of the basic research that led police to re-evaluate traditional policing methods (Cordner, 1997).
In 1975, the U. S. Department of Justice supported a study in Kansas City, Mo., to determine the effectiveness of police motor patrol units (Swanson, Territo, and Taylor, 1998; Trojanowicz, 1990). Kansas City was divided into three different beats. The first beat placed a large number of police officers in patrol vehicles. The second beat only would send a police officer in the area if the request came from a citizen. The third beat was kept to the normal patrol schedule. The research tested the hypothesis that having more police officers on the street in motor patrol units would increase response time to calls and enable the police to catch more criminals. It also tested whether citizens would feel safer in their communities by seeing more police in motor patrol units.

Among the findings:

- Rates of crime reported showed no difference among the beats.
- Citizens’ attitudes toward the police showed consistent differences and no apparent pattern across the three different types of beats.
- Fear of crime did not decline.
- Citizens’ satisfaction with the police did not improve in the experimental areas.
- Experimental conditions showed no effect on police response time or citizen satisfaction with response times.

Police leaders were finding that crime control tactics need to be augmented with strategies that prevent crime, reduce the fear of crime, and improve the quality of life in the community. Leadership in law enforcement had discover that the “external environment circumstances would force [their] organizations to adopt new approaches to maintain” public safety issues (Yin, 1979, p.5). A problem that police leaders found was any new policing
implementation was impeded by centralized management practices and traditional operating assumptions.

Community Policing

During the 1980's, law enforcement leaders began to realize that merely putting people into jail did little to affect the rising crime rate. Progressive leaders in the law enforcement community knew that an effort needed to be made to prevent crime instead of just arresting people after the fact. These leaders believed that being more proactive and working with the community citizens would assist the police in apprehending criminals and could bridge a gap between the police and the community members it was sworn to protect (Swanson, Territo, Taylor, 1998). There have been several discussions on community policing as the new philosophy of law enforcement. In fact, the philosophy dates back to Sir Robert Peel, the father of modern policing in 19th century England. Sir Peel stated in 1829 (Johnson, 1981):

The police are the public and the public are the police. The police being only members of the public that are paid to give full time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen, in the interests of community welfare and existence. (p. 19)

Community policing provides decentralized, personalized police service to the community. It recognizes that the police cannot impose order on the community from the outside, but that people must be encouraged to think of the police as a resource that they can use in helping to solve contemporary community concerns. “It is not a tactic to be applied and then abandoned, but a new philosophy and organizational strategy that provides the flexibility to meet local needs and priorities as they change over time” (Trojanowicz, 1990, p. 4).

Ten principles provide the foundation for community policing (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1994). These include:
1. Philosophy and organizational strategy.
2. Commitment to community empowerment.
3. Decentralized and personalized policing.
4. Immediate and long-term proactive problem solving.
5. Ethics, legality, responsibility, and trust.
6. Expanding the police mandate.
7. Helping those with special needs.
8. Grass-roots creativity and support.
9. Internal change.

On September 13, 1994, President Clinton signed into law the Violent Crime Control Act of 1994 (U.S. Department of Justice, 1995). The legislation not only retained reactive sentencing, but also took a proactive stance of crime prevention. At the centerpiece of this act, was a pledge to fund 100,000 community police officers for the nation’s streets.

U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno announced the creation of the Police Hiring Supplement Program, a new $150 million competitive grant program awarding grants directly to law enforcement jurisdictions to hire and/or rehire additional sworn law enforcement officers. This program, funded by the Violent Crime Control Act of 1994, required law enforcement agencies to develop community policing strategies that addressed crime and crime-related problems (U. S. Department of Justice, 1999).

The goals of the Police Hiring Supplement Program were (Meese, 1994, p. 2):

- To increase the number of sworn law enforcement officers serving areas where they are needed most.

- To improve the long-term ability of law enforcement agencies to engage in community policing by deploying additional sworn law enforcement officers.
To prevent crime, promote problem solving, and enhance public safety through innovative crime prevention, including community policing.

Eligibility for the Police Hiring Supplement Program was limited to law enforcement agencies that could demonstrate both a significant need for additional sworn law enforcement officers and a commitment to using community policing to address crime and crime-related problems. Additional requirements of the program were (Meese, 1994, p. 2):

- Include a 3-year strategy for community policing in the jurisdiction that specified how additional sworn officers would lead to increased community policing targeted against crime and related problems in the jurisdiction.

- Specify how the hiring or rehiring of additional sworn law enforcement officers would help the jurisdiction implement community policing activities.

- Describe how the applicant intended to continue the project and retain the positions created with the project funds following the conclusion of the grant period.

The U.S. Department of Justice later established the Office of Community Policing Services (COPS) to manage additional grant money for law enforcement agencies to hire new employees as community police officers. The majority of these new hires were in the large metropolitan areas because of the high crime rate as reflected the Uniform Crime Report (UCR) (U.S. Department of Justice, 1995).
Each law enforcement agency that received COPS grant money had to implement the philosophy of community policing within the organization as defined by the COPS office as (U. S. Department of Justice, 1995):

Community policing is a policing philosophy that promotes and supports organizational strategies to address the causes and reduce the fear of crime and social disorder through problem solving tactics and community-police partnerships. A fundamental shift from traditional, reactive policing, community policing stresses the prevention of crime before it occurs. Community policing is an integral part of combating crime and improving the quality of life in the nation's cities, towns and rural areas. Core components of community policing include partnering with the community; problem solving; and transforming policing agencies to support and empower frontline officers, decentralize command and encourage innovative problem solving. (p. 3)

The philosophy rests on the belief that law-abiding people in the community deserve input into the police process, in exchange for their participation and support. It also rests on the belief that solutions to contemporary community problems demand freeing both people and the police to explore creative, new ways to address neighborhood concerns beyond a narrow focus on individual crime incidents.

Community policing's organizational strategy first demands that everyone in the department, including both civilian and sworn personnel, must investigate ways to translate the philosophy into practice. This demands that organizational leadership make a paradigm shift so that everyone in the department understands the need to focus on solving community problems in creative, new ways that can include challenging and enlisting people in the process of policing themselves. Community Policing also implies a management shift within the
department that grants greater autonomy to officers, which implies enhanced respect for their judgment as police professionals.

Rural Policing

Regardless of size, communities across the United States cannot escape crime or its consequences. This is true from the smallest towns to the largest cities. The latest data indicates that rural crime, while below the rates for urban areas, is still a significant problem. Rural areas face enormous problems--like gangs and drug trafficking--which were all but unknown there a decade or two ago. Small town and rural America have the same needs as any community: safe schools and neighborhoods, and a responsive system of law enforcement and justice services. But while the basic needs are similar, rural communities often face unique hurdles, such as geographic isolation, scarce resources, and limited access to criminal and civil remedies.

The effects of geography alone pose serious problems for rural law enforcement agencies, having an impact on such things as response time and the speed with which support services can be provided. One study, for example, contradicts UCR data and suggests that the homicide rate in rural areas is higher, and because access to medical treatment in rural and urban areas is different, even if the violent act is the same in both (Wright, Rossi, and Daly, 1983).

Rural officers can expect a longer wait for backup. Geographic isolation can be a particular problem for the many rural officers who patrol alone and whose interactions with suspects have no witnesses. The large geographic areas covered
by some rural police also make responding to calls more expensive and more time consuming than in urban areas.

Rural officers usually serve less time with their agencies than their suburban or metropolitan counterparts. The problem is especially troublesome for “micro police departments ——those with fewer than 10 sworn officers” (Maqrenin and Copus, 1991, p. 1). Generally speaking, the smaller a police department, the greater the officer turnover. In one early study, officer turnover was referred to as “the plague of small agencies” (Marenin, and Copus, 1991, p. 2).

The decision to apply for grants in a smaller agency typically involves only the chief law enforcement administrator. If the chief administrator does not have experiences in grant writing, the agency loses an opportunity for additional funds (Sherman, 1999). The U.S. Department of Justice and the Governor’s Crime Commission of North Carolina have offer several grant writing workshops since 1994 in effort to assist law enforcement agencies in applying for community policing grants. The majority of those agencies that attended were from the urban areas of North Carolina (Hayes, 1999). In larger agencies, an agency grant manager usually applies and manages the grant process.

From 1995 to 1999, community policing funding to North Carolina was $138,239,905.00 and an additional 2,625 personnel were added to the streets. Seventeen law enforcement agencies in urban areas of North Carolina received $64,818,592.00 (46.8%) and 1419.8 (54%) of additional personnel from COP grant funds. Charlotte Police Department, the largest beneficiary, received
$31,809,881.00 of the total North Carolina COP funding. Not all of the remanding 515 agencies in North Carolina received COP funding (Hayes, 1999).

Background of the Problem

All too often, the leadership challenges of rural law enforcement agencies are ignored when discussed in the America criminal justice system. While there is growing awareness about the nature of management and leadership in the law enforcement field in general, there continue to be myths and misconceptions about small agencies in rural America. One of those myths--and it is a myth--is that rural jurisdictions don't have management and leadership issues.

The chief administrator of a small rural law enforcement agency must not only wear the hat of the head of the department, but also must wear many hats at the same time. Chiefs in many small agencies serve as the recruitment and training officer, the lead investigator in criminal cases, internal affairs investigator, crime analysis officer, report reviewer, district attorney liaison, filing clerk, business officer, planning and grants officer, and even function as a line officer during staffing shortages.

“Approximately one-half of all local police departments in the United States employ fewer than 10 officers. Nine hundred eighty-seven of those departments have only one officer” (Adams, 1994, p.1). “About 90 percent of all departments serve populations of less than 25,000 persons and employ fewer than 50 officers” (Adams, 1994, p. 2).
The Uniform Crime Report (UCR) of 1998 states that twenty-eight percent of North Carolina counties are listed as rural and are not part of a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). Twenty-eight percent of the North Carolina sheriff’s offices and forty-four percent of the police departments are within the UCR’s definition of a rural area.

It is impossible to understand rural and small-town crime without also understanding the rural environment. Unfortunately, policies and programs to deal with rural crime are often based on the assumption that what works well in an urban area will also work in rural and small-town America. Cronk’s (1977) report from a 1977 conference on justice in rural areas reached a conclusion that still seems appropriate today:

Generally, the participants believed that key decisionmakers lack knowledge about the critical features and the great diversity of the rural environment. . . . Lacking its own data base, rural America often gets urban solutions for rural problems. . . . The conference participants expressed concern time and again for what they perceived to be widespread imposition of the urban way of doing things on rural areas, and for the fact that too often the planning for rural areas takes place in urban centers. (pp. 12-13)

Sampson (1986) found consistent and substantial rural-urban differences in national victimization data and noted that rural crime rates are not only lower but may be the result of different factors. For example, poverty was related to crime only in urban areas, whereas in rural areas the percentage of dwellings that were multiple-family structures was a more important predictor of crime rates. Sampson (1986) concluded that:

. . . to the extent that criminal justice programs and theoretical responses are based on the underlying assumption that the structural determinants of crime in suburban and rural areas are the same as those in central cities, then such policies and theoretical models may be misguided. (p. 21)
In rural areas, law enforcement agencies are expected to perform more varied activities than their urban counterparts and with fewer resources. For example in rural North Carolina, law enforcement officers are often expected to fight fires, provide transportation in medical emergencies, and perform rescue operations.

At the same time, rural communities’ small tax bases translate to fewer dollars for justice services. In many communities, a police or sheriff’s department may operate only part of the day. Rural agencies often lack staff with expertise in applying for state, federal, and other grant monies that could help meet the need for additional resources.

In many rural areas, this scarcity of resources means that the law enforcement agency often does not have the equipment or training to do its jobs as efficiently as possible. The organizational challenges for the chief administrator of an agency in rural North Carolina are always constant, especially in the implementation of community policing.

Research Problem

The purpose of this study is to compare characteristics and leadership of law enforcement agencies that have implemented community policing in rural North Carolina, and those that have not implemented community policing. Since no research exists in this area, this study will contribute to the body of knowledge on the relationship of leadership attitudes and implementation of community policing in rural North Carolina. Based on the results of this study, local government officials in rural areas of North Carolina may be able to more
carefully assess candidates on certain leadership qualities attitudes to effectively implement community policing.

Research Questions

The research questions formulated to achieve the purpose of this study are:

RESEARCH QUESTION 1: Are there differences between rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have implemented community policing and those rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have not implemented community policing?

RESEARCH QUESTION 2: Is there a relationship between leadership attitude of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina and the implementation of community policing?

RESEARCH QUESTION 3: Is there a relationship between education of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina and the implementation of community policing?

Assumptions

Several basic assumptions will guide this research study. These assumptions include:

1) implementation of community policing in rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina will be defined as those agencies that have received federal funding from the COPS office and have personnel assigned as part of the community policing strategy.

2) lack of implementation of community policing in rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina will be defined as those agencies that did not receive federal funding from the COPS office and do not have personnel assigned as part of the community policing strategy.

Limitation of the Study

The following limitation is identified in this study:
1) The generalization of the findings will be restricted to the chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina.

Definition of Terms

Chief Administrator. The police chief or sheriff of a law enforcement agency.

Leadership. The ability to guide or direct an organization.

Rural. An area with a population of 50,000 or less that is outside of a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area as defined by the Uniform Crime Report.

Rural agency in North Carolina. Any local law enforcement agency with twenty-five employee or less that serves a population of 50,000 or less that is outside of a Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area as defined by the Uniform Crime Report.

Community policing in rural North Carolina. Those agencies that have received federal funding from the COPS office and have assigned personnel to community policing strategy.

Lack of community policing in rural North Carolina. Those agencies that did not received federal funding from the COPS office and have not implemented community policing and no community policing strategy.

In summary, the new millennium sees the law enforcement profession in transition. At the turn of the twentieth century, the profession developed and became highly bureaucratic, military-like and reactionary. During the civil rights era, citizens pushed for improved policing methods, and in the 1970's, police organizations began to respond. The 1980’s produced progressive leaders who envisioned a new philosophy of law enforcement entitled community policing.
Increased interest by the United States Department of Justice helped agencies access federal monies to implement innovative new programs.

This study focuses on how leadership attitude relates to the implementation of community policing in law enforcement agencies in rural North Carolina.

Chapter II presents review of the literature, conceptual schema, and hypotheses. Chapter III outlines the methodology, research design, sample, instrument selection, data gathering procedure and statistics. Chapter IV describes the analysis of the data and Chapter V discusses the conclusions of the study, implications, and recommendations for further study.
This study examines how leadership attitude relates to the implementation of community policing in law enforcement agencies in rural North Carolina. In addition, the literature review examines the concepts of police organizations, rural law enforcement agencies, community policing, COPS grants, educational level, and training.

To understand the relationship between leadership characteristics and attitudes and implementation of community policing in a rural agency, a review of the literature was conducted for three major concepts – community policing, leadership, and implementation of community policing.

**Law Enforcement Organizations**

A review of the literature reveals that traditional law enforcement organizations are closed systems. A hierarchical centralized management style controls the operations and the personnel of the agency. An authoritarian leadership concept is accepted behavior and McGregor’s “Theory X” is the management philosophy of control. The types of traditional theory that have strongly influenced law enforcement agencies are scientific management and the bureaucratic model (Goldstein, 1990; Shafer, 2000; Walker, 1983).

Frederick W. Taylor was known as the father of the scientific management theory. His theory, proposed in the late 1800’s, was to find the most “physically and time efficient way to sequence tasks and then to use rigorous and extensive
controls to enforce the standards” (Swanson, Territo, and Taylor, 1998, p. 102). A valued performance indicator for police agencies is to calculate the time an officer takes to complete a task. These time studies are used to discover more efficient ways to complete the task. “Taylor’s scientific management is only loosely a theory of organization because its focus was largely upon work at the bottom part of the organization rather than being a general model” (Swanson, Territo, and Taylor, 1998, p. 102).

By the end of the 1930’s, the bureaucratic model had become the organizing theme of law enforcement agencies. Max Weber, working in the same time frame as Taylor and a strong proponent of the bureaucratic model, offered guidelines for the organizational system (Swanson, Territo, and Taylor, 1998, p. 104):

1. The organization of the offices follows the principle of hierarchy; that is, each lower office is under the control and supervision of a higher one. There is a right to appeal and of statement of grievances from the lower to the higher.

2. Specified areas of competence, meaning a division of labor, exist, in each of which the authority and responsibility of every organization member is identified.

3. Official duties are bound by a system of rational rules.

4. Administrative acts, decisions, and rules are recorded in writing.

5. The “right” associated with a position are the property of the office and not of the officeholders.

6. Employees are appointed on the basis of qualifications, and specialized training is necessary.

7. Organizational members do not own the means of production.
The bureaucratic model of policing emphasized the values of neutrality, conformity, impersonality, and crime control. Patrol and criminal investigation became the backbone of the law enforcement operation. Weber’s bureaucratic model can be observed by studying a law enforcement organization chart and noting the division of labor.

Styles of Policing in Rural Areas

Given the differences between rural and urban crime and culture, it should be expected that police in rural and urban areas would approach police work differently. In his study of tasks regularly performed by police in 249 municipal agencies of differing sizes, Meagher (1985) found that small agencies were more concerned with crime prevention, medium-sized agencies showed the greatest concern for providing noncrime services, and large agencies focused on enforcing criminal laws and controlling crime through arrests.

Similarly, Flanagan (1985) examined public opinion data about the police role. He found that the larger the community the more likely citizens were to believe that police should limit their role to enforcing criminal laws. Citizens from smaller communities were more likely to want police to perform a wide variety of functions. Decker (1979) observed that:

The police were called upon and expected to render services for a wide variety of irregular occurrences, only a few of which were statutorily defined as law enforcement responsibilities. For example, the deputies complied with a request to inspect a boundary line between two farmers' property that was only accessible by tractor. In a related incident the same mode of transportation was used to check on a foundered cow. Many instances required the symbolic presence of a sheriff's deputy to legitimate its occurrence in the citizen's eyes. (p. 104)
Styles of policing are partly a reflection of the relationship between police and the community. While police in many urban areas may be viewed as outsiders, in rural areas they are an integral part of the community (Decker, 1979). In interviews with officers from one rural department and several urban departments, Kowalewski et al. (1984) found that officers in rural and urban departments had many similar concerns but differed in several interesting respects. Urban officers thought they were less respected by citizens. At the same time, police in rural communities felt more public support for being tough, particularly with juveniles. Dealing with juveniles is an important function for rural police, because this is often a major concern for rural community members (Decker, 1979).

Rural and small town police are closer to their community than are urban police. Rural and small town police are a part of the local culture and community, whereas urban police tend to form a subculture and move apart from the community. “Urban police tend to be efficient; rural police tend to be effective” (IACP, 1990, p 8).

Organizational and community factors were found to have a different impact on the adoption of a legalistic police style in rural and urban areas (Cronk, 1990; Cronk and Wells, 1991). Cronk and Wells (1991) discovered:

In urban areas characteristics of the police organization, such as the number of ranks or the ratio of administrators to sworn officers, were better predictors of police style than were characteristics of the community, such as percent minority or level of economic distress. In rural areas, the relationships were reversed, with community factors being more important than organizational factors. (p. 27)

Cronk and Well’s (1991) research suggests that rural departments are more responsive to the community and urban departments may be more sensitive to the
dynamics of the police organization. In addition, sheriffs, as elected officials, are under particular pressure to be responsive to the community.

*Sheriffs vs. Municipal Police*

The major difference between rural and urban settings is the far greater importance of the county sheriff's office in the administration of rural policing and law enforcement. In rural areas, the sheriff often becomes the central organization of policing rather than a support agency as in urban settings. Where rural necessarily includes all unincorporated areas outside of municipal units, these are by statute the primary jurisdiction of the county sheriff. Also, even incorporated places in rural areas may depend on the county sheriff for basic policing services. Where many small towns cannot afford full-time police coverage, the county sheriff's office may provide many basic policing services (Uniform Crime Report, 1998). The sheriff may also serve as a central agency to coordinate resources among the small local police departments.

A clear understanding of the differences between rural and urban policing is closely related to recognizing the basic distinction between the municipal police department and the county sheriff's office as distinct forms of police agencies. Because of their historical evolution, sheriff's offices have a different political structure and character from local police agencies, and that “authority diverges from that of local police chiefs” (Johnson, 1981, p 90). The authority of the sheriff is grounded by centuries of legal evolution, not specifically delimited by statutory law, and includes a range of implied responsibilities and powers. In contrast, the authority of the municipal police is a relatively recent statutory creation, being
expressly limited in power and function, and dating only to the 19th century (Johnson, 1981).

In North Carolina, the office of sheriff is an elected position. This affords the sheriff a degree of independence from political pressures of offices within the local governmental structure. However, it also means that the sheriff is directly subject to the community and to the power of public opinion.

Since the term of office is four years, the sheriff is dependent on good relationships with voting members of the community. In these terms, the sheriff is less insulated from the public than the police chief and lacks the administrative buffer that most municipal departments have in the mayor, police commission, or city board (Nelms, 1996).

The employees of the sheriff's office are also dependent on the sheriff's re-election, since they serve at the sheriff's pleasure in North Carolina (Nelms, 1996). Since the election of a new sheriff can result in a new set of appointed deputies and supervisors in the office, personnel in a sheriff's office have a more symbiotic relationship with the sheriff than do police officers with their chief.

In small sheriff offices, generalist patrol deputies find that a large portion of their shifts are taken up with the processing of court writs, either criminal or civil. Since most writs are for civil matters, deputies are left with little time for proactive criminal law enforcement, unlike their municipal counterparts (Nelms, 1996).

As a result, sheriffs' efforts are divided across multiple, competing administrative concerns. Even though the public image of the sheriff's office may be based mostly on law enforcement activities, the sheriff cannot afford to
concentrate on that task. The funding of the office may depend heavily on doing other tasks that generate important revenues for the county such as serving court writs and warrants or that involve substantial legal liabilities to the sheriff and the county such as holding unconvicted defendants in jail pretrial (Marenin, and Copus, 1991).

Community Policing

The changing nature of communities and the shifting characteristics of crime that affect these communities have forced the police to look inward at their own organizations. Police strategies that have worked in the past are not always effective today. Police agencies must help build stronger, more self-sufficient communities in which crime and disorder cannot thrive.

Fear of crime has become a significant problem in itself. Because fear of crime can limit activity, and keep residents inside their homes, this climate of decline can result in an even greater amount of crime. Fear of crime has implications for policing in several ways. It may affect community support for policies and budgets related to policing, and it may be important in mobilizing citizens to report crime, cooperate with investigations, and to participate in anti-crime programs.

Fear of crime is among the rural crime issues most frequently studied. Studies conducted in the 1970's generally concluded that urban residents were far more fearful of crime than were rural residents (Baumer, 1978; Boggs, 1971; Clemente and Kleiman, 1976; 1977; Conklin, 1971; 1976; DuBow et al., 1979; Erskine, 1974; Lebowitz, 1975). Studies in the 1980's and 1990's were more mixed in their
conclusions. Some found rural citizens less fearful (e.g., Ollenburger, 1981; Smith and Huff, 1982; Belyea and Zingraff, 1988). Others found only minor rural-urban differences (Lee, 1982; Bankston et al., 1987).

Still another approach is used in the American Housing Survey, which asks citizens a more general question about what bothers them about their neighborhood. In 1991, 15 percent of central city residents specifically mentioned crime, compared with less than 2 percent of rural residents (DeFrances and Smith, 1994).

Community policing is a broad concept that has been interpreted in a variety of ways. It has generated a sizable body of literature (Brown 1989; Greene and Mastrofski 1988; Moore 1992; Goldstein 1986; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990; Wilson and Kelling 1989).

Aside from the obvious emphasis on community, it is possible to extract three broad themes from the literature on community policing. The first has to do with the police being accountable to the community as well as to the formal police hierarchy. The second is that police will become more connected with and integrated into their communities, which means that police will interact with citizens on a personal level, will be familiar with community sentiments and concerns, and will work with the community to address those concerns. A third theme requires that police will be oriented to solving general problems, rather than only responding to specific crime incidents.
Citizens, business, civic officials, and the media must play an active part in the community policing process. No singular agency can stand alone in order to improve the conditions of communities. Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994, p. 21) described the “Big Six” as the following:

1. The Police - Needs to restructure, all the way from recruitment and selection to training, evaluation, and changing the reward system.

2. The Community - Needs to be an active partner, providing human and material resources, including volunteers to deal with problems to ensure long-term prevention.

3. Elected civic officials - Political leadership is critical. The leaders need to support the trade-off necessary to make community policing viable. For example, if patrol time is to be freed up for proactive policing, citizens must understand that response time may increase for non-life-threatening situations. Political leaders need to support these trade-offs as well as provide resources when necessary and practical.

4. The Business Community - The Business Community provide resources in the form of volunteers and financial support. Business leaders are often linked to the political leaders.

5. Other agencies - Because community policing is a partnership, other agencies such as hospitals, social services, schools, and mental health can provide an array of support services that perhaps take the load off the police.

6. The Media - Important because they can help educate the public about the trade-offs and stress the need for citizens to work as partners with the police. The media are also crucial in promoting pride and self-esteem for both the community and the law enforcement officers.

Community policing is democracy in action. It requires the active participation of local government, civic and business leaders, public and private agencies, residents, churches, schools, and hospitals. All share a common concern for the welfare of their community.
The Nine P's of Community Policing

Community policing is a philosophy of full-service, personalized policing where the same officer patrols and works in the same area on a permanent basis, from a decentralized place, working in a proactive partnership with citizens to identify and solve problems. Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994, p. 11) defined the "Nine P's" of community policing as:

1. Philosophy. The community policing philosophy rests on the belief that contemporary challenges require the police to provide full-service policing, proactive and reactive, by involving the community directly as partners in the process of nominating, prioritizing, and solving problems including crime, fear of crime, illicit drugs, social and physical disorder, and neighborhood decay. A department-wide commitment implies change in policies and procedures.

2. Personalized. By providing the community its own community police officer (CPOs), community policing breaks down the anonymity on both sides -- CPOs and community residents know each other on a first-name basis.

3. Policing. Community policing maintains a strong law enforcement focus; CPOs answer calls and make arrests like any other officer, but they also focus on proactive problem solving.

4. Patrols. CPOs work and patrol in defined beats areas in their communities. The goal is to free them from the isolation of the patrol car, often by having them walk the beat or relay on other modes of transportation, such as bicycles, scooters, or horses.

5. Permanent. Community policing requires assigning CPOs permanently (at least 18 months) to defined beats so that they have the time, opportunity, and continuity to develop the new partnership. Permanency means that CPOs should not be rotated in and out of their beats, and they should not be used as "fill-ins" for special assignments and absences of other personnel.

6. Place. All jurisdictions, no matter how large, ultimately break down into distinct neighborhoods. Community policing decentralizes police officers, often including investigators, so that CPOs can benefit from "owning" their neighborhood beats, in which they act as a "mini-chief", tailoring the response to the needs and resources of the beat area. Moreover,
community policing decentralizes decision making, not only by allowing community policing officers the autonomy and freedom to act, but also by empowering all officers to participate in community-based problem solving.

7. Proactive. As part of providing full-service policing, community policing balances reactive responses to crime incidents and emergencies with a proactive focus on preventing problems before they occur or escalate.

8. Partnership. Community policing encourages a new partnership between people and their police that rests on mutual respect, civility, and support.

9. Problem Solving. Community policing redefines the mission of the police to focus on solving problems, so that success or failure depends on qualitative outcomes (problems solved) rather than just on quantitative results (arrests made, citations issued--so-called "number policing"). Both quantitative and qualitative measure is necessary.

All employees of the department, both sworn and nonsworn, need to reflect the philosophy in their attitude and behavior and support its implementation. Even employees who do not have face-to-face contact with the public can still be supportive of the philosophy in their telephone contacts. By understanding the philosophy, they can explain it to friends, relatives and neighbors.

COP Grants

The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 was allocated to law and soon became known as the Community Oriented Policing Services (COPS) program (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999). Title I of this law listed four specific goals intended to change both the level and practice of policing in the United States (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999):

1. To increase the number of officers deployed in American communities.

2. To foster problem solving and interaction with communities by police officers.

3. To encourage innovation in policing.
4. To develop new technologies for assisting officers in reducing crime and its consequences. (p. 4)

To accomplish this task, Congress authorized nine billion dollars to be distributed through grants to law enforcement agencies throughout the United States.

COPS Funding Accelerated for Smaller Towns (FAST) grants provided three years of funding for the hiring of police officers and sheriffs’ deputies for the purpose of community policing. The federal funding comprised 75 percent of an entry-level officer’s salary and benefits or a total of $75,000 per officer, whichever is less. COPS FAST was designed for use in communities with a population smaller than 50,000 residents. Each department contributed at least 25 percent in local matching funds (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999).

COPS Accelerated Hiring, Education, and Deployment (AHEAD) was almost identical to COPS FAST except this grant program served larger communities with a population greater than 50,000 residents. These grants provided federal funding for 75 percent of an entry-level officer’s salary and benefits or a total of $75,000 per officer; whichever is less (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999). The newly hired officers were deployed into community policing or a comparable amount of veteran officers were redeployed into community policing in their place. Each department contributed at least 25 percent in local matching funds.

The COPS MORE (Making Officers Redeployment Effective) grants provided funding to law enforcement agencies to purchase technology and equipment and other support resources, which also included civilian personnel.
The resources had to be used for the purpose of community policing. COPS
MORE grants cover up to 75 percent of the total cost of technology, equipment or
civilian salaries for one year (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999).

The Universal Hiring Program (UHP) was implemented immediately after
COPS FAST and COPS AHEAD. UHP provided funding to all eligible communities,
regardless of size, for the direct hire of police officers and sheriffs’ deputies. The
grant stated that officers were to be deployed into community policing or a
comparable amount of veteran officers must be redeployed into community
policing in their place (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999).

As with COPS FAST and COPS AHEAD, UHP funding constitutes 75
percent of an entry-level officer’s salary and benefits or a total of $75,000 per
officer, whichever is less, over a three-year period. Generally, departments
contribute at least 25 percent in local matching funds, unless the grantee
requested and was a waiver of the local match upon demonstrating extraordinary
fiscal hardship (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999).

“An estimated 19,175 law enforcement agencies were eligible for COPS
grants” (Roth and Ryan, 2000, p.4). This estimate was obtained by merging law
enforcement agency lists maintained by the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the FBI's
National Crime Information Center, the UCR Section, and the COPS Office. “Of
these agencies, 10,537 (55 percent) requested and received at least one COPS
grant by the end of 1997. Of grant recipients, 761, or about 7 percent, had
withdrawn by March 1998” (Roth and Ryan, 2000, p. 4). In their evaluation of
community policing grants, Roth and Ryan (2000) stated:
After the COPS startup period, when short application deadlines and related local logistical problems discouraged some agencies from applying immediately, financial considerations became the primary influence on agencies’ decisions not to apply. Financial concerns during the grant period—the explicit 25 percent match requirement and the implicit match needed to cover annual salary and fringe benefits exceeding $33,333 and collateral costs of an officer, such as training and equipment—were the most commonly mentioned reasons given in 1996 by agencies for their decisions not to apply in 1995. By mid-1998, concern over the cost of retaining the officers after grant expiration was the primary influence on decisions not to apply, and this concern also led to an estimated 40 percent of the agency withdrawals. (p. 5)

Resistance to community policing was not a significant deterrent to applying for COPS grants. “Objections to community policing or to Federal grants in general were mentioned by only eight percent of respondents” (Roth and Ryan, 2000, p. 5).

COPS Grant Distribution

Eligible agencies' application decisions led to significant variation by region, but regional patterns differed depending on how they were measured. The Pacific region ranked first in terms of the percentage of eligible agencies receiving grants but third in terms of COPS dollars awarded per capita and sixth in terms of COPS dollars per crime. The Mid-Atlantic region ranked eighth in terms of agency participation but first on both the per capita and per crime measures (Roth and Ryan, 2000, p. 7).

Of all agencies selected for awards by the end of 1997, four percent served large urban jurisdictions, which are home to 27 percent of the U.S. population. They received 40 percent of COPS dollar awards for all programs combined, and 62 percent of all COPS MORE funds. “On average nationwide, core cities received
substantially larger awards per 10,000 residents ($151,631) than did the rest of the country ($86,504)” (Roth and Ryan, 2000, p. 7).

*COPS Grants and the Adoption of Community Policing*

Has the grant money advanced the adoption of community policing within law enforcement agencies in the United States? According to the national evaluation order by Congress, the answer is "yes" (Roth and Ryan, 2000, p. 11). But the report to Congress also stated that “adoption of community policing has very different meanings in different jurisdictions, and COPS funds seem more likely to have fueled movements that were already accelerating than to have caused the acceleration” (Roth and Ryan, 2000, p.12).

*Leadership and Community Policing*

Senior police leaders are more ambitious for their organizations than they used to be. “Chiefs and their deputies are no longer content to tend someone else’s store; they want to leave their own distinctive stamp on their organizations. To do this, they now recognize that management is an important specialized skill that must be developed” (Baley, 1998, p.3).

Successfully implementing a department-wide change to community policing depends on strong leadership from the top. The chief plays the most important leadership role by setting the example of good management to police managers all the way down the chain of command (Trojanowicz, 1996). The simplest definition of management is getting work done through others. The ability to inspire others to implement the change to community policing through good
management skills and obtaining the support of those who can make or break the mission should be the ultimate goals of the chief (Trojanowicz, 1996).

In their evaluation of community policing in Chicago, Skogan, Hartnett, DuBois, Comey, Kaiser, and Lovig (2000) discovered leadership in the implementation areas played a crucial role for the acceptance of community policing among patrol officers. In areas where community policing was evaluated as poor, “the sergeants felt that community policing would not change matters--except to burden their officers with more responsibilities and unnecessary paperwork” (Skogan, Hartnett, DuBois, Comey, Kaiser, and Lovig, 2000, p. 11). In the areas of the city where community policing was evaluated as good, the evaluation indicated that the most important factor determining the extent to which community policing was implemented on the ground was leadership. “The closer leaders were to officers in the field, the more their leadership counted” (Skogan, Hartnett, DuBois, Comey, Kaiser, and Lovig, 2000, p.11).

Early mobilization of support for community policing is critical. Internally, the leader must develop support at all levels of the organization; externally, the law enforcement leader must gain support from the local government, public and private agencies, the media, and other policing agencies in the region. The cooperation of the local mayor or city manager is imperative to the successful implementation of a community policing strategy, as is the cooperation of local government decision makers and community organizations. A lack of commitment from any of these key groups could result in failure.
A certain amount of opposition to community policing should be anticipated, both inside and outside the agency. Elected officials may be too impatient to await the results of a community policing effort or may prefer to have a newer version of current policing procedures. Some groups within the community may be suspicious of the concept in general. Roberg and Kuykendall (1990) stated the following:

Resistance within the agency is inevitable as restructuring occurs. During the implementation of any change, employees may feel threatened and seek ways to resist. This will be especially true if community policing is incorrectly perceived as being "soft on crime" and as making social service activities the patrol officers' primary responsibility. (p. 383)

Those at the highest level of command must be aware of the concerns of mid-level managers, who may be particularly sensitive to the shifts in decision making responsibility and to the wider discretion accorded patrol officers. Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994) stated the following:

Teamwork, flexibility, mutual participation in decision making, and citizen satisfaction are concepts that initially may threaten the supervisor who is more comfortable with the authoritarian role and routinized operations inherent in traditional policing. Thus, the education of supervisors in new styles of leadership and management must be given a high priority if they are to carry out their responsibility for the success of community policing. (p. 5)

Experience in industry and other organizations where transition has taken place indicates that it is vital to include the key people in the organization in the visioning and planning processes as well as in implementation because they then take some ownership of the problems and have an investment in the solutions. This encouragement of participation and ownership from the earliest stages of transition enhances and gives an understanding to the participants that the changes were not pushed on them without discussion and direct involvement. This
Organizational open system is a “continuous cycle of inputs, transformation, outputs and feedback produces … a continuous adjustment to external forces and of internal processes to ensure the survival of the system” (Swanson, Territo, and Taylor, 1998, p. 132).

The other important factors concerning personnel are the new roles and responsibilities, which effective community partnership and a problem solving approach will bring to the police organization. For the patrol officers, this transition provides them with empowerment and decision-making, which go hand in hand with management responsibility. Encouragement of a participatory management style is essential if empowerment is to become a reality.

Keeping all personnel well informed, involving them in ongoing planning and implementation, soliciting their input and suggestions, and encouraging feedback in all areas of implementation are essential to obtaining organization wide support. The community policing initiative is based on improved communication patterns. “If the agency leader delivers dictatorial memos to the staff and directs them in truly autocratic fashion about what they 'will do' because he says so - 'the do as you are told' model, the change process will failed” (Kappeler, Sluder and Alpert, 1994, p. 33).

One major problem with the military model of operation adopted by some police departments is the authoritarian attitudes within the organization. Leaders must instill the agency with a new spirit of trust and cooperation that will be carried over into the relationships between the agency and its community policing
partners. The early cooperation and influence of leadership is key to gaining
support throughout the ranks. Silverman (1995) stated the following:

Chiefs who do not invest in assessing and responding to the honest
attitudes of managers, who do not invest in defining the new roles
managers are expected to play, and who do not provide their managers
with the training they need to effectively fill these new roles are likely to
be frustrated in their efforts to implement change. In their frustration with
managers, they will be tempted to bypass them and to go straight to the
first-line officers with implementation plans . . . . But without the support
of the supervisors and managers, few first-line officers will be willing to
risk changing their behaviors. (p. 45)

“Agency leaders can also move to counter intraagency resistance by
building a strong external constituency” (Shanahan and Whisenand, 1980,
p. 252). The leader might make a public commitment to community policing and
elicit from special interest groups a statement of their concerns. The leader may be
able to support the work of commissions and committees that support ideas for
change. These efforts would allow the top management to approach the
organization backed by a public mandate for community policing.

A police leader can establish an implementation team, which is formed from
all ranks of the agency. “Officers on the implementation team must be allowed to
participate outside the traditional lines of authority” (O'Neill, 1976, p. 27). This
means that while a chairperson will direct and coordinate each committee's
activities, there should be no rank within committees. This team, modeled after
Total Quality Management, can look at the process of the organization. The police
leader must have frequent contact with all committees. In addition, the efforts of
committees should be coordinated by one or more facilitators who share the
leader's thinking and understand the ultimate goals of community policing.
In anticipation of a move to community policing, “a law enforcement leader might also disband some squads that emphasize traditional methods of policing, redesign evaluation systems to give credit for contributions to the nature and quality of community life, expand training to include community partnership and problem-solving strategies, and establish new communication channels with other public service organizations” (Geller, 1991, p.346).

Compared to traditional policing, community policing requires additional skills and different attitudes. In traditional policing, the ideal officer is someone who is distant and impersonal in dealings with the public and who follows rules and procedures. In community policing, the ideal officer requires good communication skills, the capacity to develop rapport with residents and the ability to conceive innovative solutions to local problems. Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994) stated the following:

If the goal is to encourage creative, community-based problem solving, an authoritarian management system that emphasizes control can stifle the freedom and autonomy required to generate imaginative solutions. Rigid policies and procedures that spell out every aspect of how a job is to be done put employees in straightjacket that can inhibit them from taking risk on new ideas. A shift to community policing therefore requires a new management approach based on empowering employees, with managers as facilitators whose job becomes finding ways to help them do their best. (p. 34)

Education

In his address to Parliament, Sir Robert Peele (1829) made reference to the need for a professionally trained police force for England. The first real emphasis on professional training and education for police in the United States came from August Vollmer, the chief of the Berkeley Police Department. In 1916, he proposed
that police should have college degrees. Due largely to Vollmer's work, the University of California at Berkeley began to offer law enforcement-related courses at that time (Eskridge, 1987).

The recommendation of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, established in 1967, was “that all police personnel with general enforcement powers have baccalaureate degrees” (Jacoby, 1979, p. 328). In general, the “various national commissions recommended: that some years of college be required for appointment; that higher requirements be set for promotion; that education programs be a matter of formal policy; and that higher education should be viewed as an occupational necessity” (Carter, Sapp, and Stephens, 1989, p. 3).

According to a study sponsored by the Police Executive Research Forum (PERF) there has been steady growth in education levels over the past 20 years (Carter and Sapp, 1992):

- An increasing number of departments require some type of college experience for employment or promotion.
- The number of officers who have no years of college has dropped by half since 1970.
- More than 60 percent [62%] of the departments surveyed had at least one policy supporting higher education, either through tuition assistance, incentive pay, or some other way.
- The level of education of African-American officers was about the same as for whites -- 13.6 years compared to 13.7. (pp 38-39)

However, Carter and Sapp (1992) stated the rise in education level is in part the result of the increased level of education in the general population. According to Carter and Sapp (1992) that “only about 14 percent of the departments surveyed
by PERF require more than a high school diploma or equivalent for entry and almost three-fourths have no policies, formal or informal, requiring college education for promotion” (p. 42).

Implementation of Community Policing

The move toward community oriented policing has met with substantial cultural resistance from the rank and file. “Cries of ‘we are cops, not social workers’ have been voiced frequently” (Greene, 1992, p. 25). Greene (1992) provides insights to the differences of department size in relation to the cultural resistance:

Community policing, therefore, is more likely to meet with internal value and cultural resistance within the larger, more complex police departments, owing in part to the decentralized and despecialized aims of this in the newest of policing corporate strategies. In smaller departments such resistance is more likely associated with value and cultural resistance stemming from beliefs about the fundamental nature of the police role itself, i.e. service orientation versus law enforcement orientation. (p. 26)

Community policing includes mutual learning and understanding: the police are learning about the community, and the community are learning about the police. But real citizen involvement in planning, designing, and implementing strategies for crime control and reduction is not an easy task. Many leaders who are change agents have seen the idea of community policing as a vital opportunity to respond creatively to the forces of change, which they have been facing. These include law enforcement reorganization as well as the deeper processes of social and economic restructuring. Commitment to the concepts of community policing provides a process of reflecting upon strategies to manage change.
Planning

Traditional law enforcement that came about in the early 1930’s had a strong foundation in the professional model. The professional model emphasized strict personnel standards, extensive training, modern technology, and the three tactics of motorized patrol, rapid response, and follow-up investigations. Several factors, such as the Kansas City experiment conducted in the early 1970’s, police use of force, and the back log of 911 calls, have forced administrators to look at their organizations to become more effective, efficient, and accountable to the citizens of the community.

Community policing requires law enforcement agencies to look at their philosophy of the criminal justice system and what their missions truly are in today’s society. “Planning is sequential or stepwise; it begins with the organizational and its renewal process…” (Boone, 1992, p. 64). “Organizational renewal involves a reexamination by the organization of the (1) the needs of its publics and (2) its own functions, structure, and processes as related to its mission, philosophy, and objectives” (Boone, 1992, p. 83). While Boone’s writing is primary rooted in the extension literature, his planning model is applicable to law enforcement.

This review establishes what needs to be changed, in what way and for what purpose. Before the change agent decides where the organization needs to go, he or she needs to know where the agency began. It assists in defining future direction and provides a baseline from which to work. Also, it assesses the degree of readiness in the organization and helps to understand its dynamics. This
process verifies where the organization is now; its management style, morale, and
how the organization operates. This organizational renewal process defines new
missions and requires new strategies and objectives. To implement community
policing is the realization that the police mission is broader than law enforcement
(Harrison, 1995). While the enforcement of laws and controlling crime are a major
function of a police agency, social problems are a concern as well.

Ideally the change agent needs to identify all the key people who are most
affected by the forthcoming change; who will feel threatened; who stands to lose,
and who will want to be consulted. Consideration should also be given at this stage
about whose support and agreement will be required. The change agent must
know what obstacles and difficulties there are, and what must be accomplished if
the change is to succeed. Even at this early stage leaders need to think about what
they want from their personnel and what the personnel are likely to expect from
them. This approach will help develop intervention strategies to manage and
influence everybody in the organization, especially the key people.

Values

Values are the defining principles that embody the philosophy of the law
enforcement agency and guide its operation. “Values are enduring beliefs about
what is right, good and desirable” (Wasserman and Moore, 1988, p.4). They
constitute the organization's assumptions about the ends worth striving for and the
appropriate means to be employed to reach those ends. In this respect, values
serve, not as specific rules of action, but as standards of conduct and as general
precepts to which the members of the department give allegiance. Values
influence how decisions will be made and will, in effect, limit or encourage certain behaviors. “The entire organization must be committed to its values and must inculcate them to its members, so that individual performance will conform to them” (Wasserman and Moore, 1988, p.5).

Wasserman and Moore (1988) claim that the commonly experienced conflicts between stated values and practical realities are caused, in part, by a lack of employee input into the value statements that emanate from top management. Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994) suggested that clarifying values within the agency through department meetings, with representation from all levels, is a good starting point for the transformation to community policing. The change agent should have the involvement of community residents to help create a law enforcement value system that is in harmony with the community being served. Hale (1981, p. 6) affirms the importance of public input at this as well as later stages of strategic planning:

To a large extent, the police role is nothing more and nothing less than a reflection of dominant community values. The police are not, or should not be, an autonomous arm of local government control, but rather an integral component of the public service system. Police agencies must be sensitive to and responsive to community values and expectations. Police goals and objectives, then, must be developed with an appreciation for what the community wants and expects from its police.

Ultimately, values must be expressed and instilled throughout the law enforcement agency in all areas of administration and operations. Policies and practices in hiring, training, promotion, enforcement and complaint handling should
conform to the value statement. Only then can the values proclaimed by the department truly become part of its culture.

_Mission statement_

The mission statement may be viewed as the driving force of an organization (Bennett and Hess, 1992, p.3). “The mission of the [law enforcement]organization establishes the parameters within which it is to function” (Boone, 1992, p.84). The development of a mission statement is the next sequence in the planning process. The mission statement is the embodiment of the core values of the law enforcement agency. Couper and Lobitz (1991) see mission as “the connecting step that aligns practices with values and forms the foundation for the subsequent setting of goals” (p. 4).

The mission statement answers the question of “why do we exist?” It focuses on the essence of what a law enforcement agency is and what it wishes to become. In so stating the agency’s primary purpose, it justifies its continuing existence and support by the community. Holden (1986) emphasizes the importance of understanding mission:

If the organization does not know what it is trying to do, it is impossible to do it, regardless of the quality of the organization. The failure to adequately determine the agency’s mission is the most effective method of assuring the organization’s ultimate failure. (p. 24)

While modeling its mission statement, a law enforcement agency should consider its past history and traditions, present culture and resources and future expectations and intention. There is no ideal type of mission statement. Each agency should describe its own unique role in the context of its particular capabilities and
community needs. Some statements are quite compact such as that of Portland, Oregon (Edwards, 1998):

The mission of the Portland Police Bureau is to maintain and improve community livability by working with all citizens to preserve life, maintain human rights, protect property, and promote individual responsibility and community commitment. (p. 15)

If organizational renewal in any agency involves changing the way that employees or citizens think about the police mission, a new mission statement may be useful. It is important for each agency to express its purpose, philosophy, and values in such a way that all employees and citizens know its value framework. The change agent must make a “constant effort to keep the value framework of the organization consistent, comprehensive, and workable” (Boone, 1992, p. 85).

Goals

With the completion of a mission statement, the planning process turns its focus to the setting of goals. The mission statement serves as “the foundation upon which goals are built and from which goals emanate” (Shanahan, 1985, p. 53). Goals, in turn, become the vehicle for accomplishing the mission.

Goals depict “a future state of affairs which the organization attempts to realize” (Shanahan, 1985, p. 53). As such, they provide guidelines for activity and standards by which agency effectiveness can be judged. Goals are broad, visionary, projected outcomes. They are viewed with a long-term perspective. As statements of what the law enforcement agency ultimately wants to accomplish, goals should be high enough to challenge the agency but realistic enough to be attainable. However, because law enforcement goals address societal problems
for which solutions are not apparent in the accountable future, goals tend to be relatively permanent. Roberg and Kuykendall (1990) stated the following:

> It is clear . . . that the closer management comes to integrating community and individual member goals with those of the organization, the more likely goal accomplishment is to occur. This can be accomplished by continually monitoring community and individual needs and expectations, and by using practices and procedures that integrate community and employee goals with those of the organization. (p. 118)

*Collaboration*

The police agency must shift gears and promote community engagement and participation in law and order problems. If it is accepted that crime, fear, and disorder cannot be contained by police efforts alone, then community policing must be about partnerships with the community and must be about developing community capacity for self-policing (Harrison, 1995).

> It is not surprising that the public in general and many communities have largely retained the perception that dealing with crime, disorder, and fear are responsibilities primarily for the police. The need and the real potential for collaborative effort between the police and community must be clearly communicated.

> To build on active collaboration between the police and the public, a coherent framework is needed in which community policing changes can take hold over the long haul (Breci, 1998). The war on crime is expensive financially and democratically, diverting resources from education, health, other kinds of community investment, and solutions to build social cohesion.
“A public may be defined as a group of people who (1) share common interests and identity, (2) manifest frequent or continuous interactions, and (3) are spatially distributed over a small area or a large territory” (Boone, 1992, p. 98).

Boone (1992) describes the characteristics community as “(1) a group of people; (2) shared interests, attitudes, and activities; (3) common identity; (4) frequent and continuing interaction; and (5) living in an identifiable territory or space that can be mapped” (p. 98).

A public or community may be a city, neighborhood, or a rural area, regardless of its location or size. Some communities are a series of smaller sub-communities, which may have different needs. A change agent must address the needs of its locality through partnership. The benefits of a partnership are being able to build a way of working for the future, something which will last longer than the life of a project.

The change agent must identify the formal and informal leaders of the community (Aryani, Garrett, and Carl, 2000). “The necessity of this task to determining the needs of the target public and to securing their commitment to participate in programs focused on their needs is underscored by the authority and power vested in leader figures within the target public” (Boone, 1992, p. 103). These powerful individuals can give an initiative credibility within the community by their support and patronage.

The change agent “must understand and be skillful in the application of the process of promoting collaborative needs identification, assessment, and analysis
with target public leaders and their followers (Boone, 1992, p. 111). This partnering breaks down the barriers between the community and the police, showing that a mix of skills, interests, and concerns that can produce innovative responses to crime problems in the community (Harrison, 1995).

A change agent must develop strategies for enhancing democratic practice by listening to the "voice" of the public. Active citizenship is the key to revitalizing local democracy. Community meetings or surveys are methods that could identify community needs. These structures help the community citizens to communicate their needs and concerns.

Having unlocked the doors to communication, the change agent’s task is to listen to the voice of the citizens in the community, involving them in a dialogue about the needs of the community. There will be different understandings of those needs. The challenge is to reach some shared understanding and agreement about priorities. Stewart (1996) stated:

Consensus-building helps people with opposing views work together and seek solutions they can all support. This is an ambitious goal, but in many cases an achievable one. Consensus-building is designed to confront the issues rather than the people. People still disagree but it tries to avoid destructive conflict and inflexible positioning. It allows time for trust to build up between the participants so that they all feel part of a team seeking solutions together. (p. 24)

Needs

The change agent “must translate the expressed needs into macro needs of the target publics...” and “the macro needs become focus of the planned program” (Boone, 1992, p. 135). The change agent must design processual tasks in a plan of action. The tasks are meant to answer four questions (Boone, 1992, p. 149):
1. What are the felt and analyzed learner needs encompassed within each need outlined in the planned program? How can the micro needs be arranged into a hierarchy?

2. What behavioral change(s) must learners exhibit to fulfill each of the micro needs contained within the macro needs? How can these be incorporated into a hierarchy of teaching objectives keyed to the micro needs?

3. What learner experiences should be selected and how should they be organized to facilitate learner achievement of the desired behavior stated in each micro objective?

4. How should learner progress be assessed and what measures should be used to evaluate learner activities.

The community may state that they have a fear of crime. Prioritizing the needs of the community may reveal their greatest fear is having their homes burglarized. This becomes one of the macro needs for the target public.

Macro needs form a hierarchy for corresponding micro needs. “The hierarchy...helps build the structure for ultimate program design, and conceptually orders the ideal needs implicit to the organization’s philosophy and objectives, while meshing the organization’s mission with community/social realities”(Boone, 1992, p. 137). The change agent can produce a hierarchy micro needs for the community. The micro needs might be:

1. Improving lighting conditions of the community.
2. Improving home security, such doors and locks.

The change agent has the “responsibility for translating the needs hierarchy into objectives”(Boone, 1992, p. 137). “This hierarchy of objectives accents the macro objective at the top of the hierarchy, with descending subordinate micro objectives”
The macro objective could be: Reduce the fear of home burglaries by providing programs on crime prevention.

Micro objectives to the macro objective could be:

1. Contact governmental officials about proper street lighting.
2. Provide a home security survey to each resident in the community.
3. Establish a community watch program to instill better communications among community residents.

The change agent must find ways to communicate to the target population about the programs, which the local police agency is promoting. “Promotional media include radio, television, newspaper, flyers, posters, even billboards” (Boone, 1992, p.160). “As a rule, word of mouth is most effective, and the best advertisement is a satisfied client. Linkages into the community also can be exploited effectively as means to promote programs” (p. 160).

Assessment

Every government and public agency, including the police, should be able to give an accurate account of its current activities to policy makers and taxpayers. An ongoing evaluation of policy and programs should be a primary function of any policing organization (Breci, 1998). “The primary purpose of [a] planned program is to effect desirable behavioral changes in a specified public” (Boone, 1992, p. 171). The behavioral change cannot contribute to the program unless the program is evaluated for impact. The evaluation process becomes even more vital when an organization is undergoing the comprehensive changes that a shift to community policing will entail. Constant assessment of the process of change is needed for
managers to determine how to keep the implementation process on track. The most effective strategies also need to be identified so change agents can make informed choices about where to allocate limited resources.

Ongoing assessment of program outcomes help gives the law enforcement agency a clear sense of direction and allows management to focus efforts on the most productive and efficient practices. Therefore, “evaluation is indispensable in determining which elements of community policing should be maintained, altered, or eliminated, and offers key decision makers in the jurisdiction a way to gauge the impact and cost-effectiveness of community policing programs” (Edwards, 1998, p. 17).

Assessment of programs will help determine whether necessary changes in the organization support systems are taking place and whether appropriate efforts are being made to accomplish the stated goals and objectives. The evaluation process also can help communicate agency expectations to employees.

Program evaluation opens community citizens’ feedback of the community policing efforts. This community feedback is critical to maintaining strong ties, ensuring continued participation, and documenting the progress made. Evaluations of the community policing strategy from the police and community leaders will affect how future cooperative efforts are constructed (Aryani, Garrett, and Carl, 2000). Thorough evaluation helps make the police more responsive to the target population needs, which should strengthen the trust and partnership on which community policing is based.
“Developing a sound evaluation program should begin with a strategic plan that outlines the goals, methods, objectives, and timetables, and assigns personnel for internal and external changes” (Edwards, 1998, p.16). These goals and responsibilities will form the basis of performance assessment and will allow police leadership to detect failures and roadblocks, as well as to chart progress of social change.

“Community Policing is a profound and revolutionary change, and it should be cautioned that in most communities it will take 10 to 12 years to fully implement and realize the impact” (Moore, 1999, p. 23). Early on, the community can expect to see an impact on crime and disorder, but the organizational implementation of Community Policing will take time. As gradual changes in the department's approach to the recruitment, selection, and training of officers occurs, turnover in the police department will allow new employees to be oriented and committed to Community Policing from the outset (Moore, 1999, p. 23).

Training

Training is key to the effective implementation of community policing. Rothwell and Sredl (1992) stated the following about training:

Training differs from other efforts to initiate change through planned learning. Unlike Organizational Development, employee training is geared more to helping individuals meet their present job requirements than it is to group change and interpersonal relations. Unlike employee development, training is usually aimed at short-term learning that can be immediately applied on the job. Unlike employee education, training is not usually linked to formal education programs or degree requirements of college, secondary schools, vocational schools, professional associations, or industry groups—instead, it focuses on applying knowledge, skills and attitudes in the unique cultural context of one organization. (p. 478)
Community policing skills should be integrated into the training curricula, not treated as a separate component of the training program. Training in community policing should supplement law enforcement techniques with communication and leadership skills that will encourage participation from the community. All personnel must become skilled in the techniques of problem solving, motivating, and team-building. Training should involve the entire agency and should include civilian personnel who can enlist participation in community meetings, help the organization sharpen its marketing message, and incorporate technology into the organization's service-oriented operations (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1994, p. 5).

A refocusing of the law enforcement training curriculum is an important change. Emphasis on rigorous physical training, with frequent use of the familiar battleground metaphors, should be replaced with community policing, problem solving, conflict resolution, diversity training, and acquiring organizational skills (Birzer, 1999; Travis, 1995; Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1994). Recruits should study such problems as sexual harassment, bias and hate crimes, HIV-AIDS, stress, and violence against women (Harrison, 1995). The students should learn “conversational Spanish” and to deal with "special populations," such as gay and lesbian people (Travis, 1995, p. 3).

Initial training efforts should be directed at managers and supervisors, who may feel their authority, is being eroded by the modified priorities of the organization. (Geller, 1991, p. 346). More important, they must be relied on to transmit and translate the new concepts to those they supervise.
The training of mid-level managers should emphasize their role in facilitating the problem-solving process by coaching, coordinating, and evaluating the efforts of patrol officers. To prepare mid-level managers for their community policing responsibilities, a leader should require all personnel with the rank of sergeant and above to attend training sessions that would have three goals: “to show supervisors how to manage officers' time so that problems could be addressed without diminishing police capability for handling calls, to describe how problems should be analyzed, and to ensure that all trainees knew what was expected of them and their officers” (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1994, p. 5).

Patrol officers must also receive extensive training that encourages and develops both initiative and discretionary ability, which would be a dramatic departure from traditional thinking (Harrison, 1995). They must develop planning, organizing, problem solving, communication, and leadership skills through ongoing, thorough training (Birzer, 1999). Eventually, selected officers will be able to assist in the training of new personnel in a field-training program.

Conceptual Schema

It was theorized that leadership attitudes effect the variable of implementation of community policing. In addition, the conceptual schema reflected the possible influence of the COPS grants variable and education level of the chief administrator on community policing implementation. It was theorized that all these selected variables impacted community policing implementation. A descriptive model of the conceptual schema for this study is depicted in Figure 1.
Figure 1. Conceptual schema depicting the relationship between selected variables and the implementation of community policing.

Hypotheses

Based on review of the literature, this researcher formulated the following null hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in studied variables between rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have implemented community policing and those rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have not implemented community policing.

Hypothesis 2: There is no relationship between leadership attitudes of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina and the implementation of community policing.

Hypothesis 3: There is no relationship between education attainment of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina and the implementation of community policing.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research methodology for this study. The chapter covers population and sample selection, research design and instrument selection, data gathering procedures, variable operationalization, statistical procedures, and data processing procedures.

The Research Design

This was a study of law enforcement leadership attitudes and community policing in law enforcement agencies in rural North Carolina. A questionnaire was used to measure leadership attitudes and professional characteristics of chief law enforcement administrators of rural North Carolina.

The study uses data from a survey of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina to examine the correlates of community policing and to determine if there are differences between agencies using community policing and not using it. It was expected that there will be common leadership attitudes among chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies that have implemented community policing and that there will be common characteristics of their departments. It was further expected that there will be common leadership attitudes among chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies that have not implemented community policing and that their departments will have common characteristics. It was also expected that departments with and without community policing grants will differ in the leadership attitudes of their chief administrators and the characteristics of their departments.
Survey research is “perhaps the most frequently used mode of observation in the social sciences” (Babbie, 1986, p. 203) and has advantages “in terms of economy, the amount of data that can be collected, and standardization of the data” (p. 236). “Questionnaires are generally used in cases where the evaluator needs answers to a variety of questions. They are frequently designed so that each question can represent a discrete concern and can yield a score specific to that concern” (Henerson, Morris, and Fitz-Gibbon, 1987, p. 27). The self-administered questionnaire allows the researcher the advantages of “economy, speed, lack of interviewer bias” (p. 236) and anonymity.

Population

The population of this study includes all the chief administrators of law enforcement agencies in rural North Carolina that employ twenty-five or less sworn personnel and serve a population of 50,000 or less. The Uniform Crime Report of 1998 listed one hundred, twenty-one agencies that form the population of this study.

Sample Selection

Each chief administrator of the one hundred, twenty-one law enforcement agencies in rural North Carolina that employed twenty-five or less sworn personnel and serve a population of 50,000 or less was mailed a questionnaire. Those returning the questionnaire were identified as the study’s sample.

Variables

Variables in the study were identified and operationalized from the review of the literature. The researcher needed data from the sample in the areas of community policing grants and departmental organization. The sample
administrators’ education level, tenure, leadership attitudes, and their view of community policing was also needed. From the needed information the variables were selected for this study.

**Community Policing Variables**

Information was needed from the respondents if their agency had a community policing grant (COP) from the U.S. Department of Justice and if their department had personnel assigned to community policing for the purpose of community problem solving. Assignment of personnel to such duties was a requirement of the COP grant (U.S. Department of Justice, 1999). Information was needed to determine if they viewed community policing as 1) a new philosophy that is changing the way the police does business, with officers and the citizens interacting with each other in a proactive manner for the betterment of the community; 2) a public relations tool; or 3) a fad that will cease when funding is eliminated.

**Organizational Variables**

Information was needed from the respondents if their department had a community watch or crime prevention program, a strategic plan, and a mission statement. Information was needed if their agency required its personnel to obtain training beyond that required by the state and whether their officers/deputies were allowed to select which training courses they wanted to attend.

**Educational Variables**

Information was needed from the respondents about their highest education level and whether or not they had attended a management training course.
Tenure Variable

Information was needed from the respondents about how many years they had been the chief administrator of their department.

Leadership Attitudes Variables

Information was needed from the respondents on their leadership attitudes, including leader orientation toward employees, delegation of authority, differentiation of the leader’s role, and the creation of teamwork.

Instrument Selection

The Administrator Survey (Appendix A) was developed by the researcher for this study to gather information on organizational and leadership characteristics. The Leadership: Employee-Orientation and Differentiation (LEAD) Questionnaire, developed by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan, (Appendix B) was selected to measure leadership attitudes.

The chief administrator survey gathered demographic information on each chief administrator. The questionnaire gathered data on the education level, years of experience, and opinion of community policing from the chief administrator. Agency information that reflects community policing grants, community policing efforts, training, and departmental size was collected.

The Administrator Survey instrument was developed according to accepted procedures of survey methodology design. Content validity was established by administering the instrument to ten law enforcement chief administrators that were not part of the sample population. Babbie (1973) listed two principles regarding pre-testing the research instrument:
1. Either the entire instrument or a portion thereof may be pre-tested. [This researcher tested the entire instrument on ten chief law enforcement administrators that were not part of the population.]

2. Preferably, the instrument should be pre-tested in the manner intended for the final study. [The researcher pre-tested the self-administered questionnaire in the same way as the final instrument was administered.] (pp. 206-207)

Ten chief law enforcement administrators of urban agencies in North Carolina were selected. These ten administrators were identified as experts from the field by community policing rewards from the Governor's Crime Commission over a three year period. The administration questionnaire was mailed to the ten administrators. Each administrator completed the questionnaire and was asked to give feedback to the researcher regarding format, estimated completion time, and any other suggestions. The only feedback given was that font needed to be larger. The average completion time was one week.

*The Leadership: Employee-Orientation and Differentiation (LEAD) Questionnaire*

In order to study leadership attitudes of chief administrators of law enforcement agencies in rural North Carolina, the Leadership: Employee-Orientation and Differentiation (LEAD) Questionnaire was selected.

LEAD (Dore, 1991) provides an objective measure of attitudes toward methods of successful leadership. The successful leadership methods were identified in a series of studies by the Survey Research Center at the University of
Michigan and consisted of employee orientation, delegation of authority, differentiation of the leader’s role, and creation of teamwork. The Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan initially studied insurance company managers and aircraft company managers in 1964. The LEAD questionnaire has since been administered to supervisors in several different industries (Dore, 1991).

The LEAD questionnaire measures two categories, 1) Employee-orientation, which includes delegation of authority and the importance of teamwork, and 2) Differentiation of the leader’s role.

The Employee-Orientation subscale has thirty questions and the range of possible scores from zero to thirty. If the scored high, it means that the leader tends to agree with the following leadership techniques: being oriented toward the employees as people rather than as means of production, delegating authority and responsibility for decisions to the employees whenever possible, and creating an atmosphere of teamwork and cooperation. If the leader scored low on this scale, the leader agreed with these methods: assigning all tasks to employees rather than letting them help to decide assignments, the leader making most decisions, supervising closely, stressing rules and work standards, and focusing on individual performance and competition rather than cooperation.

The Differentiation subscale has thirty questions and the range of possible scores from zero to thirty. On the Differentiation scale, a high score means that the leader tends to agree that a leader’s activities are different from those of his or her employees and that the leader’s activities include explaining and discussing changes in the work, planning and scheduling the overall group’s activity, training
employees, explaining their job responsibilities, giving them feedback on good and poor performance, and trying out new ideas. If the leader scored low on this scale, the leader tends to feel that a leader should stress doing the same kind of activities as the employees, being a high individual performer himself or herself, being an outstanding technical expert in his or her field, and working hard personally to get a big share of the work done.

The overall LEAD score is created by summing the two subscales and has a range of zero to sixty. If the leader is high on both scales, the total score will be high, and vice versa. A high score on one scale and a low one on the other will result in a middle score on the total. Research studies conducted by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan showed that a sample of successful supervisors in several different industries reflected on the high end of these scales, and less successful supervisors reflected on the low end of the scale (Dore, 1991).

Reliability

The reliability correlations of the scales ranged from .68 to .86, with a reliability of the total score on the questionnaire of .85 (Dore, 1991, p. 55). The scales measure two relatively independent variables: one involving an employee orientation and the other involving a differentiation of the leader’s role.

Validity

The validity of the questionnaire was demonstrated by the significant correlations of all of the scales with students’ grades in an industrial-psychology course in which the leadership methods were taught. The validity also was shown by the significant increase in mean total score for students after having completed
the industrial-psychology course, while the control group of general-psychology students showed no significant gain (Dore, 1991).

Successfully implementing a department-wide change to community policing depends on strong leadership from the top administrator. The agency with a mission statement that reflects the strategy plan and services provided to the community sets a course for an organizational effort for community policing. The chief administrator plays the most important leadership role by setting the example of good management throughout the agency. The simplest definition of management is getting work done through others. Teamwork and the delegation of authority are critical management attitudes to implement community policing. The ability to inspire others to implement the change to community policing through good management skills and obtaining the financial support should be the ultimate goal of the chief administrator.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data required for this study included educational, organizational, view of community policing, and LEAD scores. The combined Administrator Survey and the Leadership: Employee-Orientation and Differentiation Questionnaire resulted in a five-page survey.

Permission to use the LEAD questionnaire was granted by Pfeiffer and Company by purchasing the *Inventories, Questionnaires, and Surveys: Leadership* (1992) and giving credit to the Pfeiffer and Company Library (Appendix C). North Carolina State University Institutional Review Board for the Use of Human Subjects in Research approval was granted in February, 2001 (Appendix D).
Surveys were mailed on March 1, 2001 to the total population of chief administrators of law enforcement agencies in rural North Carolina that employed twenty-five or less sworn personnel and serve a population of 50,000 or fewer. It was requested that the surveys be completed and returned in the self addressed and stamped envelopes by March 16, 2001 (Appendix E).

To encourage respondents to return the surveys, a follow up letter was mailed to the total population on March 10, 2001 to remind the chief administrators that the survey needed to be completed and mailed by March 16, 2001 (Appendix F).

The returned surveys represented the sample of the population to be studied. According to Babbie, “a sample will be representative of the population from which it is selected if all members of the population have an equal chance of being selected in the sample” (1986, p. 141).

Seventy-six surveys were returned. Three were discarded due to failure to complete the LEAD questionnaire. Seventy-three surveys were successful completed. This represents 60% of the chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in the target population area.

Statistical Procedures

Descriptive statistics were utilized in this study. Method of descriptive statistics used in this study included the frequency distribution, the mean, the median, and mode.

To test the hypotheses, correlations of all dichotomous, ordinal and interval variables were assessed using Pearson’s r for interval data and Spearman’s rho.
for ordinal data. “Pearson's correlation coefficient indicates the degree of linear relationship between two variables. The correlation coefficient always lies between -1 and +1. A -1 indicates perfect linear negative relationship between two variables, +1 indicates perfect positive linear relationship, and 0 indicates lack of any linear relationship” (Jaeger, 1990, p. 377). “Spearman's rho is a 'quasi-ordinal' correlation coefficient. It equivalent to the Pearson's r correlation, computed on the variables, after they have been transformed into rank-orders” (Jaeger, 1990, p. 377).

Correlations were first examined for the entire sample, and then separately for those departments with and without a COP grant. Differences between those departments with a COP grant and those without were also examined using Mann-Whitney test and Chi-Squared test. “Mann-Whitney test the ranks of data to test the hypothesis that two samples of sizes m and n might come from the same population” (Jaeger, 1990, p. 383). “Chi-Squared test the square of a random variable having standard normal distribution is distributed as chi-square with 1 degree of freedom as appropriate” (Jaeger, 1990, p. 216). “The degrees of freedom is the minimal number of values which should be specified to determine all the data points” (Jaeger, 1990, p. 215).

Cohen’s Kappa was used to assess the agreement between the different organizational variables and having a community policing grant.

Figure 2 depicts how each hypothesis was tested for this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hypothesis 1</th>
<th>Hypothesis 2</th>
<th>Hypothesis 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spearman’s rho correlation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square Test</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen’s Kappa</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson’s correlation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 2.* The Statistical Test for Each Hypothesis

All analyses were done with SPSS 10.0. (SPSS, 1999). The level of significance was set at the .05 level.
Chapter IV

ANALYSIS

The purpose of this study was to compare characteristics and leadership attitudes of chief administrators of law enforcement agencies that have implemented community policing in rural North Carolina, and those who have not implemented community policing.

This chapter presents the findings of the analysis of data collected in this study. Included are descriptive statistics of the variables, relationships between variables, and results of hypothesis testing.

Characteristics of the Participants

The following tables represent the demographic characteristics of the participants.

*Educational Attainment*

The frequency and percentage distribution of the education variable for all respondents is reported in Table 1. The largest percentage of the chief administrators’ highest education level was high school/GED. Chief administrators that completed some college was 16.44 percent. Chief administrators with an associate degree was 17.81 percent. This was followed by 17.81 percent of chief administrators with a bachelor degree.
Table 1

Educational Attainment of Rural North Carolina Chief Law Enforcement Administrators (Entire Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School/GED</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47.95</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>82.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the educational attainment of rural North Carolina chief law enforcement administrators that received a COP grant. All chief administrators with a bachelor’s degree had received a COP grant.

Table 2

Educational Attainment of Rural North Carolina Chief Law Enforcement Administrators that received a COP Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and High School/GED</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and Some College</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and Associates Degree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the educational attainment of rural North Carolina chief law enforcement administrators that did not receive a COP grant.
Table 3

Educational Attainment of Rural North Carolina Chief Law Enforcement Administrators that did not receive a COP Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and High School/GED</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81.40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>81.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and Some College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16.28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and Associates Degree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and Bachelor Degree</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management Training

The frequency and percentage distribution of Table 4 reports that the majority of the chief administrators (entire sample) have never taken a management course.

Table 4

Management Training of Rural North Carolina Chief Law Enforcement Administrators (Entire Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64.38</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 shows the management training of rural North Carolina
chief law enforcement administrators that received a COP grant.

Table 5

Management Training of Rural North Carolina Chief Law Enforcement Administrators that received a COP Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and Management Course</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and No Management Course</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the management training of rural North Carolina chief law enforcement administrators that did not receive a COP grant.

Table 6

Management Training of Rural North Carolina Chief Law Enforcement Administrators that did not receive a COP Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and Management Course</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and No Management Course</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Years of Tenure

The data for all respondents related to years as a chief administrator variable is listed in Table 7. The years as a chief administrator ranged from 2 to 31. The mean for years as a chief administrator was 13.58 years.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 10 Years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 Years</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49.31</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>83.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 31 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.44</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8 shows the years of tenure of rural North Carolina chief law enforcement administrators that receive COP grants.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 10 Years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 Years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 31 Years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9 shows the years of tenure of rural North Carolina chief law enforcement administrators that did not receive a COP grant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 to 10 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20 Years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>67.44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>72.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 31 Years</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27.91</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Strategic Plan*

Table 10 shows that 64.38 percent of the total respondents of chief law enforcement administrators do not have a strategic plan for their organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64.38</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11 shows the rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies that received a COP grant with a strategic plan.
Table 11

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies that Received a COP Grant with a Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency n</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency n</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and Strategic Plan</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86.67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>86.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and No Strategic Plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows the rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies without a COP grant and a strategic plan.

Table 12

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies without a COP Grant and a Strategic Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency n</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency n</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and Strategic Plan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and No Strategic Plan</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mission Statement

Table 13 shows that 58.9 percent of the total sample of chief law enforcement administrators did not have mission statement for their organization.
Table 13

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with a Mission Statement (Entire Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency n</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency n</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>41.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>58.90</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows the rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies with a COP grant and with a mission statement.

Table 14

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with a COP Grant and a Mission Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency n</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency n</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and Mission Statement</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and No Mission Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows the rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies without a COP grant and a mission statement.
Table 15

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies without a COP Grant and a Mission Statement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and Mission Statement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and No Mission Statement</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officers Assigned to Community Problem Solving**

Table 16 indicates that 57.53 percent of the entire sample of chief law enforcement administrators do not have personnel assigned to community policing for the purpose of community problem solving.

Table 16

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with Officers Assigned to Community Problem Solving (Entire Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42.47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57.53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17 shows the rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies with a COP grant and officers assigned to community problem solving.
Table 17

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with a COP Grant and Officers Assigned to Community Problem Solving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency n</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency n</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and Problem Solving</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and No Problem Solving</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 shows the rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies with no COP grant and officers assigned to community problem solving.

Table 18

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with no COP Grant and Officers Assigned to Community Problem Solving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency n</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency n</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and Problem Solving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and No Problem Solving</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97.67</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Watch Program

Table 19 indicates that 56.16 percent of the entire sample of chief law enforcement administrators do not have an established community watch.
program within their jurisdiction.

Table 19

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with a Community Watch Program (Entire Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43.84</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>56.16</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20 shows the rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies with a COP grant and a community watch program.

Table 20

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with a COP Grant and a Community Watch Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and Community Watch</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and No Community Watch</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21 shows the rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies with no COP grant and a community watch program.
Table 21

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with no COP Grant and a Community Watch Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and Community Watch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and No Community Watch</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>95.35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Training Requirements Beyond State Regulations

Table 22 indicates that 42.47 percent of the entire sample of chief administrators required training for their personnel beyond the requirements of state regulations.

Table 22

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with Training Requirements Beyond State Regulations (Entire Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42.47</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57.53</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 shows the rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies with a COP grant and training requirements beyond state regulations.
Table 23
Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with a COP Grant and Training Requirements Beyond State Regulations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and Training Beyond State Requirements</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and No Training Beyond State Requirements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24 shows the rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies with no COP grant and training beyond state requirements.

Table 24
Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with no COP Grant and Training Beyond State Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and Training Beyond State Requirements</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and No Training Beyond State Requirements</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>97.67</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Officer May Select Their Own Training

Table 25 indicates that only 39.73 percent of the entire sample of chief administrators allow their personnel to select their own training.

Table 25

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies that the Officer May Select Their Own Training (Entire Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency n</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency n</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39.73</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>60.27</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 shows the rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies with a COP grant that allow the officer to select their own training.

Table 26

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with a COP Grant that the Officer May Select Their Own Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency n</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency n</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.67</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>76.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27 shows the rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies without a COP grant that allow the officer to select their own training.
Table 27

Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies without a COP Grant that the Officer May Select Their Own Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency n</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency n</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>88.37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

View of Community Policing

Table 28 indicates that 23.29 percent of the entire sample of chief administrators view community policing as a philosophy, 21.92 percent as a public relation tool, and 54.79 percent as a fad.

Table 28

Chief Administrators of Rural Law Enforcement Agencies in North Carolina View of Community Policing (Entire Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency n</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency n</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Relation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.92</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fad</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54.79</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 shows the chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina with a COP grant and their view of community policing.
Table 29

Chief Administrators of Rural Law Enforcement Agencies in North Carolina with a COP Grant and View of Community Policing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and View as a Philosophy</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.67</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>56.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and View as a Public Relation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43.33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP Grant and View as a Fad</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30 shows the chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina with a COP grant and view of community policing.

Table 30

Chief Administrators of Rural Law Enforcement Agencies in North Carolina with a COP Grant and View of Community Policing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and View as a Philosophy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and View as a Public Relation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No COP Grant and View as a Fad</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>93.02</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of Sworn Officers

Table 31 indicates the mean number of sworn personnel in the entire sample was 10.37.

Table 31

Number of Sworn Officers Employed by Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sworn Officers</td>
<td>10.37</td>
<td>5.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32 shows the number of sworn officers employed by rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies with a COP grant.

Table 32

Number of Sworn Officers Employed by Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies with a COP Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sworn officers</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33 shows the number of sworn officers employed by rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies without a COP grant.

Table 33

Number of Sworn Officers Employed by Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies without a COP Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sworn officers</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LEAD Scores

Table 34 indicates the mean and standard deviation of LEAD scores of the entire sample of chief administrators.

#### Table 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee orientation</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD total score</td>
<td>22.66</td>
<td>7.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 35 shows the total LEAD scores of chief administrators of rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies with COP grant.

#### Table 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee orientation</td>
<td>14.57</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD total score</td>
<td>30.70</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36 shows the total LEAD scores of chief administrators of rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies with no COP grant.

#### Table 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee orientation</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAD total score</td>
<td>17.05</td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses Testing

The focus of this section is the testing of the three hypotheses developed in this study. The rationale for the formulation of these three hypotheses was based on the literature review and the conceptual framework in this study. The selection of these hypotheses allowed this researcher to study the relations of leadership attitudes and the education level of the chief administrator to the implementation of community policing. The common relationships between the chief administrators that implemented community policing and those chief administrators that lack community policing was also studied.

* Differences Between Rural North Carolina Law Enforcement Agencies that have and have not Implemented Community Policing *

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in studied variables between rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have implemented community policing and those rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have not implemented community policing.

* Entire Sample *

Table 37 provides the coefficients for the Spearman's rho correlations for all variables in the study with the exception of the respondents' views on community policing. All correlations were significant at p < .05. All of the variables were positively associated with each other, except for the tenure of the chief
Again, the tenure of the chief administrator is negatively correlated with all of the other variables.

Table 37

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations for Ordinal and Interval Level Data (Entire Sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>VARIABLES LISTED IN MATRIX</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIME</strong> - Years as a chief administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLAN</strong> - Organizational strategic plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISS</strong> - Organizational mission statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRANT</strong> - Community policing grant from the US Department of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOLVE</strong> - Officers assigned for the purpose of community problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATCH</strong> - Community watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRAIN</strong> - Organizational required training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WISH</strong> - Officers may select training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIZE</strong> - Total of agency’s sworn officers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman’s rho. N = 73 for all tests. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Agencies with a COP Grant

Table 38 shows the correlation matrix for all ordinal and interval variables for respondents with a COP grant. Every department with a community policing grant had a mission statement, personnel assigned to solve community problems,
a community watch, and required training beyond that required by state regulations. Thus, in this case, all significant relationships were positive, except for the relationships with the tenure of the chief administrator.

Table 38

Correlations for Ordinal and Interval Level Data (Only Respondents with a COP Grant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>PLAN</th>
<th>WISH</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>-0.262</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISH</td>
<td>-0.262</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
<td>-0.087</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman’s rho. N = 30 for all tests. MISSION, SOLVE, WATCH, and TRAIN had no variance for respondents reporting a COP grant. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**VARIABLES LISTED IN MATRIX**

TIME - Years as a chief administrator
PLAN - Organizational strategic plan
WISH - Officers may select training
SIZE - Total of agency’s sworn officers

**Agencies without a COP Grant**

Table 39 shows the correlation matrix for all ordinal and interval variables for respondents without a COP grant. These results show the same pattern seen in those with a COP grant. All significant relationships show positive associations, except for the relationships involving the tenure of the chief administrator. For those departments without a community policing grant, having officers assigned to solve community problems was positively related to having a community watch and
allowing officers to select their own training courses. Having a community watch was positively associated with requiring training beyond state regulations and the size of the department. Requiring training beyond state regulation was also associated with allowing the officer/deputy to select their own training. Additionally, no departments without a community policing grant also had a mission statement or a strategic plan.

Table 39

Correlations for Ordinal and Interval Level Data (Only Respondents without a COP Grant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SOLVE</th>
<th>WATCH</th>
<th>TRAIN</th>
<th>WISH</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>-.076</td>
<td>-.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOLVE</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>.369</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAIN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman’s rho. N = 43 for all tests. MISSION, COURSE, and PLAN had no variance for respondents reporting no COP grant. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

VARIABLES LISTED IN MATRIX

TIME - Years as a chief administrator
SOLVE - Officers assigned for the purpose of community problem solving
WATCH - Community watch
TRAIN - Organizational required training
WISH - Officers may select training
SIZE - Total of agency’s sworn officers
Group differences

Agencies with community policing grants were very different from those without community policing grants. Table 40 shows the differences between the two groups as tested by the Chi-Square test.

Table 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>(c^2)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Concordant pairs</th>
<th>Grant = yes; other var = no</th>
<th>Grant = no; Other var = yes</th>
<th>kappa (sig)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOLVE</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.972 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COURSE</td>
<td>57.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.884 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN</td>
<td>57.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.884 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MISSION</td>
<td>73.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.000 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WATCH</td>
<td>65.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.944 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAIN</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.972 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISH</td>
<td>29.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.630 (.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIEW</td>
<td>62.93</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 73 for all.
VARIABLES LISTED IN MATRIX

COURSE - Management course
PLAN - Organizational strategic plan
MISS - Organizational mission statement
GRANT - Community policing grant from the US Department of Justice
SOLVE - Officers assigned for the purpose of community problem solving
WATCH - Community watch
TRAIN - Organizational required training
WISH - Officers may select training
VIEW – Chief administrator’s view of community policing

Departments with officers assigned to solve community problems were more likely to have a community policing grant. Only one department without a grant had officers assigned to solve community problems while no departments with a grant did not have officers assigned for that purpose. Agencies with a strategic plan were also more likely to have a grant than those without a strategic plan. These variables were also identical except for four cases were there was a grant but no plan. Everyone with a mission statement had a grant and vice-versa, indicating a perfect correlation.

Departments with a community watch were also more likely to have a grant than other departments. These two variables were identical except for two respondents with a watch and no grant. Departments which required more training than is mandated by the state of North Carolina were more likely to have a grant than other departments. These two variables were identical, except for one department which required extra training and did not have a grant. Perhaps not surprisingly, views of community policing were strongly associated with having a COP grant. All 17 respondents who viewed community policing as working for the betterment of the community had a grant. All 40 who viewed community policing
as a fad did not have a grant. Of the 16 who viewed community policing as a public relations tool, only 3 did not have a grant. Departments where the officers are allowed to select their own training courses are also more likely to have a grant.

With the exception of the report of whether or not the officers/deputies in the department could select their own training courses, the agreement between all of the dichotomous variables and having a community policing grant was very strong (Cohen’s Kappa was .884 or greater). This suggests that having a COP grant is a marker for some factor of departmental organization that is also indicated by having personnel assigned to solve community problems, a strategic plan, a mission statement, a community watch, and a requirement that personnel obtain training beyond that required by state mandates.

Allowing officers to select their own training courses is not as strongly related to having a COP grant (Cohen’s Kappa = .630), but this is still a strong relationship. There are six departments where the officers or deputies can select their own training and who do not have a community policing grant and there are seven departments where the officers cannot select their own training but there is a grant.

Those departments with a community policing grant differed from those without a community policing grant. Those departments with a community policing grant were almost synonymous with those departments with officers assigned to solve community problems, a strategic plan, a mission statement, a community watch, and requirements for training beyond that required by the state.
Furthermore, those departments with a community policing grant were larger than those without a grant. No department with more than 18 officers did not have a community policing grant while no department with fewer than seven officers had a grant.

These findings indicate that the null hypothesis that there are no differences between rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have implemented community policing and those rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have not implement community policing should be rejected.

**Leadership Attitudes**

Hypothesis 2: There is no relationship between leadership attitudes of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina and the implementation of community policing.

**Entire Sample**

The variables in this sample were all highly correlated. The relationships between all interval variables were examined using Pearson’s r. All correlations were significant at p < .05. Table 41 provides the coefficients for these correlations. All variables of the LEAD were positively related.
Table 41

Correlations for Interval Level Data for LEAD (Entire Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Orientation</th>
<th>Differentiation</th>
<th>Total Lead Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Orientation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lead Score</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson’s r. N = 73 for all tests. All Correlations significant at p < .001 (2-tailed).

Table 42 provides the coefficients for the Spearman’s rho correlations for all variables in the study with the exception of the respondents’ views on community policing. All correlations were significant at p < .05. The lowest correlation, still moderately strong with rho = .479, was between the Differentiation subscale of the LEAD scale and whether officers could select their own training. The Employee Orientation subscale, Differentiation subscale, and total LEAD variables were positively associated with each other, except for the tenure of the chief administrator.
Table 42

Correlations for Ordinal and Interval Level Data for LEAD (Entire Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.805</td>
<td>.829</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.776</td>
<td>.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>-.719</td>
<td>-.823</td>
<td>-.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miss</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>.839</td>
<td>.828</td>
<td>.853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch</td>
<td>.811</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish</td>
<td>.536</td>
<td>.479</td>
<td>.541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman’s rho. N = 73 for all tests.
Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**VARIABLES LISTED IN MATRIX**

EDUCATION- Level of formal education
COURSE – Management course
TIME - Years as a chief administrator
PLAN - Organizational strategic plan
MISS - Organizational mission statement
GRANT - Community policing grant from the US Department of Justice
SOLVE - Officers assigned for the purpose of community problem solving
WATCH - Community watch
TRAIN - Organizational required training
WISH - Officers may select training
SIZE - Total of agency’s sworn officers
E – Employee-orientation
D – Differentiation
LEAD – Total score of E and D
Respondents with a COP grant

Correlations were run separately for those departments with COP grants and those without to determine how the variables were related in each group separately. Table 43 provides the Pearson’s correlations for all interval variables for only the departments with a COP grant. The Employee Orientation and Differentiation subscales of the LEAD scale were positively associated with each other and with the LEAD scale.

Table 43

Correlations for Interval Level Data for LEAD (Only Respondents with a COP Grant).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employee Orientation</th>
<th>Differentiation</th>
<th>Total Lead Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Orientation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.818</td>
<td>.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td></td>
<td>.875 (.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lead Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson’s r. N = 30 for all tests. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 44 shows the correlation matrix for all ordinal and interval variables for respondents with a COP grant. For those with a COP grant, the Employee-orientation subscale, the Differentiation subscale, and the LEAD scale, are positively associated with having a strategic plan, the number of officers in the department, and the education level of the chief administrator.
### Table 44

**Ordinal and Interval Level Data for LEAD (Only Respondents with a COP Grant)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.388*</td>
<td>.485*</td>
<td>.413*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.034)</td>
<td>(.007)</td>
<td>(.023)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>-.338</td>
<td>-.308</td>
<td>-.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.068)</td>
<td>(.098)</td>
<td>(.098)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>-.352</td>
<td>-.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.263)</td>
<td>(.056)</td>
<td>(.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>-.315*</td>
<td>-.160*</td>
<td>-.194*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.090)</td>
<td>(.399)</td>
<td>(.305)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>-.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.735)</td>
<td>(.962)</td>
<td>(.332)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>.191*</td>
<td>.394*</td>
<td>.353*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.313)</td>
<td>(.031)</td>
<td>(.056)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman’s rho. N = 30 for all tests.
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**VARIABLES LISTED IN MATRIX**

EDUCATION- Level of formal education
COURSE – Management course
TIME - Years as a chief administrator
PLAN - Organizational strategic plan
WISH - Officers may select training
SIZE - Total of agency’s sworn officers
E – Employee-orientation
D – Differentiation
LEAD – Total score of E and D
Respondents without a COP grant

Table 45 provides the Pearson’s correlations for all interval variables for the departments without a COP grant. The overall LEAD scale was positively related to both the Employee Orientation subscale ($r = .548$, $p < .001$) and the Differentiation subscale ($r = .877$, $p < .001$). However, the two subscale were not related to each other. Therefore, the pattern for those departments without a COP grant is similar to those with a COP grant. The relationships for the interval variables are all positive.

Table 45  
Correlations for Interval Level Data for LEAD (Only Respondents without a COP Grant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employee Orientation</th>
<th>Differentiation</th>
<th>Total Lead Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>(.608)</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiation</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lead Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson’s r. N = 43 for all tests. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 46 shows the correlation matrix for all ordinal and interval variables for respondents without a COP grant. The differentiation subscale, the LEAD scale are positively associated with the size of the department.
Table 46

Correlations for Ordinal and Interval Level Data for LEAD (Only Respondents without a COP Grant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>Lead</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.359</td>
<td>.444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.115)</td>
<td>(.018)</td>
<td>(.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.455</td>
<td>-.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.886)</td>
<td>(.002)</td>
<td>(.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>-.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.374)</td>
<td>(.158)</td>
<td>(.126)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>-.127</td>
<td>-.341</td>
<td>-.340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.419)</td>
<td>(.025)</td>
<td>(.026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish</td>
<td>-.139</td>
<td>-.219</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.374)</td>
<td>(.158)</td>
<td>(.556)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.720*</td>
<td>.757*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.055)</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.456)</td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman’s rho. N = 43 for all tests.
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

VARIABLES LISTED IN MATRIX

EDUCATION- Level of formal education
COURSE – Management course
TIME - Years as a chief administrator
PLAN - Organizational strategic plan
WISH - Officers may select training
SIZE - Total of agency’s sworn officers
E – Employee-orientation
D – Differentiation
LEAD – Total score of E and D
These findings indicate that the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between the leadership attitudes of chief administrators of departments that have implemented community policing and those of departments that have not implemented community policing should be rejected.

**Education**

Hypothesis 3: There is no relationship between education attainment of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina and the implementation of community policing.

**Entire Sample**

Table 47 provides the coefficients for the Spearman’s rho correlations for education and all variables in the study with the exception of the respondents’ views on community policing. All correlations were significant at \( p < .05 \). The education level of the chief administrator is negatively associated with the chief administrator’s time in office.
Table 47

Correlations for Ordinal and Interval Level Data for Education (Entire Sample)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>CORRELATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>-.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>.871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solve</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch</td>
<td>.894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>.891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wish</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>.829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead</td>
<td>.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size</td>
<td>.783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman’s rho. N = 73 for all tests.
Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

VARIABLES LISTED IN MATRIX

EDUC - Level of formal education
COURSE – Management course
TIME - Years as a chief administrator
PLAN – Organizational strategic plan
MISSION – Organizational mission statement
GRANT – Community policing grant from the US Department of Justice
SOLVE - Officers assigned for the purpose of community problem solving
WATCH - Community watch
TRAIN - Organizational required training
WISH - Officers may select training
E – Employee-orientation
D – Differentiation
LEAD – Total score of E and D
SIZE - Total of agency’s sworn officer
Table 48 indicates that those chiefs whose agency had a grant had a higher level of education than chiefs that had no grant.

Table 48

Educational Differences Between Respondents with COP Grants and those Respondents without a COP Grant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>28.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 73. p < .001

Respondents with a COP Grant

For those respondents with a COP grant, Table 49 provides the coefficients for the Spearman’s rho correlations for education and all variables in the study with the exception of the respondents’ views on community policing. The education level of the chief administrator is negatively associated with the chief administrator’s time in office. Having a chief with more formal education is significantly associated with having attended a management course and having a strategic plan.
Table 49

Correlations for Ordinal and Interval Level Data for Education (Only Respondents with a COP Grant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EDUC</th>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>PLAN</th>
<th>WISH</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>LEAD</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.301*</td>
<td>-.383</td>
<td>.510*</td>
<td>-.217</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td>.413</td>
<td>.409</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman’s rho. N = 30 for all tests.
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

VARIABLES LISTED IN MATRIX

EDUC - Level of formal education
TIME - Years as a chief administrator
COURSE – Management course
PLAN – Organizational strategic plan
WISH - Officers may select training
E – Employee-orientation
D – Differentiation
LEAD – Total score of E and D
SIZE - Total of agency’s sworn officers

Respondents without a COP Grant

For those respondents without a COP grant, Table 50 provides the coefficients for the Spearman’s rho correlations for education and all variables in the study with the exception of the respondents' views on community policing. The increasing education levels of the chief administrator are significantly associated with having officers solving community problems having a community watch, requiring training beyond state regulations, the Differentiation subscale, the LEAD scale, and the number of officers in the department. The education level of the chief administrator is negatively associated with the chief administrator’s time in office.
Table 50

Correlations for Ordinal and Interval Level Data for Education (Only Respondents without a COP Grant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EDUC</th>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>SOLVE</th>
<th>WATCH</th>
<th>TRAIN</th>
<th>WISH</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>LEAD</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.393</td>
<td>0.386*</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>0.386*</td>
<td>0.176</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.359*</td>
<td>0.444*</td>
<td>0.321*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Spearman’s rho. N = 43 for all tests. *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

VARIABLES LISTED IN MATRIX

EDUC - Level of formal education  
TIME - Years as a chief administrator  
SOLVE - Officers assigned for the purpose of community problem solving  
WATCH - Community watch  
TRAIN - Organizational required training  
WISH - Officers may select training  
E – Employee-orientation  
D – Differentiation  
LEAD – Total score of E and D  
SIZE - Total of agency’s sworn officers

These findings indicate that the null hypothesis that there is no relationship between the education of chief administrators of rural North Carolina law enforcement agencies and the implementation of community policing should be rejected.
Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study focuses on how leadership attitude relates to the implementation of community policing in law enforcement agencies in rural North Carolina. In addition, the literature review examines the concepts of police organizations, rural law enforcement agencies, community policing, COPS grants, educational level, and training.

Chapter III outlined the methodology, research design, sample, instrument selection, data gathering procedure, and statistics. The research questions were:

RESEARCH QUESTION 1: Are there differences between rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have implemented community policing and those rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have not implemented community policing?

RESEARCH QUESTION 2: Is there a relationship between leadership attitude of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina and the implementation of community policing?

RESEARCH QUESTION 3: Is there a relationship between education of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina and the implementation of community policing in rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina?

Based on the review of the literature conducted in Chapter II, this researcher formulated the following null hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: There are no significant differences in studied variables between rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have implemented community policing and those rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have not implemented community policing.

Hypothesis 2: There is no relationship between leadership attitudes of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina and the implementation of community policing.
Hypothesis 3: There is no relationship between education attainment of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina and the implementation of community policing.

Chapter IV described the analysis of the data, and this chapter will discuss the conclusions of the study, implications, and recommendations for further research.

Conclusions

Conclusion 1: Based on the survey results there are differences between rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina that have implemented community policing and those that have not implemented community policing.

There strong and striking differences between these two types of agencies. Those agencies with a COP grant were much more likely have less tenure for a chief administrator, much more likely to have a mission statement, and much more likely to have a strategic plan. This conclusion is substantiated in the literature.

There seems to be an agreement among practitioners and scholars that community policing represents a significant organizational reform (Brown, 1989; Geller, 1991; Meese, 1994; Silverman, 1999; and Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1994). To sustain change, the structures of the organization itself should be modified, including strategic plans, policies and procedures. This change in the structures of the organization typically involves an unfreezing, change and re-freezing process.

Agencies with COP grants demonstrate changes in command structure, delegation and teamwork. A major shift from a hierarchical command structure to a
A decentralized problem solving organization is required to fully institute community policing.

Conclusion 2: Based on the survey results there is a relationship between leadership attitudes of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina and the implementation of community policing.

The data indicates that chief administrators with COP grants scored higher on the Employee-orientation, Differentiation, and LEAD scales than those of departments without a COP grant. The average LEAD score for the chief of a department with a COP grant was 30.7, while the average was 17.05 for those without a COP grant.

Leadership plays a key role in defining the organizational culture in law enforcement agencies that implement community policing. Without the foundation of a structure and environment that supports specific values, a departmental philosophy can be confusing and challenged by officers, while followed only when convenient. Conventional wisdom informs us that when values are not held and articulated by the command staff, officers on the street are not likely to be influenced by them (Meese, 1994; Silverman, 1999; and Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1994). Leadership provides the glue to hold all parts of the organization together. Understanding the existing culture, and having the ability to engender support for a shared vision become major leadership challenges. The bureaucratic model of policing is very resistant to change (Breci, 1998). Change must come from the top down. The chief administrator who implements change must make sure that the members of the organization actually follow them into the philosophy of community policing. The chief administrator should be able to act...
creativity and be able to formulate visions and then implement them into organizational strategies.

Conclusion 3: Based on the survey results there is a relationship between education of chief administrators of rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina and the implementation of community policing in rural law enforcement agencies in North Carolina.

The chiefs of those departments with a community policing grant were very different from the chiefs of departments without a grant. Chief administrators of departments with a grant were much more likely to have attended a management training course and much more likely to have a higher level of education. No agency with a chief administrator with only a high school education had a grant and no agency with a chief administrator who had received a Bachelor’s degree did not have a grant.

The intellectual caliber of the police has risen dramatically. American police today at all ranks are smarter, better informed, and more sophisticated than police in the 1960s (Carter, Sapp, and Stephens, 1989). This change is in part based on the recommendation of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice in 1967, which supported that all police personnel with general enforcement powers have baccalaureate degrees. Several commissions went as far as to call higher education an occupational necessity. This is supported in the findings of this study. Chief administrators having at least a Bachelor’s degree were much more likely to have a COP grant. The study by the Police Executive Research Forum in 1992 also reported that educational levels had grown steadily in law enforcement over the last twenty years.
Implications

These conclusions support the need for the chief administrator of a law enforcement agency to have a strong and diverse skill set in the area of leadership and management. The preparation of the law enforcement executive should be similar to the preparation of any business executive. It is no longer acceptable for the administrator to be promoted without having the skills necessary to be successful in the job. These skills include budget management, time management, team building, leadership, organizational needs and assessment, performance appraisal, grant writing, organizational behavior, communications, ethics, business etiquette, and administrative law.

Having a strong liberal arts foundation, as shown with attainment of bachelor’s degree, gives the individual a view of society that is only strengthened through experience (Carter, Sapp, and Stephens, 1989). It is likely that chief administrators with formal education are more comfortable with the academic processes required in grant writing. They might also more closely read the current literature and keep abreast of emerging trends and issues. Additionally, the chief administrator must possess exceptional interpersonal skills. There is often a need to negotiate with community leaders, staff, and city/county government.

The police organization in rural areas is increasing in complexity and the chief administrator is facing more demanding expectations. Police situations in rural locations are constantly becoming more intricate as technology is expanding and work that was once managed within a city or town or county could now extend to the state, national or international level. Sound professional leadership
competence is critical. One further key element of the successful leadership function is pro-active visionary planning. A chief administrator who uses proactive planning is adept at developing vision and mission statements, strategic planning processes, and innovative community involvement programs. This ability translates into the successful positioning of the agency for the future.

In addition to the implication that the law enforcement executive must possess a strong and diverse skill set to lead a successful organization, it is also important that the recruitment process for the chief administrator becomes more standardized and that the applicants be qualified for managing and leading as well as having law enforcement experience. Recruitment of these individuals is even more challenging in the rural area, compounded by economic and quality of life factors.

The development of regional, state and national standards for hiring law enforcement executives would assist the local governments in the selection process. The qualifications and review processes vary from area to area. It seems essential that the baccalaureate degree be the minimum requirement, as well as a knowledge base in law enforcement and the leadership/management skill set.

Based on the implications from this study, there are several recommendations for practice:

1. Changes in the hiring and selection process of chief administrators at the local rural level. These changes would include a detailed job description and development of an assessment center to be managed by a neutral third party. The minimum educational level should be the baccalaureate
degree. Qualifications should include a knowledge base in law enforcement, experience, and a leadership/management skill set.

2. Provision of training and development for current chief administrators in the areas in which they need to increase skill level. This should include both formal and informal educational opportunities.

Implications for Practice

As a result of the literature review, findings of this study and subsequent conclusion and implications, this researcher has recommendations for future research.

1. Additional research needs to be conducted to determine if focused educational interventions effect the successful implementation of community policing. In North Carolina, education and training for chief administrators is partially subsidized by the state and federal government. Participation in the activities is often low. It would be important to the educational developers and trainers to know why participation is varied and whether educational interventions support community policing.

2. Additional research needs to be conducted on those rural law enforcement agencies that have not implemented community policing to discover what barriers, if any, exist in keeping those agencies steeped in traditional law enforcement.

3. Additional research needs to be conducted on the model of community policing. The philosophy, while increasingly popular in the last decade, could potentially be under fire in this era of gang violence and terrorism. It
would be important to chief administrators to possess a policing model that includes the components needed to protect the community, while actively protecting the rights of the individual. Community policing may be no more than a public relations tool that will bend to each emerging fad.

The test of time will reveal if community policing is an enduring philosophy, a public relations tool, or a fad. As society evolves, so do the methods used to protect that society. Future research may indicate that community policing may fill a gap between the letter of the law and the spirit of the law.
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Appendix A
Chief Administrator Survey

1. Highest education level:
   - [ ] High School/GED
   - [ ] Some college
   - [ ] Associate Degree
   - [ ] Bachelor’s Degree
   - [ ] Master’s Degree
   - [ ] Other: Specify____________________

2. Have you ever attended a management course?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

3. How long have you been the chief administrator?
   _____ years

4. Does your agency have a strategic plan?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

5. Does your agency have a mission statement?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

6. Has your agency received any community policing grants from the U.S. Department of Justice?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

7. Do you have any personnel assigned to community policing for the purpose of community problem solving?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

8. Does your agency have a community watch or a crime prevention program?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No
9. Do you require training, other than those courses mandated by the state, for your agency’s personnel?

[ ] yes  [ ] no

10. Can the officer/deputy select training courses he/she wishes to attend?

[ ] yes  [ ] no

11. How do you view community policing?

[ ] A philosophy that is changing the way the police does business, with officers and the citizens interacting with each other in a proactive matter for the betterment of the community.

[ ] A public relations tool.

[ ] A fad that will cease when funding is eliminated.

[ ] Other;

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

12. The number of sworn officers/deputies employed by your agency.

________________
Appendix B
LEAD QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: This is a survey of your attitudes toward different methods of leadership. In each of the sixty items below there are two statements of things a leader can do or ways in which he or she can act. For each item, put an X on your answer sheet in either the first blank or the second blank, thereby indicating either (1) or (2), respectively, for the statement that you believe is the more important way for a leader to behave. If you think that both alternatives are unimportant for a leader, choose the statement you think is more important.

There are no right or wrong answers; your opinions are what is important. Work rapidly; your first impressions are usually best.

It is more important for a leader:

1. (1) To assign workers to specific tasks.
   (2) To allow the workers to do the job the way they want to, as long as they accomplish the objectives.

2. (1) To treat all workers equally and according to the rules.
   (2) To be aware of the feelings of the workers.

3. (1) To be accepted by the workers.
   (2) To point out the rules and policies in situations in which complaints arise.

4. (1) To be an authority in the type of work that the group does.
   (2) To explain the reasons for changes.

5. (1) To call the group members together to discuss work.
   (2) To work right alongside the workers.

6. (1) To make decisions independently of the group.
   (2) To be a real part of the group.

7. (1) To pitch right in with the workers.
   (2) To plan the work.
It is more important for a leader:

8. (1) To authorize the workers to exercise a high degree of authority and responsibility in making decisions.
    (2) To supervise the workers closely.

9. (1) To maintain an open, informal relationship with the workers.
    (2) To have a well-regulated department.

10. (1) To be the most technically skilled member of the work group.
    (2) To meet with the workers to consider proposed changes.

11. (1) To teach the workers new things.
    (2) To attempt to vary his or her job only slightly from the jobs of the workers.

12. (1) To spend over half of his or her time in supervisory activities, such as planning.
    (2) To make prompt, firm decisions.

13. (1) To have a complete knowledge of the technical aspects of his or her job.
    (2) To attempt to place workers in jobs that they desire, whenever possible.

14. (1) To take an interest in the worker as a person.
    (2) To maintain definite standards of performance.

15. (1) To explain each worker’s duties and responsibilities to him or her.
    (2) To spend some of his or her time in helping to get the work done.

16. (1) To allow the workers to do their work the way they think is best.
    (2) To rule with a firm hand.

17. (1) To speak with unquestioned authority.
    (2) To get along well with the workers.

18. (1) To decide in detail how the work will be done by the workers.
    (2) To let the workers make decisions in areas in which they feel competent to do so.

19. (1) To spend considerable time in planning.
    (2) To be respected as a person of superior technical skill in the field.
It is more important for a leader:

20. (1) To be proud of the work record of his or her group.
(2) To create friendly competition among the workers.

21. (1) To have the loyalty of the workers.
(2) To maintain definite standards of performance.

22. (1) To work hard at all times.
(2) To schedule the work to be done.

23. (1) To put the group’s welfare above any individual’s welfare.
(2) To organize the work individually rather than by groups whenever possible.

24. (1) To be an authority in the type of work that the group does.
(2) To tell poor workers when their work is not measuring up to what it should be.

25. (1) To let the workers set their own pace, as long as they finish the job on time.
(2) To divide the work load into separate and clearly defined job duties for each worker.

26. (1) To urge the group members to meet together to set group goals.
(2) To prefer workers who work well alone.

27. (1) To perform the same functions as the workers whenever possible.
(2) To plan the work.

28. (1) To prefer workers who do not need much supervision.
(2) To give exact, detailed instructions for each job.

29. (1) To stand up for the workers when they make mistakes.
(2) To submit his or her reports on time.

30. (1) To call the group members together to discuss the work.
(2) To attempt to vary his or her job only slightly from the jobs of the workers.

31. (1) To be respected as a person of superior technical skill in the field.
(2) To spend over half of his or her time in supervisory activities, such as planning.
It is more important for a leader:

32. (1) To be the most technically skilled member of the work group.
     (2) To explain the reasons for changes.

33. (1) To let the workers know how well they are doing their jobs.
     (2) To spend some of his or her time helping to complete the work.

34. (1) To make prompt, firm decisions.
     (2) To spend considerable time in planning.

35. (1) To make decisions independently of the group.
     (2) To urge the workers to work together.

36. (1) To pass along to the workers information from higher management.
     (2) To help complete the work.

37. (1) To be respected as a person of superior technical skill in the field.
     (2) To schedule the work to be done.

38. (1) To foster the workers’ pride in their work group’s accomplishments.
     (2) To discourage talking between workers on the job.

39. (1) To reward the good worker.
     (2) To encourage the workers to assist one another on the job.

40. (1) To feel that he or she belongs in the group.
     (2) To accomplish tasks on the basis of his or her own initiative.

41. (1) To teach the workers new things.
     (2) To help get the work done.

42. (1) To do the important jobs himself or herself.
     (2) To allow the workers to take their rest periods when they wish.

43. (1) To organize new practices and procedures.
     (2) To encourage one worker in the group to speak up for the rest.

44. (1) To set up all projects himself or herself.
     (2) To let the workers make all routine daily decisions.

45. (1) To be trained in the basic technical knowledge needed in the department.
     (2) To keep the workers happy.
It is more important for a leader:

46. (1) To meet with the workers to consider proposed changes.
   (2) To pitch right in with the workers.

47. (1) To discourage strong friendships from forming within the group.
   (2) To foster the workers’ pride in their work group’s accomplishments.

48. (1) To complete the work on time.
   (2) To be friendly toward the workers.

49. (1) To realize that a worker knows when he or she is a slacker without being told.
   (2) To explain each worker’s duties and responsibilities to him or her.

50. (1) To set an example by working hard.
   (2) To spend considerable time in planning.

51. (1) To encourage workers to check with him or her frequently about the work.
   (2) To let the workers decide how to do each task.

52. (1) To allow workers to make decisions concerning their work.
   (2) To prefer workers who are agreeable and willing to follow rules.

53. (1) To be an authority in the type of work that the group does.
   (2) To pass along to the workers information from higher management.

54. (1) To encourage the workers to discover the best job methods by experience.
   (2) To meet with the workers to consider proposed changes.

55. (1) To explain each worker’s duties and responsibilities to him or her.
   (2) To pitch right in with the workers.

56. (1) To plan his or her day’s activities in considerable detail.
   (2) To perform the same functions as the workers whenever possible.

57. (1) To create friendly competition among the workers.
   (2) To urge the group members to meet together to set group goals.

58. (1) To organize new practices and procedures.
   (2) To make his or her job similar to the jobs of the workers.

59. (1) To be skilled in training.
   (2) To set an example by working hard.
It is more important for a leader:

60. (1) To work right alongside the workers.
(2) To try out new ideas in the work group.
LEAD QUESTIONNAIRE ANSWER SHEET

1. _____ 13. _____ 30. _____ 47. _____
2. _____ 14. _____ 31. _____ 48. _____
3. _____ 15. _____ 32. _____ 49. _____
4. _____ 16. _____ 33. _____ 50. _____
5. _____ 17. _____ 34. _____ 51. _____
6. _____ 18. _____ 35. _____ 52. _____
7. _____ 19. _____ 36. _____ 53. _____
8. _____ 20. _____ 37. _____ 54. _____
9. _____ 21. _____ 38. _____ 55. _____
10. _____ 22. _____ 39. _____ 56. _____
11. _____ 23. _____ 40. _____ 57. _____
12. _____ 24. _____ 41. _____ 58. _____
   25. _____ 42. _____ 59. _____
   26. _____ 43. _____ 60. _____
   27. _____ 44. _____
   28. _____ 45. _____
   29. _____ 46. _____

E _____
D _____

Total _____
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Appendix D
North Carolina State University
INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Title:
Leadership Attitudes and the Implementation of Community Policing in Law Enforcement Agencies in Rural North Carolina

Principle Investigator:      Faculty Sponsor:
James Edwards      Dr. James Burrow

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to discover if there is any relationship between leadership attitudes and the implementation of community policing in rural North Carolina.

INFORMATION
You are asked to complete the survey and return it in the self-stamped, self-addressed envelope by March 15, 2001. The survey requires approximately 10 minutes to complete.

RISKS
There is no risk to you or your organization from this study.

BENEFITS
The information from this study will increase the body of knowledge about leadership and community policing in rural North Carolina.

CONFIDENTIALITY
The information in the study records will be kept strictly confidential. Data will be stored securely and will be made available only to persons conducting the study unless you specifically give permission in writing to do otherwise. No reference will be made in oral or written reports which could link you to the study.

CONTACT
If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures, you may contact the researcher, James Edwards, at P.O. Box 99 Salemburg, N.C., or 910-525-4151. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Gary A. Mirka, Chair of the NCSU IRB for the Use of Human Subjects in Research Committee, Box 7906, NCSU Campus.
PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study before data collection is completed your data will be returned to you or destroyed.

CONSENT
I have read and understand the above information. I have received a copy of this form. I agree to participate in this study.

Subject’s signature___________________________  Date________________
Investigator’s signature_______________________   Date________________
Appendix E
March 1, 2001

James T. Edwards
P.O. Box 99
Salemburg, N.C. 28385

Sheriff/Chief:

As part of my requirements to graduate from North Carolina State University, I need your assistance. I am conducting research on the implementation of community policing. Enclosed please find a Administrative Survey, a LEAD Questionnaire, and information for you about your rights as a volunteer in a research study.

Please take time from your busy schedule and complete the survey and questionnaire. I ask you to return this information to me no later than March 16, 2001. A stamped addressed envelope is enclosed your convenience.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully yours,

James T. Edwards
Appendix F
March 10, 2001

James T. Edwards  
P.O. Box 99  
Salemburg, N.C. 28385

Sheriff/Chief:

This is a friendly reminder that the Administrative Survey and the LEAD Questionnaire needs to be completed and returned no later than March 16, 2001.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully yours,

James T. Edwards