THE CAMPBELL COLLABORATION

Title registration for a review proposal: Community-oriented policing's impact on interpersonal violent crime in developing countries

Submitted to the Coordinating Group of:
X_Crime and Justice
___Education
___Social Welfare
X_Other: International Development

Plans to co-register:
X_No
___Yes   ___ Cochrane   ___ Other
___Maybe

TITLE OF THE REVIEW

Community-oriented policing on interpersonal violent crime in developing countries

BACKGROUND

Briefly describe and define *the problem*

Violence is a global public health problem with complex causes at the individual, family, community and societal levels (World Health Organization, 2002). Violence can be divided into three broad categories according to the perpetrator of the violent act: interpersonal violence; self-directed violence; and collective violence (WHO, 2002b). This review will focus specifically on the category of interpersonal violence. Worldwide, the direct impact of interpersonal violence is estimated at 1400 deaths per day (WHO, 2002b) and the economic cost is estimated to be between $95 billion and $163 billion per year (Geneva Declaration Secretariat, cited in Willman & Makisaka, 2010). For victims, mortality, physical and psychological damage, disability, and social problems are immediate and long-lasting outcomes of violence (WHO, 2002a).

Developing countries are particularly affected by violent crime, with interpersonal violence a leading cause of death and disability (Hofman, Primack, Keusch, & Hrynkow, 2005; Liebling & Kiziri-Mayengo, 2002; Morrison, Ellsberg, & Bott, 2007; Seedat, Van Niekerk, Jewkes, Suffla, & Ratele, 2009). Interpersonal violence can indirectly suppress growth in developing countries if local or international businesses refrain from investing socially or economically in developing areas plagued by violence (Akpokodje, Bowles, & Tigere, 2002). Fear of violence also prohibits development by preventing local citizens from traveling to work and school, encouraging capital flight, increasing brain drain as educated citizens leave troubled areas, and lowering social cohesion (Willman & Makisaka, 2010).

We define interpersonal violent crime as those acts of violence committed by one person or small group against another person or small group — such as assault, homicide, rape, kidnapping, sexual assault, and maltreatment. We note that the causal mechanisms for self-directed and collective violence are very different to those for interpersonal violence. As such, we consider self-directed violence, such as self-harm and suicide, or collective violence, such as war, state violence, genocide, or terrorist activity, outside the scope of this review.

Briefly describe and define *the population*

This review focuses on community-oriented policing interventions and their ability to prevent or reduce violence in developing countries. Despite the continuity implied by the terms "developing" and "developed," we propose that there are significant and qualitative differences between community-oriented policing initiatives in established democracies and those that are implemented in developing countries. Variability in institutional histories and capacities of police agencies in developed and developing countries creates great contextual differences in the way community-oriented policing is conceptualized and implemented in developed versus developing democracies. We recognize that what might be deemed a successful community-oriented policing intervention in developed countries might be fundamentally inappropriate or interpreted quite differently in the context of policing in developing nations. These developing countries often have low police professionalism, poor relations between police and the public, under-equipped police services, an unstable political and/or socio-economic situation, and in some cases, low community enthusiasm and participation (Eijkman, 2006; Frühling & Cancina, 2005). Moreover, scholars argue that western models of community-oriented policing fail to be adaptable to local culture, histories and experiences, and are insensitive to social contexts (Brogden, 2002). Overall, we argue that the histories and structural context of policing in developed and developing countries are so fundamentally different that we plan to only include community-oriented policing interventions that target populations in developing countries.

Briefly describe and define *the intervention*

Policing and police agencies in many emerging democracies and developing countries have very different histories to those in the developed world. In developed democracies, police reform has generally followed what Kelling and Moore describes as three major eras of policing: the political era, the professional era and the community-oriented policing era (see Kelling & Moore, 1988). We argue that developed country police agencies that have experienced all three eras of change and development over a period of nearly 100 years are situated very differently to police agencies in emerging democracies. In contrast to developed democracies, developing countries have long histories of military rule, with no experiences of a civilian police (Brogden, 2002). Indeed, these countries have experienced only great politicization of their policing services and have often skipped over the professionalization era in an effort to quickly establish community-oriented policing approaches as part of rapid state building activities (see for example Goldsmith & Dinnen, 2007; Goldsmith & Harris, 2010). These developing countries often lack the physical infrastructure and governance mechanisms that form an essential background to community-oriented policing in developed democracies.

Our review focuses on the impact of community-oriented policing interventions on interpersonal violent crimes in developing countries. Bayley (1994) uses the CAMPS acronym to describe community-oriented policing: *consultation* with citizens on crime problems, *adaption* of organizational structures from being controlled centrally to being decentralized, *mobilization* of police to include citizens in crime prevention and reduction initiatives, and the adoption of a *problem solving* approach to crime control and prevention. Similarly, Kelling and Moore (1988) identify seven major characteristics of community-oriented policing: (1) the source of authority in community-oriented policing stems from the community, (2) the primary function of community-oriented police agencies is balanced between crime control, crime prevention and problem solving, (3) the organizational design of agencies adopting community-oriented policing is decentralized,

task-oriented and utilizes matrix structures to prevent and respond to crime problems, (4) the relationship to the external environment is consultative, where the police defend values of law and professionalism, but listen to community concerns, (5) agencies adopting the community-oriented policing approach channel demand for police service through analysis of underlying problems rather than via emergency calls, (6) foot patrols and problem solving predominate as the preferred tactics and technology of community-oriented police agencies, and (7) organizational performance is measured by quality of life outcomes and citizen satisfaction, not by the number of arrests or other indicators of crime control (see also Skogan & Hartnett, 1997; Weisburd & Braga, 2006).

We focus this review on the impact of community-oriented policing (COP) on interpersonal violent crime. For our review, we follow Weisburd, Bennett, Gill and Telep's (2011) definition of COP:

> "...the intervention must involve a consultation or collaboration between the police and local citizens for the purpose of defining and/or dealing with local crime and disorder problems....Consultation with the public includes direct consultation with the public as a whole (all citizens within an area) or indirect consultation; for example, through a crime prevention partnership in which the public are represented by a selected or elected group of citizens...In other words, community involvement is the key distinguishing characteristic between COP and non-COP programs. We recognize that COP often overlaps considerably with other policing innovations like problem-oriented or hot spots policing, which have been the subject of Campbell systematic reviews in their own right, so the community element is the crucial dimension along which we distinguish the present review." (Weisburd et al, 2011: 3-5).

In our review, we will follow Weisburd and colleagues (2011) decision to identify community consultation as the characteristic that most clearly distinguishes community-oriented policing interventions from non-community-oriented policing interventions. We therefore focus our review on community-oriented policing, where we accept, as a basic ingredient of community-oriented policing, any intervention that involves police–community consultation. As with Weisburd et al (2011), we will consider any intervention that involves the implementation of policing strategies and/or organizational change (e.g., decentralization, streamlining of management, increased responsibility at the street level, training of officers in community-oriented policing principles, and recruitment policies), as long as the primary aim of the program is to put the local community at the center of efforts to define and tackle crime problems.

We recognize that the exact mechanism of community consultation varies, but may include meetings, surveys, the creation of representative councils, directives to police to interact with citizens in non-confrontational settings, and the creation of a citizen liaison position within police. One example of a community-oriented policing initiative implemented in a developing country is the *Fico Vivo* program, implemented in the state of Minas, Brazil, in an attempt to reduce the high rates of homicide, particularly among young people (Alves & Arias, 2012). Based on the success of *Operation Ceasefire* in Boston, USA, the *Fico Vivo* program built a targeted, community-oriented policing intervention which also provided social assistance to reduce the dependence of young people on criminal groups. One of the central processes of community consultation in the *Fico Vivo* program is the presence of trained officers in the target community for eight hours each day, whose aim is to establish ties within the community and develop an in-depth local knowledge of the area. The evaluation of this program used a time-series design measuring annual homicides in five targeted locations. Another example of a community-oriented policing intervention in a developing country is the *Safer Commune Program* implemented in 2001 in Chile (Ruprah, 2008). The program aimed to strengthen local capacity for crime prevention, and included the implementation of government and police–community consultation and participation, such as Citizen Security Committees chaired by the local mayor and with representatives from police, local government and citizens. The evaluation report for the *Safer Commune Program* provided effect sizes for multiple measures of crime, reported as the difference in change

Outcomes: What are the intended effects of the intervention?

This review aims to assess the impact of community-oriented policing on interpersonal violent crime in developing countries. We recognize that the difficulties associated with recording and accessing data on violence in developing countries may restrict primary studies' range of outcome measures, so that they are only able to provide a proxy measure (such as aggression) even when the intervention is explicitly intended to impact interpersonal violent crime. Officially recorded homicide data are the preferred outcome measure, due to their higher levels of reliability (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime 2007; United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and Latin America and the Caribbean Region of the World Bank 2007). We will code, however, other measures of violent crime such as reported aggregate violent crime rates or rates of self-reported victimization.

Unlike the Weisburd et al (2011) review of community-oriented policing, our review will consider all community-oriented policing activities targeting both people and/or places. That is, we will not limit our review to COP interventions with outcomes that capture the impact of the intervention on just geographic units of aggregation (like beats, suburbs, neighborhoods, communities or regions). COP studies that capture the impact on individuals or places (or both) will be included in our review. We will include, and code for, all types of individuals: young people, women, and all categories of race and ethnicity. We will, of course, separate the outcomes by people or place at the meta-analytic stage of the review.

OBJECTIVES

The primary objective is to provide a systematic review of the impact of community-oriented policing interventions designed to prevent and reduce interpersonal violent crime in developing countries. This review will update existing scoping reviews on the topic with new evidence and address the methodological limitations of previous reviews. This review aims to determine whether community-oriented policing interventions are effective in reducing interpersonal violent crime in developing countries. The review also aims to determine the reasons why community-oriented policing interventions fail or succeed in developing countries.

METHODOLOGY

Inclusion criteria

1. The intervention must be implemented by public police and include some mechanism of community consultation.

2. The intervention must be implemented in a developing country, as defined by the World Bank.

3. The intervention must aim to impact interpersonal violent crime. We will only include evaluations of community-oriented policing initiatives that either: (1) are explicitly aimed at impacting interpersonal violent crime, as stated in the source document; or (2) record some type of interpersonal violent crime as an outcome.

4. We will focus on violence at the interpersonal level, including acts or omissions perpetrated by an individual or small group against another individual or small group. The category of interpersonal violence includes most behaviors typically considered violent crime across countries and jurisdictions, such as homicide, rape and assault. We will consider any violent act that is classified as a crime in one of the countries under study to be a interpersonal violent crime, even if it is not considered as such in all of the countries under study. For example, domestic violence and child

maltreatment are considered crimes in some countries but not others. For the purposes of this review, we include domestic violence and child maltreatment under the definition of violent crime.

5. To be considered high quality, studies must use a quantitative evaluation design with a valid comparison group. Acceptable study designs include randomized trials, natural experiments, time series designs, regression discontinuity designs, and any quasi-experimental design with a matched or non-matched comparison group.

6. We anticipate that some evaluations may be in the form of time-series designs, and may not include a valid comparison group. We will include time-series evaluations without a comparison group in our review; however, we note that the quality of these studies may be lower than of studies that include a valid comparison group, and we will conduct sub-group analysis using study quality as a predictor variable during the synthesis stage.

7. Only studies that assign treatment and collect data at a similar geographic level (e.g. municipality) will be included.

Exclusion criteria

1. Studies that were published prior to 1975 or report on interventions that took place prior to 1975 are not eligible for review.

2. We will exclude community-oriented policing interventions that are not implemented by public police, or do not explicitly include some mechanism for community consultation.

3. We will exclude evaluations of interventions implemented in developed countries, according to the definition by the World Bank.

4. We will exclude evaluations that do not measure violent crime as an outcome, except where the source states explicitly that the intervention aimed to impact interpersonal violent crime.

5. We will exclude evaluations where two treatment programs are compared to one another with no baseline business-as-usual comparison group.

6. We will exclude outcomes relating to self-directed harm or collective violence (acts or omissions perpetrated by a state or large organized group against another state or large organized group).

7. We will exclude interventions that are implemented as part of a response to an on-going or recent violent conflict that is considered a substantively different intervention context to the majority, or that developed from a specific conflict or election context, or that aimed at preventing political violence.

Method of synthesis

We will use a random-effects model and inverse variance weighting. The meta-analysis will be implemented in Comprehensive Meta-Analysis 2.0 (BioStat). If more than one outcome is reported in a study, the study is allowed to contribute an effect size to each outcome. We will investigate the possibility of conducting moderator analyses, using analogue to the ANOVA for categorical predictors and meta-regression for continuous predictors. We will include a narrative review of eligible studies.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None of the authors have any known conflicts of interest.

AUTHOR(S) REVIEW TEAM

Lead reviewer:
Name: Lorraine Mazerolle
Title: Professor
Affiliation: The University of Queensland Institute for Social Science Research and CEPS
Address: Campbell Road, St Lucia
City, State, Province or County: Queensland
Postal Code: 4067
Country: Australia
Phone: +61 7 334 67877
Email: l.mazerolle@uq.edu.au

Co-reviewers:
Name: Jacqueline Davis
Title: Ms
Affiliation: The University of Queensland Institute for Social Science Research and CEPS
Address: Campbell Road, St Lucia
City, State, Province or County: Queensland
Postal Code: 4067
Country: Australia
Phone: +61 7 336 56071
Email: j.davis6@uq.edu.au

Name: Angela Higginson
Title: Dr
Affiliation: The University of Queensland Institute for Social Science Research and CEPS
Address: Campbell Road, St Lucia
City, State, Province or County: Queensland
Postal Code: 4067
Country: Australia
Phone: +61 7 336 56307
Email: a.higginson@uq.edu.au

Name: Kerrie Mengersen
Title: Professor
Affiliation: Queensland University of Technology, Mathematical Sciences
Address: Gardens Point Campus

City, State, Province or County: Queensland
Postal Code: 4001
Country: Australia
Phone: +61 7 3138 2063
Email: k.mengersen@qut.edu.au

Name: Laura Bedford
Title: Ms
Affiliation: The University of Queensland Institute for Social Science Research and CEPS
Address: Campbell Road, St Lucia
City, State, Province or County: Queensland
Postal Code: 4067
Country: Australia
Phone: +61 7 336 67475
Email: l.bedford@uq.edu.au

Name: Adele Somerville
Title: Ms
Affiliation: The University of Queensland Institute for Social Science Research and CEPS
Address: Campbell Road, St Lucia
City, State, Province or County: Queensland
Postal Code: 4067
Country: Australia
Phone: +61 7 336 69971
Email: a.somerville@uq.edu.au

ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

• Content: Lorraine Mazerolle, Laura Bedford

• Systematic review methods: Kerrie Mengersen, Jacqueline Davis and Angela Higginson

• Statistical analysis: Jacqueline Davis, Kerrie Mengersen and Angela Higginson

• Information retrieval: Jacqueline Davis, Jenna Thompson, Adele Somerville and Kathryn Ham

Thanks go to the review Advisory Group for their feedback and guidance.

PRELIMINARY TIMEFRAME FOR REVIEW

Submission of protocol	August 2012
Revision and approval of protocol	August 2012
Search for published and unpublished studies	November-December 2011
Relevance assessments and coding	January-February 2012
Statistical analysis	February 2012
Initial results available for presentation	February 2012
Preparation of report	September 2012
Submission of completed report	September 2012

This review is conducted as part of a larger project that includes a systematic review of justice system interventions targeting violent crime in developing countries, funded from the Global Development Network via 3ie's Open Window Round 3 (SR3/1277).

Consequently, many of the tasks listed have been completed. However, we will revise all work in accordance with feedback received on this title registration.

REFERENCES

Akpokodje, J., Bowles, R., & Tigere, E. (2002). *Evidence-based approaches to crime prevention in developing countries – A scoping review of the literature.* York, UK: Centre for Criminal Justice Economics and Psychology, University of York.

Bayley, D.H. (1994). *Police for the future.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brogden, M. (2002). Implanting community policing in South Africa: A failure of history, of context, and of theory. *Liverpool Law Review, 24*(3), 157–179.

Eijkman, Q. (2006). To be held accountable: Police accountability in Costa Rica. *Police Practice and Research, 7*(5), 411–430.

Frühling, H., & Cancina, A. (2005). *Community and problem-solving policing.* Washington, DC: The World Bank.

Goldsmith, A., & Dinnen, S. (2007). Transnational police building: Critical lessons from Timor-Leste and Solomon Islands. *Third World Quarterly, 28*(6), 1091–1109.

Goldsmith, A., & Harris, V. (2010). Police-military cooperation in foreign interventions: Timor-Leste and the Solomon Islands. In F. Lemieux (Ed.), *International police cooperation: Emerging issues, theory and practice* (pp. 221–237). Cullompton, UK: Willan.

Hofman, K., Primack, A., Keusch, G., & Hrynkow, S. (2005). Addressing the growing burden of trauma and injury in low- and middle-income countries. *American Journal of Public Health, 95*(1), 13–17.

Kelling, G., & Moore, M. (1988). From political to reform to community: The evolving strategy of police. In J. R. Greene & S. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality* (pp. 3–25). New York: Praeger.

Liebling, H., & Kiziri-Mayengo, R. (2002). The psychological effects of gender-based violence following armed conflict in Luwero district, Uganda. *Feminism & Psychology, 12*(4), 553–560.

Morrison, A., Ellsberg, M., & Bott, S. (2007). Addressing gender-based violence: A critical review of interventions. *The World Bank Observer, 22*(1), 25–51.

Seedat, M., Van Niekerk, A. , Jewkes, R., Suffla, S., & Ratele, K. (2009). Violence and injuries in South Africa: Prioritising an agenda for prevention. *Lancet, 374*, 1011–1022.

Sherman, L. W., & Eck, J. E. (2002). Policing for crime prevention. In L. W. Sherman, D. P. Farrington, B. C. Welsh, & D. L. MacKenzie (Eds.), *Evidence-based crime prevention* (pp. 295–329)*.* London: Routledge.

Skogan, W., & Hartnett, S. (1997). *Community policing, Chicago style.* New York: Oxford University Press.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2007). *Crime and development in Central America: Caught in the crossfire.* Vienna: Author.

United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and Latin America and the Caribbean Region of the World Bank. (2007). *Crime, violence, and development: Trends, costs, and policy options in the Caribbean.* A joint report by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the Latin America and the Caribbean Region of the World Bank.

Weisburd, D., & Braga, A. (2006). Introduction: Understanding police innovation. In D. Weisburd & A. Braga (Eds.), *Police innovation: Contrasting perspectives* (pp. 225–244). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weisburd, D., Bennett, T., Gill, C. E. , & Telep, C. W. (2012). Title registration for a review proposal: Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase legitimacy and citizen satisfaction in neighborhoods. *The Campbell Collaboration Library of Systematic Reviews.* Retrieved from http://campbellcollaboration.org/lib/download/1879/

Weisburd, D., & Eck, J. E. (2004). What can police do to reduce crime, disorder, and fear? *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 593*(1), 42–65.

Willman, A., & Makisaka, M. (2010). *Interpersonal violence prevention: A review of the evidence and emerging lessons.* World development report 2011. Background Paper. Conflict, Crime and Violence Team, World Bank. Retrieved from http://wdr2011.worldbank.org/interpersonal-violence-prevention

World Health Organization. (2002a). *The world health report 2002: Reducing risks, promoting healthy life.* Geneva: World Health Organization. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/whr/2002/en

World Health Organization (2002b) *World report on violence and health.* Geneva: World Health Organization. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/violence_injury_prevention/violence/world_report/en/