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Law enforcement in England and the United States are facing unique challenges. Racial inequality creates complex social problems that are not totally understood by either the police or the public they serve. The needs of marginalized communities are being met with unique responses from both countries that need to be analyzed for their impact especially on public opinion. Additionally, lack of scholarly work discussing local-level law enforcement such as Sheriff’s departments in America and rural officers in England is creating a hole in academic understanding of the entire law enforcement picture. The public’s perception of professionalism and crime safety in rural areas is not well explored.

The work of Castles (1992) provides a definition of police racism as: the process whereby police authorities stigmatize, harass, criminalize or otherwise discriminate against certain groups on the basis of phenotypical and cultural markers, or natural origins through the use of their special powers” (Yesufu, 2013, p. 282).

Issues surrounding race in policing are difficult but important to discuss. These issues present challenges to police, the citizens they serve, and governments constantly throughout the world. Social unrest, crime, and trust in the state are all undermined by issues of racial inequality. This paper examine scholarly literature that discusses histories of overt racism in England and America, such as chattel slavery and codified segregation. The social impact of these issues will be discussed to provide context for the current state of the relationship between law enforcement and minorities in America and England. This section will emphasize the civil rights era of America and will examine whether England had an equivalent movement. The presence of the modern social justice movement “Black Lives Matter” will be compared between America and England.
America’s sheriff’s departments provide a unique approach to non-municipal policing rooted in historical precedent. The history and modern form of this organization will be examined in America, where it has grown more powerful, and England, where it has been replaced by a similar and farther-reaching program of Police Crime Commissioners. The development of PCC’s will be traced, and their impact analyzed; the similarities between PCC’s and Sheriffs will also be discussed.

The methods used to empirically compare and analyze policing in England and America will then be explained. Public opinion data for both countries has been collected from both private and government-ordained surveys, which will be examined and explained to provide a picture of how the public is reacting to policy changes in England and America.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Foreword – Why local policing and race relations?

Rural districts are underrepresented in scholarly research on policing, which focuses primarily on municipal districts (Reisig & Correira, 1997). The problems presented by rural crime and community-police relationships are much different from those on cities and campuses (Fraser, 2018a). Rural policing also represents the oldest, clearest form of policing by consent in America, which England has recently begun to learn from (Loveday, 2018). The problems facing community policing of minority communities in cities are more well-researched and understood than those of rural communities. If problems of comparable scale and potential for harm to those in cities exist in rural areas in America and England, both police and communities would benefit from a better understanding of these issues. What can each country learn from the other that would benefit their systems of rural policing, community policing, and minority-police relationships?

Bias in policing is not a straightforward concept. Yesufu (2013) explained why holding behavioral attitudes based on race is harmful to police work and society. The most basic form of racism is prejudice, which is a negative set of beliefs, typically generalizations, held about a group that will influence an individual’s actions regarding this group. If the police are prejudiced, this negatively impacts community relations through targeted harassment of these groups, creating hostile backlash (Yesufu, 2013). Police may also practice stereotyping and, at
the highest level, institutional racism; stereotyping is a process of increasingly hateful and negative generalizations which allows people to justify discriminatory actions, while institutional racism involves codified practices of unequal treatment and discrimination. Officers or departments holding these views are not likely to provide service of equal quality and professionalism to all members of the public they serve (Yesufu, 2013).

By examining scholarly research on race relations, rural policing, and local policing in America and England, and comparing this research with data on crime and public satisfaction, the effectiveness of police activity in the areas of minority-community-police relationships can be qualitatively compared. Based on performance excellence and deficiency between the two countries, suggestions for improvement based on historical performance, statistical trends, and policy analysis will then be offered.

The Police in America

The office of sheriff.

Originating in England, the duties and powers of the office of sheriff were carried over to America with some key differences. According to Kopel (2015), sheriffs in England used to be elected but were forced to adopt appointments following the Norman conquest of England. America maintained the tradition of elected Sheriffs and emphasized pursuit and apprehension of criminals as a primary duty, but otherwise did not differ from the historical English Sheriff’s Office.

Today, American Sheriffs have jurisdiction over non-municipal, non-campus areas within the confines of their county (Fraser, 2018a). This typically results in Sheriffs dealing with
isolated, rural residents of varying income and education levels. Sheriff’s patrol large swathes of sparsely populated territory and generally do not have quick access to backup. The Sheriff is still an elected position (Hoefel & Singer, 2016) but no longer takes his salary from fees and taxes (Fraser, 2018a). A Sheriff’s power and duties may be added to, but not cut by, the legislative body of their state. The Sheriff in England has become a completely ceremonial office, reduced to holding annual dinners for local officials (Kopel, 2015).

The Sheriff’s Office holds the unique historical power of *posse comitatus* (Kopel, 2015). American citizens’ right to bear arms is a major foundation for this power. Like the military draft, a Sheriff may call any person he chooses to serve on his “posse.” Since the Sheriff is civilly liable for anything these posse members do, and Sheriff’s office are generally well-staffed, this power is rarely used. Standing posses exist to help Sheriffs with routine events such as festivals, and emergency rescue and crisis operations such as wildfires and floods; the Colorado Mounted Rangers is an example of such a group. Standing posses must maintain fitness, training, and equipment standards. Posses have successfully assisted during numerous civil emergencies and manhunts, including for serial killer Ted Bundy (Kopel, 2015).

**Historical context – slavery and race.**

The history of law enforcement in America is colored by violent and inequitable racial relations (Adegbile, 2017; McGoldrick, 2001). America’s first laws segregating black people from white people were passed in the 1720s and affected both black slaves and free black people. Police were able to arrest, detain, and punish black people for the simplest of perceived infractions, such as “talking back” to a white person (McGoldrick, 2001). America’s previous
heavy reliance on slavery, combined with rapid expansion, industrialization, and population
growth, is partially responsible for the state of race relations in the country today.

Prior to and immediately after the Civil War, black people in America had few rights. McGoldrick (2001) describes life in New Orleans for both slaves and free black people. Slaves were owned by whites and certain free blacks alike. Free black people were not equal, in policy or practice, to white people, and police were tasked with enforcing the laws that maintained this status quo (McGoldrick, 2001). Municipal police were primarily responsible for enforcing segregation and social regulations, while Sheriffs organized *posses* to hunt down escaped slaves. The movements of both slaves and free black people were heavily regulated; slaves had to possess specific passes written by their owners, and free blacks were subject to the exact same punishments as slaves, such as flogging. In cases of abuse, slaves could not testify against their owners, but could only show fresh, obvious physical wounding as evidence of abuse; even if their owners were convicted, the slave would be sold off to a possibly distant owner, and their owner would face no punishment, pocketing the sale’s proceeds (McGoldrick, 2001). The consequences of law enforcement’s involvement with slavery are still felt by minority communities today. These feelings of resentment and historical violence are highly difficult for police and minority communities to resolve.

Serbulo and Gibson (2013) described race relations between police and black communities between 1964 and 1985, shortly after the civil rights movement, in Portland, Oregon. Arrestees in this city were 45% black, despite only comprising 5% of the total population; similar disproportionalities were common throughout the country. Black communities viewed many police forces with reasonable fear and distrust; police attitudes in
some parts of America ranged from callous indifference to antipathy. Occurring mostly in the South from 1882 to 1968 (NAACP, 2018), police sometimes allowed or facilitated lynchings. More than 4,000 people are estimated to have been lynched during this time, 72.7% of whom were black (NAACP, 2018). Lynchings were frequently not recorded, so detailed data is not readily available (NAACP, 2018; Richardson, 2017).

Subtle violence was also practiced against black communities. Serbulo and Gibson (2013) described how police in the North would refuse to enforce or effectively patrol black communities, allowing crime to go unchecked there. White officers working in black neighborhoods were not residents, giving rise to the idea of the police as an “occupying army” or “colonial force,” though the colonial framework view of race relations was viewed as extreme due to its use by black nationalists. Officers were seldom held responsible for unjust killings of minorities during this time, as police unions sued plaintiffs seeking litigation against officers and ensured officers fired resulting from internal affairs investigations were easily rehired (Serbulo & Gibson, 2013).

Black communities addressed the issue of segregation through the civil rights movement, taking place throughout 1954 to 1965. Clayton (2018) described the movement then and compares it to social justice movements now. Blacks faced not only violent injustice such as lynching, but also systematic oppression through segregation laws, known as “Jim Crow” laws. The civil rights movement began in earnest following the death of Emmett Till in 1955 (Clayton, 2018; NAACP, 2018; Richardson, 2017). Young students formed the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in 1960 and began non-violent protest and civil disobedience, their actions formed with two guiding principles: disruption of “business as usual,” and “respectability.
politics.” These men, and sometimes women, would dress their best, take their textbooks to the whites-only section of diners, and sit quietly, enduring any abuse thrown at them without saying a word in reply (Clayton, 2018). Dr. King’s March on Washington had thousands of participants and was watched closely by both the police and military but succeeded without any recorded violence due to self-policing, self-sufficiency, and fervent belief in non-violent civil disobedience (Fraser, 2018b). Despite use of dogs, firehoses, and beatings by police, participants in the civil rights movement did not fight back or call for violence against police (Clayton, 2018).

Current movements for racial justice in America are dominated by the Black Lives Matter movement, or BLM (Clayton, 2018). The movement was founded by Alicia Garza and Opal Tometi, and gained popularity in the mainstream media following their response to the shooting of Michael Brown by officer Darren Wilson in 2014. Like the earlier Civil Rights Movement, BLM rallies around the deaths of black men and protests publicly, generally peacefully; however, calls for violence and hazardous public disruption are more common in BLM than movements such as Dr. King’s (Clayton, 2018). Black Lives Matter protesters have been recorded linking arms on public highways to block traffic, chanting violent rhetoric calling for deaths of police (Clayton, 2018; Salter, 2017; Schwebke, 2016; Tuttle, 2016) and calling to “burn everything down” (Clayton, 2018, p.458). Protests by the group have sometimes resulted in riots, as in Ferguson, Missouri and Baltimore, Maryland (Clayton, 2018). Debate exists over whether these words and actions can be attributed to the movement due to its decentralized leadership structure (Clayton, 2018).
The group’s main goals focus around reforming police practices such as “militarization” and use of force and putting communities in supervisory positions over police forces (Campaign Zero, 2018). The movement describes itself as “queer affirming” with emphasis on representation for black women and transgender people (Clayton, 2018; Design Action Collective, 2018). BLM was criticized in its infancy for lacking goals and direction, which it later developed. Members also faced criticism for commandeering the stage at presidential campaign rallies and silencing the candidates, as occurred at a Bernie Sanders rally in August 2015 (Clayton, 2018).

**Community policing.**

The actions of police are watched intently by citizens, politicians, the media, and federal oversight agencies such as the Department of Justice. Adegbile (2017) explained the careful balancing act police departments perform to fulfill the goals of consent decrees and legislation designed to lead departments towards community policing. These goals are formed through a combination input from the community, state and federal legislatures, and police officials (Adegbile, 2017; Campaign Zero, 2018; Clayton, 2018; Kimbrough, 2016).

Departments typically want their officers to adopt the “guardian mindset” instead of the “warrior mindset” (Adegbile, 2017).” The guardian mindset recognizes the symbiotic relationship between police and the policed; law enforcement are tasked with protecting citizens, and citizens must provide information and assistance to officers when they can. Officers need to foster good relationships within their communities to build trust and mutual respect (Adegbile, 2017). This mindset is adapted from guidelines laid out in 1829 by Sir Robert Peele during the formation of England’s police force, which state essentially that police power is derived from public consent.
and approval. Many experienced officers struggle with the “warrior mindset,” focusing on their equipment, tactical training, and elevated status of authority instead of their duty to protect and serve the community. (Adegbile, 2017; Adegbile, 2017). They may pride themselves on being different from the civilian population and emphasize aspects of their occupation and personality that bear military aspects (Fraser, 2018b). Actions taken under the warrior mindset contribute to the perception of police officers as an occupying army, which can aggravate preexisting issues between police and communities (Adegbile, 2017; Serbulo & Gibson, 2013).

Although police departments have tended previously to fight community policing initiatives, they have slowly recognized the mutual benefits garnered by closer police-community relations (Adegbile, 2017). Officers sometimes mistakenly perceived community-policing as “catering to public opinion,” when its truest foundation lies in offering impartial service, striking a balance between ensuring liberty and enforcing the law (Adegbile, 2017). Change in a police department is often led by the chief’s example; to encourage his officers to shed the detrimental “warrior mindset,” San Antonio police chief William McManus accepted every invitation to community functions that he received. Community meetings allow police to build relationships and share information within the community they serve (Kimbrough, 2016).

Two primary sources of friction between police and minority communities come from general profiling and use-of-force, especially lethal shootings. Frequent “unjustified” stops of racial minorities contributes to the idea of police as foreign, unfriendly, and hostile, leading to a perception among many minority communities of occupation, colonization, or invasion (Adegbile, 2017; Serbulo & Gibson, 2013). President Obama’s Task Force on Twenty-first Century Policing stated that “… trust between law enforcement and the people they protect and
serve is essential in a democracy (Adegbile, 2017, p.2228)." Shane (2018) states that public issues with use of force arise primarily through a “knowledge gap,” where lack of data contributes to an incomplete picture of nationwide use of force. Even though 90% of use-of-force incidents involve an armed subject, the public generally blames police shootings on distant systemic issues instead of proximal causes. (Shane, 2018).

Kimbrough (2016) continued to describe the benefits and structure of community policing. The commonly accepted goals of contemporary community policing were laid out by the President’s Task Force on 21st Century Policing:


Implementation of community policing has had promising results. In certain cities, it has led to falling crime rates and halved youth arrests over a one-year period (Kimbrough, 2016).

Techniques of community policing vary, but goals are generally the same: trust must be built between the community and police organization, which must be achieved through listening and acting (Kimbrough, 2016). Seeing police on patrol may not be enough; police emphasize interaction, conversation, genuine concern, and meaningful action within the communities they serve. Communities are expected to participate in meetings and surveys given by their police and work with law enforcement to solve problems in their own communities. Police are expected to respond to the voice of the community and police unions involving changes in policies and training, practice transparency in policies and procedures, and involve the community in recruiting. Finally, local governments are expected to allocate resources to community efforts...
Rural Law Enforcement

and provide opportunities for community members to be heard through surveys and meetings. (Kimbrough, 2016).

Kimbrough (2016) described how Fargo, North Dakota has implemented highly progressive policies that align with the Task Force’s suggestions. A “cultural liaison” officer interacts with immigrants and refugees, helping them feel welcome while learning valuable information about their culture. “Community trust officers” interact with youth and other underserved populations. Further, this town has implemented yearly health checks for officers, as weight gain and related problems increase in likelihood for seasoned patrol officers (Kimbrough, 2016). Citizens develop a deeper knowledge of police culture and challenges after implementation of community policing strategies, which helps to increase police-community trust. Implementation of community policing is frequently challenged by officers who view it as “not their job (Kimbrough, 2016).”

The Police in England

Historical context – the sheriff and militia.

American law enforcement owes much to English precedent, and can trace its roots back to England’s Sheriffs. Kopel (2015) describes the immense power and vast responsibilities this office had. Dating back to before 1000 A.D., sheriffs were the “Guardians of the County,” overseeing not only law and order in their domain but taking command of armies to thwart invasion and rebellion. The most substantial defending force against William the Conqueror in 1066 was King Harold’s Sheriffs. Sheriffs executed royal writs and were responsible for investigating all suspicious deaths. Though he received no salary, the Sheriff could charge fees in his county for all services rendered (Kopel, 2015).
After defeating the first invasion by Danish Forces, Alfred the Great formed the English militia, arming and training all free men for the possibility of another Danish invasion (Kopel, 2015). This militia gives critical precedence to the 2nd Amendment found in the United States’ Bill of Rights; depending upon interpretation, this amendment gives the right to bear arms either to “the people” or “a well-regulated militia.” The importance of this law to American people has bolstered the trust between citizens and rural officers, allowing for these deputies to rely on citizens for information and even armed assistance at times of crises through the powerful but rarely-used power of posse comitatus (Kopel, 2015).

**Historical race relations.**

Holdaway (1998) examined historical racial perspectives of police and society in England. During the mid-20th century, immigration from Asia and the Caribbean to England increased; these migrants were not readily accepted by the labor market, and had difficulty moving out of the high-crime areas they generally settled in. From 1950 until the 1970s, hate crimes and inadequate minority-police communications abounded. Neither the public nor police were concerned about police-race relations, as police believed that after migrants assimilated, hate crimes against them would decrease (Holdaway, 1998). It was initially believed that educating migrants about police would improve race relations, which placed an undue burden of conformity on these groups (Holdaway, 1998). Police pursued this by recruiting from migrant groups, volunteering to work with young students, making changes in police training, and appointing community liaison officers (Holdaway, 1998), now known as police community support officers (Hill, 2010). In 1972, a “cultural gap” was recognized between police and
minority groups, which brought attention to the need for training and specialized community relations departments, so police could continue to operate by public consent (Holdaway, 1998). “Middle rank” and degree-holding officers were appointed to these community relations departments. These departments contributed greatly to the modern image of professionalism among British police (Holdaway, 1998).

These strategies were tainted by the police’s perception of a minority “problem” instead of minority “communities” (Holdaway, 1998; Yesufu, 2013). Police viewed these groups as homogenous, and desired to assimilate immigrants rather than alter their strategies to suit the unique needs of these communities. The prevalence of this perspective led immigrant populations to reciprocally view police as homogenous, creating an “us against them” perspective. Finally, extensive specialization caused most line officers to view any minority-relations problems as solely the responsibility of community officers, allowing them to justify lack of action to meet these communities’ needs (Holdaway, 1998).

The Race Relations Act of 1976 addressed racial bias in the police force and made it illegal to “treat any person less favorably” based on race (Yesufu, 2013). The act defined racism based on its components and how it is exercised, separating racism into the categories of direct or indirect discrimination. This act is important because of its treatment of indirect discrimination; while its provisions for direct discrimination made sure the day-to-day operations of officers could not practice overt prejudice, prohibition of indirect discrimination ensured that the official policies that applied disproportionately to minority groups, such as height requirements, could no longer be practiced (Yesufu, 2013).
In 1978, the Institute on Race Relations found fundamental differences between how white and black people were policed, stating definitively that racialized ideals were driving these inequalities, and not a lack of cultural understanding as previously believed (Holdaway, 1998). Problems included the association of blacks with crime, treatment of black people at police stations, and overpolicing of events attended by black people. Extensive social inequality, labor market immobility, and institutional racism resulted in riots in 1981, fostering a “folk history of injustice” in England’s black communities.

The Home Office established a commission to examine training issues affecting race relations in 1983, which recommended that race issues be integrated into all parts of the entire training curriculum (Holdaway, 1998). The commission stated that all officers, even rural officers who do not regularly interact with minorities, must receive training in community and race relations, addressing both perceptions and behavior. Continual training was recommended to teach police about institutional racism (Holdaway, 1998).

The Home Office accepted these recommendations and established Race Awareness Training in 1984. It became clear that officers were suspicious and ill-informed of the training’s purpose and doubted its relevancy to patrol work. Training at the national level was finally carried out in 1993 (Holdaway, 1998).

Current race relations.

Yesufu (2013) claims a “problematic” relationship still exists between black Londoners and police. Black and middle-eastern (BME) people in the UK are six to seven times more likely to be subject to stop-and-search. Black people are frequently generalized and associated with the “criminal classes” frequently (Holdaway, 1998; Yesufu, 2013).
Prejudice in the British police is likely not only a result of occupational “canteen” culture, but also pre-existing beliefs held by the groups from which police are generally recruited (Yesufu, 2013). Racism in policing is not unique but is taken from the wider British society; the key difference is that police have the power to do real harm if they act based on prejudice or racism. Her Majesty’s Inspectorate of Constabulary recognized the problem of institutional racism in 1997, stating the racially charged language of officers, disproportionate stop-and-search by police, and “worrying” lack of intervention by supervisory officers (Yesufu, 2013). At street-level, officers who fail to follow stop-and-search procedures by making stops based on race are “inadequately disciplined”. Statistics for racial bias in stop-and-search are disturbing. In 2007/08, 128.8 black people were stopped per every 1,000 residents in England, while only 16.9 white people were stopped (Yesufu, 2013).

Managerial officers sometimes hold different perceptions between “settled” communities of residents that have been in the UK for multiple generations, and “new” communities of first-generation residents. Prior’s (2008) study outlined key perceptual differences between new and “settled” communities. For example, minority communities may accept youth loitering and be more reluctant to complain to or contact police about crime; unwillingness or “inability” to make complaints was more prevalent among Asian communities (Prior, 2008). New communities of different ethnicities interacting with each other bears the potential for conflict, as when young Polish men drink and party loudly in predominantly Muslim neighborhoods (Prior, 2008). Young Somali men are more aggressive towards outside groups, and Romanian immigrants practice organized minor crime. These behavioral tendencies result from a combination of “imported” behaviors from country of origin, and lack of understanding of prevailing societal norms (Prior, 2008).
Rural and local police.

As previously stated, England’s countryside and villages are not policed by the Sheriff any longer (Kopel, 2015). Instead, constables are assigned to these districts in the same way as cities and towns. England’s police force is highly centralized, with little individual differences between constabularies. However, as of 2012, England began electing Police and Crime Commissioners in its 42 constabulary districts, with the power to set the policy agenda and unique departmental policies (Bradford & Quinton, 2014; Loveday, 2018 Wells, 2018). The introduction of PCCs was launched with a twofold purpose: reducing constable autonomy and decreasing centralization. As a result, departments have been unchained from statistical goals that decrease autonomy and limit police-community interaction. The previous supervisory role of Her Majesty’s Chief Inspector of Constabulary (HMCIC) has been reduced to an advisory position. In addition to their initial responsibilities of establishing police and crime plans, PCCs have recently had their power expanded to oversee fire and rescue services (Loveday, 2018).

PCC elections were initially controversial when the Home Office failed to provide sufficient candidate information to the citizens electing them (Loveday, 2018). PCCs’ duty of appointing chief constables came under scrutiny as well due to vast media coverage of these appointments; the media was not given specific information on criteria for these appointments, casting public doubt on the accountability of PCCs. Further doubt on accountability was fostered by the conditions for elections of PCCs; anybody can run, and elected candidate receives no training following election (Loveday, 2018). The primary body for scrutinizing PCC policy is the Police and Crime Panel, or PCPs, which are structurally weak and have few powers, which Loveday (2018) argues makes them “irrelevant.”
PCCs pursue police-community relationships by developing crime plans that closely involve their local community safety partnerships (CSPs) (Loveday, 2018). PCCs must ask the public what it wants achieved through their police and crime plans and pursue these goals. Individual PCCs can create unique initiatives to increase public participation such as interaction on social media and civilian complaint boards. PCCs have also made significant improvements through crime plans, with one district virtually eliminating stop-and-search, and another implementing “night-time economy” crime plans to protect women that would later become nationally mandated (Loveday, 2018).

A final catalyst for the introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners came after the public criticism of prolonged police operations characterized by waste, concealment, and deception of the public, such as the Hillsborough Football Stadium incident, in which all officers present were instructed to rewrite their accounts of the incident to place responsibility on a football club (Loveday, 2018). The most important example is Operation Conifer, in which police spent 1.5 million GBP to investigate Satanic ritual abuse and pedophilia charges against former Prime Minister David Heath. This costly operation produced no results after a year of poorly conducted investigations. PCCs are empowered to combat frivolous and wasteful incidents such as these (Loveday, 2018).
Current operations.

As of 2010, the police force in England and Wales consisted of over 140,000 employees, with an annual budget of 13 billion pounds (Barton & Beynon, 2012). The police are struggling to cut costs while maintaining public faith and have been instituting measures for community policing since 2008, mainly by reporting if they have “improved levels of public confidence.” Several surveys assess public opinion annually, mainly the British Crime Survey, but also surveys sponsored by the police themselves. These surveys are reported to provide more consistent, applicable data than those given in the United States. The public in England and Wales typically looks towards rates of arrest and conviction of offenders to guide their opinions on police. Crime across most areas has been in steady decline, but possible economic crises in England’s future could drive up unemployment and crime (Barton & Beynon, 2012).

Hill (2010) describes the operations and public perception of community policing in England. The Labor government achieved power in 1997 and instituted significant reforms in public health and services. At this time, England had been practicing “reassurance policing,” which would later be rebranded into Neighborhood Policing Programs and Teams. Satisfaction with foot patrol in England was as low as 20% in 1999-2000. Recognizing this, the Home Office
created the Police Reform Act of 2002, which created Community Support Officers, non-
unsworn (equivalent in America of non-sworn) personnel designed to deter crime and increase
public perception of police presence. CSO’s were renamed Police Community Support Officers
with the Serious and Organized Crime Act of 2005, in addition to receiving more powers and
support (Hill, 2010).

Since England’s police are currently working to reduce their budget while maintaining
effectiveness (Barton & Beynon, 2012), a key goal of community policing is reducing the
resources used by warranted officers (Hill, 2010; Jones & Foster, 2010). Community police
officers work to achieve this by teaching and supporting community efforts at self-policing.
Police Community Support Officers increase the public’s trust in the police, encouraging them to
report crimes and cooperate with law enforcement. Prior to the introduction of community
policing, citizens had little casual interaction with the police; likewise, police were “enslaved” to
crime targets and statistics, measuring their impact in numbers and charts (Jones & Foster,
2010). Reliance on numbers limits interpersonal interaction, which may contribute to a negative
personal image police hold of themselves (Bradford et al., 2014).

PCSOs lack powers of arrest and are unarmed. English communities expressed
dissatisfaction with them according to Foster and Jones (2010). According to the research, they
examined, PCSOs did not take crime reports. Instead, they directed victims to a non-emergency
line, where they typically waited 45 minutes for a response. PCSOs were perceived to hold
“exclusionary” views of minority communities and referred their concerns to Minority and
Ethnic Liaison Officers. Despite this, certain marginalized groups preferred speaking to PCSOs
over warranted officers, as standard police were viewed as “uninterested” in citizens’ home life and daily struggles (Foster & Jones, 2010).

Issues impacting success of community policing of comes from lack of knowledge and inadequate relationships (Prior, 2008). Increased dialogue between PCSOs and the communities they serve is integral to filling these needs; however, this rapport is often used as a means of intelligence-gathering for crime prevention, instead of genuine interest in bettering relationships. While ASB units place top priority on hate incidents, different ASB units define hate crime differently, resulting in unequal treatment across communities.

PCSOs also tasked their communities with handling problems they were not equipped to solve. Foster & Jones (2010) surveyed communities and worked to solve the problems they found. PCSOs held meetings that were inconvenient and ineffective, generally prioritizing the problems of vocal minorities or even single individuals. Following the introduction of a new Inspector and Sergeant in these communities, however, public presence was increased, leading to more confidence and better police-community relationships; they even managed to help antisocial persons aid the community in unique ways, and dealt with perpetrators of repeated racist harassment. In this community, positive opinions of the police’s work increased from 16% to 44% of surveyed respondents after three years of impactful changes (Foster & Jones, 2010).

Indications

Analysis of scholarly literature on the topics of police-community relationships and rural policing reveals a recent trend towards similarity between England and the United States. The system of Police and Crime Commissioners implemented by England resembles the United States’ Sheriffs, in that both involve high degrees of autonomy and enable significant policy goal
difference between districts and departments. PCC’s were formed in response to intense waste of resources on dead-end investigations. Literature has also indicated similar methods of community relations among rural and small-town departments in the form of outreach and communication by non-PCSOS, high-ranking staff such as inspectors and police chiefs in England, and police chiefs and sheriffs in America. America lacks an equivalent of Police Community Support Officers, instead relying on every officer in a department to support the goals of community policing; this dissimilarity raises a question of which system is better: placing the responsibility of community relationships on individual officers, or on designated personnel?

Race relations developed differently within England and America. The latter’s history of chattel slavery and enforced segregation has led to long-standing tension between minority communities and police, while the former’s unsuccessful integration efforts of the 20th century engendered a similar police-minority antipathy. Both countries’ minority populations are seeing increased representation and consideration for their needs within their respective police forces, and the outspoken activist group Black Lives Matter is now present in both England and the United States. What problems can police help minority communities solve? Are police doing enough to help underrepresented communities?
Chapter 3: Analysis Plan

This chapter will explain the data used to compare the effectiveness of previously outlined policies in America and England, as well as the plan for policy analysis. First, this paper’s research design will be explained. Next, the reasons and plan for the topics chosen for analysis will be explained. This chapter will conclude by explaining what quantitative survey data was collected, and how it was analyzed, to draw comparisons in the following results and discussion chapter.

Research Design

To compare the efficacy of law enforcement within England and America, a comparison of the previously analyzed policies, historical contexts, and practices must be performed. This multifaceted analysis will focus primarily on the actions and changes prescribed by the chosen policies. It will also describe the pervasiveness and reception of the chosen policies, as well as the department or agency responsible for overseeing its implementation or compliance. Finally, the direct consequences of the chosen policies will be examined through analysis of literature and public satisfaction reports.

Police analysis plan – rural and local policing.

A glaring difference between American and English policing is the how each country polices its countryside and approaches the democratic process in policing. England and America’s development of non-municipal (rural) law enforcement entities will be explained, including the key points of divergence between the two. The specific differences in duties and powers will be explained through use of scholarly articles and government information sites. The
difference between the powers and responsibilities of the Sheriff and Police Crime Commissioners will also be explained. Finally, public satisfaction data on the topic of community and rural law-enforcement will be compared to determine which country’s systems and policies are more effective.

With differences and similarities between America and England properly explained and categorized, the discussion chapter will suggest changes that each country’s law enforcement could make based on available data. These suggestions will only be made for areas thoroughly discussed and compared throughout this paper and will consider relevant key differences. Suggestions for further research on issues arising from the analyzed practices will be offered as well.

**Historical and policy analysis – race issues.**

The context of racial issues between America and England is similar. Key differences will be highlighted to illustrate the problems associated with race that may differ from either country, and how their respective law enforcement approaches them. Data for hate crimes is not readily comparable between England and the United States because of the crucial differences in how either country measures hate crimes; in England, hate crimes consist of any action taken against somebody where the victim “feels” it was motivated by an identifying factor such as race, gender, sex, etc. (Home Office, 2018; ONS, 2018) whereas in America, a specific crime is required to constitute a hate crime (UCR, 2018).

**Data.**
The data necessary to draw conclusions and make suggestions based on this research must describe public opinion taken from a range of approximately the last 20 years. Historical crime and public satisfaction does not provide the best information for this paper’s purpose of comparing American and English police forces and will not be examined in depth. Data for public opinion will be collected from scholarly research articles that have performed and analyzed reliable surveys of target populations, asking questions relevant to perception of police. For England, public opinion data will be supplemented through the Office for National Statistics.

Once this data has been gathered and examined, conclusions concerning policy effectiveness will be drawn by comparing policy information with crime and public satisfaction data. Based on the degree of this correlation, it will be determined which country’s police policies and tactics are more effective, and suggestions for improving performance will be offered.
Chapter 4: Policy Analysis and Discussion

Examination of the historical context and modern realities of local level policing, racial issues, and other relevant policies in England and the United States yields an ample backdrop for discussion when compared with reliable statistical data. Survey and crime data for both the United States and England shows the impact years of racial turmoil have had on both countries and allows for the effectiveness of both countries’ police forces in this area to be examined; specifically, procedures regarding hate crime illustrate vast differences in either country’s approach. Survey data on public opinion provides the best context in which to analyze the performance of a country’s community policing initiatives and provides an adequate backdrop for the evaluation of local and rural police. After discussion of data, the key differences in both historical pathways and modern policy for England and the United States will be discussed.

Public Opinion

Reisig & Correira (1997) conducted a survey of approximately 2,000 United States residents, with respondents asked about a specific jurisdiction of police, with 1,134 city, 484 county, and 892 state responses. They were asked to evaluate the performance of their specific police agency based on questions pertaining to equal treatment of all citizens, courteousness of officers, and the quality of service. Responses were coded into categories of “favorable evaluation” and “less favorable evaluation.” Independent variables were divided into the relevant categories of race/ethnicity, age, gender, and instances of voluntary contact (community meetings, calls for service) and non-voluntary contact (traffic citations) (Reisig & Correira, 1997).
As expected, they found some positive correlations between age and public opinion. Women were found to report less favorable evaluations than men, especially from state level police. Community policing initiatives have led to less unfavorable evaluations by ethnic minorities; this is true for departments nationwide. County and state level evaluations found no difference in opinion between white and non-whites; researchers believe this is due to other factors such as neighborhood culture being non-applicable at these levels (Reisig & Correira, 1997).

Individuals seldom initiate contact with state agencies, decreasing the likelihood of unfavorable evaluations, however, people are more likely to critically evaluate county and state agencies due to a higher chance of high volume contacts. Surprisingly, citizens receiving citations at the county and city level are not more likely to give negative feedback but may do so at the state level. This is possibly because citizens view traffic citations as a central duty of the state while associating criminal enforcement with local officials (Reisig & Correira, 1997).

Dukes, Portillos, and Miles (2009) describe the key factors that determine citizens’ opinion of police, which include victimization experiences, perception of crime safety, belief in the police’s ability to fight crime, and police response to calls for service. They also discuss a specific method of community policing used in Colorado Springs known as PASS, which is designed to encourage officers to pursue “flexible” strategies of policing, with an emphasis on citizen-police relationships (Dukes, Portillos, & Miles, 2009).

Over three years, these researchers examined 3,591 residents of Colorado Springs by phone and asked them about satisfaction with their city’s community policing strategies. They found that being or knowing a victim of crime decreased feelings of neighborhood safety, which
in turn may decrease confidence in officer presence, as well as increased expectations for police. It is important to note that many respondents do not directly blame police every time a crime occurs, but patterns of increasing crime tend to erode confidence and trust. Dukes et al. (2009) state that community policing must be bolstered with effective and visible crime prevention and response. They further conclude that increasing satisfaction with police response is not limited to shortening the time between call and arrival; officers should also spend more time per incident with the caller, and devote more time to solving the wider community issues surrounding these calls. According to the researchers, data indicated that respondents in Colorado Springs viewed police as more responsible for public order than crime prevention (Dukes et al., 2009).

In England, data from 2000-2007 reviewed in a study by Mawby (2007) found that rural residents had mixed feelings about their police. Rural residents of England and Wales tended to rate their police more favorable than urban residents, and reported less crime, but some residents still feel their police are less accessible than municipal officers. The 2004/05 British Crime Survey found that 51% of rural residents said their police were doing a good job, compared to 45% of inner city residents.

Mawby’s (2007) study is based on the Cornwall audits of 2001 and 2004, which distributed surveys inquiring on public opinion concerning perceptions of police and policing, efficacy of alternative crime reduction strategies, perceptions of crime and disorder, and anxiety related to crime safety. 56.8% of respondents reported not knowing any officer closely enough to talk to them by name, and over half of respondents reported difficulty in contacting police, likely due to substation closures. Roughly half reported that police were “known as people as well as officers,” and “are more approachable here than in cities,” but 2 in 5 respondents reported the
opposite, stating they were less approachable, while one third of respondents felt emergency response time was too great. Additionally, 42% of respondents said that police prioritized community participation over police work (Mawby, 2007).

Mawby (2007) interpreted this data as indicating general but underwhelming positive attitudes towards rural police, with 27.9% either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, compared to 24.5% as satisfied or very satisfied. The second Cornwall audit of 2004 reported different results: 2,082 respondents were asked about whether the police were doing “a good job” in their area. 38.6% had positive perceptions of police performance, with only 15.6% giving negative evaluations. Another 45.7% gave a response of “average.” Additionally, respondents were asked about the difficulty of contacting police by phone or in person: 38.7% of respondents reported telephone contact as difficult, compared to 24.3% responding it was easy. In contrast, 34.7% reported personal contact as easy, while 29% said it was difficult (Mawby, 2007).

Finally, respondents were asked what strategies would help prevent crime. Of those surveyed, 89.6% believed neighborhood watch would be effective, but less than 25% were found to participate in neighborhood watch. Respondents believed increased foot patrols would greatly reduce car crime, burglary, violence, and disorder (61.9%-75.9%) compared to a range of 36% to 46.8% believed reduction through car patrol. Respondents believed neighborhood watch would be highly effective at reducing burglary and showed little faith in private security across all crime categories (Mawby, 2007).

The Ipsos MORI (2017) online survey provides a broad view of satisfaction data with police, not focusing on rural data specifically. Of those surveyed, 16,685 residents of England and Wales responded. Roughly 25% of respondents to this online survey felt crime and antisocial
behavior were major problems in their local area, and 52% were satisfied with local policing, with residents of affluent neighborhoods more likely to report satisfaction. When asked about changes in police performance, 61% reported no change, while 20% reported it had gotten worse. When asked about visible uniformed presence, 39% were unsatisfied, compared to 25% satisfaction. Finally, three in five people who had contact with police in the past year were satisfied with this contact (Ipsos MORI, 2017).

Comparison of Current Operations

A key factor to understanding differences between public perception in England and America lies in centralization. Police in America have greater autonomy and discretion than those in England. Individual states set guidelines and minimum standards for both local and state level officers, but municipal, campus, and county departments may mandate more stringent standards, and pursue policies in ways unique from other departments. The best example of this is the Sheriff, the “most powerful person in the county.” Individual sheriffs have significant discretion to change departmental policies to suit the unique needs of their county (Fraser, 2018a).

In England, it has been historically easy for the public to view all police officers as homogenous: they wore nearly identical uniforms and underwent the same training programs nationwide. Changes made in 2012 counteracted these factors; Police and Crime Commissioners were introduced as elected officials tasked with governing their respective police districts, putting more control in the public’s hands and dispelling the idea that all British police are the same everywhere [Bradford & Quinton, 2014; Wells, 2018].
American police are even more decentralized (Fraser, 2018a). England’s only elected law enforcement officials, PCCs, are elected in 42 districts; in contrast, America’s Sheriffs are elected in every county, of which most states are big enough to have more than 42. The state sets training standards governing what topics must be taught, and how many hours of instruction must be received. For many officers, this training is received at certified community colleges through BLET, Basic Law Enforcement Training, but some are trained in specialized police academies, typical of large municipal departments (Fraser, 2018a.) In contrast, English police do not train prior to being hired, but spend two years as a “student officer,” where much of their training is accomplished (National Careers Service, 2018). It is difficult to conclude which method of training may result in more diversity in policy and tactics between England and America.

Rural policing.

England’s policies for rural and urban policing are not significantly different. As previously discussed, centralization has been the norm for England until 2011, when district-based, democratically elected officials known as Police and Crime Commissioners allowed different police districts to begin to become unique from each other (Bradford & Quinton, 2014; Loveday, 2018; Wells, 2018.). England is much smaller than the United States, both in geographical area and population count (ONS, 2017), which greatly impacts differences in policing and crime needs between each country.

Contrary to popular belief, rural officers in England are not generally more friendly and approachable than urban officers. Satisfaction with rural officers was only slightly higher than that of urban police, with more than half of surveyed residents reporting not knowing any
officers on name-basis (Mawby, 2007). This is likely due to the uniformity and centralization that reigned in England prior to the election of PCCs in 2012 (Bradford & Quinton, 2014).

American citizens, on the other hand, are more likely to report favorable interaction with rural and municipal police in comparison to state law enforcement (Reisig & Correira, 1997). A problematic difference lies in logistics; American Sheriffs typically have one or more dispatch centers per county (Fraser, 2018a) whereas rural callers in England may be routed to a dispatch center more than 100 miles away (Mawby, 2007). This distance may increase response time, which decreases the likelihood of satisfied police-community relations.

England’s PCCs are comparable to America’s Sheriffs in their roles, responsibilities, and powers, but important distinctions exist. The American Sheriff has existed since shortly after the country’s inception, and has consistently acted with great independence, setting all departmental policies within state and national guidelines (Fraser, 2018a; Kopel, 2015); PCCs have existed for less than a decade, and details about their oversight and powers are still being examined by the HMCIC in England (Loveday, 2018; Wells, 2018). Interestingly, PCCs have much more power and responsibilities than Sheriffs, as PCCs oversee much wider geographical areas encompassing more communities and citizens. PCCs also oversee emergency services outside of law enforcement (Loveday, 2018) in contrast to Sheriffs, who do not. Finally, PCCs are universally overseen by individual community review boards known as Police and Crime Panels (Loveday, 2018) whereas Sheriffs determine the level of community influence they allow on their policymaking decisions (Fraser, 2018a).

Community policing.
Community policing in America is typically begun from the top in most departments, with chiefs and Sheriffs setting an example for the intensity and how underserved communities should be approached. A key struggle is retraining current officers to perceive community-relations differently: first, to deemphasize the militaristic nature of policing, and then to accept that community-policing is an integral part of their job, just as much as crime-fighting. This second task may be very difficult in England; although police in England are not as outwardly militarized as American law enforcement, they are much more stratified concerning community policing, since this task is assigned to specialized PCSOs, and not patrol officers.

Public demand for police reform is becoming more prevalent in both England and the United States, with college-age, marginalized communities speaking the loudest in both countries. Convergence of various immigrant populations from Eastern and Western Europe, the Middle East, and parts of Africa has led to cultural exchanges which sometimes create unique problems for the communities that the police must help them solve. A misunderstanding of police policies, especially those related to continuum-of-force, is creating tensions along racial lines in America. Further outreach by the police will be necessary to foster better police-community relationships.

The most common problem targeted by community policing in either country is fundamental distrust of police. Addressed early in policing by Sir Robert Peele, the consent of the policed population is necessary not only for police safety, but for the community’s benefit, as they cannot enjoy highly professional police service if they are unwilling to report crimes or provide basic information to police. In England especially, migrant populations may prefer to handle crimes themselves due to cultural mores and traditions, while histories of racial inequality
in America may cause minority communities to view police as oppressors; the role law enforcement played in this history will be difficult for police to overcome.

**Comparing race relations.**

The historical context for race relations between England and the United States is similar. England was responsible for much of the early slave trade that reached America but did not utilize enslaved West Africans to the same extent as America. Instead, England’s slave trade focused on selling captured West Africans and selling them, while utilizing poor British Nationals for domestic slave labor (Mack, 2009).

England’s history of police-based oppression tends to be more focused on class-based repression through workhouses and debtors’ prisons (Mack, 2009). In contrast, United States’ law enforcement prior to the civil war enforced both racial chattel slavery and social segregation of blacks. England and America would share this trend shortly before and during the Civil Rights Era, with both countries’ police forces practicing forms of overt racism intended to segregate and prevent the empowerment of black people (Clayton, 2018; Serbulo & Gibson, 2013; Yesufu, 2013).

Racialized lynching was more prevalent in America than England, with just under 3,000 black people lynched between 1882 and 1968 (NAACP, 2018). In contrast, one of the only historical lynching’s in Britain, that of Charles Wooten, occurred in 1919 during a spree of port-centered race riots spurred on by joblessness at the end of WWI (Liverpool Echo, 2005). Similarly, Britain’s sole lynching matches America’s many such events in that police were either
Oppression of black communities by police continued in the mid-20th century; in America, this took the form of officers intentionally providing inadequate service to black communities and opposing in force civil rights marches and demonstrations (Serbulo & Gibson, 2013). Police enforced segregation dating back to enforcing of laws governing of free blacks prior to the civil war (McGoldrick, 2001) and continued segregation by enforcing the Jim Crow laws of the mid-20th century (Serbulo & Gibson, 2013). England never had codified segregation laws, but still practiced racial inequality through apathy and ignorance. Police chiefs took an excessively hands-off approach to hate crime, maintaining that it would stop once minorities in England “assimilated” (Holdaway, 1998; Yesufu, 2013).

While England did participate in the transatlantic slave trade and chattel slavery, it did not do so to the same extent as the United States during the same period. When questions of equality arose in the early 1900s, England was silent, where America acted against these interests. Black action against oppression occurred in a similar timeframe in both countries, but as there was no codified system of state-enforced segregation in England, their civil rights movement was not as strong or loud as America’s. This may also be due to the historical lack of a significant slave population in England.

Today, black Americans are still voicing displeasure with their police and government through the Black Lives Matter movement (Clayton, 2018). This movement was founded in 2014 but has only recently become popular in the United Kingdom. Black Americans are still concerned with police violence towards them and their communities; minority communities om
England are still concerned with police violence and inaction, with a focus on disproportionate stop-and-search for BME communities (Yesufu, 2013) and racialized viewpoints held by the social groups from which English police are recruited (Holdaway, 1998; Yesufu, 2013).

Conclusions

England’s moves from nationally centralized police oversight towards district-based supervision is a step towards reduction in resource waste and community-tailored approaches to policing. The extensive discretion afforded PCCs will allow individual districts to have policies and procedures created for their unique needs. The office’s recent expansion of powers to include all emergency services clearly indicates the powers and responsibilities afforded it, and indicates England’s trust in the future success of PCCs. It would be appropriate for a survey of British citizens to be conducted in the future to assess their knowledge of and satisfaction with Police and Crime Commissioners.

Both England and the United States have been implementing community policing strategies with mixed but encouraging success for a similar period. Approaches differ slightly, with England creating sharp policy divides between PCSOs and regular officers, while the United States encourages citizen interaction with uniformed officers at all strata of law enforcement (Adegbile, 2017). As a result, many English citizens do not know their local police officers well, especially at the rural level, where the lower presence and availability of officers makes community relations critical (Mawby, 2007). England may benefit from destratification of police-community relations and moving away from specialist departments, and instead integrating officers of all functions, especially patrol, into community-based programs. It would
be appropriate to search for a correlation between the introduction of PCCs and reduced crime rates in England.

Rural policing in England could benefit from a greater community focus; greater independence would benefit not only rural police, but most urban departments in England as well. England’s police force is on the right track away from heavy centralization and “bondage” to crime statistics since PCCs, governed by the community, create individualized district plans that address the specific needs of their jurisdiction. Gradually increasing the number of districts where PCCs are elected may lead to further successes in community-policing initiatives and crime reduction. Additionally, opening more dispatch centers and rural substations could bolster public perceptions of rural law enforcement by increasing community presence and officer preparedness while decreasing emergency response times.
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