

WORK PRODUCTIVITY AND CRIME PREVENTION EFFECTIVENESS OF POLICE OFFICERS IN PAGALUNGAN, MAGUINDANAO

AKMAD, JOMAR D.
LABAS, MUJAHID M.
LAGUIBAN, JESTONY S.
LATIP, TAMBILINGAN D.
USMAN, NORHAMED M.
JESUS E. CALOTES JR.

ABSTRACT

This study determined the relationship between work productivity and crime prevention effectiveness of the police Officers in Pagalungan, Maguindanao. The descriptive-correlational design was utilized in this study. Data were gathered through survey questionnaire from selected police Officers in Pagalungan, Maguindanao. Mean was employed in analyzing the level of work productivity, and the level Crime prevention effectiveness. Pearson-product moment correlation was used to analyze the relationships that exist between the variables. The results show that the levels work productivity and crime prevention effectiveness of the police Officers are high. Meanwhile, the work productivity has significant relationship with crime prevention effectiveness ($r=.295, p<.002$).

Keywords: *Effectiveness, Work Productivity, Crime Prevention, Descriptive Correlational.*

INTRODUCTION

Work productivity is the amount of goods and services that a group of workers produce in a given amount of time. It is one of several types of productivity that economist measure. Productivity is an average measure of the efficiency of production. Typically, the productivity of a given worker will be assessed relative to an average for employees doing similar work. Productivity is about the effective and efficient use of all resources. Motivating police personnel can be complicated. Supervisors must work hard to ensure officers perform their duties efficiently and effectively. Many factors can negatively affect productivity and cause officers to become complacent, doing the bare minimum necessary.

In our contemporary society at present, every country is facing various problems in suppressing crime rate. Every country has different crime profile and no one could claim that they had the best strategy that will lessen the increasing criminality. To deal with this problem, law enforcement agencies had already move on to the principle of crime prevention rather than crime fighting on order to determine their effectiveness and efficiency in accomplishing their goals; to maintain peace and order, protect civil rights, civil liberties and enforcing the law.

The evolution of crime prevention has been expanded that, from being seen as a relatively narrow policing function, it evolves to the extent that it involves now a much broad transversal approach by different state and community actors. It is now accepted that prevention takes many forms, that it involves many sectors and levels of government and civil society, and that local authorities and communities have major role to play, supported by strong sub-regional and national strategies and policy. There is

accumulating evidence that many prevention programs are not only effective in reducing offending and victimization, but cost beneficial, resulting in considerable long-term savings for the investment entailed, and bringing social and economic benefits well beyond reductions in crime.

Crime prevention is an aspect that every state has to consider in order to ensure security as well as the safety. Peace and order rely on how efficient s state is in position to fight and prevent crime. There are laws set to assist in the government process of every nation and they decide on the penalties that an individual has to endure in order to ensure that justice prevails. The police are a body by the government that has the responsibilities of making sure that all the citizens adhere to the set laws at all times and in cases where there are law breakers then they are in power to find and restrain them in government correction facilities. Crime prevention programs are important since they contribute to an increased security system.

Statement of the problem

This study determined the relationship between social media utilization and online buying behavior of the College Students. Specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of work productivity in terms of:

- 1.1 Task Performance

- 1.2 Contextual Performance

1.3 Counter Productive Work Behavior?

2. What is the Level of crime prevention effectiveness in terms of :

2.1 Primary Crime Prevention

2.2 Secondary Crime Prevention

2.3 Tertiary Crime Prevention

3. Is there a significant relationship between work productivity and crime prevention effectiveness?

4. Do work productivity significantly predict the crime prevention effectiveness?

FRAMEWORK

The two-factor theory (also known as Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory and dual factor theory) states that there are certain factors cause dissatisfaction, all of which act independently of each other. It was developed by psychologist Frederick Herzberg. Feelings, attitudes and their connection with industrial mental health are related to Abraham Maslow's theory of motivation. His findings have had a considerable theoretical, as well as a practical, influence on attitudes toward administration. According to Herzberg, individuals are not content with satisfaction of lower-order needs at work; for example, those needs associated with minimum salary levels or safe and pleasant working conditions. Rather, individuals look for the gratification of higher-level psychological needs having to do with achievement, recognition, responsibility, advancement and the nature of the work itself. This appears to parallel Maslow's theory of a need hierarchy. However, Herzberg added a new dimension to this theory by

proposing a two-factor model of motivation, based on the notion that the presence of one set of job characteristics or incentives lead to worker satisfaction at work, while another and separate set of job characteristics leads to dissatisfaction at work. Thus, satisfaction and dissatisfaction are not on a continuum with one increasing as the other diminishes, but are independent phenomena. This theory suggests that to improve job attitudes and productivity, administrators must recognize and attend to both sets of characteristics and not assume that an increase in satisfaction leads to decrease in dissatisfaction. (Herzberg et al. 1959)

METHOD

Research Design

The researchers used a descriptive-correlational research design to determine the factors that affect the work productivity and crime prevention effectiveness of police officers in Pagalungan, Maguindanao. Descriptive-correlational studies describe the variables and the relationships that occur naturally between and among them. It discovers relationships among variables and to allow the prediction of future events from present knowledge.

Respondents

The respondents of this study were the police officers in Pagalungan, Maguindanao. A total of 60 police personnel were given a survey questionnaire.

Instruments

The researchers used a self-made survey instrument to gather all the data needed in conducting the study.

Statistical Tools

Mean and Standard Deviation was used to determine the levels of stress, and psychological well-being of police front liners. Moreover, the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was utilized to determine the relationship between work productivity and crime prevention effectiveness.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Level of Work Productivity

Table 1 shows the level of Work Productivity of the Police Officers which contains three indicators namely Task Performance, Contextual Performance, and Counter Productive Work Behavior. These three indicators have five statement each.

The overall mean of the indicator task performance is 4.47 with the standard deviation of .442 and has a high level of work productivity. This means that in terms of task performance the Police officers were always prepared before doing their work, they have set a purpose for planning ahead of time. The result also shows the harmonious relationship between the police officers aiming for one goal in service. This conforms in a study of Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1998 that when it comes to community policing, collaboration is given such credence in dealing with wicked problems encountered in the policing environment they assert that “the power of partnership and collaboration is such that even when mistakes are made, community 2 policing often triumphs”

The overall mean of the indicator Contextual Performance is 4.45 and described as agree. This means that the police officers always exceed efforts to perform well on their duties According to Jacob (2011), the Philippine National Police (PNP) is continuing efforts to improve delivery of basic police services through a more effective crime prevention program.

The overall mean of the indicator Counter Productive work Behavior is 4.47 with the standard deviation of .442. This implies that officers work behavior plus environment affects performance, some unimportant matters that should not be taken seriously affects them. There are voluntary behaviors that harm organizations or people working in the organizations. This is supported from the study of Bennet and Robinson 1995 that the driving forces behind counterproductive work behavior can be very broad and include environmental reasons, lack of training, employee personality and life changes and external factors.

Based on the results the level of work productivity of these police officers is high which means that the police officers were work effectiveness is the key to successful operation in an organization. Organizations with appropriate procedures supporting and increasing the work effectiveness of their employees tend to receive a good return on that investment and achieve rapid, effective, and sustainable development. In contrast, a lack of appropriate procedures supporting and increasing the work effectiveness of internal employees being ineffective, apathetic and unable to achieve the desired work performance. (Santiwong, 1984).

Table 1. Level of Work Productivity

--	--	--	--

Indicators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
A. Task Performance			
Category Mean	4.14	.512ss	Agree
B. Contextual Performance			
Category Mean	4.45	.466	Agree
C. Counter Productive Work Behavior			
Category Mean	4.39	.529	Agree
Overall Mean	4.47	.442	High Level of Work Productivity

Level of Crime Prevention Effectiveness

Table 2 above shows the overall mean of 4.36 with the standard deviation of .557 with the interpretation of high level of crime prevention effectiveness.

The overall mean category of the indicator Primary Crime Prevention is 4.40 with the standard deviation of .557 and described as agree. This means that the primary goal of responsibility of these police officers is eradicating the increase proliferation of crimes in the assigned community. This simply means that they take crime prevention as their primary role of duty, additionally they have recognized by themselves their significant contribution in maintaining peace and order in the

community. The result correlates findings that the primary role of the police is to prevent crime, not catch criminals, the chief inspector of constabulary for England and Wales has said. Tom Winsor (2013) said focusing on would-be offenders, likely victims and potential crime hotspots would save taxpayers' money and keep more people safe.

The overall mean of the indicator Secondary Crime Prevention is 4.46 with the standard deviation of .584 and described as high. This means that in secondary crime prevention it seeks to change people, typically those at high risk of embarking on a criminal career individual, crime prevention strategies can ultimately improve society by the implementation of prevention measures that are effective to the safety and security of society. According to Burssens (2015), the importance of evaluating crime prevention strategies is measured by the suitability and initiative to account for crime prevention. Burssens provides a theoretical perspective of the issues related to crime and how they can be altered to reduce the occurrence of crime in individuals and within.

The overall mean of the indicator Tertiary Crime Prevention is 4.39 with the standard deviation of .484 and described as agree. This implies that police officers focus on the operation of the criminal justice system and deals with offending after it has happened. The primary focus is on intervention in the lives of known offenders in an attempt to prevent them re-offending. This is anchored from the study of the Economic and Social Council Resolution 2002 that effective, responsible crime prevention enhances the quality of life of all citizens. It has long-term benefits in

terms of reducing the costs associated with the formal criminal justice system, as well as other social costs that result from crime.

Based on the results the Crime Prevention Effectiveness of the said police officers is high which garnered an overall mean of 4.36 with the standard deviation of .557. This means that program implementation of crime prevention in the area is said to be prevalent and effective. The result corroborates to the CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) CPTED is a crime prevention strategy that aims to reduce crime opportunities and citizens' anxiety of crime occurrence by improving urban environments through architectural design and urban planning, and ultimately, to improve the quality of life (Jeffery, 1971).

Table 2 Level of Crime Prevention Effectiveness

Indicators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
A. Primary Crime Prevention			
Category Mean	4.40	.557	Agree
B. Secondary Crime Prevention			
Category Mean	4.46	.584	Agree
C. Tertiary Crime Prevention			
Category Mean	4.39	.484	Agree
	4.36	.557	High Level of

<i>Overall Mean</i>			Crime Prevention Effectiveness
---------------------	--	--	---------------------------------------

Relationship between Crime Prevention Effectiveness

Table 3 presents the results of correlational analysis of the variables which its purpose is to show if the independent variable particularly work productivity has a significant relationship with crime prevention effectiveness. The result indicates the variables have high significant relationship.

From the result presented, it shows that the correlation between work productivity and Crime Prevention effectiveness revealed a p value of .000 which is less than the value of 0.05 level of confidence which indicates that there is a relationship that can be drawn from the two variables indicated. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that “There is no significant relationship between work productivity and Crime Prevention effectiveness of the Police Officers” is therefore rejected with a moderate degree of correlation ($r=.453$). In support, (Dominguez et. Al, 2015) the results obtained show the inverse relationship between police efficiency and the crime rate while a direct relationship is obtained for the variable literacy. Similar findings were obtained in our robustness analysis, in which police efficiency negatively affects other measures of delinquency levels, such as the UN victimization survey variable.

Table 3 Relationship between the Variables

VARIABLES valueRemarks	R	p-
Work Productivity and Crime Prevention Effectiveness	.453** Significant	.000

*Significant at .05 level

Conclusions

Based on the results and findings of this study, the following conclusions have been drawn. The result revealed that contextual performance and counterproductive work behavior are the highlights in work productivity of the police officers. This implies that the primary performance of the police officers in their profession is effective. Thus, evidently, they are trying their best to overcome role challenges and be efficient in their job. Similarly, the results showed that secondary and tertiary were the areas where police officers consider vital. This means that Crime Prevention in different forms provides chances of violators to recover and get corrected. The results of correlational analysis of the variables shows that work productivity has a significant relationship with the Crime Prevention Effectiveness of the Police Officers in Pagalungan, Mindanao.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, Aldrin (2011), A Review of the Effectiveness of Crime Prevention by Design Approaches towards Sustainable Development

Austin, J. T., and Villanova, P. (1992). The criterion problem: 1917-1992. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77, 836-874.

Becker, G. S. (1968). Crime and punishment: An economic approach. *Journal of Political Economy*, 76(2), 169–217.

Bell, J. & Burke, J. (1989, January). Cruising Cooper Street. *Police Chief*, 26-29

Bashir, S., Nasir, M., Qayyum, S., Bashir, A. (2012). Dimensionality of Counterproductive Work Behaviors, in Public Sector Organizations of Pakistan. *Public Organization Review*, 12, 357

Campbell, J. P. (1990a). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and

organizational psychology. In M. D. Dunnette, and L. M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Vol. 1 (2nd ed., pp. 687-732). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press

Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology (2008). *Approaches to understanding crime prevention*. AICrime reduction matters no. 1.

Crime Prevention through environmental design. Beverly Hills Sage

Carrasquel, Pamella, (2019) Three Crucial Factors Which Influence Employee

Productivity

Chang, K., & Smithikrai, C. (2010). Counterproductive behavior at work: An investigation into reduction strategies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 21(8), 1272–1288.

Cho, Youngjin, and Dongphil, Son, 2016, A Study on Amendment of Building Act and Subordinate Legislation for CPTED

Cho, Younjin and Yonggook, Kim 2016, Study on Crime Prevention Design Performance for Built Environment – Focusing on Development of Crime Prevention Evaluation Criteria for a Flat of Multiple Dwelling House

Clarke, R. V. and Felson, M. (1993). *Routine Activity and Rational Choice*. Vol. 5, *Advances in Criminology Theory*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, Inc

Civilian Secretariat for Police Service, (2021) *Violence and Crime Prevention- SaferSpaces*

Dalal, R. S. (2005). A meta-analysis of the relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and counterproductive work behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, 1241- 1255.

De Vet, H. C. W., Terwee, C. B., Mokkink, L. B., and Knol, D. L. (2011). *Measurement in medicine*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

DiLonardo, R. (1996). Defining and measuring the economic benefit of electronicarticle

surveillance. Security Journal, 7(1), 3-9.

Fortenbery, Jay, M.J.A, (2015) Improving Motivation and Productivity of Police Officers

Felson, M. (1994). Crime and everyday life: Insight and implications forsociety.

Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press. Clarke, R.V. & Eck, J. (2003). Become aproblem-solving crime analyst. London: Jill Dando Institute of Crime Science,University College London

Gordon, H. (1998). Crime prevention: Social control, risk and understanding

latemodernity. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gayon, G.P (1990), Crime Prevention and Corrections in the Philippines

Gumarang II, Odigirb Galapia (2013) Effectiveness of Crime Prevention Strategies

Herzberg, Frederick; Mausner, Bernard; Snyderman, Barbara B. (1959). The

Motivation to Work (2nd ed.).

Hope, T. (1995). Community crime prevention. Crime and Justice, 19, (Building aSafer

Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention), 21-89

Howard, Gordon L.,(1981) "Relationship between length of Service and Employee

Performance Ratings in Large Industrial Corporations"

Jeffery, Clarence Ray (1971), Crime Prevention through Environmental Design

Kim, Sangwoon 2012 Comparative Analysis of Domestic CPTED Research

Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C. M., Hildebrandt, V. H., van Buuren, S., van der Beek, A.

J., and de Vet, H. C. W. (2013). Development of an individual work performance

- International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, 62, 6- 28.
- Maslov, Anton (2015), "Measuring the Performance of the Police: The Perspective of the Public
- Myhill 2006, Police and Crime Prevention: Partnering with the Community
- Novak, Kenneth J. (2018), Preventive Patrol
- Rotundo, M., and Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of performance: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87, 66-80
- Sinclair M., (1984), Measures of Police Effectiveness and Efficiency
- Spelman, W. & Brown, D. (1984). *Calling the police: Citizen reporting of serious crime*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office
- Telep, Cody W. and Weidsburd, David (2012) "What is Known About the Effectiveness of Police Practices in Reducing Crime and Disorder"
- Tennant, A., McKenna, S. P., and Hagell, P. (2004). Application of Rasch analysis in the development and application of quality-of-life instruments. *Value in Health*, 7, S22-S26.
- Tilley, Nick (2005), *Handbook of Crime Prevention and Community Safety*
- Tomažević, N., Seljak, J. and Aristovnik, A. (2014), "Factors influencing employee satisfaction in the police service: the case of Slovenia", *Personnel Review*, Vol. 43 No. 2, pp. 209-227. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2012-0176>
- United Nations document S/2004/616, par 4, Crime Prevention
- West Yorkshire Police (2021), *Crime Preventions*
- Weisburd, D. (1997). Reorienting crime prevention research and policy: From thecauses

of criminality to the context of crime. National Institute of Justice Research Report, U.S. Department of Justice. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office

Wortley, R. (2001). A classification of techniques for controlling situational precipitators

of crime. Security Journal, 14, 63-82. Jeffery, C. R. (1977).