



BEYOND THE BEAT: EVALUATING AWARENESS AND EFFECTIVENESS OF POLICE PATROL OPERATIONS TOWARDS STRATEGIC INTERVENTIONS

Jimenez, Jose Jess B¹., Dr. Donald B. Narra²

¹Philippine College of Criminology

²University of the Visayas

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra31492>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra31492

ABSTRACT

*This study evaluated the implementation and effectiveness of police patrol operations in Northern Samar, Philippines, to establish an empirical basis for strategic interventions. Employing an explanatory sequential mixed methods design, the research integrated quantitative survey data with qualitative phenomenological inquiry using Colaizzi's seven-step method. Quantitative data were gathered from a statistically representative sample comprising patrol supervisors, beat patrollers, and community officials, complemented by in-depth interviews with key informants. The quantitative findings revealed that the level of implementation of police patrol operations across patrol duties, tasks and responsibilities, and operational procedures was rated as **Highly Implemented**. Similarly, the perceived level of effectiveness in terms of patrol guidelines, duties, and response to calls for assistance was rated as **Very Effective**. Non-parametric analysis using the Mann-Whitney U test indicated no statistically significant differences between patrol supervisors and beat patrollers regarding implementation and effectiveness ($p > 0.05$). However, Kruskal-Wallis and Dunn's post-hoc analyses showed that community officials evaluated both implementation and effectiveness significantly lower than police personnel ($p < 0.05$), highlighting a perceptual gap between law enforcement and external civic stakeholders. Qualitative results revealed key factors affecting performance, including limited patrol vehicles, archipelagic geographic constraints, and insufficient communication equipment. To bridge operational gaps and align police execution with community expectations, the study developed the **BANTAY Program**, a strategic framework focused on data-driven deployment, enhanced logistics, and strengthened community partnership*

KEYWORDS: Patrol Operations, Implementation, Effectiveness, Mixed Methods, Phenomenological Inquiry

INTRODUCTION

Police patrol operations constitute a fundamental component of law enforcement, providing the most visible and immediate interface between police organizations and the communities they serve. Beyond maintaining police presence, patrol activities are expected to deter crime, facilitate timely emergency response, maintain public order, and foster public trust. However, evidence has shown that routine random patrol alone produces limited effects on crime and fear of crime, prompting a shift toward more strategic, evidence-based, and community-responsive approaches, including hotspot policing and problem-oriented policing (Kelling et al., 1974; Weisburd et al., 2021; Braga et al., 2022). These developments underscore that patrol effectiveness depends not simply on police visibility but on how patrol activities are planned, implemented, supervised, and aligned with local crime and community conditions.

The growing emphasis on effective patrol operations is consistent with global efforts to promote safe, inclusive, and accountable communities under Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 11 and 16. Contemporary policing literature increasingly highlights the importance of strategic deployment, clear operational protocols, adequate supervision, and meaningful police-community engagement. Nevertheless, patrol

implementation continues to encounter challenges related to unclear roles and responsibilities, limited resources, inadequate operational briefings, weak supervision, and insufficient mechanisms for community feedback (HMICFRS, 2021; Wood et al., 2020; Denney & Jenkins, 2013; Hills, 2021; Tankebe & Asante, 2020). Moreover, growing attention to procedural justice emphasizes that police legitimacy and public cooperation are influenced by interactions characterized by fairness, respect, transparency, and responsiveness (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015; Nix et al., 2022; Tyler, 2022). Despite these developments, empirical assessments that integrate the perspectives of police supervisors, patrol officers, and community stakeholders remain limited, particularly in developing-country and Asian policing contexts.

The Philippine setting presents a particularly important context for examining patrol operations. The Philippine National Police (PNP) performs its policing mandate within an environment shaped by archipelagic geography, decentralized governance, diverse community conditions, and varying levels of institutional and logistical capacity. Police patrol operations are supported by the Philippine Development Plan 2023–2028, the PNP Patrol Plan, relevant operational policies, and Republic Acts 6975, 8551, and 9708. Despite these institutional frameworks,



concerns regarding patrol capacity, service responsiveness, supervision, operational standardization, and resource availability persist (Brillantes & Fernandez, 2020; Soriano, 2021; Castillo & Reyes, 2022). National assessments have also tended to rely heavily on administrative and police-generated indicators, providing comparatively limited attention to how patrol operations are experienced and evaluated by communities. This creates an important empirical gap, particularly in understanding whether prescribed patrol duties and operational protocols are translated effectively into actual practice.

This gap is especially significant in Northern Samar, where approximately 645,789 residents are distributed across 24 municipalities and more than 500 barangays, including geographically dispersed coastal and upland communities (Philippine Statistics Authority, 2024). Such geographic and demographic conditions can create substantial demands on patrol coverage, mobility, communication, and emergency response. Although the province is served by more than 1,000 police personnel, the breadth of the area of responsibility and the range of police functions place continuing demands on personnel and logistical resources (Gay, 2024). Reported concerns involving personnel availability, patrol vehicles, communication capabilities, and access to remote communities further highlight the need for patrol systems that are responsive to local conditions.

Against this backdrop, systematic evidence regarding the implementation and effectiveness of police patrol operations in Northern Samar remains limited. In particular, there is a need to examine not only whether patrol duties, responsibilities, and operational protocols are implemented, but also whether these practices are perceived as effective by those directly involved in and affected by them. Addressing this gap, the present study employs a mixed-methods approach to assess the implementation and effectiveness of police patrol operations in Northern Samar, integrating quantitative assessments with the experiences and perspectives of patrol supervisors, patrol personnel, and community stakeholders. The study further seeks to develop an evidence-based intervention framework that can strengthen patrol management, deployment, supervision, operational responsiveness, and police-community engagement. Anchored in Goldstein's (1979) problem-oriented policing perspective, the study views effective patrol not merely as the maintenance of police presence but as a strategic function that should respond to specific local crime problems and community needs. Through this approach, the study contributes localized empirical evidence to the broader discourse on strategic, accountable, and community-responsive policing.

Theoretical Framework

The study is grounded in complementary perspectives from criminology, policing, and social theory that explain the implementation and effectiveness of police patrol operations from operational, environmental, relational, and legitimacy-based perspectives. Its primary theoretical anchor is **Problem-Oriented Policing (POP) Theory**, introduced by Goldstein (1979), which advocates moving beyond reactive responses to individual incidents toward the systematic identification and resolution of

recurring problems that generate police demand. Operationally, the approach is supported by the **Scanning, Analysis, Response, and Assessment (SARA) model** of Eck and Spelman (1987), which provides a structured process for identifying recurring problems, analyzing their underlying causes, implementing appropriate interventions, and assessing their outcomes. In this study, POP provides the principal lens for examining patrol duties, tasks and responsibilities, and operational conduct. It conceptualizes effective patrol not simply as maintaining police visibility or responding to incidents, but as identifying recurring community security problems and implementing appropriate, targeted, and continuously evaluated responses. It therefore provides a basis for understanding variations in perceptions among patrol supervisors, beat patrollers, and community officials and informs the development of an intervention framework for strengthening patrol operations.

Complementing POP is **Procedural Justice Theory**, developed by Tyler (1990), which explains how perceptions of fairness influence public trust, cooperation, and acceptance of police authority. The theory emphasizes four central elements of fair treatment: opportunities for citizens to express their views, neutrality in decision-making, respectful treatment, and trustworthy motives. Contemporary research continues to demonstrate that perceptions of procedural fairness shape public evaluations of police legitimacy and willingness to cooperate with law enforcement (Tyler, 2022). Applied to this study, the theory provides a relational lens for examining patrol effectiveness. Prompt responses and proper performance of patrol duties may not be sufficient to generate positive community evaluations if police interactions are perceived as disrespectful, biased, or lacking transparency. Procedural Justice Theory therefore helps explain how community officials assess patrol operations not only according to their observable performance but also according to the quality and fairness of police-community interactions.

The study is further informed by **Routine Activity Theory** of Cohen and Felson (1979), as elaborated by Felson and Boba (2010). The theory proposes that crime becomes more likely when a motivated offender, a suitable target, and the absence of a capable guardian converge in time and space. Police patrol personnel can serve as capable guardians whose visibility, mobility, and timely intervention disrupt opportunities for crime. This perspective provides an environmental and situational explanation for the importance of patrol presence, deployment, surveillance, and responsiveness. Within the present study, patrol duties, operational responsibilities, and responses to calls for police assistance are examined partly in terms of their capacity to enhance guardianship and reduce opportunities for criminal activity. Routine Activity Theory thus complements POP by linking patrol implementation to the prevention of crime opportunities within specific community settings.

A further normative perspective is provided by **Social Contract Theory**, associated with Hobbes, Locke, and Rousseau. The theory holds that governmental authority derives from an implicit relationship in which citizens accept legitimate state authority in exchange for protection, security, and the maintenance of social order. In policing, this relationship implies



that police legitimacy is strengthened when law enforcement fulfills its protective responsibilities while respecting citizens' rights and expectations (Reisig & Lloyd, 2022). In this study, Social Contract Theory provides a broader basis for interpreting community perceptions of patrol effectiveness. Visible police presence, timely assistance, protection from threats, and respectful treatment represent practical expressions of the police obligation to the community. When these expectations are consistently met, confidence in police authority may be reinforced; when they are unmet, perceptions of police legitimacy and effectiveness may be weakened. The theory consequently supports the study's emphasis on strengthening patrol operations while reinforcing the reciprocal relationship between police institutions and the communities they serve.

The **philosophical foundation of the study is Pragmatism**, associated with Peirce, James, and Dewey and applied to contemporary mixed-methods research by Creswell and Creswell (2023). Pragmatism emphasizes the use of methods that are most appropriate for addressing the research problem and generating useful knowledge. This orientation supports the integration of quantitative and qualitative approaches in the present study. Quantitative methods provide measurable evidence regarding the implementation and effectiveness of patrol operations, while qualitative inquiry provides contextual explanations of the experiences, challenges, and conditions underlying those assessments. The pragmatic orientation therefore enables the study to integrate different forms of evidence to produce findings that are both empirically grounded and practically useful for improving patrol management and operations.

The qualitative component is additionally informed by **Phenomenology**, a philosophical tradition originating with Husserl and subsequently developed by scholars including Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty. Phenomenology focuses on how individuals experience, interpret, and make meaning of phenomena in their lived contexts. In this study, it provides the philosophical basis for exploring the experiences of patrol supervisors, beat patrollers, and community officials regarding the actual implementation of police patrol operations. Their accounts provide insights into how patrol duties are performed, how operational challenges are encountered, how police-community interactions are experienced, and what factors facilitate or hinder effective patrol services. Phenomenological inquiry consequently complements the quantitative findings by revealing operational realities and contextual meanings that may not be adequately captured through structured measures alone.

Taken together, these perspectives provide an integrated foundation for examining police patrol operations. **Problem-Oriented Policing** explains the strategic and problem-solving dimension of patrol; **Routine Activity Theory** explains its crime-prevention and guardianship function; **Procedural Justice Theory** explains the importance of fair and respectful police-community interactions; and **Social Contract Theory** frames patrol as part of the reciprocal obligation between the police and the community. **Pragmatism** provides the philosophical basis for integrating quantitative and qualitative evidence, while

Phenomenology guides the exploration of stakeholders' lived experiences. Collectively, these perspectives support a multidimensional assessment of patrol implementation and effectiveness and provide a theoretical basis for developing an evidence-based, community-responsive framework for improving police patrol operations in Northern Samar.

Statement of the Problem

This study assesses and analyzes the level of awareness and effectiveness of patrol operations among police officers, focusing on patrol guidelines, patrol duties, and responding to calls for police assistance, and to explore the experiences of informants to propose an intervention program that enhances patrol operations in Northern Samar, Philippines.

Specifically, the researcher provided answers to the following research questions:

1. What is the level of implementation of police patrol operations in terms of:
 - 1.1 Patrol duties,
 - 1.2 Patrol tasks and responsibilities, and
 - 1.3 Patrol operation?
2. Is there a significant difference in the level of implementation of police patrol operations in terms of the identified variables according to the patrol supervisors, beat patrollers, and community officials?
3. What is the level of effectiveness of police patrol operations in terms of:
 - 3.1 Patrol guidelines,
 - 3.2 Patrol duties, and
 - 3.3 Responding to calls for police assistance?
4. Is there a significant difference in the level of effectiveness of police patrol operations in terms of the identified variables according to group?
5. How do the informants describe their experiences with police patrol operations in their locality?
6. How do the informants explain the factors that enhance or hinder the effectiveness of police patrol operations?
7. Based on the findings, what program may be proposed?

METHODOLOGY

This study employed an **explanatory sequential mixed-methods design** to examine the implementation and effectiveness of police patrol operations and to explain the experiences and perspectives of key stakeholders in Northern Samar, Philippines. Mixed-methods research integrates quantitative and qualitative approaches within a single investigation to provide a more comprehensive understanding of complex social phenomena than either approach can provide independently (Creswell & Creswell, 2018). The design was appropriate because the study sought both to measure the implementation and effectiveness of patrol operations and to explain the experiences and contextual factors underlying the quantitative findings.

The study was conducted in two sequential phases. The **quantitative phase** involved the administration of structured survey instruments to patrol supervisors, beat patrollers, and



community officials. The survey measured the implementation of police patrol operations in terms of patrol duties, patrol tasks and responsibilities, and operational practices, as well as their effectiveness in terms of patrol guidelines, patrol duties, and responsiveness to calls for police assistance. Statistical analyses were conducted to determine the levels of implementation and effectiveness and to examine differences in assessments among the three stakeholder groups. This phase provided a measurable and comparative assessment of patrol operations across stakeholder perspectives.

The **qualitative phase** followed the quantitative analysis and was specifically designed to explain and contextualize its findings. Key informant interviews were conducted with selected patrol supervisors, beat patrollers, and community officials to explore their lived experiences of police patrol operations and their perceptions of factors that enhanced or hindered patrol effectiveness. The qualitative inquiry was guided by a phenomenological perspective and analyzed using **Colaizzi's (1978) seven-step method**, allowing the study to identify significant statements, formulate meanings, develop themes, and synthesize the participants' experiences into an overall description of the phenomenon. Consistent with the logic of explanatory sequential research, the selection of qualitative areas of inquiry was informed by the quantitative results, particularly notable differences among stakeholder groups, variations in ratings, and areas in which implementation and effectiveness did not appear to correspond.

Integration occurred during the **interpretation and discussion of findings**, where qualitative themes were compared with and used to explain the quantitative results. This process enabled the study to move beyond numerical descriptions of patrol performance toward an understanding of the operational, organizational, and community-level conditions that shaped those results. The integrated findings subsequently served as the empirical basis for developing a strategic intervention program addressing identified deficiencies while incorporating the experiences and contextual needs of patrol personnel and community stakeholders. Thus, the explanatory sequential design ensured that the proposed intervention was grounded in both measurable evidence and the lived realities of those directly involved in police patrol operations.

The population of the study comprised individuals who were directly involved in, supervised, or regularly coordinated with police patrol operations in the Province of Northern Samar. The study population was divided into three stakeholder groups for the quantitative phase: **patrol supervisors, beat patrollers, and community officials**, specifically barangay captains and Barangay Peace and Order Committee (BPOC) chairpersons. Based on available administrative records, the total population consisted of **2,758 individuals**, comprising **24 patrol supervisors, 458 beat patrollers, and 2,276 community officials**. These groups were included because they represent distinct and complementary perspectives on police patrol operations, covering patrol supervision, operational implementation, and community-level peace and order coordination.

For the **quantitative phase**, the study drew its respondents from the three identified population groups. Patrol supervisors represented the supervisory and management perspective; beat patrollers represented the personnel directly responsible for the operational execution of patrol duties; and barangay captains and BPOC chairpersons represented the community perspective on police presence, responsiveness, coordination, and patrol effectiveness. The quantitative respondents were selected through the prescribed probability sampling procedure, with respondents drawn from their respective population groups. The resulting sample provided the basis for measuring the implementation and effectiveness of police patrol operations and comparing assessments across stakeholder groups.

For the **qualitative phase**, the population consisted of information-rich participants drawn from the quantitative respondents who had direct and substantial experience with police patrol operations. Through purposive sampling, **thirteen (13) key informants** were selected based on their roles, experience, and ability to provide detailed accounts relevant to the quantitative findings. The key informants comprised **six (6) patrol supervisors and seven (7) beat patrollers**. Their firsthand experiences provided contextual explanations of patrol implementation, operational practices, challenges, and factors affecting patrol effectiveness. The qualitative participants were selected after the quantitative analysis so that the interview component could specifically explore and explain notable patterns, differences, and issues identified in the survey results.

For inclusion in the qualitative phase, police personnel were required to be currently assigned or serving in Northern Samar and to have at least **one year of experience** in their present assignment or position. This requirement ensured that participants had sufficient familiarity with patrol procedures, operational conditions, and community safety concerns. Participants were excluded if they were assigned exclusively to administrative, investigative, or specialized functions without patrol responsibilities; were under suspension or otherwise restricted from operational deployment; were serving outside the geographic scope of the study; did not meet the required length of service; or declined to participate in the interview.

The adequacy of the qualitative sample was guided by the principle of **data saturation**, which refers to the point at which additional interviews no longer produce substantially new information, meanings, or themes (Fusch & Ness, 2015). Purposive sampling was appropriate because it enabled the researcher to deliberately select participants with rich, relevant, and firsthand knowledge of police patrol operations (Patton, 2015). Thus, the quantitative population provided the basis for measuring and comparing patrol implementation and effectiveness, while the purposively selected qualitative participants provided deeper explanations of the experiences and operational conditions underlying the quantitative results.

The study employed two data-gathering instruments consistent with the **explanatory sequential mixed-methods design**: (1) a structured survey questionnaire for the quantitative phase and (2) a semi-structured interview guide for the qualitative



phase. Both instruments were grounded in the *Revised Philippine National Police Operational Procedures* (2021) and the *Philippine National Police Manual for Planning of Patrol Operations* (2015) to ensure alignment with established patrol policies and standards.

The **structured questionnaire** assessed the perceived implementation and effectiveness of police patrol operations in Northern Samar. Part I, *Perceived Level of Implementation of Patrol Operations*, covered **Patrol Duties, Patrol Tasks and Responsibilities, and Patrol Operations**, rated using a four-point Likert scale from 1 (*Not Implemented*) to 4 (*Highly Implemented*). Part II, *Perceived Level of Effectiveness of Patrol Operations*, covered **Patrol Guidelines, Patrol Duties, and Response to Calls for Police Assistance**, rated from 1 (*Not Effective*) to 4 (*Highly Effective*). The parallel structure facilitated comparison between patrol implementation and perceived effectiveness.

The **semi-structured interview guide** contained open-ended questions designed to explore participants' experiences and the challenges affecting patrol operations, including resource limitations, operational constraints, coordination concerns, and other factors influencing patrol effectiveness. Qualitative data were analyzed using **Colaizzi's (1978) seven-step phenomenological method** to systematically identify significant statements, meanings, and themes.

To establish **validity**, both instruments underwent expert review by patrol supervisors and subject-matter experts in police operations. The evaluation focused on content relevance, clarity, completeness, and alignment with official PNP policies and standards. Expert recommendations were incorporated before data collection, with supporting documentation provided in the appendices. **Reliability** of the survey instrument was established through statistical verification, as documented in the certification of the statistician. Data analysis was conducted using **JAMOV Version 2.3.28**, while the standardized four-point Likert scale ensured consistency in quantitative measurement across respondent groups.

Data analysis began with checking, coding, and organizing the survey data for completeness and consistency. Descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, and median, were used to summarize respondent profiles and assess the perceived implementation and effectiveness of police patrol operations. Given the ordinal nature of the four-point Likert-scale data, non-parametric procedures were employed. Implementation was rated from 1 (Not Implemented) to 4 (Highly Implemented), while effectiveness was rated from 1 (Not Effective) to 4 (Very Effective), with corresponding interpretation ranges of 1.00–1.75, 1.76–2.50, 2.51–3.25, and 3.26–4.00. The median was used as the primary measure of central tendency because it is appropriate for ordinal data. Quantitative data were analyzed using JAMOV version 2.3.28.

For inferential analysis, the Kruskal–Wallis H test was used to determine whether significant differences existed among patrol supervisors, beat patrollers, and community officials. When significant differences were found, Dunn's post-hoc test with adjusted significance levels was used for pairwise

comparisons. Epsilon squared (ϵ^2) was computed to determine the magnitude of observed differences and distinguish statistically significant findings from differences with limited practical importance. The significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$. These procedures provided an appropriate basis for assessing variations in stakeholder perceptions of patrol implementation and effectiveness and identifying areas requiring operational or policy intervention.

For the qualitative strand, interview data were analyzed using Colaizzi's (1978) seven-step phenomenological method. The process involved familiarization with transcripts, extraction of significant statements, formulation of meanings, clustering of meanings into themes, development of an exhaustive description, formulation of the fundamental structure of the phenomenon, and validation through member checking. This systematic procedure captured the lived experiences of patrol supervisors, beat patrollers, and community informants regarding patrol operations, including operational constraints, resource limitations, coordination, responsiveness, supervision, and factors affecting effectiveness. The resulting themes were integrated with the quantitative findings to explain areas of convergence and divergence and to provide an evidence-based foundation for the proposed intervention program.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Level of Implementation of Police Patrol Operations

This section presents the quantitative data regarding the level of implementation of police patrol operations in Northern Samar, as evaluated by patrol supervisors, beat patrollers, and community officials. To provide a granular assessment, the construct of implementation is analyzed across three distinct operational dimensions: (1) patrol duties, (2) patrol tasks and responsibilities, and (3) patrol operations.

Patrol Duties. This dimension assesses the administrative, tactical, and operational execution of patrol duties by supervisors and frontline officers, including planning, deployment, monitoring, visibility, responsiveness, and adherence to professional and human-rights standards. The overall median of **3.63** for patrol supervisors and **3.71** for patrol officers indicates that both dimensions were **Highly Implemented**. For supervisory duties, the highest-rated indicators were pre-dispatch briefings and subordinate evaluation, both with a median of **3.61**, while supervisors, beat patrollers, and community officials reported overall medians of **3.00, 3.89, and 3.53**, respectively. For frontline patrol duties, the highest-rated indicators were respect for human rights (**3.71**) and initiative and decision-making (**3.63**), with supervisors, beat patrollers, and community officials reporting medians of **4.00, 3.95, and 3.64**, respectively. These findings indicate consistent supervisory oversight, operational preparedness, ethical conduct, and responsive field performance. The relatively lower community ratings compared with police personnel suggest an observability gap, as community stakeholders primarily assess patrol implementation through visible police presence, behavior, and responsiveness.



Qualitative findings reinforced the quantitative results by illustrating how supervisory practices and frontline conduct are experienced in daily operations. A patrol supervisor emphasized the importance of comprehensive pre-deployment briefings on routes, standby points, and directives, noting that clear instructions provide the foundation for effective field execution (KII-PS01). Similarly, a beat patroller described routine equipment checks as essential to operational preparedness before deployment (KII-BP02). Frontline officers also emphasized respect for human rights as a fundamental professional obligation, while supervisors highlighted proper uniforms, identification, and well-maintained patrol vehicles as important elements of police visibility (KII-BP01; KII-PS02). From the community perspective, officials observed that police presence was organized and patterned rather than random and valued officers' respectful and responsive conduct during calls for assistance (KII-CO04; KII-CO02). These narratives demonstrate that structured supervision, adequate preparation, professional conduct, and visible community-oriented policing collectively strengthen public confidence, although limitations in physical visibility and resources may affect how consistently patrol capabilities are observed.

The findings are consistent with **Goldstein's (1979) Problem-Oriented Policing Theory**, which emphasizes proactive planning, supervision, and evaluation to address recurring public-safety problems, and with **Routine Activity Theory**, which views systematic patrol presence as a form of capable guardianship that can reduce opportunities for crime. The strong ratings for human-rights observance and respectful police conduct further support **Procedural Justice Theory** (Tyler, 1990, 2022), which links fair and respectful treatment with police legitimacy and public cooperation. The findings also accord with **Hiller Foshaugen and Vestad (2024)** on the importance of structured supervisory direction, **Lum, Koper, and Wu (2022)** on supervisory monitoring and implementation fidelity, and **Nix, Wolfe, and Campbell (2022, 2023)** on the relationship between professional police conduct, public confidence, and cooperation. Overall, the results indicate that patrol duties in Northern Samar are highly implemented, particularly in supervision, preparedness, ethical conduct, and frontline decision-making, while continued attention to patrol visibility, resources, and community engagement remains important for sustaining effective and legitimate police service.

Patrol Tasks and Responsibilities. This dimension assesses the operational, tactical, administrative, and service-oriented functions performed by police personnel during patrol operations. The overall median of **3.66** indicates that patrol tasks and responsibilities were **Highly Implemented**, demonstrating consistent delivery of public safety, emergency response, law enforcement, documentation, traffic management, and community assistance. Across respondents, the highest-rated indicators were providing public safety through order maintenance, emergency response, protection of people and property, law enforcement, and community relations (**3.68**), followed by incident documentation and response to traffic or

other accidents (both **3.66**). By group, patrol supervisors reported an overall median of **4.00**, beat patrollers **3.90**, and community officials **3.59**, all interpreted as Highly Implemented. Supervisors rated all 16 indicators at **4.00**, while beat patrollers particularly emphasized identifying and apprehending offenders and responding to accidents (both **3.87**). Community officials gave their highest ratings to general public safety functions (**3.64**) and incident documentation and traffic enforcement (both **3.61**). These findings indicate strong institutional confidence in the consistent execution of patrol responsibilities, although the relatively lower community ratings suggest that some administrative and coordination activities are less visible to external stakeholders.

The qualitative findings provide context for these results by showing how patrol tasks are organized and experienced in practice. A patrol supervisor emphasized the importance of clear task delegation and coordination during deployment: *"Sinisigurado ko na alam ng bawat miyembro ng aming team ang kanilang partikular na responsibilidad sa bawat patrol deployment. Hindi pwedeng mag-overlap at hindi pwedeng may blangkong lugar. Ang koordinasyon ng mga tasks ay susi sa epektibong patrol coverage"* (KII-PS04). A beat patroller similarly described patrol work as a combination of surveillance, report writing, high-risk-area inspections, coordination with barangay officials, and continuous documentation (KII-BP03). From the community perspective, officials acknowledged that many police activities, particularly paperwork and inter-unit coordination, are not directly observable; instead, they primarily assess patrol performance based on whether officers are present when needed and whether incidents are effectively resolved (KII-CO05). This explains the modest difference between police and community ratings and highlights the importance of communicating the less visible dimensions of patrol work to external stakeholders.

The findings are consistent with **Routine Activity Theory** (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Felson & Boba, 2010), which positions police officers as capable guardians whose systematic presence, surveillance, emergency response, and enforcement activities can reduce opportunities for crime. The high implementation of public safety, traffic management, documentation, and incident-response tasks demonstrates the practical application of guardianship through routine patrol activities. The results also support **Sui, Chen, and Jiang (2025)** on the importance of optimized patrol deployment and structured coverage, **Lum, Koper, and Wu (2022)** on documentation and implementation fidelity in policing, and **Repasky, Wang, and Xie (2024)** on coordinated patrol and dispatch practices for improving response and service delivery. Overall, the findings demonstrate that patrol tasks and responsibilities in Northern Samar are highly implemented across stakeholder groups, with strong performance in visible public safety functions, while continued refresher training, task coordination, and clearer communication of less visible administrative responsibilities may further strengthen operational consistency and community confidence.



Significant Difference in the Level of Implementation of Police Patrol Operations in terms of the Identified Variables

The comparative analysis in Table 1 showed statistically significant differences in perceptions of police patrol implementation across Patrol Supervisors, Beat Patrollers, and Community Officials in all five dimensions. For *Patrol Duties of a Patrol Supervisor*, the Kruskal–Wallis test yielded $H = 28.610$, $p < .001$, with median ratings of **4.00** for Patrol Supervisors, **3.89** for Beat Patrollers, and **3.53** for Community Officials, all interpreted as Highly Implemented. Similarly, *Patrol Duties by Patrol Officers* showed a significant difference ($H = 24.026$, $p < .001$), with medians of **4.00**, **3.95**, and **3.64**, respectively. The consistently higher ratings from police personnel may reflect their direct knowledge of compliance with operational procedures, briefings, deployment requirements, and duty performance, whereas Community Officials assess implementation largely through visible police presence, responsiveness, and direct community interactions. Thus, the differences suggest that internal assessments tend to emphasize procedural compliance and operational execution, while community assessments are

more strongly influenced by observable outcomes and localized service delivery.

For *Patrol Tasks and Work Responsibilities*, the results likewise indicated a significant difference ($H = 18.675$, $p < .001$), with medians of **4.00** for Patrol Supervisors, **3.90** for Beat Patrollers, and **3.59** for Community Officials. The same pattern emerged for *Patrol Operation by Supervisor* ($H = 22.689$, $p < .001$), where the respective medians were **4.00**, **3.93**, and **3.59**. These findings indicate that supervisors and beat patrollers consistently perceived patrol responsibilities and supervisory activities as highly implemented, while community officials provided comparatively lower ratings. Police personnel have greater exposure to less visible functions such as documentation, reporting, intelligence briefings, equipment inspections, shift formations, monitoring, and operational coordination. In contrast, community officials primarily observe patrol presence, response to incidents, traffic management, and interactions with residents. The divergence therefore may reflect differences in access to operational information rather than a fundamental disagreement about the existence of patrol activities.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis in the Level of Implementation of Police Patrol Operations in Terms of the Identified Variables among the type of respondents

Police Patrol Operations	Type of Respondent						Kruskal-Wallis H-Value	Test Statistics p-value
	Patrol Supervisor		Beat Patrollers		Community Officials			
	Median	Int	Median	Int	Median	Int		
Patrol Duties of a Patrol Supervisors	3.00	I	3.89	HI	3.53	HI	28.610	0.000*
Patrol Duties by Patrol Officers	4.00	HI	3.95	HI	3.64	HI	24.026	0.000*
Patrol Tasks and Work Responsibilities	4.00	HI	3.90	HI	3.59	HI	18.675	0.000*
Patrol Operation by supervisor	4.00	HI	3.93	HI	3.59	HI	22.689	0.000*
Patrol Operation by Beat Patrol	4.00	HI	3.91	HI	3.54	HI	23.956	0.000*

*significant @ ≤ 0.05 ; *Legend: HI – Highly Implemented, MI – Moderately Implemented, SI – Slightly Implemented, NI – Not Implemented

The final dimension, *Patrol Operation by Beat Patrol*, also produced a statistically significant difference ($H = 23.956$, $p < .001$), with median ratings of **4.00** among Patrol Supervisors, **3.91** among Beat Patrollers, and **3.54** among Community Officials, all interpreted as Highly Implemented. Across the five dimensions, the consistent pattern of higher ratings from police personnel and lower ratings from Community Officials highlights the importance of considering both internal and external perspectives when evaluating patrol implementation. From an operational standpoint, the findings indicate strong adherence to assigned duties, patrol procedures, supervisory monitoring, and frontline deployment. However, the relatively lower community ratings suggest areas for strengthening visible presence, communication, responsiveness, and localized engagement, particularly across geographically dispersed communities. Consistent with **Problem-Oriented Policing** and **Procedural Justice Theory**, effective patrol should extend beyond procedural compliance to address community-defined problems and ensure that police actions are visible, responsive, and perceived as legitimate. Overall, the significant differences demonstrate that

high implementation within the police organization does not necessarily translate into equally strong community perceptions, underscoring the need to align operational performance with community experience.

The post-hoc pairwise comparison in Table 2 identified significant differences in perceptions of the implementation of *Patrol Duties of a Patrol Supervisor* between **Patrol Supervisors and Beat Patrollers** ($p = .040$) and between **Beat Patrollers and Community Officials** ($p < .001$). Patrol Supervisors reported a median of **3.00**, compared with **3.89** among Beat Patrollers, indicating that supervisors assessed their duties more conservatively than frontline personnel. This difference may reflect supervisors' greater exposure to administrative demands, resource limitations, compliance monitoring, command requirements, and operational constraints, which make them more aware of procedural gaps and implementation challenges. In contrast, Beat Patrollers directly experience briefings, radio instructions, field monitoring, and supervisory guidance, leading to a more favorable assessment of supervisory performance.



Table 2. Post-Hoc Analysis in the Level of Implementation of Police Patrol Operations in Terms of the Identified Variables Among the Type of Respondents in terms of Patrol Duties by Patrol Officers

Group	Median	Grp	Median	Sig.
Patrol Supervisor	3.00	Community Officials	3.53	0.694
		Beat Patrollers	3.89	0.040*
Community Officials	3.53	Beat Patrollers	3.89	0.000*

*significant @ ≤ 0.05 ;

The significant difference between **Beat Patrollers (Mdn = 3.89)** and **Community Officials (Mdn = 3.53; $p < .001$)** further demonstrates the influence of organizational position and visibility on perceptions. Beat Patrollers observe the supervisory process from within the police organization, including command coordination, operational monitoring, and field support. Community Officials, however, primarily assess supervisory performance through visible police leadership, coordination with barangay authorities, and responsiveness to community concerns. Since many supervisory functions occur through station-based administration, briefings, reporting, and internal coordination, they may not be directly observable to community stakeholders. The lower community rating therefore suggests a gap between internal perceptions of supervisory implementation and the extent to which such activities are visible and experienced at the community level.

In contrast, the comparison between **Patrol Supervisors (Mdn = 3.00)** and **Community Officials (Mdn = 3.53)** was **not statistically significant ($p = .694$)**. Despite their different organizational positions, both groups provided relatively measured assessments of supervisory duties compared with Beat Patrollers. Supervisors may be more critical because of their awareness of operational constraints and accountability

requirements, while Community Officials may adopt a similarly cautious assessment based on observable outcomes and local expectations. Overall, the findings indicate that perceptions of supervisory patrol duties vary according to stakeholders' proximity to police operations, with Beat Patrollers reporting the most favorable assessment and both Supervisors and Community Officials providing more conservative evaluations.

The post-hoc analysis in Table 3 identified a statistically significant difference only between **Community Officials (Mdn = 3.64)** and **Beat Patrollers (Mdn = 3.95; $p < .001$)** in their perceptions of the implementation of *Patrol Duties by Patrol Officers*. Beat Patrollers rated their field duties more favorably, reflecting their direct experience in conducting patrols, responding to calls, enforcing ordinances, and performing other operational responsibilities. Community Officials, in contrast, assessed officer performance primarily through observable street presence, responsiveness, community interaction, and localized security outcomes. The difference may therefore reflect the distinction between officers' assessment of procedural compliance and community stakeholders' assessment of visible and experienced service delivery.

Table 3. Post-Hoc Analysis in the Level of Implementation of Police Patrol Operations in Terms of the Identified Variables Among the Type of Respondents in terms of Patrol Tasks and Work Responsibilities

Group	Median	Grp	Median	Sig.
Community Officials	3.64	Patrol Supervisor	4.00	0.289
		Beat Patrollers	3.95	0.000*
Patrol Supervisor	4.00	Beat Patrollers	3.95	0.615

*significant @ ≤ 0.05

No statistically significant difference was found between **Community Officials (Mdn = 3.64)** and **Patrol Supervisors (Mdn = 4.00; $p = .289$)**. Although supervisors provided a higher median rating, the difference was not sufficient to establish distinct perceptions between the two groups. This suggests a degree of alignment between supervisory assessments of frontline performance and community officials' observations of patrol implementation, despite their different perspectives. Supervisors assess officer duties based on organizational standards, deployment, and compliance, while Community Officials consider visible performance and responsiveness within their jurisdictions.

Similarly, the comparison between **Patrol Supervisors (Mdn = 4.00)** and **Beat Patrollers (Mdn = 3.95)** was not statistically significant ($p = .615$), indicating strong agreement

between police management and frontline personnel regarding the implementation of patrol duties. Both groups operate within the same organizational framework and are guided by established procedures and operational expectations. Overall, the findings indicate substantial internal police consensus on patrol performance, while the significant difference involving Community Officials and Beat Patrollers highlights the importance of strengthening visible police presence, responsiveness, and community engagement to ensure that operational performance is consistently reflected in community perceptions.

The post-hoc analysis in Table 4 showed a statistically significant difference only between **Community Officials (Mdn = 3.59)** and **Beat Patrollers (Mdn = 3.90; $p < .001$)** in their perceptions of the implementation of *Patrol Tasks and Work*



Responsibilities. Beat Patrollers provided the higher assessment, reflecting their direct knowledge of the full range of operational and administrative responsibilities associated with patrol work, including incident documentation, reporting, briefings, and field activities. Community Officials, however, primarily assess patrol performance through observable functions such as neighborhood

presence, traffic management, and responses to local incidents. The significant difference may therefore reflect the distinction between internal knowledge of comprehensive police responsibilities and external observation of visible patrol activities.

Table 4. Post-Hoc Analysis in the Level of Implementation of Police Patrol Operations in Terms of the Identified Variables Among the Type of Respondents in terms of Patrol Operation by supervisor

Grp	Median	Grp	Median	Sig.
Community Officials	3.59	Patrol Supervisor	4.00	0.231
		Beat Patrollers	3.90	0.000*
Patrol Supervisor	4.00	Beat Patrollers	3.90	0.863

*significant @ ≤ 0.05

No statistically significant difference was found between **Community Officials (Mdn = 3.59)** and **Patrol Supervisors (Mdn = 4.00; $p = .231$)**. Despite the higher median reported by supervisors, the result indicates comparable perceptions regarding the implementation of patrol tasks and responsibilities. This suggests that both groups recognize the operational demands involved in balancing administrative requirements with field responsibilities. The absence of a significant difference further indicates that supervisory assessments are not substantially different from community observations when considering overall patrol task implementation.

Likewise, **Patrol Supervisors (Mdn = 4.00)** and **Beat Patrollers (Mdn = 3.90)** did not differ significantly ($p = .863$), indicating strong internal agreement regarding the execution of patrol tasks and work responsibilities. Both groups share direct knowledge of operational requirements and function within the same organizational framework and procedures. Overall, the findings demonstrate substantial consistency between police personnel while highlighting a specific perception gap between Beat Patrollers and Community Officials. This suggests the need to make less visible police responsibilities more understandable to community stakeholders while maintaining strong communication and community engagement regarding patrol activities.

Level of Effectiveness of Police Patrol Operations

Patrol Guidelines. The findings indicate that *Patrol Guidelines* were perceived as **Highly Effective**, with an overall median of **3.67**. Patrol Supervisors gave a perfect median of **4.00**, while Beat Patrollers and Community Officials reported medians of **3.94** and **3.58**, respectively. The highest-rated indicators across the groups were performing equipment checks before dispatch, observing precautionary safety measures, maintaining comprehensive knowledge of the locality, and informing the Tactical Operations Center (TOC) before responding to incidents, each with a median of **3.64 (Highly Effective)**. These results demonstrate that operational readiness, safety, local knowledge, and timely communication are consistently regarded as essential to effective patrol. The high ratings among police personnel reflect direct experience with operational protocols, while the favorable community assessment suggests that disciplined and systematic police behavior is sufficiently visible in the field.

The qualitative findings reinforce these results by showing that patrol guidelines are translated into routine practice through mentoring, environmental awareness, and community engagement. One Patrol Supervisor explained that guidelines are treated as the foundation of safe and effective patrol and are reinforced by pairing new patrollers with experienced personnel (**KII-PS02**). Similarly, a Beat Patroller emphasized that knowing the people, places, and high-risk periods within the assigned beat requires continuous observation, inquiry, and relationship-building beyond formal training (**KII-BP04**). Community Officials also observed patterned rather than random patrols and noted officers' attentiveness to unusual activities, interpreting these behaviors as evidence that established guidelines are being followed effectively (**KII-CO03**). The convergence of police and community perspectives indicates that guideline adherence is not limited to internal compliance but is also manifested through visible discipline, systematic patrol patterns, and coordinated field behavior.

The findings are consistent with **Goldstein's (1979) Problem-Oriented Policing Theory**, which emphasizes structured, proactive, and information-informed responses to localized safety problems. Equipment checks, intelligence-informed route planning, local knowledge, and TOC communication provide officers with the readiness and situational awareness necessary for proactive patrol and risk reduction. The results also support **Weisburd, Telep, and Lawton (2021)** on evidence-based deployment, **Lum, Koper, and Wu (2022)** on the importance of supervisory guidance in translating policy into street-level practice, and **Tyler (2022)** on the role of fair, transparent, and well-regulated police practices in strengthening legitimacy and cooperation. Overall, the consistently high ratings and qualitative convergence suggest that clear guidelines, effective field mentoring, and disciplined communication contribute substantially to reliable and community-recognized patrol effectiveness.

Patrol Duties. The findings indicate that *Patrol Duties* were perceived as **Highly Effective**, with an overall median of **3.58**. Patrol Supervisors gave a median of **4.00**, Beat Patrollers **3.87**, and Community Officials **3.51**, indicating consistently favorable assessments across all groups. The highest-rated practices included managing public gatherings, patrolling



assigned beats, wearing prescribed uniforms, attending roll calls and debriefings, and conducting regular community consultations. Among Beat Patrollers, particular emphasis was placed on the **Buddy System (Mdn = 3.89)** and equipment availability (**Mdn = 3.87**), reflecting the importance of safety, preparedness, and operational readiness. The findings suggest that disciplined patrol routines, visible police presence, tactical preparedness, and community engagement contribute substantially to effective crime prevention, public order, and community confidence.

The qualitative findings reinforce the quantitative results by illustrating how these practices are experienced in daily operations. A Patrol Supervisor described the Buddy System as an essential safety measure, particularly in isolated or high-risk areas, because paired deployment provides mutual protection and strengthens response capacity (**KII-PS04**). A Beat Patroller similarly explained that proper uniform presentation, identification, and professional appearance encourage residents to approach officers, ask questions, report concerns, and provide information (**KII-BP02**). Community Officials also associated properly equipped, paired, and professionally presented patrollers with greater confidence in police effectiveness (**KII-CO01**). These accounts demonstrate that operational discipline is not only an internal requirement but also a visible component of police legitimacy, particularly when communities can readily observe preparedness, professionalism, and accessibility during routine patrol activities.

The findings are consistent with **Routine Activity Theory** (Cohen & Felson, 1979), which identifies capable guardianship as a key mechanism for reducing opportunities for crime. Beat patrollers' visible presence, paired deployment, preparedness, and active engagement strengthen guardianship within assigned communities and can deter or disrupt potential offending. The results also support **Sousa, Giacomazzi, and Nolan (2021)** regarding structured multi-officer deployment and officer safety, **Nix, Wolfe, and Campbell (2022)** on police professionalism and public trust, and **Tyler (2022)** on the importance of responsive and respectful police-community interactions. Overall, the high and consistent ratings indicate that effective patrol duties depend on the integration of tactical readiness, professional conduct, visible beat coverage, public-order management, and sustained community engagement.

Responding to Calls for Police Assistance. The findings indicate that *Responding to Calls for Police Assistance* was perceived as **Highly Effective**, with an overall median of **3.59**. Patrol Supervisors reported the highest possible median of **4.00**, followed by Beat Patrollers at **3.85** and Community Officials at **3.48**. The highest-rated indicators across respondents included managing explosive-device threats (**Mdn = 3.62**), considering environmental and situational factors (**Mdn = 3.61**), prioritizing immediate aid to injured persons (**Mdn = 3.59**), and coordinating responses to highly infectious diseases with relevant authorities (**Mdn = 3.59**). Beat Patrollers particularly emphasized initial information gathering (**Mdn = 3.87**) and threat validation, witness interviewing, hazard cordoning, and tactical scene control (**Mdn = 3.85**), while Community Officials placed greater

emphasis on threat management, environmental assessment, assistance to injured persons, and inter-agency health coordination. These results indicate that effective emergency response depends on accurate information, tactical safety, situational assessment, timely assistance, and inter-agency coordination.

The qualitative findings reinforce the quantitative results by showing that effective response involves both careful preparation and professional conduct at the scene. A Patrol Supervisor emphasized the importance of obtaining and validating sufficient information before deployment, particularly when responding to potentially high-risk situations (**KII-PS01**). A Beat Patroller similarly described approaching incidents cautiously, prioritizing victim and officer safety, and assessing the scene before entry (**KII-BP03**). From the community perspective, a Community Official recalled an incident in which officers responded promptly but avoided unnecessarily aggressive intervention, instead assessing the situation and respectfully communicating with the parties involved (**KII-CO02**). These accounts demonstrate that response effectiveness is measured not only by speed of arrival but also by the quality of information gathering, tactical judgment, safety precautions, de-escalation, and respect shown during emergency encounters.

The findings are consistent with **Bittner's (1970) Theory of the Police Role**, which emphasizes the police capacity to intervene decisively in situations requiring the restoration of public safety and order. The high ratings demonstrate that Northern Samar patrol units are perceived as capable of translating this role into structured emergency response through threat validation, tactical scene management, victim assistance, and coordinated action. The results further support **Lum, Koper, and Wu (2022)** regarding structured response and officer safety, **Nix, Wolfe, and Campbell (2022)** on humanitarian crisis intervention and public confidence, and **Tyler (2022)** on the importance of respectful and procedurally fair police encounters. Overall, the findings suggest that effective emergency response requires a balance of **speed, preparedness, tactical caution, humanitarian assistance, and professional de-escalation**, enabling police to protect both public safety and community trust.

Significant Difference in the Level of Effectiveness of Police Patrol Operations in terms of the Identified Variables According to Group

The comparative analysis revealed that police patrol operations were generally perceived as **Highly Effective** by all respondent groups across the three identified variables. Patrol Supervisors consistently reported the highest median ratings for patrol guidelines (Md = 4.00), patrol duties (Md = 4.00), and responding to calls for police assistance (Md = 4.00), followed by Beat Patrollers (Md = 3.94, 3.87, and 3.85, respectively) and Community Officials (Md = 3.58, 3.51, and 3.48, respectively). Despite the uniformly high ratings, the Kruskal-Wallis test showed statistically significant differences among the respondent groups for patrol guidelines ($H = 26.918, p < .001$), patrol duties ($H = 23.153, p < .001$), and responding to calls for police assistance ($H = 27.394, p < .001$). These findings indicate that



perceptions of patrol effectiveness significantly vary according to respondent type, with Patrol Supervisors generally expressing the most favorable assessments and Community Officials the least favorable. The results suggest the need to further examine the sources of these perceptual differences, particularly through post hoc pairwise comparisons.

Informants' experiences with police patrol operations in their locality

This section presents the emerging themes and constituent subordinate themes derived from the phenomenological analysis of informants' lived experiences with police patrol operations in Northern Samar. The findings generated three overarching themes that capture the essential dimensions of patrol work as experienced by patrol supervisors, beat patrollers, and community officials. These encompass the relational benefits of sustained patrol presence, the hardships and personal costs associated with frontline service, and the professional and personal development gained through field experience. Collectively, the themes portray police patrol as a multifaceted undertaking situated at the intersection of public service, personal sacrifice, community engagement, and continuous professional development.

Theme 1: Patrol as a Living Relationship: The Daily Making and Unmaking of Community Trust. This theme reveals that patrol operations are experienced not merely as tactical law enforcement activities but as an ongoing social process through which community trust is built and sustained. Regular visibility, respectful interaction, and assistance during emergencies enable police officers to become familiar and approachable community figures, encouraging information sharing and cooperation. Informant 1 described this experience: *"An pinakadako nga positibo nga kaagi ko amo an pagkamarupok san relasyon sa mga residente. Tungod sa pirme nga patrulya, kilala na kami kag bukas sila maghatag sin impormasyon. Nakatabang gihapon ako ha mga gurang kag ha mga emergency, nga nakapahatag kalipay ha akon buot. Labi na, nakita ko nga nagkalinaw an lugar kag nagkaminusan an krimen."* (IDI1) *(The biggest positive experience is the strengthening of relations with residents. Because of regular patrol, we are known and they are open to give information. I also helped the elderly and in emergencies, which gave me joy. Most importantly, I saw the place become peaceful and crime reduced.)* This account shows how consistent patrol presence transforms visibility into familiarity and community confidence.

Similarly, Informant 2 shared: *"Dati an mga tawo diri nagpaparapit ha amon, siguro may kahadlok han una. Pero yana nga nakikita nira nga pirme kami naglalakat didto ha ira barangay ngan nakikipag-istorya hin maopay, hira na mismo an nag-iimbatar ngan nagsusumat han sitwasyon didto."* (IDI2) *(Before, the people did not approach us, perhaps because there was fear in the past. But now that they see us constantly walking through their barangay and speaking with them respectfully, they are the ones inviting us and reporting the actual situation there.)* This narrative illustrates how sustained and respectful contact reduces apprehension and institutional distance, allowing

residents to become active partners in local safety efforts. Informant 3 further emphasized the protective dimension of policing: *"An tinuod nga kapulisan diri la matatapos hiton pag-issue hin ticket o pag-aresto... didto ko nakit-an nga iba an pagtan-aw nira ha amon uniform diri na kaaway kundi protector."* (IDI3) *(True policing does not end with issuing tickets or making arrests... I saw that they viewed our uniform differently—not as an adversary anymore, but as a protector.)*

Taken together, these accounts indicate that community trust develops through repeated experiences of police visibility, respectful communication, responsiveness, and humanitarian assistance. Patrol therefore extends beyond crime prevention and enforcement to include relationship-building and community service. The findings suggest that when residents consistently experience officers as approachable, responsive, and protective, the police are increasingly perceived as partners rather than merely agents of authority. This relational dimension strengthens cooperation and information sharing, which are essential to effective community-oriented policing.

Theme 2: The Weight of the Uniform: Hardships, Hostility, and the Personal Cost of Patrol. This theme captures the demanding and often invisible dimensions of frontline patrol work, including physical exhaustion, psychological strain, exposure to traumatic incidents, public hostility, and the emotional labor required to remain professional under stressful circumstances. Informant 4 recounted: *"Ang mga negatibong karanasan sa aking pagpapatrulya ay madalas na kinabibilangan ng mga engkwentrong may mataas na antas ng stress, tulad ng pagsaksi sa mga krimen, mga trahedyang kamatayan, ng karamihan sa tahanan."* (IDI4) *(Negative experiences in patrol duty often include highly stressful encounters, such as witnessing crimes, traumatic deaths, and domestic violence.)* The account demonstrates that patrol personnel routinely confront situations involving violence, death, and unpredictable conflicts, requiring them to manage both operational risks and emotional responses.

The psychological burden of these encounters was further illustrated by Informant 5: *"Grabe an kapoy physically ngan psychologically. Usahay maabot ka ha eksena han krimen nga frish pa an dugo, nakikita mo an pamilya nga nagtutuok. Pag-uli mo ha imo pamilya, kinahanglan mo itago iton nga trauma kay diri mo man puyde dad-on an kangitngit han kalsada ha sulod han imo panimalay."* (IDI5) *(The physical and psychological exhaustion is severe. Sometimes you arrive at a crime scene where the blood is still fresh, and you see the family weeping. When you return home to your family, you have to hide that trauma because you cannot bring the darkness of the streets into your own household.)* Informant 6 likewise described the difficulty of dealing with intoxicated and confrontational individuals: *"An pinakamakuri amo an kaagaw an mga hubog ngan sutil nga kabataan ha disoras han gab-i... Sisigawan ka, mumurayawen, pero kun pumalag ka o gumamit hin pwersa, ikaw dayon an sasampakan hin kaso hiton mga human rights groups."** (IDI6) *(The hardest part is dealing with intoxicated individuals and defiant youth during the late hours of the night... They may*



shout and hurl obscenities, but if an officer responds or uses force, the officer may immediately face a human rights complaint.)

Collectively, the narratives reveal that patrol work carries substantial physical, psychological, and emotional costs that extend beyond the immediate performance of duty. Officers must simultaneously manage traumatic experiences, public hostility, personal safety, and the expectation to exercise restraint and professionalism. These experiences highlight the need for organizational support mechanisms that promote psychological resilience, stress management, personnel welfare, and continuing professional preparation. Thus, the “weight of the uniform” represents not only the risks inherent in frontline policing but also the personal sacrifices required to maintain effective and responsible police service.

Theme 3: Learning in the Field: Patrol as a School of Self, Community, and Craft. This theme reveals that patrol operations function as an experiential classroom where academic knowledge, statutory provisions, and operational protocols are transformed into practical judgment, situational awareness, and tactical competence. Informant 1 described patrol as a source of “additional knowledge in real-life police work,” noting the excitement and experience gained from performing duties in an area where officers may be exposed to ambushes by Communist Terrorist Groups (CTGs) and other lawless elements (IDI1). Informant 2 similarly observed: *“Iba an gintututdo ha akademya, iba gihapon an kamatuoran didto ha kalsada. Ha training, conditional an scenarios. Pero kun aada ka na ha matuod nga krisis, waray libro nga magsusumat ha imo kun pan-o mo lalamuyon an imo kahadlok para lang masalbar an kinabuhian iba.”* (IDI2) *(What is taught in the academy is different from the reality on the streets. In training, scenarios are conditional. But when you are in an actual crisis, there is no textbook that will tell you how to overcome your fear just to save the lives of others.)* These accounts demonstrate that field experience develops adaptive decision-making and confidence that cannot be fully acquired through classroom instruction alone.

Informant 3 further emphasized the developmental value of repeated patrol experience: *“Ha sulod hin pira ka tuig ko nga sige patrulya, nadugangan an akon pasensya ngan situational awareness. Diri ka la nahihimo nga mas maopay nga pulis, kundi mas nakakakilala ka gihapon han imo kalugaringon ngan han tinuod nga kahintang han imo igbhato nga mulupyo.”* (IDI3) *(Over my years of constant patrol, my patience and situational awareness have expanded. You do not just become a better police officer; you also understand yourself better and comprehend the true circumstances of your fellow citizens.)* This narrative illustrates that learning through patrol extends beyond technical competence to include personal growth, emotional maturity, self-awareness, and deeper understanding of community conditions. Repeated exposure to diverse situations enables officers to refine their judgment, regulate their responses, and develop a more context-sensitive approach to policing.

The findings suggest that patrol experience serves as a bridge between formal police training and the complex realities of frontline service. Consistent with **Problem-Oriented Policing**

Theory (Goldstein, 1979), the accounts demonstrate that effective patrol requires officers to understand local conditions and adapt their responses to recurring community concerns rather than rely solely on standardized procedures. The findings also complement **Procedural Justice Theory** (Tyler, 2022), as officers’ developing awareness of community circumstances and their capacity to respond appropriately can strengthen respectful police-community interactions. Overall, the lived experiences indicate that the “school of the field” produces not only more capable officers but also more reflective, adaptive, and community-aware practitioners. This finding underscores the importance of continuous field-based learning, mentoring, scenario-based training, and community engagement in strengthening patrol effectiveness in Northern Samar.

Factors that Enhance or Hinder the Effectiveness of Police Patrol Operations

Theme 1: The Community as Obstacle: Non-Compliance, Fear, and Behavioral Resistance Weakening Patrol Outcomes. This theme captures the behavioral, psychological, and relational barriers within the community that constrain police patrol effectiveness. Informants described situations in which compliance with police presence was temporary, fear of police intimidation discouraged communication, and confrontational or intoxicated individuals created recurring public-order problems. Informant 6 stated, *“Magkakauli pag ada pa presente pero paglarga magkakabalik sa kalye”* (IDI6), *(They behave when police are present, but when they leave, they return to the streets.)* This reflects the temporary nature of deterrence based primarily on police visibility, requiring officers to maintain a repeated physical presence to sustain compliance.

The reluctance of some residents to engage with police further limits patrol effectiveness. Informant 7 shared, *“Nahahadok an tawo umapiki sa police tungod san kamaisog minsan, napakalas la deri nagsasarit.”* (IDI7) *(People are afraid to approach the police because of intimidation sometimes; they just go away without saying anything.)* This suggests that perceived intimidation can create communication barriers and reduce the flow of information needed for effective patrol. Informant 8 likewise described the difficulty of managing disruptive groups: *“Mahirap harapin ang mga grupo ng mga kabataan o mga lasing na palaging nanggugulo sa kalsada. Mahirap silang pakiusapan at kung minsan ay nagpapasimula pa sila ng away kahit pinagsabihan.”* (IDI8) *(It is difficult to deal with groups of youth or intoxicated individuals who cause disturbances on the streets. They are difficult to reason with and sometimes initiate fights even after being warned.)*

Taken together, these accounts show that patrol effectiveness is influenced not only by police capacity but also by community behavior and the quality of police-community interaction. Temporary compliance, fear of approaching officers, and resistance from disruptive individuals can undermine preventive and responsive patrol functions. The findings therefore highlight the need for community-oriented strategies that promote respectful police engagement, strengthen public confidence,



encourage information sharing, and address recurring behavioral problems through preventive rather than purely enforcement-based interventions.

Theme 2: The Structural Deficit: How Resource Scarcity, Manpower Gaps, and Geographic Distance Constrain What Patrol Can Achieve. This theme describes the material, logistical, human-resource, and geographic constraints that limit the capacity of police patrol units to provide consistent and timely services. Informant 1 identified several interconnected deficiencies: “*Kakulangan sa mga sasakyan, kakulangan sa tauhan (manpower), kakulangan sa komunikasyong panradyo, at limitadong pondo.*” (IDI1) (*Insufficient vehicles, manpower shortage, shortage of radio communication, and limited funds.*) The account demonstrates that resource limitations occur across multiple operational components, affecting mobility, communication, personnel deployment, and the overall ability of patrol units to respond effectively to incidents.

Geographic coverage further intensifies these limitations. Informant 2 explained, “*Dito sa aming barangay, may mga lugar na hindi namin agad napupuntahan sa mismong oras ng pangyayari. Katulad na lang kapag curfew, hindi namin naikot o nababantayan ang lahat dahil sa laki ng aking barangay.*” (IDI2) (*In our barangay, there are areas that we cannot immediately reach when something happens. During curfew, for example, we cannot patrol or monitor all areas because of the size of the barangay.*) Similarly, Informant 3 identified “*mga malalayong bahagi ng hurisdiksiyon kung saan mas kailangan ang kanilang presensya*” (IDI3), (*remote parts of the jurisdiction where their presence is most needed*). These accounts illustrate how large jurisdictions, distance, and limited mobility create gaps in patrol coverage, particularly in areas where police presence may be most necessary.

Collectively, the narratives reveal a structural gap between the demands placed on patrol units and the resources available to meet them. Shortages in vehicles, personnel, communication equipment, and funding, combined with extensive and difficult-to-reach areas, restrict timely response and equitable patrol coverage. Thus, even when officers demonstrate commitment and operational readiness, structural limitations may prevent them from fully accomplishing their mandate. Addressing these constraints requires sustained investment in manpower, mobility, communication systems, operational funding, and strategies specifically designed for geographically dispersed communities.

Theme 3: Institutional Credibility at Risk: How Selective Enforcement and Perceived Bias Undermine Patrol Legitimacy. This theme captures how perceived favoritism and selective enforcement can undermine the legitimacy and credibility of police patrol operations. Informants described concerns that regulations are not always applied consistently, particularly when officers are perceived to favor relatives, acquaintances, or influential individuals. Informant 4 stated, “*May mga reklamo nga an patrulya ‘namimili’ san gindakop, puyde nga ginpapabay-an an mga kaurupod o kakilala pero*

istriktong sa iba.” (IDI4) (*There are complaints that patrol ‘chooses’ whom to arrest, possibly letting acquaintances go while being strict with others.*) This account illustrates how perceived unequal treatment can weaken confidence in police impartiality, even when such perceptions may not necessarily reflect verified misconduct.

The consequences of weakened authority are further reflected in Informant 5’s experience: “*Dara san dere maupay nga pamalaod san kabataan gin-aabuso an mga tanod ngan mga brgy official... an kabataan nga amon naabutan ha kalsada ha des oras san gab-i naipaabot ko ha head teacher san school... gin-balong an akon balay hin 2 kabesis.*” (IDI5) (*Because of youth not following the rules, barangay tanods and officials are abused. Based on my experience, after I reported youths on the street at night to the school head teacher, my house was stoned twice.*) This narrative demonstrates how resistance to community regulations can escalate into retaliation against local enforcement partners. It highlights the vulnerability of barangay authorities and the difficulty of maintaining public order when community members perceive enforcement actions as unfair or intrusive.

Informant 6 summarized the broader implication: “*Kun an huna-huna san komunidad amo nga may pabor-pabor an balaod, mas mapipili hira magpabilin nga silensyo kesa makipag-atubang sa mga nagpapatrulya.*” (IDI6) (*If the community believes that the law is applied with favoritism, they will choose to remain silent rather than deal with those conducting the patrol.*) Collectively, these accounts indicate that perceived bias can disrupt the cooperation and information-sharing necessary for effective patrol operations. The findings underscore the importance of consistent, impartial, and transparent enforcement, as police legitimacy depends not only on the exercise of authority but also on the community’s perception that rules are applied fairly. Strengthening accountability, professionalism, and police-community communication may therefore help restore confidence and sustain voluntary community cooperation.

Proposed Program Based on the Results, Discussion, and Findings of the Study

The **Building Accountable, Neighborhood-responsive, Transparent, and Yielding Interventions (BANTAYI)** is a proposed three-year strategic intervention program developed directly from the quantitative and qualitative findings of the study on police patrol operations in Northern Samar. Rather than replacing existing police patrol practices, BANTAYI seeks to strengthen and institutionalize practices that were found to contribute to effective patrol while addressing the structural, behavioral, relational, and institutional barriers identified by the informants. Its five strategic pillars—**Community Relational Infrastructure Strengthening, Structural Coverage Gap Closure, Field-Grounded Competence Development, Impartial Enforcement and Institutional Trust Protection, and Behavioral Compliance Deepening and Police-Fear Reduction**—are designed as complementary interventions that collectively address the conditions influencing patrol effectiveness.



The framework responds to an important finding of the study: although police patrol operations were generally assessed as highly implemented and highly effective, differences in perceptions among respondent groups and several qualitative concerns revealed areas requiring sustained intervention. These include limited resources and manpower, difficulty reaching remote communities, inconsistent community cooperation, fear or hesitation in approaching police, behavioral resistance, and concerns regarding impartiality in enforcement. BANTAYI therefore focuses not only on maintaining operational effectiveness but also on strengthening the conditions that make such effectiveness sustainable. The program emphasizes community partnership, adequate patrol coverage, field-based professional development, institutional accountability, and positive community engagement.

Pillar 1: Community Relational Infrastructure Strengthening

This pillar addresses the finding that effective patrol operations are closely associated with sustained police-community relationships. Informants described how regular patrol visibility, respectful communication, assistance during emergencies, and familiarity with residents encouraged information sharing and strengthened perceptions of police as protectors rather than adversaries. The pillar therefore seeks to institutionalize these positive relationships so that community engagement does not depend solely on individual officers or temporary initiatives. Its major activities include the **Barangay Patrol Coordination Protocol** and the **Patrol Visibility Consolidation System**, which provide structured mechanisms for coordination among patrol supervisors, beat patrollers, barangay officials, and barangay peacekeeping personnel.

Pillar 2: Structural Coverage Gap Closure

This pillar responds to the documented limitations in vehicles, manpower, communication equipment, funding, and geographic accessibility. Informants specifically identified remote barangays and geographically extensive areas where patrol units cannot always provide timely coverage. The pillar therefore aims to improve the equitable distribution and utilization of available patrol resources through the **Remote Barangay Priority Patrol System** and the **Tanod Roster Activation and Accountability Protocol**. A geographic coverage assessment may be undertaken to identify underserved areas and prioritize patrol deployment according to population, incident patterns, distance, accessibility, and identified security risks.

Pillar 3: Field-Grounded Competence Development

This pillar is grounded in the finding that patrol personnel develop important professional competencies through actual field experience. Informants emphasized that situations encountered in real patrol operations often differ from controlled training scenarios and require situational awareness, emotional control, adaptive decision-making, and practical judgment. The pillar proposes the **Northern Samar Patrol Field Mentoring System** and the **Tanod Contextual Competency Program** to

translate accumulated field knowledge into structured learning. Mentoring, scenario-based exercises, incident debriefings, and community-specific training may be used to strengthen officers' ability to respond appropriately to the distinctive operational conditions of Northern Samar.

Pillar 4: Impartial Enforcement and Institutional Trust Protection

This pillar addresses concerns regarding perceived selective enforcement, favoritism, and the resulting erosion of police legitimacy. Informants indicated that perceptions of unequal treatment may discourage residents from communicating with patrol personnel and may weaken community cooperation. The pillar therefore proposes the **Enforcement Impartiality Verification System**, which promotes consistent application of laws, policies, and patrol procedures through supervisory review, documentation, and appropriate community feedback mechanisms. It also includes the **Patrol Officer Resilience and Dignity Protection Protocol**, which recognizes the occupational stress and hostility encountered by frontline personnel and provides mechanisms such as post-incident debriefing, peer support, recognition, and appropriate referral for assistance.

Pillar 5: Behavioral Compliance Deepening and Police-Fear Reduction

This pillar responds to the finding that some community compliance remains dependent on the physical presence of police personnel. Informants described situations in which individuals complied while officers were present but resumed undesirable behavior after patrol units departed. Other accounts indicated that fear or perceived intimidation sometimes discouraged residents from approaching police or sharing information. The pillar therefore proposes the **Barangay Norm Internalization Program**, **Police-Fear Reduction and Approachability Protocol**, and **Intoxicated Individual Response Protocol**. These interventions aim to strengthen community ownership of peace-and-order responsibilities, improve police approachability and communication, and provide patrol personnel with consistent strategies for managing recurring public-order situations involving intoxicated or confrontational individuals.

Taken together, the five pillars provide an integrated intervention framework for strengthening police patrol operations in Northern Samar. **Pillar 1** builds the community relationships necessary for cooperation; **Pillar 2** addresses the resources and geographic limitations that affect patrol reach; **Pillar 3** strengthens the field-based competencies of patrol personnel; **Pillar 4** protects institutional credibility through impartiality, accountability, and personnel support; and **Pillar 5** promotes sustainable community compliance and reduces barriers to police-community communication. The BANTAYI program therefore seeks to move police patrol operations beyond maintaining immediate effectiveness toward a more **accessible, accountable, community-responsive, and sustainable system of public safety**.



Conclusions

Based from the findings, the corresponding conclusions are here in drawn:

1. On the level of implementation of police patrol operations. The consistently high ratings across all dimensions of patrol duties, tasks and responsibilities, and operations demonstrate that police patrol operations in Northern Samar are highly implemented. However, the lower scores from community officials compared to police personnel suggest a gap in visibility and perceived transparency of certain patrol activities to the broader community.

2. On the significant differences in implementation by respondent group. The presence of statistically significant differences in ratings between police personnel and community officials indicates a divergence in perceptions regarding the actual implementation of patrol operations. This highlights the need for increased community awareness and engagement to bridge perception gaps and strengthen mutual understanding.

3. On the level of effectiveness of police patrol operations. The very effective ratings for patrol guidelines, duties, and response to calls across all groups confirm the operational competence and reliability of police patrols in the province. The high level of agreement among different respondent groups, particularly in emergency response, suggests a well-established standard of practice and effective communication protocols within patrol teams.

4. On differences in effectiveness across respondent groups. Although statistically significant differences exist among respondent groups in perceived effectiveness, the effect sizes are small, and near parity was observed in emergency response ratings. This points to a broadly shared confidence in the effectiveness of police patrols, with only minor variations in perception that do not substantially impact overall trust in patrol operations.

5. On informants' lived experiences with police patrol operations. The themes of relational policing, personal sacrifice, and experiential learning imply that patrol work is not only a technical function but also a deeply social and developmental process. These insights stress the importance of fostering positive police-community relationships, recognizing the demands placed on patrol personnel, and prioritizing ongoing, experience-based learning opportunities to sustain effective and humane policing.

6. On factors that enhance or hinder patrol effectiveness. The identified enhancing factors community partnership and professional competence and hindering factors community resistance, structural deficits, and issues of institutional credibility imply that improving patrol effectiveness requires a holistic approach. Strengthening resource allocation, fostering genuine community engagement, investing in personnel training, and upholding fairness in enforcement are all critical for sustaining public trust and optimizing patrol outcomes.

Recommendations

Based from the findings and conclusions, the following recommendations are here in offered:

1. To address the gap in visibility and perceived transparency of patrol operations, it is recommended that the police enhance communication and information-sharing initiatives with the community. Regular community forums, public reporting of patrol activities, and the use of accessible communication channels can help bridge perception gaps and foster a culture of openness.

2. Given the divergence in perceptions between police personnel and community officials, efforts should be made to intensify community engagement. This can include organizing joint patrol activities, participatory safety planning, and forming community advisory councils to provide feedback and promote mutual understanding between law enforcement and the public.

3. To maintain the high level of effectiveness demonstrated in patrol guidelines, duties, and emergency response, it is recommended that police leadership institutionalize ongoing training, regular performance reviews, and the sharing of best practices. Emphasis should be placed on the consistent application of operational protocols and the reinforcement of effective communication within patrol teams.

4. Although overall confidence in police patrols is strong, minor perceptual differences should not be overlooked. Police should continue to build trust through visible accountability measures, regular community satisfaction surveys, and transparent mechanisms for addressing public concerns, especially in areas where perceptions slightly diverge.

5. To support the social and developmental aspects of policing, programs focused on relational policing, officer wellness, and reflective learning should be implemented. Initiatives such as mentorship, peer support groups, and experiential learning workshops will help police personnel manage the demands of their role while fostering positive relationships with the community.

6. To overcome structural deficits and address both enhancing and hindering factors, it is recommended that police agencies advocate for sufficient resource allocation, strengthen partnerships with local organizations, and uphold strict standards of professional competence and fair enforcement. Community partnership programs, resource mobilization efforts, and anti-bias training should be prioritized.

7. In line with these recommendations, it is strongly recommended to implement the BANTAYI (Building Accountable, Neighborhood-responsive, Transparent And Yielding Interventions) Program. The BANTAYI Program is designed as a comprehensive, multi-pillar strategy that addresses patrol visibility, community engagement, resource adequacy, professional competence, accountability, and crime prevention. Its components include establishing community-police partnership councils, transparent reporting and feedback systems, regular joint patrols, ongoing officer training and wellness initiatives, resource mobilization, anti-bias and fairness-in-enforcement workshops, and crime prevention education. By adopting the BANTAYI Program, law enforcement in Northern Samar can systematically address both operational and relational challenges, build lasting trust, and further enhance the implementation and effectiveness of police patrol operations.



REFERENCES

1. Aguilar, M. R., & Bautista, J. C. (2021). Structural determinants of police response time: Assessing mobile patrol operations in selected Philippine cities. *Journal of Philippine Policing and Public Safety*, 8(2), 45–62.
2. Ariel, B. (2023). Adherence to planned dosage in hot spots policing: An experimental analysis of supervisory oversight and implementation fidelity. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 22(3), 511–534.
3. Ariel, B., Sherman, L. W., & Newton, A. (2020). Testing the effects of body-worn cameras on police-public encounters: A multi-site randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 16(1), 29–51.
4. Babbie, E. R. (2022). *Survey research methods* (10th ed.). Wadsworth Publishing.
5. Bélanger, M., Ruiz, J. A., & Sorensen, D. L. (2025). Unified patrol scheduling: Balancing proactive visibility and reactive emergency response. *International Journal of Police Science & Management*, 27(1), 14–31.
6. Binan, J. C., Dausan, M. S., & Echaure, R. T. (2024). Coordination gaps and standard operating procedures in patrol-based crime prevention. *Philippine Criminological Review*, 11(1), 89–104.
7. Bobis, L. V. (2025). Collective efficacy at the grassroots: Assessing police-barangay collaboration in crime prevention. *Journal of Community Policing and Development*, 14(2), 112–128.
8. Braga, A. A., Turchan, A. M., Papachristos, A. V., & Hureau, D. M. (2024). Hot spots policing and crime reduction: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Justice Quarterly*, 41(1), 34–65.
9. Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., & Turchan, A. M. (2022). Focused deterrence and hot spots policing: Operational synergies for violent crime reduction. *Crime and Justice*, 51(1), 185–232.
10. Brillantes, R. A., & Fernandez, G. L. (2020). Structural assessment of community policing integration in Metro Manila: Realities of routine patrol. *Philippine Journal of Public Administration*, 64(1), 73–96.
11. Camo, P. E., & Aguilar, T. M. (2024). Command structures and procedural compliance: Evaluating routine patrol operations. *The Philippine Law Enforcement Journal*, 19(3), 45–59.
12. Carpio, V. G., Anquiles, R. S., Cannas, M. L., & Cadangdang, P. B. (2024). Mobile patrol strategies and property crime: A time-series analysis of municipal scheduling. *Visayas Journal of Criminological Research*, 7(2), 201–218.
13. Castillo, H. N., & Reyes, M. C. (2022). Policing the pandemic: The degradation of routine patrol coverage during COVID-19 community quarantines. *Philippine Journal of Criminology*, 15(1), 102–121.
14. Cochran, W. G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
15. Cohen, L., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44(4), 588–608.
16. Colaizzi, P. F. (1978). Psychological research as the phenomenologist views it. In R. S. Valle & M. King (Eds.), *Existential-phenomenological alternatives for psychology* (pp. 48–71). Oxford University Press.
17. Commission on Human Rights of the Philippines. (2020). *Special report on grassroots security and human rights in local communities*. CHR Portal.
18. Corpuz, D. S. (2025). Performance-based governance systems within the Philippine National Police: A decade of the P.A.T.R.O.L. Plan 2030. *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*, 12(1), 15–33.
19. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
20. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
21. Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2018). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
22. Dai, M., Frank, J., & Sun, I. Y. (2021). Procedural justice during routine encounters: A comparative international assessment of officer behavior. *Policing & Society*, 31(6), 689–705.
23. Davies, T. L. (2024). Developing shared mental models through simulation-based training in tactical law enforcement units. *Journal of Police and Criminal Psychology*, 39(2), 142–156.
24. dela Cruz, J. R., & Santos, A. M. (2023). Triangulating patrol operations: Comparative perceptions of implementation among supervisors, beat patrollers, and barangay officials. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education and Research*, 18(4), 55–78.
25. Denney, L., & Jenkins, S. (2013). *Securing communities: Street-level policing in fragile and resource-constrained institutional environments* (Overseas Development Institute Working Paper No. 375). ODI.
26. Dewinter, M., Vandeviver, C., Beken, T. V., & Witlox, F. (2024). Analysing the spatiotemporal alignment of routine police patrol and crime hot spots. *European Journal of Criminology*, 21(2), 189–211.
27. Data Privacy Act of 2012, Rep. Act No. 10173 (2012) (Phil.).
28. Department of the Interior and Local Government Act of 1990, Rep. Act No. 6975 (1990) (Phil.).
29. Eck, J. E., & Spelman, W. (1987). *Problem-oriented policing in Newport News*. Police Executive Research Forum.
30. Engel, R. S., & Worden, R. E. (2023). Proactive policing and its asymmetric impacts on minority community satisfaction. *Criminology*, 61(2), 241–273.
31. Felson, M., & Boba, R. L. (2010). *Crime and everyday life* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.
32. Ferrandino, J. (2022). Supervisory clarity and organizational support as predictors of proactive patrol engagement. *Police Practice and Research*, 23(4), 415–432.
33. Fetters, M. D., Curry, L. A., & Creswell, J. W. (2013). Achieving integration in mixed methods designs – principles and practices. *Health Services Research*, 48(6pt2), 2134–2156.
34. Fusch, P. I., & Ness, L. R. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(9), 1408–1416.



35. Gay, J. M. (2024). Human resource distribution and operational deployment profiles in the Eastern Visayas police districts. *Regional Police Office 8 Administration*.
36. Gianan, K. E. (2025). Visible guardianship: Assessing the impact of routine police presence on public confidence in rural municipalities. *Eastern Visayas Criminological Review*, 4(1), 22–39.
37. Goldstein, H. (1979). Improving policing: A problem-oriented approach. *Crime & Delinquency*, 25(2), 236–258.
38. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services. (2021). Police effectiveness, efficiency and legitimacy 2021/22: An assessment of patrol supervision and beat accountability. HMICFRS.
39. Hiller Foshaugen, M., & Vestad, J. K. (2024). Proactive policing under the New Public Management paradigm: Bureaucratic accountability vs. operational flexibility. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 18, Article paae012.
40. Hills, A. (2021). Routine policing in developing societies: Resource constraints, informal norms, and tactical adaptation. *Third World Quarterly*, 42(7), 1541–1558.
41. Hoogesteyn, K., Hofer, M. S., Taniguchi, T. A., & Rineer, J. (2025). The compounding costs of police turnover: Attrition, team cohesion, and the erosion of patrol coordination. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 96, Article 102144.
42. Inocencio, E. L. (2023). Logistical disparities and beat optimization in rural policing: The case of Samar Island. *Philippine Journal of Development Studies*, 49(2), 134–155.
43. Kelling, G. L., Pate, T., Dieckman, D., & Brown, C. E. (1974). *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: A technical report*. Police Foundation.
44. Khalifa, H., Snaphaan, T., & Hardyns, W. (2024). Tracking the guardians: Utilizing GPS data to measure implementation fidelity and spatial coverage of police patrols. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 61(3), 315–348.
45. Koko, M. A., Ayuba, P., Anthony, J., & Dari, H. S. (2025). Comparative optimization models in patrol deployment: Allocating personnel and paths in low-resource environments. *African Journal of Criminology and Security Studies*, 9(1), 62–79.
46. Laraga, R. M., Gallego, P. S., Jalalon, K. T., Maldepeña, A. C., & Cuevas, N. J. (2025). Behind the frontline: The vital contributions of non-uniformed personnel to patrol logistics and documentation continuity. *Journal of Police Administration and Management*, 13(1), 44–61.
47. Lei, X., Chen, Y., Zhang, H., Wang, S., Liu, P., & Zhao, K. (2025). Dynamic deployment and predictive routing algorithms for police patrol during large-scale urban events. *Computer-Aided Civil and Infrastructure Engineering*, 40(2), 198–217.
48. Local Government Code of 1991, Rep. Act No. 7160 (1991) (Phil.).
49. Lum, C., Koper, C. S., & Wu, X. (2022). Institutionalizing evidence-based policing: Gaps between prescribed patrol policy and informal organizational culture. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 21(1), 27–53.
50. MacDonald, J., Klick, J., & Grunwald, B. (2021). The effect of private police patrols on crime: A difference-in-differences analysis. *Journal of Legal Studies*, 50(1), 1–29.
51. Manaloto, D. E., & Cruz, R. F. (2021). Predictors of procedural errors in crime scene documentation and routine patrol among municipal officers. *The Philippine Police Scientist*, 30(3), 82–99.
52. Manubag, M. S. (2024). Joint problem-solving frameworks and responsive policing: A mixed-methods assessment of police-community boards. *Journal of Legal and Criminological Studies*, 6(2), 145–163.
53. Mendoza, L. C. (2022). Continuous professional development and community-perceived effectiveness of patrol personnel. *Philippine Criminology Today*, 13(2), 104–120.
54. Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
55. Micubo, F. A. (2025). Adherence to standard operating procedures and officer safety during night-shift deployments. *The National Police Review*, 42(1), 74–91.
56. Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. SAGE Publications.
57. Navarro, V. K. (2021). Transformational leadership practices and organizational commitment among patrol officers of the Philippine National Police. *The PNP Journal of Leadership and Management*, 9(2), 115–132.
58. Nix, J., Wolfe, S. E., & Campbell, B. A. (2022). Command directive vs. supervisor feedback: Enhancing conflict de-escalation and procedural justice during routine patrol encounters. *Crime & Delinquency*, 68(8), 1323–1348.
59. Nix, J., Wolfe, S. E., & Campbell, B. A. (2023). Visible patrol presence, collective efficacy, and neighborhood perceptions of safety: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 39(2), 485–512.
60. Northern Samar Police Provincial Office Report. (2023). Annual peace and order audit and index crime tracking statistics. NSPPO.
61. Owusu-Bempah, A. (2020). Socioeconomic disparities in patrol contact: Enforcement-oriented vs. service-oriented policing in marginalized spaces. *Race and Justice*, 10(3), 263–284.
62. Palma-Borda, M., Guzmán, L. A., & Belmonte, J. (2025). Cooperative patrol routing systems: A reinforcement learning approach to minimizing path duplication and maximizing surveillance coverage. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 320(1), 142–159.
63. Pastrana, H. D., & Martir, S. L. (2024). Standardizing tactical response: Evaluating the impact of modular refresher training on patrol unity. *Journal of Criminal Justice Education in the Philippines*, 5(1), 12–29.
64. Philippine National Police. (2015). *Manual for planning of patrol operations*. Directorate for Operations.
65. Philippine National Police. (2020). Memorandum Circular No. 2020-049: Guidelines and procedures on the integration of the PNP Patrol Plan. Camp Crame.
66. Philippine National Police. (2021). Revised Philippine National Police operational procedures. Directorate for Operations.
67. Philippine National Police. (2022). Annual administrative and personnel deployment report. Directorate for Personnel and Records Management.



68. Philippine Statistics Authority. (2024). *Census of population and housing: Northern Samar geographic and demographic profile*. PSA.
69. President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. (2015). *Final report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*. Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
70. Ramos, E. T., & Villanueva, M. S. (2022). Divergent metrics: Comparing police enforcement outputs and community service expectations in patrol evaluations. *Philippine Social Science Review*, 74(1), 47–68.
71. Repasky, M., Wang, Z., & Xie, F. (2024). Synchronizing dispatch and dynamic routing: An integrated optimization framework for municipal police forces. *Transportation Research Part C: Emerging Technologies*, 162, Article 104581.
72. Republic Act No. 8551 (Philippine National Police Reform and Reorganization Act of 1998) (Phil.).
73. Republic Act No. 9708 (An Act Extending for Five Years the Time Frame for Complying with the Minimum Educational Qualification for Appointment to the PNP) (Phil.).
74. Reyes, P. O., & Corpuz, M. T. (2023). Implementation fidelity of the community-oriented policing system (COPS) across local police districts. *The Philippine Criminology Quarterly*, 20(4), 112–131.
75. Salang, T. M. (2023). Organizational alignment and long-term policing agendas: Evaluating the execution of the PNP P.A.T.R.O.L. Plan 2030 at the station level. *Journal of Police Reform and Strategic Management*, 11(3), 204–225.
76. Santos, L. B., & dela Rosa, K. M. (2023). Non-peak visibility and service responsiveness: Correlates of public trust in rural municipal policing. *Journal of Local Governance and Safety*, 6(2), 88–103.
77. Social Weather Stations. (2021). *Fourth quarter 2021 Social Weather Survey: Public satisfaction ratings of the Philippine National Police*. SVWS.
78. Soriano, J. M. (2021). Police discretion on the beat: The operational consequences of unstandardized decision-making protocols in Cebu City. *Journal of Police Studies and Criminology*, 3(1), 29–48.
79. Sotto, P. D. (2025). The strain of guardianship: Extended duty hours, resource deficits, and patrol officer morale in lower-middle-income environments. *The Southeast Asian Journal of Policing*, 16(1), 50–68.
80. Sui, H., Chen, J., & Jiang, Z. (2025). Resource balancing in police patrol planning: A multi-objective optimization framework for urban environments. *Safety Science*, 181, Article 106521.
81. Tankebe, J., & Asante, S. (2020). Procedural justice, community policing forums, and public cooperation with the police in developing nations. *International Criminology Review*, 22(4), 311–335.
82. Taniguchi, T. A., Hoogesteyn, K., Rineer, J., Gill, C., & Hibdon, J. (2025). Delineating tasks and prioritising calls: Experimental evaluation of a modular patrol workload allocation model. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 21(1), 75–98.
83. Telep, C. W., & Weisburd, D. L. (2020). Problem-oriented policing: Assessing the empirical evidence for response efficiency and repeat-call reductions. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 19(2), 421–443.
84. *The 1987 Constitution of the Republic of the Philippines*, art. II, § 5 & art. XVI, § 5.
85. Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. Yale University Press.
86. Tyler, T. R. (2022). Procedural justice, institutional legitimacy, and public cooperation: A review of the empirical literature over three decades. *Annual Review of Law and Social Science*, 18(1), 205–225.
87. Valdez, C. D. (2023). Listening to the grass roots: Key informant perspectives of barangay captains on police visibility and incident follow-up. *Philippine Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 29(3), 144–161.
88. Weisburd, D. L., Telep, C. W., & Lawton, B. A. (2021). Place-based policing and the containment of crime: Future directions for evidence-based beat design. *Annual Review of Criminology*, 4(1), 317–339.
89. Wilson, J. M., & Grammich, C. A. (2024). Police workforce planning and scheduling: Reconciling officer workload, fatigue, and proactive deployment capacity. *Policing: An International Journal*, 47(2), 253–269.
90. Wolfe, S. E., Nix, J., & Campbell, B. A. (2020). Organizational support, supervisor legitimacy, and officer misconduct: A longitudinal study of patrol personnel. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 25(2), 188–207.
91. Wood, J., Fleming, J., & Marks, M. (2020). Proactive policing and informal organizational norms: An ethnographic analysis of street-level discretion. *British Journal of Criminology*, 60(4), 1012–1031. , 10(2), 189–202.