

ARTICLE

3

**MODERN AND REFRESHED APPROACHES FOR
OPERATIONALIZING COMMUNITY POLICING
MODEL IN NIGERIA**

Ezeji Chiji Longinus¹

¹ Department of Criminology and Security Studies | Email: clezeji@gmail.com

Abstract

Community policing is a model of policing or strategy adopted by Nigeria to curb crime from the grassroots, starting from the local level. The strategy is based on the idea that local police have local responsibility to minimise the effects of stranger to stranger policing. The model promotes police working in partnership with the community in solving local problems. The idea is, however, fraught with many problems. A set of universally applicable principles and elements are identified, but exactly how they are implemented should vary from place to place, because jurisdictions and police agencies have different needs and circumstances. Throughout the development of community policing various definitions, meanings and practices have made the concept difficult to define. There is considerable uncertainty and disagreement about the conceptual framework of community policing and gross misunderstanding of the principles and elements of the model by those entrusted to implement the model. The study adopted qualitative methodology. An interview technique was used to collect data. A total of sixty-five participants were purposively selected for interview, due to their vast knowledge on the topic under study. The study reveals that officials entrusted with the implementation of the model are not specifically trained and most of them lack experience, cannot effectively operationalize the model. The recommendation includes training and retraining of community policing implementers to acquire the general knowledge of the concepts, elements and strategies of the model, need to identify other smarter policing tenets that can be operationalized in consonance with community policing, the adoption of modern, effective techniques and approach that best fits the diverse nature of Nigeria.

Keywords: Smarter Policing, Refreshed Approach, Community Policing, and Nigeria

Introduction

Recently, Nigerians have witnessed different types of crime such as extremism/insurgency, transnational crime, drug trafficking and related offences, organised crime, terrorism, and international proliferation of arms, smuggling and child trafficking, human trafficking, banditry, violence crimes, kidnapping and abduction, cybercrime, domestic violence and gender-based crimes. Police alone cannot effectively solve these aforementioned crimes. The question is, do we have enough specifically trained officers and partners who can be trusted with the operationalisation of community policing in Nigeria. The problem is that there is a misunderstanding surrounding the concept of community policing and some officials entrusted with the implementation of the model do not understand the conceptual framework of the model. Many thought that community policing is the same as regional security outfit or network. Many scholars have offered different definitions of community policing, there is considerable uncertainty and disagreement about how community policing and problem solving policing can be adopted together and the perception of limited insight of sworn officers held regarding the concepts of community policing. The study seeks to evaluate the concept and principles of community policing, identify community policing approaches and strategies, identify the elements of community policing, identify the benefits and effectiveness of community policing, evaluate barriers to community policing and make comparisons between community policing and other policing strategies. The study adopted qualitative methodology. An interview technique was used for data collection. Sixty-five participants were purposively selected for the interview due to their vast knowledge on the topic under study. The participants included officers from police force, policing experts, criminologists and academicians from various higher institutions of learning. Literature relating to the topic under study was consulted and qualitative analysis was used for data interpretations.

Rationale for the study

The study outlines new community policing strategies, which emphasised that crime and incident statistics should be used as a partial measure for police performance and suggests survey as another way of measuring performance. The strategy is consistent with the approach that encourages the police and community to work together in partnership; develop role

that is broader than the traditional crime-fighting role; decentralised police resources, define geographic areas, that have the same identity and characteristics; focuses on problem solving rather than reacting to incidents that are merely symptoms of a broader problem; and emphasise flexibility with accountability. The study supports the proposition that community policing be operationalized in consonance with community oriented policing strategies, which required in the organisational structure; the need to devolve financial and operational accountability and responsibility to lower and more appropriate levels within a structure that supports change, ensures that the staff dealing with the community have the capacity to make decisions relating to their area. In terms of consultation; the police and community should work together in partnership and in consultation with particular reference to the role police and the public should play in resolving issues and problems. In the perspective of problem solving the need for an interactive process between the community and police, which identifies and resolves community problems. Policing must be intelligence driven.

Concept of Police and Policing

Nigerian police is a department of the government charged with the preservation of public order and tranquility, enforcement of laws, the promotion of public health, safety and morals, prevention, detection and prosecution of offenders. The primary role of the police is policing. Policing is securing compliance with existing laws and in conformity with precepts of social order. However, the police are not the only agency in policing in the broad sense of the term. Conversely, not all those shouldered with policing responsibility belong to the police (Ezeji, 2020).

Policing has been necessary in all societies for the preservation of order, safety and social relations. Current police policies are based on the assumptions that proactive policing strategies will not only deter crime, but will also improve police and community relationships (Schanzer et al. 2016). Furthermore, policing is the activities conducted by police officers to preserve law and order. The policing of public places, actions of a person or group in authority to ensure fairness and legality in an area of public life. Policing involves overseeing, regulating, supervising, enforcing, implementing, observing, watching and checking up on (Ezeji, 2020).

Functionalist Theory

Functionalist or consensus approach (theory) is a model that posits that behaviour in society is structured. This means that relationships between members of society are organised in terms of rules, social relationships that are patterned and recurrent. Functionalists believe, there is value consensus in every social reality. They believe that, there is a general agreement by members of a society on what is desirable, worthwhile, and worthless. People share consensus on the values, norms, and beliefs of a society (Wroblewski & Hess, 2003). A high degree of consensus in a society whether it is democratic or communist, bind members together to form an integrated and cohesive unit. In the application of functionalist or consensus approach in this study, Ezeji (2020) affirms that community policing is an organisation-wide philosophy and management approach that promotes agreement, consensus and partnership between the community, government and the police. In this agreement and consensus, community problems are solved proactively, causes of crime and other community issues, jointly resolved by the community, police and other role players. Functionalists also assume that societies and phenomena are pervaded by stability. The theory assumes that certain degree of order and stability is necessary for the survival of social system. Functionalists downplay the conflict in society between classes and argued that once norms and values are maintained, the society would be conflict free (Harlambos & Holborn, 2005). Despite class disparities, the authorities should ensure that norms and values that promote the economic growth and social welfare of the community is prioritized through consensus reached between the community and the Nigerian police, which is an integral part of the social system, because, the inability of the police to perform their duties effectively has affected economy, polity, families and the overall security of the nation. The perception has made people feel unsafe to go about their regular businesses, hence the agitation of smarter policing model that can be effective in addressing community problems in partnership with the police and members of the community. Wroblewski and Hess (2003) noted that the essence of community policing is to return to the day when safety and security are participatory and everyone assumes responsibility for the general health of the community not a selected few, not just the local government administration, not just the safety forces, but absolutely everyone in the community. According to Fridell (2004), functionalist or consensus

approach supports the key principle of community policing that posit that police should not be separated from, but rather joined in partnership with the community. Community Policing focuses on police and community participation, setting priorities, establishing partnerships and enhancing community safety. At the heart of community reassurance is engagement, listening and acting and taking proactive measures to prevent crime.

History and advent of Community Policing in Nigeria

Due to the negative public perception about the Nigeria Police and its inefficiency in addressing crime at the local level, the former Inspector General of Police Tafa Balogun in 2003, undertook different measures to improve the police and citizens' relationship. He established in all states commands the Police Complaints Bureau and the Human Rights desks, and with the help of the British government, he introduced a pilot community policing project in Enugu State and presented eight points agenda that will address the following: massive onslaught against robbers, gruesome murder, assassination and other crimes of violence against the backdrop of which operation fire for fire was adopted as a methodology. Fast decisive crime/conflict management was adopted, a serious anti-corruption crusade, both within and outside the Force was launched. The comprehensive training programme conducive for qualitative policing was initiated, an improved condition of service and enhanced welfare package for officers, inspectors and rank and file. There were an inter-service/agency cooperation at all levels down the line. Robust public relations necessary for the vision of people's Police (Ibeanu, 2007). When Mike Okiro took over as Inspector General of Police in 2007, he introduced nine (9) way tests. The high points, which include transparency and accountability, war on corruption and crime, crime prevention, upgrading intelligence and crime database, improved training, improving the public image and relations of the police, improving human rights record of the police and interagency cooperation, Since 2004, when the Community Policing pilot project was introduced in Enugu State, it has also been implemented in other states such as Ogun, Ondo, Kano, Jigawa, Anambra, Sokoto, Cross River and Edo States (Ibeanu, 2007). Moreover, community policing can be traced back to the introduction of community constables, known as 'bobbies' by Sir Robert Peel in the newly created Metropolitan London Police District during the early the 19th century

(Patterson, 2007). Sir Robert Peel rationalised, police are the public and the public are the police.

Understanding the Concept of Community Policing

Community policing involves collaboration between police and community members characterised by problem-solving and partnerships to enhance crime prevention. Community policing has been adopted by law enforcement agencies to improve trust between community members and the police, and leveraging on police resources through voluntary assistance by community members in public safety measures. The major reason for adopting community policing is to build a police organisation that is transparent, fair, neutral, accountable and responsive to public perceptions and expectations. The community helps develop effective strategies beyond the traditional method for policing, which is exclusively based on law enforcement and which tends to be reactive (Wilson and Kelling, 2007). Community policing involves problem-solving and community engagement with an emphasis on police-community partnerships to solve the underlying problems of crime, the fear of crime, physical and social disorder, and neighbourhood decay (Palmiotto, 2000).

Moreover, Cordner (2007) argues that the concept of community policing is misunderstood as a concept and recognises that community policing is not the answer to all the problems facing modern policing. It is not anti-law enforcement or anti-crime fighting. It does not seek to turn police work into social work and there is no iron-clad, precise definition of community policing nor a set of specific activities that should be included. A set of universally applicable principles and elements can be identified, but exactly how they are implemented should vary from place to place because jurisdictions and police agencies have different needs and circumstances. Throughout the development of community policing various definitions, meanings and practices have made the concept difficult to define (Brookes, 2006).

Similarly, community policing is defined as a philosophy of policing that promotes community-based problem-solving strategies to address the underlying causes of crime and disorder and fear of crime and provides reassurance. The primary objective of community policing is that it creates

positive police community relationships, which are achieved through community engagement, and by emphasising collaboration and prevention (Cordner and Biebel Perkins, 2005). Bucqueroux (2007) uses a medical analogy to describe community policing patrol officers are 'society's casualty physician responds rapidly to an occurrence, whereas community police the 'family physicians who have the time and opportunity not only to treat an illness but to prevent disease and promote good health. Fielding (2005) suggests that community policing is not a single concept but a contrast to rapid response and enforcement-oriented policing, so constables are closer to the community. Community policing model complements the work of Neighbourhood support groups. Neighbourhood support encourages crime prevention techniques such as public surveillance; property marking; and home security. These techniques are an important component of the work of community constables.

The origins of community policing: urban or rural

Pelfrey (2007) highlights ranges of school of thought regarding the origins of community policing. The first school of thought argues that community policing developed its origins from a rural style of policing. Rural officers participate in a broader range of policing techniques due to the isolated nature and limited services available, where police are the only 24/7 service. Rural police assume a community-based model of policing, where the officers are integrated as a member of the community and establish compatible community relationships. In addition, rural officers have closer relationships with their community than officers in most urban settings. Critics of the second school of thought question whether a successful rural model of community policing can be adapted to urban areas because the urban population is more mobile; crimes differ, and communities are more heterogeneous and divided by ethnicity, culture, class, age or lifestyle or otherwise poorly defined or fragmented (Young and Tinsley, 1998). Furthermore, Scott et al. (2007) believed that rural communities are structured differently and perceive what is considered 'socially threatening' and crimes differently to urban communities. The theorist from the third school of thought argues that the changing nature of communities is the catalyst for community policing (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004), irrespective of whether it is a rural or urban setting. Scott et al. (2007) argue that rural

communities are currently experiencing 'chaotic social change' with the breakdown in traditional social roles and networks, which is characteristic of the fragmented and interpersonal relations in urban areas. Segrave and Ratcliffe (2004) state that an increasing urban sprawl and subsequent 'dormitory suburbs', which are empty during the day, has resulted in the need for community policing. Finally, the fourth school of thought argues that rural and urban policing are similar in the sense that they are reactive and primarily endorse a police professionalism ideology (Scott et al., 2007).

Origin of Community Policing of selected countries

Community policing as a concept was first introduced in the United States in the 1960s to increase police community contact and reduce the fear of crime (Innes, 2003). It became a dominant policing strategy in the United States during the 1990s with the introduction of 100,000 new community police officers (Cordner, 2007). The deployment presented a change of focus to encourage problem solving and community engagement as opposed to reactive policing. Weisheit et al., (1994) believe that community policing emerged because of many social trends and movements namely victims' rights and civil rights, which resulted in demands on police to be more accountable to the public by being more responsive and connected to the community. Bucqueroux (2006) argues that community policing emerged in response to two unintended consequences of a modernising policing profession. First, technology, such as the police radio and patrol vehicles changed the relationships between the police and community. Previously, officers developed personal relationships with the community and needed the community was willing to share information. Secondly, police applied scientific management to policing, which created the perception that police were responsible for keeping the community safe. Previously, the community understood that ultimately community was responsible for reaffirming the social norms that promoted public safety (Patterson, 2007). Fridell (2004) agrees with Sir Robert Peel who rationalised, the police are the public and the public are the police. Furthermore, Fridell (2004) believes that the above statement is the key principle of community policing and that police should not be separated from, but rather joined in partnership with, the community. Community oriented policing began in New Zealand in the late 1980s with the introduction of the New Zealand Police New Model of Policing Strategy.

The strategy was based on the idea that local police have local responsibility to minimise the effects of stranger to stranger policing (New Zealand Police, 1989). The document promoted the idea of police working in partnership with the community to solve local problems. As a result, community constables were introduced throughout the country in the late 1980s. It was quickly discovered that the community policing model complemented the work of Neighbourhood Support Groups. Neighbourhood Support encouraged crime prevention techniques such as public surveillance; property marking; and home security (Skolnick and Bayley, 1988).

Community policing was adopted in South Africa in accordance with the policy framework and guidelines for community policing which was released by Department of Safety and Security in 1997. In this respect, the policy framework stipulated a clear relationship between local government and Community Police Forum (CPF) to ensure effective crime prevention at local level and requires the CPF to cooperate with local government by involving in the following collaborative initiatives: jointly setting crime prevention priority and agreeing upon strategy to ensure their implementation, assist with the development of targeted social crime prevention program, identifying flashpoints, crime pattern, community anti-crime priorities and communicating these to local government and the SAPS and participating in problem solving, mobilising and organising community-based campaigns and activities and the resources required to sustain them and facilitate regular attendance by local elected representatives at CPF(DSS,1997). Community Policing Forum was established in all police stations across the country to ensure that station commanders or commissioners are more accountable to those they serve, was done primarily to build trust and legitimacy in the communities where there is mistrust and conflict. Community policing uses intelligence to enhance crime prevention and reduction by encouraging the public to report crime, and exchange information about crime and criminality within their locations (NCPS, 1996).

Findings and Discussions

Principles and Elements of community policing

The study identified ten principles of community policing, which recognise elements of successful community policing. These include communities as

the focus of the Nigeria Police Force policing approach; by reducing crime and road trauma, community policing improves safety and reassures the community; police are visible, accessible and familiar to their community; police listens to their community, jointly prioritise concerns and keep them informed; police provide opportunities for community participation; problems are identified and responded to on a local level with the support of area, district and national, when required; police engage other government, non-government and community groups in problem solving partnerships; flexibility with accountability for achieving local community outcomes is emphasised; community policing requires an integrated intelligence-led approach; and community policing is the responsibility of all police staff irrespective of role or rank (Cordner, 2007).

The study reveals that, philosophical dimension is one of the elements of community policing. In this perspective. The philosophical dimension is central to the ideas and beliefs that underlie community policing, such as citizen input, broad function, and personal service. The rationale for citizen input is that law-abiding people deserve to contribute to police processes, but in return they participate and support the idea of community policing. Community policing is not only about community engagement but involves police responsiveness to community concerns in the best way possible. The community define their problems, which police then take seriously, even if the problems they define differ from police priorities (Skogan, 2006). To accurately determine community needs and priorities community participation to identify problems, assist police to drive the solutions, and maintain community ownership of the issues. Extensive input from the community will not only assist in identifying problems but also in prioritising and finding solutions. Cordner (1999) suggests that there are many mechanisms for achieving community engagement, which include systematic and periodic community surveys, fora, community meetings, and meeting with advisory groups and businesses.

The study found that the type of neighbourhood determines whether the community is good at dealing with their own problems or not. In this regard, Reno et al. (1998) specified, if the community has more social capacity, will be able to deal with their own problems and attend arranged meetings

than those without such investment. The respondent (15) opines that it is necessary to adopt a range of engagement techniques to ensure broad community involvement. Broad function requires the community policing role to go beyond calls for service and arrests to meet the demands of continuous sustained contact with the community. In other words, Flynn (2004) maintains that community policing involves broadening the police mandate beyond narrow goals of law enforcement as an end in itself. It recognises the importance of police in developing and maintaining the idea of 'community.

The respondent (23) believes that community police officers have a comprehensive role as planners, problem solvers and community organisers. As planners they are required to identify principal crime and disorder problems faced by the community and prioritise, as well as analyse and develop strategies to deal with the issues. As the problem solvers, they implement the actions and strategies to address the crime concerns. As community organisers, they increase the consciousness of the community and organisations to deal with problems.

The respondent (20) states that community policing is about the police working with the community to enhance safety. The role of the police and community in this partnership involves; conflict resolution, assisting victims and reducing the fear of crime. The above respondent opines that, expanding the roles and duties of police officers in community policing will enable them to think critically, proactively engage in service delivery, follow up on activities and provide personalised service delivery.

The respondent (1) agrees with Cordner (2007) who stated that community policing works best when officers know the residents, can deliver personalised service, as opposed to stranger policing. In addition, police need to be accessible, knowing and appreciating what the community wants and needs (Mastrofski, 2006). The respondent (19) highlights, that police identify the intervention needs and crime problems of the community, maintain an intimate relationship with the people and the environment, develop localised, community-specific responses, which generates a sense of accountability and responsibility. Due to the growing requirement for customer satisfaction

within policing, Ferreira (1996) emphasises the importance of implementing community policing as a philosophy rather than just a programme or project.

According to finding, the second element of community policing is the strategic dimension. In this dimension, key strategic operational concepts translate philosophies into actions, linking with the broad ideas and beliefs that underlie community policing. The strategic dimension of community policing includes re-oriented operations, emphasis on prevention, and geographical focus. Community policing enables police address the underlying conditions that lead to crime, but enforcement is still a core function. The respondent (19) opines that in the operational practice, police should look beyond traditional policing strategies, such as motorised patrol and rapid response, and replace them with more effective interactive practises e.g. handling emergency calls more efficiently to enable more time and resources to participate in community policing activities. Moreover, Segrave and Ratcliffe (2004) maintained that community policing is about mutual support and agreement, therefore, re-orienting practises should ensure slower response times for non-emergency calls to enable officers to develop long-term solutions for community concerns. The above authors believed that by re-orienting police activities the focus will shift from patrol-based orientation to problem solving, crime prevention education, and building positive relationships.

In the view of respondent (6), the police should not take sole responsibility for crime prevention, but should play a crucial role in developing strategies in partnership with local communities. Also, measuring the impact of crime prevention should move away from relying on crime statistics and clearance rates and complement the qualitative practise of community policing.

The geographical focus is a priority in the strategic dimension. It involves organising and deploying geographically based officers to maximise identification between specific officers and their specific community these would result in stronger police-community relationships, which in turn will increase mutual recognition, responsibility and accountability. Cordner (1999) asserts that geographically based officers should develop knowledge about the community, which enables early intervention, problem

identification, avoid conflict and misunderstanding. Respondent (3) opines that permanency of officers in a location or an area is a crucial component as it builds familiarity, which in turn helps develop trust, confidence and cooperation from both police and the community. Respondent (7) supports the above respondent and points out that, if a specific officer has permanent responsibility for a fixed area, the police officer becomes more responsible for identifying, dealing with crime problems and encourage communication between the police and community.

The study identifies challenges that confront geographically based officers, which includes; the mobility of the urban population, where both victims and offenders presents a major challenge, assumption that crime-related problems do not develop in identifiable communities but in pockets of several communities, communities are fractured and difficult to engage with. To address these challenges, models of community policing need to be flexible enough to accommodate the particular character of the area.

The study reveals, the third element of community policing, which is the tactical dimension. This dimension involves translating ideas, philosophy and strategies into concrete programmes. Tactics and behaviours include; positive interaction, partnerships, and problem solving. During the police and community interaction, the police enforcement role tends to attract a degree of negative interaction, so it is vital that police take necessary steps to engage in positive interaction with all parts of the community. They engage in positive interactions, where possible, have several other benefits such as building familiarity and trust; hence, the officers will be more knowledgeable about the people and conditions of the community, obtain and provide specific information to enhance crime investigations and problem solving (Cordner, 1999). Segrave and Ratcliffe (2004) maintained that positive community perceptions of police can be linked to low levels of crime, which is achieved through positive police-community experiences.

The respondent (11) states that techniques such as media campaigns, shop-front based officers and accessible mini-stations are believed to encourage positive interactions. The above respondent further points out that getting to know the community, by talking with all members, encouraging requests

for non-emergency assistance, and becoming more visible, will encourage information sharing and increase appreciation of concerns. Moreover, Sherman and Eck (2002) argued that random motorised patrol and rapid response lead to more uneasiness between the community and police. In addition, these traditional methods are not effective way to deal with the community problems

The study reveals, tactical dimension adopts partnership strategies. In this dimension, the police engage with the community in partnerships to deal with crime and related problems, which includes working collaboratively with other public and private agencies. In this regard, the respondent (19) points out that the police and community should work in partnership not only to solve problems, but to reduce the fear of crime, physical and social disorder, and neighbourhood decay. These relationships need to be based on trust by challenging people to accept their share of the responsibility, which in turn will enable parties to identify priorities and develop responses to solve their own problems.

In support of community policing partnership strategy, Mastrofski (2006) suggests that community policing seeks to link the police more closely to the community in 'partnership' arrangements: joint activities to co-produce services and desired outcomes, giving the community a greater say in what the police do, or simply engaging with each other to produce a greater sense of police-community compatibility. Solutions developed in partnership are appropriately targeted and therefore more effective. Flynn (2004) argues that these partnerships need to be based on trust. Community policing partnerships develop information exchange: the community provides the police with information about problem conditions and locations, crime concerns, active criminals, and stolen property, and in return police provide the community with information about community fears, problems, tactical information and advice about preventing and reducing crime. Skogan (2006) points out that the police are only one of the agencies responsible for addressing community problems, and other agencies take responsibility and respond to crime prevention and problem solving in partnership with police at all levels. Working in partnerships with both public and private agencies, such as schools, health, and housing, enables a broader range of issues to be

addressed than if each was working in isolation.

Another approach adopted by community policing is problem solving strategy. In this respect, problem solving is an interactive process, involving police and communities, identifying crime problems and developing appropriate solutions. The problem solving is essential to community policing and as such, problems should not be limited to crimes, and solutions should not have to involve arrests. Police and the community should be empowered to adopt problem solving techniques and take every opportunity to address the conditions that cause crime incidents. The problem solving aspect of community policing relies more on preventing crime than traditional methods, through deterring offenders, protecting victims and making crime locations less conducive to identify (Weisheit et al., 1994). Bucqueroux (2007) suggests that problem solving needs to be measured by asking if the problem is solved. Rather than focussing on traditional methods, such as, the number of arrests.

Cordner (1999) points out that problem solving within community policing model has several important features. This operates as a standard method of policing, not an occasional special project; practiced by all staff throughout the ranks; decisions should be made on the basis of information that is gathered systematically; involves whenever possible, collaboration between police and other agencies and institutions; and incorporates, whenever possible, community input and participation, so that the community's problems are addressed not only police departments but community shares in the responsibility. Furthermore, Cordner (1999) identifies four steps for problem solving in which community input can be incorporated. These steps include the identification of the problem; analysis of the problem; a search for alternative solutions to the problem; and implementation and assessment of a response to the problem.

The study found that organisational dimension is another element of community policing. In this dimension, it is crucial that the organisation support changes promote community policing. The key elements of the organisational dimension include; structure, management and information. Police should re-examine their structures to ensure that they support and

facilitate the implementation of the philosophical, strategic and tactical dimensions of community policing. Organisational structures and training should be in place to support the concept of community policing (Skogan, 2006). In addition, the mission statement should set out the broad goals of community policing, the police should be encouraged to develop practices that will enable them to achieve set goals. Furthermore, community policing initiatives that have the greatest success in overcoming challenges are those that have been implemented for the long-term and changing to a community policing/problem solving model needs careful planning with a long-term focus, as well as considering the considerable variations across Police districts (Mastrofski et al. 2007).

The role of the management is crucial in the implementation of community policing. Leadership has been identified as key to the implementation of community policing. 70% respondents agreed that the role of management is not to direct the activities of the field personnel so much as to guide them and ensure that they have the resources they require to do their jobs. The police executives should set the tone for the organisation and provide appropriate leadership to ensure that each member is actively involved in community policing activities. It includes re-examining the way people are supervised and managed. Reno, et al. (1998) argue that the implementation of community policing would be more successful if implementers have a better understanding of the conceptual framework of community policing and support and commit to it.

According to the respondent (25), information is vital in operationalisation of community policing. Police information systems are crucial in providing information to assist the community and respond to their problems. The above respondent affirms that the utilisation of problem solving techniques has highlighted the requirement for information systems to aid the identification and analysis of problems faced by the community, including the use of geographical information systems (GIS). Cordner (1999) suggests that information can be collected from community police officers, performance appraisals that reflect community activities, evaluating programmes for effectiveness as well as efficiency and assessing the police's overall performance on a wider range of key indicators. Cordner emphasises the

need for qualitative information to measure success rather than traditional 'bean counting' techniques; e.g. collecting information on wider functions than enforcement and calls for service.

The benefits of community police

80% of respondents agreed that improving police community relationships and perceptions of police enable police to develop improved police-community relationships. They believed that improving police community relationships provides the police with the opportunity to meet the community's needs while increasing public accountability over police through participation. 55% respondents pointed out that increasing community capacity to deal with issues, building a community capacity, can mobilise and empower the community to identify and respond to crime and insecurity concerns. The benefit of an empowered community is a stronger community who wants to participate in addressing issues. Community policing offers the public a larger window into police activity and provides opportunities for 'grass roots' support for police.

Patterson (2007) asserts community policing has positive effects on police through increased job satisfaction and improved interaction with, and confidence in the community. In the view of respondent (4), community policing allows police to gain more understanding about the problem of the community, help them design appropriate intervention and promote the positive image of the police. The respondent (5) states that community policing increases the perceptions of safety and decreases the fear of crime. There is evidence that increasing community police interactions are associated with lower levels in fear of crime (Skogan, 2006).

According to the respondent (11), community policing is a policing approach adopted to address a range of different crimes, such as disorder and anti-social behaviour. 58% opined that community policing approaches can be used to address property crime, gang violence and organised crime, can be adopted to deal with anti-terrorist activities. Community policing can be used to reduce crime and victimisation.

Measuring the effectiveness of community policing

55% respondents opined that the effectiveness of community policing practise depends on the jurisdiction and approaches adopted by the implementers. It can have a positive effect on community attitudes such as fear of crime and neighbourhood satisfaction. Due to the complex nature of community policing evaluations provide limited evidence of either success or failure.

Furthermore, Patterson, (2007) argues that evidence of effectiveness has been largely anecdotal. Measurement has tended to focus more on traditional indicators such as crime statistics even though the objectives are more specific than to reduce crime (Segrave and Ratcliffe, 2004). Many of the community policing evaluations completed in some jurisdictions have been criticised for failing to determine whether practises were effective. One of the difficulties obstructing the implementation of community policing is the vague definition of success has also hindered identifying the effectiveness of community policing. In addition, the lack of concrete definition of community policing leaves it open to his- interpretation. Cordner (1999) argues that because community policing is not one consistent thing, it is difficult to say whether it works or not Likewise, Harvey (2005) suggested that there is limited evidence of effectiveness because community policing is diverse in both the intention and practise. Furthermore, the effectiveness of community policing are affected by other factors, for example organisation, operational and personality factors (Fielding and Innes, 2006).

Implementation barriers to community police

Patterson (2007) asserts that the implementation of community policing is challenged by the incremental nature in which community policing is introduced, resulting in increased resources allocated within short timeframes with little time for planning. Mastrofski et al. (2007) pointed that the traditional barriers of organisational change, scarce resources and a resistant police culture still exist and continues to the jeopardise the successful implementation of community policing initiative.

The study summarises the barriers to successful implementation of community policing. The barriers to successful implementation include: lack of organisational commitment and culture change; community

engagement seen as a one off series of events and not 'mainstreamed, lack of community ownership of the process; inequitable power relationships; lack of control, flexibility and tailoring at neighbourhood level; lack of status/incentives for beat officers; lack of understanding of police and community role; performance measurement frameworks that do not reward community engagement; individual officer appraisals that do not reward community engagement roles; lack of training for officers on community engagement philosophy and methods; police 'beats' that do not correspond to community perceptions of neighbourhoods; not recognising the historical lack of trust between police and certain communities; lack of capacity and collective efficacy in some communities; lack of a clear definition and training for the community role in engagement; lack of good quality information about crime provided to communities; lack of adequate feedback to communities on action from engagement; not valuing the contribution of communities and volunteers; lack of coordinated multi-agency approach to community engagement; and lack of initial extra investment or re-profiling of resources to community work.

The respondent (1) spotlighted gross misunderstanding of the concept of community policing, as a barrier to implementation of community policing also, officials entrusted with the implementation of the model are not specifically trained and lack experience on how the paradigm can be implemented. Most of the implementers of the model lack basic knowledge of community policing tenet, are not well exposed to the principles and elements of the community policing paradigm, thus affects the adoption and implementation of community policing

According to the respondent (30), most of the police officers and role players tasked with the implementation of the model are not adequately trained in the formation of partnerships; nor do they have experience in organising community involvement or community empowerment programmes. Respondent (29) opines that, implementers have limited training, training is short-changed because community policing is labour intensive. The respondent (11) pointed out that recruitment and training in Nigeria police have not been substantially revised to promote community policing techniques.

Skogan and Hartnett (1998) specified one of the key barriers to community policing is sustaining organisational commitment. In support of the above assertion, the respondent (26) maintains that in a system where there is sustained commitment and community ownership decline in levels of crime, social disorder and physical decay. Consequently, Polzin (2007) suggests that Police adopt effective management strategies for community successfully implementation of community policing.

Respondent (21) points out that community policing initiatives cannot survive in a police agency managed in traditional ways. If changes are not made, the agency sets itself up for failure. Moreover, Greene (2000) asserts that police culture is resistant to change towards community policing for several reasons, including the potential loss of autonomy; diversion of resources from traditional core functions; imposing unrealistic programmes. Police culture can undermine police-community relationships because police officers dominate as 'crime and disorder experts', which disadvantages the community when offering solutions.

The effectiveness of community policing becomes obstructed when community policing is operated as specialised units. Specialised units can create an environment of isolation or cause friction between staff. More successful community policing initiatives have incorporated a 'whole of organisation' approach. However, the implementation of a 'whole of organisation' approach is problematic. The respondent (11) asserts that, if problem-solving and crime prevention responsibilities are assigned to specialised units without fundamental changes in policing will affect the performance of the police in the implementation of the model. The respondent (15) points out that in some cases, specialised community policing units have caused major friction between the beat officer and the community police officer and this friction is due to the differences in practices.

The study reveals that the ability to sustain commitment from the community and external agencies has been identified as a barrier to community policing. Community policing is highly dependent upon community involvement but maintaining their sustainability has been an issue. Residents, unlike the agencies, are not paid, and to participate take time away from work,

family, friends, daily chores, and personal interests. Community policing implies that individuals have common interests, values, integrity, demands and expectations but in practise communities are ambiguous. Community involvement is not easily achieved, some areas are not easily accessible, that part of the community becomes excluded. Community policing serves the interests of the vocal minority and the presence of strong personalities and influential groups can dominate discussions and control the direction of an initiative. The ethos of individualism undercut attempts to work in partnership with the police. In addition, the lack of capital investment is seen as a lack of social investment. The conflicting values are also a problem for agencies working together. The lack of sustained interagency cooperation ensues because agencies have traditionally viewed that community policing to belong to police rather than a community-wide responsibility. They believed that working in partnership can result in conflicting values and different social values, hence affecting cooperation.

Community policing and other policing strategies

The study reveals that many ideas of community policing and problem oriented policing are inter-related, particularly the problem solving aspect. The two models involve police embracing social policing style that comprises complex programmes and organisational support. The difference between the two strategies of policing is that problem-solving policing focuses police attention on the problems that lie behind incidents, rather than on the incidents only. Community policing emphasises the establishment of working partnerships between police and communities to reduce crime and enhance security. Problem oriented policing is commonly associated with crime science triangle, with the assumption that, in order for a crime to occur, there is an offender, a victim and a location. The basic elements of problem oriented policing identified by Bullock and Tilley (2003) include; grouping incidents as problems; focusing on substantive problems as the heart of policing; effectiveness as the goal; systematic inquiry; disaggregating and accurately labelling problems; analysing multiple interests in the problems, capturing and critiquing current responses; adopting a proactive stance; strengthening decision making processes and increasing accountability; and evaluating results of newly implemented responses. However, Ezeji (2020) states that, the police should prioritise and collaborate with the community

in solving community's problems, hence community policing relies on the community to define its problems or crime issues.

Reassurance policing is a neighbourhood policing that underpins the 'refreshed' approach to community policing. Reassurance policing has been described as equivalent to community policing, which requires the community to address local crime concerns and signal crimes (Smartt, 2006). Aspects of reassurance policing that overlap with community policing, includes t police and community involvement in identifying community issues, addressing public fear of crime and increasing police visibility to encourage increased trust in police (Virta, 2006). Reassurance policing has similarity with community policing, the overarching aim of reassurance policing is to improve community perceptions of crime and safety. Reassurance policing is a contemporary variation of community policing, developed from the community policing philosophy. Fleming (2005) believes that reassurance policing requires community involvement in both individual and organisational level, outside the law enforcement and beyond the public sector. The study found that, recently, United Kingdom policing has undergone a transformation, responding to the changing nature of crime and terrorism and to the rising public expectations of police, rolling reassurance policing into an 'effective and responsive local neighbourhood-policing' approach.

Conclusions

In conclusion, the community should own the practise of community policing for it to be effective. Community ownership requires long-term commitment. To sustain this commitment from the community, a range of techniques need to be adopted. These include community meetings and working in partnership with local groups, involving other agencies in partnership to conduct crime prevention activities, sharing and solving the problem, and delegating responsibility for crime prevention from district commanders to individual officers. In order for community policing to be successful all barriers need to be identified during the design phase of community policing initiatives and addressed.

Recommendations

The study recommends specialised training for community policing implementers to enable them acquire general knowledge of community policing concept, elements and strategies. Effective smarter, tenets such as problem oriented policing, sector policing, reassurance policing and intelligence led policing can be operationalized in consonance with community policing. Should adopt modern and effective way of operationalising community-policing model in Nigeria.

Need for Police to re-examine their structures to ensure that they support and facilitate the implementation of the philosophical, strategic and tactical dimensions of community policing. Organisational structures and training should be in place to support the concept of community policing. The mission statement should set out the broad goals of community policing and encourage police to develop practises that will enable set goals to be achieved. Changing to a community policing/problem solving model needs careful planning with a long-term focus and considering the considerable variations across police districts and stations.

For effective implementation of community policing, the principles of community policing that recognise elements of successful community policing should be considered and adopted. The principles that recognise communities as the focus of the Nigeria Police Force; that focus on reducing crime and road trauma, improves safety and reassures the community; ensures police are visible, ensures police are accessible and familiar to their community; ensures police listens to their community, jointly prioritise concerns and keep them informed; police provide opportunities for community participation; problems are identified and responded to on a local level with the support of area, district and national, when required police engage other government, non-government and community groups in problem solving partnerships; where flexibility with accountability for achieving local community outcomes is emphasised; principle that requires an integrated intelligence-led approach and recognises that community policing is the responsibility of all police staff irrespective of role or rank.

To effectively operationalise community policing in Nigeria, the principles

and elements of the community policing model should be adhered to. The element involves philosophical dimension that deals with the ideas and beliefs that underlie community policing citizen input; community determines, prioritise and find solutions to problems; police respond to community concerns; police use many methods to engage the community. Strategic dimension translates philosophies into action; re-orient policing operations; tools are developed to address the underlying conditions that led to crime; operational practises are interactive; enforcement remains a core function of the police; focus on long-term solutions. Tactical dimension entails the translation of philosophy and strategies into concrete programmes.

Partnership strategy should be adopted, which means working in partnership with the community and agencies to achieve desired outcomes; developing collaborative and targeted responses to community issues; ensuring that a broad range of issues is addressed; exchanging information is mutually beneficial to police and the community. Must adopt problem-solving techniques that address the underlying causes of community problems or issues; ensures that communities play an important role in identifying and addressing their issues; involves an interactive process that is essential for community policing; a system that is less reliance on traditional criminal justice system responses to problems.

Need for an organisational dimension supports changing to promote community policing. Adopt a structure that supports a broad organisational goals that encourages a culture that supports community policing; employ long-term strategies that support community policing; encourage structures and training that promote community policing. The management should develop and take ownership of problem solving and solutions; police executives should adopt leadership style that supports community policing practices Need for adopting information systems that is crucial in the identification and analysis of crime problems.

References

- Bucqueroux, B. (2004). Community policing in the years ahead and now for the really hard part in community policing. *Police Executive Research Forum, Washington*, pp 73-82
- Bucqueroux, B., (2007). What community policing teaches us about community criminal justice.
- Retrieved August 2020 from <http://www.policing.com/articles/pdf/ccj.pdf>.
- Bullock, K. and Tilley, N. (2003). Introduction to problem-oriented policing the concept the implementation and impact in the UK and US in crime reduction And problem-oriented policing, Devon.: Willan Publishing:
- Brookes, S. (2006). Community policing in context in crime prevention and community safety, *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, 8 (2), 104-117
- Cordner, G. (2007). Community policing principles and elements, regional community policing, Retrieved August 13 2020 from <http://www.kycops.org/wcp.htm>.
- Cordner, G. and Perkins, E., (2005). Problem-oriented policing in practice in *Criminology, Public Policy*, 4 (2) 155-180.
- Department of Safety and Security. (1997). White paper on safety and security, *Government Gazette*, 5332, May 6/1998. Pretoria: Government Printers.
- Ezeji, C. (2020). Evaluation of community and problem solving policing as tools for addressing Crime in Nigeria; Conference Proceeding from *Rethinking Security and Reforming Security Architecture in Nigeria*. Lagos: Sibon Books.
- Farrell, M. (1988). The development of the community patrol program. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Fielding, N. (1995). Community policing model, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Fielding, N. and Innes, M. (2006). Reassurance policing, community policing and measuring police performance, *Policing and Society*, 16 (2)127-145.

Ferreira, B. (1996). The use and effectiveness of community policing in a democracy, Retrieved 15 October 2020 from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/policing>.

Fleming, J. (2005). Working together neighborhood watch, reassurance policing and the potential partnerships, Retrieved 21 September 2020 from <http://www.aic.gov.au/publications>.

Flynn, E. (2004). Community policing is good policing, both today and tomorrow, *Police Executive Research Forum*, 2(3) 25-38.

Greene, J. (2000). Community policing in America changing the nature, structure, and function of the police *National Criminal Justice*, 5(3)299-370

Harvey, S, (2005). *Police practice in reducing residential burglary' Report 3*, Ministry of Justice: Wellington.

Haralambos, M. and M. Holborn.(2005). *Sociology themes and perspective*. (eds.), London: Harper Collins.

Ibeanu, O. (2007). Criminal justice reforms: policing services delivery in reforming for justice, *Criminal Justice Access*, 2(7) 29-38.

Innes, M. (2003). *Understanding social control, deviance, crime and social order*, New York: McGraw-Hill International

Mayhill, T. (2006). *Community policing a skeptical view in police innovation,contrasting perspective*. Chicago: Cambridge University Press.

Mastrofski, S. (2006). *Critic community policing a sceptical view in police innovation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

National Crime Prevention Strategy. (1996). Department of safety and security. *The national crime Prevention strategy (NCPS)*. Pretoria: Government Printer.

New Zealand Police. (1989). *New model of policing strategy*, Wellington: New Zealand Police National Headquarters.

Palmiotto, M. (2000). *Community policing strategy for the 21st century*,

Boston: Jones and Bartlett Publishers:

Patterson, J. (2007). Community policing learning the lessons of history, Retrieved 12 December 2019 from <https://www.lectlaw.com/files/cjs>.

Polzin, M. (2007). A labor management approach to community policing, Michigan: Michigan State University.

Reno, J., Marcus, D., Leary, M., and Travis, J. (1998). Problem solving in practice, implementing community policing, Chicago: Department of Justice.

Segrave, M., and Ratcliffe, J. (2004). Community policing a descriptive overview, Sydney: Australian Institute of Criminology.

Scott, J., Hogg, R., Barclay, E. and Donnermeyer, J. (2007). Introduction, there is crime out there, but not as we know it, Sydney: The Federation Press.

Sherman, L.W., and Eck, J. (2002). Policing for crime prevention, evidence-based crime prevention, New York: Routledge.

Skogan, W. (1996). Evaluating problem solving policing, Retrieved 17 October 2020 from <https://www.northwestern.edu/ipr/publications/policing>.

Skogan, W. (2006). Advocate the promise of community policing in police innovations, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Skogan, W. and Hartnett, S. (1998). Community policing Chicago Style, New York: Oxford University Press.

Skolnick, J. and Bayley, D. (1988). Community policing issues and practices around the world, Chicago: National Institute of Justice.

Smartt, U. (2006) Criminal Justice and community, London: Sage.

Schanzer, L. William, S., & Andre N. 2016. Getting police to take problem oriented policing seriously. *Journal of Crime Prevention* 2(3):293-402.

Trojanowicz, R. and Bucqueroux, B. (1990), Community policing a contemporary perspective, Ohio: Anderson Publishing Co.

Virta, S. (2006). Community policing in the sage dictionary of criminology (eds.), London: Sage.

Wroblewski, H. and K. Hess. (2003). Introduction to law enforcement and criminal justice(eds.), Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson.

Wilson, R. and Kelling, R. (2007). Young people and crime: finding from crime offending and justice survey. London: Home Office.

Weisheit, R., Wells, L., and Falcone, D. (1994). Community policing in small town and rural America, *Crime and Delinquency*, 40(4) 549-567.

Young, W., and Tinsley, Y., (1998). Options for the development of problem solving policing in New Zealand, Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.