

# Community Policing as a Public Policy

Satyajit Mohanty, Additional Director General of Police, belongs to the Indian Police Service. In a career spanning over twenty five years, he has served as police chief in four districts and as Deputy Inspector General and Inspector General in three ranges in Odisha. He holds a Master of Science and a Law degree from Utkal University, Bhubaneswar, a Master's degree in Human Rights from Pondicherry University, and a Management and Public Policy degree from IIM Bangalore and Syracuse University, New York, USA. He is a member of the National Police Mission, and has been active in formulating sound policy proposals on community policing. He has authored four books on various professional subjects, and can be visited at <http://satyajitmohantyips.blogspot.in>.

Rabindra Kumar Mohanty is from the Odisha Education Service and has been teaching Sociology in undergraduate and post-graduate courses in the Universities in Odisha and in the State Police Academy, Odisha, for more than twenty-five years. He holds a Master's degree in Sociology from JNU, New Delhi, and a PhD from the Institute of Advanced Studies, Meerut, UP, with pre-PhD formalities from IIT Kanpur. As a Commonwealth Fellow, he completed a Post-doctorate degree from the University of Nottingham, UK. He has authored four books, and has published several articles in national and international journals. He acts as a consultant to World Vision International, UNDP, WFP, Action Aid and DFID. He can be visited at <http://rabisir.wordpress.com>.

Community Policing as a Public Policy:  
Challenges and Recommendations

By

Satyajit Mohanty and Rabindra K Mohanty

**CAMBRIDGE  
SCHOLARS**

---

P U B L I S H I N G

Community Policing as a Public Policy:  
Challenges and Recommendations,  
by Satyajit Mohanty and Rabindra K Mohanty

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2014 by Satyajit Mohanty and Rabindra K Mohanty

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-5953-2, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-5953-0

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<i>List of Tables &amp; Boxes</i>	<i>vii</i>
<i>List of Figures</i>	<i>viii</i>
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	<i>ix</i>
<i>Foreword</i>	<i>xi</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>xvi</i>
<i>Introduction</i>	1
<b>Chapter One</b>	
<b>Explaining Community Policing</b>	6
Definitions and Features	
Criticism of Community Policing	
Theories of Community Policing	
<b>Chapter Two</b>	
<b>Community Policing as Public Policy</b>	39
Policy Processes, Components and Phases	
Theories on Public Policy	
Community Policing from Public Policy Perspective	
Why Should Community Policing be Introduced as a Public Policy?	
<b>Chapter Three</b>	
<b>Global Perspectives on     Community policing</b>	65
Development of the Concept	
The United States of America	
The United Kingdom	
Brazil	
South Africa	
Singapore	
The “Koban” of Japan	
Australia	
Canada	
Belgium	
France	
Germany	
Sweden	
India	

<b>Chapter Four</b>	<b>Community Policing Initiative of an Indian State</b>	105
	Research Gap and Rationale for the Present Study	
	Objectives of the Study	
	Research Design	
	Features of Janamaithri Suraksha Project (JSP)	
	JSP : Pilot to State-wide Implementation	
<b>Chapter Five</b>	<b>Critical Study Outcomes and Findings</b>	131
	The Journey of Community Policing as a Policy Process in Kerala	
	Data Interpretation	
	Community Policing: Theories and Praxis	
<b>Chapter Six</b>	<b>Summary and Recommendations</b>	176
	Triangulation of Theories and Praxis	
	Policy Context-Process-Outcome Matrix	
	Challenges	
	Recommendations	
	<i>Appendixes</i>	202
	<i>References</i>	256
	<i>Subject Index</i>	271
	<i>Author Index</i>	277

## LIST OF TABLES & BOXES

<b>Table No.</b>		<b>Page</b>
1.1	Differences between Traditional Policing and Community Policing	11
1.2	Differences between CP and PCR	28
1.3	Problem Oriented Policing v. Social Resource Theory	32
1.4	Traditional CP Orientation v. Traditional SRT Orientation	33
1.5	Megadigm Shift for Reinventing the Police	38
2.1	Comparative study of Allison's & Elmore's Models	50
2.2	Wilson Matrix	52
4.1	District-wise Population in Kerala	111
4.2	Human Development Indices of Kerala vis-a-vis other Major States in India	112
4.3	Civil police per lakh of population and per 100 sq. km of area	113
4.4	Janamaithri Suraksha Project - Implementation	119
5.1	Pre-implementation Phase: Theoretical Triangulation	173
5.2	Implementation Phase - Theoretical Triangulation	174
5.3	Impact Phase - Theoretical Triangulation	175

<b>Box No.</b>		<b>Page</b>
3.1	The Seven Directives in a Nutshell	98
4.1	Hutter-Hennink Qualitative Research Cycle	109
5.1	Recommendations of Accountability Commission	132
5.2	Launching of the JSP	135
5.3	Vanitha Jagaran Samithi	143
5.4	Diary of Nodal Officer	145
5.5	Case Study	165

## LIST OF FIGURES

<b>Figure No.</b>		<b>Page</b>
1.1	The Theory of Innovation: M S Morabito	26
2.1	Simon's Bounded Rationality	47
4.1	Hutter-Hennink Qualitative Research Cycle	108
4.2	District Map of Kerala	110
4.3	Organizational Hierarchy of Police Executives in Kerala	113
4.4	Structure of the Janamaithri Suraksha Project	115
4.5	Hutter-Hennink's Qualitative Research Pyramid	123
6.1	Community Policing : Context, Process & Outcome Matrix	191



## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ASI-Assistant Sub Inspector  
BO-Beat Officer  
BPO-Beat Police Officer  
BPR&D- Bureau of Police Research and Development, New Delhi  
CAPAM-The Commonwealth Association for Public Administration and Management  
CATCH-Combined Action Against Thieves, Cheats and Hooligans  
CLG-Community Liaison Group  
COP-Community-oriented policing  
COPP-Community-Oriented Policing Project  
COPS-Community Oriented Policing Service  
CP-Community policing  
CPDC-Community Policing Department Centre  
CPI-Communist Party of India  
CPO-Central Police Organisation  
CPO-Community Police Officer  
CPOP-Community Patrol Officer Program  
CPRC-Community Policing Resource Centres in Punjab  
CSV-Center for the Study of Violence  
DGP-Director General of Police  
FGD-Focus Group Discussion  
FoP-The Friends of Police Tamilnadu  
GB-Great Britain  
GOs-Government Order  
IACP-International Association of Chiefs of Police, USA  
ICHRP-International Council on Human Rights Policy  
ICPA-International Community Policing Awards  
IDC-Intelligence, Design, Choice  
IDI-In-depth Interview  
IIAP-International Innovations Awards Program  
IIMB-Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore  
IPS-Indian Police Service  
ISO-International Standard Organization  
JSP-Janamaithri Surakhya Project  
JSPP-Japan-Singapore Partnership Programme  
JSS-Janamaithri Suraksha Samithi  
KSPA-Kerala State Police Academy  
LDF-Left Democratic Front

M.L.A-Member of Legislative Assembly  
MHA-Ministry of Home Affairs  
MM-Micro Mission  
MM-01-Human Resource Development.  
MM-02-Community Policing  
MM-03-Communication and Technology  
MM-04- Infrastructure  
MM-05-New Processes (Process Engineering)  
MM-06-Proactive Policing and visualizing the future challenges  
MSD-Mahila & Sishu Desk' of Odisha Police  
NPC-National Police Commission  
NPCs-Neighbourhood Police Centres  
NPM-National Police Mission  
NPP-Neighbourhood Police Post  
NSC-National Security Commission  
ONAM-Harvest Festival of Kearala  
PADC-Police Act Drafting Committee  
PCAs-Police Complaint Authorities  
PCO-Police Circular Order  
PCP-Police Community Partnership,  
PCR-Police Community Relations  
PCSOs-Police Community Support Officers  
PIB-Press Information Bureau  
PIL-Public Interest Litigation  
POP-Problem Oriented Policing  
POs-Police Order  
RCPI-Regional Community Policing Institute  
RPB-Residential Police Box  
SARA-Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment  
SI-Sub Inspector  
SOPs-Standard Operating Procedures  
SO-Senior Police Officers  
SRT-Social Resource Theory  
SWOT-Strength, Weakness, Opportunity and Threat analysis  
UDF-United Democratic Front  
UK-United Kingdom  
UNDOC-United Nations Office on Drug and Crime  
UN-United Nations  
US-United States  
UTs-Union Territories.  
VJS-Vanita Jagaran Samiti.  
WTC-World Trade Center



**James J. Chriss**

Professor

Department of Sociology & Criminology  
Cleveland State University, Cleveland, OH 44115

j.chriss@csuohio.edu

## FOREWORD

As Max Weber (1947) argued long ago, the master trend of modernity is specialization in the division of labor and across society more generally. One area of professional work that is growing into an increasingly specialized subfield across sociology, criminology, political science, economics, history, and psychology is policing. The study of policing has grown not only because of increasing interest among university-trained scholars from a variety of fields, but also because of the push toward higher education and the attainment of advanced degrees among law enforcement practitioners themselves. At the beginning of the twentieth century August Vollmer believed that policing represented a set of specialized skills that could be taught and which required the recruitment of educated persons of good character who collectively would constitute this newly forming profession (Chriss 2013a). Later police sociologist Egon Bittner (1970) declared that the early vision of Vollmer was slowly being realized, and even went on to predict that policing would someday become a specialized social science of and for itself. That specialized subfield is being formed right now, and it is called Police Studies.

Even though police scholars—coming from the ranks of both academia and the professional world of policing itself—are settling on a handful of first principles representing the best knowledge and practices of modern policing, it must be noted that the vast majority of such principles have been generated within the context of western—that is, American and European—society. This reflects the complexity of the social world and of the initial and scope conditions underlying all our work. The attempt to derive a set of universal principles about how some area of the social world works may have to contend with the fact that the scientific observations and inferences giving rise to these principles were never tested—or tested inadequately—in relation to global or multicultural settings. Think about

all the complexity that is introduced when one tackles policing as a topic and the various analytical levels (micro, meso, or macro) which are possible within that study. Not only are there conceptual nestings, such as understanding policing as merely one subsystem of a broader criminal justice system, there are also empirical and historical realities which must be taken into account in the matter of place, location, characteristics and culture of the population being served, and so on. Sociologists have long been aware of taking into account the great diversity of antecedent factors giving rise to any phenomena deemed worthy of study by them.

The authors of the book for which I am privileged to write this forward, Satyajit Mohanty and Rabrinda K. Mohanty, are exemplars of the sociological movement in general and of methodological triangulation in particular. Together they combine practical understandings of the workings of policing with a theoretical acumen dedicated to explaining key aspects of police practice and organization. In my book on social control I was covering the history of professional policing, explaining how Robert Peel was the central figure in formulating the Metropolitan Police Act and getting it passed into law in London in 1829 (Chriss 2013b, pp. 117-118). I also briefly covered a backstory to the establishment of the “new police” which involved Peel’s activities beginning more than a decade prior. Acting as Chief Secretary of Ireland in 1812, Peel established the Peace Preservation Force to combat agrarian violence arising from inadequate rural law enforcement in Ireland (which was magistrate-based). Peel gave his enforcement officers wide discretion to dispense harsh physical coercion wherever opposition was met.

For purposes of my social control book, this is where the backstory ended. Yet these events are connected to a larger story about the beginnings of state policing in India of which, at the time, I was unaware. Das and Verma (2003, pp. 128-133) argue that Peel’s earlier excursion into policing in the guise of the Irish Peace Preservation Force was actually a product of British colonialism, first arising in Ireland as the Royal Irish Constabulary (RIC). As opposed to the more “civil” form of professional policing that emerged in London in 1829—for example, officers were not issued service revolvers and were also sent to patrol areas where they were already well-known by the residents to calm fears of an emerging, faceless police state—the Royal Irish Constabulary is described as a “garrisoned body of military police” which initially emerged during a time when Ireland was “in a state of strife and disorder, bordering on a state of war.” Writing more than a hundred years after its establishment, Sullivan (1914, p. 876) goes on to describe the RIC as a “soreness” whose “unnecessary oppression and cruelty still lingers in the memories of the people.”

Das and Verma (2003) explain that this early development of harsh policing in Ireland was basically the same form of policing established in India by British colonial authorities somewhat later. Colonial-based policing is more concerned with the maintenance of order during periods of perceived or real unrest, while the later “professional” model of policing is primarily geared toward the prevention and detection of crime. As Michael Banton (1964) observed, police organized under the colonial model may be described as “order police,” whereas traditional policing is best described as “law police.”

The emergence of community policing is merely one example within a long line of thinking, perhaps starting with Kant and his notion of perpetual peace, that over time, through the course of the development of the human race, humanity would slowly move toward enlightenment with the ascendancy of the higher powers of human reasoning, and away from the raw and savage fight for survival which marked our ancient beginnings. Much of the history of the development of policing as a social institution across Western society seems to have moved in the same direction. In the earliest political spoils era (1830s to 1920s), policing was seen as a blue-collar craft where all that was needed to become a police officer was the right political connections and the ability to use force if needed to subdue the undesirables among the teeming masses of the newly burgeoning urban metropolis. By the second era of reform and early professionalization (1920s to 1960s) with groundwork being laid by the likes of Theodore Roosevelt and August Vollmer, police attempted to professionalize their ranks through specialization. The third era of policing, running from 1970s to the present, is known as community-oriented or problem-oriented policing that emerged out of the social transitions of the 1960s. Police organizations attempted to reach out to the citizenry, to invite them into a collaborative effort to fight not only crime—indeed, during this era the image of police as crime fighters would be *underplayed*—but even more importantly the many social problems creating the conditions which were making citizens’ lives increasingly difficult.

Mastrofski (1998, pp. 162-166) argues that community policing can be distilled down to four fundamental themes; *debureaucratization, professionalization, democratization, and service integration*. Early in its history municipal policing adopted a quasi-military, bureaucratic model of organisation which emphasized political control (especially in the first, political-spoils era), rules, strict adherence to proper communication and a chain of command, centralization (such as command-control imperatives emanating from police headquarters) and specialization (especially

beginning in the second era of policing). By the 1970s and the emergence of the community policing era, there was a feeling that the legal and technical requirements of the old bureaucratic model of policing should give way to a more humanistic and *debureaucratized* organisational model. Rather than being distant from the citizens and coldly efficient ‘snappy bureaucrats’ (Klockars, 1980) specializing in crime control, police are now expected to work side by side with citizens and other stakeholders to solve community problems collectively. *Professionalization* came by way of increasing the educational requirements of police recruits, and training of officers in newest technologies as well as in vagaries of human behaviour. Community policing could be described as a sort of democratic policing to the extent that there is an explicit attempt to get citizens more involved in the day-to-day operations of the police department. A fourth theme of community policing is service integration. More than ever, police have developed organizational linkages not only with the other city safety forces, but also with schools, social service agencies, housing services, business and colleges and universities in the local area (Chriss 2013a: 38-39).

With its emphasis on human relations and a more sophisticated approach to problem-solving, including more cross-fertilization between policing and the social sciences (e.g., the SARA method and Compstat), community policing has been positioned for a while now to make good its goal of creating meaningful collaborations between police and the citizens they serve. Studies of the effectiveness of community policing have been growing in both number and sophistication, and policy initiatives are emerging regarding best practices. The present study by Mohanty and Mohanty is an example of this trend toward policy-based analyses of community policing, here, of course, within the context of Indian society. More recent amendments to the Indian Police Act as embodied in the Report of the National Police Commission (1977-1981) appear promising as a way of overcoming the difficult conditions of the Colonial underpinnings of Indian policing toward a more humane and perhaps even emancipatory system of policing.

Like others who have studied the implementation of community policing, Mohanty and Mohanty find uneven application of community policing in India due to such things as lack of institutional support, ambiguities concerning applicability of current legal frameworks, and the massive diversity of ways community policing is understood by planners and implementers in local settings. Most of the previous studies of community policing implementation have been more descriptive than grounded in solid research concerning how and what practitioners are doing on the ground. The qualitative methods employed by the authors, including focus group

discussions with key stakeholders across communities and within the various police agencies, help our understanding of how police personnel make policy decisions or deal with obstacles standing in the way of implementation.

The authors developed a context-process-outcome matrix for understanding how and under what conditions community policing is being implemented in India. Out of this conceptual triangulation, the authors have developed a number of recommendations for facilitating community police implementation, including greater political support; building trust between police agencies and community stakeholders; the development of guidelines for recruitment and training of community police officers; formulation of standard operating procedures for best practices with regard to community policing; the importance of internal marketing; and strategic planning. Finally, Mohanty and Mohanty emphasize the importance of understanding the role of police in modern democracies, to the extent that police cannot impose order on the community unilaterally, but must strive to gain legitimacy from the members of the community they serve. With this firmly in mind, Mohanty and Mohanty add to our understanding of how diverse cultural contexts and national identities and histories—including those forged within a colonial past—either facilitate or hinder the type of collaborative work that has been at the heart of community policing from the beginning.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Rabindra Kumar Mohanty, co-author of this book for walking the journey together and keeping constant company in our collaborative efforts of writing books; this being the third one.

I am grateful to my teachers at Indian Institute of Management, Bangalore who saw me through the original thesis that became the basis of this book: to Prof. Geeta Sen and Prof. Anil B Suraj for giving me guidance, encouragement and creative momentum, to Prof. Vasanthi Srinivasan for making me understand the nuances of qualitative research methodology which I used as a tool for this study, to Prof. G.Ramesh for constant support and encouragement in my journey of “thesis” writing.

My gratitude is due to Mr Jacob Punnoose, former Police Chief, Kerala and Mrs B. Sandhya, my batch mate from Kerala, for providing all the logistics support during my field study in Kerala.

I am thankful to the officers and men of Kerala police, the members of Janamaithri Suraksha Samithi and Vanitha Jagaran Samithi all of whom spared valuable time to share their experiences with me, enabling me to collect rich and insightful textual data for the research.

I am grateful to Prof. James Chriss for kindly agreeing to write the foreword of the book; to Prof. Larry D. Schroeder and Mr. Sankar Sen for their words of encouragements.

I would like to thank Anish Alok Mohanty, student of National Law School of India University, Bangalore for his painstaking efforts in editing the manuscript.

I owe an especially large debt to my wife, Lisa and son, Adhish, who stood by me ungrudgingly and gave me the support I needed to touch the finishing line.

Last and not the least: I am grateful to IIM, Bangalore, Maxwell School of Public Policy, Syracuse (NY), Odisha Police, members of Micro-Mission-II of National Police Mission and Bureau of Police Research & Development, New Delhi for providing me the platform to write this book.

**Satyajit Mohanty**



# INTRODUCTION

Community policing, as an alternative policing strategy, revolves around the principle of pro-active policing, through people-friendly policing practices, community participation and problem solving, leading to crime prevention, maintenance of order and improvement in the overall quality of life in their neighbourhood. Community policing allows the law enforcement agency to get back to the principles upon which it was founded and to integrate itself into the fabric of the community so that the people and the police collaborate even before a serious problem arises. To state it succinctly, community policing is a useful, holistic and proactive concept and a tool to transform the police's image, strengthen the police force and create attitudinal changes both within the force and amongst the public. In its strategic dimension, it contributes to the individual, the state and national health and as such reduces social pathology.

Community policing provides decentralised, personalised policing services to the community. It recognises that the police cannot impose order on the community from the outside, but that people must be encouraged to think of the police as a resource that they can use in helping to solve contemporary community concerns (Trjanowicz Bucqueroux, 1990). It is not a tactic to be applied and then abandoned, but a new philosophy and organisational strategy that provides the flexibility to meet local needs and priorities as they change over time. To implement true community policing, the police department creates and develops a new breed of line officer who acts as a direct link between the police and the people in the community. The community policing officer's broad role demands continuous, sustained contact with the law-abiding people in the community, so that together they can explore creative new solutions to local concerns, with private citizens serving as supporters and volunteers. As the community's ombudsman, the community policing officer also acts as a link to other public and private agencies that can help in a given situation (Bucqueroux, Trjanowicz 1998)

Community policing is the need of the day and police forces in democracies around the world are realising its utility and implementing community policing initiatives in varied forms. As an innovation in the police organisation and philosophy, community policing has assumed centre stage (Choudhary, 2009). From the United Kingdom to the United States of America, Brazil to Bangladesh, Singapore to South Africa and Japan to Jamaica, countries adopt various forms of community policing with the

core philosophy remaining universal. The benefits of community policing are broken down into three areas for the sake of brevity such as Community-specific benefits, Police-specific benefits and Shared benefits. To be more specific, Community-specific benefits include identification and resolution of community concerns, ownership of local problems, improved local physical and social environment and reduced fear of crime. Police-specific benefits include an improved police-community relationship, positive attitudes towards the police, a community perception of police “legitimacy” and most importantly, an increase in the job satisfaction of police officers. The international and national best practices exhibit certain shared benefits such as a decreased potential for police-citizen conflict, a reduction in crime rates and a better flow of information between the police and community (Segrave and Ratcliffe 2004).

India inherited a colonial police force at the time of independence, whose mission and vision statements were drafted by the colonial rulers in the nineteenth century. The provisions of the old Police Act of 1861 are rendered redundant and archaic in a constitutional democracy where the authority of the people is supreme. However, despite the absence of any provision in the Act, the State and in many instances, the police leadership have embarked upon pro-active community-oriented policing initiatives making the police sensitive to the needs of the community. In the absence of an institutional and legal framework, many brilliant initiatives failed to stand the test of time. The community policing initiatives by most of the State and Union Territory governments were “informal policy processes” that should have been backed by “due process” policy. By “due process”, what is meant is that community policing practices should have been part of the police mission statement duly recognised in the Act and laws governing the police department. Of late, states like Kerala, Tamil Nadu and Rajasthan have encoded the vision of community oriented policing in their newly legislated state Police Acts. Kerala is one state that has launched its community policing scheme, “Janamaithri Suraksha Project” (JSP), with the requisite legal and institutional framework for the initiatives to survive the incumbent executive and political leadership as a public policy.

The “Janamaithri Suraksha Project”, the flagship community policing scheme of Kerala Police, was conceptualised in the year 2005, when the United Development Front (UDF) government was in power, launched in the year 2008 by the rival Left Development Front government and now consolidated under the patronage of the UDF government again. It has weathered various “political streams”, survived the “successor-predecessor syndrome” and gained public acceptance. This study examines the benefits

accrued to the police organisation, to the community and the shared benefits after studying the JSP, the overarching community policing programme of the Kerala Police and the policy processes it encountered during the pre-implementation, implementation and consolidation phases.

The study was constructed around the need to go into the complex dynamics of community policing in India and to work out an integrated approach to contextualise theories and praxis using qualitative research techniques so as to come out with a context-process-outcome framework for the guidance of the policy makers and implementers. Accordingly, the book consists of six chapters.

The first chapter presents a general outline of the concept, characteristics and constraints of community policing. Research on community policing has been the subject matter of considerable interest amongst criminologists, sociologists, police executives, legal experts and sponsoring agencies in the recent past, with a number of them having come out with a remarkable range of research work. The chapter also looks at the findings of those studies along their theoretical, methodological and substantive aspects.

The second chapter deals with the different aspects of public policy. In general parlance, public policy is understood as a system of lawful principles, regulatory measures, priority courses of action, and funding options relating to a given issue of mass concern promulgated by a governmental entity or its implementing agency. Public policy is an initiative by a government to address a public issue by instituting laws, regulations, decisions, and actions pertinent to the problem at hand. The chapter aims to justify why community policing should be introduced as a public policy instead of being left to the whims and fancies of the incumbent officer.

Community policing is arguably the single most extended paradigm in policing that can be found in one form or another in the official discourse of a majority of policing agencies in the world today. Its use as the description of either current operations or the goal of reforms is almost universal. Representatives from countries as diverse as Australia, Belgium, China, Russia, India, Ukraine and Zimbabwe all indicated that community policing was central to their future operating philosophy at the 2007 International Police Executives Symposium in Dubai. The aspirations of achieving some form of community policing are common to a wide range of countries and despite the acknowledged limitations, it continues to be a moral touchstone that will continue to determine the future of policing. The third chapter examines how the community policing paradigm is implemented in a few select countries and policing cultures, and analyses the similarities and differences in their applications and the process of institutionalisation of the philosophy.

The fourth chapter sets forth the objectives of the field study and methodologies of a community policing initiative, “Janamaithri Suraksha Project” (JSP) of an Indian state, Kerala. The objectives of JSP are prevention of crime, furthering co-operation between the police and the community and security-related mutual co-operation among citizenry. The JSP is a three-tier structure with the Beat/Community Police Officer at the bottom, the Janamaithri Suraksha Samithi (JSS), the council of local representatives, in the middle and the District Advisory Committee at the top.

This study represents an exploratory-cum-descriptive research design using qualitative methodology. The population of this study includes all the stakeholders of JSP in the state of Kerala. The stakeholders include senior police officers, uniformed community police officers, and members of the JSS, Vanitha Jagaran Samithi, a self-help group consisting of women, established with the sponsorship of the local police.

We have employed multi-stage purposive sampling for the study. The qualitative techniques for the purpose of collection of primary data included field ethnography, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions, observation and case studies. The secondary data included available books, papers and reviews published in scholarly journals, documents, reports, publications of various organisations and paper clippings collected from various libraries in the country and the library of the Maxwell School of Public Policy in the United States. Search engines and blogs have also been of profound help.

The journey of Janamaithri as a policy process has been divided into three stages and accordingly the categories or the parameters were consolidated under three major heads: *pre-implementation dynamics*, *implementation phase* and the *impact phase*. The policy parameters or categories under different phases of this community policing intervention have been conceptualised after the deductive and inductive elements of analysis. The Pre-implementation Phase and Implementation Phase have seven parameters each and the Impact Phase comprises six parameters.

In the fifth chapter, we have shown how far the codes developed from the qualitative textual data conform to *categories* under three different phases, i.e., *Pre-implementation*, *Implementation* and *Impact* phases. The analysis aims at developing a theory by undertaking the core analytical tasks of *description*, *comparison*, *categorization* and *conceptualization*, as the critical outcome of the research. The verbatim transcript and translation of the interviews and focus group discussions form the basis of textual data in this study, from which *codes* were developed. Codes are essentially topics discussed by participants and identified through reading data. On the basis of the codes from the textual data, comparison, categorisation and

conceptualisation (linking categories) of the data have been undertaken, moving the analysis to a higher level of abstraction and providing the building blocks for theory development. A matrix of theories and policy praxis has been attempted under each phase, which has paved the way for developing a Context-Process-Outcome Model as an outcome of this study. It is, however, worth tracing the long preparatory journey of the JSP before it gained approval as a major public policy. Besides, in this chapter, we have traced out the journey of JSP as a policy process in order to link the theories with praxis that have been validated during field study.

In the sixth chapter, we have attempted to summarise the discussions and to put forth the findings and recommendations. After having articulated the key findings in the preceding chapter, a Model has been conceptualised by triangulating the theories and praxis and organising them in a Context-Process-Outcome framework in respect of pre-implementation, implementation and impact phases to serve as guidelines for both the policy makers and implementers in their efforts to introduce community policing as a public policy. While articulating the challenges, we have categorised them under two major heads: internal (from within the organisation) and external challenges (from outside the organisation). Resistance to change, introduction of change management, predecessor-successor syndrome, agency problems are some of the internal challenges faced by the police organisation while introducing community policing. Under the head of external challenges, we have highlighted the lack of political will and acceptance of community policing as a public policy, trust deficit and resource scarcity of the police organisation as some of the major challenges.

The analysis of the context-process-outcome matrix and the challenges to community policing scheme in Kerala have been filtered out in the form of a set of recommendations that may serve as guiding principles to policy makers and policy implementers in introducing community policing schemes as a public policy. The knowledge on policy processes, the policy environment and the dynamics of policy making and policy evolution during implementation, we hope, will enable the policy makers and implementers to better appreciate the nuances of public policy.

\*\*\*

# CHAPTER ONE

## EXPLAINING COMMUNITY POLICING

Community policing, as adopted worldwide now, has been described as a concept, an organizational structure, a strategy, a programme or tactic, a set of values and a philosophy. It has a long past but a short history. Community policing is considered a popular contemporary policing approach in response to the decline in public confidence in the police and growing evidence that police forces cannot fight crime by themselves. Community policing incorporates a philosophy that determines the manner in which police agencies engage the public and that broadens the police mission from a narrow focus on crime and law enforcement to a mandate encouraging the exploration of creative solutions for a host of community concerns including crime, fear of crime, perceptions of disorder, quality of life and neighbourhood conditions.

It is a philosophy based on the premise that police officers and private citizens work together in a creative way to solve contemporary community problems related to crime, fear of crime, disorder and neighbourhood decay. It seeks to develop a new relationship with the law abiding people of the community, thereby allowing them a greater say in setting local policing priorities and involving them in efforts to improve the overall quality of life in their neighbourhood. The beat police officer is in touch with the people of the beat area on a daily basis and develops a personal rapport with these people and earns their trust. Here, the police serves as a catalyst and the people accept their share of responsibility for solving local problems related to crime, disorder and security (Punnoose 2008).

### **Community Policing : Definitions and Features**

Community policing has come to mean different things to different people. For reformers, community policing is a movement. For police entrepreneurs, it is a new paradigm of policing, a guiding philosophy, albeit one that is hard to precisely define and measure. Some agencies think of it as a set of community-oriented programmes and practices, crime-prevention units, and police patrols. Agencies, practitioners, and researchers tend to

define it differently, although most definitions contain similar principles, including problem solving, community involvement and organizational decentralization (Skogan 2004). The community policing movement has wrestled with the tension between philosophical ambiguity and programmatic specific strategy for quite some time. So what is community policing? What does it mean when a police agency claims to practice community policing? This section explores these questions.

The Sage Dictionary of Criminology defines community policing 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. It is a process by which crime control is shared, or co-produced with the public, and a means of developing communication with the public thus enhancing the quality of life of local communities and building police legitimacy.” (Virta 2006, 52)

According to Bayley, community policing is a strategy for encouraging the public to become partners with the police in controlling and preventing crime. It does so by demonstrating to the public that police is prepared to respond to their security concerns, values their advice, and will act in a fair, honest, and impartial manner. In exchange, the police asks the public for assistance by providing information about crime, criminals, and circumstances that create crime, and by contributing their time, resources, and moral support for crime prevention programmes. In short, community policing views public cooperation as essential to successful crime control and develops programmes to obtain willing public assistance (Bayley 2005). Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux define community policing as a new philosophy of policing based on the premise that police officers and private citizens working together in creative ways can solve contemporary community problems related to crime, fear of crime, social and physical disorder, and neighbourhood decay (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1994). Corder argues that community policing is often misunderstood as a concept and recognises that community policing is not the answer to all the problems which plague modern policing (Corder 2007b, 1). It should not be misconstrued in an anti-law enforcement or anti-crime fighting manner. It does not seek to obliterate the divide between police work and social work. There is neither an iron-clad, precise definition of community policing nor a specific set of activities that must always be included. A set of universally-applicable principles and elements can be identified, but exactly how they are implemented should and must vary from place to place, because jurisdictions and police agencies have differing needs and circumstances.

The Community Oriented Policing Service (COPS) of the Department of Justice of the United States of America defines community policing as

“a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies, which support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques, to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime.”

In the opinion of many American scholars and practitioners, community policing is based on the joint efforts of citizens and police officers towards the resolution of neighbourhood problems which, in turn, satisfies the expressed needs of citizens and enhances the residents' quality of life. “There is also a continental concept (policing in proximity), in which community policing is a tactical strategy to increase the visibility of the police officers in specific areas to prevent crime and disorder,” argues Choudhury (Choudhury 2009, 35). Choudhury also finds that

“to Spellman and Eck (1989), it is a strategy which combines citizen interaction with imaginative problem-solving techniques which reduces the incidence of crime. To Herman Goldstein (1990), it is primarily defined in terms of the ability of the police to identify, analyse and resolve crime-related problems specific to a given community. To Alpert and Dunham (1988), it is the means of improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the police by adjusting police styles to conform to specific community needs.”

Therefore, it is not surprising that community policing holds different meanings for different authors. In general, it is agreed that 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 (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990; Palmiotto 2000). Existing literature generally describes the primary objective of community policing as positive police-community relationships, which are achieved through community engagement through the emphasis of collaboration and prevention (Cordner and Perkins 2005). Bucqueroux uses a medical analogy to describe community policing. To Bucqueroux, patrol officers are “society's emergency room physicians” responding rapidly to an occurrence, whereas, the community police is the “family physician who has the time and opportunity to not only treat an illness but to prevent disease and promote good health” (Bucqueroux 2007). Fielding suggests that community policing is not a single concept but could mean:



“a contrast to rapid response and enforcement-oriented policing, so constables are closer to the community: a process by which crime control is shared with the public or a means of developing communication with the public and interest groups.” (Fielding 1995, 25)

Internationally, it is agreed that community policing needs to be a long term strategy with long term outcomes to allow for the development of decision making processes and a police culture that fosters the concept. Community policing can be defined as a justice delivery mechanism and strategy that decentralizes policing services to smaller areas, provides stable beat assignments to increase coordination and cooperation between the police and the community, assists in assessing problems and strengthening community defences against criminal penetration and utilizes the resources of other agencies and programmes in both the public and the private sector to reduce and prevent crime.

### **Key Features of Community Policing**

The essence of community policing is to minimise the gap between policemen and citizens to such an extent that the police becomes an integrated part of the community it serves. If this is to be achieved, the individual policeman should know each member of the community and he should, in turn, be known by them. An atmosphere of harmony and trust, devoid of both anonymity and animosity, is necessary. Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux argued

“Community policing, as a model is very complex because it entails implementation throughout a police department, not just selected units of officers. It is complex because it requires that the police department, and a number of levels, be in synchronization with the community it serves. Finally, it is complex because it requires not only that police agencies do different things such as meet with the community, allow the communities to decide police operations, or emphasize order maintenance over law enforcement, but it also means that police departments perform many of their old tasks differently.” (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990, 7)

Community policing truly is a paradigm shift. While community policing employs a number of strategies and tactics, the true essence of community policing is akin to the glue that holds these strategies and tactics together. The basic unit of community policing should be geographically, and

demographically, compact enough to enable a foot-patrolman to know everyone within a reasonable span of time and in turn be recognised by every member of the community. The policing and security needs of a compact geographical area can be easily identified and attended to by employing local resources. Such knowledge will also limit the incidence of local anti-social behaviour, apart from keeping outsiders at bay. Proactive action is the other key characteristic of community policing. Proactive steps will lead to the growth of co-operation and partnership in crime prevention and security in the local area, and shall earn the community police officer the acceptance and trust of the community. Eventually, his very presence in the area will deter crime and disorderly behaviour. Once this is achieved, the community will also be willing to accept the police officer's authority. When such a bond takes root, it shall also bring the community together (a factor conspicuous by its absence from today's urban settlements) and enhance the citizens' ability to resolve their conflicts without the involvement of the police. In fact, such a coming together will reduce conflicts to a great extent (Punnoose 2008). Reiss identified two trajectories of contemporary police reform that have been defined as community policing. The first, generally referred to as community or neighbourhood-oriented policing assumes that closer police-community relationships are desirable and are instrumental in providing a safer, more viable environment. This has translated into various forms of decentralized services, such as storefront operations and permanent beat assignments, police tactics, such as foot patrols and new structures including crime watch and prevention programmes that require the cooperation of the community.

The other trajectory is referred to as problem-oriented policing. This approach concentrates on identifying, analyzing and responding to community problems in a systematic and substantive way. These two approaches differ in their goals, but they are not mutually irreconcilable and may be used in combination by some departments. While community-oriented policing aims at increasing community involvement and satisfaction with police services, problem-oriented policing seeks to reduce targeted problems in the neighbourhood. Both of these approaches are in sharp contrast to traditional policing.

### **Differences between Traditional Policing and Community Policing**

A distinction between community policing and traditional policing is attempted in Table 1.1.

<b>Basis</b>	<b>Traditional Policing</b>	<b>Community Policing</b>
Police	A government agency responsible for law enforcement	The police are the public and the public are the police
Work Orientation	Unlawful incidents	Citizen's problems and concerns
Response & Role	Relative to incidents	Proactive in solving community-related problems; discuss possible solutions with the community
Resource Use	Forum on internal resources	Leverage on community resources
Supervision Style	Supervision is control-oriented and authoritative	Supervision is problem-oriented and democratic
Information Source	Limited information from the community	Information from the community comes from many sources
Efficiency measurement	By detection and arrest rate; Response time	By the absence of crime and disorder; Public cooperation
Priorities	Crimes that are heinous and violent	The problems that disturb the community most
Professionalism	Swift and effective response to serious crime	Keeping close ties with the community
Accountability	Highly centralized; governed by rules, regulations and policy directives; accountable to the law	Emphasis on local accountability to community needs
Prosecution	An important goal	One tool among many

**Table 1.1 : Traditional Policing and Community Policing**

According to Skogan (1995), community policing is based on the following general principles:

- i. Community policing relies upon organizational decentralization and reorientation of patrols in order to facilitate two-way communication between the police and the public.
- ii. Community policing assumes a commitment to broadly focused, problem-oriented policing.
- iii. It requires that the police are responsive to citizens' demands when they decide what local problems are and set their priorities accordingly.
- iv. It implies a commitment to helping neighbourhoods solve criminal problems on their own, through community organizations and crime prevention programmes.

Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux identified four major facets of community policing (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990, 3-7). These consist of a philosophical facet, an organisational and personal facet, a strategic facet and a programmatic facet, with each facet consisting of sub-facets. Philosophically speaking, community policing consists of a number of community based elements that differentiate it from the traditional professional model. Some of the core community policing ideas include a broad police function amidst a community focus, community input, concern for the people, developing trust, sharing power, encouraging creativity, and accounting for variations from one neighbourhood to another. With regard to the organizational and personal facet, community policing is more than merely involving people in crime control; it is an active attempt at enhancing the involvement of the community. The police must change its organisational structure, modify its personal orientation and adjust its value systems to allow for community policing. Strategies provide guidelines for the development of specific programmes. Community policing has at least three strategic facets. These facets include geographic focus and ownership, direct, daily, face-to-face contact, and prevention focus. These three parameters should guide operational planning when implementing community policing. The above philosophy and strategies must be operationalized into specific tactics or programmes which should include reoriented police operations, problem solving and situational crime prevention, and community engagement.

### **Nine P's of Community Policing**

Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux in their book "Community Policing: How to Get Started" list out nine P's of community policing (1983-4) and state

“Community policing is a philosophy of full service personalized policing, where the same officer patrols and works in the same area on a permanent basis from a decentralized place, working in a proactive partnership with citizens to identify and solve problems”.

First, Community policing is a *philosophy*. The community policing philosophy rests on the belief that contemporary challenge require the police to provide full service policing, proactive and reactive, by involving the community directly as partners in the process of identifying, prioritizing and solving, problems including crime, fear of crime, illicit drugs, social and physical disorder and neighborhood decay. A department-wide commitment implies changes in policies and procedures.

Secondly, it involves *personalized* service. By providing the community its own community policing officer, community policing breaks down anonymity on both sides-community policing officers and community residents know each other on first name basis.

The third acronym “p” stands for *Policing*. Community policing maintains a strong law enforcement focus; community policing officers answer calls and make arrests like any other officer, but they also focus on proactive problem solving.

Fourthly, community policing officers *patrol* their communities, but the goal is to free them from the isolation of the patrol car, often by having them walk the beat or rely on other modes of transport such as bicycles, scooters or horses.

The fifth acronym “p” for *permanence* means that community policing officers should not be rotated in and out of their beats and they should not be used as “fill-ins” for absences and vacations of other personnel. Community policing requires assigning community policing officers permanently to defined beats; so-that they have the time, opportunity and continuity to develop the new partnership.

The sixth acronym “p” stands for *place*. All jurisdictions, no matter how large, ultimately break down into smaller neatly distinct neighborhoods. Community policing officers can benefit from “owning” their neighborhood beats in which they can act as a “mini-chief,” tailoring the response to the needs and resources of the beat area. Moreover community policing decentralizes decision making not only by allowing community policing officers the autonomy and freedom to act but also by empowering all officers to participate in community based problem solving.

The seventh acronym “p” stands for *proactive* nature of community policing initiatives. As part of providing full service policing, community policing balances reactive responses to crime incidences and emergencies with a proactive focus on preventing problems before they occur or escalate.

The eighth acronym “p” stands for *partnership* dimension of community policing initiatives. Community policing encourages a new partnership between people and their police, which rests on mutual respect, civility and support.

The last but not the least is *problem solving*. Community policing redefines the mission of the police to focus on solving problems so that success or failure depends on qualitative outcome (problem solved) rather than just on quantitative results (arrests made, citations issued- so called ‘number policing’). Both qualitative and quantitative measures are necessary.

### **What is not Community Policing?**

It is important for police practitioners and policy makers to understand what practices do not constitute community policing. While attempting to understand the features of community policing, it is important to know what does not constitute community policing. Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux have listed them as the following (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux 1990):

- i. Community policing is not a technique, but an entirely new way of thinking about the role of the police in the community.
- ii. Community policing is not public relations. Police-community relations are currently by and large for the sake of appearance, while community policing is substantive.
- iii. Community policing is not soft on crime. An important ingredient of community policing is to focus on these hot spots.
- iv. Community policing is not flamboyant. Community policing recognizes that the job gets done through steady, hard work, not warrior images and tactical exercises.
- v. Community policing is not paternalistic. The traditional, paternalistic attitude suggests that crime is so complex and difficult that it must be left in the hands of skilled professionals specifically trained for the job.
- vi. Community policing is not an independent entity within the department. Ultimately, the community policing philosophy must encompass the entire department.
- vii. Community policing is not cosmetic. Unlike crime prevention and police community relations programmes, community policing goes beyond providing information and expressing goodwill. Community policing requires that the police department make substantive changes to how it interacts with the public.