CHAPTER - II

THEORIES OF COMMUNITY POLICING

Community Policing (CP) is a new theory of police administration and is said to have three core elements: citizen involvement, problem solving, and decentralization. All are related, but citizen involvement is especially crucial because it is the basis of the theoretical foundation of community policing. Mainstream CP literature starts with a basic observation which informs every theory throughout, i.e., in a democratic state run by the people we must understand how common people conceive the nature of crime and role of the police. A cursory review of literature reveals that in spite of its success there is no scientific – logical, predictable, refutable - theory explaining and explicating, predicting and refuting CP practices. The present chapter is an attempt to do so. The chapter would analyze the various theoretical constructs that support and strengthen the basic idea underlying different methods and styles of community policing. The chapter is an attempt to understand various factors responsible for making CP a success or a failure. These factors have been discussed here with the help of the following theories:

1. Social structural theory of CP
2. Modern management technology theory of CP
3. Democratic theory of CP
4. Zero tolerance theory of CP
5. Public relations theory of CP
6. Communitarian theory of CP
7. Organizational structure and culture theory of CP
(1) **SOCIAL STRUCTURAL THEORY OF COMMUNITY POLICING**

Robert R. Friedmann in his book “Community Policing: Comparative Perspectives and Prospects” maintains that from the perspectives of both community and police, community policing signifies that crime is produced by societal factors over which police have relatively little control and therefore crime control needs to focus on those societal factors which cause crime and should focus more on ‘quality of life’ issues that exceed crime. Fear of crime also needs to be attended to in attention to ‘traditional’ crime issues (2003: 3).

Well known legal anthropologists have contributed much, through their studies of “trouble cases,” to our understanding of how indigenous people of different cultures settle disputes and deal with problems. Such research informs that the problems of everyday life look and feel very differently from the inside than from outside. The lesson to be drawn from such studies is that legal classifications of a personal encounter, e.g., murder or rape, do not usually capture the true nature and felt impact of such an encounter, as experienced by the person involved. Problems as experiences are anchored within a constellation of personal relationships, shaped by a multiplicity of social factors, circumscribed by intersecting norms (moral, custom, and ethics) and moved along by situational dynamics and personal interactions. Simply, as experience, no crimes are alike.

Social life is governed by certain normative behavior that is shaped by an understanding of what is acceptable and what is not acceptable to do in a society. Laws
are simply the formalization of social norms without which societies can not exist. According to Friedmann, the criminalization or decriminalization of an act reflects society’s reaction to it and what societies will or will not tolerate. It specifies who the victim is, who the offender is, what the offence is, under what circumstances it was committed, where it was committed and what will be the penalty against it. However, the leap, or transition, from informal social norms to formal laws is not clear and while from a legal standpoint deviant behavior is to be treated as criminal only when it violates a given law, it is also important to understand that at least some amount of such deviant behavior could be handled on an informal level as well to alleviate a conflict before it becomes an official crime. Here underlies the significance of community policing (2003: 6).

American criminology rests mainly on the social structural explanations of crime and the impact that a community has on regulating the conduct of its members. This explanation has been appreciated by the criminologists all over the world. The social structural concept of community policing requires the citizens to assume the responsibility of controlling crime by reporting such instances or any deviant behavior promptly to the police and also by cooperating as witnesses when the crime occurs.

The accepted view today, is that crime and delinquency should be viewed not merely as an infraction of law, but more appropriately, as an anti-social conduct, arising from disorientational developments in the individual and disorganizational process of the society itself. Social factors like population explosion, inadequate economic growth, and inequitable distribution of opportunities, side by side unplanned industrialization and
urbanization, super imposed on ignorance and poverty, have all contributed to higher levels of disorder in the society.

Social order is a core theoretical issue in the social sciences. The most important theory of social order emanates from Aristotle and is echoed by Rousseau, Durkheim, Parsons, and their contemporary fellows. It views the ultimate source of social order as residing not in external controls but in compliance of specific values and norms that individuals have somehow managed to internalize. As per this theoretical tradition, the attainment of order is generally not considered to be problematic in socially and culturally homogeneous societies, for in these settings the internalized values and norms will tend to be common to all when compared to heterogeneous societies which comprises of a variety of normative orientations and in such societies internalization is likely to sow the seeds of conflict rather than order (Hechter, Friedman and Kanazawa 2003: 329). In such heterogeneous societies community policing programmes should aim at attaining local order by cooperating and convincing various local social groups to exercise informal social control among themselves for their own benefit. Members of the social group can be expected to produce local order to satisfy their own private ends, and once produced, this local order, regardless of its normative content, will contribute to the overall social order within the community.

Robert Lombardo and Todd Lough (2007: 122) are of the opinion that certain community police programmes and community meetings can help to increase the informal social control mechanisms inherent in communities that have been lost in
neighborhoods besieged by crime and disorder, thus enabling residents to contribute to maintaining social control. According to them, two theoretical constructs underlie most of the community policing programmes. They are ‘Broken Windows’ theory and the ‘Community Implant’ hypothesis. Both the theories are grounded in social disorganization theory and both argue that there is a direct relationship between distressed communities and crime. The social disorganization theory further argues that there exists a direct relationship between higher rates of deviance and the increased complexities of urban life. Shaw and McKay (1942) formulated a structural theory of crime according to which poor neighborhoods, inhabited by heterogeneous and residentially unstable groups, are more likely to lack social organization and, as a result, experience higher rates of juvenile delinquency. Julius Wilson (1987), after studying the city of Chicago, argued that the de-industrialization of American society has led to the establishment of a new set of structural constraints that has continued to fuel social disorganization. As such it can be rightly said that communities suffering from increased unemployment, poor educational opportunities, and residential immobility also lack the social organization needed to control delinquent and criminal behavior. In such communities, the process of community policing becomes difficult.

**Broken Windows theory**, introduced by James Q.Wilson and George L. Kelling (American criminologists) in 1982 is based on the assumption that disorder and crime are linked in a developmental sequence. If a window in a building is broken and left unrepaired, all the rest of the windows will soon be broken as well. Since the unrepaired window is a signal that no one cares and so breaking more windows will not result in any
official sanction. This type of vandalism can occur anywhere once the sense of mutual regard and the obligations of civility are lowered by actions that seem to signal a lack of common concern. Wilson and Kelling argue that neighborhoods where property is abandoned, weeds grow, windows are broken, and adults stop scolding ill-disciplined children cause families to move out and unattached adults to move in. In response people begin to use the streets less, causing the area to become vulnerable to criminal invasion. The withdrawal of the community leads to increased drug sales, prostitution, and mugging. Broken Windows theory has been a driving force in community policing programmes, because of the belief that unattended behavior leads to the breakdown of community controls, thus leading to crime. Wilson and Kelling, therefore, have called the police to pay urgent and serious attention to disorder and order maintenance policing (Lombardo and Lough 2007: 123).

However, several researchers and criminologists have challenged the ‘Broken Windows’ theory. Taylor in his book entitled ‘Breaking away from Broken Windows’ (2001) made an attempt to determine origin of civilities and to find out whether or not they eroded urban life over time. He maintained that zero-tolerance, order maintaining police strategies, aimed at reducing fear of crime, may be misdirected and should not be adopted axiomatically. He argued that incivilities are better interpreted as a result of an economically disadvantaged neighborhood, rather than as a symptom of a disorderly and disorganized neighborhood, and that crime fighting is more important than grim fighting for long term reductions in crime. Similarly, Sampson and Raudenbush (1999) argue that disorder and crime are both manifestations of the same explanatory process. They share
common structural and social origins. They maintain that the cause of crime is structural
disadvantage and weak collective efficacy: the ability of a community to regulate its own
conduct (Lombardo and Lough 2007: 124-126).

The legitimatization of order maintenance policing as advocated by the ‘Broken
Windows’ theory has brought community policing to a difficult situation. The present
model led to the establishment of aggressive patrol strategies, which often placed police
in direct confrontation with minority communities.

**Community Implant hypothesis** is based on the assumption that the main reason for
high levels of crime is the lack of informal social control in community areas. Sociologists argue that informal social control can be implanted in a community by
collective citizen action in neighborhoods where social control is naturally weak or non-
existent. The term Community Implant hypothesis was first used by Rosenbaum (1987)
in his essay entitled ‘Theory and Research behind Neighborhood Watch’. Mastrofski,
Worden and Snipes (1995) have described this hypothesis as ‘Community building’.
Community building, according to them, is a process by which police strengthen the
capacity and resolve of citizens to resist crime by building positive relationships with
argues that innovative police strategies such as educational, recreational and occupational
opportunities for youth, can mobilize the informal mechanisms of social control
embedded within the community life (Lombardo and Lough 2007: 128).
Social control generally refers to the capacity of a particular group / community to regulate its members. It involves the use of rewards and punishments. Formal social control is always derived from certain written rules and laws and is enforced by the courts and the police. On the other hand, informal social control is based on customs and norms and is enforced by the citizens themselves through behaviors such as surveillance, verbal reprimand, warning, rejection, and other emotional pressures to ensure conformity. The question for community policing then becomes whether the police, working with the community, can implement informal social control in socially disorganized communities. Social defence programmes of the police adopt a dynamic approach, in tune with national development and connected aspirations. Social defence-oriented developmental strategies are consciously adopted for improving the standards of education, employment, health and living conditions, and all this would generally enhance the quality of life of the ordinary people and will automatically lead to resolutions of tensions, reconciliation of conflicts and building up of resistances in the individual and in society all leading to minimization of deviance, delinquency and crime. S. M. Diaz (2005: 47) further maintains that in a disorganization-prone society, with an all pervading permissiveness, even normally abiding citizens are inclined to unlawful activities as a result of their frustration, discontent and anger, stemming from the disparities between promise and performance and the obvious dichotomy between profession and practice. All these problems lead to confrontations with the police.

Community policing has the capacity to solve the problems of deviant behavior in a disorganized society by handling the problem at the beginning stage itself with
appropriate community-based programmes, fully involving the community groups at various stages of decision making, planning and implementation of the programmes for the protection of the community. These programmes can subsequently become the base for all neighborhood community police projects with the involvement of the community members in community’s own organization, collective anti-crime activities, neighborhood social integration, local social control and overcoming fear of crime. Such community based programmes in turn result in the promotion of mutual understanding and appreciation among the community members.

In spite of the popularity of programmes that utilized the community-building approach, there is little empirical evidence to support the effectiveness of the community implant hypothesis. The study conducted by Skogan (1990) concluded that informal social control mechanisms do not increase solidarity or social interaction. Nor can any of such programmes improve neighborhood conditions. However, research by Silver and Miller (2004), found that community attachment and satisfaction with the police (on the basis of which community policing operates) contribute significantly to neighborhood levels of informal social control. The residents of a community that were satisfied with the ability of the police to control crime and maintain order were more likely to engage in activities to control deviant behavior (Lombardo and Lough 2007: 130).

The Social Structural theory of CP holds that community cooperation in the form of informal social control can result in successful community policing since increased satisfaction with the police is indeed one of the fundamental goals of community
The efforts to ‘implant’ informal social control in urban neighborhoods, where social control is naturally weak or non-existent can be positively affected by improved police-community relations.

(2) MODERN MANAGEMENT TECHNOLOGY THEORY OF COMMUNITY POLICING

Efforts to build a people friendly police may not achieve the desired results unless there is a real time back up of information required for the purpose and this has become possible with the implementation of modern management and information technology by the police. Yet, there are some additional initiatives that are needed in order to update the system technology as well as the methodologies for Community Policing (CP).

The development of police technology during the late 1980s focused principally on the acquisition of two major types of systems by the police: computer aided dispatching (CAD) and the automated fingerprint identification system (AFIS). While holding that crime prevention is the priority, CP also acknowledges that it is not the sole purpose of policing. CP promotes the use of technology to better analyze problems and develop crime prevention and apprehension strategies (Peak and Glensor 1996: 391).

Policing is an information-intensive business. Organizational strategy can no longer be separated from information technology strategy; properly managed, information systems can serve as a powerful tool in the hands of progressive police executives. They can cut labor costs, improve resource allocation, and increase efficiency.
and effectiveness of existing operations. For several years computers have assisted the police in budgeting, crime analysis and investigation, dispatching, fleet management, jail management, personnel allocation, and record keeping. However, Kenneth Peak and Ronald Glensor (1996: 391) maintain that police departments must manage technology rather than allow themselves to be managed by it.

During the last decade of the 20th century, the overall world environment has changed tremendously, be it administration, law and order or nature of crime and criminals, due to several reasons. Liberalization of economy, globalization and advancements in the field of Telecommunications and computer technology (I.T.) has opened up new vistas of unique development. Because of these developments, the work environment has also changed considerably. Therefore, we cannot look at the functioning of police in isolation. It is essential that we look at the present day roles and responsibilities of the police, especially with regard to CP, in a broader way and provide inputs to police personnel through their training programmes and prepare them to avail the fruits of modern telecommunication technologies.

According to A. P. Maheshwari, an Indian police officer (2001: 112) certain critical information domains must be addressed for the successful implementation of community oriented policing. Some of these are:

- Environmental Scanning
- Area demarcation and problem diagnosis
- People interface
• Strategic management
• External and internal linkages with the police organization
• Task-group role and accountability

The traditional system of policing primarily makes three types of analysis, i.e., crime analysis, intelligence analysis and administrative analysis. The Community oriented policing or CP needs to focus on new salient features with the need for socio-economic and demographic analysis of the community, and lay more emphasis on specific problems of the area (with hot-spot focus), meaningful evaluation of the tactics or programmes followed in particular context, and more emphatically, the policy options, i.e., anticipating the consequences of community policing moves. All this signifies the criticality of at least three additional sub-systems of the CP informatics:

• Geographic information system
• Problem solving information system
• External information system

Therefore it has been maintained that induction of people friendly policing culture can be possible with an easily accessible and real time logistic support in the form of CP information network.

Information technology (IT) has been proven as an enabler for the achievement of community policing goals. Yet, in terms of overall research, there has not been a significant amount of attention focused on IT and CP.
Criminologists such as David Carter and Robert Trojanowicz (Chu and Chu 2001: 28) have stated that “the goal should be to employ sophisticated and expensive technology where it will provide the greatest payback. The Community Policing Officer (CPO) is like the base of a funnel, using information filtered down from various ‘hi-tech’ sources and providing information generated from his/her neighborhood area (beat). A misconception is that CP is antithetical to hi-tech policing”. They argue that a technique like criminal profiling obviously falls into the hi-tech approach. Using sophisticated computers, the police and other investigating agencies can profile a likely perpetrator and create a description of what that person is like. Yet, obviously, that information still requires identifying the individual, finding out where he/she lives, and apprehending the suspect. Here the CPO has an advantage of being familiar with the bad actors in his beat area and will have the information necessary to make an arrest. Here lies the significance of community policing even in the IT era.

The present theory holds that there are many ways by which IT can be used as an enabler for CP. Many uses support individual officers since they are the practitioners and frontline linkages to the community. Some benefits support the whole organization. For instance, almost all law enforcement organizations have mission statements that talk about how CP promotes peace, order and civility. The theory maintains that the public needs a sense of security and also want to be consulted about their priorities. In this context, many police agencies have been using Internet Web pages as a means of disseminating information on organizational priorities (annual reports, operational plans), and they obtain feedback through e-mail and interactive message boards.
Former police administrator (USA) James Lingerfelt (Chu and Chu 2001:30) calls technology a force multiplier. He notes that there are three ways to save time and money that can be applied to CP:

(i) Use technology to off load work to other police personnel. This could involve using a Computer-Aided Dispatch (CAD) system as the focal point of a call management programme. Work can be sent to a telephone reporting unit that could handle complaints that do not require an actual police visit or immediate response.

(ii) Use technology to streamline work. Work can be moved to support services or it can be streamlined so that it is more efficient and generates higher quality outputs.

(iii) Reduce the costs of support services and apply the savings (in people and money) to direct-service areas.

This new police paradigm has also come to be known as intelligence-led policing (ILP). ILP is the collection of information to produce an intelligence based end product designed to inform police decision makers at both policy making and strategic levels. It is a model of policing in which intelligence about crime serves as a guide to police operations. ILP has been described as a new dimension of CP in that both rely on information management, two way communications with the public, scientific data analysis, and problem solving. It is built on the argument that the trusting relationships developed between patrol officers and the community can be used to gather information about crime (Lombardo and Lough 2007: 134).
“Policing today is no longer a matter of ‘brawn’ with lathi-wielding police personnel upholding the law and maintaining peace. It now revolves around higher management skills, leadership, planning, anticipation and strategizing”.¹ All this requires the judicious use of modern management and information technology in policing, especially in community policing which rests on quick transfer of information from the community and beat patrol officers to the police headquarters.

The theory insists on the use of latest technological advancements in the area of policing and holds that modern management technology could be made use of for police augmentation and making the system more efficient. For instance, Fax Net, mobile telephones, pagers, Internet, Global Positioning System, Image transmission and video conferencing over a large area and even modern transport facilities have become vital part of crime prevention networks in communities across the world by giving police a tool to rapidly alert neighborhood businesses and associations about criminal activities and wanted suspects. Modern management techniques like the Tetra radio network, apart from fulfilling regular communication needs, can help the police to transmit voice data and pictures through special handsets. Using this equipment, the policemen can send messages to each other. Further, the Global Positioning System (GPS) helps the police to monitor the movement of police patrolling parties and constables.

Dr. A.P.J. Abdul Kalam (former President of India) maintained that there is a need for Wi-max and Wi-Fi connectivities with state-of-the-art security for police

¹ Speech by P.C. Haldar, Director of Intelligence Bureau, on ‘internal security’ at SVP National Police Academy, Hyderabad on 3rd March 2008.
communication. Data about habitual criminals, including fingerprints and DNA, should also be available online to all police stations through a centralized data center with an appropriate mechanism for validation and verification without duplication of data. Video conferencing also can be used in an effective way for better communication between various police departments. The police community must enable formulation of progressive and innovative crime detection systems for the digital economy.²

From severe shortage of man power to serious security threat to public places, the police have been facing several challenges. There is a need to disseminate and share information better; create a data collection system for detecting inter regional, inter state and cross border criminal activities; and improve the collection and analysis of data on crime, prosecutions, convictions and sentences.

Technology may make police more efficient. Powerful computer data bases that analyze crime patterns may help solve crimes and locate perpetrators, new forms of identification involving DNA or computerized fingerprinting may help convict the guilty and protect the innocent. New technologies may help control police. For example police accountability might be enhanced by the video tapping of all police encounters with citizens. This could serve as a deterrent to misbehavior and offer a new form of evidence in disputed accounts and can be of significant help in the area of CP.

This theory highlights that Information and Communication Technology (ICT), when aligned with an organization’s mission and service strategies, can provide immense

benefits in the community policing era. In recent decades subtle, seemingly less coercive forms of control have emerged such as video surveillance, computer dossiers, and various forms of biological and electronic monitoring and behavioral and environmental manipulations and this has made it possible to have a society in which significant inroads are made on liberty, privacy and autonomy.

However, the dawn of the information age has meant that the general work force is becoming more knowledge-centered as against physical labor centered. The same trend has extended to the area of law enforcement. With all of the promise and capabilities that will come to the police in the high-tech era of the future, several legitimate concerns are indicated as well. As futurist Georgette Bennett observed, “Experts agree that computer crime in all its colorful variations—‘Data diddling’, ‘super-zapping’, ‘logic bombs’, ‘salami slicing’, ‘Trojan horses’—will be the single greatest crime generator we face in the future”.

Most police agencies currently have little if any internal training that addresses computer systems and other equipments. Police officers need to know, for example, that search warrants addressing computer equipment or storage media may require specific information and exact wording to stand up in court; that the delicate electronic components used in computers and information stored on magnetic media, such as floppy diskettes, are quite sensitive to temperature extremes; that exposing magnetic media to magnetic fields, such as radio waves, could also alter or destroy data; and that connecting
or disconnecting electric cables improperly could permanently damage sensitive electronic equipment (Peak and Glensor 1996: 396).

The challenge for CP officials is to embrace technology, but they must apply it intelligently. Technology can sometimes be employed at cross-purposes with CP. For example, the combination of CAD technology and computerized data in the patrol car has tethered officers to the automobile rather than facilitate the face-to-face interaction in the community that is so integral to CP.

Having too sophisticated technology and modern equipments can be as great a burden as having none at all. Police agencies also need to be well aware of the liabilities and constitutional issues surrounding the new technologies.

Drawing on Ulrich Beck, Michel Foucault, Anthony Giddens, and others, Richard Ericson and Kevin Haggerty (Ericson and Haggerty 1997: 49) perceive the police as pivotal brokers of knowledge in a ‘risk society’ geared to surveillance, exchange of information, auditing, communication, and classification. This makes police officers the knowledge workers who ‘front load’ the system. They are caught in an iron cage of information technology. Ericson and Haggerty call it as “database policing”. They argue that there is an omnivorous and insatiable demand for data (e.g., on traffic accidents and for the court system). Although the required data is available it is not used judiciously. Agencies have large departments to process this information and all activities are logged and monitored. This has made police work dehumanized.
Ericson and Haggerty provide a demystification of community policing, which they perceive as a discourse that is entwined with the communication systems that provide the context for how the police think, feel, speak, write, design their buildings, mobilize, and so on. Community policing, according to them, is communications policing where the traditional community of interpersonal relations and direct action gets lost (1997: 445). In this light, CP is highly intrusive and represents infiltration utilizing communications technology and the mobilization of others.

Finally it can be said that community policing permits the judicious use of modern technology, but it also rests on the belief that nothing surpasses what dedicated human beings, talking and working together, can achieve.

(3) DEMOCRATIC THEORY OF COMMUNITY POLICING

Community policing is based on the democratic principle that “anyone who exercises authority on behalf of the community (like the police) is accountable to the community for the exercise of that authority”. Democratic theory of community policing rests on the belief that community policing, which is the newest development in the area of policing, involves the empowerment of a new level of social organization to generate work for the police, namely, groups, neighborhoods, communities, businesses, civic groups, and so forth. The theory also maintains that the success of a democratic government depends, in large measure, on the voluntary compliance of citizens with society’s laws and norms of conduct.
Police in a democracy are always in a dilemma, for in a free society there exists a delicate balance between enforcing laws and maintaining order effectively on one hand and being repressive on the other.

Community policing in a democratic society has the following roles to perform:

- Acts as a democratic role model for citizens in society by being impartial, fair, and objective, showing restraint, compassion, and tolerance.
- Practices consistent enforcement of the laws.
- Investigates crimes and apprehends suspected criminals.
- Educates the public to protect themselves and their property.
- Attempts management of interpersonal and inter-group conflicts with minimum reliance on force.
- Works with other community and criminal justice agencies to alter the causes of crime and to cope effectively with its occurrence (Kuykendall and Unsinger 1979: 19).

According to Prof. David Bayley (2005: 298-300), the essential features of democratic policing are responsiveness and accountability. A democratic police force, according to him, is the one that responds to the needs of individuals and private groups as well as the needs of the government. Strengthening of these mechanisms will strengthen the quality of democratic policing. The police, in truly democratic countries, according to Bayley, serve the disaggregate members of the public and their needs are uppermost in the mind of a democratic police force. He, however, maintains that the problem that most of the
countries face is that democratic policing, especially in its concern with human rights and accountability, is under attack all the time because of reported increases, firstly, in serious crime and, secondly, in terrorism, assassination, and collective disorder. When there are increases in individual as well as collective threats to law and order, democratic policing becomes vulnerable to being labeled a “soft strategy”.

However, theorists of participatory democracy, like N. Poulantaz, C. Pateman and C.B. Macpherson try to assimilate and realize the ideals of direct democracy – responsive and active citizenry, participation and equality in the modern complex world. They point out that if individuals have an opportunity to directly participate in decision-making at the local level they can achieve real control over the course of their everyday life. Macpherson argues that a truly democratic society promotes powers of social cooperation and creativity (which is a prerequisite for the success of CP) rather than maximize aggregate satisfactions (Ramaswamy 2004: 404).

The democratic theory of CP also derives its ideas from the model of deliberative democracy. Deliberative democracy signifies a democratic system that deliberates to the extent ‘that the decisions it reaches reflect open discussion among the participants, with the people ready to listen to the views and consider the interest of others, and modify their own opinions accordingly’. In deliberative democracy decisions are taken wholly by consensus. It values the manner of open discussion that hears all points of view and reaches a decision. For deliberative democracy to work well, people must exercise democratic self restraint: they must think it more important that the decision reached
should be a genuinely democratic one and a decision that they themselves favor (Ramaswamy 2004: 407). Similarly developmental model of democracy is concerned with the development of human individual and the community. It holds that citizens are ‘free’ only when they participate directly and continuously in shaping the life of their community (Heywood 2004: 74). Community policing is also based on a similar belief that members of a community can lead a peaceful and orderly life only if they directly participate in the community policing activities.

The democratic theory of community policing assumes that police force in a community is just a reticulation with necessary structure, resources and expertise at its disposal towards a given end. It holds that the regular police force is just a skeleton for the true policing efforts of a democracy wherein every citizen is a policeman of his country.

One important element in defining a democratic society is a police force that:

1. Is subject to the rule of law embodying values respectful of human dignity, rather than the wishes of a powerful leader or party.
2. Can intervene in the life of citizens only under limited and carefully controlled circumstances and
3. Is publicly accountable.

Involvement of public in police activities, which is an essential prerequisite for CP, breeds a sense of belongingness. Periodic meetings between the public and the police at
various levels serve the purpose. It brings police and the public closer. The sense of participation in policing helps the public to appreciate the problems of the police and policing. It encourages citizens to partake in nation building and boosts patriotism.

However, to judge democratic societies merely by traditional standards focusing on overt and direct police behavior can result in a vision which is too narrow and an optimism which may be unwarranted. Given powerful new technologies that can silently and invisibly pierce boundaries of distance, darkness, time, and economic and physical barriers that traditionally protected liberty, police may become less democratic in their behavior. New information extractive technologies such as video surveillance, computer dossiers, and various forms of biological and electronic monitoring and behavioral and environmental manipulations are making it possible to have a society in which significant inroads are made on liberty, privacy and autonomy, even in a relatively nonviolent environment with democratic structures in place.

The theory also focuses on the continual tension between the desire for order and the desire for liberty that exists in every democratic society. The theory maintains that both are essential. While as the case of the Police State suggest, one can have the former without the latter, it is not possible to have a society with liberty which does not also have a minimum degree of order. The balance between these, however, will vary depending on

---

3 The term police state refers to a state in which the government exercises rigid and repressive controls over the social, economic and political life of the population, especially by means of a secret police force, which operates above the normal constraints, found in a liberal democracy. A police state typically exhibits elements of totalitarian and social control, and there is usually little distinction between the law and the exercise of political power by the executive.
the context and time period. Democratic theory of CP seeks to avoid the extremes of either anarchy or repression.

According to this theory, community policing is an explicit effort to create a more democratic police force. It is based on the assumption that policing will be more effective if it has the support of, and input from the community and if the community recognizes the social service and order maintenance aspects of the police role. This can certainly involve some sticky issues such as:

- What constitutes a community? There is always a danger of powerful groups pursuing their own agendas and labeling this for the ‘community’ ignoring the basic principles of democracy and the legitimate needs and interests of minorities.
- How to resolve the tensions between professionalism/ expertise and democratic participation and the danger of police being captured by a given segment of a diverse community.

It is ironic that police are both a major support and a major threat to a democratic society. When police operate under the rule of law they may protect democracy by their example of respect for the law and by suppressing crime. But apart from the rule of law and public accountability, the police power to use force, engage in summary punishment, use covert surveillance, and to stop, search and arrest citizens, can be used to support dictatorial regimes, powerful vested interest groups and practices.
The purpose of democracy, according to Andrew Heywood (2004: 71), is to establish, through some process of popular participation, a framework of laws within which individuals can conduct their own affairs and pursue their private interests. Democratic solutions, then, are appropriate only for matters that specifically relate to the community; used in other circumstances, democracy amounts to an infringement of liberty. Not uncommonly, this fear of democracy is reflected in a rejection of direct or participatory forms of democracy. The same anomaly exists in the area of CP in a heterogeneous society.

The challenge of policing a democratic society is to design a means by which public preferences are converted into policing outputs. This is less easy than it sounds, for reasons well known to democratic theorists. Moreover, it may not always be desirable. Foremost among the concerns is the fundamental risk of majority tyranny. The public may well prefer solutions that are exclusionary, or indeed, draconian, to the great disadvantage of the marginalized minorities against whom they are directed. Compounding this is the fact that people from disadvantaged backgrounds are less likely to participate in any policing process, even those through which they might further their own interests. The flip side of this is the risk of minority tyranny, where a shrill minority would prevail over an apathetic majority.

Democratic theorists differentiate between the aggregate of individual private interests, and the public interest or the common good. Most law abiding citizens, if asked, would prefer to see a greater police presence in their own neighborhood than in
somebody else’s across town. Conversely, proposals to close down police stations tend to be greeted with considerable dismay by local residents. It may not matter much to the self-interested citizen that his preferred outcomes might entail an inefficient or ineffective allocation of police resources. “Looking after number one” is a familiar mindset in our individualistic society. Citizens are usually competent judges of their own interest, but less so of the interests of others or of the public in general. This contradiction between public and private interests and the threat of majority or minority tyranny in a democracy poses a major challenge to the very basis of community policing.

(4) ZERO TOLERANCE THEORY OF CP

Zero Tolerance Policing is an intensely debated crime control strategy in the West. Zero tolerance policing is said to have its philosophical origins in the Broken Windows' article published by James Q Wilson and George L Kelling in the journal, The Atlantic Monthly, in March 1982. In short, this thesis asserts that just as an unrepaired broken window is a sign that nobody cares and leads to more damage; minor incivilities - such as begging, public drunkenness, vandalism and graffiti - if unchecked and uncontrolled, produce an atmosphere in a community in which more serious crime will flourish. Over time, individuals may feel that they can get away with minor offences, which leads them to commit more serious offences.

As a result of its popularity and vogue status, the term zero tolerance policing is defined in many different ways. It is therefore said to be an ambiguous term: To some, it connotes comprehensive, aggressive law enforcement with "no holds barred". To others,
it refers to a policing strategy which exists as part of a package of carefully designed approaches to combat the crime problems of a specific locality.

According to this theory, there is a link between minor disorderly behavior and rise in crime. Such disorderly behavior – litter, broken windows, and graffiti – would create a public perception that no one cares and everything goes. When such seemingly insignificant infractions of law are tolerated, it fosters a climate of permissiveness for major crime. If not firmly suppressed, it will frighten citizens and encourage criminals. Zero Tolerance Policing, therefore, means that, by pursuing minor crime vigorously, the authorities can create an environment in which crime of more dangerous kinds cannot flourish (Jafa 2001: 105). Importantly, the crime prevention hypothesis contained in the zero tolerance policing theory is that the more arrests police make for every petty disorder, the less serious crime there will be.

In zero-tolerance policing, laws are strictly enforced and suspicious people are stopped and questioned, which increases the opportunity to find fugitives. An example of zero-tolerance policing is the targeted approach to crime control used in New York City. From 1993 to 1997, murder and non-negligent homicides dropped 60.2%, forcible rape decreased 12.4%, robbery dropped 48.4%, and burglary was reduced by 45.7%. The Mayor’s office credited the police department for this crime decrease; the zero-tolerance policy was a primary strategy the department used (Swenson, Henggeler, Taylor and Addison 2005: 209).
However critics argue that zero-tolerance policing is a form of aggressive policing that contains the danger of over-reaction from undue enthusiasm for achieving results, or from deliberate brutality or an arrogant sense of power. For most commentators the zero tolerance policy is associated with aggressive order maintenance. This strategy is described by its critics as a punitive approach to maintaining law and order, with little or no reference to negotiating acceptable public behavior at the neighborhood level. Amongst many criminologists, therefore, the clearest picture of zero tolerance policing is drawn in terms of aggressive enforcement, as a confrontational form of policing in which petty offenders are targeted directly and fed into the criminal justice system by arrest or summons.

The long-term effects of this model of policing are unknown. It works well in densely populated areas with high policing levels and large amounts of petty crime. But where the population is dispersed or the crime rate is low, it may have little effect. And in areas of high racial tension, the policy might leave locals feeling victimized.

According to Y.S. Jafa, an Indian police officer (2001:110), zero-tolerance policing, if applied to specific problems for short durations under strict management, would be effective. However he maintains that such initiatives can not be left in the hands of petty officials. A focus on crime reduction with numerous arrests for minor offences like taxi drivers overcharging passengers or careless driving by bus drivers can unleash baser, sadistic instincts of the police organizational culture, apart from creating opportunities for corruption. Thereby well educated officers must be deployed for
handling the zero tolerance approach. Municipal officials and magistrates will have to be on the side of the police. Most importantly, public support for hard-line policing against minor offences and disorderly acts like traffic rules violation and fouling up public places should be elicited through NGOs, resident’s associations and other local groups.

The question before the law enforcement officials is whether aggressive zero-tolerance policing is the only way of effecting successful crime control within a community. Sometimes ‘get tough’ measures leading to lengthy incarceration of a large number of young offenders may offer short term relief, but in the long run by causing disruption of family ties and increasing levels of alienation, they may have negative consequences and prove to be problematic in themselves.

(5) PUBLIC RELATIONS THEORY OF CP

The notion of how important is the relationship between police and community is not new. The Public Relations theory of CP is based on the belief that not only should there be an emphasis on the maintenance of good ‘public relations’ as being so typical to many of the traditional police-community relations programmes, but there should also be an attempt to highlight the importance of inter-dependence, of mutual understandings and mutual responsiveness and support. However, while these expectations may have served as a backdrop to more systematic theoretical conceptualizations, it was not until the development of the idea of *co production* that systematized the notion of citizens and police having a joint interest and developing a set of activities together to produce security and public safety.
In the age of rapid development of communication technology, when geographical
distances are practically no longer felt, direct communication with different sorts of
public is still one of the basic conditions for long term successful and efficient operation
of any social subject, especially one like the police, which is constantly under the critical
public eye.

Virtually every organization that provides a product or service finds it necessary
to communicate with the public about what it does. Typically these communications have
two distinguishable but related aims. One is to inform the public about the availability of
its products and services. The other aim is to establish and maintain a good corporate or
organizational image or reputation. Both of these communication activities, sponsored
and paid for by the organization as an organization, are referred to as public relations
(Cox and Fitzgerald 1992: 8).

The present theory holds that public relations are an inseparable part of police
work. The police keep the public informed about matters from its sphere of activity,
unless by doing so it would prejudice its own work or justify benefits of others. By the
indirect relation that takes place through the mass media, the police endeavors to enhance
the quality and extent of information it daily communicates to the journalists, stimulating
preventive activity of the mass media and coverage of topics that are important for the
citizens from the security point of view.

Further, there are more and more different groups of people and police officers
have to establish a specific relation with everyone of them. They deal with different
people, which is why they need to adopt different approaches; those violating the law will
certainly have a different opinion of the police from those who do not violate the law. Furthermore, the public is becoming increasingly diversified in the modern society, and the police are accountable for its actions and measures taken to all of them and have to establish relations and endeavor for long term co-operation with all of them. In creating such positive communication, police public relations play an especially important role.

Some of the common tasks in police public relations at the ground level of the police operations are:

- Keeping track analytically of the coverage of the police and its representatives in the media,
- Keeping track of and analyzing the public opinion,
- Elaboration of a monthly plan of media related activities for the Police Department and of specific plans for the requirements of the operative services,
- Everyday reporting to the public through the mass media about the more important security events,
- Managing the police website.

Apart from the basic tasks in the field of police public relations the police can also perform other tasks that fall within their competence: organizing press conferences, briefings and photo sessions on various topics in the police field, press releases, notices and information for the public, and also attending to written requests and questions made by journalists. Again, the police can organize interviews, communicate data, and give clarifications and corrections of the items and articles published in various mass media.
Some of the other significant functions of the police with regard to establishment of good public relations are as follows (www.apstatepolice.org):

- To regularly inform the public of the objectives of the police, the rights of the people under law, the services, which the police have designed for the public.

- Highlight the constraints and problems of police like attacks on policemen, killing of police officers, the legal requirements of police actions, the situations arising out of conflicting rights, physical and mental strain to which the policeman is subjected.

- Disseminate information to the public on police matters particularly on important incidents and crimes.

- To apprise the public of the importance on preservation of crime scenes for evidentiary value and also informing them about the importance of giving truthful information and also the need to come forward to give evidence in courts courageously as a part of service to the society.

- The need for the public to co-operate with the police in furnishing clues, giving assistance in investigation and to come forward to figure as witnesses in the court for the effective control of crime by the police.

- In times of emergencies, critical public order situations and outbreak of crime, provide all the information required to the public.

- Interaction with voluntary organizations particularly dealing with the problems of children, women, scheduled castes, scheduled tribes, minorities and crime prevention societies;
• Production, display and distribution of brochures, television serials, short films and other forms of mass media to bring out the areas of police-public co-operation and highlight important aspects of police work including sensational crimes, crime prevention measures, and manner of overcoming lapses and failures in the police functions; and the need for effective co-operation by the public in detection, investigation and prosecution of cases.

• To provide correct feedback of public reactions and their grievances from publications or other media as well as opinion of leaders.

The effective mobilization of community support requires different approaches in different communities. According to Sanker Sen, a retired Indian police officer (2007: 5), establishing trust and obtaining cooperation is often easier in affluent middle class communities, than in poorer communities where there is longstanding mistrust of the police. He maintains that, alliance within the community should not be limited to some particular incidents or confined to a time frame. It has to be an enduring partnership between the police and the community in the quest for peace and justice.

Public relations theory holds that any successful public relations programs must include both policy and practice, or planning and action. Public relations are based upon public opinion as influenced to a greater extent by the media. Organizations concerned with public relations sample public opinion, analyze the data collected, make decisions concerning proper courses of action, and translate these decisions into action.
According to the National Crime Prevention Council of the US Department of Justice, community relationships provide worth in social value with a more informed citizenry and also provide an opportunity to the young people and others to learn about law enforcement while working with law enforcement. According to the Council, the philosophy of the citizen-police relationship results in (Sharma 1981: 168):

- Improved cooperation
- Less apathy
- Reduction in crime
- Reduction in fear of crime
- Better communications
- Improved police image and
- Clear understanding

Police-citizen relationship in all societies is essentially a situation, dependent upon two major variables obtained at a given period of history in a particular society. These are:

1. The ideological values of the political system, which the rulers of the country profess or prefer to practice in relation to the bulk of the citizenry, and
2. The operating socio-cultural norms, which tend to condition the bureaucratic ethos of the administrative structures, more so in a developing society (Sharma 1981: 168).

However, in community policing initiatives, the assumption that public are keen to develop partnership with police is often not correct. There is invariably community’s skepticism that the police are not serious and indulging in some sort of public relations
gimmicks. There is also fear of the public that they may have to face reprisals from the criminals if they closely cooperate with the police. To win public support, there is a need for the police to convincingly demonstrate that they really seek community’s help in combating crime and order (Sen 2007: 4).

An additional concern is that an increase in the decision-making autonomy of line officers and closer police-community relations will provide the police with greater opportunities for abusing their authority and corruption. Little work has been done on this, but the high levels of patronage and corruption that plagued the police in the nineteenth century (an era characterized by close ties between the police, community members, and local politicians) is a clear reminder of the danger of implicating the police directly in community life.

Recent evaluations of community policing suggest that the level of community satisfaction with police services varies according to how it is implemented, and the social characteristics of community members. Even though community policing promises to benefit everyone, specific programs may favor particular community interests (such as those of local business owners) and other dominant groups. In poor and high-crime neighborhoods, residents may be distrusting of the police and rates of community participation may be very low. The benefits of community policing may be highest in these areas, but the challenges the police face in convincing citizens that they are committed to the long-term improvement of the local neighborhood, in creating productive partnerships, and in mobilizing citizens to get involved in local organizations, are also greatest.
A cordial police-community relationship is something unprecedented and has to be attempted and continuously strived for. No society can legislate this relationship, but all societies can conventionally evolve it in the context of their social norms and cultural values. The neglect of this invites violence and corruption, which further results in the aggravation of crime and incidence of lawlessness in society. The police cannot divorce the society just because of its value incompatibilities, nor can it be allowed to transgress limits just because people deserve it. The onus of initiating and courting good relationship with the community has to be on the police and the arguments that the police is already overworked or that the police budgets or available expertise do not permit this, are simply untenable because without this the police has to handle work which it itself creates.

(6) COMMUNITARIAN THEORY OF CP

A relatively new concept that has begun to get the attention of academics and politicians alike and can be applied to the general notion of community involvement in problem solving i.e. community policing is “communitarianism”. The term was promulgated by prominent sociologist Amitai Etzioni and other academics who argued that we have gone too far toward extending rights to our citizens and not far enough in asking them to fulfill responsibilities to the community as a whole. They further maintain that there is a need to make people understand that they need to actively participate, not just give their opinions but instead give time, energy and money (Peak and Glensor 1996: 48).
The theory maintains that the basic ideas and principles underlying the concept of communitarianism can benefit CP initiatives to a very great extent. In its view, communitarianism is an attempt to nurture an underlying structure of “civil society” – sound families; caring neighbors; and the whole web of churches, Rotary clubs, block associations, and nonprofit organizations that give individuals their moral compass and communities their strength. However, communitarian theory of CP believes that the deteriorating trend of the quality of community life is not just because the elected political representatives have done a bad job but also because they have not attended to what citizenship is all about. As such, communitarians support processes such as problem solving, where neighborhoods have taken matters into their own hands, closing off streets and creating other physical barriers to disrupt the drug trade, working to overcome problems of homelessness, panhandling and so on. This is where the objectives of communitarians overlap with those of advocates of community policing: the recognition that many of the answers to community problems lie not with the government, but in the community at large (Peak and Glensor 1996: 49).

Communitarianism or more precisely political communitarianism believes that rights come with responsibilities. The communitarian political agenda is frequently referred to as value communitarianism because it is inserting community into the social contractarian equation as a source of value. According to communitarianism, communities are posited as having moral value in the way that individuals do: communities have rights; individuals have obligations to communities as well as to each other. Communitarianism stands for the protection of “common good” and community
policing is also a communitarian “justice” program that expands the role of the police from a constitutional job of protecting individual rights into a more progressive definition based on protecting the “common good”.

Communitarian theory of CP maintains that the individuals are shaped by the communities to which they belong and thus owe them a debt of respect and consideration. And as such, they readily tend to cooperate with the law enforcement agencies which assure them of peace and order in their respective communities. Communitarian philosophers such as Alasdair Macintyre, Michael Sandel, Charles Taylor and Michael Walzer hold a similar view when they argue that individuals acquire their identities (their values, their projects, their social roles, their conventions, their hopes and fears) from the communities in which they live their lives (Hudson 2003: 78). According to this view point, the people have the responsibility to fight crime and they need to actively participate in doing so.

The theory focuses mainly on two themes. The first asserts the responsibilities individuals have to communities; the second proposes a presumed decline in community as a crucial factor in rising crime rates and other social evils.

Contemporary political communitarianism believes that up to a point social order and liberty are mutually sustaining and reinforcing, but that if either is enhanced beyond that point, they become antagonistic and adversarial (Hudson 2003: 80). This view can influence CP to a very great extent. CP also believes in Cultivating processes and
institutions that can bring about reintegrative shaming: inculcating a sense of shame for wrongdoing, but without excluding the wrong doer from the community.

Communitarian theory of CP considers western life as a vicious spiral in which community decline leads to lack of informal social control which leads to a rise in criminal and anti-social behavior which further leads to demoralization and decline of community. Communitarian politics has thus brought forth zero-tolerance policing and full-enforcement criminal justice before it is too ‘late’. Wilson and Kelling (1982) in their celebrated ‘broken windows’ article thus maintain that policing against low –level crime and incivilities is very important. Zero-tolerance policing and arrest- and - charge responses to crimes that might at other times be dealt with by cautions or diverted to health / welfare institutions involve recruiting members of communities to support state agencies, mainly the police, in disciplining other members (Hudson 2003: 85). This way people become the ‘eyes and ears’ of the police. On the whole, the present theory holds that community strategies along with policing strategies can result in positive and effective responses to local demands. More precisely it can be said that community is what control strategies are intended to restore, and community is simultaneously the resource by which control is to be effected.

The theory believes that CP outcomes would be more constructive and humane than the present repressive risk control penalties of state via the police and would eventually lead to community justice since in CP police priorities and crime prevention projects are to be formulated in response to public demand.
Although this theory helps in understanding the reasons responsible for crime and antisocial behavior and the benefits of community police collaboration yet critics argue that crime prevention schemes and community policing strategies include narrow range of interests. They maintain that although these schemes are labelled ‘community’ they generally mean a small number of sectional interests. Community safety schemes usually represent business, housing associations, residents’ associations, local authorities and criminal justice agencies, as well as some officially recognized community associations. The predominance of business interests has led to crime prevention schemes as in CP being described by one critic as corporatism ‘masquerading’ as communitarianism. Neighborhood schemes, too, represent the interests of some: for example young people are often targets of exclusion expressed through opposition through opposition to student accommodation or accommodation for young single people. ‘Safer shopping’ and ‘inward investment’ can mean sweeping the streets ‘clean’ of people sleeping in doorways; it can also mean expulsion of people moving around in groups. In residential areas CP through crime prevention and improvement of quality of community life can entail refusal to allow buildings to accommodate asylum seekers, the homeless, ex-offenders or mentally challenged individuals (Hudson 2003: 88). Precisely the communitarian theory of CP can be criticized on the grounds that owners of private spaces come to control access to what were formerly public spaces.

Further, communitarianism has failed to produce satisfactory grounding for safeguards for individuals against repressive majorities. It has also failed to take adequate
account of relationships and structures of power within as well as between communities, something that can have a profound impact on the very functioning of CP.

(7) ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND CULTURE THEORY OF CP

Community policing is argued to be a paradigmatic shift in public law enforcement wherein police organizations are to become “flatter” i.e. less hierarchical, more product as opposed to process oriented, and less driven by reactive responses to citizen mobilizations. The present theory argues that although much attention in the literature on CP has concentrated on police-public contact, the organizational medium through which this new style of policing is to take shape is essentially under-studied.

The theory maintains that for CP to become a central feature of law enforcement, the institutional framework and organizational apparatus of police organizations must be altered if they are to accommodate the sweeping changes implied by community policing proponents.

Classical views of organizational dynamics emphasize structure to the near exclusion of culture. Early theories tended to downplay the role that organizational culture has in shaping bureaucracies such as the police. Max Weber (1947) separated the professional and personal lives of bureaucrats, in part as a means of leaving the issue of culture at the doorstep, rather than within his “ideal” organization. Early structural and managerial theories of organizations more often treated the internal culture of the organization as highly susceptible to manipulation by those in authority. For all practical
and theoretical purposes the culture of an organization was the object rather than the source of organizational change. The normative and cultural aspects of organizational life received attention in the work of the early human relations movement, most notably the work of George Elton Mayo (1933), Chester I. Barnard (1938), Fritz J. Roethlisberger and William J. Dickson (1939), and reemerged in the 1950s and 1960s in the work of Chris Argyris (1953, 1957), Peter Drucker (1954), and Douglas McGregor (1960). In their work the theoretical focus shifted from structure to process and from managers to workers. Work group culture dominated much of the analysis, and managerial focus shifted from control to cooperation. The socio-psychological dynamics of organizational life also gained greater credibility, providing a foundation for the analysis of organizations as cultural systems (Rosenbaum 1994: 94-95).

An organizational structure is a normative structure composed of rules and roles specifying, more or less clearly, who is expected to do what, and how. Thus, the structure broadly defines the interests and goals that are to be pursued, and the considerations and alternatives that should be treated as relevant. The various dimensions of organizational structure such as the Size and Horizontal specialization express the number of roles that are to be filled and how different issues and policy areas are supposed to be linked together or de-coupled from each other. According to Luther Gulick (Peters and Pierre 2007: 78-79), those areas that are encompassed by the same organizational unit are more likely to be coordinated than those that belong to different units. However, he maintains that in a hierarchy, separation of issues at lower levels only means that co-ordination responsibility is moved up to higher echelons. The structure may express whether co-
ordination is supposed to be hierarchical or collegial. ‘Collegiality’ usually means that decisions have to be reached through arguing, bargaining or voting rather than through command. CP rests on a similar belief. Finally, organizational structure may be more ambiguous or loosely coupled than other structures, thus facilitating innovative behaviour, flexible responses and extensive policy dynamics. CP organization is supposed to be collegial in nature.

According to the Community policing proponents like Jack R. Greene, William T. Bergman and Edward J. McLaughlin (Rosenbaum 1994: 93), the success or failure of CP, to a large measure, is affected by the organizational structures and processes that characterize modern day policing. They hold that the internal culture of these organizations, together with structural and technological considerations, also can shape the success or failure of CP implementation efforts. This they say is true for several reasons:

(i) By all accounts, police organizations have been some of the most intractable of public bureaucracies, capable of resisting and ultimately thwarting change efforts.

(ii) The history of police organizational change has generally favoured the police organizations over the institutions bent on changing it. Organizational adaptation in police bureaucracies has tended to be one way: the change efforts adapt to the organization, rather than the organization adapting to the intended change. Moreover, police organizations are rank and power centered.
Culturally they remain inward looking and they are often distant from their clients and they shun most civic oversight attempts.

An agency or an organization must cope with the constraints and pressures applied by the outside social context in which it operates. Therefore it develops its own organization character. Institutionalization is a concept that defines the process through which the members of an agency/organization acquire values that go beyond the technical requirements of organizational task. No organization is completely free of such a process. Community policing is one such example.

Institutionalization necessarily takes time. It means that organizations are growing increasingly complex by adding informal norms and practices. These informal norms and role expectations are impersonal in the sense that they exist independently of the concrete individuals who happen to be in the organization at different points in time (Peters and Pierre 2007: 80). Thus, the present theory holds that organizations like community policing organizations become real institutions as they come to symbolize the community’s aspirations, its sense of identity.

J.G. March and J.P. Olsen (Peters and Pierre 2007: 94-95) who are political scientists and founding fathers of New Institutionalism argue that organizations that handle public affairs should be conceptualized as institutions rather than instruments. They believe that in order to understand how policy making really functions inside organizations, three fundamental dimensions should be considered: the actual goals the
various units pursue, the way information, opportunities and support are built and elaborated, and the choice or decisions processes. New institutionalists provide a framework that predicts and explains how individuals and organizations try to reach some degree of understanding and some form of intelligence of the contexts they face and how they allocate their attention to a particular subject at a given time and how information is collected and exploited. A similar framework is considered in case of CP since New Institutional frameworks coordinate the views and mindsets of multiple partners, make them speak a common language and share a common perception about what to do, how, when and for whom. Further, new institutionalism perspective favours a vision of democratic order in which responsibility is a consequence of the institution of the individual, citizens are free, equal and discipline-oriented agents, and governance is enlightened and rule-constrained. This perspective applies to CP as well.

Organizational structure and culture are closely linked and mutually reinforcing. However, the chief of police and the leadership he or she demonstrates plays a critical role in changing both the culture and the organization. Critics argue that special units with a “few good officers” do not have the clout to change the larger organization, as the history of team policing so vividly illustrates. Secondly, a police organization that is heavily invested in the professional model of policing with a centralized, hierarchical, and bureaucratized command structure will have difficulty creating an environment that is conducive to community policing strategies. This is not to say that CP initiatives cannot survive in these conditions, but doing so may require the creation of an informal support structure within the organization or a completely isolated unit with its own set of
rules, regulations, and performance standards for some period of time. Despite numerous expectations several questions remain unanswered in this area, such as: How do different police departments, with a variety of pressures both internally and externally, cope with the efforts to institute structural, programmatic, and institutional changes?; How do organizational structure and cultural climate influence the overall planning and implementation of CP?; and what mechanisms are necessary or useful to promote the shift from a traditional operating mode to a community policing approach? Finally it can be rightly said that police chiefs and community policing officers on the cutting edge have their attention focused almost exclusively on the goals of policing rather than the means of policing. While this change of focus is laudable, perhaps there has been too little attention paid to the means of policing.

Seven broad conclusions follow from the theories presented above. These may be listed as below:

Firstly, the community policing initiative depends on several factors for its success namely the social factors like population, economic growth, industrialization, employment opportunities along with the normative behavior of the individuals residing in a community. Apart from this, modern management techniques and information and communication technology also provide a major momentum to CP initiatives.

Secondly, besides mutual understanding and mutual support between the police and the community members, democratic participation by different levels of social organizations such as neighborhood groups, communities, civic groups, business houses,
voluntary and non governmental organizations in decision making, investigations and other policing activities can be of great help in making CP a success.

Thirdly, there exists a direct relationship between minor disorderly behavior and rise in crime.

Fourthly, there also exists a direct link between distressed communities and crime.

Fifthly, certain other factors like police discretion in the use of coercive power, image building through public relations campaign and participatory decision-making influence CP in India and else where to a very great extent.

Sixthly, it can be maintained that communities cooperate with the police for the maintenance of peace and stability since they owe a sense of responsibility to the community to which they belong.

Finally, the depth of an organization’s commitment to bureaucracy appears to be inversely related to the speed at which it is able to implement community policing.

The present study, however, explores the possibility of developing a participatory theory of community policing which strives to create opportunities for all members of a society to make meaningful contributions to decision-making, and seeks to broaden the range of people who have access to such opportunities. The study uses a model of participatory theory, thus blending the received theories of community policing, since the participatory theory forms the very basis of community policing. Other theories influence only a part of CP and hold good only under certain existing social and economic situations, as has been discussed at the end of each of these theories.
Participatory approach to CP has the advantage of demonstrating that “no citizen is a master of another” and that, in society, “all of us are equally dependent on our fellow citizens”. Jean Jacques Rousseau suggested that participation in decision –making increases feeling among individual citizens that they belong in their community. This feeling of cooperation and consensus is the building block of community policing. The model also holds that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process. It implies that the public's contribution will influence the decision and may be regarded as a way of empowerment and as vital part of democratic governance (Hacker 1961: 327).

The Participatory Theory which gained popularity during the past few decades is mainly associated with the names of scholars like Jean Jacques Rousseau, Carole Pateman, C.B. Macpherson and N. Poulantaz. Participatory theorists try to assimilate and realize the ideals of direct democracy – responsive and active citizenry, participation and equality in the modern complex world of nation-states.

Carole Pateman points out that if individuals have an opportunity to directly participate in decision-making at the local level, they can achieve real control over the course of their everyday life. She is of the opinion that participation can help individuals learn about key issues in resource creation and control, thus, being better able to assess the performance of their political representatives, judge national questions and when need arises, participate in national decisions. She maintains that the local and national institutions shall be kept open and flexible for people to experiment with new political
forms and reform rigid structures imposed by different asymmetries of power (Ramaswamy 2004: 404).

On the other hand, C.B. Macpherson argues that a truly democratic society promotes powers of social cooperation and creativity rather than maximize aggregate satisfactions. He argues for transformation based upon a system combining competitive parties and institutions of direct democracy (Ramaswamy 2004: 405).

The participatory theory can be said to be based on the following principles, the ideas of which can also be found in the context of community policing. These principles are:

1. Democratization of parliaments, bureaucracies and political parties to make them more open and accountable. CP also rests on the belief that solutions to contemporary community problems demand freeing both people and the police to explore ways to address neighborhood concerns.

2. Decentralization of powers to ensure participation of people in the formulation of policies from bottom to top. CP also emphasizes on a decentralized personalized police service with the inclusion of private citizens.

3. Accountability of political leaders and administrators to the people whom they represent. CP also ensures greater police accountability to the public.

4. Direct participation of citizens in the regulation of the key institutions of society. The concept of CP also considers crime control and public order management as truly participative functions, with the total involvement of the community.
5. Maintenance of an open institutional system to ensure the possibility of experimentation with political forms. The new policing philosophy has also been preceded by lot of experimentation and innovation in order to provide a more scientific basis to the concept.

Participatory theory possesses several merits. In the first place, it focuses on the individual in the context of the overall society and cooperation with others. Secondly, it makes a bid to find out the means for achieving the ideal of self-rule. Thirdly, it makes suitable suggestions for remedying the ills of the existing societies. Finally, it helps to find out the limitations of the existing system and suggests changes to improve the socio-economic conditions of the people. On the whole it can be rightly said that the principles underlying participatory theory can facilitate an evaluation of the concept of community policing.