



Bingöl Üniversitesi  
İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi  
Bingol University  
Journal of Economics and Administrative Sciences

Cilt/Volume: 8, Sayı/Issue: 2  
Yıl/Year: 2024, s. 21-34  
DOI: 10.33399/biibfad.1468119  
ISSN: 2651-3234/E-ISSN: 2651-3307  
Bingöl/Türkiye



**Makale Bilgisi /Article Info**  
Geliş/Received: 14/04/2024 Kabul/ Accepted: 28/06/2024  
Makale Türü: Derleme Makalesi

## Community Policing: The Successful Implementation of Organizational Change\*

### Toplum Destekli Polislik: Örgütsel Değişimin Başarıyla Uygulanması

Serdar Kenan GÜL\*\*

#### Abstract

The goal of community policing is to improve interaction and collaboration between local law enforcement agencies and the people and neighborhoods they serve. Its primary objectives are to reduce and prevent crime and increase residents' sense of security. Community policing starts at the top of management and flows down to the very lowest level of the police department. Thus, police managers play an important role in the change process. The goal of this study is to analyze the successful implementation of organizational change in police agencies. This article first lays out the definition of community policing, its key components, its advantages, and its differences from traditional policing. Then it discusses the process of change, the sources, and strategies of resistance to change. In the conclusion section, this study makes recommendations for a successful implementation of the organizational change process.

**Keywords:** Community policing, organizational change, police management, resistance to change

**JEL Codes:** Z18; G38; O38

#### Öz

Toplum destekli polisliğin amacı, yerel kolluk kuvvetleri ile hizmet verdikleri kişiler ve mahalleler arasındaki etkileşimi ve işbirliğini geliştirmektir. Başlıca hedefleri suç azaltmak, önlemek ve bölge sakinlerinin güvenlik duygusunu arttırmaktır. Toplum destekli polislik yönetimin en tepesinden başlar ve polis teşkilatının en alt kademesine kadar iner. Bu nedenle polis yöneticileri değişim sürecinde önemli bir rol oynamaktadır. Bu çalışmanın amacı, polis teşkilatlarında örgütsel değişimin başarılı bir şekilde uygulanmasını analiz etmektir. Bu makale ilk olarak toplum destekli polisliğin tanımını, temel bileşenlerini, avantajlarını ve geleneksel polislikten farklarını ortaya koymaktadır. Daha sonra değişim süreci, değişime direnişin kaynakları ve stratejileri tartışılmaktadır. Sonuç bölümünde ise bu çalışma, örgütsel değişim sürecinin başarılı bir şekilde uygulanması için önerilerde bulunmaktadır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Toplum destekli polislik, örgütsel değişim, polis yönetimi, değişime direnç

**JEL Kodları:** Z18; G38; O38

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Over the past 40 years, police agencies have changed significantly; some philosophical and others operational. From a philosophical point of view, many agencies have adopted ideas such as community policing, problem-focused policing, neighborhood-oriented policing, or

\* This paper was presented and published at the proceedings of the International Conference on Empirical Economics and Social Sciences (ICEESS'23)- June 23-24th, 2023 / Bandırma - Türkiye.

\*\* Doç. Dr., Kastamonu Üniversitesi, İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi, Siyaset Bilimi ve Kamu Yönetimi Bölümü, skgul@kastamonu.edu.tr, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4771-9202>.

with other similar names. We can name all of these challenges or efforts as “community policing” to refer all of these contemporary approaches. On the operational side, police agencies have implemented a variety of different patrol strategies, such as community networking programs and crime prevention programs. The durability of community policing depends on how well it is integrated ideologically and operationally with customary law enforcement activities.

Central to this shift toward community policing is the development of innovative patrol strategies by many police departments that simultaneously respond to citizen concerns and make better use of department resources. What this new form of policing has in common is that a significant emphasis is placed on the notion that it is crucial for police organizational structures to transition from a paramilitary and hierarchical paradigm to a more decentralized and participatory framework, which involves staff empowerment. It is clear that community policing requires other significant changes as well. Oliver (1998) explains that in order to successfully implement community policing, structural changes need to be made, both organizationally and managerially.

Police managers play a crucial role in the change process. The goal of this paper is to discuss how organizational changes in police authorities can be successfully implemented. This study begins by defining community policing, its key components and benefits, and how it differs from traditional policing. Then the process of change, the sources and strategies of resistance to change are discussed. In the concluding part, the study gives recommendations for a successful change process.

## 2. COMMUNITY POLICING

The issue of defining community policing has proven to be a challenging one. Skogan and Hartnett (1997) contend that, from a definitional standpoint, it is not a concept that can be easily delineated. This is because it involves changing the organizational culture into a more decentralized, problem-oriented, and human-oriented service style (Skogan and Hartnett, 1997).

There are some issues that are commonly misinterpreted about community policing. Community policing is not about providing the police with the cutting edge technology or reducing response times, catching criminals through intensive criminal investigation techniques or even other crime mapping strategies. These are all necessary advancements in policing. Who knows, one day the police will be able to observe all criminals closely from the space. Even if those days come in the near future, we cannot mention modern and democratic policing. The ultimate goal of modern, effective, democratic, or in this case “community policing” is making the police more accountable to their consumers. The real spirit is; establishing bridges between police and the public, in which two-way communication is possible at all times. The goal of community policing is to improve interaction and collaboration between local police and the people and neighborhoods they serve. Its goals are to reduce and prevent crime and increase residents' sense of security.

Community Policing suggests that the police department is responsible for improving the life quality of citizens with a broader problem-solving approach than traditional policing and does not take the detection and arrest rates as measures of efficiency but the lack of disorder and crime. In community policing the highest priority is the problems and concerns of the community and the criterion for effectiveness is public cooperation (Trojanowicz and Bucquireoux, 1996).

In accordance with the changes in philosophy, goals, and strategies in community policing, scholars have speculated that the responsibilities of first-line patrol supervisors have also changed. Supervisors are advised to assume the role of coaches and mentors for subordinate officers. The tenets of community-oriented policing necessitate that patrol officers are afforded increased discretion and are incentivized to develop inventive problem-solving methodologies. At this juncture, the function of supervisors transforms into that of a coaches and mentors, facilitating the shift in objectives through team building and enhancing morale (Engel, 2002).

One crucial aspect that should not be neglected is that community policing is not only the line officers' duty. Community policing starts from the top of the management and flows down to the very lowest level of the police department. Thus it is imperative that police managers believe in community policing and are willing to implement it. Managerial decisions must be made while taking into account the community policing philosophy of the department. Therefore, it is imperative that community policing is implemented as a comprehensive and inclusive strategy, encompassing all members of the police department.

### 3. KEY ELEMENTS OF COMMUNITY POLICING

Skogan and Hartnett (1997) discuss four main components of an ideal community policing model. The first principle is *organizational decentralization*, which not only allows officers more autonomy in dealing with the problems and in investigating situations in the community, but also allows flexibility in decision-making. Community policing involves the deliberate structuring of an organization and its resources to effectively cater to the needs of the public. This approach ensures that the police are receptive to the demands of citizens, particularly in identifying and prioritizing local issues (Skogan and Hartnett, 1997). This is only possible if the decision-making process is local and the number of bureaucratic layers is reduced.

This practice is completely opposite to the traditional way of policing. In traditional policing, the organization is highly centralized; the policies and practices are decided at the top and flowed down in the form of orders. When police organizations are larger and centralized, the structure becomes more paramilitary and the decisions are made far from where the problems are. In those police organizations where the resources are distributed based on central politics, authoritarian policing arises and tension between police and society gets high. Since the police is not certain about the danger, aggressiveness and abuse of authority become part of the culture (Pauline et al., 2004). In such police organizations the culture of "us" against "them" becomes more visible instead of "we are for them".

The second key element of community policing is a *problem-oriented approach*. Dejong et al. (2001) defines problem-oriented policing as a proactive scientific approach that aims to address the underlying causes of crime with data collection, interagency cooperation, and long-term approaches rather than short-term reactive ones. The police organization can keep track of their society's problems and has the ability to solve them when they are small. It enables establishing honest relationships between police and the public. Other institutions are encouraged to fulfill their own tasks, so social life functions smoothly at the local level.

However, in traditional policing, the police only respond to calls for help from the public and are largely reactive. According to this model, the police are crime fighters and avoid any social activity to solve crime. With a crime-fighting orientation, traditional policing does not care much about the causes of problems and long-term strategies, whereas community policing does with the problem-solving orientation.

---

The third component is *being responsive to the public*, after setting priorities and building strategies. Officers need to listen to the community's needs closely in order to help meet those desires. The idea is to make the police more accountable to their consumers. In contrast to contemporary policing, traditional policing operates under the premise of executing only the essential measures to establish order within a limited timeframe. Such an approach prioritizes expediency and concision in response, rather than thoroughness and long-term efficacy.

The final principle is that *community policing helps the community to solve their own problems* through organizations in the community and initiatives to reduce crime. The basic idea is that police cannot solve crime without getting the community's support and help. However, establishing such a system of policing requires long-term institutional commitment. This is only possible with efficient, pro-service-oriented style leadership. Building such a leadership style that pushes authority and responsibility downward and gives priority to street-level service is a challenging issue. First of all, offering guidance and foresight constitutes a crucial component of any strategy aimed at effecting organizational change (Skogan and Hartnett, 1997), where top police administrators must communicate this philosophy to officers effectively. Without appropriate leadership, community policing strategies are more likely to fail, regardless of the magnitude of the previous investments.

On the other hand, the traditional way views the police as officers who operate autonomously from other governmental organizations and depends upon a limited spectrum of conventional law enforcement measures. It should be kept in mind that just taking policing precautions can never be enough for order maintenance alone without the active involvement of the public in this process.

For rules-driven comprehensive orders, traditional criteria for reward and promotion are founded on quantitative results such as the number of subpoenas that have been issued, the number of arrests made, and the number of cases that have been resolved. The client orientation that is required for community policing entails the acknowledgment of personnel for their quality work and a lesser emphasis on the rewarding of quantity. As stated by an official, "It is now no longer a question of how many apples one collects, but how one collects them" (Clark, 1994). Thus, it is imperative that general policies are revised to include proven participation in community policing initiatives as one of the prerequisites for awards and medals of merit, as well as for the consideration of promotion. Community policing is a paradigm shift in which the emphasis is placed on the effectiveness of law enforcement rather than the mere production of numerical outputs.

The theory of "broken windows", first introduced by George L. Kelling and James Q. Wilson in 1982, posits that urban decay creates an atmosphere that promotes criminal activity. In an experiment conducted to test the theory, two vehicles were abandoned, one in a disadvantaged neighborhood and the other in an affluent area. Within a week, the car left in the disadvantaged neighborhood was stripped, while the one in the affluent neighborhood remained untouched. After intentionally breaking a window on the affluent car, it too was stripped. The findings of this experiment indicate that deteriorated neighborhoods attract criminal behavior and instill fear. These observations became the foundation for the implementation of the community-oriented policing philosophy (Thibault et al., 2004: 174).

According to Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1998: 8-10), the implementation of a community policing program requires ten essential principles:

1. *Change*: The modification of organizational and individual behavior has the potential to optimize the delivery of police services.

2. *Leadership*: Leadership should consistently reinforce the vision, values, and mission of community policing at all levels of an organization.

3. *Vision*: The establishment of a vision is imperative for the enhancement of public safety and the improvement of the quality of life.

4. *Partnership*: The development of principles that ensure equal partnerships among all community groups is essential.

5. *Problem-Solving*: A comprehensive problem-solving process that involves the recognition, pinpointing, and development of solutions is necessary.

6. *Equity*: The principle of equity dictates that the provision of police service to citizens should be done in a manner that is valuable and respectful, regardless of differences such as age, race, gender, ethnicity, religious belief, or sexual preference.

7. *Trust*: The principle of trust necessitates that the police force should exhibit a high level of integrity and be consistent in carrying out their promises.

8. *Empowerment*: The principle of empowerment entails conferring greater authority to frontline personnel and the community to effectively discharge their respective roles.

9. *Service*: The principle of service is rooted in a commitment to deliver personalized services tailored to the unique needs of the community.

10. *Accountability*: The principle of accountability is reciprocal, requiring both the police force and the community to hold each other responsible for their actions.

According to Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1998:7-8), the achievement of community policing's mission requires the collaboration of six distinct groups: First, the Police Department, including both sworn and civilian personnel. Second, the Community, comprising individuals from both formal and informal backgrounds. Thirdly, Elected Officials, who are representatives of the local, county, state, and federal levels. Fourthly, the Business Community, which includes both local and major corporations. Fifthly, Other Agencies, which include social services, public health departments, and non-profit organizations. Lastly, the Media, which encompasses both electronic and print media.

In summary, the fundamental principle of the community policing philosophy posits that effective evaluation of crime prevention tactics by police departments is contingent upon collaboration with the public. In comparison to the responsive, restrictive, and event-based attributes of conventional law enforcement, community-oriented policing prioritizes transparent, adaptive, anticipatory, and issue-centered policing (Swanson et al., 1998).

After defining and describing the key features of community policing, the following section examines the sources of resistance to change and strategies to overcome resistance to change for successful implementation.

#### **4. SOURCES OF RESISTANCE TO CHANGE**

It is vital to take into account the fact that there exist individual as well as organizational origins of opposition towards change. Nevertheless, this does not imply that the process of change is entirely unaffected by external stimuli. Moreover, as posited by Stojkovic et al. (2000), hindrances to change from external sources are extensive and pose a challenge to their identification.

---

*Individual Sources:*

1. A misunderstanding of the purpose, mechanics, or consequences of change can hamper an individual's ability to adapt to new circumstances.
2. Failure to recognize the necessity of change can result in a reluctance to embrace new ways of doing things.
3. An individual's fear of the unknown can inhibit their willingness to take risks and explore new opportunities.
4. The fear of losing one's status, security, power, or other valued attributes may lead to resistance to change.
5. A lack of identification or involvement with change can impede an individual's ability to fully engage with new ideas and approaches.
6. Habitual patterns of behavior can be deeply ingrained and difficult to overcome, which can hinder an individual's ability to adapt to change.
7. A vested interest in maintaining the status quo can create an aversion to change, despite its benefits.
8. Group norms and role prescriptions can exert a powerful influence on individuals, leading them to resist change and cling to established ways of doing things.
9. The prospect of disrupting existing social relationships can be a significant barrier to change, especially if one's sense of identity and belonging is closely tied to those relationships.
10. When personal objectives conflict with those of the organization, individuals may resist change, especially if they perceive that their own interests are being threatened.

*Organizational Sources:*

1. The reward system has been identified as a potential organizational source of resistance to change.
2. Interdepartmental rivalry or conflict can lead to an unwillingness to cooperate, which can impede the change process.
3. Sunk costs in past decisions and actions can create resistance to change, as individuals may feel that their past efforts will have been wasted.
4. Fear that change will upset the current balance of power between groups and departments can be a significant source of resistance to change.
5. The prevailing organizational climate can also impact the willingness of individuals to embrace change.
6. An ineffective approach to introducing change can contribute to resistance, as individuals may not understand or agree with the proposed changes.
7. Past history of unsuccessful change attempts and their consequences can also contribute to resistance to change.
8. Structural rigidity is another potential source of resistance to change, as established structures and processes may need to be altered to accommodate new initiatives.

The emergence of individual sources of resistance to change may be attributed to a deficiency in acknowledging one's involvement in the process of change. A common reason

---

for resistance to change is the uncertainty it brings, as individuals may fear the unknown. There is no assurance that a novel proposition will be equally gratifying as its predecessor, notwithstanding the fact that the latter may have been flawed (White, 2000). Police officers have long been in the habit of doing their jobs by the book. Detailed manuals have been developed to provide actions for each possible event. It is their belief that they are not being held accountable for their actions, resulting in limited opportunities for creativity and the development of problem-solving abilities. As a result, much of their day is spent attempting to avoid errors (Oliver, 2000: 177).

In traditional police organizations, the hierarchical structure is one of the most visible characteristics, where officers feel themselves responsible to their superiors, superiors to the chiefs, and the chiefs to the politicians. This classical autocratic, military hierarchical model of organizational management and leadership poses a top-down approach to decision-making, problem-solving, and the flow of communications. The decisions are made far from where the problems actually take place. Consequently, day-to-day politics become the main agenda of the police, unless a serious incident occurs. Public concerns only gain management's attention temporarily. Individuals with political or monetary power are less likely to encounter issues with the police. Ultimately, the police become the catchers of the small fishes. Organizational change is difficult because even small changes require consistent and long-term policies. Nonetheless, going by the status quo is almost always the safest option. Therefore, resistance to change becomes one of the most prominent tenets of the organization.

Organizational change essentially requires a change in organizational routines. However, due to the abolition of traditional routines, the organization and its members will find themselves in precarious situations, which can lead to resistance to change (Stojkovic et al., 2000). The scope of the traditional practices that have been eliminated is extensive, encompassing a wide range of consequences, including the erosion of hierarchical power structures and the impact on particular subsets of members. Swanson et al. (1998) posits that individuals occupying lower echelons within their organizations may possess firsthand experiences that have caused them to conflate change with unfavorable outcomes.

Police agencies of significant size are typically structured in a bureaucratic manner and are frequently perceived as paramilitary entities. They possess a well-defined chain of command and a hierarchy of authority that is supported by formal rules and regulations. The inflexible formality of these agencies necessitates and engenders a series of routines that are arduous to eradicate or modify. Consequently, these agencies are resistant to change, and law enforcement officials are prohibited from participating in any proposed alterations.

Certain members of law enforcement perceive the world as dichotomous, separating individuals into "us and them," and consider community relations to be a form of appeasement that undermines police authority. Officers who engage in community policing by patrolling on foot are often regarded by their peers as "social workers" rather than bona fide law enforcement officials. Many conventional police officers and administrators perceive the role of community police officers as being in opposition to their customary duties. Furthermore, they assert that the implementation of community policing will lead to a diminution of authority, given that it requires working in tandem with individuals who have historically been perceived as objects of oppressive domination by law enforcement personnel.

The configuration of law enforcement entities accentuates principles such as effectiveness, dependability, and accuracy, as posited by Janssen et al. (1998). Organizational values wield considerable influence in molding the process of transformation. Apart from

organizational values, customary practices, composition, or leadership approach can determine an organization's success or failure (Stojkovic et al., 2000: 360).

According to Greene et al. (1992), the organizational culture within law enforcement agencies plays a crucial role in the change process. Watson (1966) posits that culture can act as a barrier to change. Skolnick and Bayley (1988) have acknowledged several cohesions in police culture, including an exaggerated sense of danger and the development of a defense mechanism in the form of suspicion. Additionally, police culture is characterized by fraternity or solidarity, which combines danger and mistrust. Harrison (1998) further emphasizes the existence of cultural features such as isolation and management versus street distrust among police officers, in line with the concept of solidarity. Furthermore, Harrison (1998) posits that the state of isolation within the police agency leads individuals to engage in deviant behavior. From an alternative perspective, Sparrow (1988) elucidates the notion of police isolation. He contends that prolonged and constantly changing shifts greatly diminish the prospects of having a conventional social life. Consequently, the predominant portion of a law enforcement official's societal interactions occurs within the confines of their immediate professional network. This could potentially lead to both seclusion and the need to manage any mistrust from the public, which in turn may impede efforts to enact meaningful reform.

Apart from the sources of opposition to change that exist at the individual and organizational levels, there are additional potential sources of resistance, including the attributes of the innovation itself, the public's perception of the innovation, and the impact of police unions and the media. Stojkovic et al. (2000) argue that resistance to change may arise as a result of particular characteristics of the innovation. They suggest that introducing fundamental change is likely to encounter greater resistance than efforts to create circumstantial change. Moreover, if the innovation entails significant financial, temporal, and personnel investments, it is probable that it will face heightened opposition from executives within the organization and other local or federal administrators. Innovations that come with a substantial price tag are frequently implemented with considerable reluctance. Finally, when the impetus for change originates externally, there may be persistent resistance within the police organization (Trajonawicz and Bucqueroux, 1990).

Public perception represents a significant source of resistance to change. Although the traditional functions of policing enjoy seemingly widespread support, particularly in regard to conventional evaluation criteria like visible motorized patrol and response time, an appreciable segment of society opposes the reform of law enforcement (Skolnick and Bayley, 1986). Moreover, the media occupies a critical role in the process of change, especially as it relates to law enforcement agencies. Police officers and other criminal justice officials view the media as a threat and rarely endeavor to cultivate its support (Stojkovic et al., 2000).

## **5. STRATEGIES TO OVERCOME RESISTANCE TO CHANGE**

The ultimate achievement of any organizational modification endeavor is contingent upon the organization's ability to effectively alter the behavioral patterns of its personnel (Roberg and Kuykendall, 1997). When implementing a change initiative within an organization, it is imperative to consider the individual impact of the change (Moran and Brightman, 2000). The fundamental assumption of strategies aimed at individual change is that members of an agency or groups within it must alter their attitudes, abilities, and behaviors (Stojkovic et al., 2000). The conventional techniques utilized in strategies for individual change encompass training, education, alteration of attitudes, and socialization, as stated by Porter et al. (1975).

---



*Participation* constitutes a fundamental aspect of organizational change. The expression of ideas by personnel to address job-related issues can significantly contribute to the successful functioning of an organization (Janssen et al., 1998). Resistance to change is likely to arise when individuals lack a clear understanding of its rationale (Hart, 1996). The effectiveness of change and the degree to which individuals embrace new organizational objectives cannot be determined without participation (Zajac and Bruhn, 1999). Therefore, leaders must encourage and facilitate the individuals' participation in the change process to achieve success.

The structure of police organizations plays a pivotal role in the process of change. The restructuring of the organization creates an environment where individuals can function in accordance with the requirements of the transformation. There are notable disparities between the administrative structure of conventional law enforcement and community-oriented policing. Consequently, to implement community policing, police agencies must first modify their structure and ideology. A written statement outlining the organization's overarching objective to establish the philosophy and principles of community policing is imperative for a police organization.

An organization's structure is grounded in its mission statement. According to Osborne and Gaebler (1992), a mission statement has the power to guide an entire organization from its highest level of hierarchy to its lowest. The effective establishment of community policing is reliant upon its incorporation as a constituent of the embracing institution's statement of purpose (Kratcoski and Dukes, 1995). Gleason (1998: 2) asserts that a restated mission statement, in conjunction with a published vision and a set of core values, will serve as the foundation for effecting the necessary behavioral changes to institutionalize community policing. An exemplary mission statement could be: "The mission of the ...Police is to maintain and improve community livability by working with all citizens to preserve life, maintain human rights, protect property, and promote individual responsibility and community commitment".

In order to effectively implement change within police organizations, it is imperative for police managers to acknowledge and recognize the diverse range of obstacles that may arise. These obstacles may stem from individual, structural, or external sources, and as such, it is necessary to meticulously evaluate the sources of resistance to the change process. Insufficient contemplation of these sources may hinder efficacious endeavors to execute community policing. Furthermore, it is imperative to engage other entities, such as community associations, businesses, and media, in the transformational process. Absent their active involvement, law enforcement agencies may encounter obstacles in effectually implementing community policing.

It is incumbent upon police management to discern and articulate values in a compelling and unequivocal manner (Kelling and Moore, 1988). In all fairness, it is possible that instances may arise where the inability to effect change can be attributed to the police managers themselves, who may encounter obstacles in navigating the challenges associated with implementing change (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1998: 8). It is imperative that police executives extend their support towards the implementation of community policing.

Skolnick and Bayley (1986) conducted a study that highlighted the value of leadership in achieving successful innovation. Their research identified four pivotal factors that police organizations must take into account when striving to implement community-oriented policing.

Initially, it is imperative that the police chief demonstrates an unwavering dedication to the principles of a police organization that prioritizes crime prevention.

Subsequently, the chief must actively promote the values and initiatives of community policing by inspiring and persuading members of the organization to adopt these principles.

Furthermore, it is crucial to take deliberate measures to preserve the integrity of any newly implemented program.

Finally, innovation is unlikely to occur without the backing of the community. As such, leaders must devise tactics to garner public support for their endeavors to introduce the new program and guarantee its triumph.

According to Lipitt (1997), internal communication has the potential to not only enhance comprehension of the dedication to a novel strategy but also diminish opposition to it. Consequently, in the course of the progression towards community policing, law enforcement agencies must communicate with utmost efficacy to impart a fresh perspective of community policing to each and every police officer within the organization.

Police managers must always remember that, regardless of their enthusiasm or inclination towards achieving immediate results, change is a gradual process. The key term in the process of change is patience. Moreover, various other impediments may hinder this process. Above all, police administrators ought to recognize the predicaments of their organization and consider each alternative solution. Administrators should adopt a perspective detached from the organizational climate to enable them to view problems from a distinct and advantageous standpoint. Although police agency administrators are often aware of these concerns, there may be other issues to consider. The adoption of community policing mandates sufficient funding to finance the additional endeavors that are requisite for the transformation process. As a result, police administrators are compelled to establish effective partnerships with pertinent government entities.

The importance of administrators during the transformation cannot be overstated. Law enforcement agencies ought to endeavor to devise tactics aimed at enhancing the efficiency of their approach to problem-solving. It is advisable to incentivize police officers to adopt proactive approaches to solving crimes. Rather than simply addressing isolated cases, it is recommended that officers be encouraged to employ analytical techniques and develop solutions that address the root causes of the problems.

Mid-level managers, sergeants, lieutenants, and captains constitute a crucial personnel cohort responsible for executing the process of change within law enforcement agencies. Consequently, administrators should give priority to the development of personnel based on their leadership abilities and analytical expertise in the realm of policing (Gül, 2011).

The leaders of law enforcement organizations must demonstrate adherence and steadfast dedication to the principles that form the foundation of a police organization with a focus on crime prevention. Furthermore, they must promote specific values and initiatives by inspiring and even exerting influence on personnel within the organization to adopt such values. Moreover, once a novel program is implemented, deliberate steps must be taken to safeguard the program's reliability. Community support is essential for fostering innovation. It is imperative for leaders to devise strategies to garner public support for the implementation of a new program and ensure its success. Additionally, administrative leaders within police agencies must formulate contingency plans in the event that the outcome deviates from the anticipated result. To achieve success, it is essential to produce substitute resolutions to a given

---

problem, which can be derived from the ongoing assessment of the change process. Recognizing the presence of an issue is the primary phase towards resolving it and progressing to the ensuing phase.

## 6. CONCLUSION

The implementation of community policing is a global phenomenon that is experiencing a perpetual expansion. The community as a whole is like a living organism. If there is a problem in any part of it, it spreads and affects society entirely. Without being aware of these facts, no problem can be solved, and no further development for the good of the community can be done. Hence, it is evident that the community policing strategy holds greater benefits compared to the conventional policing method, as it provides a proactive approach towards policing as opposed to a reactive one.

The criminal justice system is dynamic, not static. The capacity of an agency to effectively handle change is demonstrated through proficient management and dedicated leadership. Police executives must possess an awareness that, in contrast to the conventional policing paradigm, community policing is a fluid concept. The implementation of community policing procedures is a progression, rather than a one-time occurrence.

The implementation of change within a police agency is contingent upon the vigilance of the agency administrator in recognizing the necessity for innovation, their willingness to relinquish conventional management techniques, and their aptitude for cultivating an environment that encourages open communication and constructive feedback from subordinates. Of course, changing an entire organization is not an easy task. It requires that everyone in the organization from most top-to-the-line officers in the streets believe in the change and be willing to change.

It is imperative to acknowledge that for some police organizations, the objective of implementing community policing is not to reduce criminal activity; rather, it appears that community policing is implemented with the intention of securing financial backing from federal or international sources. As a result, community policing becomes subject to politicization. In such cases, we cannot expect success. Commitment and sincerity are key elements for the successful implementation of community policing.

Police managers cannot make changes by decree/memos/orders. The people who will ultimately be affected by change must be part of the planning and change process. Otherwise, officers absolutely have no ownership over the new policies or applications. People who are expected to follow the policies and procedures should be familiar with them, understand them, and believe that they are relevant to the work. Therefore, it is imperative that the personnel are engaged at every stage of the transformation process.

In community policing, training should be sufficient to win the minds and hearts of officers. The key component of training must be learning how to identify problems and solve them depending on the unique circumstances of a community. Thus, instilling innovative training, as opposed to following procedures, is the most radical departure of community policing.

It is imperative for law enforcement officials to acknowledge that the transition to community policing necessitates a cultural shift. It is essential for the police to comprehend that altering cultural norms is a challenging yet feasible undertaking. In essence, the replacement of an antiquated culture with a new one requires a considerable time and effort. Furthermore, it is imperative for law enforcement officials to acknowledge that cultural

transformation necessitates deliberate management, given that it can be a protracted undertaking that can be expedited through suitable instruction. To be efficacious, training should be tailored specifically towards community policing and cultural change. Trainees should be instructed on the philosophy of community policing, with a particular emphasis on the police values and behaviors that are conducive to supporting such a transformation. Insufficient training may result in police officers lacking the necessary knowledge and skills.

Therefore, it is crucial that police administrators, particularly those overseeing police stations, as well as newly recruited officers, receive training on community policing in addition to the general training provided to all officers. As the leaders of the serving units, it is imperative that they possess a thorough comprehension of the concept of community policing and its underlying principles to guarantee the efficacious execution of community policing. The prioritization of providing training to newly recruited personnel is of paramount significance, given their lack of exposure to the established police culture. It is highly likely that they will readily embrace service-oriented police values. Police organizations have the opportunity to utilize these highly trained recruits as agents of change, capable of disseminating the newly established service-oriented values within the police work environment. This can result in a significant cultural transformation throughout the entirety of the organization.

Effective implementation of community policing necessitates constant oversight. Effective communication between patrol officers and their superiors is imperative for the success of a community policing program. It is the responsibility of supervisors to act as mentors, motivators, and facilitators in this regard.

Participatory management and decentralization within the organization can be important dynamics in achieving community policing objectives. Participatory management is perceived as a means to enhance the contentment of police officers with their work, supervision, organization, and career advancement prospects. As a result, it may have a significant impact on delivering superior policing services to the community. Furthermore, decentralization of power and decision-making in the department grants autonomy to line officers and thus provides them with greater discretion to anticipate and solve problems on their beats. Finally, reducing the number of layers of command in the pyramid of the organizational hierarchy, as proposed by Maguire (1997), expedites the decision-making process and improves the flow of communication between superiors and subordinates.

It is crucial that law enforcement entities take into account the notion of transformation and its resultant effects. This undertaking necessitates a significant amount of time and forbearance. Consequently, even though it may be too early to declare whether community policing has been successful, it is incumbent upon scholars and researchers to conduct scientific evaluations of the initiatives and approaches to gain a comprehensive understanding of the multifaceted nature of community policing. In conclusion, the collaboration of police agencies can yield a significant impact on the communities they serve.

## References

- Clark, J. R. (1994). Does community policing add up? *Law Enforcement News*, 20(399), 1-8.
- Dejong, C., Mastrofski, S. D., & Parks, R. B. (2001). Patrol officers and problem solving: An application of expectancy theory. *Justice Quarterly*, 18, 31-61.
- Engel, R. S. (2002). Patrol officer supervision in the community policing era. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30, 51-64.

- Gleason, T. (1998). I'm too tired for community policing. *Community Policing Exchange*, 5(19), 1-2.
- Greene, J. R., Alpert, G. P., & Styles, P. (1992.) "Values and culture in two American police departments: Lessons from King Arthur". *Contemporary Criminal Justice*, 8(3), 183-207.
- Gül, S. K. (2011). Toplum Destekli Polislikte Polis Yöneticilerinin Rolü (The Role of Police Managers in Community Oriented Policing), in (Ed. Alper Sözer), *Toplum Destekli Polislik, Toplum ve Güvenlik (Community Oriented Policing: Community, Crime and Security)*, Ankara: Adalet Publishing.
- Harrison, S. J. (1998). Police organizational culture: using ingrained values to build positive organizational improvement. Available: <http://www.pamij.com/harrison.html>.
- Hart, J. M. (1996). The management of change in police organizations. National Institute of Justice. Available: <http://www.ncjrs.org/unojust/index.html>.
- Janssen, O., de Vries, T., & Cozijnsen, A. J. (1998). Voicing by adapting and innovating employees: An empirical study on how personality and environment interact to affect voice behavior. *Human Relations*, 51(7), 945-967.
- Kelling, G. L., & Moore M. H. (1988). From political to reform to community: The evolving strategy of police. in J. R. Greene & S. D. Mastrofski (Eds.), *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality?* (3-26). New York: Praeger.
- Kratcoski, P. C., & Dukes, D. (1995). *Issues in community policing*, Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Lipitt, M. (1997). Say what you mean, mean what you say. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 19(4), 18-20.
- Maguire, E. R. (1997). Structural change in large municipal police organizations during the community policing era. *Justice Quarterly*, 14(3), 547-576.
- Moran, J. W., & Brightman, B. K. (2000). Leading organizational change. *Journal of Workplace Learning: Employee Counseling Today*, 12(20), 66-74.
- Oliver W. (2000). *Community Policing: Classical Readings*, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Oliver, W. M. (1998). *Community oriented policing: A systematic approach to policing*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Osborne, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Porter, L.W., Lawrel, E.L., & Hackman, J. R. (1975). *Behavior in organizations*, New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Roberg, R. R., & Kuykendall, J. (1997). *Police management*. (2nd ed.). Los Angeles: Roxbury.
- Skogan, W. G., & Hartnett, S. M. (1997). *Community Policing*. Chicago Style, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Skolnick, J. H., & Bayley, D. H. (1986). *The new blue line: police innovation in six American cities*. New York: The Free Press, A Division of Macmillan, Inc.
- Skolnick, J. H., & Bayley, D. H. (1988). *Community policing: Issues and practices around the world*, Washington, D.C. National Institute of Justice.
-

- Sparrow, M. K. (1988). Implementing community policing. in Oliver, W. M. (Ed). *Community policing: Classical readings*, (172-183), Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Stojkovic, S., Kalinich, D., & Klofas, J. (2000). *Criminal Justice Organizations: Administration and Management*. CA: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Swanson, C. R., Territo, L., & Taylor, R. W. (1998). *Police administration: Structure, processes, and behavior*. (4 th ed.). Prentice-Hall, Inc., New Jersey: Upper Saddle River.
- Thibault, E., Lynch L., & McBride, R. (2004). *Proactive Police Management*. NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Trojanowicz R., & Bucqueroux, B. (1998). *Community Policing: How to get started*. Second Edition, Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
- Trojanowicz, R. C., & Bucqueroux, B. (1996). The Ten Principles of Community Policing. in S. G. Brandl & D. E. Barlow (Eds.), *Classics in Policing*, Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Pub.Co.
- Trojanowicz, R., & Bucqueroux, B. (1990). *Community policing: A Contemporary perspective*. (2 nd ed.). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Watson, G. (1966). Resistance to change. in W. G. Bennis, K. D. Benne, & R. Chin (Eds.). *The planning of change*, (2nd ed.), (488-498), New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.
- White, L. (2000). Changing the “whole system” in the public sector. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 13(2), 162-177.
- Zajac, G., & Bruhn, J. G. (1999). The moral context of participation in planned organizational change and learning. *Administration & Society*, 30(6), 706-733.

---

**Ethics Statement:** The authors declare that ethical rules are followed in all preparation processes of this study. In case of detection of a contrary situation, BİİBFAD Journal does not have any responsibility and all responsibility belongs to the authors of the study Author **Contributions:** Serdar Kenan GÜL's contribution rate is 100%. **Conflict of Interest:** There is no conflict of interest between the author.

---