COMMUNITY POLICING

Ph.D. Gökhan KOCA
Aksaray
Tel: +90 505 366 58 69
E-mail: gkoca68@hotmail.com

Abstract

Community policing, a recent paradigm in policing, has been prevailed since the early 1980s. Community policing is a philosophical paradigm involving reality-based approach. In other words, community policing is not a program. Reducing crime rates is one of the primary problems for all governments. Community policing has become one of the most popular attempts for this effort. Many policies established during this effort. But getting tough policies on criminals or creating community policing generally a lack of realizing of why crime takes place and therefore short terms of possible effect by the proposed policies. Community policing has three core components. These are community partnership, organizational change and problem-solving. Police have to develop a positive relationship with the community in order to get a partnership. Police also aware of the specific concerns of the community for problem-solving). Community policing is the recent policing paradigm encompassing various changes supposed to occur in a number of substantive domains. The changes in each domain encompass highly complex processes. Because of its size, it is difficult to assess community policing. It has pros and cons. In keeping in mind the difficulties in assessing the community policing, the pros and cons of the community policing are presented in this study.

Keywords: Community Policing, Crime, Police, Community, Pros and Cons Community Policing, Public Safety

Introduction

Community policing, a recent paradigm in policing, has been prevailed since the early 1980s. It has been an alternative way of policing to the traditional policing, which had accepted as to be failed. Traditional policing was based on the reform model of "professional" policing that focused on the efficiency of rapid response as the primary means of addressing serious crimes

(Community Criminal, 2003). Community policing, on the other hand, recognizes the contribution of prevention and intervention as well as recognizing the importance of the immediate response to a crisis.

According to the paradigm of community policing, police should become partners with the community to make neighborhoods of the community safer. In this sense, community policing requires using a wide range of police tactics including diversion programs, neighborhood watch programs, developing social, educational and athletic activities and so forth, as well as arrest one of the primary tools of traditional policing.

Community policing is a philosophical paradigm involving reality-based approach. In other words, community policing is not a program. A program ends with the implementation of one or several changes. A reality-based philosophy, on the other hand, involves a philosophical shift characterized by the choices people make to institute continuous improvement in various processes. There are trade-offs associated with those choices. In other words, there is no clearly superior alternative in each circumstance. The choices possess two realities: uncertainty and opportunity. The uncertainty associated with the choice is how to make change happen; and the opportunity associated with the choice is to open up innovations and to facilitate a move towards continuous learning organization (Boles and White, 2003).

Community policing requires various important organizational changes. These changes are supposed to occur in a number of substantive domains, including the culture, behavior, and structure of police organizations (Maguire, Shin, Zhao and Hassell, 2003). The changes in each of those domains encompass highly complex processes. Partially, they are those complexities in various domains to make assessing community policing difficult (Reisig, 2000). In keeping in

mind the difficulties in assessing the community policing, the pros and cons of the community policing are presented in this study.

Definition and Key Concepts of Community Policing

Reducing crime rates is one of the primary problems for all governments. Community policing has become one of the most popular attempts for this effort. Many policies established during this effort. But getting tough policies on criminals or creating community policing generally a lack of realizing of why crime takes place and therefore short terms of possible effects cannot be seen by the proposed policies. There are very little discussions about what is a crime and why crime takes place in society. Without understanding crime and reasons of crime, these policies cannot be successful. Reasons of commuting crime also must be fully understood for successful policies. Community policing can help us to understand reasons and try to be a part of the community to fight on crime (Friedmann, 1996).

Traditional policing also labeled as professional policing included generic, responsive strategies to fight or answer crime (Weisburd and Eck, 2004). These approaches largely underline resource management and finding criminals, etc. rather than long-term results such as police legitimacy and citizen satisfaction. Traditional policing rarely let the community to fight against crime (Gill, Weisburd, Telep, Vitter and Bennett, 2014). Accelerating crime and the effectiveness of criminal justice practice controlled criticism of traditional policing during the 70s (Martinson, 1974). The relevant literature on police during the 70s and 80s showed that there were a lot of problems about traditional policing (Bayley, 1998). Significant critiques are;

1- The growth of the number of police officers is not an effective approach to reduce crime or disorderly behavior. This calculable statement cannot resolve the essential qualitative transformation of how to do good policing (Greene, 1998);

2

2- The police cannot stop the crime alone with the help of the community. People who live in the community can be the eyes and the ears of the police (Rosenbaum, 1998).

3- Tactics of traditional policing are too responsive so they don't effect reasons that source crime and disorder;

4- Police policy is too extensive and is used different problems ("one size fits all) (Skogan, 1998).

In the early 1980s community policing became a popular especially in the USA, European countries and Australia, replacing such terms as police-community relations, team policing, and problem-oriented policing. There was not a definition available in the literature until 1992. There were two sets of ten principles on community policing until that time. These were written by John Alderson (1979) and Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990). Alderson's ten principles were related with policing under conditions of personal freedom, on the other hand, Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux's (1990) principles were more related to police forces (Friedmann, 1996).

"There is no simple or commonly shared definition of community policing, either in theory or in practice" (Eck and Rosenbaum, 1994). "Community policing is not a clear-cut concept, for it involves reforming decision-making processes and creating new cultures within police departments rather than being a specific tactical plan (...). He further states: "Under the rubric of COP, American departments are opening small neighborhood substations, conducting surveys to identify local problems, organizing meetings and crime prevention seminars, publishing newsletters, helping form neighborhood watch groups, establishing advisory panels to inform police commanders, organizing youth activities, conducting drug education projects and media campaigns, patrolling on horses and bicycles, and working with municipal agencies to enforce health and safety regulations" (Moore, 1994). Bennet (1990) also argues that; "It is generally

agreed that these organizational structures and operational strategies do not in themselves represent community policing as they could exist equally well within the context of a different policing philosophy or policing paradigm. However, when they are implemented within a community policing paradigm they become community policing structures and strategies".

It is a very wide 'umbrella' term, used in different settings and for different determinations, and with a wide range of applications. Nonetheless, it is important to jump somewhere and one effort to define 'community policing' (McLaughlin and Munice, 2001). According to their definition, community policing is; "A policing philosophy that promotes community-based problem-solving strategies to address the underlying causes of crime and disorder and the fear of crime. The stated intention of community policing is to enhance the quality of life of local communities."

According to Friedmann's (1992) definition; "Community policing is a policy and a strategy aimed at achieving more effective and efficient crime control, reduced the fear of crime, improved quality of life, improved police services and police legitimacy, through a proactive reliance on community resources that seeks to change crime causing conditions. This assumes a need for greater accountability of police, greater public share in decision making, and greater concern for civil rights and liberties." (Friedmann, 1996).

This proactive attitude as detained by community policing holds a far more comprehensive perspective where the emphasis is given to accomplishing more than just crime control; nontraditional issues such as fear of crime, quality of life, better-quality services, and police validity are also included. However, the departure point of this definition lies not in the greater comprehensiveness of its policing purposes but in its focus on reasons of crime as the likely

possible source for reducing crime and achieving the other objectives as well. Therefore, this definition shows that it is important to focus on the next three components:

1- Intra-departmental changes (internal communications, police supervision, discretion, police deployment, recruit, training, reward structure, performance evaluation),

2- Inter-agency cooperation (level of interaction between different agencies, needs, resources, cross-jurisdictional cooperation),

3- The community (mapping crime and reliance on communal institutions such as school, family, church etc.), its needs, and its resources (Friedmann, 1996).

According to COPS (2014) definition, community policing is " a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnership and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder and fear of crime."

The U.S. Department of Justice's Community Oriented Policing Services Office defines community policing as "a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies, which support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques, to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder and fear of crime." (COPS, 2014).

Community policing is a good example of democracy in action. It requires the active involvement of government, public and private agencies, inhabitants, schools, churches and hospitals. The implementations of community policing need some basic changes in structure and managements of police organizations. Police managers have to adopt these changes. Community policing has three core components. These are; community partnership, organizational change and problem-solving. Police have to develop a positive relationship with the community in order to get

a partnership. Police also aware of the specific concerns of the community for problem-solving. The main aim of community policing is reducing crime rates by examining the nature of problems carefully and taking necessity steps at the correct time (Bureau of Justice Assistant, 1994). Organizational change requires changes of climate and culture, leadership, labor relations and decision-making process, information systems (COPS, 2014).

Community policing is understood as an effective way to help public safety and to improve the quality of life in a community. Community policing plays an essential role in the two important elements of policing: police-community relations and problem-solving. "First, it should broaden police organization goals ...Second, it should alter the way police are organized to accomplish their goals." (Weisburd and Braga, 2007).

Community policing is based on the idea that, police are not restricted the traditional police powers (Weisburd and McElroy, 1988). This method involves traditional pyramid of police departments in order to decision making process with the help of police officers who directly contact with the community (Cordner, 1999). For that reason, community policing is not only to improve the relationship between community and police but also it helps the problem-solving methods (Trojanowicz, Kappeler, Gaines and Bucqueroux, 1998). Community members and police officers cooperate the problems in the community so community policing is different from problem-orienting policing (Clarke, 2002). The main idea of problem-oriented policing is, problem-solving which community may or may not be involved, on the other hand in community policing it is necessary to be involved the community in problem-solving activities (Gill et.al., 2014).

Most of the definitions have same key concepts. These concepts include;

1- "Two-way police–community engagement and partnership

2- Accountability

3- Trust-building

4- A community-based problem-solving approach

5- Service-oriented

6- Organizational decentralisation

7- Leadership" (Somerville, 2009).

According to Cordner (1999) community policing requires;

1- Partnerships and association,

2- Trust and acceptability,

3- Communication,

4- Skills and training,

5- Broadview,

6- Prevention.

Kelling and Moore (1988) asserts that "during the 1950s and 1960s, police thought they were law enforcement agencies primarily fighting against crime." In the "community policing era," the police function broadens and includes order maintenance, conflict resolution, provision of services through problem-solving, as well as other activities". In early times of community policing is to know that it answers to the question: What is the justification for the police if they cannot prevent crime? Whereas crime fighting has increasingly become the main problem in community policing over the last decade, an important role of community policing to police revolution was its acknowledgment that there were many serious community problems that the police could report that were not traditionally definite as crime complications. The classification

of new responsibilities can be understood as an answer to the disappointment of police to reach the crime-fighting areas of the professional model of policing (Spelman and Brown, 1984).

However, COPS office encourages agencies and offer funds to implement community policing, there has been an important decline about using community policing (Reaves, 2010). Stone and Travis (2011) tried to explain reasons that lie under that decline. According to them, some police departments felt hesitant of what to question of communities and felt the transformative effects of the program did not meet hopes. Trajanovicz et. al. (1998) state that, "community policing is not just a tactic that can be applied to solve a particular problem, one that can be abandoned once the goal is achieved". Furthermore, each police department has unique problems and mission for the community which they work for. For that reason, there are no exact conditions for implementing community policing (Morabito, 2010).

There are some studies about the effectiveness of community policing. Gill, Weisburd, Telep, Vitter and Bennett (2014) conducted a study about the effect of community policing on crime and disorder, fear of crime, legitimacy, and citizen satisfaction. According to their results; there is a small impact on violent crime, a nonsignificant impact on property crime, and a small effect on fear of crime. Hence, community policing was only weakly related to reducing crime, at least in the short term. And also, community policing was related with larger, significant positive aids for citizen satisfaction, perceived disorder, and police legitimacy.

Tyler (2004) studied about community policing. According to his results; there was a small effect on crime in the short-term, but there was a positive relationship between the long-term effect on crime and community policing with the help of increased levels of legitimacy and satisfaction. These improved citizen perceptions of police legitimacy may pay to increased agreement with the

law and reduced crime. But it is really difficult to reach any strong assumptions about the relationship between community policing and long-term crime reduction.

Mazerolle, Bennett, Davis, Sargeant, and Manning (2013) studied about police involvements considered to improve procedural justice and/or increase citizen perceptions of police legitimacy. To their findings, there was evidence that these involvements improved citizen satisfaction, cooperation, and levels of procedural justice.

Bennett, Holloway and Farrington (2009) studied about the effectiveness of neighborhood watch programs. According to their findings; there was a relationship between neighborhood watch and crime reduction. Bennett et al. (2009) found that the programs were related to a crime reduction of between 16 and 26 percent.

On the other hand, results of some researches seem to like to be insignificant and in some cases non-existent or immeasurable (Greene, 2000). Community policing had slight or no effect on police exercise (Weisburd and Braga, 2007); but age and years of service variables effect on police work (Mastrofski and Snipes, 1995). Because Community Policing has a tendency to increase the contact between the police and the community, with a minimal use of necessary actions, it is probable to progress the public satisfaction. But this point of view has only limited price because those who are required to stay in contact with the police (especially victims and offenders) seem to be exactly those who are mostly disappointed about the police work. This means that Community Policing programs have a great effect on the upgrading of the image than on the success of the police. This issue also can be seen in research (Brodeur, 1998).

"Neighbourhood Watch" programs are generally used in community policing but this program resulted in inadequate effects on crime. On the other hand, it helps the feelings of security

and the communication between the public and the police. As a result of that, the image of the police is strengthened and the job satisfaction of police officers is improved (Bennett, 1990).

Some researchers come to the assumption that community policing can have some result on the awareness of crime by the population and on the thankfulness of the quality of police service. Additionally, the moods of insecurity seem to reduction, because of the improved visibility of the police in public space and the increase of the communication between the population and the police central often to a better gratefulness of the police job. Community policing has the effect of reduction on fear of crime in the community (Greene, 1998). Bayley (1994) asserts that "We don't know if community policing works. Most of the time, a small effect can be detected, but sometimes also contradictory results. The best results can be observed in focused activities of problem-oriented policing. It is not proven that citizens can act against insecurity in an effective way. Initiatives as "neighborhood watch" don't have an effect on crime. Most of the time these initiatives work the best there where they are least needed and least where they are necessary. Nevertheless, most authors conclude that it is not the model that is failing, but in first instance the deficient implementation of it"

Aronowitz (1997) conduct a study about community policing. According to his results; citizens are more elaborate in the identification of problems in the community and the relation with the police progresses. Additionally, he asserts that the method also upsurges the level of self-help of the citizens. They take a more dynamic role in the care of security and the quality of life in their community. Another outcome has a relation with the care of legal order: not only are citizens more motivated to report to the police, but also the feelings of security progress.

Sherman, Gottfredson, MacKenzie, Eck, Reuter and Bushway (1997) conducted a systematic review, amongst others on community policing. They argued their hypotheses as;

10

" (1) Neighbourhood Watch programs are considered to be effective, while they encourage the level of surveillance by inhabitants of neighbourhoods, which leads to the consequence that they have a deterrence effect on criminals; (2) The stream of information stemming from the communities is stimulated towards the police concerning suspects, offenders and suspect circumstances, which leads to an increased probability to arrest offenders. This information exchange improves the problem-solving ability of the police; (3) The improvement of information from the police to the public empowers the population to protect oneself, certainly when it concerns recent trends in crime patterns and risks; (4) The credibility and legitimacy of the police is sustained and the population has more confidence in the police, which leads to more compliance to the law by the population". According to their findings; proof for the hypothesis that crime prevention is continued by the increase of information from the community to the police is not available. For the second and third hypotheses is no evidence existing neither. But there was enough evidence for the fourth hypothesis about the legitimacy.

Sunshine and Tyler (2003) studied about community policing and the assessment of police legitimacy According to their findings; personal interactions between police and community are vital – not the awareness of the public with respect to how well the police fight against crime.

Dammert and Malone (2006) assert in their study that community policing had a significant effect on reducing public fear of crime. They also assert that their results are very vital in these 'tough-on-crime-countries'.

To the results of a study by Reisig (2007) that; citizens who judge police performs as fair and respectful are more exposed for involvement in (property) crime prevention. This implies that it is not simply the valuation of success that effects willingness of the public to join, but only the way in which police performs are supposed. This assumption could be made notwithstanding the

11

level of property crime in the community. At this point of view, the use of community policing can be realized as a critical element in fighting against crime. Social survey data also presented that foot patrols - a part in community policing - encounters the public requests and supports "the symbolic function of policing as a sign of social order". Foot patrol effects citizen' satisfaction with police performs and reduce the crime rates (Wakefield, 2007).

These progresses have spread-out in especially the last twenty years. Whereas many privileges have been completed, the increasing development in research based on a deep and serious understanding of policing is uncertain in part because the research focus is distant too narrow. In order to better understanding, more research is needed (Reisig, 2000).

Pros of Community Policing

Traditional policing rests almost on the punitive model, with prevention limited to deterrence. In contrast, community policing emphasizes the prevention and intervention. In fact, the priority of community policing includes preventive response to the public order through a level of delegation of authority with community members, and line officers as a response to future crime (Kelling and Coles, 1996). To achieve this end, community policing provides the police an outreach to the community. As well as the preventive purposes, other purposes of this outreach are to promote cooperation and collaboration with the community to enhance public safety, to reduce the fear of crime, to improve the quality of life, to increase the police accountability and to increase public scrutiny of the police.

Community policing makes the community as a part of the solutions and identifying and prioritizing the problems by promoting cooperation and collaboration between police and the community. Furthermore, the impact of community mobilization efforts resulted by assembling a community-based problem-solving team comprised of police, judges, prosecutors and correction

12

officers as well as community residents, school, religious leaders and other community leaders, is so huge that it may produce multi-faced solutions to solve multi-faced problems of the community. Combining the people from different strata of the society to solve the problems create solutions in a broad range. In fact, the solutions are only limited by the resources and by the imagination of the people involved.

Community policing is a tool of democratic policing because it intrinsically involves informing the community about law enforcement activities as well as increasing public participation in the governmental decision making (Gordon, 2001). This fact has particular importance for the police agencies which usually have anti-democratic images composed of brutality, aggressive patrol, and so forth. According to Xiaming (2002), policing strategies depends strongly on mass participation provides an informal control which deters the people engaging in delinquency. In fact, he argues that the parallel development of formal and informal control mechanisms of social control is the best way to approach the crime. In this sense, community policing is one of the best ways of crime prevention and intervention by providing both formal and informal control mechanisms.

Although the community policing is expensive, it may reduce the expenses of incarcerated people by reducing crime and recidivism rates. In other words, community policing has potential in reducing the expenses of entire criminal justice system if it becomes successful.

Fighting Terrorism v. Community Policing

Community policing goes further than focusing merely on crime. According to Robert L. Werling, a project coordinator at the Texas Regional Community Policing Institute, community policing "addresses the fear of crime as well as non-criminal social disorder. As community fear and anger intensify and related issues emerge, community policing is well positioned to address

these issues" (Bankson, 2003). Community policing has used a two-pronged approach to enhance the quality of life: reduce negative influence in people lives, such as crime and disorder, and amplify the positive influences, such as citizen involvement to improve the community. Werling stated this two-pronged approach makes sense in addressing terrorism." The first step is to address threats of terrorism. The second step is to strengthen communities through citizen cooperation. Such alliance helps build trust and confidence. This "trust is invaluable in developing intelligence relating to terrorism" (Bankson, 2003). In fact, an ideal strategy in crime/terrorist fighting would require a community to trust police enough to call them whenever they see a suspicious act. The statement of Gordon England, Deputy Secretary of Department of Homeland Security, summarizes the nexus of terrorism fighting and community policing briefly: America will win in the struggle against terrorism "if the nation continues to promote community policing, partnerships and proactive leadership." (Intelligence Sharing, 2003).

European Commission (2011) also declared that; "Terrorist radicalisation and recruitment are not confined to one faith or political ideology. This is best demonstrated by the fact that Europe has experienced different types of terrorism in its history. It is important to underline that the vast majority of Europeans, irrespective of belief or political conviction, reject terrorist ideology. Even among the small number of people that do not reject such ideology, only a few turn to terrorism. Preventing terrorist radicalisation and recruitment will only work if we remain fully dedicated to respecting fundamental rights, promoting integration and cultural dialogue and fighting discrimination."

Because of the widespread and multifaceted nature of the problem, close cooperation between citizens and the police can be more effective for terrorism (White and McEvoy, 2012). At this point of view European Commission (2011) asserts that "Radicalisation that can lead to

acts of terrorism is best contained at a level closest to the most vulnerable individuals. It requires close cooperation with local authorities and civil society." White (2011) added that " Since motivations and reasons for engaging in radical violence are often initiated by local grievances, not global politics it follows that possible solutions will also be found at the grassroots, local, level within host communities."

Cons of Community Policing

Community policing has many problems/difficulties in both theory and implementation.

The first big part of problems/difficulties in the community policing arises from internal factors because community policing asks police officers to do a job different than one for which they were hired. In other words, community policing implies change, which is so massive that it implies a total rejection of some police officers' life-works. Besides, some police officers have philosophical disagreements with a problem-solving approach which assessing the performance based on community satisfaction. Some ranked officers are also disagreeing with the concept of community policing which gives more authority to the line officers and lessens the centralized authority of ranked officials. According to Lumb and Breazedele (2003), and Skolnick and Fyfe (1993) police subculture including stress, and top-down management hinder the implementation of community policing.

As well as the dissensions of police officers, there are further internal impediments about the community policing. Are the police symbols including military-like clothes and guns and other tools, appropriate in trying to access to the community? Is the current leadership and management style of police appropriate to implement community policing? How much time will the judges and police officers spend to talk to the community? How can such a disparate problem-solving group reach consensus? How do we ensure that the voice of community will be heard? Are the resources

enough to implement community policing? (Community Criminal, 2003; Bucquerox, 2003). Unfortunately, the responses to these questions reveal the problems of community policing implementations.

The second big part of problems/difficulties in the community policing arises from external factors. Community policing can be accomplished if all parts of the community are willing to cooperate and collaborate on the implementation of it. Will the legislators be willing to become part of the team? Will the affluent people living with private security guards support a system which promotes risk-taking in the poor and minority neighborhoods (Community Criminal, 2003)?

The third part of problems/difficulties may arise from the conceptual descriptions of community and community policing. Some scholars argue that some cities do not have a well-defined community in which to establish a partnership with the police. This is true particularly in the ghetto areas, poor neighborhoods, and inner cities characterized by transient populations with few or no institutional ties and little or no identity (Swanson, Territo and Taylor, 2001). Similarly, there is no well-defined concept of community policing. The confusion about what the exact meaning of "community policing" confuses its practitioners about exact description of their job (Swanson, et al., 2001).

Lack of credible evaluation to assess community policing is another problem of community policing as it is mentioned in the Introduction. Kelling argues that traditional measures such as response time and crime statistics are not appropriate to assess community policing (Swanson, et al., 2001). Thus, there is no objective and widely-accepted criteria to measure success and failure of community policing. Without having any criteria to evaluate the current results of community policing implementations, there will be no clue whether the implementers are in the true path or not.

Challenge of Community Policing to the Traditional Bureaucracy

Community policing promotes decentralization of authority by increasing discretion of line officers in decision-making and problem solving (Morabito, 2010). In this sense, community policing requires a tremendous change in classical Weberian bureaucratic structure encompassing principles of jurisdiction, hierarchy, specialization, written documents (files), and general rules.

Weber's definition of bureaucracy underlies the structural logic of the bureaucratic state in the twentieth century. His delineation of jurisdiction constitutes a kernel from which theorists for the past eighty years have "developed theoretically and normatively robust concepts of division of labor, functional differentiation, and, as a result, clear jurisdictional boundaries within a governmental entity" (Fountain, 2001). If the community policing changes the Weberian concept of jurisdiction, what form will jurisdiction take in the era of community policing?

Weber's second and third principles, hierarchy and specialization, forms the essence of bureaucracy. Simon (1962) argues that hierarchy enables the decomposability of complex problems. The ability to factor complex problems and then assign each factor to specialists to solve, and then to recombine partial solutions is the primary superiority of bureaucratic structure over other forms of structures. If the community policing changes the Weberian concept of expertise and hierarchy, what form of problem-solving mechanism it offers to solve over-sized complex problems such as a drug which has political, economic, social and cultural dimensions?

The fourth and fifth principles of Weberian bureaucracy, files and rules, constitute an important departure from personalized and subjective decision making that needs no documentation. "Files" enables the bureaucrat as neutral with respect to organizational goals and

direction, impersonal with respect to the application of law and regulations, and expert in the conduct of clearly defined tasks. Indeed, neutrality (or existence of rules) is a key feature of professionalism within every democratic entity of civil services. In the era of community policing, since the police officer has the discretion to make some decisions based on his subjective observations and information without requiring acting within the framework of standard rules, how can similar response for similar incidents be ensured?

The modern Western states reflect the ideas of both Weber and Frederick Taylor. Probably, Weber does not hold a central role in the Western democracy if not for the complementary between his ideas and Taylorism. Taylorism consists of efficiency gain in production process through strict control and command over the workforce and design of work. Taylorist police supervisors treat subordinates as machinelike, rational, Weberian elements (Garvey, 1995).

In sum, the traditional criminal justice system of the US has been constructed on Taylorism and Weberian bureaucracy, which provides efficiency gain and problem-solving mechanisms. The paradigm of community policing has many philosophical contradictions with the Weberian bureaucracy which has been placed in the essence of structures of American law enforcement agencies. However, community policing doesn't offer clear mechanisms to replace the current Weberian structure.

Taylor, Fritsch and Caeti (1998) identified 5 challenges of community policing. These are;

1- There is a little empirical evidence that supports about community poIicing has a positive impact a community believes of the police or crime reduction.

2- Community policing requires a systematic change not only police departments structure but also city government's structure.

3- The implementation of community policing is more academic. It is really difficult to make changes in the actual world.

4- Community policing has become too "politicized". If a department didn't want to join in community policing, it was called as stationary, non-progressive or worse.

5- Community policing can only be justified as successful in politics. It is too dangerous that some police chiefs and politicians are taking credits for statistics such as crime rate down, violent acts down etc.

Conclusion

Community policing is the recent policing paradigm encompassing various changes supposed to occur in a number of substantive areas. The changes in each domain encompass highly complex processes. Because of its size, it is difficult to assess community policing. It has pros and cons. In this study, after exploring the pros and cons of community policing, Community policing is better than traditional policing in many respects. On the other hand, community policing may not be mature enough to replace all aspects of traditional policing. For example, community policing doesn't have a well-defined solution for the people who doesn't live in an institutionalized community structure. Similarly, community policing doesn't have a mechanism to solve large-scale problems that can be solved in a bureaucracy. In other words, the bureaucracy has the mechanism to factor the problem, then to assign each factor to specialists to solve, and then to recombine partial solutions to produce a final solution; community policing doesn't have such mechanism for large scale problems.

In conclusion, community policing face same problems with traditional policing (Taylor et.al., 1998). A hybrid approach combining positive sides of community policing and traditional policing is ideal for better policing.

References

Alderson, J. C. (1979). Policing Freedom: A Commentary on the Dilemmas of Policing in Western Democracies. Eastover, Plymouth: McDonalds & Evans.

Aronowitz, A. (1997). "Progress in Community Policing", European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research, 5(4).

Bankson, R. (2003). "Addressing the Fear of Crime." In Community Links. Magazine of the Community Policing Consortium (COPS), p. 12-13.

Bayley, D. (1994). Police For The Future, New York, Oxford University Press;

Bayley, D. (1998). What Works in Policing, New York, Oxford University Press.

Bennett, T. (1990). Evaluating Neighborhood Watch, Aldershot Gower Publishing Company Ltd.

Bennett, T., Holloway, K., Farrington, D.P. (2009). A Review of the Effectiveness of Neighbourhood Watch. Security Journal, 22(2): 143–155.

Boles, J. G., & White, J. P.. (2003). "What We Do – Organizational Change". [Online]. Available at http://www.cj.msu.edu/~outreach/rcpi/function.html.

Brodeur, J.P. (1998). How to Recognize Good Policing: Problems and Issues. Thousands Oak, CA, Sage.

Bureau of Justice Assistant, (1994). Understanding Community Policing. A Framework for Action. [Online]. Available at https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles/commp.pdf.

Bucquerox, B. (2003). Leadership Versus Management. [Online]. Available at http://www.policing.com/articl/lead.html.

Clarke, R.V. (2002). Problem-oriented Policing and The Potential Contribution of Criminology. Washington DC. U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice

"Community Criminal Justice." (2003). [Online]. Available at http://www.policing.com/articl/cci.html.

COPS (2014). Community Policing Defined. [Online]. Available at https://ric-zai-inc.com/Publications/cops-p157-pub.pdf.

Cordner, G.W. (1999). Elements of Community Policing. In L.K. Gaines & G.W. Cordnes (Eds) Policing Perspectives: An Anthology, p: 137-149. New York: Roxbury.

Dammert, l. M., Malone, F.T. (2006). "Does it Take a Village? Policing Strategies and Fear of Crime in Latin America." Latin American Politics and Society 48(4): 27-51.

Eck, J., Rosenbaum, D. (1994). Effectiveness, Equity and Efficiency in Community Policing in Rosenbaum, D. Editor The Challenges of Community Policing – Testing The Promises. Thousand Oaks, Sage.

European Commission (2011). http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/crisisand-terrorism/radicalisation/index_en.htm

Fountain, J. E. (2001). Building the Virtual State. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Friedmann, R. (1992). Community Policing: Comparative Perspectives and Prospects. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Friedmann, R. (1996). Community Policing: Some Conceptual and Practical Considerations, Home Affairs Review Volume XXXIV (No. 6): 114-23

Garvey, G. (1995). "False Promises: The NPR in Historical Perspective". In Donald F. Kettl, and John J. DiIulio Jr (eds.), Inside the Reinvention Machine: Appraising Governmental Reform, 88-95. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C.W., Vitter, Z., Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented Policing to Reduce Crime, Disorder, and Fear and Increase Satisfaction and Legitimacy Among Citizens: A Systematic Review. Journal of Experimental Criminology, Vol.10 Issue 2

Gordon, D. R. (2001). "Democratic Consortium and Community Policing: Conflicting Imperatives in South Africa". Policing & Society, 11, 2, 121-150. England: Routledge Publishing.

Greene, J. (1998). "Evaluating Planned Change Strategies in Modern Law Enforcement, Implementing Community-Based Policing"; in Brodeur, J.-P. Editor, How to Recognize Good Policing: Problems and Issues, Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Greene, J. (2000). Community Policing in America. Oxford Clarendon Press.

"Intelligence Sharing is 'Critical'". (2003). In Community Links. Magazine of the Community Policing Consortium (COPS), Aug. 2003, p. 1-2.

Kelling, G., Coles, C, M. (1996). Fixing Broken Windows. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Kelling, G., Moore, M. (1988). "From Political to Reform to Community: The Evolving Strategy of Police." In Jack Greene and Stephen Mastrofski (eds.), Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality? New York: Praeger.

Lumb, R. C., Breazedele, R. (2003). "Police Officers Attitude and Community Policing Implementations". Policing & Society, 13, 1, 91-106. England: Routledge Publishing.

Maguire, E. R., Shin Y., Zhao J. S., Hassell K. D. (2003). "Structural Change in Large Police Agencies in the 1990s". Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management, 26, 2, 251-275. Emerald Publishing.

Mastrofski, S., Snipes, J. (1995). Law Enforcement in the Time of Community Policing. Criminology, 33, 539-563

Martinson, R. (1974). What Works? Questions and Answers About Prison Reform. The Public Interests, 10, 22-54

Mazerolle, l., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E., Manning, M. (2013). Procedural Justice and Police Legitimacy: A Systematic Review of The Research Evidence. Journal of Experimental Criminology. 9(3). 245-274

McLaughlin, E., Muncie, J. (2001). The Sage Dictionary of Criminology. London: Sage.

Moore, M. (1994). Research Synthesis and Policy Implementations in Rosenbaum, D. Editor The Challenges of Community Policing – Testing The Promises. Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Morabito, M.S. (2010). Understanding Community-Oriented Policing As An Innovation: Patterns of Adaptation. Crime and Delinquency, 56(4), 564-587

Reisig, M. D. (2000). "Measuring Performance In The Era of Community Policing". [Online]. Available at http://www.cj.msu.edu/~outreach/cp/measperf2.html.

Reisig, M. D. (2007). "Continuing the Discussion on Community Policing, Issue 2. Procedural Justice and Community Policing—What Shapes Residents' Willingness to Participate in Crime Prevention Programs?" Policing 1(3): 356-369.

Reaves, B.A. (2010). Local Police Departments, 2007 (No NCJ 231174). Washington DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Retrieved from http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/Ipdf.pdf.

Sherman, L.W. Gottfredson, D., MacKenzie, D., Eck, J., Reuter, P., Bushway, S.(1997). Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising in http://www.ncjsr.org/works

Simon, H. A. (1962). "The Architecture of Complexity." Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 106, 467-482.

Skogan, W. (1998), "Community Participation and Community Policing"; in Brodeur, J.-P. Editor, How to Recognize Good Policing: Problems and Issues, Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Skolnick, J. H., & Fyfe, J. J. (1993). Above The Law: Police And The Excessive Use of Force. New York, NY: The Free Press.

Somerville, P. (2009). Understanding Community Policing. An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 32(2): 261–277.

Stone, C., Travis, J. (2011). Toward A New Professionalism in Policing. Washington DC: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice.

Spelman, W., Brown, D. (1984). Calling The Police: Citizen Reporting of Serious Crime. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Sunshine, J., Tyler, T.R. (2003). The Role of Procedural Justice and Legitimacy in Shaping Public Support for Policing. Law and Society Review, 37, 555-589

Swanson, C. R., Territo, L., Taylor, R. W. (2001). Police Administration. (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Taylor, R.W., Fritsch, E.J., Caeti, T.J. (1998). Core Challenges Facing Community Policing: The Emperor Still Has No Clothes. Academy of Criminal Justice Science, Vol. XVII, Issue 1

Trojanowicz, R. C., Bucqueroux, B. (1990). Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.

Trojanowicz, R.C., Kappeler, V.E., Gaines, L.K., Bucqueroux, B. (1998). Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective, Cincinnati, Anderson.

Tyler, T.R. (2004). Enhancing Police Legitimacy. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. 593(1). 84-99

Xiaming, C. (2002). "Community and Policing Strategies: A Chinese Approach for Crime Control". Policing & Society, 12, 1, 1-13. England: Routledge Publishing.

Wakefield, A. (2007). "Continuing the Discussion on Community Policing, issue 2. Carry on Constable? Revaluing Foot Patrol." Policing 1(3): 342-355.

Weisburd, D., Braga, A. (Eds.) 2006. Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Weisburd, D. L., McElroy, J. (1988). Enacting The CPO Role. Findings to the New York City Pilot Program in Community Policing. In J. Green & S. Mastroski (Eds.), Community Based Policing: Rhetoric or Reality? New York, Praeger.

Weisburd, D.L., Eck, J.E. (2004). What Can Police Do to Reduce Crime, Disorder and Fear? Annals of The Academy of American Political and Social Science, 539(1), 42-65

White, S. (2011). The Importance of Community Policing in Troubled Times. Conference Paper for the International Crime Prevention Conference, 14-17 November 2011, Singapore.

White, S., McEvoy, K. (2012). Countering Violent Extremism: Community Engagement Programs In Europe. QIASS-report: http://qiass.org/news/details/?NewsId=39