

**Alternative Approach to Policing in Nigeria: Analyzing the Need
to Redefine Community Policing in Tackling the Nation's
Security Challenges**

By

Monsuru Adegboyega Kasali

Department of Political Science & International Relations

Crescent University, Abeokuta.

and

Rafiu Gbolagade Odetola

Security Practitioner and Analyst

Abstract

By 2004, Nigeria joined the league of countries operating community policing to address its gamut of security problems including ethno-religious conflicts, banditry, economic terrorism, among others, which had already attracted public acrimony and condemnation against the civilian government. Indeed, the practice of community policing in Nigeria is fraught with many contradictions, which have hitherto deepened the nation's frustration in forging appropriate path to safeguard the security of lives and property in the face of growing security threats. The study examines the general philosophy of community policing and how it is operated in Nigeria with the aim of identifying various areas of deficiency in the implementation of the concept. In fulfilling the objectives of this study, we explore conceptual definition of community policing, dissect community policing as alternative security option, examine community policing practice in Nigeria and recommend ways through which it can meet the nation's security needs.

Keywords: Community policing, Security management, Nigeria Police, Security Threats, Alternative Policing

Introduction

From the beginning of the 1980s, there is no doubt that community policing as security management approach has become a "buzz-word" in policing circle, replacing such terms as police-community relations, team policing, and problem oriented policing. However, to date, community policing is still an elusive term meaning different programs and approaches to different police departments. Despite the foregoing, many countries of the world have continued to adopt community policing to meeting their different security needs. The complexity of the contemporary security challenges like increasing trans-border crime, terrorism, human trafficking, armed robbery, homicide, to mention a few, overwhelms the public security sector as many governments have subscribed to the need to extend the security sector to include private security providers and the citizens. Hence, building a cordial relationship between the police and the public has become sacrosanct to

effective security management in any community, rationalizing the growing relevance enjoyed by community policing as alternative security policy framework to address growing security challenges.

In recent times, many governments have realized that they can no longer monopolize the business of security in local domains as well as the world at large. This opinion has led to extending the security community to include private players (in security business), NGOs and above all, the civilians take the center stage in security management (Kasali, 2010). Since the 1990s, the attention of the world population has shifted to redefining security and looking for the best approach that could guarantee effective security management, different from the traditional ones that had failed to address the increasing security threats. The search for the best approach led to the emergence of the community policing approach.

Historically, community policing as a concept originated from the United States in the 1970s as a philosophy and tactic of policing to integrate the public into police institution, not as police personnel but as collaborators in the security affairs of the nation for optimal efficiency and responsiveness (Wong, 2009: 2). Indeed, this approach advocates for a paradigm shift. Rather than leaving entirely the job of policing to state and police, people are more than ever tasked to play a lot of complementary roles in the security affairs of their communities. Therefore, it is not the function of the state (or government) to determine security imperatives for the people but it is the people who should have the final say in deciding their own security. It is against this background that many governments of the world have begun to adopt community policing for effective security management.

Conceptualizing Community Policing

Despite the increasing popularity enjoyed by community policing, one of the basic challenges confronting law enforcement agencies has remained a problem arising from inability to appropriately define the concept of community policing. The reason for the conceptual problem can simply be as a result of the philosophical values that underlie the concept, which make it remain different things to different people.

Indeed, the term philosophy, among other things, is defined as the set of values of an individual or culture (David, 1979), or personal attitude (Morehead & Morehead, 1981), which may be responsible for the conceptual problem adorning the term community policing. For instance in Nigeria, according to DFID, majority of the police personnel and most members of the public seem to perceive community policing as an approach of engendering better relations between the police and community, and seen to be "managed through a departmental function, rather than a policing philosophy that is focused upon providing best quality service and therefore should inform each and every police activity" (DFID, 2000: 12).

In fact, not until 1992 that clearer conceptualization of community policing began to dominate the literature. Despite the ever increasing popularity of the term the closest to a

Alternative Approach to Policing in Nigeria by Kasali and Odetola

definition in the professional literature were two sets of ten principles on community policing. The first was offered by Alderson (1979) and the second by Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990). Alderson's ten principles related to policing under conditions of freedom with emphasis on guaranteeing personal freedom and free passage while the principles offered by Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux have more to do with the implementation of the concept in a given police force. Yet in most communities the shift to community policing was characterized by introducing (or re-introducing) foot-patrol and the beat officer returning to the neighborhood.

Community policing encompasses a variety of philosophical and practical approaches and is still evolving. Community policing strategies vary depending on the needs and responses of the communities involved; however, certain basic principles and considerations are common to all community policing efforts. Nevertheless, community policing is one of the concepts with a lot of misconceptions and wider scope in definition, as it is often conceptualised according to the needs and aspirations of where it is adopted. Be that as it may, it has been argued that many definitions appear phlegmatic to considering various properties of community policing as they often "seem to ignore some aspects" of community policing while they also fail to "... provide clear operational terms that allow comparative implementation and testability" (Friedmann, 1992: 3).

In fact, community policing has remained a problem-solving approach to security management in many countries of the world. For instance, in the United States, community policing approach has nevertheless "gone a long way toward preventing crime" (Holland, 1994: 12). It is no exaggeration that if people are afforded the opportunity to be involved in the policy and decision making process of the police, there may be no need of having large police (see Bittner, 1970; Gaskill, 2002).

Community Policing as Alternative Security Management Strategy

The outcomes of the partnership between police and community however differ. Thus, the effectiveness in the way through which community policing is implemented in any given community will largely impact on the outcomes of the approach whether it will be successful or not (Young & Tinsley, 1998). These partnerships are very essential because the police are only one of the agencies responsible for addressing community problems, and other agencies need to take responsibility and respond to crime prevention and problem solving in partnership with police at all levels (ibid).

The success of the outcome of the partnership between the police and community largely lies on the amount of trust that exists in their relations (Flynn, 2004). Certainly, trust is the value that underlies and connects the components of community partnership and problem solving. A foundation of trust will allow police to form close relationships with the community that will produce great achievements. Without trust between police and citizens, effective policing remains elusive. Community policing partnerships develop information exchange: the community provides the police with information about problem conditions and locations, crime concerns, active criminals, and stolen property, and in return police provide the community with information pertaining to community fears,

problems, tactical information and advice about preventing and reducing crime (Farrell, 1988).

The outcomes of community policing are largely determined by some key elements of the concept. Some of these may include structure, management and information. Cordner (2007) argued that for community policing to be effective, police institution must appreciate the underlying opportunities embedded in partnering with the public. The police institutions should be structured to ensure that they support and facilitate the implementation of the philosophical, strategic and tactical dimensions of community policing. Community policing demands that organizational structures and training should be put in place to support the concept of community policing (Skogan, 2006). In community policing, the issue of setting the mission statement is also very essential, as it will afford the police opportunities to determine which broad goals of community policing, and encourage police to develop practices that will enable those goals to be achieved (Mastrofski, 2006). The neighborhood patrol officers who are supported by the police organization will definitely assist community members mobilize support and resources to solve problems and enhance their quality of life.

Management is another key element of community policing and its "role...is not to direct the activities of the field personnel so much as to guide them and ensure that they have the resources they require to do their jobs"(The Community Policing Consortium, 1994 cited in Fridell, 2004: 9). Police authorities are required to take a lead in the effective implementation of the policy and provide appropriate leadership to ensure each member is actively involved in community policing activities (Skogan, 2005). This includes re-examining the way people are supervised and managed (Cordner, 1999). According to Reno, et al. (1998), the implementation of community policing will be more successful if officers and the rank and files of the police have a better understanding of the concept (community policing), and are supportive of and committed to it.

Information is also very critical to the success of community policing as security management approach. However, police information systems are crucial in providing information to assist the community and respond to their problems (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990). The utilization of problem solving techniques requires information systems that will aid the identification and analysis of problems faced by the community, including the use of Geographical Information Systems (GIS). Community policing demands that police departments reform their relationship with local communities, and that police officers change their attitudes and behaviors toward citizens and police work. In order to foster police-community cooperation in tackling community problems, police agencies must first elicit community input. This can be achieved via a variety of methods, including door-to-door visits conducted by police officers, mail-out surveys, and residential block meetings. The gathering of this information helps the police identify and prioritize community concerns. In their attempts to reduce crime and disorder, the police can seek the assistance of community members by encouraging citizens to report illegal or suspicious behavior. One of the high-points of community policing is the usual effort to

Alternative Approach to Policing in Nigeria by Kasali and Odetola

improve the frequency and the quality of interactions between individual police officers and members of the public.

Community policing also has to be problem solving. Indeed, problem solving is an interactive process, involving police and communities identifying crime problems and developing appropriate solutions (Young and Tinsley, 1998). Problem-solving is germane to community policing and as such, problems should not be limited to crimes, and solutions should not have to involve arrests. Police and the community should be empowered to adopt problem solving techniques and take every opportunity to address the conditions that cause security breaches (Cordner, 2007). Unlike traditional policing system, community policing as an alternative security approach is essentially more interested in crime prevention through deterring offenders, protecting likely victims and fortify environment to contain the activities of human threats rather than the traditional methods like the number of arrests made (Bucqueroux, 2007).

Community Policing in Nigeria

The relationship between police and civil community in Nigeria has been considered by many as unfriendly such that the men and officers of the police institution are often perceived by the public as those without any sense of responsibility, integrity and commitment to duties. From the evolution and functions of Nigeria Police, the public police are often considered as stooges of the state whose loyalties wholly lie with the political elites and their cronies (see Alemika, 2003; 1993). Marenim (1985: 80) corroborated the foregoing, observing that:

The police in their routine work tend to protect the powerful. Police are visible enmasse during ceremonial occasions when they cordon off VIPs from the common folk; they are assigned to guard the homes of the powerful, government buildings, and act as body guards for important officials. One rarely sees high ranking officer without a police officer. Police are concentrated in urban areas and within urban areas concentrate on patrolling Government Residential Areas (GRAs) – the home of indigenous and expatriate elites ... such practices teach the rank and file who needs protection and who does not, who is entitled to services and whose demand can be rejected.

In addition, they have always been accused of endemic corruption, human rights abuse, lawlessness, and above all, exhibiting hatred towards the common men (Alemika, 1993,1999; Alemika & Chukwuma, 2000a; Chukwuma, 1994; Nowrojee, 1992; et seq). Nevertheless, the modus operandi of the police in colonial era laid the foundation of the continual invocation of 'strangers policing strangers' philosophy that till date heralds the relationship between the police and civil community (Rotimi, 2001).

Unfortunately, the enemy image that adorned the relations between the police and local community in the colonial era has failed to fade away in post-colonial Nigeria as many decades "... after independence, the police are yet to change its orientation to a people

oriented police force...."(Adisa, 1999: 7). However, lack of partnership between police and community could be said to be one of the major factors responsible for the inability of the police in the country, to address the growing security challenges bedeviling Nigeria such as incessant armed robbery, ethnic and religious violence, political assassinations, arson, kidnapping, among others.

Since the inception of the Fourth Republic in 1999, in order to contain the security challenges confronting the nation, a number of reforms has been undertaken by police authorities in the country (Arase and Iwuofor, 2007), culminating the introduction of community policing in 2004. One cannot but agree that the adoption of community policing as a security strategy and philosophy by Nigeria Police demands a change in the attitude, tactic and orientation of police personnel to policing in order to achieve the desired goals of this emergent security approach.

To buttress the foregoing point, Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990) opined that community policing is a philosophy, which is operated based on the assumption that changes today will make communities safer and more attractive tomorrow. This objective, according to Segrave and Ratcliffe (2004), can be achieved by working together towards shared goals. To this end, it is no exaggeration to assert that the importance of community policing cannot be over-emphasized in the management of security in any community, especially as it brings the police and community closer and offers a myriad of other benefits.

In Nigeria, community policing was adopted to address the challenges confronting the nations as a result of high crime rate. Beginning from the middle of the 1970s, the incidence of crime in Nigeria has been on rapid increase, reaching a pathological stage (Odekunle, 2005). In an attempt to address the growing problem of insecurity and criminality in Nigeria following the long sojourn of military in Nigerian politics, as well as public suspicion of Police anti-democratic ethos imbibed from colonial experience (Alemika and Chukwuma, 2000a; Onoja, 2007; Tamuno, 1970), President Olusegun Obasanjo in April 2004, initiated Community policing in collaboration with police authorities under the tutelage of former Inspector General of Police, Mr. Tafa Balogun. Hence, six states including Benue, Enugu, Jigawa, Kano, Ondo, and Ogun were selected for the pilot scheme. The involvement of people in the pilot states by the Police covered issues of quality service delivery, partnership, accountability, empowerment and problem-solving. By 2007, the number of states where community policing was introduced increased to 18, as 12 more states were added to the previous 6. Those additional states included Lagos, FCT (Abuja), Cross River, Kaduna, Anambra, Edo, Bauchi, Kogi, Oyo, Imo, Katsina and Borno.

There is no doubt that community policing has been very effective in crime reduction and control in several countries including the US, Israel, UK, Canada, Japan, to mention a few (Allen-Bond, 1984; Friedmann, 1992; Holland, 1994). In many states in Nigeria, the capacity of the police to maintain law and order has continued to be undermined by rapidly

Alternative Approach to Policing in Nigeria by Kasali and Odetola

growing incidence of violent crimes. Incidences of bank robbery and kidnapping have drastically increased in many parts of Nigeria. For instance in Ogun State, many banks closed down their branches in some parts of the state due to cases of bank robbery, some of which claimed human lives (*Newswatch Times*, 2014).

Without doubts, the attempts by many law enforcement officials to define the term community policing and develop its programs produce a number of non-uniform programs, which vary in terms of both the name and the content of the programs. Zhao *et al.* (1995) held that one of the ways of bringing all law enforcement officials to familiarize themselves with community policing is basically through training. Thus, training and education is an essential element if the implementation of community policing initiatives is to be successful especially as a result of its philosophy, which espouses fundamental changes in many areas of policing. These changes including those that are strategic, tactical, or organizational, not only affect the way the police respond to crime, but also the way they search for crime solutions.

Palmiotto *et al.* (2000) opined that, considering the complicated and dynamic nature of community policing, any fundamental changes that community policing as a security management approach may bring must be addressed and discussed thoroughly. They also suggested that philosophy and fundamentals of community policing should be incorporated into all aspects of police recruit training (*ibid.*). Although, Nigeria Police has continued to train some of its personnel on the workings of community policing from the year 2004 when it was introduced till date but unfortunately there is little evidence shown as to how training affects the way they understand community policing as a security approach.

With the aim of realizing the objectives of community policing, Nigeria Police has therefore identified a number of training needs among which include Conflict Resolution and the Management of Public Order, Management of the Recommended Intelligence Model and Intelligence Analysis, Management of Community Safety, Management of Policing Standards, Accountability and Anti-corruption, Crime investigation, Management of Serious Crime, Recruit Development, Development of a Police Leadership Framework, Development of leadership and Management Skills (Strategic Management and Middle-level Management), Management of training function, Financial management and budget preparation, Managing and developing human resources, as well as Management of informal policing training (www.npf.gov.ng/info/community_policing.aspx#).

However, in the Federal Capital Territory (Abuja), Kano and Kaduna, police authorities facilitated training for a number of Intelligence Officers in some of the Police Divisions on the concepts and methods of Intelligence-led Policing (ILP) who would in turn share with their relevant colleagues in their various divisions, the transferable skills generated through the training (www.npf.gov.ng/info/communitypolicing.aspx#). Police authorities in the country revealed the importance of such training to security management citing an instance of Gwagwalada in the F.C.T. where it was reported that “a group of cultists were meeting to plan a revenge attack; due to information the police were able to intervene and prevent the incident (*ibid.*).

It is also of note that police authorities in the country have gone further in their commitment to have positive outcomes from their community policing initiatives by introducing Community Safety Partnership (pilot scheme) in Lagos as a strategy of drawing a synergy between the police and community, as *“the senior representatives involved – from Local Government, police, the communities and many other key agencies have made a commitment to work together in the future to gain a full understanding of the local safety issues that affect their communities and work in a partnership to resolve them”* (Ibid.).

Among the many challenges confronting Nigeria Police is lack of adequate adoption of the community policing philosophy into its practice as many of the police personnel are still found entangled with traditional law enforcement approaches, which negate the principle community partnership policing. Community policing requires many fundamental changes, some of which may include empowerment, partnership, and problem solving, which are necessary for its success. McLaughlin and Donahue (1995) highlighted a number of challenges that can undermine the potency of the practice of community policing. First, it is important to note that community policing training differs from traditional police training, which tends to be rigid and strictly conformed to law, policies, and procedures. Second, it must filter from the top down, meaning that all politicians, city officials, and police executives involved in the process must understand and support its goals, and that these people should, at some time, attend training. Third, although community policing and traditional police training require carefully developed lesson plans, apparent differences exist. Components of community policing training take into account specific community needs and the likelihood of success in meeting those needs, therefore requiring updated public input and innovative and proactive thinking on the part of police planners. In contrast, traditional police training is developed in accordance with department protocol and often emphasizes any potential liability issues.

Again, delivery of community policing training must also deviate from the behavioral/teacher-centered to adult education approaches (i.e. learner-centered) because community policing requires police officers to be more versatile and are human-oriented due to the increasing numbers and magnitude of public police encounters. Fourth, it is difficult to determine whether community policing training is used by supervisors and officers, and whether it improves their performance. In other words, proper evaluation is needed to find out whether the police are implementing the program or just paying lip service.

Undoubtedly, several empirical evidences have shown that practicing community policing without adequate community policing training could greatly compromise the desirable goals. For instance, Kratcoski and Noonan (1995:183) studied attitudes of rank-and-file officers from the two police departments that did not receive community policing training before implementing community policing programs and found that many of the participating officers did not understand community policing programs, and many of the

Alternative Approach to Policing in Nigeria by Kasali and Odetola

officers' responses appeared to be guarded, noncommittal, or negative. The results of their study showed that 63.3 percent of the officers of one department stated the Mini-Station Program was not important and that 60.6 percent of officers of the other department believed the same. They however suggested that training in community policing must be an integral part of the police academy program. There is no doubt that community policing training is a key factor affecting the success or failure of community policing programs.

Cordner et al. (1991) revealed that resistance within the agency is inevitable as restructuring occurs. During the implementation of any change, employees may feel threatened and seek ways to resist. For instance in Nigeria, it has been noted by Dickson (2007) that most of the men and officers of Nigeria Police who have been engaged in community policing training have found it difficult to depart from the traditional ways of doing things especially their relations with their various communities, which are considered not cordial. DFID (2000) traced some of the reasons for the phlegmatic response and non-cooperation of several police personnel to community policing in Nigeria as follow:

- *Lack of understanding as to the precise nature of Community Policing;*
- *Vested interest on the part of those benefiting from the status quo;*
- *A fatalistic attitude involving a belief that change is not possible whilst the police "rank and file" (i.e. junior personnel, continue to be poorly paid);*
- *Unwillingness to abandon practices that are familiar in favour of the unknown or uncertain (i.e. feeling threatened by the different operational and managerial competencies required for modern policing);*
- *Many police officers and other stakeholders tend to view Community Policing as the development of better community relations managed through a departmental function, rather than a policing philosophy that is focused upon providing best quality service and therefore should inform each and every police activity; and*
- *Community policing being mistakenly considered by some as an import from a former colonial power and therefore irrelevant to policing in Nigeria. (DFID, 2000: 11-12).*

Dickson (2007) argued that the challenges confronting the implementation of community policing in Nigeria cannot be blamed entirely on uncooperative attitude of many police personnel in the country, stressing that other factors are also responsible for the inability of the nation's police to meet the desired goals of community policing in the management of security. These may include inadequate support from the members of the public, lack of job satisfaction resulting from absence of good welfare packages, motivations and incentives, as well as lack of will on the part of the political elite to provide sufficient support to the implementation of community policing program in the country.

Nevertheless, Corder (1998) opined that, in as much that community policing is aimed at solving security problems, it is important to take into account the practice by personnel throughout the ranks, community input and participation, and collaboration between police and external agencies whenever possible. This will be especially true if community policing is incorrectly perceived as being "soft on crime" and as making social service activities the patrol officers' primary responsibility. Those at the highest level of command must be aware of the concerns of mid-level managers, who may be particularly sensitive to the shifts in decision making responsibility and to the wider discretion accorded patrol officers. Sparrow *et. al.* emphasized the importance of partnership between police and community to the management of local security, contending that:

. . . the police must move to empower two groups: the public itself and the street officers who serve it most closely and regularly. Only when the public has a real voice in setting police priorities will its needs be taken seriously; only when street officers have the operational latitude to take on the problems they encounter with active departmental backing will those needs really be addressed (Sparrow et. al., 1990: 182-183).

Community policing alters the contemporary functions of supervisors and managers. Under community policing, management serves to guide, rather than dominate, the actions of patrol officers and to ensure that officers have the necessary resources to solve the problems in their communities. Indeed, creativity and innovation must be fostered if satisfactory solutions to long-standing community problems are to be achieved. Meese (1991) espoused the roles of leadership, management and education in achieving the desired goals of community policing, arguing that:

Teamwork, flexibility, mutual participation in decision-making, and citizen satisfaction are concepts that initially may threaten the supervisor who is more comfortable with the authoritarian role and routinized operations inherent in traditional policing. Thus, the education of supervisors in new styles of leadership and management must be given a high priority if they are to carry out their responsibility for the success of community policing (Meese, 1991: 7).

Keeping all personnel well informed, involving them in ongoing planning and implementation, soliciting their input and suggestions, and encouraging feedback in all areas of implementation are essential to obtaining organization wide support. Management must instill the agency with a new spirit of trust and cooperation that will be carried over into the relationships between the agency and its community policing partners. There is no doubt that cooperation and influence of management are very essential in gaining support throughout the ranks.

Alternative Approach to Policing in Nigeria by Kasali and Odetola

The police executive shall also be expected to display exemplary leadership in the move to community policing. Change must come from the top down. The behavior of the chief executive will set the tone and pattern for the entire organization. Sparrow (1988) is of the view that management must create a new, unified organizational outlook, and strategies must be developed to deal effectively with obstacles to change. According to him:

For the police it is an entirely different way of life...The task facing the police chief is nothing less than to change the fundamental culture of the organization...Throughout the period of change the office of the chief executive is going to be surrounded by turbulence, like it or not. It will require personal leadership of considerable strength and perseverance (Sparrow, 1988: 2).

Early mobilization of support for community policing is critical. Internally, police chiefs must develop support at all levels of the organization; externally, the chief executives of police must gather support from the local government, public and private agencies, the media, and other policing agencies in any given communities or across the nation. As a matter of fact, consistent supervision is necessary for effective community policing. There should be close collaboration between patrol officers and their supervisors, and this is critical to successful community policing as well as the partnership between the officer and the community members. While patrol officers need consistent supervision, according to Oettmeier & Bieck (1988: 35), it is expected that “the attitude that police officers must be guided and directed at every turn must be discarded...”

In addition, supervisors should function as mentors, motivators, and facilitators. Community policing’s broad approach to problem solving can enhance communication and interaction between departmental levels. If middle career officers are made an integral part of the problem-solving process, they will become another resource for patrol officers, rather than just another level of supervision (Sparrow, 1988). Definitely, by acting as liaisons, running interference, and suggesting appropriate auxiliary support, supervisors can help patrol officers respond to a wide variety of service demands.

Suffice, accountability which is very critical to the success of community policing is largely lacking in Nigeria Police. Accountability creates confidence-building in the relationship between the public and police. Public tends to have confidence in dealing with police that upholds principle of human rights protection, standard operations procedure, commitment to bring erring police men and officers to justice, and treating information volunteering with high confidentiality. Police in Nigeria is awash with allegations of endemic corruption and flagrant abuse of power (Tamuno, 1993; Alemika & Chukwuma, 2000b). Alderson (1979) classified police corruption into two: individual and departmental. Individual corruption usually involves individual men and officers of police using their positions as law enforcement agents for personal aggrandizement. Police corruption can also involve departmental level of commission whereby top hierarchy of the institution partner with junior officers in the perpetration of corrupt practices.

Beyond the rhetoric of “Police is Your Friend”, the attitude of police is nothing to be desired. Endemic corruption that permeates the entire fabrics of Nigeria Police has reduced the security agency to nothing but public enemies commissioned by the state, posing devastating challenge to community policing in the country. The culpability of official corruption among men and officers of Nigeria Police transcends the brazen impunity that accompanies extortion of motorists and other civilians by low and middle rank police personnel on the streets and stations who also give return to their superiors (possibly) including Inspector General of Police (IGP). Police authorities are often alleged of sending their subordinates to 'Siberia' (meaning to departments, stations or areas that are not money spinning) for the failure of the affected officers to 'play ball' (not remitting adequate returns from the kickbacks collected to the superiors). For instance, former IGP Tafa Balogun, during whose tenure community policing was introduced, was accused of redeploying Commissioners of Police and other top officers who failed to remit enough *booties* from their corrupt contraptions to him (The News, 2003). Perhaps, among all public sectors, Nigeria Police has emerged the most corrupt (ACBF, 2007).

The litany of rights abuse that often accompanies corrupt dealings of the erring men and officers of Nigeria Police has actuated cataloguing habitual violations of human rights by many scholars and organizations (Alemika & Chukwuma, 2000a; Chukwuma, 1994; Human Rights Watch, 2010; Kasali, 2010; Odekunle, 2005; Onyeozili, 2005; Tamuno, 1993). For instance, Human Rights Watch (2010) presented not only serious allegations leveled against Nigeria Police by victims of police abuse interviewed but also images of savagery and ruthlessness of armed police men and officers. Among the abuses often perpetrated were extortion, unlawful detention, physical abuse including torture, sexual violence while extra-judicial killings appear a regular routine among the police (Human Rights Watch, 2010). It is very unfortunate that many of these cases of abuse have remained not investigated.

Concluding Remarks

Without mincing words, there was increased effort by Nigeria Police authorities under Tafa Balogun to promote community policing in Nigeria especially by creating awareness about the relevance of this security approach to crime control but the leaderships after him paid lip-service to community policing. Consequently, the country became more enmeshed in insecurity as crime situation has now reached a very abnormal level since the nation's independence in 1960. Making the matter worse, information that is so critical to community policing practice is largely missing as evident in various intelligence flaws recorded by the Police in the prosecution of crime suspects as reaffirmed by a former Attorney General and Minister of Justice, Mr. Ahmed Adoke. In fact, the recent fiasco in the inter-agency cooperation in the public security sector has further exposed the mammoth incompetence and inept that has dominated police administration in Nigeria. For instance, the contention between the Nigeria Police and Department of State Security (formerly State Security Service) concerning the case of late Comrade Olaitan Oyerinde, the slain Governor Adam Oshiomole's aide has continued to generate mixed feelings and criticisms among the public, which has further deepened the loss of public confidence in

Alternative Approach to Policing in Nigeria by Kasali and Odetola

Nigeria Police. The two security agencies paraded two different sets of suspects as responsible for Oyerinde's murder while two of them accused each other of covering-up facts about the genuine culprits of the high profile killing (see Vanguard Newspaper, March 3, 2013).

Generally, community policing has failed to attract any tremendous progress in the control of crime not as a result of ineffectiveness of the approach but misapplication of the concept and poor implementation. Studying the attitude of police toward the citizens, it appears that the police authorities are yet to realize that the implementation of community policing largely depends on better understanding of community policing among police personnel, so that they can support the policy and make it a success. In actual fact, the training of men and officers of Nigeria Police needs to expand beyond arrest procedures to include building effective inter-personal skills, anger-management, emotional intelligence, and adequate community orientation.

In addition, in order for police to achieve better relationship with the community, various commands, area offices and, zonal offices and stations need to become and operate more like open systems. This will have huge implications on the organization of Nigeria Police. The structure of police departments needs to be more decentralized to allow better deployment in the community and more effective use of officers and response to citizens and in building the network relations with citizens. It is important to have a more flat rank structure; this will allow officers to continue good performance without necessarily aspiring for command positions, and it will improve the quality of police personnel in the field. The use of more civilians in auxiliary and liaison functions will generate closer ties with the community as well as free officers to do police work.

Apart from the foregoing, internal communications need to be exchanged at the lower level to break the relatively rigid chain of command and to improve the flow of information. Police supervision should enhance interaction between all levels (officer-supervisor and officer-community) in order to expand the spans of responsibility of officers. Officers should have greater discretion to empower them in their decision-making and to encourage more flexibility in non-law enforcement situations. This will make police work far more efficient and will enhance performance on the part of officers who are expected to do more in a position of trust. Police deployment should be proactive, preventive and community-oriented, to complement the traditional policing strategies. Recruitment of people into Nigeria Police should emphasize higher educational levels and seek people-oriented, service/mediation-centered officers.

Finally, inter-agency cooperation should be improved among various agency levels (not only between department heads). They should develop a better understanding as to what constitutes overall community needs and how they can, by working together and improve their response to those needs.

References

- ACBF (The African Capacity Building Foundation). (2007). Institutional frameworks for addressing public sector corruption in Africa: Mandate, performance, challenges & capacity needs. Boulder, Colorado, USA: The African Capacity Building Foundation.
- Adisa, J. (1999). "A New Nigerian Police Image: Its Role in the Next Millennium" A Paper delivered at a seminar organized for Assistant Inspectors-General and Commissioners of Police by the Nigeria Police Force at the International Conference Centre Abuja, October 19-20.
- Alderson, J.C. (1979). *Policing freedom: A Commentary on the Dilemmas of Policing in Western Democracies*. Eastover, Plymouth: Macdonalds & Evans.
- Alemika E.E.O. (1993). Colonialism, State and Policing in Nigeria. *Crime, Law and Social Change*, (20) 187-219.
- (1999). Police-Community Relations in Nigeria: What Went Wrong? In I. Chukwuma and I. Ifowodo (eds.), *Policing a Democracy*. Lagos: Centre for Law Enforcement Education.
- (2003). Federalism and the Police in Nigeria. In A.T. Gana and S.G. Egwu (eds.). *Federalism in Africa: The Imperative of Democratic Development* (Vol. 2). New Jersey: Africa World Press.
- Alemika, E.E.O. and Chukwuma, I.C. (2000a). *Police-Community Violence in Nigeria*. Lagos: Centre for Law Enforcement Education.
- Alemika E.E.O. and Chukwuma I.C. (2000b). *Analysis of Police and Policing in Nigeria*. Center for Law Enforcement Education and National Human Rights Commission, Lagos.
- Allen-Bond, M. (1984). Policing Japan. *Law and Order* 32(5): 46-52.
- Arase, S.E. and Iwuofor, I.P.O. (eds.). (2007). *Policing Nigeria in the 21st century*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books.
- Bittner, E. (1970). *The Functions of Police in Modern Society*. National Institute of Mental Health.
- Bucqueroux, B. (2007). *What Community Policing Teaches us about Community Criminal Justice*. Available on <http://www.policing.com/articles/pdf/ccj.pdf>. Retrieved on 28th August, 2007.

Alternative Approach to Policing in Nigeria by Kasali and Odetola

- Chukwuma, I. (1994). *Above the Law: A Report on Torture and Extra-Judicial Killings by the Police in Nigeria*. Lagos: Civil Liberties Organisation.
- Cordner, G.W. (1998). Community Policing: Elements and Effects. In G.P. Alpert and A. Piquero (eds.). *Community Policing: Contemporary Readings*. Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press, pp. 45-62.
- Cordner, G.W. (1999). Elements of Community Policing. In L. Gaines and G. Cordner (eds.). *Policing Perspectives: An Anthology*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company, pp137-149.
- Cordner, G. (2007). *The Key Elements of Oriented Community Policing*. Colorado: Regional Community Policing Institute.
- Cordner, G.W., Craig, B.F., and Wexler, C. (1991). Research, planning and implementation. In W.A. Geller (ed.). *Local Government Police Management*. Washington, D.C.: International City Management Association. 3rd edition.
- Cordner, G. and Perkins, E. (2005). Problem-Oriented Policing in Practice. *Criminology and Public Policy* 4(2): 155-180.
- Davies, P. (Ed.) (1979). *The American Heritage Dictionary*. New York: Dell Publishing.
- DFID-Nigeria's Security, Justice and Growth Programme (2000). *Community Policing: Frequently Asked Questions*.
- Dickson, A.Y. (2007). Community Policing. In Arase, S.E. and Iwuofor (eds.). *Policing Nigeria in the 21st Century*. Ibadan, Spectrum Books.
- Farrell, M.J., (1988). The Development of the Community Patrol Program: Community-Oriented Policing in the New York City Police Department. In J. Green and S. Mastrofski. *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality*. New York: Praeger Publishers, pp73-88.
- Flynn, E. (2004). Community Policing is Good Policing, both Today and Tomorrow. In L. Fridell and M Wycoff (eds.). *Community Policing: The Past, Present, and Future*. Washington DC: Police Executive Research Forum, pp 25-38.
- Fridell, L (2004). The Defining Characteristics of Community Policing. In L. Fridell and M. Wycoff (eds.). *Community Policing: The Past, Present, and Future*. Washington DC: Police Executive Research Forum, pp 3-12.
- Friedmann, R.R. (1992). *Community Policing: Comparative Perspectives and Prospects*. New York: St. Martin's Press, Inc.

- Gaskill, D.M. (2002). *Crime and Mentalities in Early Modern England*. Cambridge University Press.
- Holland, M. (1994). Two Programs Help Cut City Crime. *Savanna Evening Press*.
- Ibrahim, A. (2015). Police Corruption and the State: Prevalence and Consequences. *Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(3): 19-29.
- Kasali, M.A. (2010). *Basic Security and Security Threats*. National Open University of Nigeria.
- Kratcoski, P.C. and Noonan, S.B. (1995). An Assessment of Police Officers' Acceptance of Community Policing. In Kratcoski, P.C. and Dukes, D. (eds.). *Issues in Community Policing*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing, pp. 169-85.
- Marenim, O. (1985). Policing Nigeria: Control and Autonomy in the Exercise of Coercion. *African Studies Review*, 28(1): 73-93.
- Mastrofski, S. (2006). Critic-Community Policing: A skeptical View. In D. Weisburd and A. Braga (eds.), *Police Innovation: Contemporary Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 44-73.
- McLaughlin, V. and Donahue, M.E. (1995). Training for Community-Oriented Policing. In Kratcoski, P.C. and Dukes, D. (eds.). *Issues in Community Policing*. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing, pp. 125-38.
- Meese, E. III. (1991). Community Policing and the Police Officer. *Perspectives on Policing*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
- Morehead, P.D. and Morehead, A.T. (eds.) (1981). *The New American Webster Handy College Dictionary*. New York: Penguin Group.
- Newwatch Times (2014 Sept. 23). Banks Shut over Armed Robbers' Threat in Ogun. Also available on <http://www.mynewswatchtimesng.com/banks-shut-armed-robbers-threat-ogun/>. Retrieved on 31 March, 2016.
- Nowrojee, B. (1992). *The Nigeria Police Force: A Culture of Impunity*. New York: Lawyers Committee for Human Rights.
- Odekunle, F. (2005). Overview of Policing in Nigeria: Problems and Suggestions. In E. O. Alemika & I.C. Chukwuma, *Crime and Policing in Nigeria: Challenges and Options*. Network on Police Reform in Nigeria (NOPRIN)/CLEEN Foundation. Pp 22-34.

Alternative Approach to Policing in Nigeria by Kasali and Odetola

- Oettmeier, T.N. and Bieck, W.H. (1988). *Integrating Investigative Operations through Neighborhood-Oriented Policing: Executive Session #2*. Houston: Houston Police Department.
- Onoja, A.F. (2007). Sustaining a Tradition of Policing through Alienation: An Assessment of Recruitment and Training in the Colonial and Postcolonial Nigeria Police. *Afrika Zamani*, Nos. 13 & 14, 2005–2006: 137–151.
- Palmiotto, M.J., Birzer, M.L. and Unnithan, N.P. (2000). Training in Community Policing: A Suggested Curriculum. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 23(1): 8-21.
- Reno, J., Marcus, D., Leary, M.L., and Travis, J. (1998). *Problem Solving in Practice: Implementing Community Policing in Chicago*. US Department of Justice: National Institute of Justice. Also available on <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/179556.pdf>. Retrieved on 8th August, 2007.
- Rotimi, K. (2001). *The Police in a Federal State: The Nigerian Experience*. Ibadan: College Press Limited.
- Segrave, M. and Ratcliffe, J. (2004). *Community Policing: A Descriptive Overview*. Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Skogan, W. (2005). Evaluating Community Policing in Chicago. In K.R.. Kerley (ed.). *Policing and Program Evaluation*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, pp. 27-41.
- (2006). Advocate: The Promise of Community Policing, In D. Weisburd and A. Braga (eds.). *Police Innovations: Contrasting Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp 27-43.
- Sparrow, M.K. (1988). *Implementing Community Policing. Perspectives on Policing*. Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.
- Sparrow, M.K., Moore, M.H., and Kennedy, D.M. (1990). *Beyond 911: A New Era for Policing*. New York: Basic Books.
- Tamuno, T.N. (1970). *The Police in Modern Nigeria*. Ibadan: University of Ibadan Press.
- (eds). (1993). *Policing Nigeria: Past, Present and Future*. Lagos: NPF, Kam Salem House.
- The News, Tuesday, July 29, 2003.

- Trojanowicz, R. and Bucqueroux, B. (1990). *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*. Ohio: Anderson Publishing Co.
- Vanguard Newspaper (March 3, 2013). *Public Hearing on Oyerinde's murder: Nigeria Police vs State Security*.
- Wong, K.C. (2009). *A General Theory of Community Policing*. http://works.bepress.com/kam_wong/6. Retrieved on 20 June, 2011.
- www.npf.gov.ng/info/community_policing.aspx#. Retrieved on 20 June, 2011.
- Young, W. and Tinsley, Y. (1998). *Options for the Development of COP/Problem Solving Policing in New Zealand*. Wellington: Victoria University of Wellington.
- Zhao, Z., Thurman, Q. and Lovrich, N.P. (1995). Community-Oriented Policing Across the US: Facilitators and Impediments to Implementation. *American Journal of Police* 14(1): 11-28.