CHALLENGESAND PROSPECTSOF COMMUNITY POLICING IN NIGERIA

BY

OLAYINKA BABATUNDE, BALOGUN
B.Sc. Political Science (Ife), LL.B. (UNN), BL., M.A. Peace and Conflict Studies (Ib.)

MATRIC. NO.: 118613

A Thesis in the Peace and Conflict Studies Programme Submitted to the Institute for Peace and Strategic Studies in partial fulfillment of the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

of the

UNIVERSITY OF IBADAN

JUNE,2019

CERTIFICATION

I certify that this work was carried out by OlayinkaBabatunde BALOGUN in the Peace and Conflict StudiesProgramme, Institute for Peace and Strategies Studies, University of Ibadan under my supervision.

_____   _____

Supervisor   **Date**
PROFESSOR I.O. ALBERT
Institute for Peace and Strategies Studies
University of Ibadan

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to Almighty Allah

ACKNOWELDGEMENT

ABSTRACT

Police officers require public support for effectivelaw enforcement. Progressive loss of confidence in the Nigeria Police Force (NPF) haveprevented functional cooperation that is critical to policing effectiveness. The adoption of community policing as an alternative policing model by the Police Management Team (PMT) in 2002 was therefore expected to reduce relational conflicts and promote collaboration. Contrary to expectations that scholars would examine the workings of community policing in detail, research focus has remained largely on crime, governance and human rights. This study, therefore, examined motivations for the introduction of community policing, challenges of its implementation, the extent to which the initiative has impacted policing practice and the prospect of community policingin Nigeria.

Wilson and Kelling's Theory of Incivilities and Cohen's Theory of Social Reproduction provided the framework. The research design was cross-sectional survey involving 900 copies of two sets of self-structured questionnaires that were administered in three police stations each in three pilot Divisions created by PMT in Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun States. Unstructured interviews were conducted with sixteen key informants: Deputy Inspector General of Police (Operations);Deputy Commissioner of Police (community policing); three coordinating Assistant Commissioners of Police and three Divisional Police Officersin each pilot state; theProgramme Officer, British Council/Department for International Development Community Policing Support Programme and the national coordinator of Network for Police Reform in Nigeria (NOPRIN). In addition, six focus group discussions comprising an average of six persons including police officers, Police Community Relations Committee officials, leaders of community vigilante and selected civil society groups were conducted in each state covered by the study. Data were content analysed.

Experimentation with community policing stemmed from the felt need to address negative perception and reinvent the NPF as a people-and-service-orientedorganisation. Implementation challenges included: low coverage as the scheme covered only 129 (2.0%) of Nigeria's 6424 administrative units; its perception as elite-dominated and elite-driven; poor understanding and low penetration of community policingphilosophy;low level of community ownership of policing preferences and strategies; poor documentation of the

gains of community policing; indiscriminate transfer of officers trained in community policing techniques and retention of centralised control of the NPF which shows low adaptation to required change. The PMT appeared committed to adoption of community policing nationwide and there was an increased focus on training and retraining, attitudinal change, publication and circulation of training manuals on different aspects of community policing and the forging of collaboration for problem solving with diverse stakeholders. State governments, local councils and communities across Nigeria are also deepening community policing practice by establishing and funding Security Trust Funds, Police Community Consultation Committees and Neighbourhood Watch schemes as forms of strategic support to the police.

Community policing promoted mutually-beneficial collaboration and policing effectiveness in pilot communities. The Nigerian government should decentralise the structure of the Force and support full implementation of community policing nationwide, while the Police Management Team should sensitise the public on the viability of community-policing as a collaborative problem-solving approach to relational and security challenges.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Pages

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

An organized human community like the modern nation-state requires an agency that will oversee the sustenance of law and order within it. For this reason, the Police Force,an agency of the state responsible for maintaining public order, preventing and detecting crime in close collaboration with other agencies, are created and empowered to use force where necessary for the attainment of this public goal.

However, Etanibi and Alemika (2000:10) are quick to point out that even though it appears to be the most prominent factor in police versus citizens' interactions in Nigeria, the use of forceserves only as a means to an end and is not expected to be the defining mechanism of such interactions.Abasilim likewise pointed out the intimate link between policing and social justice in noting that "the police officer is expected to serve as a counselor, law enforcer, protector, arbiter and peacemaker all rolled into one" (*Daily Times*, May 30, 1995, p.19).

The Metropolitan Police established by Sir Robert Peel in 1829 to work on crime prevention is the world's first organized contemporary police force after which many other political systems across the world modeled their police forces. Its work was (and still is) guided by the belief that effectiveness in its appointed task will only be possible where they have the consent and support of the general public(Mazower, 1997:8). According to the Enabling Act, police constables were expected to be civil and courteous to members of the public, and an early operating procedure required policemen to walk in the gutter to indicate their status as servants of the public rather than masters and overlords who could act with impunity and outside the law which they are mandated to enforce.

In Nigeria, Section 4 of the Nigeria Police Act provides that the police force "shall be employed for the detection and prevention of crime, the apprehension of offenders, the preservation of law and order, the protection of life and property as well as the due enforcement of all laws and regulations with which it is directly charged." In essence, the Nigeria Police Force has a Constitutional role of maintaining peace, ensuring public safety and restoring order each and every time there is a breakdown (*Third Eye*, 24/7/96, p.6).

The history of the Police in Nigeria attest to this. The subjugation of territories within what is now known and referred to as Nigeria led to the establishment of a constabulary force for such areas (Alemika, 1993). In 1879, an armed paramilitary force (Hausa Constabulary) of 1200 men was established for Southern Protectorate and in 1894the Niger Coast Constabulary was established in Calabar; and in the Northern Protectorate, the Royal Niger Company set up a Constabulary headquartered in Lokoja in 1888. Theseconstabulary forces were merged in 1914 when Sir FrederickLugard effected the amalgamation of the Protectorates of Southern and Northern Nigeria. Later on, regional police forces were established but were disbanded in 1966 following the first military intervention (Tamuno, 1970).

The 1979 Constitution (enacted when the military was making its first exit), and the 1999 Constitution (enacted when the military was making its third exit) both prohibit the establishment of any other police force other than that established to act centrally with exclusive jurisdiction as the national police force. The key functions of the Nigeria police as spelt out under section 4 of the Police Act and Decree 23 of 1979 include:

> *... the Prevention and detection of crime, apprehension of offenders, the preservation of law and order, the protection of life and property, and due enforcement of all laws and regulations with which they are charged and...such military duties within or without Nigeria as may be required of them by, or under the authority of this and other Act.*

Under Section 214(1) of the 1999 Constitution, the provision is that:

> *There shall be a police force for Nigeria, which shall be known as the Nigeria police force, and subject to the provisions of this section no other police force shall be established for the Federation or any part thereof.*

The character of a police force reflects the social, political and economic structures of the society within which it operates (Osaghae, 2002).As an institution, the police force helps to preserve, fortify and reproduce the prevailing social order. The origin etymology and role of the police during the colonial era has, for instance, been tendered as one factor which contributed substantially to its current problems (Odekunle, 2004:26).

Thus, when the social order is oppressive, exploitative or characterized by injustice, the police unwittingly preserve it by suppressing and defusing demands for reforms. In similar fashion, in an egalitarian society where the rule of law is observed, the police serve as the vanguard for social democracy, respect for human rights and institution of socio-economic justice.Alemika is thus of the view that problems that eroded the credibility and reduced the efficiency of the police force is tied to "the rise of the military state in Nigeria where government rules by force, harassment and intimidation and the threat of imprisonment" (*The Guardian*, 5/5/94, p.5).

Misperception of the Constitutional role of the police derives from the historical legacy of making use of the police to suppress the populace by colonial and post-colonial governments (Alemika and Chukwuma, 2001:8). The extensive level of impunity condoned under colonialism (e.g. the Epe uprising of 1863, Aba women Riot and Enugu Coal Miners massacre); civilian governments (Western Regional House of Assembly in 1961, peasants in Bakolori in 1982, and the "shoot-at-sight" directive to policemen in Oyo state in 1983); and military governments (Rivers State Internal Security Task Force) under the guise of combating crime and maintaining public order have been cited as examples of how a prevailing social order impacts on policing (Tamuno, 1970; Isibor, 2000:15) and informed Onoge's observation that police violencethrives under dictatorial political systems and exploitative economic relations. This linkage was also stressed by Inspector General of Police (IGP) Musiliu Smith who noted, like Alemika, thatabuse against community members by policemen

> *is part of societal problem following the long period of military rule….The police had all the power while the military was in power* (2002).

Due to the peculiar circumstances of the Nigerian environment and the existing laws, the Nigeria police force is centralized and under the headship of an Inspector General of Police who is an appointee of the Head of State and Commander-in-Chief. Within the first two years of sovereign independence, the force came under severe criticism for being partisan, malleable and susceptible to manipulation by the political leadership which employed the institution for the harassment and intimidation of political opponents (see

Panther-Brick, 1970: 97-98; Balogun, 1973:17; Barnes, 1986:152; Dudley, 1982:89; Anifowose, 1982:243).

In an interview granted in 1994, Alhaji Ibrahim Coomasie, the then Inspector General of Police (IGP), also noted that the police institution operate under a number of dilemmas that hamper its ability to win public confidence and function effectively including, how to impose authority on the public and at the same time gain their consent and approval in enforcing laws that may be infamous or obnoxious. He adds that despite the negative publicity, the work of the police force is guided by a plethora of regulations including the African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights, the Nigerian Constitution, and the United Nations Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials (*CRP Journal*, April-June 1997). Political developmentsin the post-independence and especially the yearsunder military rule have foisted a very negative perception of the force as grossly inefficient and an institution where acts of brutality, incivility, and corruptionare rife. Issues that have eroded public confidence and sometimes become the subject of criticism and litigation include, but is not limited toalleged bias in favour of incumbent regimesduring political transitions(Olasupo, 2003:270), corruption, susceptibility to official manipulation, and an excessive reliance on force for interaction with individuals and groups(Roberts and Simbine, 2002).

Statement of the Problem

Building public confidence has been a major dilemma of policing in Nigeria. It has been difficult for the police in Nigeria to present itself as a people-oriented force, and for this reason, the police have been unable to attain the kind of functional cooperation that will enhance its performance from members of the general public. The level of citizen participation in individual and collective crime prevention is usually borne out of their fear

of the unpredictability of breakdown of law and order at the community level (Taylor and Perkins, 1996), but loss of confidence in the Nigeria Police as an institution has prevented the public from working closely with police officers and explains why some communities have resorted to self-help and vigilantism rather than rely on the official police institution(Alemika and Chukwuma, 2000). As Omotola (2007) captures the problem:

> *...Because of this bad image, there has emerged a regime of mutual suspicion, distrust and hatred between it (the police) and the people. As such, the gulf between the two gets deeper by the day, thereby frustrating the emergence of a mutually reinforcing pattern of relations between them. A major implication is that the much more information needed by the police for effective policing cannot easily be divulged to them by the people because the police have come to be seen as an evil institution that if one must be a very long spoon to avoid any form of frivolous indictment (p. 627).*

A number of subtle inhibiting factors, such as inadequate funding and a non-existent welfare package,inadequate wages, absence of a good retirement plan,shortage of men and materials, low morale, low self-esteem, a critical public that is unwilling to acknowledge positive achievements in the face of daunting odds, and dearth of critically-needed infrastructures that should facilitate mobility all militate against the full operational efficiency of the Nigeria Police Force, and have combined to foster negative perception, and eroded public confidence in the capability of policemen to perform optimally (Jike, 2004; Omotola, 2007; Guardian, 25/11/1997, P.7; Nigerian Tribune, 19/4/2004).

Barley (1992) argued that "the power of the police to fulfill their functions and duties is dependent on the approval by public of the existence, actions, and behaviour as well as their ability to secure and maintain optimum public respect." In an attempt to correct the

negative image that the police have in the eye of the public, win approval and cooperation and thereby enhance their ability to perform optimally notwithstanding the various structural and bureaucratic inhibitions that are permanently obstructing the drive for efficiency, several initiatives have been tried out by police authorities.

The attendant rapid deterioration of public safety and security, coupled with excruciation image crisis for the police in Nigeria are critical issues in the search for alternative policing model that will not only deliver adequately on its mandates, but also be result-oriented and people-driven. Such a proactive shift in orientation and focus is considered necessary in order to allow for a truly democratic, accountable and effective policing. It is, therefore, not surprising to see the Obasanjo administration declare upon the assumption of office in 1999 that police reform would be one of its primary concerns.

A critical dimension of the reform process, which is the primary focus of this study, relates to the introduction of the model of community policing in 2004.

The decision to implement the community policing initiative in Nigeria is part of ongoing attempts to reform policing procedures and to that extent, very little has been done by way of research in that area. It is also noteworthy that very little mention has been made of its workings and the possibility of its success given the peculiar circumstances of the political environment in Nigeria.

Rationale of the Present Study

This study is a pioneering work on a contemporary challenge of law enforcement and collaborative joint problem solving focused on the recently-introduced community policing initiative in Nigeria. For this reason, a conflict management approach will not only be unique, it will help us to preempt and deal with the existing pitfalls and structural challenges

that may hinder future expansion and success of the model in Nigeria. Secondly, by interrogating and highlighting the key issues that forced recent attempts to mainstream confidence building and preventive rather than reactive policing into our security sector reforms, this study stands a good chance of informing future policy decisions on community policing in particular and security sector reform in Nigeria in general.

Aim and Objectives of the Research

The aim of the study is to critically interrogate the adoption ofcommunity policing initiative in Nigeria, underscoring its motivations,accomplishments, problems and prospects as well as the way forward.Specifically, however, the study seeks to:

1.   Understand the motivations for the introduction of community policing in Nigeria

2.   Identify the challenges and problems of effective implementation of community policing in Nigeria

3.   Determine the extent to which community policing initiative has impacted the police force and policing practice in Nigeria

4.   Interrogate the prospect of sustainable community policing in Nigeria

Research Questions

1.   What were the motivations for the introduction of community policing in Nigeria?

2.   What challenges and problems confront the effective implementation of community policing in Nigeria?

3.   How has the community policing initiative impacted the police force and policing practice in Nigeria?

4.   What is the prospect of sustainable community policing in Nigeria?

Significance of the Study

This study is significant in a number of ways. Despite the existence of some studies on police and policing in Nigeria, albeit insufficiently, no systematic attempt has been made hitherto to explore the emerging trend of community policing in Nigeria. By exploring a relatively new field of study, the study contributes theoretically to the understanding of community policing in general and in Nigeria in particular.

The study also has empirical significance given its adoption of survey research methods through extensive fieldwork. This allows for comparison between the performance level of community policing and the traditional (reactive) police model still in operation in most states in Nigeria.

Finally, the study is also significant for its research, activism and policy implications. Researchers, civil society actors and policy makers in police and policing will not only find the work informative and useful, but will also fill other valid research, activism and policy gaps. The study can, therefore, propel further studies, activism and policy initiatives on community policing in Nigeria, especially in other states where it has not been introduced.

Conceptual Definition:Community Policing

The main concept that the researcher will need to define is '*Community Policing*'. In brief, the goal and processes of community policing are designed to engender stable, healthy and secure neighborhoods. It also seeks to involve all stakeholders (community members, community development agencies, and police officers) in efforts to improve the quality of life. In terms of process, police departments work in close collaboration with host communities to develop strategies for improving the quality of life and reduce both the fear of crime and its incidence. While the police officers involved in these programs are expected

to become community problem-solvers by identifying the full range of problems experienced by community residents and working with their leadership to develop strategies for addressing such problems; community members and leaders are expected to facilitate the intervention of local, public and nonprofit stakeholders to support such strategies.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Framework

Police is a unit of armed forces established for the main purpose of maintaining law and order. It is a department of government that is charged with the preservation of public order and security, enforcement of laws, the promotion of public wellbeing, safety and morals; the prevention, detection and indictment/prosecution of offenders. Although concepts of *police* and *policing* are used interchangeably in everyday usage, they seldom mean the same thing. While the essential role of the police being policing, policing as a

public responsibility is not a sole responsibility of the police. On the other hand, not all those assigned with policing responsibility belong to the police organization.

Policing has to do with securing compliance with existing laws and congruity with statutes of social order. This critical task has always been essential in all societies for the safeguarding of order, safety and social relations. The necessity is even more obvious in modern societies that are characterized by diversities and logical inconsistencies in areas ofheterogeneity of population, urbanization, industrialization, clashing belief systems on appropriate socio-political and economic form of organization (Alemika&Chukwuma, 2005).

Community policing, on the other hand,is a reasoning that advances the precise utilization of associations and critical thinking systems to proactively address conditions that offer ascent to open security issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of wrongdoing or crime (President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing, 2015). This explains why community policing was defined as having the tendency of"bringing police and citizens together to forestall crime and solve problems, emphasizing the prevention of crime instead of the customary policing technique for reacting to crime after it happens" (Tillman, 2000:1).

In essence, community policing involves collaboration characterized by problem-solving partnerships between police and community members focused on enhancing public safety. Community policing was thus widely adopted among law enforcement agencies with a view to improving functional collaboration between community members and police, while utilizing police assets through willful help by community members in public safety measures (COP Office, 2008).

Theoretical Framework

This study will explore a number of theories that are relevant to the practice of community policing. These will form the plank on which the modeling of community policing practice in the three pilot states under review will be tested for relevance. The frameworks are: Incivilities Theoryand Policing Theory.

Incivilities Theory

According to this framework, conditionsof disorder or physical and social "incivility," symbolize not justanevidence of apparent neglect of the community but additionally, an underlying breakdown in both local norms of behavior and formal and informal social controls (Lewis and Salem, 1985; Taylor and Shumaker, 1990). While social incivilities are problems such as the menace of 'area boys', "one-chance" robbery schemes, and the 'almajiri' phenomenon associated with certain areas or districts or neighbourhoods within a political community such as southwest and northern Nigeria;physical incivilities include such environmental stimuli as slums, vacant or dilapidated housing, abandoned vehicles, and 'red-light' districts that constitute security black spots.

Researchers have expanded this model from its previously restricted usage by adding a longitudinal perspectivein suggesting that increases in social and/or physical signs of incivility might not only inspire fear within communities, but might also contribute to feelings of insecurity and neighborhood decline. They argue further that if incivilities are not dealt with promptly and effectively, residents perceive more social problems in the locality and lose confidence in their law enforcement agency's ability to prevent or control open displays of disorder and serious crime.

The theory suggests that as feelings of insecurity and avoidance behaviors increase, informal social controls systems weaken, opportunistic behaviour as dimensions of incivilities multiply, habitual and potential offenders are emboldened to prey on other members of the community, the community becomes a crime haven as criminals from other areas are attracted to it, and the downward spiral or decline of law and order becomes self-reinforcing (Skogan, 1990). According to security analysts, this broader theory of disorder has, for some years, strongly influenced adoption of and policy changes in community policing and community crime prevention (Greene and Taylor, 1988; Wilson andKelling, 1982).

Policing Theory

According to policing theory, three principles distinguish community-oriented policing from traditional policing: shared responsibility for community safety, crime prevention, and officer discretion in the performance of police duties. Unlike traditional policing philosophy, which places sole responsibility for maintenance of public order in the hands of the police force and other official law enforcement agencies, community policing philosophy stresses that the responsibility for the maintenance of law and order in a community must be collectively shared by both the police and members of that community. Such shared responsibility requiresregular and persistent communication as essential ingredients for building mutual trust and cooperation between community residents and policemen working in their community.

Whereas traditional policing largely involves responding and reacting to calls for service once a crime has been committed, community policing includes joint efforts at identifying the underlying driversof crime and taking dedicated steps to alter such

conditions. As a problem-solving orientation that typically involves collaboration between policemen, community members, and other public and civil society organizations in the development and implementation of community development programmes, community policing stresses a preventive, rather than reactive orientation. Operationally, this means policemen have to acquire new skills and orientation that are slightly at variance with the basic policing procedure training that police colleges scattered across the country provide at entry points.

In addition, community policing theoristsare of the view that for optimal results that increase security of life and property, community leaders and membershave to become more actively involved in crime prevention through crime reporting, provision of timely intelligence on the activities of criminals and miscreants, as well as organizing neighbourhood watch or vigilante groups with the active involvement of the police formation. Shared responsibility also requires policemen to respond to problems that community members identify as important. Police officers have to be given the opportunity to attend community meetingsand establish informal interactions with community residents. It also means that officers are assigned 'permanent' beats so that they can integrate with the community that they serve.

Finally, the community policing philosophy stresses increased use of discretionary powers over their modus operandiin line with the need to be responsive to community concerns and build community confidence. Rather than recourse to standard operating procedures as contained in the Police Act, they have to be given enoughslack to handle problems in a way they believe will be most effective. Officers would therefore need a high degree of creativity in the process of addressingproblems within the community. It is evident

that such changes in procedure require a high degree of decentralization of the police command structure.

Transformation Theory

Community policing assumes that its logic includes theories of change that follow the assumption that changes in the attitudes, perception and behavioral disposition of Police officers are important mechanisms through which the Police as an institution is able to improve their performance for effective and efficient service delivery. Specifically, it is expected that new initiatives in training, re-orientation, rewarding performance will not only change what Skolnick (1966) described as the "occupational subculture" of policing, but also make a difference in policemen's attitudes and behaviours towards their work and host communities.

Transformational theory applies the logic of the "Human Relations School" in private sector management which postulates that good supervision, cohesive work groups, opportunity to get involved in challenging tasks that allows for improvement in skills, and good employer-employee relations that allow participation in decision-making processes are keys to effective job performance. In line with this position, Rosenbaum et al (1994:333) propose that policemen will be motivated to perform optimally when their individual needs for independence, recognition, responsibility, challenge, accomplishment, participation, compensation and others are met by the Police organization.

This assumes that employees' needs are met as soon as Police organizations allow their "men" the freedom to "think outside the box", without fear of negative sanctions for going outside "Standard Operating Procedures", and when they have the needed support for professional development. Thus, in the estimation of Transformation theory, policemen are

likely to change their attitude positively when their operational environment is friendly and encourage the taking of initiatives. Although this is what community policing preaches, there appears to be very little evidence that this is found 'developed societies', talk less of "transitional societies".

Literature Review

Community Policing

Although a relatively new idea in Nigeria, there is a large body of literature on community policing in diverse parts of the world (Greene and Mastrofski, 1988; Rosenbaum, 1994; Lurigio and Skogan, 1988; Skogan and Hartnett, 1997). According to Bayley and Shearing (1996), two developments are responsible for recent moves towards reform of the traditional approach to policing: the pluralizing of policing globally and the search by police authorities for an appropriate role that will mirror acceptable conduct by police officers in the new democratic dispensation that globalization is imposing on all societies.

According to Abiri (2011), adopting this proactive approach were part of efforts to build police organizations that are transparent, reasonable, unbiased,accountable and responsive to public perceptions and expectations.It also showed dissatisfaction with traditional policing that is exclusively based on reactive law enforcement. For Bucqueroux(2006, as cited in Coquilhat, 2008), however, latentfactors that triggered the emergence of community policing. Are traceable to two unintended consequences of a modernizing policing profession, namely: technology which changed the relationships between the police and the community; andthe application of scientific management to

policing, which created the perception that the police were responsible for keeping the community safe.

Disagreement among scholars and practitioners is not constrained to finding an exact definition. Community policing is alsovariously referred to as community-oriented policing, community-based policing, or problem oriented policing (Leighton, 1991), and is currently presented as "modern" and "progressive"policing (Greene and Mastrofski, 1988). It has become a major hallmark of contemporarypolicing reforms among North American police divisions and Maguire and Wells (2002) have described it as "the most significant era in police organizational change since the introduction of the telephone, vehicle, and two way radio."

Despitearguments to the contrary, these works prove that law and order policing is no longer the exclusive preserve of the police because vigilante and neighbourhood watch systems are fast gaining prominence and are being openly courted by police commands even in Nigeria (Chukwuma, 2000). Aspublic institutions, police forces all over the world are going through a phase of self-evaluation of effectiveness or efficiency in crime control, as well as every aspect of their performance—objectives, strategies, organization, management, discipline, and accountability.

In their study of the working of community policing in two communities—Asheville and Greensboro—in the American State of North Carolina,Rohe, Adams and Arcury (2001) built on an earlier study in 1996 to provide a significant insight into the potential benefits of collaborative problem-solving between community police officers and planners, and illuminated the differencebetween community policing andconventional policing. The studyhighlightedthe forms of collaborations that planners and community police officers had

in both cities andmade a number of suggestions on how community development planners could establish collaborative relationships with police officers.

In their conclusion, they note that although the transition from conventional to community policing is often accompanied by some degree of dissension within police formations because officers often find themselves struggling with the new demands that comes with this transition, the benefits of cooperation, including reduced crime and fear of crime and engagement of local residents in revitalization efforts through what Gittel and Vidal (1998) described as "opportunity-oriented organizing,"are far too significant to discouragethose who are committed tothe goal of improving the quality of life in communities.

Some research on community policing practice indicated unwavering disparities in participation rates. Wesley Skogan's review of Houston, Chicago and Minneapolis' community policing programmes (1990), confirmedthe findings of an earlier study by Jerome Skolnick and David Bayley (1986) which focused on the degree of acceptance and participation among social and racial groups. Both studies concluded that in majority of cases analyzed, the initial structuringof community policing favored, and was widely supported by racially dominant groups, whites and higher income, long-term residents of single family homes and established interests, while minority groups benefited the least and were less supportive.

A more recent study by Forman (2004) focused on a form of social exclusion in noting that young people are not likely to be part of decision-making processes where community policing priorities are set.Asa group most likely to engage in criminal conduct, to be victims of crime, and to be targeted by police;exclusion of youths fromthe planning

process of this model of policing,and viewing them as targets of policing rather than as assets to it,has tremendous implicationsfor public safety. In his estimation, security within communitiesdepends largely on the attitude and disposition of youths to the law and its enforcement.Treatingyouths as threats to public order in line with what he called "the discredited warrior approach to policing", by habouringapreconception that they are anarchistic in disposition, creates and reinforces attitudes of hostility and opposition and make collaboration with law enforcement agents less likely.

Studies by Bergman and McLaughlin (1994), Rosenbaum (1994), Maguire (1997), Morash and Ford (2002), and Reed (1999)all focused on the diverse forms of cultural and structural transformation that the implementation of community policing forces on police organizations. They conclude that: not only does the model force a new orientation of policing on an institution that is previously disposed to Forman's "warrior approach" to policing, it also creates an accompanying necessity for reorientation of policemen from a strictly law and order temperament to a community problem-solver temperament (Comey et al, 1999).

This new orientation, according to Jackson (1989) makes it easier for minority groups to share ownership and responsibility for law enforcement; overcome structural exclusion (Forman, 2004);and deal with conflicting structural, social and class values (Thracher, 2001).It will help members of the public to readily acknowledge that the police is indeed their 'friend' (Alemika and Chukwuma, 2004) and that the new slogan "To Serve and Protect with Integrity" is not just another 'catch phrase' that lacks substance and commitment on the part of the police high command.

Mike Brogden's "*Commentary: Community Policing: A Panacea from the West*" (2004) represents one of the growing critiques of wholesale application of community policing models as practiced in Europe and the United States in Africa and South Asia. Drawing copiously from earlier critiques of community policing experiments in South Africa (Scharf, 2000) and Kenya (Ruteere and Pommerolle, 2003), both of which drew the conclusion that, all said, the scheme has little operational relevance to the local contexts; reinforced social inequalities; and that claims that claims of successful implementation as problem-solving initiatives are, in fact, false. Ruteere and Pommerollenoted in the case of Kenya that instead of promoting democratic practices, it has served instead to "strengthen undemocratic and oppressive structures".

Brogden'swork focuses on donor assistance to community policing from the US (training of specialist law enforcement), Dutch (youth justice), British (COP training programme in four South African Provinces), Belgian(a five-year police-restructuring programme covering community policing, public order policing, and organized crime), Danish (training, printing and distribution of community policing information booklets), Swedish (human rights and democracy training, design of model police stations in South Africa), French, German, Canadian (marshalls' training programme) governments and their development agencies as well as multilateral organizations like the Commonwealth, EU, UN and even NGOs argues that their bid to support security sector reforms by exporting policing techniques to 'transitional societies' is driven by a combination of donor interest than customer demand.

Brogden is of the view that the idea of community policing is increasingly being sold to societies in transition across the world as a solution to complex local issue but that almost

without exception, these schemes have reinforced social inequalities by assisting paramilitarypolicing agencies in co-opting local business and political elites. He acknowledged that even though an earlier study by Call and Barnett (1999) had called attention to the dangers of trying to transplantthe model without considerationfor local traditions and peculiarities, they erroneously assumed that it is flexible enough tosurmount such impediments.

A review done by Rosenbaum (2001) in two Police Departments in two American cities that introduced major reform activities to "retool" their officers to think and act in manners consistent with the basic tenets of community policing showed that though hypothesized changes were observed in problem solving and attitudinal disposition of Police officers over six years (1991-1997).The overall results show very little change across a wide variety of other measures and confirmed the position of Mastrofski(1998) and Green (2000) that:thoughsensible,the goals of community policing stands little chance of success without a will to follow-up with the appropriate organizational and administrative changes that will sustain it., including decentralization and retraining. He noted that evidence on the
ground shows that too often, cosmetic rather than needed changes are introduced as part of impression management scheme to draw public support.

Approaches to Community Policing

Basically, there are three basic approaches to community policing, namely: community partnerships, organizational transformation, and problem-solving. These approaches will be explained one after the other.

i.   **Community Partnerships Approach:**Involves development

of collaborative partnerships between the police and the individuals and communities that they serve to develop solutions to problems and increase trust in police (Chene, 2012). For instance, in the Final Report of the *Presidential Task Force on 21st Century Policing*(2015), it wasobserved that: community policingrequires the active building of positive relationships withmembers of the community-on an agency as well as on a personal basis. This canbeachieved by assigning officers to various geographic areas on a consistent basis, sothat through the continuity of assignment, they have the opportunity to intimate themselves withthemembers of the community (P.42).

Similarly, Schanzer*etal.(*2016) opined that policing agencies (e.g., NPF, Customs, SSS, NDLEA, Immigrations, etc.) will find it extremely difficult when it comes toestablishing and formalising partnerships in their bid to fulfil their crime-fightingmandates until they establish trusting and symbiotic relationships with the communities that they serve. The community policing strategies employed under a community partnership model includecommunity assessments and engagement; as well as efforts to educate members of the public, private,and non-profit communities. The strength of this approach is the immense and unquantifiable value of actionable information that they will be able to gatherfrom residents and other stakeholders about the key issues that createsecurity concerns within the community that canhelp the police to design strategiesthat will be best suited to addressingsuch local concerns.

ii. **Organizational Transformation Approach:**Understanding the dynamic process of organisational transformation and establishing the critical success factors needed for

achieving change is of practical value for those who steer the ship of any large organisations faced with the need to adapt to radical changes.The organizational transformation approach to community policing, therefore,involves the alignment of police structure,management, personnel and information systems to support partnershipsandcollaborative/proactive problem-solving inlocal communities (Chene, 2012). To do this, the Force (NPF) needs to break with the past, manage the present and invest in the future.

iii. **Problem-solving approach:**Problemsolvingcomprises the using of generic or specific methods for finding solutions to problems in an orderly manner. Problems can be classified into two distinct types (ill-defined and well-defined) for which appropriate solutions are to be sought. Ill-defined problems are those that have noclear goals, solution paths, or expected solution. On the other hand, problems which are well-defined have specific goals, clearly defined solution paths, clear expected solutions and gives room for initial planning than ill-defined problems (Schacter, 2009: 37).

Being able to solve problems in some instances involves dealing with pragmatics (logic) and semantics (interpretation of the problem).The ability to understand what the nature of a problem is and what strategies could be applied represent the key to solving the problem, because a problem sometimes requires some abstract thinking and coming up with a creative solution (Robertson, 2001).

In the context of community policing,problem-solving has to do with the process of undertaking proactive andmethodical examination of problems being identified in a bid to develop and meticulously evaluate effectiveresponses. Problem solving is hence a new way

of policing which aims to address not only the causes of crime andthe fear of such crime but all issues with regards quality of life in the community.

Community Policing in Nigeria

Community policing is a philosophy that started many decades back in the United Kingdom and United States, but did not evolveuntil 2004 in Nigeria. This strategy has been integrated into modern policing to enable the police respond to democratic system of governance.In most developed countries, the Police have unearthed the fact that crime control tactics needs to be augmented with strategiesofcommunity policing that both prevents crime and reduces the fear of crime in neighbourhoods. Fear of crime is a significant social problem in itself.

According to Fielding (1996, cited in Wright, 2002), there are three models that generally characterize policing work. These include: *the enforcement model*, which principally focus on the police work ofcrime control and law enforcement;*the service model*which sets policing priorities for dealing with crime control, ordering maintenance and service delivery in consultations with the public; and*the community model*, which gives utmost priority to maintaining public placidity over crime control. The philosophy here is that the police and the public have joint responsibility for keeping their society safe.

Community policing was hence adopted widely among law enforcement agencies in the early and late 1990s, with a view toimprove trust between community members and police on one hand, and leveraging police resources through voluntary support by community members in public safety measures (Schanzer, Kurzman, Toliver, & Miller, 2016). Under the scheme, the police no longer serve as the sole custodian of law and order;

rather, community members become allies who work together to improve safety in the community.

A key attraction of the model for IGP Ehindero is that this kind of policing is characterized by the notion of "police service" under the service model and not "police force" or enforcement model or outlook, where the most significant bench marks of performance are public satisfaction, trust and confidence. He therefore altered the "Fire for Fire" slogan of his predecessor,replacing it with the new slogan: "To Serve and Protect with Integrity".The essence, is constructive engagement with people who are the end users of the services rendered by thepolice thus making the community co-producers of both justice and a quality police service (Yusuf, 2007). Doing so, offers a way for the police and the community to work hand-in-hand in resolving problems within the community (Okiro 2007).

Given the multitude of challenges and constraints that have adversely affected police image and police-community relations in Nigeria, the need to reconnect the police with the people they serve necessitated the introduction of the concept of community policing as a cardinal initiative in the evolving police reform agenda since the transition to democracy (Abiri, 2011).By getting community members involved, the Nigeria Police is expected to have more resources available for crime prevention activities instead of being forced into the reactive response to crime management and public safety that is commonly seen across Nigeria.

As earlier indicated,community policing entails close collaboration between the Police and community members through which they jointly identify security challenges in

the neighbourhood or communities and proffer workable solutions or strategies forcombatting them.

Compared with traditional policing method that sees security planning and implementation as the exclusive role of police officials, community policing offers anopportunity for Police officers and community members to jointly define the problem and work together to resolve problems so identified in their communities.

Under the system, the police could have regular interactive forums similar to a village townhall meeting with members of the local community. This would provide them the opportunity to hear directly from the community and also for them to discuss directly with members of the community. In addition, this serves as an opportunity for confidence building in the activities of the police.

In essence, some of the features that recommended community policing as a new framework of policing in Nigeria rested on the fact that provides expanded outlook on crime control and prevention. While, crime control and prevention remains the central priority to both, the NPF and community stakeholderswere expected to collaborate in addressing the problem of crimes and general insecurity, disorders and criminality like oil bunkering in the Niger Delta and the Boko Haram insurgency.

At a second level, the NPF high command laid a new emphasis on making community members active participants in the process of managing security challenges within their community. The partnership between the Police and community members, going forward, willtherefore hinged on co-dependence, mutual trust and confidence.The NPF high command also understood that: for that kind of good working condition to be created, the police need to be polite, friendly, honest, approachable, law abiding and

demonstrate a high sense of responsibility in dealing with members of the public while discharging their duties. The belief is that as the link between the Police and community members is strengthened, the partnership will be duly able to pinpoint and adequately mitigate the underlying cause(s) of crime.

Policing challenges in Nigeria led to the search for a new approach to engagement—aparadigm shift that seeks to concentration on constructive engagement with people who are the end users of the police service(s) thereby making the community co-producers ofjustice and a quality police service (Okeshola&Mudiare, 2013). Kappeler& Gaines (2009) highlighted the potential gains of community policing when they averred that:

> *(community policing) is a dramatic change in the philosophy that determines the way police agencies engage the public. It incorporates a philosophy that broadens the police mission from a narrow focus on crime and law enforcement to a mandate encouraging the exploration of creative solutions for a host of community concerns-including crime, fear of crime, perceptions of disorder, quality of life and neighborhood conditions* (p. 1).

An obvious prospect of community policing, as posited byCoquilhat (2008), is that it offers a larger window into police activity and provides opportunities for 'grassroots' support for police to the public.

Coquilhat notes, however, that even though communities with existing local capacity in security management are more likely to participate in community policing, they are, paradoxically, less likely to benefit from it becausethey are already proactively addressing issues that increase community safety. Okeshola&Mudiare (2012) similarly argued that, adopting community policing in Nigeria presumes that it will foster better communication and understanding between

the NPF and members of the public. As Cheurprakobkit (2008) noted, confidence building is essential because without trust and respect, police-citizen cooperation and information sharing through partnerships are unlikely to consolidated.

Gaps in Knowledge

The Nigerian society became weary of normal practice of policing and its old monotonous ways. The police remain to many members of the society, an unfriendly, distrusted group and therefore not properly qualified to secure local communities. Agitation for a participatory and people-friendly policing eventually forced the search for new strategies. What readily came to the minds of the proponents of a new policing regime is that the two components—Policeand Community—mustbe welded together. The result is the coinage: Community Policing – a police that will belong to and serve the people with the ultimate goal of securing lives and property in communities.

However, in as much as community policing is desirable and capable of providing the much-needed advancement in police versus public relationships, little attention had actually been paid to the problems that face the orthodox policing as it is practiced in Nigeria.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Humans engage in reasoning in order to acquire knowledge: through acquaintance; description; revelation; intuition; tenacity; authority; the senses or empirical engagement; and reasoning (Babarinde, 2006:20-26).

Research Design

A research design is conceptualized as the domain of generalizability, that is, whether they obtained interpretations that can be generalized to a larger population or to different situations (Frankfort-Nachmias and Nachmias, 1992). It is the programme serves to guide the researcher in data collection, data analysis and interpretation of the data collected.

For effective data collection, a mixture of descriptive, survey and case study designs will be used. A survey gets information from a sample of people by means of self-report, that is, the people respond to a succession of questions posed by the investigator, while interviews are conversations between two people with the ultimate objective of collecting relevant information for the purpose of research. The descriptive survey design is chosen to meet the objectives of the study.

This study is a descriptive cross-sectional survey, yet, empirical to the extent that the stated rationale for community policing as a specific case study was carefully weighed against the pre-existing framework of policing, and the process of the implementation of the initiative. In order to fulfill the need for scientific objectivity, the research methodology involved the use of several types of data collection techniques that do not easily lend themselves to manipulation such as questionnaire and focus group discussions.

Recent research in community development suggests that on-site observations of communal living may help us understand perceptions of crime and related community problems. But these studies are limited in several ways, even if we focus on the set of studies including on-site observations and residents' perceptions of disorder.

Study Population

The population of the study is the Nigeria Police. The study itself was primarily concerned with the challenges, problems and prospects of community policing in Nigeria. This is a complex and very elaborate subject that encompasses several institutional and non-institutional actors in government circles at various levels, the federal, state and local governments, police formations and units, civil society organizations and NGOs, communities and donor states/agencies.

The population of the study comprisedmultiple stakeholders who were involved at one level or the other in the introduction, planning, execution, evaluation and improvement of community policing in Nigeria, especially in the pilot states of Enugu and Ogun and Kaduna.

The Study Areas: Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun States

The study is about the challenges, problems and prospects of implementing community policing in Nigeria. For in-depth analysis, however, the focus is on three purposively selected cases, namely Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun states. In this section, the study gives a brief historical and geographical background of these states.

Enugu State

Enugu State is one of the States of the Southeastgeopolitical zone of Nigeria. Enugu is the old capital of the Eastern Region and is regarded as a major town of the lgbo and other ethnic groups that made up the defunct Eastern Region of Nigeria.

Kaduna State

Kaduna State is one of the States in the Northwest geopolitical zone of Nigeria. Its capital city is the seat of many political social and financial and educational institutions. It also harbors most of the educated elites in the Northern part of the country. Accordingto the 2006 census, which puts its population at 6,113,503 people,Kaduna State is the third most populous State in Nigeria.

Ogun State

Ogun State is located in the Southwest geo-political zone of Nigeria. Ogun State may not fit into same category as the two States mentioned above because it is much younger and of recent creation. However, the capital Abeokuta, is regarded as the cradle of early civilization by virtue of the fact that it was one of the first port of call for the early missionaries. It therefore became one of the first beneficiaries of western education and the attendant benefits.

The three States that are the focus of this study, therefore, perfectly serve the purpose for which they were picked for the Community Policing pilot implementation.

Characteristic of the Study Population

The sample population was drawn from the three States under investigation, namely: Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun. In each of these States, a total of 300 questionnaires were

administered to stakeholders in community policing as identified above, making a total of 900 questionnaires. Of these, a total of 761 were retrieved and analysed, amounting to a general response rate of 84.55%.

The breakdown by state is as follows: Enugu 246; Kaduna 239; and Ogun 276. This gives a fairly high response rate of 83%, 79.66% and 92% for Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun states, respectively. A careful analysis of the returned questionnaires indicates some interesting characteristics about the sample population. This is tabulated in table 1 below.

Table 1: Characteristics of Study Population

Description	Enugu State	Kaduna State	Ogun State	Total/Percentage
TNQ	246 (83%)	239 (79.66%)	276 (92%)	761 (84.55%)
Sex				
Male	161 (65.44%)	172 (71.96%)	179 (64.85%)	512 (67.27%)
Female	85 (34.55%)	67 (28.03%)	97 (35.14%)	249 (32.72%)
Total	246 (100%)	239 (100%)	276 (100%)	761 (100%)
Education				
Primary	62 (25.20%)	63 (26.35%)	43 (15.57%)	168 (22.07%)
Secondary	95 (38.61%)	97 (40.58%)	79 (28.62%)	271 (35.61%)
Post-secondary	71 (28.86%)	67 (28.03%)	149 (53.98%)	287 (37.71%)
No formal education	18 (7.31%)	12 (30.76%)	5 (1.81%)	35 (4.59%)
Total	246 (100%)	239 (100%)	276 (100%)	761 (100%)
Occupation				
Civil service	21 (8.53)	30 (12.55%)	62 (22.46%)	113 (14.84%)
Business/Trading	59)23.98%)	38 (15.89%)	41 (14.85%)	138 (18.13%)
Transportation	28 (11.38%)	46 (19.24%)	41 (14.85%)	115 (15.11%)
Security officer	37 (15.04%)	40 (15.48%)	30 (10.86%)	107 (14.06%)
Teaching	21 (8.53%)	19 (7.94%)	25 (9.05%)	65 (8.54%)
Student	21 (8.53%)	23 (9.62%)	30 (10.86%)	69 (9.06%)
NGO work	21 (8.53%)	23 (9.62%)	25 (9.05%)	69 (9.06%)
Artisan	15 (6.09%)	10 (4.18%)	10 (3.62%)	35 (4.59%)
Others	23)88.46%)	10 (4.18%)	12 (.34%)	45 (5.91%)
Total	246 (100%)	239 (100%)	276 (100%)	761 (100%)

Source:ResearchersFieldwork data 2013/14

As table 1 above indicates, the gender breakdown of respondents at the general level is as follows: 512 (67.27%) male and 249 (32.72%) female. When split into the various cases examined, the table shows that there were 161 (65.44%), 172 (71.96%), and 179 (64.85%) male for Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun states, respectively.

The breakdown of female respondents by states, however, reveals that there were 85 (34.55%), 67 (28.03%) and 97 (35. 14%), for Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun states, respectively. Generally, this indicates a deliberate attempt by the researcher to reflect some degree of gender balance in the administration of questionnaires. Despite variations in the gender characteristics of respondents, which tilted in favour of the male population, at least the 30% threshold set by the Beijing Conference, which has since become the standard of evaluation, was attained in the three states except Kaduna, where the female respondents constituted 28.03%. This may be as a result of inhibitions occasioned bywidespreadpracticesofIslam in the State than the other two. Even at that, there was 32.73% female representation in the sample population at the general level.

In terms of educational level, 168 (22.07) of the respondents had primary education, 271 (35.61%) with secondary education, 287 (37.71%) had one form of post-secondary education, including diplomas, first degree, masters and Ph.D degrees, leaving only a negligible 35 (4.59%) of the respondents without any form of formal education. This implies that on the whole, 726 (95.40%) of respondents has one form of formal education or the other. At the level of the specifics at State level, there is no much variations in the educational level of respondents. InEnugu State, 228 (92.68%), Kaduna state 227 (94.97%) and Ogun 271 (98.18%) of the respondents had formal education at various levels. There is, therefore, no State under investigation where the import of these is that the study has largely

captured the informed public that are most likely to be aware and knowledgeable about the subject of study.

Occupationally, 113 (14.84%), 138 (18.13%), 115 (15.11%), 107 (14.06%), 65 (8.54%), 69 (9.06%), 69 (9.06%), 35 (4.59%), and 45 (5.91%) of the respondents were civil servants at various levels, especially at the state and local government; business men/women/traders; transporters either as vehicle owners, drivers or motorcycle riders and/or their unions; security officers, particularly the police; teachers; students; NGO/CSO5 workers; artisans; and other categories of employment, respectively. This breakdown depicts the representation of the diverse sector of the political economy in the sample population.

This way, it was possible to get the views of the various publics on the delivery of community policing in Nigeria. It is, however, important to note that while these occupational diversities were captured in the three case studies, there were still some differences, especially with respect to the degree of representation of each occupational specialization. For instance, the proportion of civil servants in Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun State was 8.53%, 12.55%, and 22.46% respectively. For it was 23.98%, 15.89% and 14.85% in the same order. In the transport sector, it was 11.38%, 19.28, and 14.85% for Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun states, respectively. This trend seems a reflection of the strength of each of these States.

Sampling and Sample population

According to Imoisili, the principle of sampling often generally applies to the selection of relevant literature on the formation of research problem, the determination and choice of research variables as well as methodology, the selection of field respondents and ultimately in isolation of data that are directly required for the preparation of a research

report (*Imoisili, 1996:66*).Sample is a small part of anything or one of a number intended to show the quality, style or nature of the whole (specimen).

The study adopted purposeful sampling method to select its sample population, including selected case studies and respondents at all levels. The researcher adopted purposive sampling technique because of its advantage to reach the target population. In addition, purposive sampling technique was also adopted to select participants for interview and focus group discussions. On this note, the choice of the purposive sampling technique in this study is premised on the fact that, the primary data required for this study especially interview can only be provided by individuals who are well informed and possess adequate knowledge on the causes and management of ethno-religious conflicts in Nigeria. This necessitates a conscious approach in identifying such individuals.

Overall, three cases (states) were selected for in-depth study. Two of these states were pilot states in community policing, notably Enugu and Ogun states, while the third, Kaduna, was not. This allowedfor comparison between community policing states in Nigeria. The study also selected its respondents, both for in-depth interviews, FGDs and questionnaires, through purposeful sampling.

The use of purposeful sampling was informed by a number of reasons. The first was to ensure the inclusion of states set aside by the police high command as pilot states to experiment with the community policing initiative. The second is to enable the researcher include those identified as key informants, including top police officers, civil society actors in the security sector and notable figures in community/local policing arrangements in the sample population. Finally, this procedure not only helps to save time, but also serves to

avoid the complexities associated with probability sampling such as simple random sampling.

Purposeful sampling method was used to select the three statesthat were studied and the Police Divisions where the pilot programme was being experimented in each of the three states studied. This was necessary to ensure the inclusion of three pilot states. It was also important because there was need for comparison between pilot states and those operating community policing but not part of the original pilots. Purposeful sampling was also used to select key informants in the sample population chiefly because their involvement at one level or the other is well established.

Sources of Data

The study utilised both primary and secondary sources of data collection. Data from these sources served mainly to provide insights into the data derived through the primary sources. Materialsfrom secondary sources also served to address some of the questions that have to do with conceptual and thematic issues.

Method of Data Collection

The study explored both primary and secondary instruments of data collection. Primary data were collected via the use of unstructured interviews, Focus Group Discussions (FGDs), the administration of two sets of self-structured questionnaires and the cumulative experience/observation of the researcher as a participant observer, as a senior police officer in Nigeria for years. Key informant interviews were conducted with a wide variety of police officials, development agencies, Community Policing Affairs Commissioners, police

officers, corporate organizations, Police Community Relations Committee (PCRC) officials and other civil society actors.

FGDs were conducted with Divisional Police Officers (DPOs) of Divisions engaged with community policing in the three states. Moreover, through the administration of questionnaires, a survey of police officers was also conducted in each state covered by the study. This was designed to assess level of performance and support for community policing among police officers.

The same questionnaires were administered to a purposefully selected sample of residents in the jurisdictional areas of community policing of each of the stats surveyed by the researcher. The in-person survey was designed to assess residents' knowledge of and participation in existing community policing programmes, satisfaction with police performance, specific components of fear of crime, and perceptions of social transformation that may have resulted from the new initiative.

Specifically, a total of 18 officers involved in community policing, including a Deputy Inspector General of Police (DIG) and an Assistant Commissioner of Police in charge of Community Policing at the Force Headquarters, Abuja, and the Five Divisional Police Officers (DPOs) in the Divisions operating community policing in each of the three states covered by the study, were interviewed.

A total of six FGDs were conducted, two in each of the three states. Three of these were with the DPOs in charge of community policing in each of the three states of investigation and the other three with selected participants in community policing in one way or the other, including vigilante groups, traders and police officers. In each of these FGDs where the researcher provided the lead, there were at least five participants.

Finally, a total of 900 questionnaires were administered to selected respondents in the three states, 300 apiece. However, a total of 246 (83.00%), 239 (79.66%) and 276 (92.00%) of the questionnaires were retrieved and analyzed from Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun states respectively. This gives a total response rate of 761 (84.55%) across the three states. Secondary data werecollected from publications such as books, journals, official publications and reports, magazines, newspapers and the Internet. These data complement those gathered through field work in a way to help to confirm or refute existing perspectives on community policing in Nigeria.

Method of Data Analysis

Data analysis was mainly descriptive and predicated upon content analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data gathered from the field. Evaluation of the surveys was guided by three important criteria, namely, effectiveness, responsiveness and efficiency. Effectiveness was measured in terms of the attainment of goals. Responsiveness is determined by satisfaction of community members—Inthis case, the people's perception of police performance in all ramifications, including security of lives and properties. Efficiency, however, had to do with effective utilization of available resources to get optimum results.

The study was also evaluative, gauging whether community policing in Nigeria has been implemented effectively, responsively and efficiently to the satisfaction of the police and the people.Evaluation cannot be carried out in a vacuum. Without clearly defined criteria, evaluating any given policy or programme may not be anything more than a subjective exercise in futility. In order to avoid such a pitfall in this study, the evaluation of the performance of community policing in Nigeria was guided by three important criteria,

namely, effectiveness, responsiveness and efficiency (Ostrom, et al, 1979). Effectiveness is measured in terms of the attainment of goals. Responsiveness is determined by consumer satisfaction, in this case the people's perception of police performance in all ramifications, including security of lives and property. Efficiency, however, has to do with effective utilization of available resources to get optimum results, that, is greater effectiveness.

These criteria resonate with the three standard evaluation methods, which available comparative literature on programme evaluation have identified. These are goal-based evaluation, process-based evaluation and outcome-based evaluation (McNamara, 2008). While goal-based evaluation evaluates the extent to which programmes satisfied predetermined goals or objectives, process-based evaluation is aimed at fully understanding how a programme works, that is, how it produces the results that it does.

An outcome-based evaluation, however, engages crucial questions of whether the organization is really doing the right programme activities to bring about the desired outcomes by all stakeholders. Outcomes are benefits to clients from participation in the programme, which manifest usually in terms of enhanced learning (knowledge, perceptions/attitudes or skills) or conditions, e.g., increased peaceful resolution of disputes, human security approach to peace-building, self-relianceand so on.

Though often confused with programme outputs or units of services, e.g., the number of clients who went through a programme, outcome basically has to do with impact analysis. By implication, the goal-based, process-based and outcome-based frameworks of evaluation are coterminous with the criteria of effectiveness, responsiveness and efficiency.

The study, therefore, adopted a combination of these approaches/criteria of evaluating community policing in Nigeria, using the qualitative and quantitative data generated during the researcher's fieldwork and other relevant documents.

Scope of the Study

This study focused on the implementation and impacts of community policing in three states in Nigeria (Enugu, Ogun and Plateau) under various IGPs who publicly acknowledged the necessity of the community policing model between the time of its inception in 2002 and year 2012. These states are chosen in the first place because they constitute the pilot states for community policing programs in Nigerian; and secondly, they could be said to be fairly representative of the geopolitical zones of Nigeria with one state each in east, west and northern Nigeria.

This study is a critical assessment of the implementation of community policing in Nigeria, with emphasis on its challenges, problems and prospects. The basic criteria of evaluation are the effectiveness, responsiveness and efficiency of the programme (Ostrom, et al, 1979). Effectiveness is measured in terms of the attainment of goals. Responsiveness is determined by consumer satisfaction, in this case the people's perception of police performance in all ramifications, including security of lives and properties. Efficiency, however, has to do with effective utilization of available resources to get optimum results.

These measuring criteria resonate with the three standard evaluation methods, as identified in the available comparative literature on programme evaluation. These are goal-based evaluation, process-based evaluation and outcome-based evaluation (McNamara, 2008). While goal-based evaluation evaluates the extent to which programmes satisfied

predetermined goals or objectives, process-based evaluation is aimed at fully understanding how a programme works, that is, how it produces the results that it does. An outcome- based evaluation, however, engages crucial questions of whether the organisation is really doing the right programme activities to bring about the desired outcome by all stakeholders. Outcomes are benefits to clients from participation in the programme, which manifest usually in terms of enhanced learning (knowledge, perceptions/attitudes or skills), or conditions, for example, improved security of and property and reduction in crime rate. Though often confused with programme outputs or units of services, e.g., the number of clients who went through a programme, outcome basically has to do with impact analysis. By evaluation are coterminous with the criteria of effectiveness, responsiveness and efficiency.

This study, therefore, adopted a combination of these criteria for evaluating the delivery of community policing in Nigeria, using the qualitative and quantitative data generated during the researcher's fieldwork and other available relevant documents. Though not without its shortcoming, most notably with respect to objectivity, these criteria remain the standard test of evaluation, especially when data are sourced from representative interests and opinions, as this study attempted to do. This is why in administering the questionnaires for the study, the researcher was conscious of the need for a fairly even distribution among ethno-regional groups, as well as diverse stakeholders in community policing, including the police community, local government, PCCC, motorcycle operators, transport unions, traders, vigilantes, religious leaders, among others, so as to get representative opinions. This was why in Nigeria, for example, the questionnaires covered the six geo-political zones of the country

CHAPTER FOUR

CONTEXTS AND FRAMEWORKS OF COMMUNITY POLICING IN NIGERIA

o   Social, Political and Ethical context

o   Policy framework

o   Operational framework

o   Strategic framework

Dey defined context in a generic way when he averred that "Context is any information that can be used to characterise the situation of an entity" (2001, p. 5). For Rosemann et al. (p. 3), context covers "The combination of all implicit and explicit circumstances that impact the situation of a process..." Summarising both definitions enable us, therefore, to conclude that context is any implicit and explicit information about circumstances or situations which affect an entity. Consequently, a certain characteristic of such a circumstance or situation is termed as contextual factor.

Following from the above, context can be described as the surrounding or environment associated with phenomena that are critical in determining the success or failure of any change, and this stems from the inkling that context may work as a catalyst for change or as an inhibiting factor that constrains transition to the required attitudeand/or behavior (Johns, 2001). Context,as posited by Pichault(2007), are the elements and triggers that are projected to impact the content and the process of change. Resistance or acceptance of change can be understood and justified by therefore analyzing contextual themes. Even unpredictable intervention or events can be analysedbased on its context characteristics as Johns (2001, p. 4) argued "the most convincing illustration of why to pay attention to context reside in its capacity to explain anomalous organizational phenomena". Context can

play a vital role in achieving adaptability, flexibility and" absorptive capacity", (Klarner*et al*, 2008, p.59).

When it comes to discourses on factors influencing organisational change, existing literature on the subject tend to divide context into internal and external circumstances and conditions which influence performance or action. According to Armenkis and Bedein (1999), an organization functions within two types of contextual conditions:

> *(E)xternal conditions which include such factors as governmental regulations, technological advances, and forces that shape market place competition; internal conditions, which include the degree of specialization or work specificity required by exiting technology, level of organisational slack, and experience with previous change (p. 295).*

When Pettigrew *et al* (1987) conceptualized contextual forces to be national economic, political context, social context, and the perception and interpretation of actions in which the organisations operate in the national level (outer context) and organisational strategy, structure, culture and management processes as the internal context (inner context), he drew criticism because, some like Pichault(2007) some felt that his definition of context "remains unsatisfactory if we want to explore a particular project" (p.267).

Caldwell (2006) also criticized Pettigrew's definition when he argued that the meaning of 'context' offered in Pettigrew's work overlaps with his definition of 'process' as the third dimension of change, both of which he defined as a "realm of action and choice rather than macro-determinism or predictive causal analysis" (p. 72). Furthermore, Caldwell noted what he perceives as the ignorance to the interaction and interrelationships between

the inner and outer contexts. He therefore went on to opine that the role of leadership is undermined because of the over-emphasis on contextual forces although process impacts which are considered as a vital component and construct of change has a lot to do with the role of leaders and management.

Contextual factors have the potential to influence how a social outcome manifests, and how it affects other outcomes, such as: national, State, local, and organizational policies; community norms and resources; historical factors and recent events,and so on.Changes in these factors affect context over time. Therefore, paying attention to and reporting on context has great potential to explain seemingly inconsistent results of observable phenomena; because what works in one context may not work in another, leading to potentially conflicting conclusions due to heterogeneity of results in different contexts.

Thinking contextually involves a way of approaching research design, implementation, and analysis that uses and expands upon existing methods to consider contextual factors. Generating a list of potential domains of contextual factors and how they may interact can be helpful in determining what is most important to measure during the course of one's research. Since contextual factors continually interact with each other and with decision outcomes, it is imperative to consider context and how it influenced the decisions of the Police high command to experiment with community policing in the three pilot States covered by this study.

The Nigeria Police Force

The Nigeria Police Force (NPF) is designated as national police with exclusive jurisdiction throughout the country by Section 194 of the 1979 constitution. Constitutional provision also exists, however, for the establishment of separate NPF departments and units "forming part of the armed forces of the Federation or for their protection of harbors, waterways, railways and airfields"(Ehindero, 1998: 1).

Nigeria's police began with a thirty-member consular guard formed in Lagos Colony in 1861. In 1879 a 1,200-member armed paramilitary Hausa Constabulary was formed. In 1896 the Lagos Police was duly established. A similar force, the Niger Coast Constabulary, was formed in Calabar in 1894 under the newly proclaimed Niger Coast Protectorate. Likewise, in the north, the Royal Niger Company set up the Royal Niger Company Constabulary in 1888 with headquarters situated at Lokoja.

When the protectorates of Northern and Southern Nigeria were proclaimed in the early 1900s, part of the Royal Niger Company Constabulary became the Northern Nigeria Police, and part of the Niger Coast Constabulary became the Southern Nigeria Police. Northern and Southern Nigeria were amalgamated in 1914, but their various police forces were not merged until 1930 and this led to thebirth of the NPF which headquarters in Lagos. During the colonial period, most police were associated with local governments (native authorities). In the 1960s, under the First Republic, these police forces were first regionalized and then nationalized.

The police are the biggest, most visible and the most important sub-system of the criminal justice system. They provide the entry points into the system either through publiccrime reports or fromits own discovery. It is the key institution that provides regular direct contact with the public (Dambazau, 1999).

However, there are other policing agencies in Nigeria that police the affairs of citizens and even foreigners within the country's territorial boundary but they all complement the primary role of the police. These agencies include National Security and Civil Defense Corps (NSCDC) Federal Road Safety Corps (FRSC), Nigeria Immigration Service (NIS), Nigeria Custom Service (NCS), States Security Services (SSS), National Intelligence Agency (NIA), Defense Intelligence Agency (DIA), and the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA).

The NPF perform conventional police functions and is primarily responsible for internal security; for supporting the prison, immigration, and customs services; and for performing military duties within or outside Nigeria as directed (Reiner, 2000; Oluwaniyi, 2011).

Structure of the NPF

The Nigeria Police Force is a law enforcement institution of the federal government of Nigeria with acentralized command structure headed by the Inspector General of Police (IGP) who reports directly to the President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (See: sec. 215(3)Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999).

According to Nigeria's constitution, the president must "consult" with the Nigeria Police Council prior to appointing or removing the IGP. However, the council, a civilian oversight body whose membership includes the 36 state governors, has rarely met in the past 10 years (Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999, schedule 3, part I, sec. L.). The 1979 constitution provided for a Police Service Commission that was responsible for NPF policy, organization, administration, and finance (except for pensions), In February 1989, the then commander-in-chief, Babangida, abolished the Police Service Commission

and established the Nigeria Police Council in its stead and this wasdirectlyunderpresidential control. The new council was chaired by the president while the chief of General Staff, the minister of internal affairs, and the Inspector General of Police were members. As part of the government reorganization in September 1990, AlhajjiSumailaGwarzo, formerly SSS director, was named to the new post of minister of state, police affairs.

The independent Police Service Commission (PSC) is responsible for appointing, promoting, and disciplining all members of the police force, with the exception of the IGP (See, Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999, schedule 3, part I, sec. M). However, these powers have been delegated to the police force for all junior and rank-and-file police personnel (See, Police Service Commission, 2008 Annual Report, p. 41.)

The eight-member Police Service Commission consists of a chairperson; a retired justice of the Supreme Court or Court of Appeal; a retired police officer at or above the rank of commissioner of police; one representative each of women's interests, the press, nongovernmental human rights organizations, and organized private sector; and the secretary of the commission. The chairperson and members are appointed by the president and subject to confirmation by the Senate (Police Service Commission (Establishment) Act 2001, part I, sec. 2).

COMMAND STRUCTURE

President of the Federation

Nigeria Police Council

Ministry of Police Affairs

Police Service Commission

Inspector General of Police

Zonal Commands (12)
(Assistant Inspector General of Police)

State Commands and
Federal Capital Territory Command (37)
(Commissioner of Police)

Area Commands (127)
(Assistant Commissioner of Police)

Police Divisions (1,129)
(Divisional Police Officer)

Police Stations (1,579),
Police Posts (2,165) and
Village Police Posts (1,591)

RANK AND NUMBER OF POLICE OFFICERS AT EACH RANK

Inspector General of Police (1)

Deputy Inspector General of Police (6)

Assistant Inspector General of Police (20)

Commissioner of Police (99)

Deputy Commissioner of Police (141)

Assistant Commissioner of Police (355)

Chief Superintendent of Police (1,407)

Superintendent of Police (1,498)

Deputy Superintendent of Police (3,875)

Assistant Superintendent of Police (13,221)

Senior Police Officers

Inspector (28,175)

Sergeant (42,975)

Corporal (41,795)

Constable (178,107)

Fig 1: Command structures, police ranks, and the number of police officers at each rank as of 2008. ***Source***: Human Rights Watch (August 2010) Everyone's in on the Game" Corruption and Human Rights Abuses by the Nigeria Police Force; New York: HRW

Over the years, civilian oversight of the police has fallen under several government ministries some of which includes the Ministry of Interior and the Ministry of Police Affairs. The Ministry of Police Affairs was disbanded in 2007 and subsequently subsumed as a department within the Ministry of Interior. In December 2008, the Ministry of Police Affairs was again established as a separate ministry (Ministry of Police Affairs Handbook, p. 9.)

Each of Nigeria's 36 states, as well as the Federal Capital Territory, is served by an administrative unit known as a state command. The state commands are grouped into 12 zonal commands—with two to four states in each zone—with each under the supervision of an assistant inspector general of police (AIG). Each state command is headed by a commissioner of police (CP) who is directly accountable to the AIG in the respective zone. State commands are divided into smaller area commands which includespolice divisions (ably headed by a divisional police officer, or DPO), police stations, police posts, and village police posts (See Nigeria Police Force, 2008 Annual Report of the Nigeria Police Force, pp. 81 & 94).

In1986, the NPF was reorganized nationwide into seven area commands, which superseded a command structure corresponding to each of Nigeria's states. Each command was under a commissioner of police and was further divided into police provinces and divisions under local police officers. The NPF headquarters, which was also an area command, supervised and coordinated the other area commands.

The 1986 NPF reorganization was occasioned by recurrent eruption of tensions between the police and the army. A superintendent was suspended for a period for protestingthat the army had usurped police functions and kept police pay low, and there were fights between the police and army officers over border patrol jurisdiction. The armed forces chief of staff announced an exhaustive rearrangement of the NPF into the seven new area commands and five directorates (criminal investigations, logistics, supplies, training, and operations) under Deputy Inspectors Generals. About 2,000 constables and 400 senior police officers were expelled by mid-1987.

In mid-1989 another NPF restructuring was proclaimed after the AFRC's acceptance of a report by Rear Admiral MurtalaNyako. In 1989 the NPF also created a Quick Intervention Force in each state, separate from the mobile police units, specifically to monitor political events and to quell unrest during the transition to civil rule. Each state unit of between 160 and 400 police was commanded by an Assistant Superintendent and equipped with vehicles, communications gear, weapons, and crowd control equipment, including cane shields, batons, and tear gas.

The NPF experienced endemic problems with conscription of additional personnel. In the late 1970s, an attempt was made to expand the NPF by reducing the recruitment age from nineteen to seventeen and by enrolling soldiers who had beendemobilized, but this did not yield the expected result. Plans were announced in mid-1980 to expand the force to 200,000. By 1983, the strength of the NPF was almost 152,000.Therewere allegedly more than 1,300 police stations nationwide. In 1989, General Babangidadeclared that a larger number of officers would be posted to their local zones to encourage police- community relations.

At the end of military rule in 1999, there were roughly 140,000 police officers in the Nigeria Police Force. This added up to just one police officer for every 820 Nigerians, which was well below the United Nations-recommended general benchmark of one police officer per 400 citizens (PCPR, 2008: 22). It was hardly surprising that an average police officer will be overwhelmed by the sheer enormity of such burden in the face of acute insecurity.

In response to rising levels of crime that followed the end of military rule in 1999, then-President OlusegunObasanjo ordered the inspector general of police to undertake a massive recruitment drive aimed at adding 40,000 police officers per year for five years. By

2008, the police force had more than doubled in size to about 371,800 personnel in less than eight years (HRW, May 4, 2009). With a Population close to 200 million policed by less than 400,000 policemen, Nigeria still has an abysmally low ratio of about 1 police officer to 500 citizens.

However, for reasons best known to successive military and civilian administrations, the Nigerian government failed to provide anequivalentincrementin funding to train, equip, and manage the vastly enlarged force. The 2008 Presidential Committee on the Reform of the Nigeria Police Force noted that police training became overstretched and little or no attempt was made to upgrade police training institutions" (PCPR, p.22) the committee accordingly concludedthat as a result, Nigeria became "saddled with a very large number of unqualified, under-trained and ill-equipped officers and men many of whose suitability to wear the respected uniform of the Force is in doubt" (PCPR, p.22).

Police training, however, was directed from headquarters by a Deputy Inspector General designated as commandant. Recruits were trained at police colleges in Oji River, Maiduguri, Kaduna, and Ikeja, which also offered training to other security personnel, such as armed squads of immigration, prisons and customs officers.

The Police College at Ikeja trained cadet Assistant Superintendents and cadet Sub-inspectors. There were also specialized schools for in-service training, including the Police Mobile Force Training School at Gusau, the Police Detective College at Enugu, the Police Dogs Service Training Centre, and the Mounted Troops Training Centre.

In August 1989, General Babangida laid the foundation stone for a Nigeria Police Academy (NPA) in Kano State. The NPA was to be affiliated with Bayero University until adequate infrastructure was available for independent operation. Admission was to be

regulated by merit, by the quota system, and by federal character. The commandant was to be no less than an AIG and assisted by a provost who would oversee the academic program. Modeled after the Nigerian Defence Academy in Kaduna, the NPA offer a five-year academic and professional degree program for new cadets and an eighteen-month intensive course for college graduates aspiring to a police career. Babangidaadditionally acquiredtechnical assistance from Britain to establish a central planning and training program to modernize and upgrade police training in Nigeria.

Funding of the NigeriaPolice

Despite the fact that poor funding is often cited as one of the significant explanations behind police corruption, the Nigeria Police Force (NPF) receives considerable financing from federal governmentallocations each year, which are augmented by vast sums of money from the state and local governments as well as from private-sector donations and trust funds. The NPF operating budget between 1984 and 1988 was in the N360 million to N380 million range, and in 1988 increased to N521 million.

More striking were large capital expenditure infusions of N206 million in 1986 and N260.3 million in 1988, representing 3.5 and 2.5 percent of total federal capital expenditures in those years. These increments were utilizedin acquiring new communications equipment, transport, and weapons to combat the rising crime wave, such as 100 British Leyland DAF Comet trucks delivered in 1990. Notwithstanding these purchases, an NPF study in late 1990 inferred that the force's budget must double to meet its needs.

When Nigeria returned to civilian rule in 1999, the NPF budget stood at ₦22.6 billion (See: PCPR Main Report, 2008, p. 25). A decade later, the police budget, at ₦210.7 billion ($1.4 billion), had balloonedfive-fold (Federal Ministry of Finance, 2009). Most of

the increased funding was earmarked toward personnel costs. The police personnel budget increased from ₦16.2 billion ($168.8 million) in 1999 to ₦172.8 billion ($1.1 billion) in 2009, a nearly ten-fold increase. The non-personnel police budget increased from ₦6.4 billion ($66.7 million) to ₦32.1 billion ($212.6 million) during this same period.

Police salaries and benefits in 2009 accounted for 82 percent of budgeted expenditures. The increase in personnel costs mirrored the sensational growth of the police force—approximately 230,000 police officers were added to the force during the decade and this necessitated significant increases in salary levels because from 2007, the starting monthly salary for a police constable (the lowest rank in theforce) had been increased fromapproximately ₦8,000 to ₦26,158 (2008 PCPR Main Report, p. 109). Apart from personnel costs, the police budgeted ₦32.1 billion ($212.6 million) for operating costs and capital expenditures in 2009. In 2006, the Obasanjo administration established a ₦50 billion Police Equipment Trust Fund but most of the funds were embezzled by the managers of that scheme, while little or no benefit accrued to the Force.

In addition to the NPF federal budget, state and local governments provide considerablefunding to the Nigerian police. The 2008 Presidential Committee on Police Reform found that oftentimes, state government funding covered at least 50-70 percent of police operating costs within the state.

The Lagos State government, for instance, established a trust fund in 2007 that has raised ₦5 billion ($33.1 million) for policing and security operations. It provided police vehicles as well as fuel, armored personnel carriers, bullet-proof vests, and salary subsidies for police personnel (*The Nation* (Lagos), August 11, 2009). The local government councils in Lagos State also donated more than 100 patrol vehicles to the police in 2009.

Similarly, *Operation Yaki,* a state government security program in Kaduna Statedonated 100 patrol vehicles and 250 motorcycles to the police between 2007 and 2008 and subsidized the salaries of 3,000 of police officers. At another level, several international agencies, foreign governments and private foundations have also provided various forms of assistance to the Nigeria Police since 1999. These covered donation of vehicles and equipment;occasional training on best-practices in relationship managementandmainstreaming human rights in Police procedures.

Police—Public Relationship

In Nigeria, the relationship between the Police and the public is largely characterized by mutual mistrust and hostility. Goldsmith and Harris (2012) noted for instance, that considering the nature of police work, obtaining cooperation can be particularly difficult; yet, there are multiple benefits from cooperation and collaboration with the public.There is little or no doubt, for instance, that the conduct of many police officers fall far below the expectations of the Nigerian public and this, over time, engendered a low level of public confidence and a tendency to resort to self-help.

The problematic relationshipbetween the Police officers and members of the Nigerian public has a lot to do with brutality, the excessive use of force, unlawful arrest and detention, and incivility to members of the public. Instances of police brutality are most common during crime control; crowd control during public events and ceremonies; control of processions, protests and demonstrations, during investigations, emergency situations such as ethnic or religious crises and at checkpoints.

Due to a combination of poor training, inadequate infrastructure, and absence of respect for due process and human rights, the Police often resort to torture to extract

confession and information from suspects. Extra-judicial killings, summary execution of suspects and revenge killings are also widely reported, in spite of repeated warnings against such practices by the leadership of the Force. Worse still, there are claims that citizens who call on the Police for assistance during or after crime incidents, do not get prompt assistance.

In essence, the general causes of the negative opinion on the Police by the public include, the repressive nature of law enforcement under authoritarian colonial and post-colonial governments; general inefficiency of the Police due to inadequate facilities; corruption; poor remuneration and conditions of service, and insensitivity and incivility towards the public by the Police.

There is need to make the point, however, that, the attitude of the public towards government and laws tends to be negative and this attitude is often transferred to the Police whose duty it is to enforce the laws enacted by the government. Reiner (2000) noted that, all over the world, the police are often in conflict with a significant percentage of the population. This, for him, is because the police are agencies of the state that are employed to maintain law and social order, which serve the interest of the ruling class. As a result, maintaining neutrality is near impossible.

Corruption is another factor that is also often cited as responsible eroding the integrity of the Police and public respect for law enforcement officers. Police officers in Nigeria are accused of different forms of corrupt behaviour. Reports of police collusion with criminals, especially after revelations that came to light during the Lawrence Anini saga, are common. From the late 1980s, the crime wave became exacerbated by worsening economic conditions and corrupt practices by police, military, and customs personnel who colluded and conspired with criminals or actually engaged in criminal conduct.

These corrupt practices that are frequently cited are sometimes the consequences of many inadequacies, such as inadequate funding for operational vehicles and stationery; lack of rigorous screening of candidates prior to recruitment; improper monitoring and handling of misconduct among officers; poor remuneration and conditions of service; inadequate training to inculcate professionalism as enshrined in sections 324 and 325 of the Police Regulations. In an effort to reduce bribery and to make identification of offenders easier, Police officers on duty patrol and at checkpoints were, until recently, not allowed to carry more than N5 on their person.

In their assessment, Nigerians have advanced several reasons for this state of affairs ranging from high level unemployment to acute poverty in the land, ill equipped Police Force, ineffective Policing or the collapse of internal security architecture. They allege that law enforcement agencies usually respond to crimes slowly, if at all, and provide little or no investigative support to victims.

Research on the NPF by Hills (2008) revealed that many factors including a challenging environment; under-resourced officers incapable of effectively policing the most populous poverty-stricken Black nation on earth; high rates of urbanization and a volatile underclass of unemployed youths; the lack of social cohesion and traditional control mechanisms; insufficient thought to public order strategy; unlawful arrests and detention; slow response of the police during widespread rioting; and excessive use of discriminate force.

All the above-mentioned factors point in the direction of a need for comprehensive programme aimed at building public confidence and smoothening the relationship between the NPF and members of the public.

In attempts to correct the negative image that the police have in the eye of the public, win approval and cooperation and thereby enhance the ability of the NPF to perform optimally in spite of the various social, structural and bureaucratic inhibitions that are permanently obstructing the drive for efficiency, several initiatives have been tried out by police authorities.

As far back as 1973, the NPF created the Police Public Relations Department under the *Force Administrative Instructions No. 30 (1972)* with a view to "providing the public and the Press with swift and accurate information on Police Affairs and taking appropriate action to counteract any undesirable or ill-motivated criticism of the Force". Paragraph 323 of the Police Regulations of 1968 also mandates every officer to ensure good relations with members of the public.

The establishment of the Police Community Relations Committee (PCRC) in 1984 is one of the earliest efforts to facilitate and sustain productive dialogue between the police and community members, overcome the inhibiting legacy of suspicion and lack of confidence and the inhibiting effects of structural and institutional challenges that have frustrated attempts to develop a more fruitful relationship with the Nigerian public. The PCRC intervenes by providing financial and material assistance to local police formations (Security & Safety Review, 2001).

The setting up of Police Public Complaints Bureau (PPCB) on 13 April 1993 was another attempt at dealing with the problem of low public confidence in the police. IGP Coomasie who initiated this, set up in addition, the X-Squad (or Anti-Vice Squad) as an internal mechanism for ridding the force of those he referred to as 'bad eggs' who give the Force a bad image (see:*The Guardian (Nigeria)*, 24th January 1998, p.14).

Despite this, the problem of corruption has persisted (Post Express, 11/10/1997; p.9). This initiative was later mirrored by IGP Smith's "Ghost Squad," which had a similar mandate of arrest, detention and prosecution of erring police officers (The Guardian, 23 April, 2002). Other IGPs who came before and after, initiated similar programmes that produced equally abysmal results.

On assumption of office in March 2002, IGP TafaBalogun immediately unfolded what came to be referred to as his administration's *8-Point Programme of Action,*which formed the thrust of his leadership of the NPF. The key argument of that administration was that the Force had been groaning under the heavy burden of public distrust, accusation of brutality and corruption, and that, this had impaired its effectiveness as a key public institution. His answer to these problems was the introduction of the Community Policing initiative, which according to the IGP is meant "to transform the Nigeria Police from being a widely feared and despised organization to a friendly and service-driven institution that works in close partnership with the communities it serves."

Under the leadership of IGP Sunday Ehindero who succeeded IGP Balogun, a *Workshop on Prevention of Violation of Human Rights in Nigeria* was organized by the Nigeria Police Force in Abuja between August 18-19, 2005 showed the concern of the police authorities with the fact that policemen are often in conflict with a significant percentage of the population and explored ways of reducing the antagonism and hostility between the police and the public that they serve.

Police Reform in Nigeria

Reform can change organisational structures and regulations but, without socio-political change, its effects tend to be superficial, localised and temporary. In their

examination of security sector reform in Nigeria, Fayemi and Olonisakin (2008) noted that issues that have dominated discussions and decisions around oversight revolve around: de-politicization and subordination of the military to civil authority; constitutionalising and redefining the role and mission of the military; reorientation and re-professionalisation policy; and central to this study, demilitarization of public order and civil policing.

Over the years, there have been many processes of police reform which, according to Rauch &Spuy (2009), are still underway. Current police policies are based on suppositions that proactive policing techniques won't just deter crime but, will likewise improve police-community relations (Wiley &Esbensen, 2013).

Accordingly, Police reforms in Nigeria have incorporated the establishment of a Ministry of Police Affairs, which increased recruitment and staffing of the police service; procurement of equipment; establishment of a Police Service Commission in 2001; and the introduction of community policing in some states with the support of the DFID funded Security, Justice and Growth Programme.

Thus, the transition from military to civilian democratic rule in 1999 marked the first real efforts or opportunity to undertake reform of the Nigerian Police Force. General David Jemibewon (Rtd.) the Police Affairs Minister at the time, made a series of announcements in 2000 signalling the Nigerian government's plans to reorganize the NPF: According to him, "The image of the new police this administration wants to build is that of a courteous, polite, well-disciplined and well behaved police officer and men who are truly friends of the people" (see: *The Guardian,* July 15, 1999 and*Post Express,* July 29, 1999). Initial measures undertaken to realize this were a massive recruitment drive to increase the force strength, the promotion of senior police officers and other members of the rank and file, the provision of

training and development facilities as well as improvements in the salary and welfare package for officers.

In the same year 2000, the Ministry of Police Affairs produced a five-year development plan for the police force and with substantial support from the American and British governments, drew up a detailed strategic plan to guide its implementation. This included the drafting of a *Mission and Values Statementfor the Nigerian Police Force* and the identification of six organizational goals and strategies to achieve them (USAID-OTI/ DFID, December 14, 2000). Thestated goals covered a diverse range of issues including the implementation of community policing, creation of sustainable partnerships with civil society, improvement in internal and external communications of the force, the provision of adequate law enforcement resources, improvements in leadership, and the reduction of fear and violent crime in local communities.

In 2000, also with the support of the United States Office for Transition Initiatives, a mechanism for ensuring input on police reform from civil society—Network on Police Reform in Nigeria (NOPRIN) was established. It aimed to identify issues for reform, provide civil society input to the police reform process and improve police and civil society relations. The network is still in existence today and continues to play an important role in policy discussions on reforms in the NPF.

The reform efforts intensified during the tenure of Inspector General of Police TafaBalogun, but they were accompanied by an increasingly belligerent policing approach. On his appointment to the post in year 2002, TafaBalogun announced an eight-point plan aimed primarily at combating rising crime and the resultant insecurity that was being experienced across Nigeria, particularly in urban areas. The central pillar of his anti-crime

strategy was the introduction of "Operation Fire-for-Fire," which, while outlining a policy that was technically within police officers' right to act in self-defense, raised concerns that policemen would utilise it as an excuse to engage in disproportionate use of force (See: Agence France-Presse, June 24, 2002 and U.S. State Department: Country Report on Human Rights Practices in Nigeria 2002).

Confirming the fears and concerns by international as well as local partners on police reforms in Nigeria, IGP Balogun further reiterated the orders in October 2002 when widespread social unrest across Nigeria and confrontations between the police and criminals showed no signs of abating. He was quoted as saying:

> *Shoot and kill whenever they want to attack your barracks…All I want to hear is that as they were trying to burn a police station or barracks that no fewer than a certain number, say forty-five, were killed in the process* (IRIN, October 21, 2002).

In clear continuation of the strategy of IGP MK Smith, his predecessor, Balogun in 2002 pledged to and improved the welfare package for officers, promoted more than 70,000 officers, ensured the payment of one year's salary arrears, and ordered the building of additional barracks accommodation across Nigeria (*Newswatch*, January 26, 2003). To address the inadequacy of personnel, a campaign was launched to recruit 40,000 new officers every year.

Under pressure from the federal government, the IGP undertook some efforts to tackle low-level corruption, in particular the notorious checkpoints allegedly used by police officers to extort money from motorists. Although this initiative appeared to have little effect on the nefarious practice, IGP Balogun announced that 900 policemen had been

dismissed from the NPF for involvement in extortion in July 2004 (See: *This Day,* July 21, 2004). The IGP also undertook a number of other measures to improve the relationship between the police and the general public including the establishment of Police Complaints Bureau and Human Rights Desks in all State Commands with the support of the British government.

In January 2005, IGP Balogun was replaced by IGP Sunday Ehindero. On his appointment, Ehindero took immediate action on two key issues that were designed to improve the public image of the force. First, he overhauled the vexatious engagement strategy: "Operation Fire-for-Fire and replaced it with a new slogan: 'To serve and protect with integrity", stressing the need to move away from authoritarian and symbolic justice to a more accountable and responsive police force (Ehindero, 25 January 2005). Shortly after that, he announced the total elimination of the vexatious police roadblocks, which had become synonymous with police extortion nationwide (*This Day*, February 2, 2005).

In addition, IGP Ehindero announced an ambitious ten-point program of reform to address what he perceived as shortcomings of the Nigerian Police Force. The program was divided into ten plans of action on a broad range of issues: improving the intelligence and investigative capacity of the police, combating violent and economic crimes, conflict prevention, community policing, improving relationships with the general public, anti-corruption and improving the salary and welfare package of officers.

However, critics insist that while President Obasanjo and IGP Ehindero promoted the idea of community-based policing, they nonetheless tolerated a style of policing that depends on bribes, graft, exploitation and intimidation. It was also alleged that they both promoted police–community partnerships for conflict resolution, yet, relied on squadrons of

paramilitary police squadrons to crush sectarian or separatist conflicts that occurred under their watch. While admitting that there is indeed no evidence to suggest that both were insincere in their reform plans, critics concede that they also were realists who knew where the limits were (See for example, Hills, 2008).

Review of the Police Act

The Nigerian Police Force is governed by a colonial law, which had seen no comprehensive review since its initial promulgation in 1943. The initiative to review the Police Act started in November 2004 and was undertaken by an interagency committee comprising of the police, government and representatives of civil society. This involved several stages of public consultation and a legal audit of all the laws regulating the work of the police. A draft bill was discussed and approved by the interagency committee before final presentation to the House of Representatives towards the end of 2005 (CLEEN Foundation/Open Society Justice Initiative, 2005).

The foremost objective of the review was to ensure the new law is compatible with international human rights standards, in particular the *United Nations Code of Conduct for Law Enforcement Officials* and the fundamental rights provisions of the Nigerian constitution. Article 5 of the U.N. Code of Conduct states that:

> *No law enforcement official may inflict, instigate or tolerate any act of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, nor may any law enforcement official invoke superior orders or exceptional circumstances such as a state of war or a threat of war, a threat to national security, internal political instability or any other public emergency as a justification of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.*

The recurring criticisms and occasionally startling revelations regarding widespread abuses, corrupt practices and the general conduct of Police officers in the course of discharging their duties of maintenance of law and order and protection of lives and property prompted the Federal Government in 2006 to set up the *Committee for the Reform of the Nigeria Police* headed by AlhajiDanMadami. However, when the committee concluded its assignment, the recommendations that they made were not implemented.

Subsequently, President Umaru Musa YarAdua inaugurated in January 2008, a 17-member *Presidential Committee for the Reform of the Nigeria Police Force* led by Alhaji M.D Yusuf. The committee was mandated to, among others:

i.   examine the state of the Nigeria Police Force and review previous efforts, reports and Government White Papers on the re-organization, restructuring and repositioning of the Nigeria Police Force;

ii.   identify and recommend definitive measurable and practical measures for the enhancement of effective police service delivery—including possible areas of assistance from development partners; and to

iii.   examine and recommend measures needed for complete transformation of the Force into an effective and proficient agency for the effective maintenance of law and order in Nigeria.

The 2008 Presidential Committee reviewed the findings of four previous governmentpanels: the 1995 Inspector General of Police Reform Panel, under M.D. Yusuf; the Vision 2010 committee set up in 1996 under General SaniAbacha; the 2002 Presidential Panel on National Security, headed by Professor TekenaTamuno; and the 2006

DanmadamiPolice Reform Committee, and concluded that little or no efforts were made to implement any them (see: PCPR Main Report, 2008).

The MD Yusuf Committee produced a comprehensive report that examined the systemic problems within the Nigeria Police Force, including police corruption. The highly critical report called on the Nigerian government to reform the budgetary process and financial oversight of the police, create a credible public complaint mechanism, prosecute abusive police officers, and revamp the Police Service Commission.

The committee also recommended that the police leadership overhaul the anti-corruption "X-Squad" (Vice Squad), create effective monitoring mechanisms and establish functioning forensic laboratories. The report similarly defined new guidelines for the appointment, removal, and tenure of the Inspector General of Police to insulate the institution from political manipulation.

The Nigerian government accepted the vast majority of the recommendations, but rejected those on the appointment and removal of the inspector general (Government White Paper on the Report of the Presidential Committee on the Reform of the Nigeria Police Force, April 2008). The government set up an implementation committee, chaired by the minister of police affairs to oversee the implementation program. However, no mention was made of the community policing project by both the implementation committee report and the Government White Paper that considered it.

Years after completion of their assignments, the reports have neither been made public nor significantly acted upon by the government. Consequently, in February 2008, the CLEEN Foundation convened a 2-day meeting of experts and stakeholders to review the work of both panels, noting in particular, that in discharging its mandate, the Dan Mandami-

led committee received memoranda and organized public hearings in the six geographical regions of Nigeria. It also consulted government officials, traditional/ paramount rulers, and visited various police training institutions, stations, commands, barracks and Force headquarters to gain insights into the problems facing the Force. In its report, it made a total of 120 recommendations covering organization and operational control of the NPF; crime prevention and control; recruitment and personnel development; police welfare and condition of service; public confidence in the police; logistics support; community policing and improvement of services.

Unfortunately, despite its extensive work, the need to review the Police Act to provide legal status to recent reforms introduced in the Nigeria Police Force such as adoption of community policing strategy, enhancement of the role of women in the police and incorporation of the provisions of human right treaties ratified by Nigeria in the act appear to have been left out in the recommendations of the committee.

If the NPF is to strengthen its social linkage with the Nigerian public, it is essential that the sections of the law relating to contact situations such as arrest are redrafted to incorporate safeguards, including strict guidelines on what constitutes a warrant for arrest, thresholds of proof and judicial review that will prevent the misuse of this provision. In addition, measures to improve the effectiveness of the NPF, such as training, upgrading the requirements for recruitment and performance measures and the establishment of juvenile and women's units, were also included. Incorporating positive policy initiatives, such as community policing, was also essential to guarantee the long-term sustainability of such programs and insulate them from the whims of the political leadership in Nigeria.

Perhaps the thorniest issue of the review is that of the political accountability of the police. The Inspector General of Police is appointed by the President and accountable to the President who has overall operational control of the force. This clearly compromises the independence of the police force, therefore leaving it open to political manipulation by the executive arm. Civil society actors have remained insistent that amending these sections to grant the legislature and Police Service Commission a role in screening, confirming and, in cases of gross misconduct, removing the Inspector General of Police, is necessary to extend accountability and promote accountable policing in Nigeria.

Support for Police Reforms

Since Nigeria's independence from the United Kingdom in 1960, Nigeria's police have received a huge amount of outside technical assistance, training and support. The British and United States governments are among the principal donors providing multimillion dollar support for police reform initiatives in Nigeria. Both governments have been closely engaged in supporting reform efforts since the transition from military rule in 1999. Specifically, In August 2001, the US Agency for International Development (USAID) commenced work with the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID) to help develop community policing and police reform in Nigeria, with a $25,000 donation from South Africa's Nedbank (Bogden, 2004: 638).

TheDFID funds a 30 million-pound (US$ 55.5 million) *Security, Justice and Growth Program* which began in 2002 under its former title "Access to Justice." Managed by the British Council, the 5-year (2002—2007) program had three components, one of which concentrated on enhancing security and safety in Nigeria through collaboration with the Nigerian Police. The aim of the collaboration was to develop the quality of police service

delivery, improve the effectiveness of informal policing systems, and help develop processes for conflict prevention, resolution and management (Davies, 2005).

In July 2002, the United States and Nigeria signed a comprehensive law enforcement assistance and cooperation agreement. A grant of US$ 3.5 million was dedicated to assist law enforcement agencies including the Nigerian Police Force, the National Drug Law Enforcement Agency (NDLEA), the EFCC and Independent Corrupt Practices Commission(ICPC). US$ 2.6 million of the overall grant funds police reform through provision of technical assistance, training and equipment (Jeter, July 2, 2002).

The main vehicle for this collaboration is a program of community policing described as a holistic approach to police reform (HRW, May 2005). Formally launched by President Obasanjo in April 2004, the community policing program aimed to transform the culture and organization of the police, improve the police force's relations with ordinary citizens and the quality of the service delivered.

According to the *Community Policing Project Plan*, the six key components of the program are:

i. creating awareness of community policing both within the force and wider society;

ii. introducing intensive skills development and leadership training of local police officers;

iii. examining police structures and organization;

iv. reviewing training curricula and methodologies of the police;

v. developing intelligence led policing and the use of new technology; and finally,

vi. reviewing legislation and procedures (CPPP, February 2004).

The program was piloted in Enugu State, with initial plans to extend the project to five other states in 2005.

A core part of the British Government's project involved intensive training of selected police officers, known as *Community Policing Developers* (CPDs). The training aspired to bring about major attitudinal change through leadership training and skills development. In addition, the project aimed to develop the *Human Rights Units*(HRUs) in each police division. To this end a training program for police investigators to improve their effectiveness at managing complaints, victims, witnesses, suspects, and case files was designed and initial training provided.

As a further complement to funding and implementing such police reform programs, the British and the U.S. governments, along with other members of the international community, engaged in continuous dialogue with the Nigerian police and government. A workshop that took place between 24 and 26 November, 2003 in Elmina, Ghana under the auspices of *Africa Dialogue and Security Research* (ASDR), drew participation from the academia, security management practitioners, and representatives of various security sectors, civil society and Governments across West Africa. The agenda covered a multitude of subjects on security governance, including international and regional perspectives on security sector governance, governance of police and policing, governance of intelligence and governance of the Armed Forces.

Between April 26 and 29, 2004, a *National Summit on Crime and Policing in Nigeria* organized by Network on Police Reform in Nigeria (NOPRIN), in collaboration with different stakeholders in the security and safety sector discussed the upsurge in crime, the appropriateness of policing strategies in the country, public accountability in the policing

sector, the challenges of crime and policing in transition, role of civil society and networking in effective policing, and the introduction of community and informal policing in Nigeria with a view to recommending ways in which the current efforts of the police and government can address those issues most effectively.

Through the focus on training and attitudinal change, this program aimed to reduce human rights violations by officers of the Nigerian Police Force. During a preliminary evaluation conducted in early 2005 by a team of local and international consultants, just months after the pilot project began, the preliminary findings indicated reduced levels of police corruption, reduction in the fear of crime, general improvements in the care and custody of prisoners and improved relations between the police and the Nigerian public.

According to US Embassy officials, the budget for the police assistance program was increased to US$12.65 million in 2005.

Like the British government program, there is a strong emphasis on community policing to improve police and community relations and a pilot project was also begun in Kaduna State. There was also support for curriculum development and basic training for new recruits to the force. This was carried out for nine months at the Kaduna Police Training College and plans were made to extend it to colleges in Kano, Maiduguri and Enugu.

In April 2005, a three-day workshop on *Building Effective and Accountable Security Institutions in Africa: A Dialogue on Governance*, organized by the African Security Sector Network (ASSN) was held in Cotonou, Benin Republic. The workshop brought members of the ASSN together with African security sector practitioners to discuss ways of strengthening security sector governance and reform across the African region, including strategies for disseminating 'best practices' among African Union (AU) countries; and to

create an opportunity and a framework for long-term dialogue and capacity-building between the network and security sector practitioners and managers as well as policy-makers in the region (GFN-SSR, 2005).

The issues covered by most discussions on police reforms show an increasing concern for efficient policing (Kenney and McNamara, 1999: iii). Questions that were posed include:

- Are the organizations of public security effective and efficient?

- Are the structures for public security efficient for the combating of insecurity?

- If security is to be provided adequately, how should the problem of personnel be addressed where resources are limited? (and)

- How can police forces provide adequate security where their ratio to local populations is abysmally low?

All these questions are relevant in the context of Nigeria's move to establish its community policing initiative.

As the examples above show, reforms currently taking place in developed as well as in emerging democracies like Nigeria are occurring under private as well as government auspices and will have profound effects on current approaches to public security, human rights, and public accountability (Hill, 2000). The driving forces behind restructuring are fear of crime, the inability of government to satisfy society's longing for security, and the privatization of security. These issues have increased the debates on the future of policing in Nigeria and are provoking a wide range of discussions on policies that are needed to bring about positive change.

The problematic, as far as this study is concerned is whether the fact that policing in Nigeria has proved problematic for the reasons given earlier, informed the adoption of the community policing initiative in Nigeria during the tenure of former IGP TafaBalogun; whether this was borne of the need to inculcate 'best practices' in law enforcement from other regions; or whether, like several others before it, it is another exercise that serves only to give the impression that something is being done to change the problematic character of policing in Nigeria.

Policy Options on Policing in Nigeria

Arguments abound that community policing is highly desirable and more suitable to policing our society than the orthodox law and order approach of current practice. There have, however, also been strident calls for the creation of State Police based on the community policing model within the reform process that both the Nigerian State and Police high command is keen on implementing.

There is really not much actualor technical difference between 'Community' and 'State' policing systems. If, for instance, the word 'State' is removed, both models of policing will easily fuse into one another. Operationally, the two nomenclatures mean the same thing in practice and even to members of the public.

It is on record that the Nigeria Police took off along the line of local control of Police units (See for example, Tamuno, 1971). When Britain established the Nigeria Police Force in 1861, it started with a 30-member consular guard in the Lagos Colony. This was followed by a 1,200 paramilitary Hausa Constabularyup in 1879.The Lagos Police and the Niger Coast Constabulary in Calabar(under the authority of Niger Coast Protectorate)was formed Seventeen years later in 1894. In 1888, the Royal Niger Company set up the Royal Niger

Company Constabulary in Lokoja. These were collapsed into twoin the early 1900s—theNorthern Nigeria Police and the Southern Nigeria Police.

Despite the amalgamation of the northern and southern protectorates in 1914, the two regions maintained two separate police forces till 1930 when they were merged to form the Nigeria Police Force with headquarters in Lagos. That merger is what has grown to become today's centralized police system, which is at variance with a federal system.

Though the police in a particular State systemwithin Nigeria's federal system are regarded as agents and representatives of the federal government, the indisputable fact is that these policemen live, operate and serve the people of that particular State. Similarly, even though the Federal Governmentof Nigeria (FGN) pays the emoluments and provide some of the logistics that policemen use in their daily operation, the contribution of State governments far outweighs and at times completely dwarfs the contribution of the FGN.

'State police' technically means that a State should be in operational control of policemen serving within its territory. Under such an arrangement, policemen would be recruited, trained, funded and guided by the laws and values of the state.The advantages of this would be that the operational impediments and problems such as strength, finance, equipment, accommodation and others would be easily resolved and taken care of by the State.

Such police units and their officers would be very close to the authorities who will know the number of policemen that they have and provide for them according to their needs. Such policemen would not have the communication dilemma that currently exists with regards to locus of command between constituted authorities of the State and the Federal authorities who are they actually consider to be their masters. Rather, aState police

arrangement will likely percolate down to local governments and local communities. It is this crop of policemen that can effectively be referred to as community policemen.

In reality, however, the researcher discovered in the course of this study that apart from the community policing pilot States,there is a semblance of Community or State police in so many States in Nigeria. In these States, virtually all the operational requirements of the NPF are provided by the Governors, Local Governments and other stakeholders within such States. These provisioning range from simple services like construction and/or renovation of office and barrack accommodations, provision of office furniture, refurbishing of old patrol vehicles to procurement of sophisticated communication gadgets, logistic and close-protection (body armour, helmets, etc.) equipment and Armored Personnel Carrier (APC).

Many States like Lagos, Ogun, Edo, Oyo, Rivers and Ekiti have set up *Security Trust Funds* for the coordination of efforts for procuring such materials. In addition to this, these States pay regular and monthly allowances to officers serving in their States to augment whatever statutory financial obligations is rendered by the federal government. On the average, however, this study has discovered that the provisions from the States sometimes far outstrip the provision from the Federal Government. Inpractice, therefore, State police is almost a fait accompli in many States of the Nigerian federation.

In many States, such as Lagos, Ogun, Oyo, Edo, Kano, Osun, Plateau and the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), the Governors have spent and continue to spend a lot of money supporting their Police commands. In Community Police pilot states like Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun and others, State Governments have invested massive resources to ensure that Community Policing become entrenched. In addition to the establishment of various community policing support systems such as the *Police Community Relations*

Committee(PCRC), the *Police Community Relations Consultative Committee* (PCRCC) and *Intelligence Committee*, many State Governments have made tremendous advancement through the establishment of *State Security Trust Fund*s. Through this, many governments have established legitimate and constitutional avenues whereby both the government and the people can generate fundsthroughwhichPolice units in their States are provided with critical crime prevention and law enforcement equipment. They also carry out routine and constant maintenance of such equipment and provide hazard and emergency funds for officers and men to motivate them. In the 2013/14 budget, the thenLagos State Government budgeted about N5lbillion for fuel and other lubricants for about 9,000 police patrol vehicles.It also stated that the ultimate aim of the Security Trust Fund is to provide bullet proof vests and other security gadgets,100 patrol vehicles for the Rapid Response Squad (RRS) and 3 patrol vehicles each to the 13 Area Commands and 106 Police stations in the State.

Similar action was observed in Ogun and Ekitiwhere the State Governors (IbikunleAmosun and KayodeFayemi) provided the State police commands in Ogun with 15 Armoured Personnel Carriers (APC), 180 Patrol Vehicles equipped with modern communication gadgets; and 6 APC and 50 Patrol Vehicles in Ekiti, respectively.All these werefueled and maintained from the coffers of the State Security Trust Fund(Oral interview: AlhajiYusuphOlaniyonu, Commissioner for Information, Ogun State,6 January, 2014).The researcher took active part in the scenario above as the Commissioner of Police in Ekiti State where he personally received the equipment on behalf of the Inspector- General of Police in 2011 and also as a member of the Ogun State Security Trust Fund, since 2013.

In separate media reports and oral interviews, Mr. Fola Arthur Worrey, the Executive Secretary, Lagos State Security Trust Fund and Mr. Michael Awotedu,Executive Secretary,

Ogun State Trust Fund both outlined theirState'sefforts in supporting Police formations in their respective States (See also:The Nation (Nigeria) November, 2013 and Crime World Magazine of May 2013).Ironically, the various Police commands that are being provisioned by State Governments are ironically under the strict operational control of the Federal Government.

Despite stiff opposition, calls for establishment of State Police in Nigeria has remained strident. According to a commentary, the agitation for State Police is predicated on the contradiction that State Governors, as "chief security officers" have no control over the Police in their domain, yet are expected to maintain law and order in their various states ("State Police and Security in Nigeria" *Daily Sun* (Nigeria) — November 28th 2013).

The arrangement at the time of Nigeria's independence made the maintenance of law and order an issue of concurrent jurisdiction between the Federal and Regional governments. Opposition to regional control of local police forces was based on fears that it could be used for political purposes and therefore, the insistence that the local police be directly under the control of the Inspector-General of Police.

The position of the regional governments that local Police remain under their control, on the other hand, was informed by the obvious fact that the Local Government Police were more effective becausetheir knowledge of local culture and norms makes it easier for them to mix with the people and the community,investigate crimes and trace criminals much more easily than their national police counterparts who are mostly non-indigenes and are often not familiar with, or trusted by members of the community they are policing.

To show their preference for local and community based policing and police officers, many State Governments in Nigeria today encourage, nurture and even fund various

vigilante groups, some of which have been approved by their legislative houses, to complement the Police in security and law enforcement.

The major fear that State Police may be used for political purposes can be allayed through the establishment of firm legislation that will not only categorically provide for the duties of state police, but also provide legal limitations for such outfits. The oft-quoted and argument that State Police can be manipulated by Chief Executives of States, may be unfounded in the light of events in different partsof Nigeria where political rallies, demonstrations, meetings and conferences have been disrupted, banned and at times brutally dispersed by Police on the orders of the Federal Government. This, in itself being a fallout of the conflicting judicial interpretation and judgment on the issue of *Public Order Act* and the 1999 Constitution as to whether in a democracy, the Police must give executive permit before politicians can hold rallies.

This being the case, a law can be made specifically to insulate State Police from having anything to do with category of national activity (such as elections) at any level. This sensitive area which is obviously the main bone of contention between the pro and anti-State police organization can then be left exclusively for federal Police, while the State Police units are made to face the sole and primary responsibility of combating crimes and criminalities in their various states.

These duties have been clearly set out in the Police Act Section 4 and Decree 23 of 1979 as "...the prevention and detection of crime, apprehension of offenders, the preservation of law and order, the protection of lives and properties, and due enforcement of all laws and regulations with which they are charged.Regardless of its attractiveness, there

are numerous impediments to the emergence of a State policing system. These include, but are not limited to the following:

1. **Legal Impediments in the Nigerian Constitution:** under Section 214 (1) of the 1999 constitution, it is provided that:

   > *(T)here shall be a police for Nigeria, which shall be known as the Nigeria Police Force, and subject to the provisions of this section no other police force shall be established for the federation or any part thereof.*

   This shows that the Nigerian constitution specifically provided for only one Police Force for the federation. In other to operate or bring about State police, the constitution would have to be amended so that the matters relating to the police force will be removed from the exclusive to the residual or concurrent legislative list.

2. **Political structure of the Nigerian State:** Even though Nigeria is supposed to be operating a federal structure, it is obvious that it operates more like a unitary system. In a federal system, the States, as it obtains in other parts of the world, have legislative powers over their component units such as education, health, judiciaryandlaw enforcement. This is not so in Nigeria. The exclusive list must therefore, be amended to devolve some powers to federating units, especially the on the issue of policing and law enforcement which must be provided for in the concurrent list just like education, health, transport and others.

3. *Political Interests:*There is no doubt that the political calculations of some interest groups in Nigeria is affecting agitation for and against state police. Some believe that allowing the States to share control with the Federal Government will negatively

affect some political equation and balance in Nigeria. While some believe that they need the federal Police in the center to retain some modicum of political power and relevance; others believe that State Police is a necessary balance of power within federating systems.

There is also, a sprinkle some level of social and political ignorance in the argument considering the fact that an institution like the Nigeria Police was inherited from the British colonial administration, which, in fact, left behind a regional system policing when they were departing in 1960. There were regional police structures in the Western, Eastern and Northern regions. These structures were functioning even though with some little problems until the military intervention of January, 1966.

The military structure of monolithic command affected the structure of the Police Force and brought about the unitarist police structure that we have today. If the colonial government which bequeathed the existing police organization to Nigeria still operate regional, state and Metropolitan Units in the United Kingdom, United States of America, Germany and other developed parts of the world, there is no reason why Nigeria should not emulate. All that is needed is to create a legal enabling environment that will take care of all the inherent fears regarding likely misuse.

Opposingtheemergence of State Police completely for whatever reason appear not only retrogressive, but also incompatible with the realities on ground in many States of the federation. The Police as an organization must be completely civil, tame and community-oriented such that police officers operating in a particular environment must be completely domesticated, knowledgeable and service oriented towards the community and the people they serve.

The cliché "community policing", will remain a misnomer and a meaningless phrase if police officerslack cultural and legal compatibility with the people. They cannot be outsiders and should not be subjected to frequent transfers and movements that will make them absentee or stranger elements in the community they are serving. Their involvement as community police officers are challenges that call for reflexive initiatives and proactive service delivery.They need, therefore, be able to think outside the box to function effectively. If they already carry cultural, linguistic, and environmental baggage that will negatively affect their service or slow down their response to issues within the community, then community policing will suffer serious impediments.

It is ironic though that there is any form of misunderstanding over the issue of State Police and Federal Police. This is because the Federal Government never raises any objection whenever States donate law enforcement equipment to the Police.Rather, the Inspector-General of Police (as the representative of the Federal Government), happily receive these donations and even encourage more States to emulate the gesture. It is, therefore, a classic case of a "payer of the piper who cannot dictate the tune".

The Geography of Community Policing in Nigeria

Nigeria is currently made up of 36 states and a Federal Capital Territory (FCT). This indicates the vast expansive of Nigeria's administrative environment, poses serious challenges for the maintenance of law and order. For instance, there is need for adequate human, financial and material resources to be able to ensure security of life and properties. Nevertheless, concerns about how to reinvent the NPF to make it proactive, democratic, problem-solving and people oriented, in line with the new democratic ferment and the global

wind of change in police reform, necessitated the adoption of community policing in Nigeria.

Since its conception in 2002/2003, community policing has been introduced in three states, namely, Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun states. These states were meant to serve as pilot states for the scheme. The basis for the pilot approach was for the scheme to be introduced in a gradualist and incrementalfashion which would be first experimented on a small scale before gradual expansion. Future expansion would thereafter be determined by the success or otherwise of the scheme in the pilot states. This way, the country could avert national security dilemmas in the event of the collapse/failure of the scheme in the pilot states.

For ease of administration and effectiveness, Nigeria currently operates 6, police or service delivery centres across the country. However, with the relative success of the scheme in the affected areas, there has been some considerable expansion in the coverage of the scheme. According to a study by DFID in 2005 to assess the impact of the scheme in six states revealed that there had been reduction of fear of crime, better human rights records and better performance by the police in the affected areas and states from 2005 (lwar, 2010). It was such positive evaluations as these that may have informed the expansionist drive of the scheme, especially as it comes from DFID, which is the main financier/facilitator of the programme.

Currently, the community policing initiative has been extended to 18 of the 36 states in Nigeria. These states are: Enugu, Plateau, Ogun, Lagos, Kano, Kaduna, Rivers, Sokoto, Bauchi, Oyo, Ekiti, Ondo, Edo, Imo, Benue, Kwara, Akwa-Ibom and Bayelsa. In each of these states, five police stations are selected for the experimentation stations are used, respectively. This gives a total of 129 police stations across the 18 states currently operating

community policing. This coverage is certainly too restricted and narrow, as much as it poses its own challenges for the evaluation of the scheme. This geographical/spatial limit of the coverage of the scheme assumes greater significance, especially when one recalls the fact that there are 6, 424 police or service delivery stations in the country. So, geographically and spatially speaking, the coverage of community policing in Nigeria, as currently operated, needs to be further expanded.

Implementation and Accomplishments of Community Policing

The implementation of the community policing initiative in Nigeria was predicated upon the institutional architecture and strategies earlier. It is, however, important to note that these institutional structures and strategies exist in all the States that are currently operating community policing, but there are variations in the application of the main principles, depending on the peculiarity of a particular area. But across board, efforts have been concentrated on internal and external reform measures, geared towards creating a new policing culture that is compatible with the philosophy, vision and mission of community policing in Nigeria.

Despite the limited coverage, it is important to note that the holistic goal of community policing in Nigeria, in the long run, is to adopt it as a strategy of reforming the entire Nigeria police organization to make it democratic, professional and proactive (Iwar, 2010; Ahmadu, 2010). This implies that notwithstanding the selective execution of the scheme, it cannot be regarded as a special-unit, responsibility or function, but a holistic reform measure.

Internally, for example, the main focus has been on the identification of gaps in the existing roles/responsibilities of the NPF and the creation of new ones to rectify identified lapses. Besides, considerable efforts have also been devoted to the training and retraining of police officers in the acquisition of necessary skills and knowledge for the effective implementation of community policing. In these trainings and workshops, there have been deliberate efforts to emphasize the need for change of attitude and behavior among police officers.

To these end, many training manuals have been produced and distributed amongst officers.Theseinclude, for example, Nigeria Police Force Operational Handbook on Community Policing(2007); the Nigeria Police Force Community Policing Divisional Management Team Course Manual(2008); Nigeria Community Safety Handbook(2009); Nigeria Police Force Operational Community Policing Intelligence-Led Policing (Level 1) Practitioner Handbook(2009) and even the recently reprinted Code of Conduct (2004) among others. This is to enable police officers keep refreshing their memories on the dictates of the new scheme.

At the external level, there has also beenprogressive focus on forging partnership and collaboration with communities, Local Government councils, Non-Governmental Organisations and Civil Society Organisations, the mass media, religious groups and public and private agencies. The NPF high command is keen on mobilizing their support and understandingfor the delivery of community policing. The PCCC, the Vigilante Support Officer (VSO), Community Policing Developer (CPD) and the Community Police Office (CPO) are some of the platforms through which such partnerships and mobilization for the execution of community policing are being anchored.

More concretely, and outside the scope of the case studies, some measures have been taken that further deepens the implementation of community policing in Nigeria. For example, in July 2008, the NPF selected four model sites for the implementation of the Intelligence Led Policing (ILP), namely Maitama, Gwagwalada, Victoria Island and Apapa, the first two are under the FCT while the latter two are in Lagos state. In each of these Divisions, a Division Intelligence Officer (DIO) was appointed with support staff to gather information and intelligence from patrols and other reliable sources, recording the information on nominal cards, analyzing the information together with crime information, and providing regular briefings to the DPO and all officers (Nigeria Police Force, 2008b).

Also in 2009, the Local Safety Partnerships (LSP) programme was experimented in two areas: namely,Gwagwalada, FCT and Apapa, Lagos. The LSP was to, among others, work with other agencies and civil society groups under the community policing framework to establish sustainable LSP structures, undertake local community safety audits, develop communication plans to support their work, and to implement these action plans (Nigeria Police Force, 2009a). These two experiments were adjudged to be hugely successful that the Nigeria Police came up with two separate publications, detailing the experiences from the selected cases to serve as a reference guide for those considering the establishment of similar community safety schemes in other parts of Nigeria (NPF, 2009b).

Overall, the community policing experiment has handsome degree of successin Nigeria. In the first official attempt to evaluate the performance of the initiative, DFID (2005) found that the scheme has positively impacted on the security landscape of the country, as well as on the public perception of the police. ACP Austin Iwar who was in charge of community policing corroborated this positive assessment when he stated that

"We are a learning curve…we have started a process which has not disappointed us" (lwar, 2010). DIG John Ahmadu echoed similar sentiments when he noted that:

> *Community policing has been able to bridge the gap between the police and the community. We allow the people to talk and interact with us. Police response too has been in terms of attitudinal change, which makes the people to regain confidence in the police. The reactions of the people, especially in Bauchi have always been very impressive (Oral interview, Ahmadu, 2010).*

The implementation of community policing in the selected case studies have followed similar patterns as enunciated above.

In EnuguState, the researcher conducted interviews with four of the five DPOs of the Police Divisions that are operating community policing in the State to ascertain their collective perspectives on the initiative.According to them, implementation of community policing was based on the principle of partnership among all stakeholders in the communities: the police, community, religious and youth leaders, tradersand transport unions, vigilante groups, government agencies particularly the Local Government Councils and Civil DefenceCorps.

Apart from this partnership, there was also the training of Policemen as Community Developers.Theywere sponsored to undergo training programmes in various parts of the country, including Jos and Kaduna. Upon completion of their training, the Community Developers returned to conduct step-down training for other officers in their Divisions.

There are also important mechanisms for generating feedback on the implementation of community policing in the affected Divisions. The most notable of these include regular monthly meetings of the PCCC where stakeholders not only express their perception on the

execution of the community policing initiative, but also release the security information they have gathered that may assist the police in discharging its duties.There are also informal interactive mechanisms in the form of visitations atthe individual/private level between the police and community members and leaderships.

As a result of these and related measures, community policing has positively impacted on the security situation in Enugu as well as on the image of the police in the State. One particular area where this has manifested the most is in the increasing appreciation and understanding by community stakeholders that the task of effective policing is a collective responsibility that cannot be left completely in the hands of the police alone. This realization is exemplified by the impressive level of collaboration between the police and various segments of the community to enhance police services.

Jacob Muri, DPO of Enugu North Division, revealed that the Chairman of the Local Government bought a brand-new Toyota Hilux Patrol Van for the police. The same Chairman was also said to be making tremendous financial contributions to assist the DPO of the Division in fueling the vehicle. Similarly, a Housing Estate donated a computer set to the police for the storage and retrieval of law enforcement data. Power Holding Company of Nigeria (PHCN) Limited also intervened to solve the power problem in the area as a result of the community policing initiative. These were apart from contributions from several individuals, all indicating the restoration of mutual trust and respect between the police and the communities.

Generally, various Governments in Nigeria have actually imbibed the ideals of community policing through purchase of patrol vehicles including armored cars, communication gadgets, establishment of Police Security Trust Fund and the provision of

Monthly or Quarterly financial assistance to various police patrol teams. This can be found in virtually all the states in Nigeria.

As a result of the foregoing, the community policing initiative in Enugu could be said to have helped bridge the security and communication gap between the police and the people. This is partly because it has facilitated a two-way channel of communication, unlike the past when communication between the police and the community was usually unidirectional.

The overarching implication is the considerable reduction in crime rate and the fear of crime/insecurity, as well as an increase in the level of public trust in the police. Jacob Muri expressed this feeling thus: "if you have been watching the NTA News of recent, you would have seen that the Governor of Enugu has been very happy about this feat" (Muri, 2010).

Kaduna State

The situation is not so different in Kaduna state. There, the implementation of community policing draws on similar institutions and methods. The five Divisions practicing community policing are Sabon Tasha, Kawo, Zonkwa, Kaura and Pambegwa Divisions in the State. In separate interviews with the five DPOs in charge of the Divisions, and in a collective FGD with these DPOs, they revealed some of the methods they adopted in executing community policing in their effort to achieve the desired results. For example, Isaac Gopep, the DPO of Sabon Tasha Division—aDivision notorious for youth restiveness—notedthat the approach was mainly predicated on partnership with the community, a point that was corroborated by the other DPOS.

In these Divisions, permanent and ad-hoc committees are usually set up to address specific security and policing concerns, depending of the issue at hand. In some cases, these large committees are split into sub-committees to enable them discharge their duties adequately. One of such sub-committees in Sabon Tasha, for example, was the 'Electricity Committee'comprising community members and representatives of NEPA/PHCN staff. There were tasked with explaining power failure problems in the area and the steps to be taken to address them.

Other committees include the 'Tribal Committee'set up to address issues of tribal conflicts; 'Youth Committee', where youth leaders are appointed to address the issue of youth restiveness; 'Vigilante Committee', composed of representatives of farmers and Fulani herdsmen placed under the direct supervision of the police.The community also has a'Transport Unions Committee' to see to frequent quarrelsamong commercial motorcyclists, drivers and NURTW officials (Gopep, 2010).

It is important to note that all these committees are well represented in the PCRC (now PCCC), which is the main plank of police-community relations. The PCCC in Kaduna State benefits a lot from at least two unique innovations. The first is decentralization of the PCCC in these Divisions to District levels to address specific policing issues at various police out-stations. The second is the institutionalization of a monthly meeting of the PCCC, where all stakeholders and committees are represented. The immediate impact of the decentralization of the PCCC to District levels is that many more people get involved, thereby promoting a culture of collective policing/security in a way that reinforces the ideals of democratic, community policing. This not only instills a kind of healthy competition

among various Districts, but also yields great effectiveness and efficiency. Similar benefits are also derivable from the monthly meeting of the PCCC.

Under the partnership arrangement in Kaduna State, it is important to note that the police have been able to forge a kind of special bond with the Local Government Councils. Due to the collaboration between the two, the DPOS, especially of Sabon Tasha, produce weekly/monthly security reports for the Council, which promptly responds to such issues. For example, in one of such reports, where the problem of electricity was highlighted as the accelerator of crime in some parts of the Division, the Local Government responded by providing 12 transformers to PHCN to fix the problem.

Another unique innovation of the Divisions in community policing in Kaduna State is active participation in community activities, not just in terms of provision of security, but more in terms of police contributions. For example, any time the community, through any of its organs (say for example, the youth) is organizing seminars, workshops or conferences, the police usually send representatives to make an input and present their own perspectives on the theme of suchprogrammes.

Moreover, at Sabon Tasha, the police instituted what it calls the Weekly DPO Lecture Series, where experts from various walks of life are invited to come and speak on an assigned security-related topic.Dignitaries such as the State Commissioner of Police and officers in charge of community policing are invited to attend the lecture. Opportunities are also given to the people, the police and community people alike, to ask questions to which the DPO or assigned officers would respond. This way, the police get to appreciate the community perspectives on certain security matters, the same way the community develops better understanding of policing issues, thereby gradually changing some old-standing

stereotypes about the police as an unfriendly, and irresponsive organisation. These strategies not only bridge the gap between the police and the community, but also provide avenues for sensitization on security issues.

Community policing in Kaduna State benefit a great deal from well-structured feedback mechanisms. These include the monthly PCCC forum, where both the police and the community present their evaluation and perception of police service delivery; the erection of feedback and/or complaint boxes at police stations through which people can make complaints and ask questions on community policing, including the delivery of Police service; and provision for private visits to the Police by the people and vice versa.

These institutions and delivery mechanisms have enabled community policing to be largely successful in Kaduna state. As noted earlier, Sabon Tasha is notoriously reputed for youth restiveness almost on weekly basis. The problem of violent crime such as armed robbery was also commonplace in the area and at least four to five incidents used to be recorded on weekly basis. But as the DPO in charge of the Division pointed out, since his training in community policing and the application of these strategies, no single riot had been recorded in the area.

Armed robbery has also been drastically reduced to a level where for a whole month the police may record just one or two incidents (Gopep, 2010). This claim was corroborated by other DPOs in Divisions dealing with community policing in the State (Abubakar, 2010; Ossai, 2010; Chior, 2010; Garba, 2010). This achievement was attributed to a better system of gathering adequate information through the willingness and ability of the people to partner the police in enforcing proactive policing. It was also made possible by the strategies of executing community policing in the State.

The problem of cattle rustling, which was very pervasive in the State, has also drastically reduced. This was due to the collaboration between the police and the Fulani vigilante groups, which jointly patrol the bushes.

At the Kawo Division where the big motor garage/park has assumed a notorious reputation for vehicular theft, the community policing initiative has helped to address the problem. Apart from reduction in the number of car theft, the police have been able to make a lot of recovery of stolen vehicles as a result of useful information provided by community members. Over a period of five months between October 2009 and March 2010, the Division recorded no single case of armed robbery (Abubakar, 2010). This was also due to the reinforcement of mutual trust and respect between the police and the community.

At Zonkwa Division, the police was able to concretely address the high rate of crime largely because of its partnership with various segments of the community. Such partnerships resulted in the training of over 150 vigilantes by the police in community policing. They were subsequently issued with uniform, remunerated and equipped by the Local Government (Ossai, 2010).

Overall, community policing in Kaduna State could be said to have positively impacted the police and the society in mutually reinforcing ways. For the police, community police has helped foster attitudinal change towards democratic policing based on popular participation and mutual trust. As such, the popular perception of police and policing is gradually assuming an upward, positive turn. This increasing positive perception of the police as the friend of the people may have contributed to the high level of trust and support granted the police by various stakeholders in community policing in the State. The community has appreciated that policing is a collective responsibility.

In Sabon Tasha, for instance, the community decided on its own to buy torchlights for the police, fuel their patrol vehicles, apart from providing 12 transformers to boost electricity supply based on the security report filed by the DPO.TheChairman of the Local Government interact constantly with the police on security matters and the State government supplied over 250 motorbikes for patrol.

In the same Division, the DPO reported that when he resumed duty, the two available vehicles in the Division were grounded. The Local Government repaired one, while the PCRC repaired the other. Moreover, the Local Government built and equipped modern police stations at Gwagwada, Kujama and Sabongawawithin the Division.

The community also organ established vigilante groups, equip and pay them. The police partner with such groups street-by-street and community-by- community to combat crime (Gopep, 2010). In Kawo Division, the lgabi Local Government erected and equipped a modern police station at Afaka. The Abakpa community also built and equipped their police station. These are signs of genuine partnership and mutual trust between the police and the community.

For the community, the result is drastic reduction in crime rate, decreased level of fear of crime, better understanding of security and policing issues and a general improvement in the security situation of their environment. With these, the members of the communities are better positioned to actualize their potentials, which would have been otherwise threatened, if not impossible, under an environment punctuated by fear of insecurity and excruciating level of criminality.

Ogun State

In Ogun State, another pilot state for community policing, the researcher also conducted separate interviews with the DPOS in charge of the five Divisions operating community policing, and like in Enugu and Ogun State, later brought them together for a FGD.

The community policing initiative in the State is largely hinged on police community collaboration and partnership, community sensitization and value reorientation. These partnerships cut across various stakeholders, including police, trade anddrivers' unions, okada riders, vigilante groups, Local Government officials, who interact to identify and device means of addressing security issues in the communities. In order to achieve the stated goals, there is a monthly meeting of the PCCC to facilitate regular contact and forum interaction between the police and the community. Such a forum allows the people to participate in policing affairs, thereby creating a sense of ownership and belonging in the community.

There are also institutionalized mechanisms that cut across these Divisions for generating feedbacks and measure performance level of community policing in the State. One of these mechanisms, as noted earlier, is the monthly meeting of the PCCC, where stakeholders freely express their views on these important issues. Rooms are also created for individuals and groups, either in person or writing, to visit the Divisions to make submissions on their perception on the delivery of police services under the community policing initiative.

Another important feedback mechanism is the practice of follow-up by the police to ascertain what has been done or remains to be done. This is usually carried out by the Divisional Intelligence Officer, who is mandated to go out and gather intelligence report

from diverse sources about public perception of the performance of community policing in the Division. The officer does this, analyses the data collected and reports appropriately to the DPO, who takes responsibility for charting alternative steps forward, though in conjunction with other stakeholders.

Like in other States, the implementation of community policing has yielded some positive results in OgunState. IsholaBabaita, the DPO of Iperu Division, confirmed that the initiative had been highly successful in the Division because, community policing

> *...has contributed immensely in terms of crime reduction, community participation, alleviation of fear of the and crime rate, confidence building and trust between the police and community* (Babaita, 2010).

He attributed the success to an emerging culture of transparency in the management of police affairs in such a way that people now feel free to come to the stations to ask questions, lodge complaints, all because of the change from undemocratic to democratic policing.

One inevitable conclusion from the above submission, no matter its potentials for subjectivity, is the fact that there is now in existence a culture of mutual trust and respect between the police and the community. This is correct to the extent that the DPO expressed personal satisfaction with the support and contributions of the various stakeholders to the success of the initiative. According to him,

> *...satisfaction is a relative term, but generally, the stakeholders have been very encouraging. They are trying their best for the success of community policing*(Babaita, 2010).

In trying to buttress this claim, Babaita mentioned some of the important contributions of the community to the police in executing proactive, problem— solving, democratic policing in the Division. The DPO noted that the two serviceable patrol vehicles at the Iperu Division (Brand new cars) estimated at about Eight Million Naira (N8m)were donated by an individual in the community for effective policing. In a related vein, some other members donated computer sets with full accessories for storage of data and ease of operation. These or related gestures cut across four other Divisions in community Policing in the State as attested by the DPOs (Faniyi, 2010; Sonubi, 2010; Irozuru, 2010; Kayode, 2010).

Generally, various Governments in Nigeria have actually imbibed the ideas of community policing through purchase of patrol vehicles including armored cars, communication gadgets, establishment of Police Security Trust Fund and the provision of Monthly or Quarterly financial assistance to various police patrol teams. The Trust Fund is made up of respected members of the community, institutions and headed by tested and trusted personalities. For example, the Trust Fund in Edo State is headed by a retired Justice of the Supreme Court; that of Ogun by a retired Director-General of State Security Services and that of Lagos by a retired Inspector General of Police. The researcher was a pioneer member of the Trust Fund in Edo State. This trend is spreading and will soon be found in virtually all the States in Nigeria.

From the foregoing account, community policing could be said to have contributed to effective policing in mutually-reinforcing ways for both the police and the community. This manifests in the promotion of the effectiveness and responsiveness of the police and policing, exemplified by reduction in crime rate and community satisfaction with the police and policing. The emerging culture of mutual trust and respect between the police and the

community seems to hold the main key to greater effectiveness, responsiveness and efficiency of community policing in the country.

CHAPTER FIVE

CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTSOFIMPLEMENTINGCOMMUNITY POLICING IN NIGERIA

Those who plan to implement a new strategy always attempt to understand and weigh different models and to consider the most important factors that could affect the implementation of such a strategy. The approaches will often have prescriptions onhowtocope with challenges that exist either within the organizational setting itself or in the immediate environment within which the organisation operate. Only organizations that are able to overcome these challenges will be able to implement their chosen strategy effectively.

Community policing is a policing model that promotes policing effectiveness and efficiency and therefore came highly recommended when it was introduced in Nigeria. However, in spite of high expectations by all stakeholders and the widespread support it has received among security stakeholders, there remains a number of critical challenges that have limited its effectiveness, but also its total application throughout Nigeria.Thus, implementation of community policing in Nigeria has been beset by some general and specific problems.

Implementation Challenges

Simply defined, a strategy is a plan of action. In the case of private and public organisations and institutions, after recognizing the need for strategic change, the managers set the goals that such strategies will achieve. After this,they must determine actions that must be taken to achieve those goals with the resources available.

Pryor et al. (2007) noted that when implementing a strategy, it is dangerous to ignore critical components because strategy implementation requires an integrative disposition. For example, people and their behaviour play an important role in strategy planning and implementation. The people act in line with specific organizational structures that affect their behaviour, but the behaviour of the people also has an influence on the organizational structure itself. Strategy is influenced by both and also influences them. This implies thatstrategy implementers have to keep in mind the interdependence of different factors and should not disregard any.

In the case of community policing in Nigeria, a number of general challenges were noticed in the course of undertaking this study.These include:

1. **Poorcoverage.** Nigeria has 36 states and a Federal Capital Territory(FCT). These territorial administrative units have a combined total of 6,424 police or service stations across the country. Out of these, only 129, spread almost evenly across 18 states currently operate community policing. This shows that community policing activities currently cover only roughly 2% of Nigeria's territorial administrative units.

    This low coverage is particularly evident is a situation where each of the three pilot states with an average of 20 Divisions only have five stations that are experimenting or piloting thecommunity policing model. It then follows that only an extremely minute segment of the population experience the implementation of community policing and its benefits on a day-to-day basis. By implication, the benefits of the scheme that have been observed in the pilot States do not have a

nationalspread. Rather, they only apply to jurisdictional levels where the schemes are being implemented.

2. **Poor Understanding of the Concept and Philosophy of Community Policing**.Another general problem that is associated with poor coverage is the problem of poor understanding and low penetration of the concept and philosophy of community policing. The DPOs in charge of the scheme in Enugu and Kaduna states harped on the salience of this problem in terms of the limits it posed for effective operation in pilot communities. Since only five Divisions operate community policingwithin a State, only the communities within such jurisdictions have the opportunity to engage the police on security and policing matters. Even within such communities, and despite its appeal to various stakeholders involved in the implementation of the scheme, many of the DPOs interviewed noted that the initiative is elite-dominated and elite-driven. For this reason, vast majorities of the people remains unacquainted with the scheme and lack the ability to participate.

3. **Zero budgeting and overdependence on DFiD:** Adequate funding remains central to the success of any plan. This is the case in the implementation of community policing in Nigeria. Before the introduction of community policing in 2002/2003, one of the major problems of policing institutions and the NPF has been underfunding. This problem is further complicated by the phenomenon of official corruption which deprive the Force of sorely-needed resources needed for boosting efficiency. The introduction of community policing, without adequate budgetary provisionmeant that, but for the intervention of DFID, community leaders and some State and Local Governments, the scheme would have collapsed long ago.

Since the inceptionof community policing in Nigeria, DFID has been the main donor responsible for the funding. So far so good, the agency has been honouring its financial commitment to the scheme. There is, however, the fear of what happens when DFID decides to end its funding support. Although those who expressed reservations about the larger-than-life influence that DFID have over the overall conception, re-conception and execution of the scheme,AustinIwar, the most senior officer in the Force Headquarters who is saddled with overseeing the implementation of the strategynoted that "DFID has no influence in the definition and implementation of community policing in Nigeria. No imposition. Werafted all the documents". Nonetheless, there is need for the Force to own the project by ensuring that its design and implementation is less dependent on support from a foreign body.

4. **Weakness of Divisional Structures:**A major problem confronting the scheme that was identifiedin the course of the researchers interviews with many of the DPOs interviewed is the weakness of Divisional Structures. It was discovered that even in the pilot states, Beat Officers did not have clearly defined responsibilities, lacked prescribed guidelines and standard operating procedures to do their work. In situations whereby such officers are deployed to road blocks for stop and search or other close interface operation without any specific guidelines or monitoring for compliance with laid down community policing standard operating procedures, they are often left to their own discretions in discharging their duties. This has not yielded the desired results of the scheme.

5.   **Poor Documentation:** Another problem that was observed across the three states covered by the study is that of inadequate documentation of community policing experience and gains in the pilot areas. It was observed that across the three states, all the claims about reduction in crime rates were given, at times without documented statistical evidence. The researcher repeatedly attempted to obtain data to substantiate some of the claims made about improvement in security and reduction of crime,all to no avail. This is probably because such data are notregularly updated. When the researcher's probing persisted, some of the DPOs claimed it was beyond their powers to make such data available to researchers. The situation is not different even at the national level because available statistics of crime rate was tabulated on a state-by-state basis, without Divisional breakdown of the data.

At specific levels, however, the pilot States, namely: Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun experienced different challenges and problems in the course of implementing community policing. In Kaduna state for example, one of the major problems reported by the DPOs was the issue of frequent transfer of officers who have been trained and retrained in the philosophy, vision, mission and implementation of community policing. In fact, Isaac Gopep, the DPO at Sabon Tasha, narrated his experience when he was briefly transferred awayfrom the Division, only to be returned later. Duringthe short period of his absence, however, most of the structures he put in place to aid the execution of the scheme were dismantled by his successor, who incidentally, had no experience in community policing because he had never worked in any of the Divisions operating the scheme.

On his return to the Division, it took him time and other resources to be able to restore those structures. He also lamented how many of those who have benefited from step-

down/local training are frequently transferred and once that is done, he had to start training new sets of people. Apart from the usually very huge cost of retaining, this does not allow for continuity. Austin Iwaracknowledged the gravity of this problem when he averred that:

> *Being a pilot programme, we train officers and send them to the pilot Divisions. But shortly thereafter, they may be transferred. This makes it difficult for lessons to be learned and to capture best practice. As the officer is transferred, the training acquired becomes useless, especially if transferred to another station or Division that is not part of the pilots (Oral interview, 2010).*

This, however, is not necessarily the case acrossDivisions in Kaduna. Joseph Ossai, the DPO of ZonkwaDivision(which is not a part of the pilot Divisions in Kaduna)who had acquired prior training in community policing while serving as the DPO of UngwanRimi Division, explained how he took advantage of the trainings and experience, as well as applied the skills to address the high rates of crime in Zonkwahisnew area of responsibility. Accordingto him, the positive results were well appreciated by the community (Oral interview, 2010).

It is possible to argue that because he was the DPO,it was possible for him to introduce the changes he desired and compel his subordinates to obey his directives and commands. This may not be easywhere it is a junior officer that received training in community policing techniques because they only take orders from superior officersand execute same without question. They therefore cannot insist on implementing a strategy without being expressly authorized to do so by their superior officers.

The specific challenges and problems of community policing that were identified in Ogun State are, however, somewhat different. First, there is the peculiar problem of police

adaptation to the changes that accompany implementation of community policing.IsholaBabaita, the DPO of Iperu Division, for example, observed that many policemen still considered the involvement of the community in what they perceive to be traditional and conventional police functions as an intrusion. This sentiment was shared by Austin Iwarwho admitted that: "many police officers see community policing as an add-on, another strategy of doing police work, not knowing that community policing actually defines police work" (Oral interview 2010).

Perceptions such as this has made it difficult for some police officers to adjust to the realities of community policing, thereby hampering their overall commitment and contributions toward the success of the scheme. This should not have been the case, given the fact that ideally, the police are for service to humanity and whatever change is needed to achieve this should be easily adopted and adapted to by all officers. John Ahmadu further underscored this attitudinal problem when he noted that:

> *Apart from the opportunity it offers some police officers for overseas training, not many officers take the community policing initiative with serious passion. This is because adequate incentives are not there. Consequently, after foreign training many police officers want to return to traffic and other "strategic" postings.*

Also, DPOs in OgunStateidentified another peculiar problem to be that of conflict between the personal interests of individual members of the community and those of the largercommunity.YomiFaniyi, the DPO of Ago-Iwoye was very particular about this problem, underscoring how the contributions of some individuals to community policing were not informed by altruism, but by some ulterior motives (FGD, 2010).

However, DIG John Ahmadu offered a new lens through which the point could be x-rayed when he averred that "some individuals see the community policing initiative as a means and an opportunity to get closer to the police as a cover for their nefarious activities" (Oral interview, 2010). The import of this is that: while individual philanthropism should be interpreted as a friendly gesture towards the police and policing, it should also be treated with some degree of circumspection. According to DIG Ahmadu, Police officers should endeavour to ascertain the integrity and pedigree of any individual or group making donations to them to determine what and what not to take.

Prospects of Sustainable Community Policing in Nigeria

The benefits of bringing police forces closer to the community include promoting closer ties between the police and the community and providing opportunities for long-term personal interactions and collaborationsbecause the tasks of crime prevention and detection as well as ensuring public safety cannot be successfully performed without the cooperation of members of the community. The dismal image of the Nigeria Police however, remains a key impediment even in the pilot States and Divisions covered by this study.

In January 2010, the then Inspector-General of Police (IGP), OgbonnayaOnovocommented on the adjustment of the NPF's engagement strategy thus,

> *As we are faced with more sophisticated and enterprising*
> *criminal threat, our emerging policing philosophy—*
> *CommunityPolicing—recognizesthat the police alone do not have*
> *the necessary proactive or reactive capability and capacity to*
> *meet the challenge. Thus, multi-agency and community*
> *collaboration-through partnerships-becomeimperative. In*
> *particular, countering serious crimes requires collaboration for*
> *those functions where there is an operational and business*
> *imperative for joint decisions*(IGP Monthly Briefing, January 25,
> 2010).

This perception of the gains of close collaboration was also pervasive in State Commands of the Force. According to the Public Relations Officer (PRO), Oyo State Police Command, AyodeleLanubi, cooperation is sine- qua-non to effective policing:

> *(T)he police have recorded some measure of successes in fighting*
> *crimes due to the cooperation of the community.Theresult of*
> *working with public and private organizations, artisans and traders*
> *can be very rewarding where there is the feeling of collective*
> *responsibility, mutual understanding and direct consultations with*
> *most of the official barriers removed. (*Nigerian Tribune -
> Community News, 18th January, 2013*).*

In a write-up titled: "Police and the rest of us",Amanze Obi, *Daily Sun* Newspaper of 13th December 2012, noted that the hitherto common scenario of policemen quarreling with the members of the public, threatening people with arms and extorting money and materials from intimidated members of the public is fast disappearing as a result of the advent of

community policing, which has considerably removed the barrier between the police and the members of the publicin some areas.

Despite the avalanche of problems and challenges confronting the effectiveness of community policing in Nigeria, the initiative still holds some prospects for success and sustainability. The prospect of the scheme is informed by a number of factors. These include:

1. ***The possibility of expansion on a national scale.*** This prospect is hinged on the fact that when the project was officially launched on 27 April 2004, the project took off in only three pilot states, namely Enugu, Plateau and Ogun. Between then and 2010—aperiod of six years—theproject has been expanded and now covers 18 states of the federation. This gradualist approach demonstrates that the NPF in particular is committed to the development of the project on a national scale.

2. ***Diversity of funding**:*Attaining national coverage requires adequate funding, which may not be readily available. This is more so given the widespread fear of what would happen if DFID withdraws its funding of the project. Despite the uncertainty that this creates, two factors suggests the prospects of sustainable funding, irrespective of what DFID does whether to continue funding the project or not. The first is that the federal government of Nigeria decided,effective from the 2010 budget,to classify the community policing project as a capital project. This not only show the level of importance the government attach to the scheme, but also an indication that community policing will continue to attract more funds from the government.

The second basis of financial optimism for community policing is the increasing level of cooperation and partnership between the police and communities to ensure the success of the scheme. As mentioned earlier *Security Trust Funds* through which community members donate money and materials voluntarily and officially to assist police funding are springing up in many states like Oyo, Ekiti, Lagos, Edo, and lately Ogun States. The researcher is in fact a member of the Security Trust Fund in Ogun State. This, in a way, is a reflection of the mutually reinforcing benefits of community policing to both the police and the community.

The attendant financial and material contributions to the scheme by community members and groups on the one hand, and the increasing commitment of the police to effective delivery of police services on the other, approximate current symbiotic relationships. As such, it is unlikely that the communities will fold their hands and allow the policing initiative that have not only brought them security of life and property, but also enhanced their participation and understanding of security and policing affairs to collapse over lack of funding.

In the circumstance, there is the likelihood that communities may increase their financial and material commitments to the sustainability of the scheme during periods of financial stress. Without any doubt, the costs of increasing support for the success of the project will be small compared to the costs of withdrawals, including the return of fear of crime, increasing crime rate and mutual distrust between the police and the community, all of which may undermine the full actualization of individual and group potentials in communities.

1. **Feedback Component:**The existence of institutionalized mechanisms for generating feedback on the project, which gives room for measuring success and failure, also offers some prospects for community policing. Apart from the specific mechanisms which vary from one State to another, the level of international enthusiasm for the project is considerable. In Enugu state, for instance, the DPOs revealed how several expatriates had visited to have a first-hand assessment of the scheme.

    DFID has also been committed to periodic evaluation of the scheme by commissioning evaluations. The first was in 2005 and the second in 2009. The Department of Sociology of the Ahmadu Bello University also reportedly did a comprehensive survey on the implementation of the scheme in Kaduna state. In both the DFID and ABU surveys, the project was highly rated to have made positive impact on security and policing issues, most especially in terms of facilitating harmonious police-community relations. Yet, they also noted specific areas that require adjustments and suggestions about what to be done to effect desired changes. Such feedback mechanisms are, therefore, like lenses through which the project could be mirrored in terms of accomplishments, failures and the way forward.

2. **Capacity Building:** With constant training and retraining of police officers, there are prospects that the police will soon overcome initial misunderstanding, misconceptions and resistance to the scheme which are currently very high. Such attitudinal changes have already begun to manifest. During the researcher's interview with them, Austin Iwar and DIG John Ahmadu—twohighly placed officers in the implementation of the scheme—both bore testimony that there has been tremendous improvement in police attitude toward community policing.

In Ogun state where the DPOS lamented that some police officers saw community involvement in community policing as an intrusion, they admitted that the situation was actually improving as a result of constant training. Better still the police have published several training/workshop manuals on different aspects of community policing, which are now widely circulated among police officers and communities to further educate and remind them about the essentials of community policing. These gestures are well positioned to alter negative perception of the project both within and outside the police.

3. **Annual Stakeholders' Conference:**The institutionalization of an annual stakeholders' conference which brings together police officers and community members has also contributed to the prospects of community policing in Nigeria. Such a conference provides a broader platform than the PCCC at Divisional levels, which cut across all the Divisions in the 18 states involved in community policing across the country, to interact. This helps inter-Divisional and inter-State comparison and exchange of ideas on how to improve the delivery of the scheme. In a way, this helps develop greater interest and commitment to the scheme by the police and the people.

4. **Massive Public Support:**Finally, there is an overwhelming public support for the initiative and the imperative of its continuity. As revealed in the perception survey conducted, various stakeholders expressed satisfaction with the community policing initiative, expressing their trust in the scheme and desire for it to be sustained.

Public Perceptions of Community Policing in Nigeria

In order to ascertain the veracity of the claims of positive accomplishments by the police, the study carried out substantial survey of public perception of the performance of community policing in Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun states. The following section reports the main findings of the survey.

Table 2: Perception of Community Policing in Pilot States

Description	Enugu State	Kaduna State	Ogun State	Total (%)
Level of awareness about community policing (CP)	201 (81.70%)	199 (83.28%)	221 (83.28%)	621 (81.60%)
Positive rating of CP	193 (78.45%)	196 (82.00%)	219 (79.34%)	608 (79.89%)
Positive effect on crime	190 (77.23%)	196 (82.00%)	216 (78.26%)	602 (79.10%)
Level of community participation	194 (78.86%)	207 (86.61%)	198 (71.73%)	599 (78.71%)
Personal involvement or someone I know	171 (69.51%)	189 (79.07%)	191 (69.20%)	551 (72.40%)
Awareness of feedback mechanisms	157 (63.83%)	181 (75.72%)	181 (65.57%)	519 (68.19%)
Use of these mechanisms	139 (56.50%)	162 (67.76%)	163 (59.05%)	464 (60.97%)
Police response feedbacks	139 (56.50%)	161 (67.36%)	159 (57.60%)	459 (60.31%)
Trust for the police for effective policing	168 (68.29%)	198 (82.45%)	188 (68.11%)	544 (72.79&)
Noticeable lapses	171 (69.51%)	149 (62.34%)	191 (69.20%)	511 (67.14%)
Desired continuity of CP	169 (68.69%)	198 (82.45%)	198 (71.73%)	565 (74.24%)
Always willing to support CP	201 (81.70%)	196 (82.00%)	221 (80.07%)	618 (81.20%)

Source: Researchers Fieldwork data 2013/14

As the table above indicates, public perception of community policy in the three states investigated is highly positive and supports the claims of success made by the NPF. Every indicator used in measuring public perception of the initiative scored highly on the scale of frequency distribution and percentage analysis, irrespective of noticeable variations from State to State.

First, the level of public awareness in the jurisdictional areas of the project was very high. Overall, a total of 621 of the 761 respondents claimed to be aware of the community

policing initiative in the locality. This gives an average of 81.60% across the three states. Specifically, however, 201 (81.70%), 199 (83.28%) and 221 (80.07%) of the 246, 239 and 276 respondents from Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun state, respectively, demonstrated awareness of the project.

Beyond awareness, many of the respondents have either participated directly in the scheme, or knew someone who had participated one way or the other. Across the three states, a total of 551 (72.40%) of the respondents expressed this perception. At the level of individual state, 171 (69.51%) of the respondents in Enugu state, 189 (79.07%) of the respondents from Kaduna state, and 191 (69.20%) of respondent from Ogun state claimed to have participated in the scheme one way or the other. When asked to demonstrate specific modes of participation in the scheme, some of the respondents listed one or more of the following, namely: attending community security meetings; membership of security committees such as the PCCC and /or vigilante group; increased personal visits to the police station to lodge complaints or volunteering useful information that helped the police in their duties; feeling more relaxed and confident in reporting crimes to the police;and financial/material contributions toward the success of the scheme.

These claims appear to be valid because many of the respondents demonstrated familiarity with available feedback mechanisms on community policing in their locality. In totality, 519 (68.19%) of the respondents across the three states made this claim, the breakdown according to each state is as follows: Enugu 157 (63.83%), Kaduna 181 (75.73%) and Ogun 181 (65.57%).

In further attempt to verify the authenticity of the claims, respondents were asked whether they or somebody they knew had explored the use of any of such mechanisms.

Interestingly, many of the respondents also answered the question in the affirmative. To be sure, a total of 464 (60.97%) of the respondents claimed to have either used or know someone who had used any of the feedback mechanisms. In Enugu state, 139 (56.50%) made this claim, while 162 (67.78%) and 163 (59.05%) of the respondents made similar claims inKaduna and Ogun.

The respondents were also asked to evaluate police response to the feedback they often receive from the public, whether such feedbacks feed into the policy processes of the community policing framework. In other words, respondents were asked to express their level of satisfaction with such responses. In Enugu state, 139 (56.50%) of the respondents expressed satisfaction with police responses to the feedbacks they received. It was 161 (67.36%) in Kaduna and 159 (57.60%) in Ogun states. On the average, this amounts to 459 (60.31%) of respondents across the three states. This obviously represent the lowest approval rates of all the indices that were used to assess public perception of community policing across the three states. It may be an indication that the people are not well carried along in the design of such feedbacks. Nevertheless, both at the general level and in each state, the statistics is still encouraging because the level of positive approval is above average.

Against the background of the feedbackabove, it is hardly surprising that respondents reported a high level of community participation in the community policing project. For the avoidance of doubt, a total of 599 (78.71%) of the respondents in the three states were of the view that people from the jurisdictional areas have been adequately informed and carried along, and that they also participate in the execution of the programme. About 194

(78.86%), 207 (86.61%), and 198 (71.73%) of respondents from Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun, respectively, expressed this view.

Due to the fact that the scheme was not operated state-wide, respondents were also asked to evaluate the performance and impact of the scheme in their locality. Specifically, respondents were of the view that community policing has brought about some appreciable level of reduction in the level of crime and the fear of insecurity that were the order of the day in the pre-community policing era. They also felt that the scheme has helped restore public confidence in the police as well as mutual respect between the police and the community.

The feedbacks above corroborates the views of the DPOs of the affected areas who made similar claims in their interviews and FGDs with the researcher. Respondents who felt the scheme had made positive contributions in the aforementioned areas across the three states were 602 (79.10%), the breakdown of which shows that 190 (77.23%), 196 (82.00%), and 216 (78.26) of them were from Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun states respectively.

It is partly for the above reasons that the public expressed profound trust in the police as capable of undertaking effective, proactive and problem-solving policing, especially when provided with the enabling environment. For example, 544 (72.79%) of the total respondents said they trust the police as capable of providing effective policing. The breakdown shows that 168 (68.29%), 198 (82.45%), and 188 (68.11%) of respondents from Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun expressed this perception, respectively. This translates to an improved public image for the police in the jurisdictional areas of community policing.

Nevertheless, this is not to say that everything about the scheme was granted public approval without exemptions. The respondents were asked to identify noticeable lapses in

the conception and execution of community policing in the locality. Despite the seeming public romanticism with the project, as the foregoing statistics of approval demonstrate, respondents noted that there were noticeable lapses to be improved upon. Overall, 511 (67.14%) of respondents across the three states expressed this perspective. At the state level, it was 171 (69.51%), 149 (62.34%), and 191 (69.20%) for Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun states, respectively.

Some of the lapses identified include the poor coverage of the scheme as currently operated, which tends to limit the overall impact of the project; the frequent transfer of police officers that have been trained for the scheme, and worse still their replacement with those who have not been trained in the art of community policing; and the corrupt tendencies of some police officers. This buttresses the submissions of DPOs in charge of community policing in the study areas about some of the problems and challenges they confront in implementing the project.

Despite these reservations, however, it is important to note that majority of the respondents still passed a vote of confidence on the scheme through expression of strong support for continuity of the scheme. The total number of respondent who expressed support for the continuity and sustainability of the scheme across the three states were 565 (74.24%). At the level of each state, it was 169 (74.24%), 198 (82.45%), and 198 (71.73%) for Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun states, respectively.

In a seeming demonstration of the importance they attached to the above claim, most of the respondents expressed their willingness and ability to continue to support the scheme one way or the other as 201 (81.70%), 196 (82.00%), and 221 (80.07%) of the respondents from Enugu, Kaduna and Ogun state respectively indicated a willingness to provide further

support in future. This amounts to a total of 618 (81.20%) of the total respondents in the three states.

It is, therefore, not surprising to see the respondents rate the scheme very highly. When asked how they rated the scheme in their locality, majority claimed they rated it as either effective or highly effective. The combination of those who made such expressions amounted to 193 (78.45%) in Enugu state, 196 (82.00%) in Kaduna state, and 219 (79.34%) in Ogun State. This adds up to 608 or 79.89% of the sample population.

A careful reading of the above data afforded some interesting revelations about public perception of community policing among Nigerians, including the police and the communities. One, there is no discernible difference between the perception of the scheme by police officers and community members in the pilot communities. In other words, they both perceive the scheme in positive light. This is exemplified by the high level of positivity that both publics attribute to the scheme as shown above. Two, there is little or no discrepancy in the public perception of community policing across the three states where the scheme operated.

Despite following the same trend across the three states, the rate of approval was a little bit higher in Kaduna State than in the two other states, on all, but one of the indices of evaluation (see table above). This may be due to variations in the level of innovations in the applications of the scheme in the different states. Specifically, the decentralization of the scheme (for example the PCCC in particular) to District levels within the jurisdictional areas in Kaduna state may have accounted for the broader level of public awareness and participation in the scheme. This suggests that the ingenuity of police leadership at various

Divisions in devising appropriate implementation strategies that is suitable to their jurisdictions is vital to the effective implementation of the scheme.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Summary

When implementing any kind of change within a complex organization like the Nigerian Police Force, flexibility in implementation is critical. Changemanagers must adapt to cues andsuggestionsfrom the people with whom they are working irrespective of whether these are foreign development agencies who are willing to provide technical and or financial support or community stakeholders who show a commitment to self-preservation by investing in communal security.

Community policing initiativewas embraced by the NPF as a panacea to several institutional handicaps that it has especially an enduring image problem, centralization of policing in a federating system, inefficiency occasioned by low provisioning by the Nigerian government, manpower shortages and a testy and caustic relationship with a public that they were commissioned to serve and to protect. Several attempts on the part of military and civilian regimes to address these through reforms failed to reverse the handicaps.

While changing anorganization like the NPF that is deeply and culturally set in its ways will usually pose a challenge for change leaders, redirecting such an organization can sometimes take years of concerted effort especially where leadership remains constant or stable. In the case of the NPF, there is some attempt to work more closely with local communities, but it is nonetheless still struggling to endear itself to Nigerians and the mutual suspicion remains palpable especially in areas that are not covered by the community policing initiative. Besides, the leadership stability required for deepening the initiative has remained largely unstable due to political interference and manipulations that result in frequent changes in NPF leadership.

Under the new initiative, police officers are being asked to engage in broad-based community problem solving alongside community members in order to create secure and safecommunities.Thisassumesthat there is a mutual commitment to broadly focused, problem-oriented policing and requires that police officers become embedded in the communities that they serve in return for close collaboration and support from the community. In the community policing pilot States, these expectations were clearly met to the extent that; from three, community policing practice have now expanded to eighteenStates in Nigeria.

The failure of all previous initiatives to facilitate the reforms needed for the emergence of a people-oriented police force led to calls from concerned groups for a rethink of existing regulations guiding policing practice; the decentralization of the Nigeria police in such a way that control will rest with the political authority in each State of the federation, rather than with the Federal Government;and ultimately, establishment of State police to replace the current centralized federal policing system.

Proponents of the establishment of State Police insist that centralization is an anomaly under a federal system and that implementation of community policing models often calls for decentralization, de-formalization, de-layering, and de-specialization of the police organization. Opposing to this proposal rests on fears that the peculiar nature of the Nigerian political system makes the prospect of its success doubtful. This debate continues to rage,but this study clearly established the fact that the flexibility of the community policing model and its ability,not only to adjust to local peculiarities in pilot communities, but to attract massive support within the first decade of its inceptionis a step in the right direction; irrespective of whether it leads to the establishment of a State policing system.

Conclusion

This study established the contextual and institutional factors that occasioned the establishment of the community policing model in Nigeria.It also examined existing political and institutional challenges that continue to hinder the attainment of full benefits of this participatory securitization model in Nigeria. In the process, the study was able to identify positive experiences associated with the model that underline its wholesale adoption in Nigeria. Even though Nigeria has adopted the language and organisational features of community-oriented policing in more States than those that started the scheme in 2002 and several other stakeholders are investing in improving its effectiveness and efficiency in terms of law enforcement,the NPF remain fundamentally the same as it has always been—politicised, malleable and under-resourced by the federal government.

Despite the acknowledged relevance of the community policing in modern policing practice and the fact that there ismassive literature on the subject, the model is not taken so

seriously by the police high command and in most cases, whether or not it gets attention in any particular year is a function of which IGP is on the saddle.

From the data generated from the field survey and analyzed, community policing appear to be making some inroad into the policing philosophy of Nigeria. From a small beginning of three selected states to pilot the scheme, it has expanded into 18 states of the federation, though on a restricted basis in each of these States. In each of the States covered by the study, it was found that the institutional structures of implementing the scheme are essentially the same. The same thing applies to the strategies of implementation, which also draws on similar mechanism, except for a few instances of innovations and adaptations.

The study also revealed that community policing has made some important contributions to the effectiveness, responsiveness and efficiency of policing in the country. These contributions, however, are applicable to the jurisdictional areas of implementation, namely the police Divisions where the scheme is being operated, as against the entire country. This brings to the fore the challenges and problems confronting the scheme, in this particularly case the problem of coverage. This is in addition to other challenges such as funding, attitudinal problems to the scheme among some police officers, logistic problems and so on.

The studyclearlyindicate that public perception is overwhelmingly in support of the scheme. It is, therefore, important to devise means of addressing the identified challenges that are currently dogging the implementation of the scheme so as to enhance greater effectiveness, responsiveness, efficiency and thesustainability of the scheme.

Recommendations

In view of the findings of this study on the design, implementation challenges and the prospects of community policing for maintaining law and order, fighting crimes and protecting lives and properties, improving public security and promoting closer collaboration and joint problem-solving between local communities and other stakeholder groups with the police in Nigeria, the researcher makes the following recommendations:

1. Adoption of a community policing system across the length and breadth of Nigeria to further consolidate the gains experienced across the pilot States in Nigeria because effectiveness in law enforcement will only be possible where police officers have the trust and support of the public;

2. Establishment of a dual policing system whereby there will be federal policein charge of security and law and order matters that are national in nature; and a community policing system under the control of States that will be designed to reflect the security needs of such a State.

3. Amendment of the Nigerian constitution to bring the police under the concurrent legislative list, but with all the legal caveats that will prevent conflicts between the federal and the state policing systems.

4. Thefederal police and the state police system coexist and strictly controlled and guided to reduce possible conflicts over overlapping mandates. In the United States, for example, the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) or federal police exist side by side with the State Police Departments all over the country and there is no conflict because the law clearly separate their powers and functions. While the state police departments concentrate solely on fighting local crimes in their respective states, the

FBI covers both criminal and political matters throughout the federation but is empowered to intervene and take over specific cases where necessary.

5.   The Nigerian public should be sufficiently sensitized on the viability and necessity of community-policing as a joint problem-solving approach to contemporary security challenges.

1.   Cordial public-police relations should be promoted through
     deliberate public relation programmes and re-orientation activities.

7.   Stakeholders should support funding of the police and other security agencies with a view to improving their welfare incentives, accommodation, equipment, conditions of service and so on.

8.   Suitable educational qualification should guide recruitment into
     the Nigeria police force to ensure good service delivery

9.   Impediments to establishment of state police should be removed so that federal, state and local government police structures could co-exist for effective security and maintenance of law and order.

Limitations

It is common that certain limitations confront exploratory studies into a relatively new area as community policing in Nigeria. This included scarcity of publications on the workings of the community policing initiative and reluctance on the part of respondents to provide full details of their involvement in the scheme.

Although exploring the three states comparatively would certainly be more revealing, as such a comparative exploration could be said to be fairly representative of the three geopolitical zones in Nigeria with one state each from the eastern (Enugu), western

(Ogun) and northern (Kaduna) regions of Nigeria. This, however, poses its own unique challenges, most notably that of data collections and huge financial requirement for fieldwork in the three states. Yet, the study could not do a comparative analysis of reported crime statistics for the target states for the years covered by this study with a view to generalizing about the observable impact of the initiative. This is because community policing is still being selectively executed in only five Divisions of the affected states. Unfortunately, available crime statistics do not have Divisional analysis. It, therefore, becomes difficult to make meaning out of the data, at least for the purpose of this study.

However, the fact that the researcher is an 'insider'(Police Officer) induced cooperation and thereby enhanced access to relevant data and key informants on community policing in Nigeria.

Contribution to Knowledge

One of the key contributions that this study makes to existing knowledge on police and policing in Nigeria is laying bare the key impediments to the full and proper implementation of community policing in Nigeria especially those having to do with structural or constitutional handicaps imposed by centralization of policing in a federal system like Nigeria and the need to rework this by placing aspects of policing under the residual list of tasks that States, rather than the Federal Government should take responsibility for.Another contribution has to do with the exposition of frameworks within which the Nigeria Police could perfect its relationship and image challenges; especially the need for police officers to understand and operate within local culture, tradition, social mores and values because a police organization that will operate community police must belong in totality to the community.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abiri, B. (2011). "Models of community policing: What worked and what did not, CLEENFoundation experience". Paper presented at the 3rd biennial national conference on community development in Nigeria, Nov. 22, 2011, Grand hotel, Asaba, Delta state

Abdulkadir, M. B., "Measuring Police Effectiveness in Nigeria: An Evaluation of Input and Output". In Alemika and Chukwumaeds, (2004) Crime and Policing in Nigeria: Challenges and Options. Ikeja: CLEEN Foundation

Alao, Abiodun (2000) "Working Paper: Security Reform in Democratic Nigeria", The Conflict, Security and Development Group, King's College, London.

Alemika E. E. (1988) "Policing and Perceptions of Police in Nigeria" *Police Studies* 11(4): 161-176.

Alemika, E. E. O. (1993) "Colonialism, State and Policing in Nigeria" *Crime, Law and Social Change* 20: 187 - 219

Alemika, E. E. O. (2003a) "Police, Policing and Rule of Law in Transitional Countries" in Lone Lindholt, Paulo de MesquitaNeto, Danny Titus and Etannibi E. Alemika (eds.)

Alemika, E. E. O. (2003b) "Police Corruption and Insecurity in Nigeria", in S. Einstein and M. Amir (Eds.) Police Corruption: Paradigms, Models and concepts – Challenges for Developing Countries, Huntsville, Texas: Office of International Criminal Justice, Sam Houston State University, Chapter 18 (445-494).

Alemika, E. E. O. and Innocent C. Chukwuma (2004), Crime and Policing in Nigeria: Challenges and Options. Ikeja: CLEEN Foundation.

Alice Hills (2000), Policing Africa: Internal Security and the Limits of Liberalization. Boulder, CO.: Lynne Rienner.

AlozieOgugbuaja, 'The People's Police' Vol. 2 (2002)
    CLASSIFIED.

Babarinde, S. A., "The Link between Everyday Reasoning, Scientific Research and Theory". In: Olayinka, A.I., V. O. Taiwo, A. Raji-Oyelade, and I. P. Farai eds. (2006) Methodology of Basic and Applied Research 2ndEdn. Ibadan: The   Postgraduate School, University of Ibadan.

Barley, D. H. (1992), Comparative Organization of the Police in English-speaking Countries; Chicago: Chicago UP.

Barry Goetz and Roger Mitchell, "Community-Building and Reintegrative Approaches to Community Policing: The Case of Drug Control." *Social Justice*. Volume: 30 (1) 2003.

Barry N. Leighton, "Visions of Community Policing: Rhetoric and Reality in Canada." *Canadian Journal of Criminology* Volume: 33 (4) 1991.

Billy Dudley, (1973), Instability and Political Order: Politics and Crisis in Nigeria; Ibadan: Ibadan UP

Blair Davies, 'British Council Security Justice and Growth Program, Nigeria Police Community Policing Document, May 3, 2005.

Brogden, M. (2004), Community Policing: International Perspectives. Crompton: Willan Publishers,

Call, C. and M. Barnett (2007), 'Looking for a few good cops', *International Peacekeeping* 6(4)

"Camps to replace roadblocks – Ehindero," *This Day (*Nigeria),
    February 2, 2005.

Chene, M. (2012).Community policing as a tool against corruption.U4Anti-corruption Resource Centre, Transparency International.

Cheurprakobkit, S. (2008). "The importance and incorporation of community policingcharacteristics in midsize and large police departments: police chiefs' views".

In J. Ruiz & D. Hummer (eds.) *Handbook of police administration*. Boca Raton: CRC Press.

Chief OlusegunObasanjo, Opening address at the four-day *National Summit on Crime and Policing in Nigeria* organized by Network on Police Reform in Nigerian (NOPRIN) in April 2004.

Chukwuma, Innocent, "Improving Police-Community Relations in Nigeria: Issues at Stake"; Paper presented at the *Workshop on Prevention of Violation of Human Rights in Nigeria*, organized by the Nigeria Police Force at the Sheraton Hotelsand Towers, Abuja, August 18-19, 2005

--------------- (2008), "Motions Without Movement" Report of the Presidential Committees on Police; Ikeja, Lagos: CLEEN Foundation

Community Policing Project Plan: Report and Recommendation on the Implementation of Community Policing in Nigeria, February 18, 2004.

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999; Apapa, Lagos: Federal Government Press

Coquilhat, J. (2008). Community policing: An international literature review. Wellington: New Zealand Police.

"Crime, Police and Society;" *Third Eye(*Nigeria), July 24, 1996.Anifowose, Remi (1982), Violence and Politics in Nigeria: The Tiv and Yoruba Experience. New York: Nok Publishers International

"Crime, Police and Society;" *Third Eye(*Nigeria), July 24, 1996.

Cynthia Jones and David Maurrasse eds. (2003) A Future for Everyone: Innovative Social Responsibility and Community Partnerships. New York: Routledge.

Dambazau, A. B. (1999). *Criminology and Criminal Justice*. Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited

David H. Bayley and Clifford D. Shearing, "The Future of Policing." *Law & Society Review*, Volume: 30. Issue: 3. (1996).

Dennis Jay Kenney and Robert P. McNamara (1999), Police and Policing: Contemporary Issues; Westport, CT: Praeger.

Dionne, E. J. Jr. ed. (1998), Community Works: The Revival of Civil Society in America. Washington, DC.: Brookings Institution.

Douglas D. Perkins and Ralph B. Taylor, "Disorder: Their Relationship to Fear of Crime and Theoretical Implications"; *American Journal of Community Psychology,* Volume 24(1), (1996:65).

Edward R. Maguire and William Wells, "Community Policing as Communication Reform" *Law Enforcement, Communication and Community* 33, (2002).

Ehindero, S.G. (1998). The Nigeria Police and Human Rights.Jos: Ehindero Press.

----------- (2005). "Crime Indices in Nigeria: Linkages to Socio-Economic Inadequacies". Being a paper presented at the National Summit in Social Security held at Abuja, Nigeria.

Erin Gibbs Van Brunschot, 'Community Policing and "John Schools"'.*The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* Volume: 40. (2) 2003; Canadian Sociology and Anthropology Association.

EtanibiAlemika and Innocent Chukwuma eds. (2004) Crime and Policing In Nigeria: Challenges And Options. Ikeja: CLEEN Foundation.

"Extortion: 900 Policemen Fired," *This Day (*Nigeria)*,* July 21, 2004.

"Fashola Launches Platform for Ordinary Nigerians to Donate to Security Trust Fund," *Lagos State Government Press Release*, October 16, 2009.

Fayemi and Olonisakin (2008), "Nigeria" in Challenges of Security Sector Governance in West Africa, DCAF Publication

Federal Government of Nigeria (April 2008) White Paper on the Report of the Presidential Committee on the Reform of the Nigeria Police Force.

Femi Odekunle, "Overview of Policing in Nigeria: Problems and Suggestions". InAlemika, E. E. O. and Innocent C. Chukwuma eds. (2004), Crime and Policing in Nigeria: Challenges and Options. Ikeja: CLEEN Foundation

Fred Reed, "The Cost of Community Policing," *The Washington Times* 26April 1999,

Gittel, R. and A. Vidal (1998), Community Organizing: Building Social Capital as a Development Strategy. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Global Facilitation Network for Security Sector Reform (2005), Building Effective and Accountable Security Institutions in Africa; UK: GFN-SSR, Cranfield University, Swindon. www.gfr-ssr.org/edocs/

Goldsmith, A. and Harris, V. (2012)."Trust, Trustworthiness and Trust-building in International Policing Missions."In*Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, Vol.45, No.23.

Green, J. "Community Policing in America: Changing the Nature, Structure and Function of the Police". In Horney, J. et al eds (2000), Policies, Processes and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System (Vol. 3); Washington DC: US Department of Justice.

Greene, J., and S. Mastrofski (1988), Community policing: Rhetoric or reality. New York: Praeger.

Greene, J., Bergman, W., & McLaughlin, E. (1994), "Implementing Community Policing: Cultural and Structural Change in Police Organizations," in D. Rosenbaum (Ed.).

Grinc, R. "Angels in marble: Problems in stimulating community involvement in community policing". *Crime and Delinquency* 40, (1994:437-468).

Hills, A., 2008, 'The Dialectic of Police Reform in Nigeria', Journal of Modern African Studies vol. 46, no.2, pp. 215-234

Hope, T. & M. Shaw Eds. (1988), Communities and crime prevention. London: Home Office Research and Planning Unit.

"Human Rights Group criticizes Fire-for-Fire," *Daily Trust (*Nigeria)*, April, 2002

Human Rights and the Police in Transitional Countries, The Hague: Kluwer Law International

Human Rights Watch interview with Blair Davies, Police Advisor, British Council Security Justice and Growth Program, Abuja, March 17, 2005.

"IG scraps Operation Fire-for-Fire," *Punch (*Nigeria), January 26,

2005.

Isibor, O. "Security Challenges Ahead for the Police" *ThisDay*, October 1, 2000.

James Forman Jr., "Community Policing and Youth as Assets."*Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*. Volume: 95 (1) 2004; Northwestern University, School of Law.

"Jemibewon to Overhaul Police Force," *The Guardian (*Nigeria)*, July 15, 1999.

Jennifer T. Comey, Jill Dubois, Susan M. Hartnett, Marianne Kaiser, Justine H. Lovig, Wesley G. Skogan (1999), On the Beat: Police and Community Problem Solving. Boulder, CO.: Westview Press.

Jerome Skolnick and David Bayley, "The new blue line: Police innovation in six American cities" (1986).

Kappeler, V.E. & Gaines, L.K. (2009).*Community policing: A contemporary perspective* (5th edition). Newark, NJ: Matthew Bender & Company.

Kleinenberg, E. (2001),"Bowling Alone, Policing Together." *Social Justice* 28,3: 75-80.

Lurigio, A. and W. Skogan, "Winning the hearts and minds of police officers: An assessment of staff perceptions of community policing in Chicago"; *Crime and Delinquency* 40; (1994: 315-330).

Lyons, W. (1999) The Politics of Community Policing. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Madaki, Maikano and Mustapha HashimKurfi (2013), "Toward Enhancing Police-Community Relations in Nigeria: Problems and Prospects". *Journal of Sociological Research*, Vol. 4, No.2; pp 125—134. Available @: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/jsr.v4i2.3972

Maguire, E.R. (1997) "Structural Change in Large Municipal Police Organizations During the Community Policing Era." *Justice Quarterly* 14: 548-576.

Makkai, T. and J. Braithewaite (1994) "Reintegrative Shaming and the Compliance with Regulatory Standards."*Criminology* 32: 361-383.

Mark Mazower (1997), The Policing of Politics in the Twentieth Century: Historical Perspectives. Providence, RI: Berghahn Books.

Mastrofski, S. (1983) "The Police and Non-Crime Services." G. Whitaker and C.D. Phillips (eds.), Evaluating Performance of Criminal Justice Agencies. Beverly   Hills: Sage.

Mastrofski, S.D., R.E. Worden, and J.B. Snipes (1995) "Law Enforcement in a Time of Community Policing."*Criminology* 33: 539-562.

Matthews, R.G. () "Schmoke to Add Drug Programs: 3 Agency Heads Told to Find $5Million to Pay for Expansion." *Baltimore Sun* (January 14, 1997). Available @ www.newslibrary.com.

McNamara, J.D. (1995) "Drug Peace." *San Jose Mercury News* (May 17).

Morash, M. and A. Robinson (2002) "The Nexus of Community Policing and Domestic Violence." M. Morash and J.K. Ford (eds.), The Move to Community Policing:Making Change Happen. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Pp.180-203.

Morash, M. and J.K. Ford (2002) The Move to Community Policing: Making Change Happen. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

National Crime Prevention Council (2007): Improving Police-Community Relations through Community Policing. Abuja: Bureau of Justice Assistance.

Nigel Fielding (1995), Community Policing. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

"Nigeria Police: Relating with the men in black"; *Security and Safety* Vol. 5 No. 30, 2001:26.

 "Nigeria Police Force, Police Transformation in Nigeria, the Strategic Planning Process," United States Agency for International Development, Office of Transition Initiative and United Kingdom, Department for International Development, December 14, 2000.

Nigeria Police Force, 2008 Annual Report of the Nigeria Police Force. Available @ http://www.nigeriapolice.org/ police-annual-report.html

Nolan, J.L. (2001) Reinventing Justice: The American Drug Court Movement. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

NOPRIN (2010) 'Criminal Force: Torture, Abuse, and Extrajudicial Killings by the Nigeria Police Force'; Lagos: NOPRIN

Nyemutu Roberts and Antonia Simbine (2002), "Federalism, Hegemonic Politics and the Forces: The Case of the Nigeria Police Force." In M. Jibo and A. Simbine eds. (2003), Contemporary Issues in Nigerian Politics; Ibadan: Jodad.

Offe, C. (1974) "Structural Problems of the Capitalist State: Class Rule and the Political System: On the Selectiveness of Political Institutions." K. von Beyme (ed.), German Political Studies. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Okereke, G. O. "Public Attitudes towards the Police Force in Nigeria." In Police Studies: International Review. *Police Development*, 113:16.

Okeshola, F. B. &Mudiare, P. E. (2012).Community policing in Nigeria.Challenges andprospects.*American International Journal of Contemporary Research*.*3* (7): 134-138.

Okiro, M. M. (2007). "The Nigeria Police Force Operational Handbook on Community Policing". Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

Olujinmi, A. (2005). "Keynote Address: Crime and Policing in Nigeria". In E.O. Alemika&I.C. Chukwuma (eds.) *Crime and policing in Nigeria: Challenges &Options*. Lagos,Nigeria: CLEEN Foundation. Pp. 19-21.

Ola Balogun (1973), The Tragic Years: Nigeria in Crisis 1966-1970; Benin City: Ethiope Publishing Corp.

Oluwaniyi, O. O. (2011). Police and the institution of corruption in Nigeria, Policing andSociety.*An International Journal of Research and Policy 21* (1): 67-83

Pamela Irving Jackson (1989), Minority Group Threat, Crime, and Policing: Social Context and Social Control. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Panther-Brick, S. K. ed. (1970), Nigerian Politics and Military Rule: Prelude to the Civil War; London: The Athlone Press.

Pelser, E., J.Schnetler, and A. Louw (1999), 'Not Everybody's Business: Community policing in the SAPS' priority areas', Monograph no. 71. Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies.

Pino, N.W. (2001) " Community Policing and Social Capital." *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management* 24:200-215.

Police Act and Regulations (CAP. P19.LFN 2004) (2009).2nd Edition. Police Service Commission, 2008 Annual Report; Abuja: PSC

President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing (2015). *Final Report of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing*. Washington, DC: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Reiner, R. (2000). *The politics of the police*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

"Reorganisation of Police Force Underway," *Post Express (*Nigeria*),* July 29, 1999

Report of the One-Day Interactive Forum on the Review of the Nigerian Police Act organized by the House of Representatives Committee on Police Affairs in Collaboration with the CLEEN Foundation and The Open Society Justice Initiative,."

Reuter, P., P. Hirschfield, and Curt Davies (2001) "Assessing the Crack-Down on Marijuana in Maryland." Unpublished manuscript.

Rhoda E. Howard (1995), Human Rights and the Search for Community. Boulder, CO.: Westview Press.

Richard E. Adams, Thomas A. Arcury, William M. Rohe, "Community Policing and Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association*; Volume: 67. (1) 2001.

Roberg, R. (1994). Can Today's Police Organizations Effectively Implement Community Policing? In D. Rosenbaum (Ed.), The challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Robertson, S. Ian (2001) Problem solving;New York: Psychology Press.

Rohe, W., Adams, R, &Arcury, T. (1996b), Community Oriented Policing: What it is--Why it works--How to get started. Chapel Hill, NC: Center for Urban and Regional Studies.

Rohe, W., Adams, R., &Arcury, T. (1996a), Community Oriented Policing: The North Carolina Experience. Chapel Hill, NC: Center for Urban and Regional Studies.

Rosenbaum, D. Ed. (1994), The challenge of Community Policing: Testing the promises. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

Rosenbaum D. and D. L. Wilkinson (2001), "*Community Policing and Organizational Reform: The Impact on Police Personnel over Six Years*." Revised edition of Paper presented at International Policing Research Conference, Northwestern University, Illinois (October 2000).

Rosenbaum, D. P., Yeh, S. and Wilkinson, D. L. (1994), "Estimating the Effects of Community Policing Reforms on Police Officers". Crime and Delinquency; Vol. 40, No. 3,pp. 331-353.

Rotimi K. (2001), The Police in a Federal State: The Nigerian Experience; Lagos: College Press Limited.

Ruteere, M. and M. E. Pommerolle; 'Democratizing security or decentralizing repression?The ambiguities of community policing in Kenya.'*African Affairs* 102, 409 (2003), pp. 587–604.

Sadd, S., &Grinc, R. (1994), "Innovative Neighborhood Oriented Policing: An Evaluation of Programs in Eight Cities," in D. Rosenbaum (Ed.),

Samuel Abasilim, "The Nigeria Police Force: Towards a moralrearmament;" *Daily Times*, May 30, 1995.

Sandra T. Barnes (1986), Patrons and Power: Creating a Political Community in Metropolitan Lagos; London: Manchester UP.

Schacter, D.L. et al. (2009). Psychology (2nd Edition). New York: Worth Publishers.

Schanzer, D., Kurzman, C., Toliver, J., & Miller, E. (2016).The challenge and promise of using community policing strategies to prevent violent extremism.US National Institute of Justice.

Scharf, W., 'Community justice and community policing in post-apartheid South Africa'. Paper presented at the International Workshop on the Rule of Law, Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex, 1–3 June 2000.

"Shoot Anti-Police Rioters On Sight, Law Enforcers Told," *IRINNews*, October 21, 2002.

Skogan, W. (1988), "Disorder, Crime and Community Decline" in Hope, T. & M. Shaw (Eds.), Communities and Crime Prevention. London: Home Office Research and Planning Unit.

Skogan, W. (1990), Disorder and Decline: Crime and the spiral of decay in American cities. New York: Free Press.

Skogan, W. (1994), The Impacts of Community Policing on Neighborhood Residents: A Cross Site Analysis. In D. Rosenbaum (Ed.), The Challenge of Community Policing:

Skolnick, J. and Barley, D. (1988), Community Policing: Issues andPractices around the World-National Institute of Justices, Issues and Practices. Washington DC: US Department of Justice

Smith, M. A. K., "Role of the Police in Policing the Electoral System." Paper presented at the Presidential retreat on the political process and violence, 7-10 February, 2002.

Sunday Ehindero, "Address delivered by Sunday Ehindero, Acting Inspector General of

Police to the maiden conference of senior police officers at Force Headquarters, Abuja," 25 January 2005

Stephen Akiga, "Why Police are Helpless." *Police News* Vol. 1, No. 2, October-December 2001

"Student shootings spark concern over Nigerian police tactics," Agence France-Presse, June 24, 2002

Tamuno, T. N. (1970), Police in Modern Nigeria; Ibadan: University of Ibadan Press.

Thracher, D. (2001) "Conflicting Values in Community Policing." *Law and Society Review* 35, 4: 765-798.

Tillman, R. J. (2000). The effectiveness of community policing.School of Police Staff &Command, Eastern Michigan University.

Trevor Jones and Tim Newburn (1998), Private Security and Public Policing. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Trojanowicz, R., B. Bucqueroux, T. McLanus, and David Sinclair (n.d.) "The Neighborhood Network Center: Basic Issues and Planning and Implementation" in Lansing, Michigan. *Community PolicingSeries* No. 23; National Center for Community Policing, Michigan State Univ.

U.S. Department of State, Nigeria Country Report on Human Rights Practices in 2002, 2003 and 2004.

"We've restored sanity," *Newswatch Magazine (*Nigeria), January 26, 2003.

Wiley, S. A. &Esbensen, F. (2013). The Effect of Police Contact: Does Official Intervention Result in Deviance Amplification? *Crime & Delinquency*, XX(X), pp. 1-25

Wright, A. (2002). Policing: An Introduction to Concepts and Practice. Devon: Willan Publishing.

Wycoff, M. (1994), Community Policing Strategies. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.

Yusuf, A. (2007). The Nigeria Police Force Operational Handbook on Community Policing. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press.

APPENDIX I
QUESTIONNAIRE ON LEVEL OF SUPPORT FOR COMMUNITY POLICING AMONG POLICE OFFICERS

Dear respondent,

The purpose of this research is to find out your experiences and views of community policing in your areas of jurisdiction. This questionnaire is designed to assess the extent to which the new approach has impacted law enforcement outcomes and the performance of police officers within communities where it is in operation. We are particularly interested in hearing your views and experiences as well as your thoughts and ideas on what needs to be done to improve the initiative in your Division. Your responses to this survey will be kept strictly confidential and will only be used for academic purpose. Thanksin anticipation of your help.

OlayinkaBabatunde BALOGUN

SECTION A: Socio-economic Variables

Rank:

Rank and File	{ }
Middle Level Officer	{ }
Senior Police Officer	{ }

Gender :

Male	{ }
Female	{ }

Division…………………..

State……………………….

Department:

General Duty	{ }
Investigations	{ }
Administration	{ }
Special Duty	{ }
Other……………..	

SECTION B

1. What do you understand by community policing?
    …………………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………

2. Are you involved in the implementation of this initiative in any way? Yes { } No{ }

3. If yes, in what specific area?
    …………………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………………
    ………………..

4. What reasons do you consider were responsible for the introduction of community policing in Nigeria?
    …………………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………………………………………………………………………………
    …………………

5. Who are the key stakeholders that the police have been working with to ensure that this initiative succeeds?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………

5. Would you say there is any noticeable change in how police work is now done?Yes { }   No { }

6. If yes, what specific changes have you noticed?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………

7. Do you think community policing initiative has made your work easier?Yes { }No{ }

8. If easier, how?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………

9. If harder, in what ways?
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………

10. Do you think community policing initiative has made your work more effective?Yes { } No{ }

11. If yes, in what ways?
……
……
……………………………

12. Would you say there have been changes in the roles you play as a police officer? Yes { } No { }

13. What new role(s) are police officers playing under the initiative?……………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………..

14. Would you say that community policing approaches are in any way different from the previous operational approach?

Yes { }No{ }

15. If yes, what differences have you observed?
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………

16. What are the challenges/problems militating against its effectiveness in your Division?
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………

17. Are community members involved in any way in what you do under the community policing initiative? Yes { }   No { }

18. If yes, in which of the following ways are community members involved? (tick as many as it applies)
   a. information gathering only
   b. detection, investigation, and prosecution of offenders
   c. arrests and hand over of suspects to police
   d. night and vigil patrols and surveillance in the community
   e. crime prevention (stop and search at road blocks or check points)
   f. crowd or riot control
   g. Others (specify)……………………………………………………

19. If no, what reasons do you ascribe?………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………

20. Would you say community policing approach has had any noticeable impact in your Division? Yes { }   No{ }

21. If yes, what forms of impact has it had on your Division?
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………

22. In view of your experience on the working of community policing in your Division, do you think community policing is sustainable? Yes { }   No{ }

23. If no, what suggestions do you have for ensuring its sustainability?…………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………..………………………………………………………
………………………..

APPENDIX II

RESIDENTS' KNOWLEDGE, PARTICIPATION AND LEVEL OF SATISFACTION

WITH COMMUNITY POLICING'

The purpose of this research is to garner your experiences, thoughts and views of/and on community policing in your community. This questionnaire is essentially designed to assess your knowledge of and participation in existing community policing frameworks in your own community. The research also seeks to interrogate your level of satisfaction with police performance under this initiative. We are particularly interested in hearing of your views on the attitude of police officers in your community policing since its inception. Your responses to this survey will be kept confidential and will only be used for academic purposes. Thank you.

OlayinkaBabatunde BALOGUN

SECTION A: Socio-economic Variables:

Sex: _____

Age: _____

Occupation:_____

State: _____

Local Government Area: _____

Current Area of Residence: _____

Period of Residency: _____

SECTION B

1.   Are you aware of the concept of community policing?

   Yes { }   No { }

2.   If yes, what is your understanding of it?_____

   _____3. Do you have

community policing in your neighborhood?

   Yes { }   No { }

3.   If yes, do you participate in such initiative in your neighborhood?   Yes{ }   No { }

4.   If yes, which of the following forms does this participation take? (tick as many as it

   applies)

   a.   information gathering only
   b.   reporting of criminal activities/tendencies to the police
   c.   joining of voluntary security groups (vigilante groups and other related
           groups)
   d.   Others(specify)_____

5.   If your answer to question 5 is 'NO',why not?

   _____

   _____

6.   Would you say community policing initiative has been a success story in your
   neighborhood?   Yes { }   No { }

7.   If yes, what specific local impacts have the programme made over time?

   _____

   _____

8.   What would you say is responsible for
   this?_____

   _____

9.   Would you say you are satisfied with the partnership your neighborhood has created
   with the police?   Yes {   }   No { }

10.   If no, why? _____

   _____

11. What specific benefits have your community derived from community policing?

    _____

    _____

12. In what ways have your community supported community policing?

    _____

    _____

13. Please rate the disposition of police officers involved in community policing in your neighborhood
    a.   Friendly/Accommodating
    b.   Unfriendly/Hostile
    c.   Aloof/Indifferent/Same as before
    d.   Patronising

14. Please rate the performance of police officers involved in community policing in your neighborhood

    a. Good
    b. Fair
    c. Poor
    d. Can't say

16. Do you think police officers in your community are doing their best to ensure the success of community policing initiatives?   Yes   { } No { }

17. If no, what do you think could be responsible for this?

    _____

    _____

18. What do you think will be required for men of the Police Force in improving on their work on community policing?

    _____

    _____

    _____

19. Is/are there noticeable lapse(s) in the implementation of community policing in your community? Yes   {} No { }

20.   If your answer to Question 19 is 'YES', what have you observed?

_____

_____

21.   What would be your suggestion(s) on how this could be addressed?

_____

_____

22.   Comparatively, which of these policing models do you prefer?

a.   Conventional policing
b.   Community policing
c.   State police
d.   Vigilantes

23.   Kindly state the reason(s) for your choice_____

_____

APPENDIX III
KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW (KII) GUIDE
COMMUNITY POLICING MANAGEMENT TEAM

1.   What is community policing all about?

2.   What specific policing challenges would you adduce for the introduction of the initiative in Nigeria?

3.   Would you say the introduction of the initiative has brought any noticeable change to the Nigeria Police Force and policing practice?

4.   What positive results have you noticed in the State Commands where the initiative is being implemented?

5.   Have you noticed any conflict or drawbacks in relation to the new orientation?

6.   The Police Force is implementing community policing only in a few pilot states. Are there any plans to expand the initiative to other States in Nigeria?

7.   In view of your position as a member of police management team, do you think community policing is sustainable in Nigeria?

8.   To what extent wouldyou say the implementation of this initiative is successful or otherwise?

9.   Whatsuggestions do you have for ensuring its sustainability?

10.   How far do you agree with some who equate community policing to State policing?

APPENDIX IV
FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION (FGD) GUIDE
COMMUNITY POLICINGSTAKEHOLDERS

1.   What is your understanding of community policing?

2.   What specific security challenges is the initiative addressing in this State?

3.   To what extent are you involved in the scheme and what specific roles do you play as civil society stakeholders?

4.   To what extent have local communities embraced the initiative?

5. What positive results have you noticed in communities where the initiative is being implemented?

6. Have you observed any conflicts or drawbacks that are attributable to the new orientation?

7. Would you say the implementation of this initiative has improved security in this State?

8. What suggestions do you have for improving current performance?

9. In view of your direct experience with community policing, do you think it is sustainable?

10. How far do you agree with those who equate community policing to State policing?