Security Agencies Organizational Structure and the Implementation of Community Policing In Njoro Sub-County, Nakuru, Kenya

James M. Chimera [1], Eric K. Bor[2] And Babere K. Chacha [3]

[1]*Department of Peace, Security and Social Studies, Egerton University, P.O.Box 536-20115 Egerton, Kenya*
[2]*Department of Peace, Security and Social Studies, Egerton University, P.O.Box 536-20115 Egerton, Kenya*
[3]*Department of Public Affairs and Environmental Studies, Laikipia University, P.O.Box 1100-20300 Nyahururu, Kenya*

Abstract: *The paper examines the organizational structuring of security agencies in the face of the implementation of community policing in Njoro Sub-County, Nakuru, Kenya. A cross-sectional survey in Njoro Sub-County was undertaken and data collected from 138 sample respondents using interview schedules. The study targeted three security agencies: the National Government Administration, Kenya Police Service and Administration Police Service; whose officers were the sample respondents. The study conducted focused group discussions with 22 chiefs' elders and administered interviews to the Sub-County Security and Intelligence Committee members as Key informants. The three security agencies formed the strata from where officers were selected by simple random sampling. The study concludes that there have been little efforts put in re-structuring of the security agencies to accord with and respect the structural requirements of implementing community policing. There is need to ensure that the necessary structural reforms are undertaken in the face of community policing implementation. These findings inform policy on the ongoing security sector reforms especially on the structural reforms that are required to transform the country's security sector in Kenya.*
Key words: *Community Policing, Organizational Structuring, Implementation.*

I. Introduction

Since 2003, the Government of Kenya has been implementing community policing as a core crime prevention strategy. This strategy involves combining the efforts and resources of law enforcement agencies and community members. It facilitates partnership so that the public can seek assistance from law enforcement agencies. It also operates on the premise that crime perpetrators and their accomplices live within the communities in which they unleash crime are known to their neighbours and this vital infromation can be tapped to reduce crime (Government of Kenya, 2004). The adoption and implementation of community policing was expected to bring a paradigm shift in the management of public security, with the introduction of partnership and teamwork between the security agencies and the community in a problem solving policing. When community policing was officially launched in Kenya in 2005, it was seen as the solution to Kenya's policing problems. The community policing strategy was to introduce partnership and problem-solving approaches aimed at improving the relations between security agencies and the community and to subsequently improve quality of police services, notably reduced crime levels (Government of Kenya, 2004).

The implementation of community policicng requires that the implementing agency adopt organizational changes that promote the implementation of Community Policing (Cordner, 2007). Studies on diffusion of innovation consider the factors and processes that influence innovation uptake in organizations (Darroch and Mazerolle, 2013; Rogers, 1995). These studies focus on how a wide range of organizational and environmental factors shape the uptake and development of innovation within organizations, addressing questions such as the role of organizational size, administrative arrangements, and bureaucracy in supporting innovation, while other approaches focus on the role of leaders and champions in promoting innovations (Darroch and Mazerolle, 2013; Duman, 2007; Wilson, 2002). Organizational factors in police agencies shape effectiveness and the adoption of innovation (Bayley, 2002; Mastrofski, 1998). Changes in policy, procedure, structure, practice, training, leadership, and management arrangements are the principal mechanisms used to take innovation from idea to actuality. However, like the broader public sector, security agencies often struggle to innovate successfully.

Braga and Weisburd (2007) conclude that security agencies are likely to adopt innovations that require the least radical departure from their hierarchical paramilitary organizational structures, continue incident-driven and reactive strategies, and maintain their sovereignty over crime issues. Innovations that support or do not threaten these features fare better than strategic innovations.

The implementation of Community Policing requires an organizational transformation inside the law enforcement agency so that a set of basic values, rather than mere procedures, guide the overall delivery of services to the community. Organizational transformation involves the integration of the Community Policing philosophy into the mission statement, policies and procedures, performance evaluations, hiring and promotional practices, training programmes, and other systems and activities that define organizational culture and activities (Connors and Webster, 2001).

However, the fruits of this strategy have not been realised in many parts of Kenya where it was rolled out, Njoro Sub-County included. Crime levels are still high. There are wide spread accusations of corruption among security agencies and mistrust between the community and security officers. It also is not known to what extent the Security Agencies in Njoro Sub-County have re-structured their organizations in the face of community policing strategy implementation. Specifically, the study intended to establish the level of organizational structuring by security agencies in Njoro Sub-County.

II. Organizational Structuring That Support The Implementation Of Community Policing

Evidence from several studies on human dynamics of organizations has shown that the structure of organizations is a major determinant of employee behaviour. For any change to occur successfully, an organization has to effectively alter the behavioural pattern of its employees. This relationship is substantiated by organizational theorists who assert that most organization problems usually stem from structural flaws rather than flaws in individuals (Bolman and Deal, 1992). Any organization's structure should correspond with its mission and the nature of the work performed by its members. Some aspects of the traditional security organization structure seem more suited to routine bureaucratic work than to the discretion and creativity required for Community Policing (Connors and Webster, 2001). Security agencies should therefore re-examine their structures to ensure that they support and facilitate the implementation of the philosophical, strategic and tactical dimensions of community policing (Cordner, 2007).

Successful implementation of Community Policing, therefore, requires full commitment of any implementing organization. The organization has to initiate reforms right from the organizational structural set up, exercise strong and innovative leadership, transform the climate and culture of their organization, full utilization of media and other advertising strategies, garner political buy-in, attain additional resources and develop true partnership with the community (Kiarie, 2012, Lyman, 2001, Mehmet, 2008). Given that Community Policing emphasizes prevention and problem solving, rather than incident driven reaction and arrest, organizational restructuring is necessary in order to incorporate new tactics and methods. The restructuring initiatives include reformation of job-performance appraisals, operations, promotion processes, general orders, strategic plans and trooper basic training. Agencies that implement the programmatic components of community policing without the structural changes required will lack the appropriate infrastructure to support community policing activities, and will maintain or eventually revert to more traditional forms of policing (Williams, 2003).

In Cordner's (2007) "organizational dimension" of Community Policing, he isolates one element of this dimension that he refers to as "restructuring." As Cordner notes, the types of restructuring associated with Community Policing include: decentralization (delegating authority to lower ranks), flattening (reducing layers of hierarchy), de-specialization (reducing specialized units to devote more resources to Community Policing), geographic deployment (assigning of patrol officers permanently to one beat), teams (working in teams) and civilianization (allowing non-sworn officers to handle non-emergency calls in the field). This study examined the organizational structuring factors that influence the implementation of community policing.

III. Methodology

The study used a cross-sectional descriptive survey research design. A descriptive survey design was suited for the study since the study aimed at collecting and analyzing data in order to describe and report on the structural adjustments security agencies undergo in the face of the implementation of community policing strategy among security agencies in Njoro Sub-County. This design was appropriate as it involves collection of information from a cross section of respondents selected in the study area and it offers a researcher the advantage of focusing on specific description or characteristics. It is also suitable where attitudes and opinions of respondents towards a given phenomenon are being sought. The study used a combination of qualitative and quantitative data. The quantitative paradigm is said to have an objective and outcome-oriented (Mwanje, 2001) while the qualitative paradigm subscribes to an inductive, holistic and subjective world view.

The respondents were selected using a stratified random sampling procedure and were interviewed once. The three security agencies were designated as the strata and formed the sampling frame from which a random sample of 138 officers was selected from each stratum. In addition, purposive sampling was used to select six key informants and twenty two participants for focused group discussions from the study area. Purposive sampling allowed the researcher to use cases that had the required information with respect to the

objectives of the study. The Key informants were the members of the Sub-County Security and Intelligence Committee (Sub-CSIC).

The participants for the focused group discussions comprised chiefs' elders from Njoro, Mukungugu and Gichobo locations.

The study used both quantitative and qualitative data analysis approaches. Qualitative method was used to analyze data from the key informant interviews and focused group discussions, while quantitative method was used to analyze data obtained from sample respondent interview schedules. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used. Descriptive statistics helps in explaining the findings of the study by use of mean, mode, medians, frequency tables and percentages. Inferential analysis involved the use of Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

IV. Findings And Discussion

Organizational structure of a security agency is important in the implementation of community policing (Cordner, 2007). In structuring an institution to perform the functions of community policing, many organization aspects of the security agency have to be re-structured in order to perform the Community Policing functions well. The organizational structural aspects of the security agencies that were considered in this study included five major variables, which were: (i) decentralization, this included independency in decision making by field officers, and wide delegation of authority and responsibility, (ii) de-specialization, which involved having fewer specialized personnel/units, and assigning more investigative responsibility to patrol officers, (iii) civilianization, this included the engagement/employment of non-sworn/civilian officers, and allowing them to work or handle non-sensitive security work, (iv) flattening of ranks, which included having fewer ranks, and having supervisors being more accessible, and (v) geographic deployment, which included having permanent patrols or beats, and not transferring officers. The five variables of the organizational structure of the security agencies were operationalized by asking the security personnel to assess the indictor variables of their agency based on a four point Likert scale: strongly agree rated as 4, agree rated at 3, disagree rated at 2, and strongly disagree rated as 1. The survey items forming the organizational structuring are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Organizational Structuring Variables

Factors	Number of items	Mean	SE	SD	Range
Decentralization	2	4.40	0.116	1.365	6
Despecialization	2	4.37	0.111	1.308	6
Civilianization	2	4.55	0.127	1.494	6
Flattening ranks	2	4.80	0.094	1.106	6
Geographic deployment	2	4.73	0.099	1.167	6
Organization Structuring	**10**	**22.88**	**0.347**	**4.086**	**30**

(Source: Field data, 2014)

The means for each of the five indicator variables appear to indicate similar values of an average of 4. This could imply that all of the five indicator variables of organizational structuring have been similarly re-structured. During the interviews with the key informants, it was revealed that the Sub-County had some decentralization of police services, police patrols, and that security officers assume responsibilities in their areas of jurisdictions. The five indicators of organizational structuring were then combined to form an index of organizational structure, depicting the level of structuring among the security agencies, which was used in subsequent analysis for this study. The scale of the indicators was transformed with a value of 4 being assigned to the highest positive responses and a value of 1 to the most negative responses. The ten transformed variables (indicators) were then added together to form one index called the level of organizational structuring, whose frequency distribution is given in Table 2.

Table 2: Frequency Distributions of the Index of Organizational Structuring

Scale of the index	Frequency	Percent
10.00	1	0.7
14.00	1	0.7
15.00	1	0.7
16.00	4	2.9
17.00	5	3.6
18.00	6	4.3
19.00	8	5.8
20.00	9	6.5

21.00	13	9.4
22.00	14	10.1
23.00	14	10.1
24.00	22	15.9
25.00	9	6.5
26.00	11	8.0
27.00	6	4.3
28.00	6	4.3
29.00	3	2.2
31.00	1	0.7
33.00	2	1.4
35.00	1	0.7
39.00	1	0.7
40.00	0	0.0
Total	**138**	**100.0**

Mean 22.88± 0.347, std. dev.4.086, mode 24, median 23, minimum 10 and maximum 39
(Source: Field data, 2014)

The index of the level of organizational structuring of the three agencies, with a possible range of 10 and 40, actually ranged between 10 and 39 and had a mean of 22.88± 0.347, a mode of 24, median 23 and a standard deviation of 4.086. The index (22.88 out of 40.00) represents 57.20% level of organizational structuring by security agencies in Njoro sub-county. This indicates a structuring level of 57.2% of the organization had been done necessary to implement CP.

The level of organizational structure of the three security agencies showed that the majority of the respondents (54.8 %) ranked the organizational structure at level 23 or slightly above the average, while 44.7 % of the respondents ranked the level at 22 and below. This implies that the majority of respondents felt that more than 50 % of the organizational structures had already been put in place for the implementation of community policing in Njoro sub-county.

The analysis indicates that even though a majority of the respondents felt that more than 50 % of the organizational structures for community policing had been implemented, a good number of them (25.2 %) felt that much still needed to be done and scored the organizational structures at below 20, while only 1 % of the respondents felt that all the structures had been implemented. This was corroborated by FGD participants, who noted,

"Although security officers are changing the way they operate, they still have a long way to go. For example, they will easily look for elders when they want assistance in arresting a suspect but will rarely be available when you need them. They are either guarding banks or flower farms".

These perceptions show that there are variations and differences in the implementation of organizational structuring in the sub-county.

Differences in the Security Agencies Level of Organizational Structuring

The level of organizational structuring among the three security agencies was compared to ascertain the differences in their level of implementation of the structuring required in their institutions to implement community policing. The one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the three means of the level of organizational structuring and the results are given in Table 3.

Table 3: Mean Comparison of the Level of Organizational Structuring among the Security Agencies

Security Agency	Level of organizational structuring				
	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Std. dev.	n
Administration Police Service (APS)	23.8	14	33	3.8	47
Kenya Police Service (KPS)	23.0	14	33	3.8	42
National Government Administration (NGA)	21.8	15	31	3.5	49
All Agencies	**22.8**	**10**	**39**	**4.0**	**138**

ANOVA F=2.88, p>0.05

The means of the level of organizational structuring among the three security agencies were compared using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). It was found out that there was no significant ($p \geq 0.05$) effects of the independent variable mean of the organizational structuring on the dependent variable security agencies.

This implied that the adjustment of the structural organization of the three security agencies (National Government Administration, Administration Police Service and Kenya Police Service) were similar without much difference even though the mean for the level of organizational structuring of the Administration Police Service appeared to indicate a higher value than the one of the Kenya Police Service and the National Government Administration respectively.

V. Conclusion

The study was to examine the organizational structuring factors of security agencies that influence the implementation of community in Njoro Sub-County. Changing from traditional police organizations to community policing compliant organization requires structural adjustments. The overall aggregate level of structural change was found to be 57.20%. This shows that only slightly above half of the structuring necessary to implement CP had been undertaken. Among the indicator items for the organizational structuring, the study indicated that flattening of ranks had the highest mean (4.80) while Despecialization had the lowest mean (4.37).

Though the mean for the level of organizational structuring of the Administration Police Service appeared to indicate a higher value than the one of the Kenya Police Service and the National Government Administration respectively, a comparison of means of the level of organizational structuring among the three security agencies using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) found out that there was no significant effects of the independent variable mean of the organizational structuring on the dependent variable security agencies.

The study concludes that there have been little efforts put in re-structuring of the security agencies to accord with and respect the structural requirements of implementing community policing. This is due to the fact that the study found out that the level of organization structuring was at 57.2%. Nevertheless, the one activity in the structuring process that received more action than the rest was flattening of ranks. This, however, could have been as the result of the police reforms where ranks within the National Police Service were reduced. On the other hand, de-specialization received the least action among the organizational structuring indicators. It is also concluded that structuring among the security agencies in the Sub-county was similar, that is, although the Administration police Service indicated a higher organizational structuring level than the Kenya Police and National Government Administration, this variation was not statistically significant.

VI. Recommendations

The objective of the study was to examine the organizational structuring factors of security agencies that influence the implementation of community policing in Njoro Sub-County. The study showed that security agencies in the Sub-county had re-structured to a level of 57.2%. This means that just about half of re-structuring required for the successful implementation of community policing had been undertaken by the three security agencies. Based on these findings, the study recommends that the Principal Secretary, Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government should undertake reforms in the structures of the three security agencies. This could be incorporated in the ongoing security sector reforms. Of concern also, is restructuring the specialization aspect prevalent in security agencies as this is known to hinder the proper implementation of community policing. In fact, the community implementation indicator activity that received the least positive response was Despecialization. It is, therefore, recommended that security agencies be reformed to have as few specialist officers or units as possible.

References

[1]. Bayley, D. H. (2002). Foreword. In E. Maguire (Ed.), Organizational structure in American police agencies: Context, complexity and control. New York: State University of New York Press.
[2]. Bolman, L. G., and Deal, T.E. (1992). Reframing Organization: Artistry, Choice and Leadership. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
[3]. Braga, A. A., and Weisburd, D. L. (2007). Police innovation and crime prevention: Lessons learned from police research over the past 20 years (No. 218585) Washington, DC:
[4]. Connors, Edward and Webster, Barbara. (2001).Transforming the Law Enforcement organization to Community Policing. National Institute of Justice U.S. Department of Justice.
[5]. Cordner, Gary (2007) Community Policing: Principles and Elements, Regional Community policing Institute: Eastern Kentucky University. http://www.kycops.org/wcp.htm (accessed 13/08/2014).
[6]. Darroch, Steve and Mazerolle, Lorraine. (2013) Intelligence-Led Policing: A Comparative analysis of Organizational Factors Influencing Innovation Uptake. Police Quarterly16 (1) 3–37
[7]. Duman, Ali (2007). Effects of Contingent Factors on Community Policing Activities: A Critical Analysis of Adopting a Certain Policing Model. A PhD dissertation, Kent State University.
[8]. Government of Kenya (2004). National Policy on Community policing; Nairobi: Government Printers.
[9]. Kiarie, Joshua (2012). Factors Influencing Implementation of Community Policing Programmes: A Case of Thika Municipality in Kiambu County. An Unpublished Research Project Report, University of Nairobi.
[10]. Lyman, Lynne (2001). Implementing Community Policing: Police-Community Partnership. Kennedy School Review, 141-155.

[11]. Mastrofski, S. D. (1998). Community policing and police organization structure. In J.P. Brodeur (Ed.), How to recognize good policing. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

[12]. Mehmet, Alper Sozer (2008). Assessing the Performance Of Community Policing:The effect of Community Policing Practices on Crime Rates. A Ph.D Dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

[13]. Mwanje, J.I (2001). Issues in Social Science Research. Social Research Methodology Series.   Module 1. Ethiopia: OSSREA.

[14]. Rogers, Everett M (1995). Diffusion of innovations. New York: Free Press.

[15]. Williams, E. J. (2003). Structuring In Community Policing: Institutionalizing Innovative   Change. Police Practice and Research, 4(2), 119-129.

[16]. Wilson, Jeremy M. (2002). The implementation Of Community Policing In Large Municipal Police Organizations. A PhD Dissertation, Ohio State University.