

Modern Trends in Policing: Public Perceptions of the Preferred Policing Models in Slovenia¹

Kaja Prislan², Branko Lobnikar³

Modern police organisations operate in a highly dynamic environment amid a sea of various fast-paced societal, economic, political and technological trends to which they must find suitable responses. For reforms to be efficient, flexible structures and innovative solutions are essential. Yet, implementing innovation in the public sector is made especially challenging by issues that encompass systemic transformations. In previous decades, the police in Slovenia have initiated many reforms and implemented new policing approaches and models. Still, critical analysis shows that in some areas the reforms have not produced the desired results. One reason for this is that the planned changes and policing styles are incompatible with the existing organisational structures and the needs of communities. In the first part, this article reviews the latest developmental trends in modern police organisation and their impacts on policing. The article's second part presents the results of a study performed among Slovenian residents regarding which policing model is perceived to be the most appropriate for their communities. Respondents chose community policing and the lawful policing model as the most suitable models, while the overall findings give the basis for the future development of police models and police work in Slovenia.

Keywords: police, policing models, community policing, future of policing, Slovenia

UDC: 351.741(497.4)

1 Introduction

Police organisations do not operate in a controlled environment; they encounter a number of trends and demands from their surroundings, forcing them to respond adequately. According to Sheptycki (2012), policing is actually the result and reflection of various developmental and societal trends. Like commercial businesses, police forces must deal with different types of political, economic, societal, technological and legal trends, and decide when/how to change their organisational processes and structures (van den Born et al., 2013). Moreover, the safety needs of modern societies are becoming ever more complex, while security threats are evolving and are more dynamic than ever before (Sotlar & Tominc, 2016).

The diverse and multilevel activity of policing organisations raise the question of how to ensure that the approaches and plans are in harmony with the needs of the various community environments in which they operate. Van der Vijver and Moor (2012) state that important challenges of modern policing include not simply adapting policing strategies to modern trends, but to the current needs of society.

Especially today, when change is coming at an increasing pace, flexible structures and innovative solutions are essential to ensure effective adaptation. Innovations in policing include a range of changes in practice, from developing new policing styles, and adopting new technology through to rethinking communications and networking (Darroch & Mazerolle, 2012). Yet, in the public sector it is particularly challenging to implement innovative strategies and programmes due to an inhospitable environment that leads to an inability to make changes successfully (Borins, 2001). In public agencies, the effectiveness of changes and their adoption levels depend heavily on organisational factors and the attitude held by top managers toward innovation (Damanpour & Schneider, 2006). Changes at the micro- and macro-levels (policy, procedure, structure, practice, training, leadership) are first required for innovations to be accepted, also explaining why police forces often struggle to innovate successfully (Darroch & Mazerolle, 2012). The police mainly adopt innovations that require fewer radical changes to their organisational structures, and support

¹ This article is based on a research programme Security and safety in local communities – comparison of rural and urban environments (P5-0397 (A), 2019–2024), financed by the Slovenian Research Agency. The research programme is carried out by the Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, University of Maribor, Slovenia.

² Kaja Prislan, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Security studies, Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, University of Maribor, Slovenia. E-mail: kaja.prislan@fvv.uni-mb.si

³ Branko Lobnikar, Ph.D., Professor of Security studies, Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, University of Maribor, Slovenia. E-mail: branko.lobnikar@fvv.uni-mb.si

their main incident-driven and reactive strategies, whereas strategic transformations are harder to implement (Braga & Weisburd, 2007).

In the past decades, police organisations in developed countries already made certain vital changes as part of replacing the rigid bureaucratic and authoritative model with an open, democratic and more flexible approach to policing (Lobnikar, Sotlar, & Meško, 2013). The most visible progress is seen in the internationalisation, professionalisation, pluralisation and technological modernisation of the police, with changes also observable in police powers, human resource structures, and management systems (Modic, Lobnikar, & Dvojmoč, 2014).

These foundational changes and environmental trends have also led to the emergence of different models and types of policing in the last 30 years. Among these, community policing is seen as a current philosophy that has developed in response to the demands of local communities where problems of crime and disorder stand out. Despite its popularity, enthusiasm for community policing has been waning and many police organisations report its limited implementation. This may be linked to: 1) the fact that police were unable to adequately implement the structural changes needed to institutionalise this strategy; and 2) the insufficient fit between policing styles and community needs. The latter is a significant predictor of community policing implementation and should be considered while deciding on which policing styles should be implemented in a particular community, and how.

The aim of the article is to analyse current societal trends and changes that affect modern police organisations, and their effect on policing. In the first part, we review the future of modern policing strategies and the factors influencing success in implementing reforms, with an emphasis on what local communities need and expect. In part two, a study on preferred policing models in Slovenia is presented and the most suitable approaches to policing according to the residents' expectations, with the results providing the starting point for developing future policing models.

2 Police Work in the Future – A Review of Current Trends

Police organisations and approaches to policing are transforming in line with different trends. The changing socio-demographic characteristics of communities and societies, the norms and values of societies, developments in information and communications technology [ICT], the complexity of crime, and cuts in public spending are special trends with

a considerable impact on the police (Deloitte, 2018; van den Born et al., 2013). As noted by de Guzman and Kim (2017), police organisational developments appear amid multiple factors like technological developments, ideological shifts, political and civil rights struggles, trends related to the economy, and urbanisation. A study by Crank, Kadleck, and Kosi (2010) on the future issues of police forces as seen by US scholars in the area of policing shows that policing will face significant cultural and normative changes in the future. Professionals believe the central role and mission of the police will change, together with the way police officers socially perceive their work and act out their values. Given the dynamics of police environments, it is necessary to reconsider police structures, investigative and prevention methods, recruitment approaches, and ways of engaging the public and adapt them accordingly (Deloitte, 2018).

The changes lying ahead for policing were extensively covered by the Composite international project that sought to analyse political, economic, societal, technological and legal trends expected to affect police across Europe. Conducted among police forces from 10 EU countries, the research found that technological and economic trends have the biggest impact, followed by societal trends, while the impact of political and legal changes is seen as moderate. Both economic and societal trends are perceived as having a negative impact on police forces, with legal and technological trends being regarded as beneficial for the police. In the paragraph below, we summarise the project's main findings because the conclusions reflect the trends and challenges that are being faced by European police organisations today (van den Born et al., 2013).

Most political opportunities for and threats to policing involve changes of government at the national, regional or local level. However, overall political changes typically do not have a high impact since the police in democratic societies operate quite independently of day-to-day political fluctuations. Nevertheless, the police mainly encounter two types of political change: change in political influence, entailing the general political climate in a country, and change in government influence, relating to specific policies. For many police forces, 'government influence' means they have to adhere to different priorities when governments come and go (e.g. through reorganisations, policy setting, priority shifts, introduction of new processes and procedures, and micromanagement). It is noted that reforms in several countries aim for greater efficiency and leading in the direction of centralisation and more incident-driven policies and practices. Both right- and left-wing political trends may be observed in EU countries, each with different effects for policing priorities and the expectations of police organisations. Moreover, international politics is seen as exerting the most negative and most influential im-

pact, mainly due to concerns about international terrorism, which demand joint and coordinated responses that distract the police from other priorities (van den Born et al., 2013).

Police organisations are also influenced by legal changes, especially those relating to labour regulations, codes of conduct and new declarations of certain police actions as unlawful, in turn demanding that police organisations adapt their practices and priorities. Of all categories, economic trends are perceived to bring the worst impact. They affect the police and policing by influencing society, whereby poor economic conditions can lead to more crime and lead to changes in police budgets or wages. Budget cuts are emphasised as a very influential factor since the police are required to fight more crime with fewer resources. Besides economic trends, changes in society (mainly alterations to demographics, crimes, and societal norms) are also seen as having a negative effect on police forces because they often call for greater police work. Higher unemployment and poverty are directly responsible for an increase in certain types of crime and in lower respect for police authority (van den Born et al., 2013).

In response to these economic and societal trends, plural policing that involves cooperation between public and private security institutions has emerged. It is a fact that public policing depends greatly on its fiscal environment. The ability of the (public) police to provide community services rests on the budget that is available, which is constantly in question and ever more conditioned by the need to show measurable results. On the other hand, the financing of private security is stable and improving. In the past 20 years, a decentralisation trend in policing and a significant rise in the number of private security companies intended to fill the gaps in policing that the public service does not cover have generally been observed (Bayley & Shearing, 2001; Forst, 2000). The trend of pluralisation – or the provision of security via the collaboration of various stakeholders – requires suitable political and legislative solutions that allow actual implementation, support coordination, delimit responsibilities and strengthen control which, as Modic et al. (2014) state, remains a challenge for the future. Accordingly, partnerships and collaborative relationships between public and private security organisations are an important trend for inclusion in discussions on the future of policing.

Further, among the aforementioned trends, technological advancements are regarded as having the most positive impact on the police. The police need to deal with new sorts of crime and also increase its efficiency while dealing with existing crimes, raising the importance of keeping up with technological advances (van den Born et al., 2013). Since public functions are essentially information-processing tasks, pub-

lic-sector organisations can benefit from information technology in different ways (Garicano & Heaton, 2010).

For this reason, the importance and effects of ICT advancements have been extensively addressed and investigated by other researchers in the area of policing. In the past decade, information technology has become the foundation of most police processes and systems (Darroch & Mazerolle, 2012) and, according to Rosenbaum (2007), in the 21st century policing has entered the era of information technology. The great relevance of technological advancements is that ICT allows the police to optimise processes in a way that helps to gain access to information and secure communication, supports internal regulation, makes information sharing easier, and offers a way for the police to more efficiently communicate with the public (Mastrofski & Willis, 2010; van den Born et al., 2013).⁴

The use of modern and advanced technologies in policing is seen in both reactive and preventive policing. Technological modernisation is currently primarily visible in the implementation of systems and services that facilitate easier communication and the quicker gathering and processing of data required for the effective detection of security events and their responses. Popular advanced technological solutions (for tracking suspects, identifying potential security events, coordinating incident response) already in use by many police organisations include unmanned aerial vehicles, advanced traffic control and border monitoring devices, global positioning systems, high-tech video surveillance equipment with infrared and heat-seeking capabilities, and public video monitoring devices (Crank et al., 2010). Deloitte (2018) notes that the majority of forces are also already investing in drones, cyber security, cloud computing, data analytics and biometrics (including facial recognition, fingerprinting, and iris identification). The results of technological advancement are reflected in more advanced approaches to data analysis and integrations, seeing the emergence of data-driven polic-

⁴ Despite all the advantages new and advanced technologies could bring to the policing capabilities, some side effects of technological developments that affect (perceived and actual) police performance are observed as well. Increased availability of ICT to the public means that people have more access to information, triggering them to be more critical about police procedures. The extensive use of social media, mobile phones and the internet facilitates the quick development and diffusion of opinions among residents, which are much easier to share. Moreover, criminals can facilitate their activities using new technologies and profit from information transfers, which means that the online environment facilitates both cybercrime and “traditional” criminal activities (van den Born et al., 2013). This means that technological advancements create not only opportunities, but also new threats for policing performance.

ing, hot spots policing, geographically-based crime fighting and intelligence-based decision-making (Ratcliffe & Guidetti, 2008; Rosenbaum, 2007).⁵

2.1 Challenges of Police Reforms and Innovation

Police organisations are trying to adapt to all these various changes and trends, yet in practice, the progress is fragmented and scarce. Traditionally, innovation and adaptation challenges have been an issue for the public sector and the police, especially when strategic changes and transformation are in question (Allen, 2002). The common explanation given for most reform- and change-related failures is a lack of individual support and of a planned and proactive approach.

Following an extensive literature review, Darroch and Mazerolle (2012) observed that resistance to reforms is chiefly related to a rigid and traditional police culture, differences between stakeholders' expectations, and unorganized approaches to changes. This was confirmed by Deloitte (2018) in its report Policing 4.0 which presents the results of a survey on the future of policing conducted among the leaders of UK police forces and national bodies. They found that police organisations struggle to keep up with future trends, where namely the leaders expressed concerns about: a) policing's capacity to effectively harness technology; b) establishing a coordinated local, regional and national response in the context of modern crime problems that often do not fit within geographic or organisational boundaries; and c) motivating a changing police workforce and mastering specialist skills.

Innovation struggles are, for example, quite evident in the attempts at adopting new technologies within police work. Technology innovation in policing is mainly complicated by two issues: 1) lack of specialised skills among police officers; and 2) problems of interoperability with technologies and systems already in use (Crank et al., 2010). One shared concern that is also often stressed and debated in discussions on police modernisation is that ICT often fails to produce the desired effects on policing performance. However, one must understand that direct and absolute improvements are not common. A significant relationship between technological innovation,

crime fighting and deterrence productivity is only possible when ICT is adopted as part of a whole package of organisational changes (Garicano & Heaton, 2010). That is, research shows that when the police adopt new technology, the results are often not as expected because the technology is integrated into traditional (i.e., bureaucratic) structures (Maguire & King, 2004; Weisburd, Mastrofski, McNally, Greenspan, & Willis, 2003) and is not complemented by changes in particular organisational and management practices (Garicano & Heaton, 2010).

As shown by the review of developmental trends, significant progress has been made in policing in Europe over the last decades, with many being successfully implemented according to the practice of sample organisations. Yet similar obstacles have emerged in implementation, resulting in many ideas to strengthen and improve current practices and approaches. The research review also indicates that, in addition to the positions held by policing experts and practitioners, it is necessary to understand the perceptions and expectations of the communities. If we wish to ensure a high level of success with policing approaches, feedback from the environment in which these approaches are applied is vital. This is consistent with observations showing that, historically, reform efforts in the police were typically connected to public perceptions and demands arising from citizen oversight (Crank et al., 2010).

In his study, Perkins (2016) found that societal and structural characteristics (geodemographics) affect the community's perceptions of their police. He concluded that police styles (or models) should therefore fit these perceptions to ensure satisfaction and a positive outlook on the police. This is especially important since the public's perception of the police's performance affects the legitimacy of the police (Hinds & Murphy, 2007; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). From a practical perspective, this affects the behaviour of people (willingness to report offences, crimes, willingness to obey the police and respect laws, cooperate in procedures as witnesses) and their attitudes (trust in the correctness of work and belief in the correctness of the legal system) (Kochel, Parks, & Mastrofski, 2013; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tankebe, 2008; Tyler & Fagan, 2008), which then makes the results of police work contingent. The legitimacy of the police is derived from the perceived successfulness of the police and the congruence of approaches (policing models) with the actual needs of the environment. If police departments in developed and democratic societies wish to ensure the successfulness and acceptance of policing models and policing-related reforms, then public's expectations must be considered. Accordingly, it is necessary to develop approaches adapted to the needs of local communities and to consistently monitor their effectiveness. In this regard, it is important to determine how residents assess the quality of the implementation of the changes and current policing ap-

⁵ Although technological modernisation has been considerable, compared to other sectors, policing is still falling behind on adaptation of some key digital tools and processes that are relatively well developed and have the potential to help deliver on police organisations' aspirations. Among these are, for example, residents' relationship management processes supported by technology that would allow police to build an accurate assessment of those they interacted with, and workforce relationship management technologies that would allow effective communication and information sharing within police forces (Deloitte, 2018).

proaches, and what their preferences are for the environment in which they live. This ensures that people responsible for policing are given the relevant feedback on the present situation and guidance for planning improvements and implementing the most suitable policing models in the future.

3 Models of Policing

Scientific models are to some extent simplified presentations of the actual activity entailed in studied phenomena, specifically developed to capture the essential aspects of those phenomena. While describing activity in models, we leave out many real-world elements (particularity) and focus on the elements that interest us or seem relevant for describing an activity (Lukman, 2014). In policing, individual police organisations use different approaches depending on their goals and the organisational, political and societal circumstances in which they operate. The policing model thus reflects the values and norms of the police organisation. For an approach to qualify as a policing model, it must describe at a minimum; a) the goals of policing; b) the position of prevention; c) the attitude to police discretion; and d) the level of community significance. The choice of the policing model therefore answers the general question: What kind of policing do we want in a specific society? Here we should point out that a policing model cannot be equated with a specific police organisation because the characteristics of different policing models can be observed in practical work. Further, policing models cannot be interpreted as mental patterns with a clear time sequence since various policing models can occur simultaneously in a different time sequence. From the perspective of the previously described criteria for determining the policing model, modern theory distinguishes four basic policing models⁶ (Ponsaers, 2001): military-bureaucratic model, lawful policing model, public-private divide policing, and community-oriented policing.

Bureaucratic model theorists were proponents of the reforms in US police organisations at the start of the 20th century implemented to combat police corruption and ineffectiveness. Their proposals for structural changes were largely aimed at increasing internal controls, improving effectiveness, and protecting the police from political influences. Even though they called their views a “professional model”, they

essentially promoted a military mentality and organisation in the police (Banutai, Rančigaj, & Lobnikar, 2006). They based their work on Weber’s organisational model, implemented bureaucratic organisational principals, while the most important element for determining the structure was the size of the organisation (Pagon, 2004). One of the more prominent proponents of this approach was Bruce Smith (in Langworthy, 1986) who wrote an article that considerably influenced the reform of police organisations during and after the Second World War. The author called for the simplification of policing, which would make it easier to control. He believed that the organisational structure is determined by the principles of high levels of specialisation, the scope of control, and unity of command, in addition to the number of employees. The size of an organisation should affect both horizontal and vertical differentiation. The *militaristic-bureaucratic model* emphasises discipline and was developed in response to the high corruption and strong politicisation of the police (Ponsaers, 2001). The model is characterised by the rational pursuit of goals with a hierarchically prescribed manner of command, disciplining of disobedient individuals, and a closed system of promotion within police ranks. It is further characterised by a high level of specialisation and an emphasis on maintaining law and order, achieved by a professional attitude and reactive policing. The option to use discretionary rights is minimal, as is police employees’ level of accountability to external bodies and organisations. While working with the public, policing in the militaristic-bureaucratic model is limited to enforcing legally prescribed regulations, while the primary purpose is preventing disorder. Thus, the essence of this policing model is maintaining law and order (Lobnikar & Sotlar, 2006).

The *lawful policing model* was developed as a response to the militaristic-bureaucratic model. It is characterised by strong separation from the community and a high level of specialisation, with a stress on combating crime. Wilson⁷ (in Ponsaers, 2001) described a similar model, naming it a legalistic style of police organisation. The authority of the lawful policing model is based on consistent adherence to legally protected values, which in turn leads to the non-recognition of discretionary decision-making by individual police officers. Public relations are instrumental in nature, and their purpose is chiefly to raise the public’s awareness of criminality. Due to the belief in general and special prevention with the consistent sanctioning of offenders, there is little focus on prevention. There is an emphasis on policing professionalisation, which is built by police officer training and improvement. The lawful policing model seeks legitimacy for the

⁶ As already mentioned, there are different variations of policing models in practice; as a result, various forms of innovative approaches became prominent in recent years, such as problem-oriented policing (POP), intelligence-led policing (ILP), and performance management initiatives such as CompStat and crime-mapping solutions (Crank et al., 2010; Darroch & Maze-rolle, 2012).

⁷ Wilson (in Ponsaers, 2001) also defined the watchman style, similar to the bureaucratic model, and the service style, similar to community policing.

legal use of powers; we may therefore conclude that, within the scope of this model, legality equals legitimacy (Lobnikar & Sotlar, 2006).

The endeavours of bureaucratic organisation theorists (for both the bureaucratic and lawful policing models) have largely eliminated the disadvantages and deficiencies in policing such as corruption, ineffectiveness, political interference in police operations etc. Due to such successes, this model started being implemented across the world. However, side-effects soon became apparent, which have in many ways outweighed the model's advantages. The bureaucratic model has alienated the police from the community.

Traditionally, during the time of pre-modern and modern societies, we were accustomed to the police being under the auspices of the government, having a monopoly over the use of force and on providing security for residents and organisations operating in its territory. Such a division was otherwise simple in organisational terms as it was at all times clear who is responsible for providing security. Still, in the last few decades, it has proven to be ineffective. The police itself cannot fulfil all safety-related needs. Therefore, during this time of late modern history, we can say that policing has been *divided into public policing* provided by the state and local authorities, and *private policing* that supplements public policing and overcomes the limits facing the public/state police. The *public-private divide policing model* may be considered as the first comprehensive policing pattern (Ponsaers, 2001) that moves beyond the framework of the overly limited and traditional conceptualisation of the police. It is focused on developing hybrid enforcement and prevention, which includes third-party collaboration; namely, residents, regulatory agencies and private parties to deal with crime-related problems (Crank et al., 2010). It is defined by the mutual interaction of the two spheres, reflected in a strong discretionary and selective orientation of interest for the benefit of the client of a specific security service. The essence of private policing/security activities is the prevention of harm. This is related to preventive activities, high professionalism, multi-lateral accountability (to national (public) institutions, to clients of security services, and to stakeholders of private security organisations), and legitimacy that arises from the contractual nature of the private security industry. The interaction of public and private sectors results in *hybrid* policing (Lobnikar & Sotlar, 2006) we can observe in modern societies: a multitude of different police organisations (public police, city warden service, city police etc.), management institutions holding special authorities (e.g., private security and private investigation chambers, security councils), government and para-government agencies, which in one way or another overlap with policing and, more broadly, the provision of security (Ponsaers, 2001). The

reason for the rise of private policing may be found in free market dynamics. The leading factor in the growth of this industry in western societies is strongly associated with the constantly growing entrepreneurial demands and needs, and with particular emphasis on the supporting developmental role of insurance companies.

The public-private divide policing model differs from other pre-modern (bureaucratic policing model, lawful policing model) and post-modern models (community policing, as described below) in several key respects. On the issue of discretionary right, we find that private policing is very fragmented, which affects the lack of any comprehensive policy on the issues of safety and crime management. Although private policing providers are limited by the legal frameworks represented by the relevant legislation, most activities are regulated by a business agreement between the client and the contractor. As opposed to public (national) models of policing, which operate in the interest of residents (public interest), the interest of private policing is much more selective (private interest). Hence, the main task (albeit not exclusively) of private policing is not to operate for the good of the public, but for the benefit of the client of the security services (even though the security services contractor is a public sector or government institution). The relationship is that of a client and a provider; therefore, the activity is defined by the contractual relationship. The essence of private police security is accordingly not providing public safety, but primarily to *prevent damage* (Lobnikar & Sotlar, 2006).

When examining changes in police work, Buerger (2007) noted that police organisations are generally transforming from a punitive to more of a regulative culture, which stresses the social orientation of the police instead of its exclusive law enforcement role (Crank et al., 2010). Moreover, the study by de Guzman and Kim (2017) tests a presumption that community needs influence the models of policing. In their research, they examined the relationships between community needs, organisational factors, and police departments' pursuit of different policing models. The findings suggest that the community's hierarchy of needs and organisational factors has a significant effect on the departments' implementation of policing models.

In modern police organisations, the emphasis is thus on the community policing model, for which two basic terms exist: "community policing", which is the most common, and "community-oriented policing", which is also used quite often. The community (oriented) policing [CoP] model is one of the most important modern approaches to policing and emphasises a democratic and inclusive strategy that is adapted to the needs of residents and communities. However, due

to inconclusive research results on its impacts, of all the presented models, CoP has received by far the greatest attention of researchers and professionals in terms of its efficiency and rationality. We therefore dedicate slightly more attention to this model in the section below.

3.1 The Present and Future of Community (Oriented) Policing (CoP)

CoP is an example of police reform aimed at improving police responsiveness. In the last 30 years, CoP has been the dominant philosophy of police agencies working in urban and rural settings (Crank et al., 2010; Wilson, 2006), and has been considered an effective response to the needs and problems of communities (Reisig & Parks, 2004; Skogan & Hartnett, 1997).

The main principle of CoP is collaboration (partnership) between the police and the local community (Trojanowicz, Kappeler, & Gaines, 2002). In addition to the above partnership, most definitions of CoP emphasise the problem-oriented approach to policing (Miller & Hess, 2002). Among the results of well-organised community policing, Kelling and Wycoff (2001) include the following indicators: 1) crime prevention; 2) satisfaction of the residents with community life; 3) resolved issues/problems; and 4) legitimacy and legality of policing. Other authors (Meško, Fallshore, & Jevšek, 2007; Skogan & Hartnett, 1997; Trojanowicz & Carter, 1988) add a lower level of fear of criminality to the important results of this approach.

A comparison of CoP with traditional policing models (i.e. bureaucratic and lawful) shows that the latter are repressively oriented towards the 'fight' against crime, while the former type of policing seeks to improve the quality of life of residents and reduce fear of crime (Greene, 2007). The traditional or standard type of policing is characterised by responding to occurrences, relying on enforcing the law, situational crime deterrence and carrying out traditional tasks related to criminal prosecution, which does not distinguish between characteristics of people, places, time and circumstances. On the other hand, CoP is a different policing model with a wider organisational strategy: it involves problem-solving, which is also included in the standard model, but it promotes partnerships with members of the local community (Clarke & Eck, 2005). The main characteristic of CoP is, therefore, an upgrade of policing with preventive activities, which include active participation of the community in recognising and solving security-related issues.

Despite its popularity in reform initiatives, researchers and practitioners observed that at the start of the 21st century, the enthusiasm for CoP was in decline and actual implementation was slowing (Myers, 2004). In their research, Crank et

al. (2010) found that most police agencies in the USA noted a drop in the number of officers associated with CoP and have generally abandoned this strategy. Reasons for this decline in community policing are associated with some of the aforementioned trends, such as budget cuts, emerging national security priorities, community resistance and its rejection by police leaders.

Many departments were unable to appropriately implement CoP because the structural changes needed on the organisational level to institutionalise this strategy were not put in place (Crank et al., 2010; Maguire & King, 2007; Skogan & Hartnett, 1997). Differences in the level of CoP implementation between different police organisations were also observed by Wilson (2006), who attributed such variations to organisational factors. Researchers (de Guzman and Kim, 2017) observed that police departments' decisions on implementing CoP could be explained by contingency and institutional theories. They implemented the strategy because they were reacting to pressures to do something about crime and also because their peers were doing the same, and the administration wished to follow the example of other institutions.

Further, the main rationale for the non-acceptance of and consequently for the lack of a strategic and proactive approach relates to the absence of evidence able to confirm CoP's significant impact on crime (Crank et al., 2010). Researchers argue that it is impossible to assert with great confidence that CoP has a general and significant effect on crime reduction; moreover, the actual impacts on communities are different and vary by their characteristics (de Guzman & Kim, 2017; Zhao, 2004). Nevertheless, as de Guzman and Kim (2017) highlighted, such discrepancies in CoP implementation should not be surprising since this model should consider the needs of the community it is serving. They claim that variations in CoP implementation may be explained not only by departmental variables but also by community structural variables. For example, Skogan and Hartnett (1997) concluded that well-organised communities benefit the most from CoP while in disadvantaged communities, the impacts are smaller.

This is consistent with the view of Lambertus and Yakimchuck (2007) on the beneficial effects of CoP. They state that implementation can only be effective in communities that have already fulfilled their basic community needs. They presented three hierarchical levels of community safety needs. Social order is the basic need of communities and the foundation for the community's existence and social participation of its members. Maintenance of order is next in the hierarchy of community needs and relates to consistently ensuring order. The next level is referred to as social order enhancement, reflecting a self-actualised and empowered commu-

nity. Moreover, Lambertus and Yakimchuck (2007) explain that communities on the first level are characterised by high crime and disorder, which is why they aim at social recovery; once this order is restored, they can strive for higher qualities. Similarly, the relationship of community structures and models of policing was investigated by Travis and Langworthy (2008). They suggested the CoP model is appropriate for solidary communities whose members have a consolidated and common agreement on the provision of security, while the traditional form of policing is more appropriate for disorganised communities.

Based on these presumptions, de Guzman and Kim (2017) categorise community characteristics (e.g. social disorganisation, geodemographics) among significant predictors for community policing implementation and policing styles. They believe that the alleged failures of CoP to make a difference in communities are due to the lack of fit needed between the type of policing model and community needs. Community cooperation and action, the components needed for CoP, are indeed affected by social and structural characteristics, and often prevent the police from fully implementing the strategy. Accordingly, CoP and informal social controls should be implemented only after the traditional model of police enforcement has been able to sustain order. Only when communities are well regulated can CoP implementation be beneficial.

Based on the review of previous work, we may conclude that issues related to police model implementation arise from organisational factors and, primarily, a non-comprehensive approach to the implementation of changes and rejection of reforms, which is mainly an outcome of the belief that the changes do not produce the expected results. However, the original problem that leads to such ineffectiveness in approaches and a lack of commitment in implementing changes stems principally from the incongruence of the planned approaches and policing styles with the needs of the communities. Such obstacles and misgivings, particularly in the implementation of CoP, can also be observed in reforms of police organisations in Central and Eastern European countries, which have strongly followed western trends and practices in their development.

4 Policing Reforms and Transformations in Slovenia

Policing in Central and Eastern European countries has undergone profound changes in the 20th century with the aim of bringing the police closer to the western style of policing. Militarised police structures, which originally developed

under the influence of the French (so-called Napoleonic) model, have transformed into democratic and civil, community-related police organisations (Jere, Sotlar, & Meško, 2012; Meško & Lobnikar, 2018). Given that developmental trends in European countries are relatively coordinated, police organisations in Europe are gradually reflecting ever more uniform characteristics (Lobnikar et al., 2013). Police organisations in this region face similar societal, technological and economic trends (van den Born et al., 2013), with the basic focus of changes being on democratisation, legitimacy and accountability, by emphasising and developing problem-solving, community-oriented and intelligence-led policing styles (Meško & Lobnikar, 2018).

Like elsewhere across the world, European police departments face an important double challenge, which creates demands and needs for organisational change. The search for balance between the demands and expectations of local communities and needs for inclusion in supranational security processes entails an important challenge for modern police organisations. The police must collaborate successfully in the international environment as that is the only way to successfully combat crimes that know no borders or require specific investigative know-how; simultaneously, great effort has to be directed to working in the local environment because residents are becoming increasingly demanding in terms of the desired results (Lobnikar et al., 2013). More noticeable, developmental trends that have been transferred from the west to the Central and Eastern European region include the pluralisation of policing and institutions of formal control (Modic et al., 2014). Accordingly, policing is developing into a knowledge-based activity. The pluralisation has strengthened the professionalisation of policing and the awareness regarding the police as an important profession, which is followed by the academisation of police work. The development of knowledge in the area of policing is increasingly supported by quality science and research activities, while academic demands in police education are ever growing (Lobnikar et al., 2013; Lobnikar & Modic, 2018).

The influence of these trends is also shown in the development of policing in Slovenia. After gaining its independence in 1991, Slovenia embarked on a comprehensive overhaul of the organisation, mission and duties of the police (Modic et al., 2014), and since then the Slovenian police has been characterised by several police reforms, reflected in different legislative changes and efforts to improve policing internally and externally. In 2013, this was even more evident when new police legislation was adopted aimed at achieving greater decentralisation and better cooperation between the police and local communities (Meško & Lobnikar, 2018). Further, a new Community Policing Strategy (Ministrstvo za notranje

zadeve RS, Policija, 2013) was adopted in 2013, which sets precise orientations that stress the importance of preventive programmes on the local community level.

Slovenia has adhered to the principles of CoP since its independence; however, practical implementation was not initially successful due to different cultural and organisational obstacles. Despite the ambitious goals, there were implementation problems and the CoP model was hindered by legal regulations, and the fact the strategy did not adjust according to the environmental characteristics. The main problems of implementing the CoP model were and still are similar to those that other police organisations around the world face – they are mainly associated with the lack of flexibility and with the rigid and legalistic mentality of police officers (Meško, 2009). Thus, community policing has remained at the level of ideology for many years, with noticeable progress only being apparent in the last few years.

Parallel to the practical implementation of these changes, innovations and new strategies, the need to determine their effectiveness logically arises. The public is mainly interested in whether the changes in police organisation philosophy and planned reforms have the predicted impact on improved safety, police effectiveness, and public satisfaction.

Many researchers have looked at the development of policing and the impacts of organisational changes in Slovenia (Durić & Šumi, 2018; Lobnikar et al., 2013; Lobnikar, Meško, & Modic, 2017; Meško & Klemenčič, 2007; Meško, Lobnikar, Jere, & Sotlar, 2013; Modic et al., 2014; Modic, Lobnikar, Tominc, Sotlar, & Meško, 2017). For example, success in CoP implementation was examined in a national study by Lobnikar, Prislan and Modic (2016) who found that, based on the public perception of safety, community cohesion and quality of police officers' work, the implementation of CoP has been relatively successful in Slovenia, but that improvements are needed primarily in the quality of interpersonal contacts of police officers with residents of local communities. Modic, Sotlar, and Meško (2012) came to a similar conclusion by relying on a meta-analysis of various studies on community policing in Slovenia. Those research findings show that both sides – police and residents – favour CoP over a more traditional approach to policing. Residents are generally satisfied with the way the police operate within the local environment, and are also willing to work with the police officers; yet, they emphasised the need to increase police accessibility and their presence in the field.

In 2017, Prislan and Lobnikar (2017) presented the results of a study on the appropriateness of safety and security measures and police work after analysing the views of police

officers and residents of local communities in Slovenia. The survey aimed at identifying which measures are satisfactory and which measures should be strengthened or enforced in the future. For this purpose, a comparison was made between police officers (n = 520) and residents (n = 1266) in the same environment to examine which measures and changes were the most popular. The results show that respondents (residents and police officers) share a strong opinion on certain measures, while some opinions are only characteristic for a given group. Respondents expressed the belief that more consistent punishment of perpetrators and improved traffic safety should be ensured in the future. On the other hand, they showed the least support for expanding police powers to city wardens, and increasing the powers of private security organisations. Even though both groups agreed on the areas that require special attention, their priorities were distributed somewhat differently. For example, police officers were much more inclined than residents to additional hiring or increasing the number of police officers, the introduction of a unified emergency telephone number, and the greater use of private security. In contrast, residents considered a better community arrangement, more active participation of non-governmental organisations, and improvement of their own self-defence capabilities as being much more important. This research shows that the expectations and needs of residents and police officers differ somewhat, but opinions and expectations about particular security and safety measures are the same. On this basis, areas of future development and priority work in local communities were identified and agreed by both groups. Planning for changes based on shared expectations and similar views can indeed ensure faster adoption and easier implementation (Prislan & Lobnikar, 2017).

The overview of the vast body of research concerned with the development and quality of police work in Slovenia reveals challenges remaining for the future of policing in Slovenia, which relate to questions such as how to ensure the participation of local residents in solving security problems, how to consolidate the implementation of the CoP philosophy among the various stakeholders, and how to maintain the high level of integrity of the partners.

In summary, a review of modern trends affecting the development of policing shows that the changes policing organisations are subject to appear on different levels, while the success of adaptation primarily depends on the capabilities of a systematic and systemic approach to these changes. Below, we present the results of a study conducted in 2018 on residents of Slovenia that attempted to determine which of the policing models described previously is considered by the respondents as the most suitable for the Slovenian environment.

5 Study of Public Perceptions on Preferred Police Models in Slovenia

5.1 Description of the Questionnaire

For the purposes of the study, we developed a questionnaire to assess the attitude of Slovenian residents to various policing models. Each model is defined by different criteria reflecting their specific characteristics stemming from the theoretical definition of the policing models (Ponsaers, 2001), where we considered the following criteria for their definitions (Kmet, Prisljan, & Lobnikar, 2019):

- 1) The attitude to the use of discretion in policing: How much discretion do police officers hold?
- 2) The attitude to the law: Is the law understood as a tool for policing or is the enforcement of laws the ultimate goal of policing?
- 3) The question of determining police accountability: To whom and in what way is the police accountable?
- 4) What is the nature of the cooperation between the police and the community?
- 5) What are the appropriate levels and nature of professionalisation and specialisation in the police?
- 6) What are the sources of police legitimacy?
- 7) The attitude of police to preventive activities.
- 8) The fundamental focus of policing: Is the emphasis on proactive or reactive policing?

The questionnaire has two parts, where the first part includes eight substantive subsections. Each substantive subsection included an initial description of the individual criteria, followed by four statements that describe these criteria within a specific policing model. For each statement, respondents had to decide to what degree they agreed or disagreed with it. They marked their answers on a 5-point scale where 1 represented “I strongly disagree with the statement” and 5 “I strongly agree with the statement”. The level of agreement with a particular policing model could thus be calculated by adding up the values of individual criteria that described a specific model. The model was thus assessed as the sum total of respondents’ attitudes to the eight criteria describing an individual policing model. Cronbach’s alpha for the entire questionnaire items on policing models was 0.785.

In addition to the attitude to the different criteria defining an individual policing model, we measured the level of residents’ trust and satisfaction with police work in the second part. This was achieved using a questionnaire with 16 statements (e.g., “I am satisfied with police work in our municipality”; “I can ask a police officer for help without hesitation”;

“Police officers exhibit in their work a high degree of concern for residents”; “I trust the police to make decisions in the best interest of municipal residents”, etc.). The respondents indicated their answers using a 5-point scale, where 1 represented “I strongly disagree with the statement” and 5 “I strongly agree with the statement”. Cronbach’s alpha for these questionnaire items was 0.961. A factor analysis was carried out for this part of the questionnaire (principal component method, KMO = 0.963), resulting in two factors. The first was named “*impartiality and legality*” and included 11 statements (e.g., “Police officers treat all residents of our municipality with respect and dignity”; “Police officers in our municipality understand and concretely enforce laws” – the new factor explained 64% of the variance), while the second was named “*concern for safety*” and included five statements (e.g., “Police officers exhibit a great deal of concern for the residents”; “Police officers try to make our municipality safe” – the new factor explained a further 6.5% of the variance).

We determined that both parts of the questionnaire are internally consistent and thus useful for further analysis.

Apart from these two substantive sets, we collected several socio-demographic data on the respondents (sex, age, marital status, education, years of employment, employment status and place of residence).

5.2 Methodology and Sample⁸

We conducted the study using an online survey in the spring of 2018. Respondents were invited to complete the questionnaire using various social media channels and by e-mail invitation. The sample was not random, while the participation method was based on the snowball model – each respondent was asked to share the survey with their acquaintances. Participation in the survey was voluntary, and we ensured the anonymity of respondents and confidentiality of their answers. The survey was completed by 249 residents of Slovenia; 32.1% were male, with an average age of 35.6 years (SD = 11.1) and an average of 11.53 years of employment (SD = 12.44); 46% of respondents lived in a rural environment, 54% in an urban environment; most respondents (39%) had completed secondary school education, 20% had a short-cycle higher education, and 26% had a first-cycle Bologna degree. The remaining participants held a second-cycle Bologna degree or higher education, while 60% of respondents were employed, 15% were pupils or students, 20% were unemployed, and 5% were retirees.

⁸ The authors are grateful to Ms. Maja Kmet for her assistance with the data collection.

6 Results

Table 1 presents data on how suitable for the Slovenian environment the respondents assessed individual policing models. The result for a model is the sum total of values attributed by respondents to the individual criterion used for assessing an individual model. Since there were eight criteria, the lowest value was eight and the highest possible value was 40.

Table 1: Assessment of the suitability of specific policing models for the Slovenian environment

Policing models	N	Min.	Max.	M	SD
Military-bureaucratic model	244	12.00	40.00	23.16	5.40
Lawful policing model	243	8.00	40.00	27.87	5.08
Community-oriented policing model	245	17.00	40.00	31.95	4.29
Public-private divide policing model	244	12.00	40.00	25.54	5.51

The respondents assessed community-oriented policing as the most suitable model, which also shows the lowest standard deviation, whereas they assessed the lawful policing model as the second most suitable policing model in Slovenia, giving a lower grade to the public-private divide policing model and assessing the militaristic-bureaucratic policing model as the least suitable one. Table 2 shows a schematic overview of the respondents' attitude to a suitable policing model from the perspective of the individual criteria used to assess their attitude. The character (-) marks criteria assessed as being below-average – meaning the respondents assessed them as

unsuitable for the Slovenian environment. The character (o) marks criteria assessed by the respondents as being in a neutral position, while (+) marks criteria the respondents assessed as a suitable approach to policing in their environment.

We see that the descriptions most often viewed as suitable are those included in the community policing model; only the lawful policing model included other positive assessments. The discretion held by police officers, stemming from the high standards of the police profession and the partnership of police officers with residents, is seen as giving the basis for the performance of police tasks in local communities. Residents' attitude to police discretion thus arises from a broader perception of police work as a profession and rejects a narrower legal perception of discretion. The accountability of the police derives from residents' assessment of the police, which brings the opinion of the Slovenian population very close to one of the basic assumptions of democratic policing made by Sir Robert Peel: *“The police are the public and the public are the police.”* Moreover, the legitimacy of police work builds on the effective enforcement of laws, with particular emphasis on the successful investigation of criminal offences. The results show that, in addition to proper investigation of crimes already committed, residents expect from the police a more proactive approach, especially in the prevention of crimes and violations of law and order. We see that the community policing model and the lawful policing model are the only two models without a negative assessment under any criteria. The most unfavourable assessments were for the criteria describing the militaristic-bureaucratic policing model, while the private-public divide policing model was also assessed quite unfavourably. The former model (bureaucratic) is probably considered obsolete, while the latter (private-public divide

Table 2: Assessment of the (un)suitability of policing models by individual criteria

	Military-bureaucratic model	Lawful policing model	Community-oriented policing model	Public-private divide policing model
Discretion	O	O	+	-
Law as a means	O	O	+	-
Accountability	-	O	+	O
Co-operation with the community	-	O	+	O
Specialisation	O	+	O	-
Legitimacy	-	+	O	O
Attitude towards preventive activities	-	O	+	O
Proactivity/reactivity	-	O	+	O

policing model) still seems – regardless of the reality of the Slovenian environment, where private policing is as frequent as public (both national and municipal) policing – unfamiliar and as such less acceptable.

Table 3 below shows the results of a correlation analysis performed to determine whether the attitude to individual policing models is correlated to any substantive or socio-demographic factors.

The table shows that the traditional policing models (bureaucratic and lawful policing models) have a positive and statistically significant correlation. We expected such a correlation since both models address the two main functions of policing: the bureaucratic model is based on authoritative intervention, whose ultimate goal is to ensure law and order, while the lawful policing model addresses symbolic justice whose ultimate goal is the enforcement of laws for everyone, thereby strengthening the sense of justice in a community.

Table 3: Correlation analysis of the attitude to individual policing models

		1	2	3	4
<i>Military-bureaucratic model (1)</i>	R	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)				
	N	244			
<i>Lawful policing model (2)</i>	R	.649**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000			
	N	239	243		
<i>Community-oriented policing model (3)</i>	R	.064	.087	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.326	.181		
	N	241	239	245	
<i>Public-private divide policing model (4)</i>	R	.272**	.151*	.492**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.020	.000	
	N	240	238	241	244
Impartiality and legality	R	.101	.227**	.028	-.001
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.131	.001	.678	.987
	N	225	224	225	224
Concern for safety	R	.111	.155*	.031	.025
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.098	.020	.641	.705
	N	225	224	225	224
Age ⁹	R	-.174**	-.235**	.037	-.081
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	.000	.569	.206
	N	244	243	245	244
Years of service	R	-.138*	-.217**	.032	-.057
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.039	.001	.630	.395
	N	226	225	227	226
Education	R	-.170**	-.174**	.014	-.159*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.007	.832	.014
	N	242	241	243	242

⁹ Age, education and years of service were collected as scales data so that the Pearson correlation coefficient could be used in the analysis.

The fact that the community policing model is significantly different from the first two models in terms of both mentality (attitude to preventive policing, attitude to community,

and attitude to sources of legitimacy are fundamentally different than in traditional models) and organisation is also indicated by the results showing that community policing is not statistically correlated with either the bureaucratic model or the lawful policing model. However, the two traditional models are statistically significantly and positively correlated to the last policing model – the private-public divide policing model. This reveals that many stakeholders of plural policing (e.g., the city warden service on one hand and private security companies and private investigators on the other) carry out functions that are attributed to the traditional policing models. The name itself, city warden service, indicates the basic purpose – to maintain law and order, while the basic task of, for example, private investigators is to enforce laws and rules in areas where the government has not ensured exclusivity. Yet, the private-public divide policing model has the strongest correlation with community policing. Community policing is based on partnership resolution of security problems, while the function of the private-public divide policing model is to eliminate risks for the occurrence of harmful events (*damage control*), meaning that the two models are complementary (Kmet et al., 2019).

Moreover, we found some statistically significant correlations with the two factors used to measure the level of residents' satisfaction with the police work. The residents who assessed the impartiality and legality of police work as important also assessed as more important the criteria that made up the lawful policing model. The same is true for the correlation with concern for safety. Considering the results of the analysis, we may conclude that the level of residents' satisfaction with police work is statistically significantly and positively correlated with law-enforcement processes and ensuring equality before the law; still, it is interesting that satisfaction is not correlated with community policing. We can conclude that respondents who attributed greater emphasis to equality and justice in police work are also more supportive of the lawful policing model. Ensuring legality and equality, with a focus on ensuring safety, is therefore a fundamental activity, while the partnership resolution of security problems is just an upgrade of this fundamental police orientation.

We also found that the younger respondents are distinctly not in favour of the first two (modern) policing models; the same applies to those respondents with a higher level of education and more work experience. However, we need to emphasise that this does not mean a greater disposition towards other policing models – the results simply indicate that the younger, more educated, and more experienced respondents do not consider the bureaucratic and lawful policing models suitable for the modern Slovenian environment.

Using a t-test and an analysis of variance (ANOVA), we determined that retirees ($F = 4.125$; $p = 0.007$) and women ($t = -2.97$; $p = 0.004$) are more inclined to the lawful policing model than the other groups, while single respondents ($t = 2.04$; $p = 0.042$) are more inclined to community policing. The private-public divide policing model is assessed more favourably by respondents holding the highest level of education ($F = 2.59$; $p = 0.037$), as is shown by the correlation analysis. Surprisingly, we found no statistically significant differences in the attitude to the suitability of specific policing models in the Slovenian environment between respondents living in a rural environment and those living in urban centres.

7 Discussion

As shown by the overview of reforms in Central and Eastern Europe and in Slovenia, policing is subject to numerous political, economic, societal and technological changes, which in the future will require greater flexibility from police organisations and innovative approaches to policing. The success of policing in the future builds on the capability to implement appropriate systemic and strategic changes that take account of the expectations and needs of the various stakeholders and the environment in which policing is carried out. By identifying the expectations of the community, police can obtain information on how to develop security activities that meet community expectations and identify those areas in which stakeholders' views and positions on priorities need to be coordinated. Although police activity has often been a topic of research projects in Slovenia (Lobnikar, Modic, & Sotlar, 2019), integrated research on local-level safety/security was not conducted until 2015. In 2015, the four-year research project *Safety and security in local communities* started at the Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security (University of Maribor). Researchers found that in city areas, particularly in urban environments, there appear to be more security-related issues than in other municipalities. The dynamics of urban life are more intense where crime and other deviant behaviours are no exception and therefore the project thoroughly examined the extent and the nature of crime and public disorder in Slovenian cities, and included a victimisation study encompassing the study of fear of crime and subjective perception of deviant behaviours (Meško, 2017). As part of that project, Prislan and Lobnikar (2017) analysed the perceptions of different stakeholders about the effectiveness of the current security and safety-related measures applied in local communities as well as their expectations for safety and security provision in the future. On this basis, priority development areas for each community were identified. Important directions for strategic and operational planning are provided by the study presented in this article about preferred police models and this project.

Effective law enforcement that includes the participation of different stakeholders in crime prevention and the provision of security seems the right combination of policing designs for the Slovenian environment. On this basis, security programmes adapted to communities can be developed in different environments. Our study of policing models found that respondents assessed community policing as the most suitable organisational approach to policing in Slovenia, followed by the lawful policing model; although, we need to add that the respondents still consider policing based on the impartial enforcement of rules and laws as fundamental. From the perspective of the strategic management of policing, it is, therefore necessary to consider residents' expectations while not ignoring current developmental trends associated with the development of knowledge-based and technologically advanced policing, which we described in the first part of the article.

Summarising both the results of police research in Slovenia and current trends in police activity in democratic and developed societies, the future clearly shows many opportunities for policing. Thus, decision-makers must make the right choices about priorities, policing philosophy and which new capabilities they will develop to cope with the new realities. Deloitte (2018) developed some suggestions for police leaders to ensure that policing is adequately prepared for the future:

- involving the public in prioritisation choices and trade-offs to maintain legitimacy;
- deploying rigorous and evidence-supported conversations about which demands and preventative activities can be serviced;
- maintaining crime-prevention capabilities in order to avoid a vicious cycle of simply responding to increasing demand, by setting up services and resolution activities for a more effective response to low level crimes, improving visibility and accessibility with ICT enabled communication and engaging public sector partners and businesses in dialogue to determine responsibilities and areas of collaboration;
- ensuring a clear vision for the future, by clarifying core policing and leadership philosophies;
- defining the necessary capabilities and means needed to address current and future demands, focusing not just on budget and people, but also on processes and technologies;
- investing in data as a critical organisational asset which, when properly used and analysed, can enhance productivity and support the identification and assessment of threats; and
- developing 'resident relationship management' systems, which enable personalised services and the harnessing of community prevention capabilities, and workforce relationship management systems and tools to manage workforce creativity, skills, and well-being.

All of these recommendations are in tune with the research results presented in the previous sections. Active monitoring of modern trends, best practices, and identifying opportunities for innovations are fundamental preconditions for ensuring that policing develops in the best direction. At the same time, it is necessary to meet the requirements for a systematic approach to ensure the appropriate conditions for implementation and integration. The review of the literature and research in Slovenia showed that the systematic approach means that reforms are adapted to the characteristics of the environment in which they are implemented but also follow developmental trends in the world. Namely, flexible organisational structures are vital for reforms to flourish and produce the expected results. Police organisations must change their mechanistic structure that used to fit in with a stable environment, into a more flexible, decentralised and organic structure that is aligned with the contemporary dynamic environment (van den Born et al., 2013). On top of a flexible organisational structure (that is in tune with the desired community policing model), appropriate organisational support that promotes the practical implementation of changes is also necessary. Leadership support is one of the most important factors of implementing innovations in police work. From this perspective, of all things, transformational leadership contributes the most to the adoption of innovations and change (Darroch & Mazerolle, 2012). Police organisations have traditionally used a transactional approach to productivity management, using control, assessment and rewarding based on measured results (Glenn et al., 2003), yet when implementing preventive plans, particularly in the CoP strategy, there is a growing need for transformational management to allow for more discretion and emphasis training, empowerment and creativity of police officers in problem solving. Further, there is no doubt that goal-oriented leadership is also important. Police managers must be strongly committed to the planned changes and clearly defined goals; otherwise, resistance to change and weak innovation is likely to emerge.

Moreover, for innovation to succeed, the performance of new approaches must be benchmarked and analysed over time, while frontline officers need to be encouraged, motivated, engaged and trained for new roles (Darroch & Mazerolle, 2012). Police officers working in the field are, in fact, the ones who influence public perceptions, create people's experience, and enforce organisational rules in practice. Whether the changes dictated by the strategic police management are appropriately implemented in practice depends on their conduct and enthusiasm. If the police managers fail to simultaneously improve police officers' work conditions and ensure fairness in mutual relationships while pursuing increased effectiveness and improved public relations, such changes are quite unlikely to be successful (Trinkner, Tyler, & Goff, 2016).

This is a crucial challenge for Slovenian police managers trying to reinforce the CoP model in Slovenia. It is also important because, by doing so, they would be meeting the expectations held by Slovenian residents concerning the way policing should be organised and performed.

In conclusion, for police to be able to efficiently adapt to changes and trends, they must develop deep insights into the future environment to which their mission and organisation must adapt, as well as into the current internal weaknesses of their agencies that must be changed (van den Born et al., 2013). The success of policing and related reforms therefore depends greatly on the appropriate goal-oriented approach, which must be accepted by the communities and accompanied by suitable support on all levels of police organisation. Last but not least, for reforms to be successfully implemented it is necessary to ensure a leadership philosophy that focuses on public trust. This requires that democratic approaches be used within police organisations, whereby trust and legitimacy are created by just, fair and inclusive planning and policing.

Analysing the expectations and perceptions of different stakeholders is therefore an important instrument for gaining feedback and information for future plans. In this context, it is worth mentioning at least two research projects at the Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security that may help in responding to these dilemmas. Starting in 2019, the first project is *Security and safety in local communities – a comparison of rural and urban environments* (Meško, 2019a). This five-year project, following the *Safety and security in local communities* project from 2015, focuses on crime and disorder in rural environments in Slovenia, including social control (informal and formal) perspectives. Researchers here are planning to study rural and urban criminology theory, the nature of crime, victimisation, and fear of crime in rural areas in Slovenia, to further analyse the provision of safety and security in local communities, and to develop new models of cooperation between security organisations in the rural and urban environment. The second project that will give a stronger foundation for the further development of the public-private police model concentrates on *perspectives of plural policing in local communities in Slovenia* (from 2018 to 2020). Here the researchers aim to determine the roles and functions and where work overlaps amongst state and local police (wardens), as well as municipality inspection services, judicial police, financial police, private security, and private detectives (Meško, 2019b).

These research projects will address current issues regarding the efficiency of police activity in Slovenia and provide a knowledge-base for decision-makers and future plans. Still, in line with the trends described in this article, the circumstances surrounding the development and implementation of

new technology-based approaches to policing should also be explored in the future.

References

1. Allen, R. Y. W. (2002). Assessing the impediments to organizational change. A view of community policing. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 30(6), 511–517.
2. Banutai, E., Rančigaj, K., & Lobnikar, B. (2006). Pomen in pripravljenost prebivalcev Slovenije za sodelovanje s policijo [The importance and willingness of the residents of Slovenia to cooperate with the police]. In B. Lobnikar (Ed.), *Raznolikost zagotavljanja varnosti: Zbornik prispevkov* (pp. 586–601). Ljubljana: Fakulteta za policijsko-varnostne vede.
3. Bayley, D. H., & Shearing, C. D. (2001). *The new structure of policing: Description, conceptualization, and research agenda*. Washington: US Department of Justice.
4. Borins, S. (2001). Encouraging innovation in the public sector. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 2(3), 310–319.
5. Braga, A. A., & Weisburd, D. L. (2007). *Police innovation and crime prevention: Lessons learned from police research over the past 20 years* (No. 218585). Washington: National Institute of Justice.
6. Buerger, M. (2007). Third party policing: Futures and evolutions. In J. A. Schafer (Ed.), *Policing 2020: Exploring the Future of Crime, Communities, and Policing* (pp. 452–486). Washington: US Department of Justice.
7. Clarke, R. V., & Eck, J. E. (2005). *Crime analysis for problem solvers – in 60 small steps*. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
8. Crank, J. P., Kadleck, C., & Koski, C. M. (2010). The USA: The next big thing. *Police Practice and Research*, 11(5), 405–422.
9. Damanpour, F., & Schneider, M. (2006). Phases of the adoption of innovation in organizations: Effects of environment, organization and top managers. *British Journal of Management*, 17(3), 215–236.
10. Darroch, S., & Mazerolle, L. (2012). Intelligence-led policing: A comparative analysis of organisational factors influencing innovation uptake. *Police Quarterly*, 16(1), 3–37.
11. de Guzman, M. C., & Kim, M. (2017). Community hierarchy of needs and policing models: toward a new theory of police organizational behavior. *Police Practice and Research*, 18(4), 352–365.
12. Deloitte. (2018). *Policing 4.0. Deciding the future of policing in the UK*. London: Deloitte.
13. Durić, D., & Šumi, R. (2018). Leadership development in Slovenian police: Review and way forward. In G. Meško, B. Lobnikar, K. Prislan, & R. Hacin (Eds.), *Criminal justice and security in Central and Eastern Europe: From common sense to evidence-based policy-making* (pp. 105–118). Maribor: University Press.
14. Forst, B. (2000). Privatization and civilianization of policing. *Criminal justice 2000*, 2, 19–79. Retrieved from https://www.ncjrs.gov/criminal_justice2000/vol_2/02c2.pdf
15. Garicano, L., & Heaton, P. (2010). Information technology, organization and productivity in the public sector: Evidence from police departments. *Journal of Labour Economics*, 28(1), 167–201.
16. Glenn, R. W., Panitch, B. R., Barnes-Proby, D., Williams, E., Christian, J., Lewis, M. W. et al. (2003). *Training the 21st century Police Officer: Redefining Police Professionalism for the Los Angeles Police Department*. Santa Monica: RAND Public safety and Justice.
17. Greene, J. R. (2007). *The encyclopedia of police science*. New York: Routledge.

18. Hinds, L., & Murphy, K. (2007). Public satisfaction with police: Using procedural justice to improve police legitimacy. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 40(1), 27–43.
19. Jere, M., Sotlar, A., & Meško, G. (2012). Community policing practice and research in Slovenia. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, 63(1), 3–13.
20. Kelling, G. L., & Wycoff, M. A. (2001). *Evolving strategy of policing: Case studies of strategic change: Research report*. Rockville: National Institute of Justice.
21. Kmet, M., Prislán, K., & Lobnikar, B. (2019). Modeli policijske dejavnosti – preference prebivalcev Slovenije. [Models of policing – preferences of residents in Slovenia]. In M. Modic, I. Areh, B. Flander, B. Lobnikar, & B. Tominc (Eds.), *Zbornik povzetkov: 20. Dnevi varstvoslovja* (p. 42). Maribor: Univerzitetna založba Univerze.
22. Kochel, T., Parks, R., & Mastrofski, S. (2013). Examining police effectiveness as a precursor to legitimacy and cooperation with police. *Justice Quarterly*, 30(5), 895–925.
23. Lambertus, S., & Yakimchuk, R. (2007). *Future of policing in Alberta: International trends and case studies* (A discussion paper). Alberta: Alberta Solicitor General and Public Security Office Research Unit.
24. Langworthy, R. H. (1986). *The structure of police organizations*. New York: Praeger.
25. Lobnikar, B., & Modic, M. (2018). Profesionalizacija slovenske policije [Professionalization of the Slovene police]. *Varstvoslovje*, 30(3), 286–308.
26. Lobnikar, B., & Sotlar, A. (2006). Celovito upravljanje z varnostnimi tveganji kot dejavnik dolgoročne uspešnosti podjetja. [Integrated risk management as a factor of long-term business success]. In A. Dvoršek, & L. Selinšek (Eds.) *Kriminalni napadi na premoženje gospodarskih subjektov* (pp. 9–22). Maribor: Pravna fakulteta, Ljubljana: Fakulteta za policijsko-varnostne vede.
27. Lobnikar, B., Meško, G., & Modic, M. (2017). Transformations in policing: Two decades of experience in community policing in Slovenia. In J. A. Eterno, A. Verma, A. M. Das, & D. K. Das (Eds.), *Global issues in contemporary policing* (pp. 199–220). Boca Raton; London; New York: CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
28. Lobnikar, B., Modic, M., & Sotlar, A. (2019). Policijska dejavnost v Sloveniji – analiza razvoja dejavnosti in njenega raziskovanja. [Policing in Slovenia – Analysis of the development and research of policing]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, 70(2), 162–175.
29. Lobnikar, B., Prislán, K., & Modic, M. (2016). Merjenje uspešnosti implementacije policijskega dela v skupnosti [Measuring the effectiveness of implementing community policing in Slovenia]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, 67(2), 89–110.
30. Lobnikar, B., Sotlar, A., & Meško, G. (2013). Razvoj policijske dejavnosti v Srednji in Vzhodni Evropi [Development of policing in Central and Eastern Europe]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, 64(1), 5–18.
31. Lukman, P. (2014). Znanstveni modeli in digitalizacija [Scientific models and digitalization]. *Razpotja: Revija humanistov Goriške*, 4(13), 20–26. Retrieved from <http://www.razpotja.si/znanstveni-modeli-in-digitalizacija/>
32. Maguire, E. R., & King, W. R. (2004). Trends in the policing industry. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 593, 15–41. Retrieved from https://www.jstor.org/stable/4127665?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents
33. Mastrofski, S. D., & Willis, J. J. (2010). Police organization continuity and change: Into the twenty-first century. *Crime & Justice*, 39(1), 55–144.
34. Meško, G. (2009). Transfer of crime control ideas – Introductory reflections. In G. Meško, & H. Kury (Eds.), *Crime policy, crime control and crime prevention – Slovenian perspectives* (pp. 5–19). Ljubljana: Tipografija.
35. Meško, G. (2017). Uvodna predstavitev rezultatov raziskave o varnosti v lokalnih skupnostih v Sloveniji v letu 2017. [Introductory presentation of the results of the research on security in local communities in Slovenia in 2017]. In G. Meško, K. Eman, & U. Pirnat, (Eds.) *Varnost v lokalnih skupnostih – izsledki raziskovanja zaznav varnosti v Sloveniji: Konferenčni zbornik* (pp. 3–15). Maribor: Univerzitetna založba Univerze.
36. Meško, G. (2019a). *Security and safety in local communities – comparison of rural and urban environments*. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Security-and-safety-in-local-communities-comparison-of-rural-and-urban-environments-2019-2024>
37. Meško, G. (2019b). *Perspectives of plural policing in local communities (in Slovenia) (2018–2020)*. Retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/project/Perspectives-of-plural-policing-in-local-communities-in-Slovenia-2018-2020>
38. Meško, G., & Klemenčič, G. (2007). Rebuilding legitimacy and police professionalism in an emerging democracy: The Slovenian experience. In T. R. Tyler (Ed.), *Legitimacy and criminal justice: International perspectives* (pp. 84–115). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
39. Meško, G., & Lobnikar, B. (2018). Police reforms in Slovenia in the past 25 years. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*. DOI: 10.1093/police/pay008
40. Meško, G., Fallshore, M., & Jevšek, A. (2007). Policija in strah pred kriminaliteto [Police and fear of crime]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, 58(4), 340–351.
41. Meško, G., Lobnikar, B., Jere, M., & Sotlar, A. (2013). Recent developments of policing in Slovenia. In G. Meško, C. B. Fields, B. Lobnikar, & A. Sotlar (Eds.), *Handbook on Policing in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 263–286). New York: Springer.
42. Miller, L., & Hess, K. M. (2002). *The police in the community: Strategies for the 21st century*. Belmont: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
43. Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve RS, Policija. (2013). *Strategija policijskega dela v skupnosti*. [Strategy of community policing]. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve RS.
44. Modic, M., Lobnikar, B., & Dvojmoč, M. (2014). Policijska dejavnost v Sloveniji: Analiza procesov transformacije, pluralizacije in privatizacije [Policing in Slovenia: An analysis of the processes of transformation, pluralization, and privatization]. *Varstvoslovje*, 16(3), 217–241.
45. Modic, M., Lobnikar, B., Tominc, B., Sotlar, A., & Meško, G. (2017). Metropolitan policing in post-socialist countries: The case of Slovenia. In E. Devroe, A. Edwards, & P. Ponsaers (Eds.), *Policing European metropolises: The politics of security in city-regions* (pp. 144–164). London; New York: Routledge.
46. Modic, M., Sotlar, A., & Meško, G. (2012). Praksa in raziskovanje policijskega dela v skupnosti v Sloveniji [Community policing practice and research in Slovenia]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, 63(1), 3–13.
47. Myers, R. W. (2004). What future(s) do we want for community policing? In L. Fridell, & M. A. Wycoff (Eds.), *Community policing: The past, present, and future* (pp. 169–182). Washington: Police Executive Research Forum.
48. Pagon, M. (2004). *Teorije policijske dejavnosti*. [Theories of policing]. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za policijsko-varnostne zadeve.

49. Perkins, M. (2016). Modelling public confidence of the police: How perceptions of the police differ between neighborhoods in a city. *Police Practice and Research*, 17(2), 113–125.
50. Ponsaers, P. (2001). Reading about “community (oriented) policing” and police models. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 24(4), 470–496.
51. Prislan, K., & Lobnikar, B. (2017). Zagotavljanje varnosti lokalnih skupnosti v prihodnje: Percepcije različnih deležnikov v Sloveniji [Ensuring the safety of local communities in the future: Perceptions of different stakeholders in Slovenia]. In G. Meško, K. Eman, & U. Pirnat (Eds.), *Varnost v lokalnih skupnostih – izsledki raziskovanja zaznav varnosti v Sloveniji: Konferenčni zbornik* (pp. 131–142). Maribor: Univerzitetna založba Univerze.
52. Ratcliffe, J. H., & Guidetti, R. (2008). State police investigation structure and the adoption of intelligence-led policing. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 31(1), 109–128.
53. Reisig, M. D., & Parks, R. B. (2004). Can community policing help the truly disadvantaged? *Crime & Delinquency*, 50(2), 139–167.
54. Rosenbaum, D. (2007). Police innovation post 1980: Assessing effectiveness and equity concerns in the information technology era. *Institute for the Prevention of Crime Review*, 1, 11–44. Retrieved from <https://www.publicsafety.gc.ca/lbr/archives/cnmcs-plcng/ripcr-v1-11-44-eng.pdf>
55. Sheptycky, J. (2012). Policing theory and research – What’s in a metaphor? *Journal of Police Studies*, 4(25), 55–69.
56. Skogan, W., & Hartnett, S. (1997). *Community policing, Chicago style*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
57. Sotlar, A., & Tominc, B. (2016). The changing functions of the police and armed forces (in extraordinary situations) in Slovenia. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo*, 67(4), 326–338.
58. Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law and Society Review*, 37(3), 513–547.
59. Tankebe, J. (2008). Police effectiveness and police trustworthiness in Ghana: An empirical appraisal. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 8(2), 185–202.
60. Travis, L. F., & Langworthy, R. H. (2008). *Policing in America: A balance of forces* (4th ed.). Cincinnati: Prentice Hall.
61. Trinkner, R., Tyler, T. R., & Goff, P. A. (2016). Justice from within: The relations between a procedurally just organizational climate and police organizational efficiency, endorsement of democratic policing, and officer well-being. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 22(2), 158–172.
62. Trojanowicz, R. C., & Carter, D. (1988). *The philosophy and role of community policing*. East Lansing: The National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center.
63. Trojanowicz, R., Kappeler, V. E., & Gaines, L. K. (2002). *Community policing: A contemporary perspective*. Cincinnati: Anderson.
64. Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities. *Ohio State Journal of Criminal Law*, 6(1), 231–275.
65. van den Born, A., van Witteloostuijn, A., Barlage, M., Sapulete, S., van der Oord, A., Rogiest, S. et al. (2013). Policing opportunities and threats in Europe. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 26(5), 811–829.
66. van der Vijver, K., & Moor, L. G. (2012). Theories of policing. *Journal of Police Studies*, 4(25), 15–29.
67. Weisburd, D. L., Mastrofski, S. D., McNally, A., Greenspan, R., & Willis, J. (2003). Reforming to preserve: COMPSTAT and strategic problem solving in American policing. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 2(3), 421–456.
68. Wilson, J. (2006). *Community policing in America*. New York: Taylor & Francis Group.
69. Zhao, J. S. (2004). The future of policing in a community era. In Q. C. Thurman, & J. Zhao (Eds.), *Contemporary policing: Controversies, challenges, and solutions* (pp. 370–381). Los Angeles: Roxbury.

Sodobni trendi v policijski dejavnosti: Stališča prebivalcev o najprimernejših modelih policijskega dela v Sloveniji

Dr. Kaja Prislan, docentka na področju varnostnih ved, Fakulteta za varnostne vede, Univerza v Mariboru.
E-pošta: kaja.prislan@fvv.uni-mb.si

Dr. Branko Lobnikar, redni profesor na področju varnostnih ved, Fakulteta za varnostne vede, Univerza v Mariboru, Slovenija. E-pošta: branko.lobnikar@fvv.uni-mb.si

Sodobne policijske organizacije delujejo v izrazito dinamičnem okolju, v katerem se soočajo z različnimi sociološkimi, ekonomskimi, političnimi in tehnološkimi trendi, ki od njih zahtevajo ustrezne prilagoditve. Za uspešen razvoj policijske dejavnosti je v prihodnje treba zagotoviti predvsem fleksibilnejše organizacijske strukture in inovativne rešitve. Reforme v organizacijah javnega sektorja sicer niso enostavne, saj jih spremljajo različni izzivi, povezani s težavami implementacije sistemskih sprememb. V zadnjih dveh desetletjih je policija v Sloveniji že izvedla številne organizacijske reforme in v delo vpeljala nove pristope k policijskemu delu, vendar analize kažejo, da nekatere spremembe niso bile učinkovite in niso zagotovile pričakovanih rezultatov. Temeljni vzrok za neuspešnost reform v policijski dejavnosti je predvsem neusklajenost pristopov in modelov z obstoječimi organizacijskimi strukturami ter potrebami okolja. V prvem delu avtorja predstavljata pregled sodobnih razvojnih trendov na področju policijskih organizacij in policijskega dela, v drugem delu pa so predstavljeni rezultati raziskave med prebivalci Slovenije o njihovih stališčih glede najbolj primernih pristopov oziroma modelov policijskega dela. Rezultati kažejo, da med najbolj zaželenimi oziroma primerne sodita policijsko delo v skupnosti in na pravo temelječ model policijskega dela, ugotovitve pa predstavljajo izhodišče za nadaljnje načrtovanje razvoja in pristopov k policijskemu delu v Sloveniji.

Ključne besede: policija, modeli policijskega dela, policijsko delo v skupnosti, prihodnost policijske dejavnosti, Slovenija

UDK: 351.741(497.4)