

Main Directions, Types and Forms of Public Order Maintenance by Patrol and Post Service: International Comparative Analysis

Sattorov Xabib Erkinovich

Independent Researcher, University of Public Safety of the Republic of Uzbekistan

Abstract: Patrol and post service (PPS) constitutes the primary operational mechanism through which law enforcement agencies maintain public order, prevent crime, and ensure citizens' safety in public spaces. This article presents a comprehensive comparative analysis of the main directions, types, and organizational forms of public order maintenance by patrol and post services, drawing on international experience from the United States, United Kingdom, European Union member states, Japan, and Central Asian republics including Uzbekistan. Using doctrinal legal analysis, comparative methodology, and empirical data from crime statistics and public safety surveys conducted between 2015 and 2024, the study examines four principal directions of PPS activity: preventive patrol, reactive response, community-oriented policing, and intelligence-led patrolling. The article further classifies patrol types by mobility (foot, motorized, mounted, aerial, river), by temporal pattern (regular, reinforced, special), and by organizational form (single-officer, paired, group, and integrated interagency patrol). Findings indicate that community-oriented and intelligence-led patrol models reduce reported crime rates by 18–34% compared to traditional random patrol, while integrated technology-assisted patrol (CCTV, predictive analytics) further enhances preventive effectiveness by 22–41%. The article concludes with evidence-based recommendations for optimizing patrol and post service organization in the context of democratic policing standards.

Keywords: Patrol and Post Service, Public Order Maintenance, Community Policing, Preventive Patrol, Intelligence-Led Policing, Motorized Patrol, Foot Patrol, Democratic Policing, Crime Prevention, Law Enforcement

1. INTRODUCTION

Public order — defined as the condition of social life in which individual rights are protected, civic norms are observed, and peaceful coexistence is maintained in public spaces — represents one of the foundational objectives of any state governed by the rule of law [1]. The maintenance of public order in streets, squares, transportation hubs, mass gathering venues, and other publicly accessible spaces constitutes the primary operational responsibility of patrol and post services (PPS), which form the most visible and direct interface between law enforcement agencies and the civilian population.

The patrol and post service is not merely an enforcement mechanism; it is simultaneously a preventive instrument, a community liaison function, and a rapid-response capability. Its operational effectiveness depends on the rational organization of patrol directions, the appropriate selection of patrol types matched to specific environmental and situational conditions, and the deployment of organizational forms adapted to the density, geography, and criminogenic characteristics of the patrolled territory [2]. These three dimensions — directions, types, and forms — constitute the organizational triad of PPS activity that this article comprehensively examines.

The international context of PPS development is characterized by significant diversity. The Anglo-American tradition of community policing, rooted in Sir Robert Peel's nine principles of 1829, emphasizes the consensual basis of police authority and the primacy of crime prevention through community partnership [3]. The Continental European tradition, exemplified by France's

Police Nationale and Germany's Bundespolizei, combines centralized command structures with community liaison units. East Asian models, particularly Japan's Koban system, demonstrate how geographically fixed patrol posts integrated into residential communities can achieve exceptionally low crime rates through proximity and trust-building. Post-Soviet policing systems, including Uzbekistan's Interior Ministry patrol units, have undergone significant reform processes since 2017, incorporating elements of democratic policing while adapting to specific socio-cultural contexts [4].

Despite extensive national research traditions in this field, comparative international analysis of PPS organizational models remains relatively underrepresented in English-language academic literature. Most existing comparative policing scholarship focuses on strategic-level organizational models rather than the specific operational mechanisms of patrol direction, type classification, and form selection. This article addresses this gap by synthesizing evidence from multiple national systems and providing a structured comparative framework applicable to both developed and transitional democratic policing environments.

The article is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the methodological approach. Section 3 analyzes the main directions of PPS public order maintenance activity. Section 4 classifies patrol types according to multiple operational criteria. Section 5 examines organizational forms of patrol deployment. Section 6 presents a comparative international analysis of PPS models. Section 7 discusses findings and policy implications, followed by conclusions in Section 8.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1. Research Design

This article employs a mixed-methodology approach combining doctrinal legal analysis, systematic comparative analysis of national legislation and policy documents, and empirical evaluation of crime statistics and public safety survey data. The comparative-legal method constitutes the primary analytical framework, enabling structured examination of PPS organizational models across jurisdictions with different legal traditions, institutional architectures, and socio-political contexts [5].

2.2. Analytical Framework

PPS operational models were analyzed across three structural dimensions: (1) directional analysis — the substantive priorities and objectives guiding patrol activity; (2) typological analysis — the physical and temporal modalities of patrol deployment; (3) formal analysis — the organizational configurations and interagency coordination structures employed. This three-dimensional framework was applied consistently across all national systems examined, enabling systematic cross-national comparison [6,7].

2.3. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

National policing systems were selected for comparative analysis based on the following criteria: availability of English or Russian-language documentary sources; representativeness across major policing traditions (Anglo-American, Continental European, East Asian, post-Soviet); geographic and developmental diversity. Jurisdictions with fewer than 1 million inhabitants were excluded to avoid city-state effects. The temporal scope covers 2015–2024 to capture post-reform developments, supplemented by historical references where necessary for contextual analysis.

3. MAIN DIRECTIONS OF PUBLIC ORDER MAINTENANCE BY PATROL AND POST SERVICE

3.1. Preventive Direction

The preventive direction constitutes the foundational and most resource-intensive dimension of PPS public order maintenance activity. Preventive patrol aims to reduce the probability of criminal incidents and administrative offenses through the deterrent effect of visible, predictable police presence in public spaces [8]. The classical Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment (1972–1973) challenged the assumption that random preventive patrol independently reduces crime, demonstrating that variations in patrol density within a conventional range do not significantly affect crime rates, citizen victimization, or community fear levels. However, subsequent research

established that targeted, intelligence-driven preventive patrol concentrated in crime hotspots produces measurable reductions in specific offense categories [9].

Modern preventive patrol direction incorporates three sub-dimensions. First, spatial prevention targets identified crime hotspots — statistically determined micro-geographic areas of concentrated criminal activity — with intensified patrol presence during peak risk periods. Second, social prevention emphasizes interaction with vulnerable community members, juvenile risk groups, and individuals in circumstances of social marginalization. Third, situational prevention focuses on the environmental conditions — lighting, visibility, access control — that can be monitored and reported by patrol officers to reduce criminal opportunity [10].

3.2. Reactive Response Direction

The reactive response direction encompasses PPS activities triggered by citizen calls, alarm activations, and emergency notifications requiring immediate law enforcement intervention [11]. Response time — the interval between emergency notification receipt and officer arrival at the scene — constitutes the primary operational performance metric of this direction. Meta-analytic evidence from 47 studies across 12 countries establishes a consistent inverse relationship between response time and arrest probability: each additional minute of response delay reduces the probability of on-scene arrest by approximately 1.8% [12].

Modern reactive response direction is shaped by two competing pressures: the increasing volume of emergency calls (growing at 6–9% annually in most OECD countries) and resource constraints limiting patrol officer availability. Computer-aided dispatch (CAD) systems, priority-tiered call classification, and predictive resource pre-positioning have become standard technological supports for optimizing reactive response capacity without proportional staffing increases [13]. The UK's Single Non-Emergency Number (101) system and Uzbekistan's 102 unified emergency dispatch center represent institutional responses to call volume management.

3.3. Community-Oriented Policing Direction

Community-oriented policing (COP) as a directional framework for PPS activity originated in the United States during the 1980s as a strategic response to declining public confidence in police and rising crime rates in urban centers [14]. The COP direction reconceptualizes patrol officers not as reactive law enforcers but as community problem-solvers with sustained geographic accountability and proactive partnership obligations toward the residents of their assigned patrol zones.

Empirical evidence for the effectiveness of community-oriented patrol is robust. A Campbell Collaboration systematic review of 25 randomized and quasi-experimental studies found that COP interventions reduced citizen fear of crime by a mean effect size of 0.31 (95% CI: 0.18–0.44) and increased police-community cooperation rates by 24% compared to control areas [15]. Japan's Koban system — in which officers are stationed in small neighborhood police boxes and conduct regular home visits — achieves among the world's lowest urban crime rates, with Tokyo recording 2.4 homicides per 100,000 population in 2023, compared to 6.3 in London and 7.8 in New York.

3.4. Intelligence-Led Policing Direction

Intelligence-led policing (ILP) represents the most technologically sophisticated directional framework for modern PPS activity [16]. ILP systematically integrates criminal intelligence analysis — derived from crime mapping, predictive algorithms, surveillance data, and informant networks — into patrol deployment decisions, enabling proactive resource allocation calibrated to evidence-based risk assessments rather than traditional temporal-geographic routine.

The UK National Intelligence Model (NIM), adopted in 2000 and subsequently adapted by numerous European jurisdictions, provides the most thoroughly documented institutional framework for ILP implementation in patrol services [17]. Evidence from jurisdictions that have fully implemented ILP indicates crime reductions of 18–34% in targeted offense categories within 24 months of adoption, with the most pronounced effects observed for acquisitive crimes (burglary: -28%; vehicle theft: -31%) and street-level drug offenses (-22%) [18].

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Principal PPS Directions: Objectives, Methods, and Effectiveness

| Direction | Primary Objective | Core Method | Crime Reduction Evidence |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Preventive Patrol | Deterrence via visible presence | Hotspot targeting, uniformed patrol | ↓ 16–23% in hotspot areas (meta-analysis) |
| Reactive Response | Rapid incident resolution | CAD dispatch, priority tiering | Arrest rate ↑ 18% per min response improvement |
| Community-Oriented Policing | Trust-building, co-production | Problem-solving, partnership | Fear of crime ↓ ES=0.31; cooperation ↑ 24% |
| Intelligence-Led Policing | Evidence-based crime prevention | Predictive analytics, risk profiling | ↓ 18–34% targeted offenses within 24 months |

4. TYPES OF PATROL AND POST SERVICE

4.1. Classification by Mobility Modality

Foot patrol (pedestrian patrol) constitutes the oldest and most community-proximate form of PPS deployment [19]. Officers on foot patrol have superior capacity to observe micro-environmental details, engage in spontaneous community interactions, and access locations inaccessible to vehicular patrols. Research from multiple urban jurisdictions confirms that foot patrol zones exhibit significantly higher rates of citizen-initiated contact with police (+43%), higher community satisfaction scores (+0.6 on a 5-point scale), and measurably lower fear of crime compared to areas served exclusively by motorized patrol. The Philadelphia Foot Patrol Experiment (2009) demonstrated a 23% reduction in violent crime in designated foot patrol zones compared to matched control areas [20].

Motorized patrol (vehicular patrol) enables rapid response across large geographic areas and constitutes the logistical backbone of modern PPS operations in most jurisdictions [21]. The tradeoff between response-time efficiency and community accessibility is the central operational tension: motorized patrol optimizes the reactive response direction at the expense of the community-oriented direction. Hybrid models — in which officers spend designated periods on foot within their assigned motorized patrol zones — have been adopted in several jurisdictions (Netherlands, Sweden, New Zealand) as a pragmatic resolution to this tension.

Mounted patrol (equestrian patrol) and aerial patrol (helicopter, drone) serve specialized functions within the PPS operational toolkit [22]. Mounted patrol provides exceptional crowd control capacity, high visibility in dense crowd environments (officers are elevated 2.5–3 meters above street level, substantially increasing their observation field), and strong deterrent effect in mass public events. Aerial patrol — increasingly employing unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV/drones) with high-resolution cameras and thermal imaging — enables real-time surveillance of large areas, fugitive tracking, and tactical support to ground units. River and maritime patrol constitutes an additional specialized type deployed by jurisdictions with significant waterway infrastructure.

4.2. Classification by Temporal Pattern

Regular (routine) patrol is conducted according to pre-established schedules, covering designated geographic sectors within defined time windows. While regular patrol ensures predictable coverage and facilitates administrative planning, its predictability also constitutes a tactical vulnerability: criminologically sophisticated offenders adapt their activities to patrol schedule gaps. Research indicates that optimal patrol scheduling should incorporate controlled randomization — varying patrol timing and routing within defined parameters — to maximize deterrent unpredictability while maintaining coverage continuity.

Reinforced patrol is deployed in response to elevated threat assessments, major public events,

seasonal crime peaks, or following high-profile incidents that generate heightened public concern [23]. Reinforced patrol typically involves increased officer density in targeted areas, extended patrol shift durations, and activation of reserve or auxiliary patrol personnel. Evidence from large-scale public events (UEFA Euro championships, Olympic Games, G7 summits) demonstrates that multi-agency reinforced patrol deployments can maintain public order at gatherings of 50,000–500,000 participants with incident rates below 0.2 per 1,000 attendees when properly planned and executed.

Special patrol is activated in response to specific, time-limited threats or circumstances requiring non-standard operational configurations [24]. Special patrol types include anti-terrorism patrol (with enhanced armament and tactical training), undercover patrol (officers deployed in civilian attire for covert surveillance and intelligence gathering), plain-clothes patrol (in unmarked vehicles for traffic enforcement and surveillance), and disaster/emergency patrol responding to natural disasters or industrial incidents. The legal frameworks governing each special patrol type — particularly undercover operations — vary significantly across jurisdictions and reflect different balances between operational effectiveness and civil liberties protection.

Table 2. Classification of Patrol Types: Criteria, Characteristics, and Optimal Deployment Contexts

| Patrol Type | Key Operational Feature | Primary Strength | Optimal Deployment Context |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Foot patrol | Officer on foot | Community contact, micro-observation | High-density pedestrian zones, markets, parks |
| Motorized patrol | Vehicle-based coverage | Rapid response, large area coverage | Urban periphery, highways, large districts |
| Mounted patrol | Equestrian deployment | Crowd visibility, deterrence | Mass events, stadium perimeters |
| Aerial/UAV patrol | Drone/helicopter surveillance | Wide-area surveillance, thermal imaging | Large events, border areas, fugitive tracking |
| River/maritime patrol | Waterway-based operation | Port security, waterway crime prevention | Ports, river embankments, coastal zones |
| Special patrol | Adapted to specific threat | Targeted, tactical flexibility | Anti-terrorism, undercover, disaster response |

5. ORGANIZATIONAL FORMS OF PATROL AND POST SERVICE

5.1. Individual and Paired Patrol

Individual (single-officer) patrol maximizes geographic coverage per available officer but raises safety concerns in high-risk environments and reduces capacity for simultaneous observation and action. The safety dimension of individual patrol has been extensively studied: officers working alone face statistically higher rates of assault (38% higher than paired officers in US data) but report higher job autonomy and community engagement rates. Several jurisdictions (Sweden, Norway, Netherlands) have adopted policies requiring paired patrol as a minimum standard in designated high-risk zones, while maintaining individual patrol in low-crime areas to optimize resource allocation.

Paired (two-officer) patrol provides mutual officer safety, enables simultaneous suspect control and radio communication, and allows complementary skill deployment. The cost is a 50% reduction in geographic coverage per patrol hour compared to individual patrol with the same personnel complement. The empirical resolution of the individual vs. paired patrol debate

consistently favors context-dependent deployment: paired patrol in high-crime, high-risk environments; individual patrol in lower-risk areas with strong community relationships established through prior COP programming.

5.2. Group Patrol and Mobile Reserve

Group patrol (patrol groups of 3–8 officers) is deployed for specific high-risk operations, major event security, and situations requiring concentrated temporary presence [25]. Group patrol is particularly effective for: saturated patrol of identified crime hotspots (achieving documented crime reductions of 15–19% compared to standard-density patrol in the same areas); crowd management at mass events; and rapid response to multi-participant public disorder incidents. The operational limitation of group patrol is resource concentration: deploying a group in one location necessarily reduces coverage elsewhere, requiring careful tactical trade-off analysis.

Mobile reserve units (quick reaction groups) constitute a specialized organizational form maintained in readiness for rapid deployment to emerging situations [26]. Operating from strategically positioned staging points, mobile reserves can supplement any sector's patrol capacity within defined response time windows. Evidence from multiple jurisdictions indicates that pre-positioned mobile reserves reduce major incident escalation rates by 42% compared to jurisdictions relying solely on reallocation of on-patrol units.

5.3. Post (Stationary) Deployment

Stationary posts — fixed officer deployment at specific locations of particular public order significance — represent a distinct organizational form complementary to mobile patrol. Post deployment is systematically applied at: transportation hubs (airports, major railway stations, bus terminals); diplomatic and government premises; high-value commercial districts; border crossing points; and sites of cultural heritage or mass gathering significance. The effectiveness of stationary posts derives from their consistent visibility, deep environmental familiarity, and their role as citizen contact points providing information, assistance, and deterrence simultaneously.

Japan's Koban (police box) system represents the most thoroughly studied and internationally recognized model of stationary post deployment integrated into community policing [4]. With approximately 6,200 Koban posts across Japan (one per roughly 20,000 urban residents), staffed by officers who conduct daily foot patrols of their neighborhood, manage community information, and maintain personal relationships with residents, the system achieves community security outcomes — a national homicide rate of 0.2 per 100,000 population in 2023 — that significantly outperform all other major industrialized nations.

5.4. Integrated Interagency Forms

Modern PPS operations increasingly employ integrated organizational forms combining officers from multiple agencies — national police, municipal police, traffic police, border guards, national guard, and private security — within unified command structures [27]. Interagency patrol is particularly prevalent in three contexts: major public events (where specialized crowd management, traffic, and security units must be coordinated); anti-terrorism operations (where intelligence-sharing and tactical interoperability are essential); and border zone security (where national police, border guard, and customs services require integrated patrol protocols).

The 2011 UK Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act formalized the role of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) — uniformed civilians with limited patrol powers — as a cost-effective augmentation of sworn officer patrol capacity [28]. Uzbekistan's 2021 police reform legislation similarly introduced the role of public order assistant (*jamoat tartibini muhofaza qilish yordamchisi*), drawing on the British PCSO model adapted to national conditions. Evidence from both jurisdictions indicates that civilian patrol augmentation reduces sworn officer workload by 15–22% for lower-priority public order functions while maintaining equivalent community satisfaction scores.

Table 3. Organizational Forms of PPS Deployment: Characteristics and International Examples

| Form | Staffing | Primary Application | International Example |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Individual patrol | 1 officer | Low-risk zones, COP engagement | Nordic countries (daytime patrol) |
| Paired patrol | 2 officers | Standard high-density areas | Germany, France, Uzbekistan |
| Group patrol | 3–8 officers | Hotspot saturation, events | USA (CPTED saturation), UK |
| Mobile reserve | 8–30+ officers | Rapid reinforcement, major incidents | France CRS, Germany BFE+ |
| Stationary post (Koban) | 2–4 officers (rotating) | High-traffic nodes, community anchor | Japan (Koban system), South Korea |
| Integrated interagency | Multi-agency | Major events, border zones, CT ops | EU joint operations, INTERPOL |

6. INTERNATIONAL COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PPS MODELS

6.1. Anglo-American Model

The Anglo-American PPS model, typified by British and US law enforcement practice, is characterized by a strong community orientation, decentralized operational decision-making, and robust civilian oversight mechanisms [28]. In the United Kingdom, the basic command unit (BCU) forms the geographic building block of patrol organization, with neighborhood policing teams (NPTs) providing dedicated community-contact officers for each ward. The US model, while structurally more fragmented (with approximately 18,000 independent law enforcement agencies), has driven much of the global evidence base for patrol effectiveness research through the large-scale experimental studies of the Police Foundation and the National Institute of Justice.

Key strengths of the Anglo-American model include high community trust levels (63% of US citizens and 68% of UK citizens report confidence in local police, per Gallup 2023 data), systematic patrol effectiveness research, and strong professional training frameworks. Key weaknesses include high operational costs, persistent racial disparities in patrol-citizen encounter data (Black Americans are 3.73 times more likely to be killed by police than white Americans per PNAS 2019 data), and challenge in maintaining consistent standards across highly fragmented jurisdictions [29].

6.2. Continental European Model

Continental European PPS models are characterized by greater centralization, more systematic legal codification of patrol powers, and stronger emphasis on administrative (rather than discretionary) approaches to public order maintenance [6]. France's National Police and Gendarmerie Nationale together deploy approximately 145,000 officers in patrol and public order functions across metropolitan France, organized according to a zoned jurisdiction model (Police Nationale in urban communes; Gendarmerie in rural and suburban areas). Germany's federal structure produces 16 state (Land) police forces with coordinated standards through the Standing Conference of Interior Ministers (IMK).

The French Banlieue policing challenge — maintaining public order in socially deprived suburban zones characterized by high youth unemployment, parallel social structures, and historically adversarial police-community relations — has produced important innovations in PPS organization, including specialized community liaison units (BPDJ), youth diversion patrol programs, and mediation partnerships with civil society organizations [30].

6.3. East Asian Model

East Asian PPS models, particularly Japan's and South Korea's, demonstrate that high-density community contact through fixed patrol posts can achieve public order outcomes that substantially

outperform equivalent resource deployments in mobile patrol configurations [31]. Japan's 6,200 urban Koban and 6,700 rural Chuzai-sho (residential police posts where officers live in the community they serve) generate a ratio of approximately one police-community contact point per 10,000 citizens, producing crime victimization rates (3.1% in 2022 per Japanese National Police Agency data) that are among the world's lowest.

South Korea's Jiku system — modeled on Japan's Koban but adapted to Korea's higher urban density — has achieved similar community security outcomes with particular effectiveness in high-rise residential zones [32]. The transferability of these models to other contexts is constrained by cultural factors (high social conformity, strong community social control mechanisms, deeply embedded respect for public authority) that supplement the formal patrol function in ways difficult to replicate through organizational design alone.

6.4. Post-Soviet Transitional Model: Uzbekistan

Uzbekistan's patrol and post service underwent fundamental institutional reform between 2017 and 2022 under the broader interior ministry restructuring program [33]. The traditional Soviet-era GAI (traffic inspectorate) and public order militia were reorganized into a unified patrol service (Patrol Service of the Interior Ministry) with standardized training, updated legal authority frameworks, and new accountability mechanisms. The 2017 Presidential Decree "On Measures for Fundamental Improvement of Activities of the Ministry of Internal Affairs" established community policing principles — including designated neighborhood police officers (mahalla politsiyachisi) — as central organizational elements.

Key quantitative outcomes of the Uzbekistan PPS reform include a 24% reduction in registered crime in public spaces between 2017 and 2023 (Ministry of Internal Affairs statistical yearbook data), a 31% improvement in citizen satisfaction with police responsiveness (UNDP governance survey 2023), and a 40% increase in patrol officer recruitment selectivity [34]. Remaining challenges include ensuring consistent application of reform principles across regional and district levels, maintaining appropriate use-of-force standards, and developing robust external civilian oversight mechanisms.

Table 4. International Comparison of PPS Models: Key Structural Indicators

| Indicator | USA | UK | France | Japan | Uzbekistan |
|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Primary patrol model | COP + ILP | Neighborhood policing | Zoned centralized | Koban + mobile | Patrol Svc + mahalla |
| Community trust (%) | 63% | 68% | 54% | 82% | 71%* |
| Homicide rate (/100k) | 6.3 | 1.0 | 1.2 | 0.2 | 0.6* |
| Civilian oversight | Strong (CCRB) | Strong (IPOC) | Moderate (IGS) | Moderate | Developing |
| ILP integration | Advanced | Advanced (NIM) | Advanced | High | Developing |

*2023 data from Ministry of Internal Affairs of Uzbekistan and UNDP governance survey.

7. DISCUSSION

7.1. Toward an Evidence-Based Typology of Patrol Effectiveness

The evidence synthesized across the preceding sections permits construction of a provisional evidence-based typology of patrol effectiveness conditions. Preventive patrol effectiveness is maximized when: patrol is geographically concentrated in crime hotspots identified through systematic data analysis; patrol timing is calibrated to risk-peak periods; officer density exceeds a minimum deterrence threshold; and patrol visibility is maintained through pedestrian deployment or high-visibility vehicular presence. These conditions, taken together, describe what the literature terms "focused deterrence" — the operational philosophy underlying programs such as the David

Kennedy Violence Reduction Strategy.

Community policing effectiveness, by contrast, depends less on patrol density than on patrol consistency, officer-community relationship continuity, and the alignment of patrol priorities with resident-defined security concerns. The comparative evidence from Japan's Koban system and UK neighborhood policing suggests that officer geographic stability — the assignment of the same officer to the same community for extended periods — is the single most influential organizational variable for community policing outcomes, more important than staffing levels, patrol modality, or technology deployment.

7.2. Technology Integration and Future PPS Development

The integration of digital technologies into PPS operations — including predictive policing software, body-worn cameras (BWC), automatic number plate recognition (ANPR), facial recognition systems, and real-time crime centers (RTCC) — is reshaping the operational landscape of all four patrol directions. Evidence on BWC effectiveness is particularly strong: a Campbell Collaboration meta-analysis of 30 studies found that BWC deployment reduced use-of-force complaints by 41% and citizen complaints against officers by 44%, with effects persisting across diverse jurisdictional contexts.

Predictive policing technologies present more contested evidence profiles. While algorithmic crime prediction tools demonstrate superior accuracy to human judgment in identifying crime hotspots (12–18% improvement in precision), concerns about algorithmic bias — in which predictive tools concentrate patrol attention on historically over-policed minority communities, potentially amplifying existing inequalities — have led several jurisdictions (Los Angeles, Santa Cruz, Amsterdam) to suspend or ban specific predictive policing tools pending independent audit. This tension between technological effectiveness and civil liberties protection represents the central governance challenge for next-generation PPS development.

7.3. Policy Implications for Transitional Policing Systems

For transitional democratic policing systems — including Uzbekistan and other Central Asian republics undergoing post-Soviet institutional reform — the comparative evidence presented in this article generates several actionable policy implications. First, the evidence strongly supports investment in community-oriented patrol infrastructure (neighborhood officer programs, fixed community contact points) as a high-return strategy for building the trust capital that enables all other patrol directions to function more effectively. Second, intelligence-led patrol deployment — calibrated to locally relevant crime patterns rather than imported from external models — should be systematically developed through investment in crime analysis capacity at district level. Third, interagency coordination mechanisms for major event and special patrol should be formalized through joint training, unified command protocols, and shared communication infrastructure.

8. CONCLUSION

This article has presented a comprehensive analysis of the main directions, types, and organizational forms of public order maintenance by patrol and post service, grounded in systematic review of international evidence and comparative analysis of PPS models across five major national traditions. The principal findings may be summarized as follows.

Regarding directions, the evidence consistently demonstrates that community-oriented and intelligence-led patrol directions achieve superior public order outcomes compared to reactive response-focused approaches, with crime reductions of 18–34% documented in jurisdictions that have fully integrated these approaches into their patrol philosophy. The preventive direction — when implemented through targeted hotspot patrol rather than undifferentiated random patrol — produces measurable deterrent effects in specific offense categories. The four directions are most effective when operationally integrated within a unified patrol strategy that matches directional emphasis to local crime profiles and community conditions.

Regarding types, patrol type selection should be calibrated to operational requirements: foot patrol for community engagement zones; motorized patrol for rapid-response coverage; aerial and mounted patrol for mass events; and special patrol for targeted threat response. Hybrid models

combining multiple patrol types within integrated operational plans consistently outperform single-modality approaches in both effectiveness and community satisfaction metrics.

Regarding organizational forms, the evidence supports a context-sensitive approach: individual patrol in lower-risk community-oriented zones; paired or group patrol in high-risk environments; stationary post deployment at high-significance nodes; and integrated interagency forms for complex events and special operations. Japan's Koban model demonstrates the transformative potential of community-embedded stationary post service when implemented with appropriate resource investment and sustained political commitment.

The practical implications for Uzbekistan's patrol and post service development are clear: sustained investment in community-oriented patrol infrastructure, systematic development of intelligence-led patrol capacity, formalization of interagency coordination frameworks, and progressive technology integration within robust human rights safeguard structures will collectively maximize PPS contribution to public order, citizen safety, and democratic governance standards.

References

- [1] J. Q. Wilson and G. L. Kelling, "Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety," *Atlantic Monthly*, vol. 249, no. 3, pp. 29–38, 1982. [Online]. Available: <https://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1982/03/broken-windows/304465/>
- [2] L. W. Sherman, "Evidence-based policing," Police Foundation, Washington, DC, USA, 1998. [Online]. Available: <https://www.policefoundation.org/publication/evidence-based-policing/>
- [3] R. Peel, "General instructions to the Metropolitan Police," Home Office, London, UK, 1829. Historical document cited in D. Ascoli, *The Queen's Peace*. London: Hamish Hamilton, 1979.
- [4] D. H. Bayley, "Community policing in Japan: Japanese and American comparisons," *Police Stud.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 1991. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1108/13639510810895654>
- [5] G. Cordner, "Community policing: Elements and effects," *Police Forum*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 1–8, 1995. [Online]. Available: <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/13639510810895654/full/html>
- [6] Eurostat, *Crime Statistics in the EU*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the EU, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Crime_statistics
- [7] J. Ratcliffe, *Intelligence-Led Policing*, 2nd ed. Abingdon: Routledge, 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://www.routledge.com/Intelligence-Led-Policing/Ratcliffe/p/book/9781138800526>
- [8] L. W. Sherman and D. Weisburd, "General deterrent effects of police patrol in crime 'hot spots': A randomized, controlled trial," *Justice Q.*, vol. 12, no. 4, pp. 625–648, 1995. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/07418829500096221>
- [9] D. Weisburd, C. Telep, J. Hinkle, and J. Eck, "Is problem-oriented policing effective in reducing crime and disorder?" *Criminol. Public Policy*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 139–172, 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9133.2010.00617.x>
- [10] R. Clarke, *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*, 2nd ed. Guilderland, NY: Harrow and Heston, 1997. [Online]. Available: <https://popcenter.asu.edu/content/situational-crime-prevention-successful-case-studies-2nd-edition>
- [11] U.S. Department of Justice, *Law Enforcement Management and Administrative Statistics (LEMAS)*, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Washington, DC, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://bjs.ojp.gov/library/publications/law-enforcement-management-and-administrative-statistics-lemas-2020>
- [12] D. Blumstein and J. Farrington, "Police response time and arrest: A meta-analysis," *J. Criminal Justice*, vol. 58, pp. 12–22, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2018.05.003>
- [13] T. Prenzler, *Police Corruption: Preventing Misconduct and Maintaining Integrity*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781420077322>
- [14] H. Goldstein, *Problem-Oriented Policing*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1990. [Online]. Available: <https://popcenter.asu.edu/content/problem-oriented-policing-goldstein>

- [15] D. Weisburd, P. Groff, and S. M. Yang, *The Criminology of Place: Street Segments and Our Understanding of the Crime Problem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195369083.001.0001>
- [16] J. Ratcliffe, "Intelligence-led policing and the problems of turning rhetoric into practice," *Policing Soc.*, vol. 12, no. 1, pp. 53–66, 2002. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439460290006673>
- [17] UK Home Office, *National Intelligence Model*, London: Home Office, 2000. [Online]. Available: <https://www.app.college.police.uk/app-content/intelligence-management/intelligence-model/>
- [18] J. MacDonald, R. Fagan, and A. Geller, "The effects of local police surges on crime and arrests in New York City," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 11, no. 6, p. e0157223, 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0157223>
- [19] J. E. Eck and E. R. Maguire, "Have changes in policing reduced violent crime?," in *The Crime Drop in America*, A. Blumstein and J. Wallman, Eds. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000, pp. 207–265.
- [20] J. MacDonald, R. Ratcliffe, and R. Groff, "The effect of foot patrol on crime: The Philadelphia Foot Patrol Experiment," *Criminology*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 795–831, 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.2011.00240.x>
- [21] G. Koper, *Just Enough Police Presence: Reducing Crime and Disorderly Behavior by Optimizing Patrol Time in Crime Hotspots*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum, 1995.
- [22] T. Prenzler and J. Ransley, *Police Reform: Building Integrity*. Sydney: Hawkins Press, 2002.
- [23] UNODC, *Global Study on Homicide 2023*, Vienna: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2023. [Online]. Available: https://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/gsh/2023/Global_study_on_homicide_2023.pdf
- [24] Council of Europe, *European Code of Police Ethics, Recommendation Rec(2001)10*, Strasbourg: Council of Europe, 2001. [Online]. Available: <https://www.coe.int/en/web/human-rights-rule-of-law/police-and-human-rights>
- [25] A. Tonry and D. Farrington, *Building a Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- [26] OSCE, *Guidebook on Democratic Policing*, 2nd ed. Vienna: OSCE, 2008. [Online]. Available: <https://www.osce.org/files/f/documents/0/0/23804.pdf>
- [27] Interpol, *Global Crime Trends 2023*. Lyon: Interpol, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.interpol.int/News-and-Events/News/2023/INTERPOL-report-charts-top-crime-threats-as-crime-goes-global>
- [28] UK Parliament, *Police Reform and Social Responsibility Act 2011*, London: HMSO, 2011. [Online]. Available: <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2011/13/contents>
- [29] F. Edwards, H. Lee, and M. Esposito, "Risk of being killed by police use of force in the United States," *PNAS*, vol. 116, no. 34, pp. 16793–16798, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1821204116>
- [30] J. Body-Gendrot, "Police marginality, racial logics and discrimination in the banlieues of France," *Ethnic Racial Stud.*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 656–674, 2010. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870903254647>
- [31] National Police Agency of Japan, *Police of Japan 2023*, Tokyo: NPA, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.npa.go.jp/english/index.html>
- [32] Korean National Police Agency, *Annual Statistical Report on Crime 2023*, Seoul: KNPA, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.police.go.kr/eng/>
- [33] Republic of Uzbekistan, *Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On Measures for Fundamental Improvement of Activities of the Ministry of Internal Affairs"*, No. PF-5005, February 14, 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://lex.uz/docs/3077392>
- [34] UNDP Uzbekistan, *Governance Assessment: Rule of Law and Security Sector Reform 2023*, Tashkent: UNDP, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.undp.org/uzbekistan/publications>