A Community's Attitude towards Community Oriented Policing (COP) Development and Implementation in Malaysia

[1] Dr. Mohammad Mujaheed Hassan, [2] Prof. Dr. Aldrin Abdullah
[1] Security & Community Development, [1] [2] School of Housing, Building & Planning, UniversitiSains Malaysia. Email: [1] boneillness@hotmail.com, [2] aldrin@usm.my

ABSTRACT. The community oriented policing strategy (COPS) is a partnership between local residents and the police in charge of the district. The government of Malaysia tries to allocate more resources towards fighting crime and establishing more agencies to review police rules and conduct and investigate public complaints. The need to achieve greater efficacy in the delivery of police service led them to seek support and legitimacy within and from the public. In the middle of 2007, throughout Royal Malaysian Police (RMP) five years strategic plan (2007-2011), the government has introduced COP into Malaysia's policing strategies. COP comes with its own unique set of challenges. It reduces crime by engaging the public as a partner in the fight against crime rather than relying on aggressive law enforcement as the only solution to community problems. COP is a belief that by working together, the police and the community can accomplish what neither can accomplish alone. It involves a rethinking of the role of the police and a restructuring of the policing. The purpose of this paper is: (a) to investigate community awareness towards COP implementation; (b) to investigate community perception towards COP implementation; (c) to evaluate community participation towards COP implementation

Keywords: Community oriented, policing, community, crime, awareness, perception.

How to cite this article:
M. M. Hassan & A. Abdullah (2017). A Community's Attitude towards Community Oriented Policing (COP) Development and Implementation in Malaysia.

I.   INTRODUCTION

Crime does not only affect the individual, but it also has an effect on the community and the urban neighborhoods. Based on the Research for Social Advancement (REFSA), Focus Paper 2011/08/26 for Security - Royal Malaysian Police, nearly half (49%) of the Malaysian population felt unsafe and feared in becoming crime victims. Moreover, the feelings of being insecure and anxious have made the people less free in their community to perform daily activities as usual. Meanwhile, as for the victims, the psychological impact is bound to carry heavy traumatic experiences. Based on a previous research by Suffian (2012) and Bahaman (2009), criminal activities are often associated with street crimes, such as snatching, robberies, pickpocketing, carjacking, gang violence, drug dealing, and rape. On top of that, according to Sidhu (2005) and Asmah (2007), basically, many factors cause the occurrence of crime, including population growth, huge gap between the rich

andpoor (economically), different levels of education, increment in unemployment rates, and low employment opportunities in the country. Therefore, the government and the administration of the laws have been trying to control this phenomenon. In fact, most of their efforts have been focused in combating crime through suppressive or police force related methods. However, this in itself may not be effective.

According to the Royal Malaysian Police (RMP), the ratio of police to population in Malaysia was three officers to 1, 000 citizens (3:1000, which is equivalent to 1:334) in December 2009. In the year 2011, based on the REFSA finding, the policeman we had in 2010 had been equivalent to one officer to 270 citizens (1:270), which was very near to the 1:250 benchmark set by the International Police Organization (INTERPOL), and better than our neighbors, Thailand (1:321)

and Singapore (1:396). However, despite this, the serious crime rate has been generally higher than in those countries. Malaysia outstripped in murder cases only by Thailand, and we have more reported rape incidents than Thailand, Singapore, and Hong Kong. These indicate that the police have failed to address the present crime issues. They cannot seriously hope to single-handedly contain the burgeoning crime, drugs, and problems concerning gangs for the best of our society, as well as drain our federal, state and local resources.

In addition to that, the government has tried to allocate more resources towards fighting crime and establishing more agencies to review police rules and conduct, as well as investigate public complaints. The need to achieve greater efficacy in the delivery of police service has led them to seek support and legitimacy within and from the public.

Furthermore, the move towards community-oriented policing has gained momentum in recent years as police and community leaders search for more effective ways to promote the concept as to enhance the quality of life in their neighborhoods. The Ministry of Home Affairs, Non-Government Organization (NGO), and other policing officials are currently assessing what changes in orientation, organization, and operation will allow them to benefit the communities they serve by improving the quality of service and mechanism they enforce and provide.

Thus, the spirit of community empowerment, smartship, and interdependency between all stakeholders, including the community, police, NGOs, and other interested parties are very much needed in this country through active and inactive ways. Moreover, Dato' Hishammuddin bin TunHussien, the Minister of Home Affairs (2011), in one of his speeches related to Crime National Key Result Area (Crime NKRA), humbly highlighted for all Malaysians to join hands to be involved in fighting crime together with the authorities. In addition to that, Dato' Hishammuddin also mentioned about the new crime prevention approach, which is based on community participation (community oriented policing), by actively involving multiple agencies

to counter the crime issues and problems in Malaysia. Other than that, Dato' Haji TunHisan bin Dato' Haji TunHamzah, Chief of Police, Contingent of Selangor gave a speech during the International Conference On Principled Policing: "Rule Of Law, Public Order and Sustainable Development" (2012) and mentioned that the Police force itself cannot work alone to fight against crime. Nevertheless, the police force needs joint efforts, synergies, and human connection with the surrounding communities in order to be successful against crime. Besides that, he also emphasized on the importance of building networks and establishing friendships with the communities to empower the spirit of partnership and the diversity of policing strategies.

In addition to that, community-oriented policing comes with its own unique set of challenges. It should not be presented to the community as a simple solution, and residents should understand from the outset that it will not put an end to crime. According to Cordner and Biebel (2005), community-oriented policing has a more preventive orientation. It reduces crime by engaging the public as a partner in the fight against crime rather than relying on aggressive law enforcement as the only solution to community problems.

Meanwhile, Friedmann (1996) asserted that the major weakness of the earlier community-oriented policing programs is that the police agencies did not allow or support community involvement in various crime prevention efforts. The community seemed to imply a group of people with common history, understanding as well as a sense of themselves as "us" and outsider as "them'. Community-oriented policing is not a program or a series of programs. It is a philosophy; a belief that by working together with the police, the community can accomplish what neither can accomplish alone. It involves a rethinking of the role of the police and the restructuring of the police force (Linda and Karen, 2008).

Besides that, community-oriented policing has been widely regarded as one of the more significant recent developments in policing around the world (Maguire and Wells, 2002; Skolnick and Bayley, 1988; Friedmann, 1992).

The concept has been widely discussed and applied in various countries and in a range of contexts, thus raising questions about what exactly it involves and what in particular is so attractive about it? Despite the widespread interest in the concept, it seems that there is no clear agreement on its meaning and, as various scholars have indicated, it appears to be understood by different people in different ways, besides invoking both acclaim and criticism in roughly equal measures (Skolnick and Bayley, 1988; Manning, 1988; Mastrofski, 1988; Klockars, 1988; Eck and Rosenbaum, 1994; Trojanowicz et al, 2002). For these reasons, the investigation of the concept and the practice of community-oriented policing had been a strong driver in this research.

On top of that, some scholars, such as Eck and Rosenbaum (1994), have noted that there are so many different expectations about community-oriented policing that one could ask "if it is possible for community-oriented policing to deliver on all or even most of them". In the search for clarifying its meaning, several authors have commented on the difficulty of defining both the terms 'community' and 'policing' (Lyons, 2002; Buerger et al., 1999; Waddington, 1999). Others have tried to identify common defining characteristics (Oliver, 2008; Goldstein, 1990), while some others again have sought to highlight the contradictory elements (Seagrave, 1996; Lyons, 2002). From the perspective of the local practice, some scholars have pointed to the contradictory goals associating with the term in the perceptions of police and citizens respectively (Podolefsky, 1984; Winship and Berrien, 1999; Thacher, 2001a). Meanwhile, others have studied its practice in terms of similarities and differences of community-oriented policing from an international perspective (Bayley, 1994; Friedmann, 1992; Lab and Das, 2003).

Furthermore, according to Skogan and Hartnett (1997) and Fielding (2005), it is important to be involved in and examine the perspectives of a sample of community in some key principles of community-oriented policing, which is that of giving the community more say in how it is carried out and their role in the co-production of community safety. This statement was supported by Thacher (2001b) as the researcher stated that the inclusion of community perspective is considered important as some researchers suggest that community views are not always aligned with the understanding of the police force. Therefore, their views could be critically important to study. In conjunction with that, this research also paid attention to examine community attitude towards community-oriented policing implementation in Malaysia.

The five significant reasons for studying community-oriented policing towards crime prevention are:

1. A comparison of traditional policing methods with more contemporary methods emphasizing on community-oriented policing enables us to highlight the deficiencies of traditional policing. Although traditional policing methods are not entirely bad, the community-oriented policing emphasis has provided numerous strengths, including reducing fear of crime in the neighborhood and improving a sense of personal security.

2. Modern policing is clearly directed towards the development of closer relations between the public and the police. Information-sharing activities alert citizens to new crime-fighting methods used by the police in different jurisdictions. Taking a proactive role in working more closely with police officers in their enforcement activities enables citizens to better understand the reasons for police conduct.

3. Community-oriented policing's key priorities are crime control and prevention. It accomplishes these objectives, in part, by developing more effective liaisons between the public and the community's law enforcement agencies. Involving neighborhood residents in collaborative efforts to solve or to control community crime furnishes police with indirect community support for their enforcement activities.

4. Several political, legal, and social factors inhibit the acceptance of community-oriented policing programs in certain jurisdictions.

Understanding these factors may enable the police to work with different agencies in the community to facilitate changes in policing activities that will have long-term community benefits. Besides acquiring an understanding of factors involved in resistance to change, it can perhaps help us develop better change strategies and present community-oriented policing in more favorable contexts.

5. Community-oriented policing implies several things for neighborhood residents. It implies more understanding and caring law enforcement component dedicated to working in collaborative ways to resolve community crime problems. It may result in fewer complaints from the citizens leveled at police officers, if the public comes to appreciate the benefits of community-oriented policing programs. It implies more integrated communities, as citizens band together in productive ways with the police to make their neighborhoods safer for themselves and their families.

II. METHODOLOGY

In this research study, the researcher employed "Stratified Sampling" as a method of survey. Stratified sampling is a probability sampling technique wherein the researcher divides the entire population into different subgroups or strata, then randomly selects the final subjects proportionally from the different strata.

Stratified random sampling is used to highlight a specific subgroup within the population. This technique is to ensure the presence of the key subgroup within the sample. In this research study, the subgroup is a housing scheme that is implementing community-oriented policing and the sample is the community that lives in the housing scheme. This method was used to observe the existing relationships between two or more subgroups. With this method, the researcher can representatively sample even the smallest and most inaccessible subgroups in the population which allow the researcher to sample the rare extremes of the given population. With this method, the researcher will have a higher statistical precision because the variability within the subgroups is lower compared to the variations when dealing with the entire population. This method also allows the researcher to have a small sample size which can save a lot of time, money and effort of the researchers.

Based on data from IbuPejabat Polis Daerah (IPD), Daerah TimurLaut, there are six (6) housing schemes that implemented community-oriented policing in their housing schemes which are: i) Bandar Sri Pinang; ii) PulauTikus; iii) Bayan Baru; iv) PantaiJerjak; v) Relau; and vi) Green Lane.

In the year 2009, Bahaman conducted a study on the effectiveness of community participation in Volunteer Patrol Scheme in residential areas in selected states in Peninsular Malaysia. The population samples were drawn from members of Rakan COP who registered voluntarily. It was found that a total of 73,786 members were enrolled in Rakan COP Kuala Lumpur, while there were 240,323 members across the country. Bahaman had set the criteria of the sample with the assistance Kuala Lumpur Police Headquarters. The criteria were that respondents in this study must be (a) a Malaysian citizen; (b) staying, studying or working in selected focus areas and (c) registered as members of Rakan COP. As a result, Bahaman selected 384 respondents based on Krejcie and Morgan's (1970) formula which is if the population size (n) is in the range of 75,000 – 100,000, the total sample required is 384 respondents which is equivalent to 0.5% only. Bahaman selected his location based on verbal discussion with Kuala Lumpur Police Headquarters. The selected location areas were identified as namely (i) Sentul; (ii) Dang Wangi; (iii) Brickfields; (iv) Bangsar and (v) Cheras. Data were distributed and collected in May 2009 using self-administered survey.

As for this research study, the calculation of sample (N) was adopted from scholar and researcher Yamanae, T. (1973). As a result, 2,032 respondents from 23,517 populations were selected as a sample for the research study which is equivalent to 8.63%. It was considered higher compared with a previous research conducted by Bahaman in his research study "The Effectiveness

of Community Participation in Volunteer Patrol Scheme on Residential areas in selected States in Peninsular Malaysia".

As for questionnaire distribution design, a total of 28 questions were developed for the survey directed to Community residents. The questionnaire survey included both quantitative and qualitative questions, which means it is a semi-structured questionnaire. In addition to that, a semi-structured interview was preferred as this method still allowed for a general framework to be present in the interview, but also allowed the interviewer to flexibly change the way the questions were asked or the order they were asked in. This allowed probing from the researcher and the interviewees responded in their own terms or ways that had been significant and relevant (Jupp et al., 2007). The advantage of the semi-structured interview is that the researcher is able to explore in depth some aspects of the respondent's feelings, motives, meanings, and attitudes (ibid). This had been particularly important for the aim of this dissertation. On the contrary, an unstructured interview was not considered, as Bryman (2004: 321) described it as 'very similar in character to a conversation'. Moreover, one way to address some of these issues would have been to use a different research method, such as self-completion questionnaires. This would have eradicated any interviewer bias and would have ensured anonymity. This method, however, may have been too structured for the research aim. Questionnaires are not the best way to gather meanings and feelings, as they are impersonal and do not allow the researcher any flexibility. This is why for this research, despite the limitations with interviews, it was decided that they were the most appropriate method of gathering the data to answer the research questions.

However, for a professional interview with the Police Officers, the researcher developed 18 questions together with the checklist. The questions were directly asked to the Police Officers in charge about the strategies that were used to implement Community-Oriented Policing in Pulau Pinang. The researcher also indirectly asked the human relationship between the Police Officers and the Community residents in the questions of the survey interview. In this research

study, the researcher tried to manipulate the respondents by indirectly asking the Community residents and the Police Officers about their human relationship. It was to prevent the tendency of bias answers from the respondents.

In order to strengthen the questionnaire, the researcher also conducted a desk research to obtain secondary data. Desk research was done through newspaper archives, internet, and books to retrieve the view of the research design. As secondary data have a tendency to provide biased data (Forgaty and Dirsmith, 2005) and cannot provide meaningful answers to the research questions (Premaratne, 2002), based on the study and the nature of the research problem, primary data were collected from the field to obtain empirical findings.

The data collected were analyzed by using IBM Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 22 software. Most of the data were analyzed using descriptive statistical analysis, correlation analysis and mean in SPSS.

III. RESULTS ANDDISCUSSION

Community awareness towards community-oriented policing

Community demographic profile and awareness
Based on previous research studies related to community safety and security, Sim (2002), Rosembaum (2008) and Connell (2008) agreed that socio-demographic factors also influence neighborhood participation and might increase the effectiveness as well. Researchers internationally believe that factors such as socioeconomic status (Foskett, 1955), level of education (Perkins, 1996), home ownership (Lelieveldt, 2004), age (Putnam, 2000), racial identity (Eisen, 1994; Ong and Jakes, 2004; Suffian, 2012), work status (Loopmans, 2010) and marital status (Bahaman, 2009) have strongly been correlated to participation in neighborhood projects especially in community oriented program. While studies in Malaysia such as Bahaman (2000) and Suffian (2012) also found the same findings that most of the demographic factors discussed before were potentially contributing towards the successfulness of the neighborhood programs.

As a result, only gender, marital profile, tenancy profile and employment profile are significant towards community awareness in community-oriented policing implementation. Therefore, not all variables in respondents' profile which is also known as socio-demographic profile are significant to community awareness.

Table 1: Correlation-Gender and community awareness on community-oriented policing implementation

		Please indicate your gender?	Is community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhood?
Please indicate your gender?	Pearson Correlation	1	-.310**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	2032	2032
Is Community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhood?	Pearson Correlation	-.310**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	2032	2032

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

(a) Gender and awareness: Based on Pearson Correlation generated by SPSS, it was statistically significant with r=-0.310, p=0.000 at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Therefore, with 99% confidence level, the null hypothesis was rejected because there are weak negative significant correlations between gender and community awareness towards community-oriented policing implementation. Community-oriented policing is one of the programs and strategies that provide safety to the community. This might drag men's interest into it.

Generally, whenever it's dealing with safety or security, it concerns men more than women. It has become a responsibility for men to make sure their family is safe and secure. Therefore, men tend to explore alternatives to which they can provide a safe environment for their families such as by buying a housing property with strata scheme with gated and guarded scheme. Nevertheless, there are some men who try to provide their family with extra safety like installing a CCTV and alarm system surrounding the housing area in order to make sure that their family is safe from uncertainty.

Table 2: Correlation-Age and community awareness on community-oriented policing implementation

		Is Community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhood?	Please indicate your age?
Is Community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhood?	Pearson Correlation	1	-.050*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.024
	N	2032	2032
Please indicate your age?	Pearson Correlation	-.050*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.024	
	N	2032	2032

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

(b) Age and awareness: Based on Pearson Correlation generated by SPSS, it was statistically significant with r=-0.050, p=0.024 at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). Therefore, with 95% confidence level, the null hypothesis was rejected because there are very weak negative significant correlations between age and community awareness towards community-oriented policing implementation.

The finding shows that 59.8%, N=680 over 1136 of the respondents that are aware of community-oriented policing implementation within the neighborhood are from a group of ages 35-44 years old followed by a group of ages 25-34 years old with a score of 32.8%, N=372. Generally, these two (2) groups of ages (from age 25-44 years old), are considered as middle age and young.

In addition to that, these groups can be considered as active with high commitment of life such as workload, financial, personal responsibility, etc. Normally, these groups of ages are most updated with any changes of their surrounding environment which means that they are aware of their surroundings. Most people in these groups of ages are married and with a family. These groups are concerned with their families and their surrounding's safety and security

Table 3: Correlation-Ethnicity and community awareness on community-oriented policing implementation

		Is community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhood?	Please indicate you race?
Is community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhood?	Pearson Correlation	1	.016
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.458
	N	2032	2032
Please indicate you race?	Pearson Correlation	.016	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.458	
	N	2032	2032

(c) Ethnic and awareness: Based on Pearson Correlation generated by SPSS, the value r=0.016 (p=0.485 > 0.05) is not significant. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected due to the value of 'p' which is more than 0.05 with 95% confidence level. Therefore, there is no significant correlation between race and community awareness towards community-oriented policing implementation. The finding indicates that there is no significant difference between ethnicity to the community awareness.

Table 4: Correlation-Marital profile and community awareness on community-oriented policing implementation

		Are you aware of the implementation of community-oriented policing in Malaysia?	Please indicate your marital profile?
Is community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhood?	Pearson Correlation	1	-.221**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	2032	2032
Please indicate your marital profile?	Pearson Correlation	-.221**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	2032	2032

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

(d) Marital profile and awareness: Based on Pearson Correlation generated by SPSS, it was statistically significant with r=-0.221, p=0.000 at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Therefore, with 99% confidence level, the null hypothesis was rejected because there are weak positive significant correlations between marital profile and community awareness towards community-oriented policing implementation. Married respondents are more aware of their surrounding changes and are more concerned with family safety and security. Nevertheless, the number of single individual respondents that are aware of community implementation within the neighborhood can be considered as high as almost 50% of total married respondents.

These single groups are most probably aware of community-oriented policing implementation within the neighborhood through their night activities near or within the neighborhood such as loitering, hanging out with friends, etc.

Table 5: Correlation-Tenancy profile and community awareness on community-oriented policing implementation

		Is community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhoods?	Please indicate your tenancy profile?
Is community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhood?	Pearson Correlation	1	.271**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	2032	2032
Please indicate your tenancy profile?	Pearson Correlation	.271**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	2032	2032

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

(e) Tenancy profile and awareness: Based on Pearson Correlation generated by SPSS, it was statistically significant with r=-0.271, p=0.000 at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Therefore, with 99% confidence level, the null hypothesis was rejected because there are weak positive significant correlations between tenancy profile and community awareness towards community-oriented policing implementation.

Based on the data collected, a majority of respondents that are aware of community-oriented policing implementation within the neighborhood are respondents that own units within the housing schemes. Generally, people who tend to show their concern to the neighborhood changes and safety are the original owners or if they own units in that neighborhood.

Normally, rental tenants are less aware of their surroundings. They usually use rented units only for shelter and rest after work and on weekends. In addition to that, the rental tenants are usually not local residents and they rent the house because the house is near to the work place or the monthly rental is cheap. That is their main purpose which is only for shelter and not that they are really taking part in any changes or safety awareness within the neighborhood.

Table 6: Correlation-Educational profile and community awareness on community-oriented policing implementation

		Is community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhoods?	Please indicate your educational profile?
Is community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhoods?	Pearson Correlation	1	.010
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.639
	N	2032	2032
Please indicate your educational profile?	Pearson Correlation	.010	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.639	
	N	2032	2032

(f) Educational profile and awareness: Based on Pearson Correlation generated by SPSS, the value r=-0.010 (p=0.639 > 0.05) is not significant. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected due to the value of 'p' which is more than 0.05 with 95% confidence level. Therefore, there is no significant correlation between educational profile and community awareness towards community-oriented policing implementation. The finding indicates that there is no significant difference among educational profile level towards awareness.

Table 7: Correlation-Employment profile and community awareness on community-oriented policing implementation

		Is community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhoods?	Please indicate your employment profile?
Is community-oriented policing implemented in your neighborhoods?	Pearson Correlation	1	-.310**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	2032	2032
Please indicate your employment profile?	Pearson Correlation	-.310**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	2032	2032

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

(g) Employment and awareness: Based on Pearson Correlation generated by SPSS, it was statistically significant with r=-0.310, p=0.000 at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Therefore, with 99% confidence level, the null hypothesis was rejected because there are weak negative significant correlations between employment profile and community awareness towards community-oriented policing implementation.

The finding shows that a community working with the government sector is more aware of community-oriented policing implementation in Malaysia. Community-oriented policing was implemented by the government through

Malaysia's five (5) year annual plan which all government servants will generally be informed.

Community and fear of crime in community-oriented policing

Table 8: Correlation-Gender and Fear of Crime

		Do you Fear of Crime?	Please indicate your gender?
Do you Fear of Crime?	Pearson Correlation	1	-.234**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	2032	2032
Please indicate your gender?	Pearson Correlation	-.234**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	2032	2032

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 9: Crosstab-Gender and fear of crime

Gender	Fear of Crime				Total
	Yes		No		
	The number of respondents	%	The Number of respondents	%	
Male	848	61.1	539	84.5	1387
Female	545	38.9	100	15.5	647
Total	**1393**	**100**	**639**	**100**	**2032**

(a) Community gender and fear of crime: According to John Howard Society of Alberta (1999), gender has been found to be the strongest predictor of fear. Women have a much greater fear of crime than men, but are victimized less than men. Women's fear comes mostly from their vulnerability to sexual aggression: women are ten times more likely to be sexually assaulted than men are (Crowell and Burgess, 1996).

This fear of sexual assault and rape transposes itself onto other types of crime (Ferraro, 1996). Women do not simply become aware of this fear one day, nor are they born with it; women are socialized into thinking that they are vulnerable to attacks if they, for example, go out alone at night. Parents, peers and media emphasize and reinforce this fear, and women are expected to succumb to it.

Other suggestions have been made as to why women are more fearful. These include: irrationality; fewer coping skills in relation to being a victim; a great concern for their children which fuels their fear; and less control over public and private spaces than men (Gilchrist et al.,

1998). There is no one reason why women are more fearful than men; it is likely that numerous reasons exist which plays a role.

Based on Pearson Correlation generated by SPSS, it was statistically significant with r=-0.324, p=0.000 at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). Therefore, with 99% confidence level, the null hypothesis was rejected because there are weak negative significant correlation between gender and fear of crime. The finding shows that 84.5%, N=539 over 639 of the female respondents have fear of crime whereas the male respondents have only 61.1%, N=548 over 1393.

Table 10: Correlation-Age and fear of crime

		Do you Fear of Crime?	Please indicate your age?
Do you Fear of Crime?	Pearson Correlation	1	.010
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.661
	N	2032	2032
Please indicate your age?	Pearson Correlation	.010	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.661	
	N	2032	2032

(b) Community age and fear of crime: John Howard Society of Alberta (1999) found that age is also a powerful predictor of fear but unlike gender, with age, the fear varies from crime to crime. When it comes to age, it is customary to assume that the elderly are the most fearful, and for many crimes, this assumption holds true, such as in mugging cases and break and entries. When it comes to crimes like rape, sexual assault and stranger attacks, it has been found that younger people tend to be more fearful (Evans, 1995). Elderly people have a high fear level in relation to many crimes because they feel vulnerable. This vulnerability stems from the physical and social limitations that elderly people have which renders them unable to defend themselves or to seek support and help. Based on Pearson Correlation generated by SPSS, the value r=0.010 (p=0.66 > 0.05) is not significant. The null hypothesis cannot be rejected due to value of 'p' which is more than 0.05 with 95% confidence level. Therefore, there is no significant correlation between age of groups and fear of crime. In essence, either young or older ages have a similar fear to crimes whether rape, sexual assault and

stranger attacks. In fact, both groups are equally exposed to become a victim of crime.

Community perception towards community-oriented policing implementation

Table 11: Frequency-Respondents' thoughts of community-oriented policing

	Frequency	Percent	Percent without 'not applicable' consideration
Not applicable	806	39.7	0
Community assisting PDRM to ensure safety within the neighborhoods due to shortage of PDRM manpower	446	21.9	36.3
Community and PDRM together doing patrol within the neighborhoods	316	15.6	25.8
It is a new policing strategy by PDRM to encourage community to take part and to assist PDRM in crime prevention	354	17.4	28.9
Community and PDRM work together in solving crime problem within the neighborhoods	110	5.4	9.0
Total	2032	100.0	100.0

Community thought towards community-oriented policing

Based on the data collected, four (4) various thoughts have been identified from the respondents on their understanding towards community-oriented policing in which the community assumed that community-oriented policing are: (i) Community assisting PDRM doing patrols and to ensure safety within the neighborhood due to shortage of PDRM men power, (ii) It is a new policing strategy by PDRM to encourage the community to take part and assist PDRM in preventing crime, (iii) Community and PDRM together doing patrols within the neighborhood, and (iv) Community and PDRM together solving crime problems within the neighborhood.

Table 12: Frequency-Community expectation

	Frequency	Percent	Percent without 'not applicable' consideration
Not applicable	846	41.6	0
To enhance safety and security within the neighborhoods	302	14.9	25.5
To have info sharing session with COP committee and PDRM	192	9.4	16.1
To prevent crime and social problem within the neighborhoods	224	11.0	18.8
To conduct active patrols within the neighborhoods	262	12.9	22.1
To have better relationship with the PDRM towards crime prevention	124	6.1	10.5
To react quickly after receiving complaints from the residents	42	2.1	3.6
To be reliable to the residents	40	2.0	3.4
Total	2032	100.0	100.0

Community expectation towards community-oriented policing

Seven (7) expectations were highlighted by the respondents during the data collection; respondents are expecting that Community-oriented policing can enhance safety and security within the neighborhood area. Most of the respondents see community-oriented policing as an additional safety and security effort by PDRM with the assistance of the community residents themselves within certain radius area in the neighborhood. According to the respondents, even knowing that most of the neighborhoods are gated and guarded strata housing scheme, this scheme covers residents within the housing scheme strata boundary only. The residents still have a risk of become a victim of crime especially for those residents who park their cars outside the scheme and for those without guarded scheme.

The respondents expect Community-oriented policing committee to have consistent and regular patrol beat system within the neighborhood area. PDRM together with the committee should schedule the patrol beat accordingly at least once every night. This regular basis patrol beat is the best effort to prevent crime and social problems within the neighborhood.

Besides that, the respondents are also assuming that with Community-oriented policing implementation in the neighborhood, community residents, committee and PDRM will have a

session for info sharing regarding the current crime and social problems within the neighborhood. The respondents expect that PDRM, with the existing committee, will have more time for one on one sessions with the community residents at least once a month to share their concerns about the surrounding safety environment.

According to the respondents, this session shall assist in building a strong relationship between PDRM, the committee and the community itself. In addition to that, it is an opportunity for PDRM and the committee to introduce, educate and explain community-oriented policing strategy to the community. Nevertheless, it is also a bridge that can connect PDRM and the committee to personally communicate, interact and build trust with the community. This session might be a medium for PDRM to achieve their objectives towards community-oriented policing implementation and crime prevention.

Nevertheless, the respondents are also expecting PDRM to respond much faster after receiving any complaint or report from the residents in the housing scheme with the assistance of Community-oriented policing committee in charge. This is to achieve the efficiency of PDRM and Community-oriented policing implementation service.

Table 13: Frequency-Community ideas to improve the success of community-oriented policing implementation

	Frequency	Percent	Percent without 'not applicable' consideration
Not applicable	846	41.6	0
To have a seminar that educate community on COP implementation	604	29.7	50.8
To allocate more of PDRM officer to supervise community-oriented policing committee	224	11.0	18.8
To have frequent bonding time between community, committee and PDRM	162	8.0	13.6
To have more info sharing between community, committee and PDRM	42	2.1	3.6
PDRM should trained the selected committee professionally to led community residents	102	5.0	8.6
PDRM to have a road shows to introduce and educate community on COP	52	2.6	4.6
Total	2032	100.0	100.0

Community ideas of improvement towards community-oriented policing

Based on the data collected, six (6) improvement ideas have been highlighted by the respondents towards the success of Community-oriented policing implementation in Pulau Pinang. A majority of the respondents suggested having a seminar that can educate the community on community-oriented policing implementation. Basically, this suggestion was highlighted by the respondents because the respondents feel that the community does not really understand what community-oriented policing is all about. They were not educated and explained in details on what is community-oriented policing. PDRM should conduct a seminar in every housing scheme, maybe quarterly every year, to refresh the community about the objectives, mission and vision of community-oriented policing implementation in Malaysia.

The respondents also suggested PDRM to allocate more of their officers to supervise community-oriented policing committee in the housing scheme with regular patrol basis; this statement was highlighted by the respondents because of the respondents' concern about committee safety during the patrol beat. In addition to that, the respondents did highlight the concern that the committee might misuse their power and authority during patrol without the existence of a police officer. Besides having a PDRM officer to supervise the committee during the regular patrols, this is to ensure that the Community-oriented policing implementation is not just another policing program and strategy that is endorsed by PRDM but it is an effort by the PDRM to show that they are really concerned about public safety towards quality of life and crime prevention.

The respondents also suggested having frequent bonding time between the community, committee and PDRM. This bonding time is not necessarily in formal occasion; it can be in informal activities such as festival celebrations like Hari Raya open house, charity occasion, etc. Respondents do admit that there are gaps between the community and PDRM's relationship. A community resident always sees PDRM as one agency which did not allow or support community involvement in various crimes prevention. In addition to that, the community residents seemed to imply a group of people with common history, understandings as well as a sense of themselves as "us" and outsiders as "them'. Basically, the relationship can be improved from time to time with regular committee meetings and patrol basis with PDRM. The committee, especially the PDRM officer, should take the opportunity while doing patrols and meeting with the community residents by approaching them, introduce themselves to the community residents, try to have a short conversation at least by saying 'Hi" to the community residents.

In addition to that, PDRM should conduct training for those who are already in the committee on a monthly basis. Generally, PDRM should assume that community residents that participate in community-oriented policing only have a basic knowledge on community-oriented policing program. It becomes PDRM's responsibility to train the community in the committee to become more knowledgeable of their roles. This community will be a medium for PDRM to send a message to other community residents who are not in the community-oriented policing committee yet. In this training, the PDRM should include self-defense training as the committee is exposed to danger during patrol beat. Furthermore, this training is not limited to community residents that participate in community-oriented policing only, it should involve those PDRM officers that are in charge of the community-oriented policing program.

Some of the respondents also suggested PDRM to conduct a road show to each housing scheme. This is the best way to promote, explain and educate the community residents about community-oriented policing program. In addition to that, it will help PDRM to build a relationship with the community residents.

PDRM should have more info sharing with the committee and community directly by conducting a talk at least twice a year in every housing scheme. This sharing is not limited to community-oriented policing itself; maybe it can be sharing of PDRM's next strategies in preventing crime and social problems.

Community participation and role towards community-oriented policing

Table 14: Frequency-Respondents' participation in community-oriented policing

	Frequency	Percent	Percent without 'not applicable' consideration
Not applicable	896	44.1	0
Yes	203	10.0	17.9
No	933	45.9	82.1
Total	2032	100.0	100.0

Generally, 55.9%, N=1136 of the respondents from total N=2032 are aware of community-oriented policing implementation in the neighborhood; however, the finding shows that a small amount, 17.9%, N=203 of the respondents who are aware of community-oriented policing implementation in the neighborhood do participate. The finding shows that the majority 48.0%, N=97 of the respondents that participate N=203, joins community-oriented policing because of ensuring the neighborhood's safety, 41.0% of the respondents to be more responsible to the neighborhood followed by 11.0%, N= 23 which is to prevent crime within the neighborhood.

Table 15: Frequency-Respondents describe their understanding of their role in community-oriented policing

	Frequency	Percent	Percent without 'not applicable' consideration
Not applicable	1829	90.0	0
To assist PDRM doing patrol within the neighborhoods	52	2.6	26.0
To share information regarding crime or any issues that are relevant to the PDRM	60	3.0	30.0
To participate in crime problem-solving	30	1.5	15.0
To ensure safety within the neighborhoods	51	2.5	25.0
To provide security within the neighborhoods	10	.5	5.0
Total	2032	100.0	100.0

Majority of 30.0%, N=60 of the respondents believe that their role in community-oriented policing is to share information regarding crime or any issues that are relevant to PDRM. 26.0%, N=52 of the respondents believe that their role is to assist PDRM in doing patrols within the

neighborhood followed by 25.0%, N=51 of the respondents who believe their role is to ensure safety within the neighborhood. 15.0%, N= 30 believe that their role is to participate in crime problem solving and 5.0%, N=10 believe that their role is to provide security within the neighborhood.

Table 16: Likert scale to measure level of activeness

Likert Scale	Description
Score of 1.00-1.99	Very passive
Score of 2.00-2.99	Passive
Score of 3.00	Fair
Score of 3.01-4.00	Active
Score of 4.01-5.00	Very active

Table 17: Mean-Level of activeness in community-oriented policing

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Yes	3.33	142	0.712
No	1.64	61	0.484
Total	2.82	203	

The mean score for community activeness in community-oriented policing is passive with a score of 2.82, N=203, std. Deviation 0.000. The Likert's scale used in the research study is 1=very passive, 2=passive, 3=marginal, 4=active and 5= very active.

Table 18: Frequency-Refuse to join community-oriented policing

	Frequency	Percent	Percent without 'not applicable' consideration
Not applicable	1099	54.1	0
Time Factor	296	14.6	31.8
Age factor	40	2.0	4.4
Safety factor	255	12.5	27.2
Not under my responsibility	150	7.4	16.1
This is Strata Titles housing scheme with gated and guarded scheme	192	9.4	20.5
Total	2032	100.0	100.0

Based on the data collection, five (5) reasons have been identified as to why the community is refusing to join community-oriented policing implementation in the neighborhood. The main reason is the time factor. A majority of the respondents are committed to their work from 8.00 am to 6.00 pm daily. In general, people who

are committed with work will have a short amount of time for their own personal lives. Most of the time, they are committed to work which is nine (9) to ten (10) hours daily, one (1) to two (2) hours daily for travel, seven (7) hours daily for sleep and rest, and three (3) to four (4) hours daily for family and personal matters. As for community-oriented policing, people need to commit their time of at least two (2) to three (3) hours daily for patrols, meetings, etc which is more valuable to be spent with their person and family. Safety becomes the second factor as to why respondents refuse to join community-oriented policing in the neighborhood. Respondents are afraid that their personal safety, especially during patrol beat, is exposed to danger.

The third reason that was highlighted by the respondents is that their house is a strata housing scheme with gated and guarded scheme. The housing scheme is offering them safety and security which includes monthly maintenance fees. Most of the community members bought housing scheme with strata title to have this safety benefit. In addition to that, it should not become a responsibility for the community to put their time, safety and energy at risk and commit in community-oriented policing as they have paid such an amount to the management to handle and take responsibility for their safety. Furthermore, the respondents feel that it is not their main responsibility, as Malaysia has its own safety force such as PDRM to take charge of it.

IV. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

Basically, there is a process to generate and develop ideas and solutions. The first process is to understand the findings and issues from the data collection. In the research study, several issues have been identified based on the data collection from the research distribution survey and interview. The issue that has been identified was that the community is lacking information, explanation, education and understanding on community-oriented policing strategies and implementation which has led to negative perception and lack of participation in community-oriented policing development and implementation.

There is no doubt that a lot of information regarding community-oriented policing strategies and development has been published in the PDRM website, social media, newspaper and other mass media. However, this information was not explained enough or in the right way to the community. It does need a little bit of effort from related parties to explain what Community-Oriented Policing is all about. The best way to explain to the community is to educate the community by showing and demonstrating it so that the community will understand it.

The recommendations were based on the issues and problems from the research findings of the data collection. The recommendations were generated to solve and give ideas to improve the community-oriented policing concept and strategies. Some of the ideas were adopted from readings and previous case studies and modified to suit with the issues and problems that have been identified in the previous chapter (what previous chapter?). The researcher has listed and analyzed some recommendations that can be applied to improve community-oriented policing implementation in Malaysia especially Pulau Pinang as follows:

(1) Communicating with the public on crime: The authorities should increase communication about crime prevention and crime enforcement across a variety of broadcast and interactive media which will help the public to reduce its fear of crime, engage with the PDRM directly and reduce its susceptibility to criminal acts.

The PDRM's Public Affairs Officers should collaborate with the KementerianPenerangan, KomunikasidanKebudayaan (KPKK) and media agencies to inform the public of ongoing and special initiatives. Notable successes achieved by the PDRM should be publicized, to increase public confidence and boosting the PDRM's morale. According to Mr. Lim (the Bandar Sri Pinang CP committee president), there has been a lot of activities and conference between the CP committee members and the police force that has

never been published by any media. As a result, the number of participants seems to be a bit stumpy.

Therefore, a Mobile Police Vehicles (MPV's), collaborating with the community policing committee, should stop and talk to people on the ground for at least 10-15 min of every hour during regular patrols to the public and residents. Talking to the public includes gathering information, getting feedback and providing information, e.g., sharing flyers with crime prevention tips or local police contact details. This will give the general public more opportunities to raise concerns with the police and get to know their local officers. It will also build the public's trust in the police, helping to address the feedback received from some of the public during the Open Days that they fear and mistrust the police.

(2) Educate and training program: Develop and implement a comprehensive education and training program to canvass the shift in policing focus from predominantly reactive to a more proactive style. This education and training program should accommodate both police as well as community members.

The concept of community-oriented policing entails a partnership arrangement and the utilization of this partnership is to identify and pose solutions for community problems. The partnership arrangement involves both police and community members and such an arrangement requires both parties to have a commonality of understanding concerning the policing concept in order for it to be successfully implemented. As the terms "partnership" implies, both parties must contribute and participate equally unless the issue involved requires specific police issue. Therefore, as one of the foundation blocks for successfully implementing the policing concept, both police and community need to be exposed to education and training packages that promote the understanding of the concept of "community oriented policing".

However, this education and training arrangement should not be considered as a "one-off" exercise but be developed to provide regular updates on the residential area. In addition to that, the successful

implementation of particular police-community strategies addressing local community problems should be utilized as experiential learning across the whole police organization.

In Texas, the Texas Police Department has created a program called the Huston citizen patrol program in which members of the community help police in crime prevention matters. This program is specially designed to allow members of the community group to carry out patrols to reduce crime in local areas. The police assist by providing training and equipment such as radio and trademarks. This program is considered successful with the assistance and close cooperation between police and community members. Huston Police Department as stated in Priest and Carter (1999) showed that 80 civil patrol group in Huston with more than 3, 100 volunteers have undergone more than 82, 000 h of patrol per person in 1991.

There is another campaign, which is also welcomed in the United States, the "McGruff" Crime Prevention Campaign. The objective of this campaign is to spark a sense of responsibility in each individual in an effort to prevent crime, educate the community to jointly take preventive measures, change the mindset of the people to work with non-governmental bodies (NGOs) in the prevention of crime. In the study conducted for this campaign in 1991 by Matera and Artique (2000), 88% of crime prevention enforcement personnel are involved in this campaign, while awareness among community members was 80%. In addition to that, 86% embraced the campaign activities and responded with what they have learned from it.

(3) Conduct research into strategies and tactics: Conduct research into strategies and tactic that can be adopted to maintain and/or promote a sense of community association incorporating the police and enhancing the quality of life (QoL) within the community.

This recommendation is linked to those previously mentioned. By conducting research into strategies for promoting community association in the residential areas, the police would be able to develop the best practice tactics

to enhance areas of resourcing activities, crime prevention, include "fear of Crime" reduction and enhancement of quality of life (QoL). The research would also form the basis of reviewing and maintaining currency of the education and training component for implementing the community-oriented policing concept.

The Community-Oriented Policing in Pulau Pinang, as any policing program endeavoring to implement a revised policing focus, needs to market the concept, educate all persons involved and the implementation process. Otherwise, the implementation process will only amount to a piecemeal and "ad hoc" arrangements providing only minimal success.

REFERENCES

Asmah, A (2007). The Changing Trend and Pattern of Public Safety in Malaysia Since Independence Implication to its Social Well-Being. Malaysia: E-Bangi J., Vol. 2, P. 1-16.

Bahaman, A. S., O. Jamilah, K. Nurani, H.H. Hanina& M.H. Rezal (2009). Consultation Report: Study on the Effectiveness of Voluntary Patrolling Scheme and Community Participation. Institute for Social Science Studies, Unversiti Putra Malaysia Press, Malaysia.

Bayley DH (1994). International Differences in Community Policing. In Rosenbaum, D. P The Challenge of Community Policing. Sage Publications: London pp. 278 181Chaudhary, C. M. 1991. Research methodology. RBSA, Jaipur.

Bryman, A. (2004) Social Research Methods (3rd Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buerger ME, Petrosino AJ, Petrosino C (1999). "Extending the Police Role: Implications of Police Mediation as a Problem-Solving Tool." Police Quarterly 2(2) June.

Cordner, G. W. & Perkins, E B. (2005) 'Problem-Oriented Policing in Practice' in Criminology and Public Policy, Vol. 4(2), P. 155-180.

Crowell, N. A., & Burgess, A. W. (1996) Understanding Violence Against Women. Washington DC: National Academy Press.

Eck J, Rosenbaum DP (1994). The new police order: Effectiveness, equity, and efficiency in community policing. In D. P. Rosenbaum (Ed.), The challenge of community policing: Testing the promises. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. Pp. 3-24.

Eisen, A. (1994) Survey of Neighborhood-Based, Comprehensive Community Empowerment Initiatives. Health Educ. P. 235-252.

Evans, D. J. (1995) Crime and Policing: Spatial Approaches. England: Avebury.

Foskett, J. M. (1955) Social Structure and Social Participation. Am. Sociol. No. 20, P. 431-438.

Friedmann R (1992). Community Policing: From Officer Smiley to Interagency Cooperation". Unpublished paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, November, New Orleans, LA.

Friedmann W (1996). The community role in community policing. In Rosenbaum, D. P. The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises. Sage Publications. Pp. 263-269.

Goldstein H (1990). Problem-Oriented Policing. Temple University Press.

Gilchrist, E., Bannister, J., Ditton, J., &Farrall, S. (1998) Women and the 'Fear of Crime': Challenging the Accepte Stereotype. British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 38(2), P. 283-298.

John Howard Society of Alberta (1999) Fear of Crime. [On-line]. Available: http://www.johnhoward.ab.ca/pub/old/pdf/C49.pdf

Jupp J., Langdon P. &Godsill S. (2007) Mobile Computing in Maintenance Activities: A 'Situational Induced Impairments and Disabilities' Perspective. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 4554, p. 696–705.

Klockars CB (1988). The rhetoric of community policing. In J. R Greene and Mastrofski, S. D. (eds), Community Policing: Rhetoric or reality?, New York: Praeger, pp. 239-258.

Lab SP, Das DK (2003). International Perspectives on Community Policing andCrime Prevention. Pearson Education Inc. New Jersey.

Lelieveldt, H. (2004) Helping citizens help themselves. Urban Affairs Rev., Vol. 39: P. 531-551.

Linda SM, Karen MH (2008). Community Policing: Partnership for Problems Solving. (5th Ed.), Thomson Higher Education, 10 Davis Drive, Belmont, CA 940002-3098, USA.

Lyons W (2002). The Politics of Community Policing: Rearranging the Power to Punish. The University of Michigan Press.

Maguire ER, Wells W (2002). Community policing as communication reform. In Giles, H. Law enforcement, communication, and community. John Benjamin Publishing. Pp. 33-66.

Manning PK (1988). Community policing as a drama of control. In J. R Greene an Mastrofski, S. D. (eds), Community Policing: Rhetoric or reality?, New York: Praeger, pp. 27-46.

Mastrofski SD (1988). Community policing as reform: A cautionary tale. In J. R Greene and Mastrofski, S. D. (eds), Community Policing: Rhetoric or reality?, New York: Praeger, pp. 47-68.

Matera, F. R. & R. J. Artique (2000) Public Relations Campaign and Techniques. Allyn and Bacon, Needham Height, Minnesota.

Oliver WM (2008). Community-Oriented Policing: A systematic approach to policing. Pearson Prentice Hall, USA.

Ong, M. J. & D. A. Jenks (2004) Hispanic Perceptions of Community Policing: Is community Policing Working in the City? J. Ethnicity Criminal Justice, Vol. 2, P. 53-66.

Priest, T.B. and D.B. Carter (1999) Evaluation of Police Performance in an African-American Sample, J. Criminal Justice, Vol. 27, P. 57-65.

Putnam, R.D. (2000) Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community. Simon and Schuster, New York, USA. ISBN-13: 9780743203043, P. 541.

Premaratne, S. P. (2002) Entrepreneurial Networks and Small Business Development: The Case of Small Enterprises in Sri Lanka. PhD diss., Eindhoven University of Technology. Rosembaum, P. D., A. M.

Schuck, S.K. Costello, D. F. Hawkins & M. K. Ring, (2008). The Influence of Race/Ethnicity, Social Class and Neighborhood. Context on Residents' Attitudes toward the Police. Police Quarterly, Vol. 11, P.496-519.

Seagrave J (1996). Defining community policing. Am. J. police 15(2):1-22.

Sidhu AS (ACP) (2005). The rise of crime in Malaysia: An academic and statistical

analysis. J. Kuala Lumpur Royal Malays. Police Coll. No. 4, p. 25.

Skogan WG, Hartnett SM (1997). Community policing. Chicago style. Oxford University Press, New York.Skolnick JH, Bayley DH (1988). Theme and variation in community policing. Crime Justice 10:1-37.

Suffian, S., A.S. Hadi, O. Jamilah& L.D. Jeffrey (2012) The Influence of Perception and Knowledge Factors among Youth towards the Effectiveness of the Rakan Cop Program in Kuala Lumpur. Sci. Ser. Data Rep., Vol. 4, P. 68-85.

Thacher D (2001a). Conflicting Values in Community Policing. Law Society Rev. 35(4):765-797.

Thacher D (2001b). Equity and Community Policing: A new View of community Partnerships: A new view of community partner ships. Crim. Justice Ethics 20:3-16.

Trojanowicz RC, Kappeler VE, Gaines LK (2002). Community Policing: Contemporary Perspective, Third Edition. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing.

Waddington PAJ (1999). Policing citizens: authority and rights. UCL Press: London. Weisheit, RA.

Yamane, T. (1973) Statistic: An Introductory Analysis. Happer& Row, New York.