

The Evolution of Community-Oriented Policing (COP): Community Perception and Expectation on Community Oriented Policing (COP) Development & Implementation in Malaysia

¹ Dr. Mohammad Mujaheed Hassan, ² Prof. Dr. Aldrin Abdullah

¹ Security & Community Development,

^{1 2}School of Housing, Building & Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia.

Abstract- Community Oriented Policing (COP) is a bridge that enables community and law enforcement agencies to communicate, collaborate and work together to build safer, more caring community. COP comes with its 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. COP 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. It is a philosophy; a belief that by working together with the police, the community can accomplish what neither can be accomplished alone. It involves a rethinking of the role of the police and the restructuring of the police force. The purpose of this paper is: (a) to investigate community perception on COP development & implementation; (b) to investigate community expectation on COP development & implementation.

Index Terms- Community, perception, involvement, community oriented, policing.

How to cite this article:

Hassan, M. M. & Abdullah, A. (2017). The Evolution of Community-Oriented Policing (COP): Community Perception and Expectation on Community Oriented Policing (COP) Development & Implementation in Malaysia.

I. INTRODUCTION

The concept has been widely discussed and applied in various countries and 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 (Trojanowicz et al, 2002; Eck and Rosenbaum, 1994; Skolnick and Bayley, 1988; Manning 1988; Klockars, 1988). Formerly, the community understood that ultimately, the community was responsible for reaffirming the social norms that promoted public safety.

According to Brookes (2006), there are various definitions, interpretations, and applications that have made the difficult to define community-oriented policing. Cordner (1999) argues that community-oriented policing usually misinterpreted as a concept and recognizes that community-oriented policing is. Palmiotto (2000) has agreed with Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990) that community-oriented policing involves partnership and problem solving. In addition, the researcher believes that community-oriented policing emphasis on community and police engagement to resolve the underlying issues of crime, fear of crime, physical and social disorders which according to Virta (2006) it is similar to the Sage Dictionary of Criminology defines community-oriented policing. Virta also believes that community-oriented policing is a process that is police and community together control crime and develops interaction between them as to enhance the quality of life level and building police legitimacy. For these reasons, the investigation of the concept and the practice of community-oriented policing has been a strong driver in this research.

II. THE EVOLUTION OF COMMUNITY-ORIENTED POLICING (COP)

Traditional conceptions of policing envision police officer as responding to crime reports after crimes have occurred. This approach has caused some citizens to view police work as mostly passive. However, the philosophy of community-oriented policing is being advanced as the new policing system for the twenty-first century. In the early 1980s, the concept of community-oriented policing appeared as the principal direction and thinking towards policing. It was designed to unite the police with the community. Community-oriented policing has applied in various forms by the police agencies, for example, community-oriented policing is differs based on the community needs, politics, and recourses available in the United States.

Furthermore, many past and present practitioners have become staunch proponents of the community policing concept. As for former New York City Police Commissioner, Lee P. Brown (1992), who earlier implemented community policing in Houston, Brown believes community policing is the future of American law enforcement, which builds a problem-solving partnership between police and those they serve. In addition, according to Brown, in the essence of bringing back a modern

version of "cop on the beat". Brown suggests that community-oriented policing should solve community problems rather than just react to them. It is time to adopt new strategies to address the dramatic increases in crime and fear of crime. As for Brown, he views community policing as a better, smarter, and more cost-effective way of using police sources.

However, community-oriented policing is a long-term process that involves fundamental institutional change. Scholar Vaughn (1991) has warned the police managers that "if you approach the community-oriented policing as a program, you will likely fail". Beware of the trap that seeks assured, perfect, and immediate result. Community-oriented policing goes beyond simply implementing foot and bicycle patrols or neighbourhood stations. It redefines the role of the police officer on the street, from crime fighter to problems solver and neighbourhood ombudsman. It forces a useful transformation of the entire department, including a decentralized organizational structure and changes in recruiting, training, rewards system, evolutions, promotions, and so forth. Furthermore, this philosophy asks officers to break away from the bonds of incident-driven policing, but to seek a proactive and productive resolution to crime and disorder. Table 1.0 represents the major points where community-oriented policing is intended to depart from traditional policing.

Table 1.0 Traditional vs. Community Policing, Source: Malcolm K. Sparrow, Implementing Community Policing. U.S Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice. November 1988. Pp.8-9.

Questions	Traditional Policing	Community Policing
Who are the Police?	A government agency principally responsible for law enforcement	Police are the public, and the public is the police; the police officer is those who are paid to give full-time attention to the duties of every citizen.
What is the relationship between the police force and another public service department?	Priorities often conflict.	The police are one department among many responsible for improving the quality of life.
What is the role of the police?	Focusing on solving crimes.	A broader problem-solving approach.
How is police efficiency measured?	By detection and arrest rates.	By the absence of crime and disorder.
What are the highest priorities?	Crimes that are high value (e.g., bank robberies) and those involving violence.	Whatever problems disturb the community most?
What, specifically, do police deal with?	Incidents.	Citizen is problems and concerns.
What determine the effectiveness of police?	Response times.	Public cooperation.
What view do police take off service calls?	Deal with them only if there is no real police work to do.	Vital function and an excellent opportunity.
What is police professionalism?	Swift and effective response to serious crime.	Keeping close to the community.
What kind of intelligence is the most important?	Crime intelligence (the study of particular crimes or series of crimes).	Criminal intelligence (information about the activities of individuals or groups)
What is the essential nature of police accountability?	Highly centralized; governed by rules regulations and policy directives; accountable to the law.	Emphasis on local accountability to community needs.
What is the role of headquarters?	To provide the necessary rules and police directives.	To preach organizational values.
What is the role of the liaison press department?	To keep the 'heat' on operational officers so they can get on with the job.	To coordinate a primary channel of interaction with the community.
How do the police regard prosecutions?	As an important goal.	As one tool among many.

Essentially, community-oriented policing is a new concept of policing. It is a movement of a new policing strategy, which is from the independent (traditional) policing into community-based or oriented policing. Usually, Police is known as a government agency principally responsible for law enforcement, and it focuses on several cases of crime, especially those with high values, such as bank robbery and those involving violence. However, the new concept of community-oriented policing is a concept whereby the police are the public and the public is the police, and besides, police officers are those who are paid to provide full attention to the duties of every resident.

Community policing, in contrast to the traditional systems, is focused on solving the problems rather than on generating arrest statistics; quality, and not quantity. It shifts creative problem-solving, which the police have always done from being an informal part of the service to the essence of formal police service. Therefore, the challenge is to find ways to capture and to present the community police successes, along with the traditional kinds of data that the police have always kept and will continue to need to keep.

Adopting a comprehensive approach concerning community-oriented policing requires the changing of performance evaluations of virtually everyone in the field to reflect how well they express this new concept in their service. Nevertheless, it is a community out on beat who most completely and directly expresses the performance evaluation for the community-oriented policing officer's job hence the changes that should effect in all the other performance evaluations.

Clearly, performance evaluations should be based on behaviour, as much as possible eliminates bias and prejudice. Approaching support from officers for performance evaluation is effected by how they used does not take long for employees in any organization to figure out when the performance evaluations are disciplinary rather than constructive purposes. The purpose of performance evaluations is needed to provide documentation to justify disciplinary actions, but it's only applies to a handful of cases.

III. THE MAJOR OBJECTIVES OF COMMUNITY-ORIENTED POLICING

Community policing is not just a program with a single consolidated form to implement. Rather, it varies according to the community and its needs along with the police department that attempts to apply it (Peak & Glensor, 2004). In the United States, many programs have been established under the banner of community policing. Each program has had slightly different objectives to achieve; however, certain common strategies used in these programs distinguish a community policing strategy from traditional policing (Wycoff, 1988). For example, in the year 2000, COPS developed four major objectives to implement community policing:-

- (a) **Community Partnership:** The expression "community partnership" has dominated both private and public sector management ideologies for at least the last three decades (Roth et al., 2004). The participation of citizens in solving community problems is essential in almost every community-based program. Without the participation of the community, any community policing

program is subject to fail. Not surprisingly, the collaborative partnership between community and police is one of the major premises of community policing to improve police performance (MacDonald, 2002). Through two-way communication, police departments obtain more information regarding community needs, and they can generate appropriate responses by working closely with the community (CPC, 1994). Although police agencies use a variety of partnership tactics, Bayley (1996) and Roth et al., (2004) classified the tactics under two major categories with slight differences.

According to Bayley (1996), the first partnership category is a consultation that refers to defining and prioritizing neighbourhood problems by reaching community residents. Police receive information about community problems, including complaints about police, and they also have an opportunity to educate, as well as to inform community members about crime and disorder, along with the department's success and failure. In this process, the two-way information flow makes the police and the resident's co-produce public safety (Greene, 2000). In addition to its contribution to public safety, receiving feedback from the community can be used in the performance appraisal of police officers, assessing the quality of police service, and in the police department's program evaluation (McGarrel, Benitez, & Gutierrez, 2003).

The second partnership category is mobilization, which refers to the active participation of community members and organizations in crime prevention strategies. When community members actively engage in crime prevention strategies, a sense of community and community cohesion is increased (Bayley, 1996). Police, in addition to community members, work closely with community organizations, businesses, and other agencies to improve the quality of life issues, such as working with the municipality to remove graffiti, working with landlords to properly maintain properties, as well as working with parks and recreation agencies to provide recreational programs for youths (Bayley, 1996).

On the other hand, Roth et al., (2004) categorized the types of partnership activities as community partnership and problem-solving partnership. "The former varied from simple information sharing to coordination (i.e., planning and executing joint activities involving all partners) to special collaboration, such as adaptation by all partners of a joint agenda" (Roth et al., 2004).

(b) Problem-solving: Goldstein (1977) argued that "the failure of team policing was due to a focus on secondary considerations," such as generating an organizational change without a clear focus on underlying problems creating calls for service (Goldstein, 1977). Currently, community policing is viewed as the impetus for drastic changes in both organization and philosophy; therefore, team policing, at best, can be perceived as a partial

reflection of current community policing (Greene, 2000).

In his later work, Goldstein (1990) emphasized the importance of community collaboration while solving the underlying causes that were responsible for the calls for service. Some scholars prefer to distinguish community policing and problem-oriented policing (Sherman & Eck, 2006; Walker & Katz, 2005; Eck & Spelman, 1987a). These scholars suggest that the roots of community policing and problem-solving are distinct. One of the main reasons for the emergence of community policing was that the police alienated from the community they served (Miller & Huss, 2002; Champion & Rush, 1997; Rosenbaum, 1988). On the other hand, a major impetus for problem-solving was that police had failed to address chronic problems (Goldstein, 1990).

Second, what differentiate those two are the ends over means syndrome. Problem-oriented policing stresses the importance of the final product rather than stressing the means by which policing is done (Eck & Spellman, 1987a). In community-oriented policing, the ultimate goal is to establish a positive relationship between the police and the community. In problem-oriented policing, solving chronic problems that create calls for service is the primary goal. Unlike community policing, in problem solving, community involvement is not necessarily a prerequisite (Sherman & Eck, 2006; Walker & Katz, 2005; Eck & Maguire, 2000; Eck & Spellman, 1987b). Based on this perspective, it seems accurate that community involvement is secondary in the course of solving problems.

However, the relationship between community policing and problem solving is a relative one. There has to be a geographic boundary and a community with particular problems to be solved to implement problem-oriented policing that will effectively address local issues; and this can be best achieved with community involvement (Kelling & Moore, 1988). Moreover, community policing today does not only offer genuine relationships between the community and the organization, but it also offers tangible benefits, such as crime prevention, as well as a reduction in disorder and fear of crime (Tilley, 2004).

(c) Crime prevention: Community policing refers to a significant change in the role of police (Walker & Katz, 2005). Instead of emphasizing crime control, the role of police within community policing philosophy emphasizes partnership with the community in solving problems about which the community is most concerned (Palmiotto, 2000). This shift in the role of police attempts to accomplish a "crime prevention" goal rather than crime control (Riechers & Roberg, 1990).

(d) Organizational change: Community policing cannot succeed without fundamental alterations inside the organization of police agencies (Redlinger, 1994). It not only requires a philosophical shift regarding police mission, but it also requires a commitment to alter the organization and the structure (Kappeler & Gaines, 2005). Moreover, Eck and Maguire (2000) discuss the need for organizational changes in three areas: -i) organizational structure, ii) organizational culture, and iii) management styles (Eck and Maguire, 2000).

- i. **Organizational Structure:** Traditional police organizations have a military type hierarchical system and management style, in which community policing cannot be achieved (Miller & Huss, 2002). "Community policing requires the shifting of the initiative, decision-making, and responsibility downward within the police organization" (CPC, 1994, p. 22). Community policing demands a flat hierarchy by giving beat officers more authority and flexibility to respond to community-specific problems. Parallel with changes in the private and the public sectors, police agencies within the frame of community policing should be more decentralized, and should empower beat officers to make decisions and participate in management (Mastrofski, 1999). Another issue regarding the change in the organizational structure is assigning officers to certain geographic areas so that they can become familiar with their areas, their residents, and the area's specific problems. The hypothesis is that if an officer is assigned to a particular beat, he/she will respond more effectively to residents' concerns. Moreover, officers can be held accountable for the incidents that take place in their beats, which in turn, creates a sense of ownership in the assigned area among the officers.
- ii. **Organizational Culture:** The core elements of traditional policing, such as crime fighting, quick response time, and making a large number of arrests are assumed by police cadets when they enter the police force. The tenets of traditional police culture resist change in the view of police officers (Walker & Katz, 2005). A study conducted by Zhao, Thurman, and Lovrich (1995) revealed that the implementation of community policing in agencies was frustrated more by internal organizational barriers than obstacles in the community. Agencies that scored higher on internal resistance were less likely to implement community policing.
- iii. The management style of community policing should also be different than in traditional policing. In traditional management, the primary concern is maintaining discipline by stressing departmental rules and regulations (Walker & Katz, 2005).

However, police managers in community policing should assist line officers in developing community contacts and in finding resources to solve community problems. This task might be achieved by vertical staff meetings, where line officers can discuss issues that emerge in the communities they serve with their supervisors (Kappeler & Gaines, 2005).

Besides, community policing might enable supervisors to alter their management role. In some agencies, community policing is implemented by the chiefs who would like to be seen as progressive and willing to enhance public relations despite the fact that they do not believe in community policing principles. In fact, not many changes typically occur in these types of agencies. Community policing that is all about cosmetics, and basic service delivery is still based on the traditional policing mentality (Hunter & Barker, 1993).

IV. THE EVOLUTION OF COMMUNITY-ORIENTED POLICING (COP) IN MALAYSIA

Community-oriented policing was endorsed by the government throughout Polis Di Raja Malaysia (PDRM) five (5) years strategic plan (2007-2011) as to encourage the community to participate and to cooperate with the police force in order to fight crimes at all levels in the country. In addition, the government also hopes that with the implementation of the concept, it can build and improve the human relationship between the police force and the community residents.

Generally, the government has endorsed several new concepts of community-oriented policing as additional concepts to be implemented in Rukun Tetangga. Basically, the concept of Rukun Tetangga is to improve and to unite the community with different ethnics, cultures and religions as to become one big community who is living in harmony. However, with the new concept of community-oriented policing in Rukun Tetangga, the focus and scope of Rukun Tetangga will become wider and expanding into more directions.

The concept of community-oriented policing is slightly different with the concept of Rukun Tetangga. It is not just a concept to encourage various activities in the community which enable local people to meet or to interact and to bridge the relationship between the grassroots leaders or to encourage activities with charity organisations. COP is actually a concept to improve the human relationship and to encourage the community to participate and to work together with the police force. Community works as the "eyes" for the police and provides valuable information about crime in their area to the police.

People may get confused between the concept of community-oriented policing and the concept of Rakan COP (August, 2005). Basically, community-oriented policing is a part of Rakan COP. The concept is similar which is to improve human relationship, to encourage the public to become the "eyes" and to share any information about crime with the police. However, the concept of community-oriented policing is to encourage the public as a community to get involved with and volunteering to work with the police by doing the patrol beats and fighting the crime in their residential area.

Community-oriented policing also borrowed the basic concept of *Ikatan Relawan Rakyat Malaysia (RELA)* (January, 1972). Basically, the scheme is to deploy and to mobilize the volunteer force in order to reduce illegal immigrants and to assist other law enforcement agencies in order to maintain peace and security throughout Malaysia. As a result, community-oriented policing becomes a new concept to be implemented with a bigger scope and objectives into neighbourhood association revolution in Malaysia. The main objectives of community-oriented policing are to increase the participation of the community and to improve the human relationship between the police force and the community residents in a specific residential area.

In addition, police and community strive to work towards a safer community through close cooperation and understanding with the police by sharing a responsibility in the development and the implementation of proactive problem solving strategies as in identified issues and problems occurs.

It is basically the same whether it is *Rakan Cop*, *Rukun Tetangga*, *RELA* or community-oriented policing concept. It actually shows the evolution of Malaysia policing program. As we can see, these four (4) programs are almost similar in terms of concept and direction in which they improve the human relationship, working voluntarily and sharing of information between the community and police force.

For example, the concept of *Rukun Tetangga* was endorsed to build and to improve human relationship within the community with different ethnics, cultures and religions. The same concept has also been used in community-oriented policing which is to build and to improve human relationship but with different target of individuals which is between the community residents and the police force. The same concept was also developed and used in *Rakan Cop* and *RELA*.

Malaysia has developed *Ikatan Relawan Rakyat Malaysia (RELA)* (1972) and *Kawasan Rukun Tetangga* (1975). Malaysia developed these two different concepts and schemes. *RELA* is a concept of deploying and mobilizing the volunteer force and to maintain peace and security in Malaysia. However, as for *Rukun Tetangga* concept, the concept is to build trust and to unite the community from different ethnics, cultures and religions in Malaysia.

In 2005, Malaysia has developed a new concept of policing related to community based. *Rakan Cop* was introduced by PDRM in Kuala Lumpur on 9th August 2005, the main concept of *Rakan Cop* was to encourage the public to become the “eyes” of the police and to provide information on crime to the Police Command Centre through the hotline or SMS.

In 2007, the community-oriented policing was fully endorsed by the government throughout PDRM five years strategic plan as to build trust, partnership and to improve human relationship between the community residents and the police force in Malaysia.

In addition, the concept is considering the community as a partner with the police force to fight and to prevent crime at all levels in Malaysia. In this stage, Malaysia has developed community-oriented policing throughout several phases in Malaysia. This concept will be implemented slowly throughout Malaysia according to the strategic plan.

V. 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 *Ibu Pejabat Polis Daerah (IPD)*, *Daerah Timur Laut*, there are six (6) housing schemes that implemented community-oriented policing in their housing schemes which are: i) *Bandar Sri Pinang*; ii) *Pulau Tikus*; iii) *Bayan Baru*; iv) *Pantai Jerjak*; 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 analysed by using IBM Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 22 software. Most of the data were analysed using descriptive statistical analysis, correlation analysis and mean in SPSS.

VI. RESULT & DISCUSSION

Community perception towards community-oriented policing development & implementation

Table 2.0: 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

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 neighbourhood 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 neighbourhood, and (iv) Community and PDRM together solving crime problems within the neighbourhood.

The majority 36.3%, N=446 of the respondents believe that community-oriented policing program is the community assisting PDRM to ensure safety within their neighbourhood due to shortage of PDRM manpower. 28.9%, N=354 of the respondents believe that community-oriented policing is a new policing strategy by PDRM to encourage the community to take part and to assist PDRM in crime prevention. 25.8%, N=316 of the respondents believe that community-oriented policing is a program in which the community and PDRM are working together doing patrol within the neighbourhood. 9.0%, N=110 of the respondents believe that community-oriented policing is the community and PDRM are working together solving the crime problem within the neighbourhood.

Generally, the main idea of community-oriented policing implementation in Malaysia is to create a safer living lifestyle. Community-oriented policing is based on the partnership between the police and the community in which both parties share the responsibility to identify, to reduce, to eliminate and to prevent problems that impact community safety and order. The main vision of the community-oriented policing implementation in Malaysia is to foster mutual belief, trust, respect, understanding, responsibilities and embracing smart strategies and solutions between the public and the police department in crime prevention.

There are seven (7) missions have been set up in the program by PDRM which are i) to create crime awareness/shared responsibilities among community and reducing/denying crime, ii) to address and moderate police grouses and complaints made against police officers, iii) to provide free legal advice and necessary services to the public and police to ensure the justice and fairness of law, iv) to encourage community in embracing the “Broken Window” Theory, v) to promote a trustful and truthful working relationship between the public and the police, vi) to establish and to enhance participation of local authorities efforts and cooperation in crime prevention and vii) to advocate and to educate the public in creating safer concept through proactive community based programs.

It is vital that community and PDRM to have the same interpretation towards these three (3) main keys which are i) objective, ii) vision and iii) mission towards community-oriented policing. Misinterpretation of these three (3) main keys may lead the program to failure.

Community expectation towards community-oriented policing development & implementation

Table 3.0: 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

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 neighbourhood 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 neighbourhood. According to the respondents, even knowing that most of the neighbourhoods 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 neighbourhood 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 neighbourhood.

Besides that, the respondents are also assuming that with Community-oriented policing implementation in the neighbourhood, community residents, committee and PDRM will have a session for info sharing regarding the current crime and social problems within the neighbourhood. 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.

VII. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION

Each community member have a different understanding and interpretation of community-oriented policing. Some community may give a positive review on the community-oriented policing program and understand the main objectives, mission, and vision of the program. This group of the community will encourage other community members within their group to appreciate and to support PDRM efforts towards community-oriented policing implementation. However, there will be a small group of community with a lack of understanding of the community-oriented policing program. This group may spread wrong information about the program to the other community members within the group. This situation will lead to the failure to the program.

There are several processes to generate and to develop ideas and solutions. The first process is to understand the findings and issues from the data collection. There is no doubt that plentiful information regarding community-oriented policing strategies and development has been published in the PDRM website, social media, newspapers and other mass media. However, this information did not explain enough or in the right way to the public. It may need more efforts from related parties to explain about the community-oriented policing. The best way to explain to the public is to educate the public by showing and demonstrating it to them so that the public will be able to understand it.

It is important to develop and implement a comprehensive education and training program to canvass the shift in policing focus from a predominantly reactive to more proactive style. This education and training program should accommodate both police department as well as community members.

The concept of community-oriented policing entailed a partnership arrangement, and the utilization of this partnership is to identify and come up with the solutions for community problems. The partnership arrangement involves both police department and community members and such arrangement requires both parties to have a commonality of understanding concerning the policing concept for it to be successfully implemented. As the terms "partnership" implies, both parties must contribute and participate equally unless the pertaining issue requires specific police involvement. Therefore, as one of the foundation blocks to successfully implementing the policing concept, both police department and community need to be exposed to appropriate 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 should be developed to provide regular updates about the residential area. In addition, the successful implementation of police-community strategies in addressing local community problems should be utilized as experiential learning across the whole police department.

In Texas, the Texas Police Department has introduced a program called the Huston citizen patrol program in which members of the community will assist the police department 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 department will assist the community by providing training and equipment such as radio and trademarks. This program is considered successful with the assistance and close cooperation between the police department and community members. Huston Police Department as stated in Priest and Carter (1999) showed that 80 civil patrol groups in Huston with more than 3, 100 volunteers had undergone more than 82, 000 of patrol per person in 1991.

There is another campaign, which is also commenced 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, to educate the community to take joint preventive measures, change the mind-set of the people to work with the non-governmental body (NGOs) on the prevention of crime. In the study conducted for this campaign in 1991 by Matera and Artique (2000), found that 88% of crime prevention enforcement personnel were involved in this campaign while the awareness among community members was 80%. In addition, 86% embraced the campaign activities and responded positively with things that they had learned from it.

REFERENCES

- [1] 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.
- [2] Bayley, D. H. (1996) What Do Police Do?. In: Saulsbury, W., Mott, J. & Newburn, T., (eds). Themes in Contemporary Policing, London: Independent Enquiry into the Roles and Responsibilities of the Police.
- [3] Brown, Lee P. (1992) 'Community Policing: Partnership with Promise'. The Police Chief.
- [4] Bryman, A. (2004) Social Research Methods (3rd Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [5] Champion, D. J. & Rush, G. E. (1997) Policing in the Community. Upple Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [6] Cordner, G. (1999) Elements of Community Policing. In: L. Gaines & G. Cordner, (eds). Policing Perspectives: An Anthology. Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company. P. 137-149.
- [7] Community Policing Consortium. (1994) Understanding community policing: A framework for Action. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Assistance.
- [8] Eck, J. E. & D. P. Rosenbaum (1994) The New Police Order: Effectiveness, Equity and Efficiency in Community Policing. In Dennis P. Rosenbaum (eds) The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises. Sage: Thousand Oaks. P. 3-23.
- [9] Eck, J. E., & Maguire, E. R. (2000) Have Changes in Policing Reduced Violent Crime? An Assessment of the Evidence. In: A. Blumstein & J. Wallman (eds). The Crime Drop in America. New York: Cambridge University Press. P. 207-265.
- [10] Eck, J. E. & Spelman, W. (1987) Problem Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport New. Washington, D.C.: Police Executive Research Forum.
- [11] Forgaty, G. J. & Drismith (2005) Response Bias in Computerised Test.
- [12] Foskett, J. M. (1955) Social Structure and
- [13] Goldstein, H. (1977) Improving Policing: A Problem-Oriented Approach. Crime and Delinquency.
- [14] Goldstein, H. (1990) Problem-Oriented Policing. Temple University Press.
- [15] Greene, J. R. (2000) Community policing in America: Changing the Nature, Structure, and Function of the Police. Washington, D. C.: Criminal Justice, National Institute of Justice, Vol. 3, P. 299-370.
- [16] Hunter, R. D. & Barker, T. (1993) The New Police Organizational Style. American Journal of Police, Vol. 12, P. 157-168.
- [17] 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.
- [18] Kappeler, V. E. & Gaines, L. K. (2005) Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.
- [19] Klockars, C. B. (1988) The Rhetoric of Community Policing. In: J. R. Greene & S. D. Mastrofski (eds). Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New York: Praeger. P. 239-258.
- [20] MacDonald, John M., (2002) "The Effectiveness of Community Policing in Reducing Urban Violence", Crime and Delinquency, Vol. 48(4), P. 592-618.
- [21] Manning, P. K. (1988) Community Policing as a Drama of Control. In: J. R. Greene & S. D. Mastrofski (eds). Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality. New York: Praeger. P. 27-46
- [22] Mastrofski, S. D. (1999) Ideas in American Policing: Policing for people. Washington, DC: Police Foundation.
- [23] McGarrel, E. F., Benitez, S. & Gutierrez, R. S. (2003) Getting to Know Your Community through Citizen Surveys and Focus Group Interviews. In: Q. C. Thurman & E. F. McGarrel (eds). Community Policing in a Rural Setting. Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing. P. 113-121.
- [24] Miller, L. S. & Huss, K. M. (2002) The police in the community: Strategies for the 21st century (3rd ed). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- [25] Palmiotto, M. (2000) Community Policing: A Policing Strategy. Boston: 21st Century, Jones and Bartlett Publishers.

- [26] Peak, K. J. & Glensor, R. W. (2004) Community policing and problem solving: Strategies and practices. (4th ed). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- [27] Premaratne, S. P. (2002) Entrepreneurial Networks and Small Business Development: The Case of Small Enterprises in Sri Lanka. PhD diss., Eindhoven University of Technology.
- [28] 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.
- [29] Redlinger, L. J. (1994) Community Policing and Changes in the Organizational Structure. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice*, Vol. 10(1), P. 36-57.
- [30] Riechers, L. M., & R.R. Roiberg (1990) "Community Policing: A Critical Review of Underlying Assumptions." *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, Vol. 17(2), P. 105-114.
- [31] Rosenbaum, D. P. (1988) The Changing Role of the Police: Assessment of the Current Transition to Community Policing. In: J. P. Bodeur (eds). *How to Recognize Good Policing: Problems and Issues*. Thousands Oak: CA, Sage Publications. P. 27-53.
- [32] Roth, J. A., Roehl, J., & Johnson, C. C. (2004) Trends in Adaptation of Community Policing. In: W. G. Skogan (eds). *Community Policing: Can it Work*.
- [33] Sherman, L. W., Denise Gottfredson, Doris Layton MacKenzie, Ecl J.E, Peter Reuter, & Shawn Bushway (1997) *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising—A report to the AttorneyGeneral of the United States*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.
- [34] Sherman, L.W., & Eck, J. E (2002) Policing for Crime Prevention. In: Sherman, L. W., Farrington, D. P., Welsh, B. C., & MacKenzie, D. L.,(eds). *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention*, Routledge: New York. P. 295-329.
- [35] Sherman, L. W. & Eck, J. E. (2006) Policing for Crime Prevention. In: L. W. Sherman, D. P. Farrington, B. C. Welsh & D. L. Mac Kenzie (eds). *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention* New York: Routledge. P. 331-403.
- [36] Skolnick, J. H. & Bayley, D. H. (1988) Theme and Variation in Community Policing. *Crime and Justice*, Vol. 10, P. 1-37.
- [37] Sparrow, Malcolm K., Mark H. Moore, & David M. Kennedy (1990) *Beyond 911: A New Era in Policing*. New York Basic Books.
- [38] Tilley, N., (2004) 'Community Policing and Problem Solving', in *Community Policing (Can it Work)*, Wadsworth: Toronto. P. 165-184.
- [39] Trojanowicz, R. C. & Bucqueroux, B. (1990) *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*. Cincinnati, OH.
- [40] Trojanowicz, R. C., Kappeler, V.E., & Gaines, L.K., (2002) *Community Policing: Contemporary Perspective, Third Edition*. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson Publishing.
- [41] Vaughn, J. R. (1991). "Community-Oriented Policing . . . You Can Make It Happen." *Law and Order* 39(6), P. 35-39.
- [42] Virta, S. (2006) *Community Policing*. In: McLaughlin, E., & Muncie, J., (eds). *The Sage Dictionary of Criminology*. London: Sage.
- [43] Walker, S., & Katz, C. (2005) *The Police in America: An Introduction* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [44] Wycoff, M.A. (1988) The Benefits of Community Policing: Evidence and Conjecture. In: J reen & S Mastrofski (eds). *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality*. New York: Praeger Publishers. P. 103-134.
- [45] Yamane, T. (1973) *Statistic: An Introductory Analysis*. Happer & Row, New York.
- [46] Zhao, J., Thurman, Q. C., & Lovrich, N. P. (1995) Community-Oriented Policing Across The U.S.: Facilitators and Impediments to Implementation. *American Journal of Police*, Vol. 14, P. 11-28.

AUTHORS

First Author – Dr. Mohammad Mujaheed Hassan, Security & Community Development, School of Housing, Building & Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia, boneillness@hotmail.com
Second Author – Prof. Dr. Aldrin Abdullah, School of Housing, Building & Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia, aldrin@usm.my