



ASSESSING THE INFLUENCE OF COMMUNITY PARTNERSHIP IN MONITORING AND EVALUATING COMMUNITY SAFETY IN LAMU WEST SUB-COUNTY

Madoya Micah¹, Dr. George Wagah², Dr. Isabella Asamba³

¹Student, Maseno University

²Lecturer, School of Planning and Architecture Department of Urban and Regional Planning Maseno University

³Lecturer, School of Planning and Architecture Department of Urban and Regional Planning Maseno University

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra12171>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra12171

ABSTRACT

Though community policing elements such as community partnership have been mentioned as possible CP elements that can influence monitoring and evaluation of community safety, there is limited research to ascertain this in Lamu West Sub County. The purpose of this study was to establish the effect of community partnership in monitoring and evaluating community safety in Lamu West Sub-County. The study adopted quantitative design where data was collected from a sample of 405 respondents drawn from 32,873 of Lamu West Sub-County residents with the aid of a questionnaire. Correlation and regression analyses were adopted in data analysis to help in establishing the relationship between the dependent and independent variables. The findings of this study demonstrated that there was statistically positive relationship between community partnership and in monitoring and evaluating community safety in Lamu West Sub-County at ($\beta=0.619$; $p<0.05$). The study found that community has been in the forefront of collaborating with the police. The study also shows that there was need for a partnership between police and the community for a sustained peace and harmony in the society. Majority of respondents agreed that partnering with the police has enabled easy identification of criminal activities. The study concludes that community partnership significantly influences monitoring and evaluating community safety. The study recommends that effective collaborations between law enforcement and community stakeholders are critical to public safety, and it's critical that government agencies, community organizations, nonprofits, companies, and private citizens all see public safety as a shared duty. There is need for more involvement of all key stakeholders in maintaining security.

KEY WORDS: Community Partnership, Monitoring and Evaluating, Community Safety

INTRODUCTION

Community safety is a global necessity. Community safety is about feeling safe, whether at home, in the street or at work. It relates to quality of life and being able to pursue and obtain the fullest benefits from your domestic, social and economic lives without fear or hindrance from crime and disorder (US Department of Justice, 2021). A safe and healthy workplace not only protects workers from injury and illness, it can also lower injury/illness costs, reduce absenteeism and turnover, increase productivity and quality, and raise employee. Across the globe, policing and community safety partnerships (PCSPs) or community policing programs set up to help make communities safer.

One of the fundamental objectives of police reforms globally is to (re)establish confidence in the state police and create

relationship of trust between police officers and citizens (Zikhali, 2019; Biwott, 2017). The delivery of community safety requires the integration and collaboration of services and partnership working to ensure a wrap around, holistic approach.

Researchers in the field of community policing found that police do not have adequate resources to address the underlying challenges and causes of societal problems and challenges hence they need support for other state agencies such as civil society (Diphorn & Van Stapele, 2021). Equally, police need public support to obtain timely information for preventing and addressing crime problems. For instance, Diphorn and Van Stapele (2021) observed that through social control, police have the opportunity to directly solve social environment. The police can serve as a catalyst, challenging people to accept their share



of responsibility for overall quality of life in their respective communities.

Denney and Jenkins (2013) opined that particularly segment of the society has become particularly victims of growing insecurity and social disorder. This resulted into increased call among scholars, policy makers and academics for a shift in the philosophy of police work from an exclusive law enforcement approach to one that also focuses on partnerships, problem-solving and leadership (Denney & Jenkins, 2013). Partnerships in policing appears to be an alternative method of combating insecurity since the traditional policing approach has not provided answers to crime problems in the area. Globally, community partnerships in policing have been effectively implemented in countries such as the United Kingdom, Australia, and Holland (Dempsey & Forst, 2009; Khamisi & Mange, 2020).

Lawrence and McCarthy (2013) added that community partnership is more than just frequently sharing information and contacting each other but rather involves an ongoing effort to work together in meaningful ways for the purpose of addressing security problems facing the neighbourhood. Partnering requires that community is continually involved in decisions regarding security operations and measures within the community. The community tends to feel part of the team in the event that they are fully engaged and equal partners (Azemi, 2017). Biwott (2017) opined that for community partnership to be effective, there is need for some degree of mutual respect and trust between the community and the police department. Thus, the first step to effective community partnership is ensuring that there is trust between the police and the communities.

Across the continent implementation of the community policing strategy and specifically the role of monitoring community safety is still a daunting task. For instance, in Nigeria, Arisukwu, Igbolekwu, Oye, Oyeyibo et al, (2020) observe that the absence of social infrastructure, inadequate police presence and government support to unemployed youths made the crime situations worse in rural areas. There was low level of community interactions with the police in crime prevention and control in rural Nigeria. In Rwanda, Bizimana and Umutohi (2019) discuss how community night patrols commonly referred to as *ironde ry'umwuga* have been effective in crime prevention.

The Kenyan state has used community policing as a vehicle to transform state police towards people-centered policing and numerous projects have been undertaken in the past decades (Andrew, 2007; Chumba, 2012). The traditional style of policing, which primarily focused on the exclusive enforcement of law, the efficiency of rapid response as a mean to addressing crime and the bureaucratization of the police has however proven to be no longer appropriate for tackling the emerging

crime problems and safety concerns of the contemporary society (Chumba, 2012).

In a study in Kenya, Kiptoo (2017) opined that problem-oriented community policing is mainly concerned with encouraging creative problem solving among community members and police officers in identifying the root causes of the problem and figuring out how the problem can be best addressed. Kiptoo (2017) observed that police departments grounded on community policing tend to train and assign their officers to duties which are focused on creative and active problem solving and prevention instead of just reacting to criminal activities and disorderliness.

The Kenyan Constitution provides a strong foundation for the country's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) practices by strongly advocating for responsive, accountable and effective institutions (Republic of Kenya, 2012). Given the clarity of the transformation agenda in Kenya's State, provided by the new Constitution and Vision 2030 there is a unique opportunity for planning, budgeting, monitoring and evaluation to be placed at the heart of new institutional arrangements (Republic of Kenya, 2007). Notwithstanding CP elements implementation in Kenya has faced many challenges and these include poor public image of the police force; poor customer service procedures within the police force, which discourage the residents from reporting crime; belief by the residents that crime is a source of livelihood for some people, pressure to demonstrate that COP reduces crime, and lack of support from local government (Amuya, 2017). These are likely to also compromise the capacity and/or efficacy of the CP elements in monitoring and evaluating community safety.

Personal Safety and the right to live devoid of fear is fundamental for people in Kenya, particularly among the poor and underprivileged individuals. Social and economic development can be improved, hence benefiting the Kenyan economy and quality of life of the general population through reduction in criminal activities. There are still numerous cases reported, which depict deplorable community safety in some parts of the country. One such area is Lamu Lamu West Sub-County. An example includes the killing of six people in Witho and another in Bobo –Sunkia villages in Hindi, in Lamu West, and which resulted in mass exodus of residents. This raises questions as to the strength of monitoring and evaluation of community safety in the area.

Though community policing elements such as community partnership have been mentioned as possible CP elements that can influence monitoring and evaluation of community safety, there is limited research to ascertain this in Lamu West Sub County. This study has been prompted by the paucity of past studies on the significance of community partnership on monitoring and evaluation of community safety in Lamu West



Sub County. Nevertheless, existing studies conducted in different counties in Kenya appear to ignore these three elements with respect to monitoring of community safety. It is against this background that this study is conducted to access the community policing indicators elements on monitoring and evaluating community safety in Lamu West Sub-County

Community Partnership and Monitoring and Evaluating of Community Safety

Oliver (2004) cited that police-community partnership is a complete scale attempt that tries to acquaint community and the police with each other's challenges and stimulate actions aimed at fixing those problems. Each parties have to be concerned in identifying and fixing all kinds of issues. Lab (2004) posits the significance of police-network with family members and the community on policing implementation as follows: community policing calls for co-operation among police and the opposite individuals of the community. Police-network relations try to clear up the abhorrence or anathema among regulation enforcement and residents by beginning lines of communication. Both Oliver (2004) and Lab (2004) relate to developed countries context which may not be similar to that in developing countries.

Research conducted by Reuland et al. (2006) found that community partnership was important in handling domestic violence incidents and victims. According to Reuland et al. (2006), partnership members were in the planning committees, teams, task force and coalitions mandated at addressing domestic violence. Another study conducted by Headley (2018) found that community partnership was the determining factor on whether a survivor reports violence and receive adequate treatment and whether violence perpetrators is apprehended, investigated and prosecuted. Denney and Jenkins (2013) found that adoption of community partnership was fundamental in increasing trust and effectiveness of police in preventing and responding to violence against women.

Biwott (2017) also concluded that community policing is premised on the argument that solving of criminal activities and promoting safety within the community requires partnership and collaboration between the police and the communities. Important partners in community policing include community members who include formal and informal community leaders, activists, volunteers and other government agencies like probation and parole officers. However, regression analysis conducted by Njiri et al. (2014) found that community policing had insignificant positive relationship with safety and crime level. Thus, Njiri et al. (2014) concluded that there was no adequate information on community policing to public officers and this might affect their partnership and interactions with stakeholders. However, to the best of the knowledge of the researcher, limited studies have been conducted to this end in

Lamu County, Kenya. Moreover, the studies conducted seemed to ignore the aspect of monitoring and evaluation of community safety. As such, the focus of the researcher will be to investigate the influence of community partnership on monitoring and evaluation community safety.

Study Area

The study assessed the community policy indicators on monitoring and evaluating community safety in Lamu West Sub-County. The area is also one of the electoral constituencies of Lamu County, Kenya. It is one of two constituencies in Lamu County. The constituency has eleven wards, all electing MCAs for the Lamu County Assembly. Over the last decade, the area has been marred with insecurity stemming from terrorist activities.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study utilized a descriptive survey research to effectively assess the community policing elements on monitoring and evaluating community safety in Lamu West Sub-County. Mugenda and Mugenda (2012), highlights that a descriptive survey configuration reveals existing associations among factors under examination. The exploration approach doesn't at any rate endeavor to transform anything in that course of action.

Target population is defined as a universal set of the study of all members of real or hypothetical set of people, events or objects to which an investigator wishes to generalize the result. Mugenda and Mugenda (2003) define the target population as a complete set of individuals, case or objects with the same common observable characteristics. The study targeted 32,873 households 15 Community policing committee members, 15 chiefs, 5 police officers, 4 ACCS and 1DCC. Table 1 shows the target population.

A sample is a smaller group or sub-group obtained from the accessible population (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999). This sub-group is carefully selected so as to be representative of the whole population with the relevant characteristics. The researcher adopted the 30% of the total population. According to Mugenda and Mugenda (2003), a sample can comprise of 10-30% of the population provided it is sufficient.

Using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table of sample size determination a population of 9,862 gives 370 as the sample size. Moreover, using proportionate sampling technique, each stratum was apportioned the random samples. Finally, simple random sampling technique was used to obtain the required samples in each stratum.

The study adopted multistage sampling procedure. Purposive sampling technique was employed to select community policing committee members, chiefs, ACCS and DCC. This is justified



by the fact the there is only one chief ACCS and DCC in a given location. Furthermore, household heads were selected using proportionate sampling technique to apportion the samples in each category. Finally, simple random sampling technique was used to obtain the required samples for the households.

Data was collected using questionnaires. The study utilized a 5 Likert scale guided the responses, which is represented as follows (SA) = Strongly Agree; (D) = Agree; (N) = Neutral; (2) = Disagree; and (1) = Strongly Disagree. Data was analysed for descriptive statistics and inferential statistics using SPSS.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Community Partnership and Community Safety

Descriptive statistics for Community Partnership and Community Safety were as provided in Table 1. The results are presented in Table 10. The surveyed respondents indicated that they would want to have community partnership with police for improving on community safety. It was observed that 16% of respondents agreed that there should be good cooperation between the community and the police. There was consensus among the study participants that community partnership is fundamental for promoting peace and stability. However, 43.3% of respondents disagreed that there was a good cooperation between the community and the police. This view was upheld by 35% of those who disagreed that police community partnership has brought peace and stability Lamu West Constituency. It is imperative that there exists a partnership between police and the community for a sustained peace and harmony in the society. These findings concur with that of Headley (2018) who asserts that maintaining public safety and successful policing requires strong relationships of mutual trust between police agencies and the communities they serve. Community members are relied upon to offer information about crime in their communities and to collaborate with the police in devising solutions to crime and disorder issues. Equally, community members' willingness to trust the police is also reliant on whether they believe police activities reflect community values and include procedural fairness and legitimacy principles.

On a positive perspective, it was established that up to 27.9% of the respondents agreed that their community has been in the forefront of collaborating with the police. Similarly, 24.5% agreed that partnering with the police has enabled easy identification of criminal activities. This implies that when there is good partnership between police agencies and community members, a feasible peace in the community will be realized. This finding agrees with that of Jannetta and Lachman (2011) who asserts that the police can assist with monitoring probationers and parolees to enhance their accountability far beyond what any supervision officer can do alone, but only if police have access to information on the supervisees and the conditions of supervision for which they are accountable. Police encountering supervisees also gain valuable real-time intelligence regarding how they are doing, but this can be shared only if the police can readily identify the supervision officer.

The significance of community partnership has also been demonstrated by Denney and Jenkins (2013) where they observed that community partnership is fundamental in increasing trust and effectiveness of police in responding to violence. Consistent with the present study, Njiri et al. (2014) observed that there is still no adequate information regarding community policing to public officers and this might affect their partnership and interaction with the local community. Poor public image was found to be the deterrent to effective implementation of community policing in Kajiado South Sub-County (Mwaura, 2014). These findings imply that most people in Lamu West sub-county believe that community partnership is fundamental for enhancing community safety. These surveyed individuals believe that aspects such as consultation, participation and engagement are fundamental for enhancing community safety. Nevertheless, most of the participants agreed that the level of community partnership is not sufficient in Lamu West subcounty hence the need for community leaders and police departments to engage in a continuous consultations, participation and engagements.

Table 1: Community Partnership

Statement	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean	Std. Dev.
Would you want to have a good cooperation between your community and the police for safety	13.8%	43.3%	13.7%	16.0%	13.2%	2.71	1.26
Police community partnership has brought peace and stability Lamu west constituency	15.6%	35.0%	15.3%	26.1%	8.0%	2.75	1.22
My community has been in the forefront of collaborating with the police.	13.5%	39.0%	9.8%	27.9%	9.8%	2.81	1.25
Partnering with the police has enabled easy identification of criminal activities	15.6%	30.1%	12.6%	24.5%	17.2%	2.97	1.36
Overall mean Index						2.81	1.06
Valid N (listwise)						326	

**Monitoring and Evaluating Community Safety**

Monitoring and evaluating community safety is critical in documenting safety concerns in a community. The findings indicate that 30.7% of the respondents disagreed that there was adequate sensitization on monitoring and evaluating community safety. Moreover, 29.4% also disagreed that monitoring and evaluation of community partnership has result to increase in community safety. This could hamper efforts of evaluating safety and security issues in a community. These findings agree with those of Sherman (2001) indicates that the effectiveness of community policing is heavily reliant on information from members of the public, who provide information with authorities on a regular basis, resulting in enhanced societal security.

Community challenges should take the shortest time to be resolved for a sustainable peace to be realized. From the study findings, it was established that up to 33.7% of the respondents agreed that the timelines allocated for the community problem solving has greatly reduced through monitoring and evaluation.

Moreover, 26.4% of respondents similarly agreed that monitoring and evaluating has assisted in documenting the security progress of the community. It is no surprise the majority of respondents agreed that Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Leadership has greatly Improved community safety. This could be a factor that leads to accountability and responsiveness of community leaders to the needs of the community pertaining security safety in Lamu West Sub-County. Thatcher (2001) reports that community policing encounters a number of roadblocks, one of which is a clash of values and priorities followed by social institutions.

Inferential statistics allows researchers to describe data and draw inferences and conclusions from it. By using inferential statistics, an individual can deduce what a population believes or how it has been affected based on sample data. This section begins with the diagnostic tests followed by ANOVA tests. Moreover, Pearson Correlation as well as regression analysis was run.

Table 2: Monitoring and Evaluating Community Safety

Statement	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean	Std. Dev
There is adequate sensitization on monitoring and evaluating community safety	15.6%	30.7%	16.6%	23.9%	13.2%	2.88	1.3
Monitoring and evaluation of community partnership has result to increase in community safety	18.4%	29.4%	16.3%	23.9%	12.0%	2.81	1.31
The timelines allocated for the community problem solving has greatly reduced through monitoring and evaluation	12.6%	22.7%	16.9%	33.7%	14.1%	3.14	1.27
Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Leadership has greatly Improved community safety	9.8%	26.7%	16.6%	30.1%	16.9%	3.17	1.26
Monitoring and evaluating has assisted in documenting the security progress of the community	11.0%	28.5%	15.6%	26.4%	18.4%	3.12	1.31
Overall mean Index						3.02	0.89
Valid N (listwise)						326	

Correlation Analysis of Community Partnership, and Monitoring and Evaluating Community Safety

The results in Table 3 revealed that there exists a positive and statistically significant relationship between community partnership and monitoring and evaluating community safety ($r=0.733^{**}$; $p<0.01$). This implies that when aspects such as

community consultation, participation, training, and capacity building is enhanced, monitoring, and evaluating community safety will be improved. Conversely, when these features are lacking evaluating community safety will become impossible. In order to promote community safety, community partnership should be one of the areas of strategic focus. Community



partnership can be encouraged through consultations and engagement between the community members and police

departments to identify and mitigate criminal activities in the community.

Table 3: Correlations Matrix

		Monitoring and Evaluating Community Safety
Community Partnership	Pearson Correlation	.733**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000
	N	326

Regression Analysis

Model Summary

The influence of community partnership on the dependent variable is analyzed using multiple linear regression analytic framework. The finding is presented subsequently. The results

shows that the adjusted R Square value of 0.538 indicates that up to 53.8% in monitoring and evaluating community safety is explained by other contributors / variables. This leaves 46.2% as unexplained variation that can be elucidated by other factors outside the model.

Table 4: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.733a	.538	.537	.610

a. Predictors: (Constant), Community Partnership.

Model Robustness

The strength of the model was tested at 0.05 test significance level by using the three independent variables. The results are presented in Table 5. The results indicates that the model was

statistically significant in predicting monitoring and evaluating community safety using these variables: community leadership, community partnership, community problem solving at 0.05 alpha levels, $r^2 = 0.538$, $F(1,324) = 377.297$; $p < 0.05$.

Table 5: ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	140.558	1	140.558	377.297	.000 ^b
Residual	120.703	324	.373		
Total	261.260	325			

a. Dependent Variable: Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Safety

b. Predictors: (Constant), Community Partnership

The Beta coefficients

The strength and significance of community partnership was analyzed and presented in Table 6. It was observed from the results that community partnership significantly influences monitoring and evaluating community safety ($\beta = 0.619$; $p < 0.05$). This implies that a unit increase in community partnership increases monitoring and evaluating community safety by 0.615

positive units. This means that community partnership was a strong predictor in monitoring and evaluating community safety.

The overall model of the research:

$$Y = \beta_0 + \beta_3 X_3 + \epsilon$$

$$Y = 1.285 + 0.619(\text{community partnership}) + 0.096$$

Table 6: Beta Coefficients

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	1.285	.096		13.391	.000
Community Partnership	.619	.032	.733	19.424	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Safety



CONCLUSION

The study concludes that community partnership significantly influences monitoring and evaluating community safety ($\beta=0.619$; $p<0.05$). This implies that when aspects such as community consultation, participation, training, and capacity building is enhanced, monitoring, and evaluating community safety will be improved. Conversely, when these features are lacking evaluating community safety will become impossible.

RECOMMENDATIONS

First the study recommends that effective collaborations between law enforcement and community stakeholders are critical to public safety, and it's critical that government agencies, community organizations, nonprofits, companies, and private citizens all see public safety as a shared duty.

The study found that there were cases where community stakeholders are not actively involved in monitoring and evaluation of community safety. There is need for more involvement of all key stakeholders in maintaining security.

REFERENCES

1. Adams, R. E., Rohe, W. M., & Arcury, T. A. (2015). Awareness of community-oriented policing and neighborhood perceptions in five small to midsize cities. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33(1), 43-54.
2. Andrew W. K. (2007). *Community policing best ways to arrest run away insecurity*. Daily Nation, p. 12
3. Arisukwu, O. Igbolekwu, C. Oye, J. Oyeyipo, E. Asamu, F. Rasak, B. Oyekola, I. (2020). Community participation in crime prevention and control in rural Nigeria, *Heliyon*, 6(9), 7-18
4. Azemi, F. (2017). The role of leadership in community partnership, organizational changes and decision-making process in addressing crime issues, and terrorism. *Eurasian Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(3), 19-23
5. Barlow, D. E., and Barlow, M H. (2009). *Community Policing in the United States: Social Control Through Image Management*, In D. Wisler And I. D. Onwudiwe (Eds), *Community Policing: International Patterns and Comparative Perspectives*, Boca Raton, Florida, Pp. 167-188.
6. Bayley D. H. (2005). *Community Policing the Implementation Process*; State University of New York At Albany For The Civilian Police Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations
7. Bayley, D. H. (1986). *Community Policing in Australia: An Appraisal*. Working Paper. South Africa: National Police Research Unit.
8. Bayley, D. H. (1989). *Model Of Community Policing: The Singapore Story*. Washington,
9. Bayley, D. H. (1994). *Police for the Future*. New York, NY [U.A.: Oxford Univ. Press.
10. Biwott, F. J., (2017). *Factors influencing the implementation of community policing programme in Kenya: A case of Nyeri Police Station, Nyeri County*. University of Nairobi.
11. Boostrom, R. (2000). *The Community-Oriented Policing and Problem Solving Paradigm What Have We Learned?*
12. Brodgen, N. (2005). *Local Prosecutors response to crime*. Alexandria (U.S.A): Amer Prosecutors Research Institute.
13. Brown.L. (1990). *.Neighbourhood-oriented Policing*. American journal of Police
14. Bureau of Justice Assistance (1994). *Understanding Community Policing: A Framework For Action*. Washington: Bureau of Justice Assistance Response Center.
15. Boyd, J. H. (1992). *Leadership in community oriented policing*.
16. Carter, D. L. (2000). *A Policy Paper Revised For The Regional Community Policing Institute*. U.S: Regional Community Policing Training Institute.
17. Chumba, C. (2012). *Community Policing and its effect on terrorism in Kenya: a survey of Nairobi area Community Policing: The Middle Manager's Perspective*; *Police Quarterly Vol. 6 No. X, Month 2004 1-22*
18. Denney, L. & Jenkins, S. (2013). *Securing Communities: What and the How of Community Policing*, Background Paper. London, UK: Overseas Development Institute
19. Denney, L. & Jenkins, S. (2013). *Securing Communities: What and the How of Community Policing*, Background Paper. London, UK: Overseas Development Institute.
20. Department for International Development (DFID) Nigeria (2010). *Community Policing Frequently Asked Questions; Security, Justice and Growth Programme, Nigeria*
21. Diphoorn, T., & van Stapele, N. (2021). What Is Community Policing?: Divergent Agendas, Practices, and Experiences of Transforming the Police in Kenya. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 15(1), 399-411.
22. Gay, R. (1981). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and evaluation*. NewYork: McGraw-Hill.
23. Government of Kenya, (2005). *Message to the Nation by Hon. Mwai Kibaki, on the Launch of Community Policing at Ruai Police Station*,
24. Government Printers Kenya Henry, S. and Lanier. M. M. (2001). *What is Crime? Controversies over the Nature of Crime and What to Do About It*. UK: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
25. John Kenneth, G. & Addison-Wesley D. (1973). *Designing Complex Organizations*. Cross road Publishing
26. Justus, K., (2002). *Understanding community Based Policing*, Kenya Police Review.
27. Kenya Government, (2014). *National Community Policing Policy; Draft Policy*. Kenya: National Police Service.
28. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, (2013). *Persons Reported to Have Committed Offences Against Morality Other Persons By Gender, 2007-2012*.
29. Khamisi, S. N. & Mange, D. (2020). *Partnership between the police and community policing on enhancing security in Kwale County, Kenya*. *International Academic Journal of Law and Society*, 1(2), 46-67
30. Kiptoo, A. K., (2017). *Determinants of performance of community policing project in Kisii County, Kenya*. University of Nairobi.
31. Kirby, S. (2003). *Improving the effectiveness of partnerships in community safety*. Safer Communities.
32. Kothari C.R. (1999). *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*, (2nd edition), Wishwa Prakasha.
33. Kothari,C. (2003).*Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*. Second edition.



34. Lawrence P. R. and Lorsch. J.W. (1967). *Differentiation and Integration in Complex Organizations*. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 12, (1967), 1-30
35. Lawrence, S., & McCarthy, B. (2013). *What works in community policing: a best practices context for measure Y efforts*. *The Chief Justice Earl Warren Institute on Law and Social Policy*.
36. Mugenda, M. & Mugenda, G. (2003). *Research Methods. Quantitative and Qualitative approaches*. African Center For Technology Studies Press. Nairobi, Kenya.
37. Mukinda, F. (2010). *New Pay for Kenya Police on the Way*. *Daily Nation*, p 23.
38. *National Police Service Act (2014)*. Act No.11 of 2014 CAP 84 Published by the National Council for Law Reporting with the Authority of the Attorney-General.
39. *National Police Service Act (2014)*. Act No.11 of 2014 CAP 84 Published by the National Council for Law Reporting with the Authority of the Attorney-General.
40. Njiri, N. M., Ngari, L., & Maina, L. (2014). *Assessment of Implementation of Community Policing Programme in Nakuru Police Division, Nakuru County, Kenya*. *International journal of science and research*, 3.
41. *Qwetu News (January 7, 2022)*. *Learning Paralyzed in Lamu as Insecurity Levels Heighten*. <https://www.qwetunews.com/learning-paralysed-in-lamu-as-insecurity-levels-heighten/>
42. Reuland, M., Morabito, M. S., Preston, C., & Cheney, J. (2006). *Police-community partnerships to address domestic violence*. US Department of Justice COPS Office.
43. *The Constitution of Kenya (2010)*. Published by the National Council for Law Reporting with the Authority of the Attorney-General.
44. *US Department of Justice (2021)*. *Advancing Public Safety through Community Policing*. https://vrnclearinghousefiles.blob.core.windows.net/documents/COPS_Advancing%20Public%20Safety%20through%20Community%20Policing.pdf
45. Zikhali, W. (2019). *Community policing and crime prevention: Evaluating the role of traditional leaders under Chief Madliwa in Nkayi District, Zimbabwe*. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democracy*, 8(4), 109-122