



# ASSESSING THE INFLUENCE OF THE COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP IN MONITORING AND EVALUATING COMMUNITY SAFETY IN LAMU WEST SUB-COUNTY, KENYA

Madoya Micah<sup>1</sup>, Dr. George Wagah<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Isabella Asamba<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Student, Maseno University

<sup>2</sup>Lecturer, School of Planning and Architecture Department of Urban and Regional Planning Maseno University

<sup>3</sup>Lecturer, School of Planning and Architecture Department of Urban and Regional Planning Maseno University

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra12229>

DOI No: 10.36713/epra12229

## ABSTRACT

Despite the fact that community leadership as a key community policing element has been mentioned as a factor influencing 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 leadership 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 leadership and monitoring and evaluating of community safety at ( $\beta=0.106$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). The study concludes that community leadership 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. It is recommended that community leadership should be people centered in order to enhance accountability that seeks to promote community safety. There is need for more involvement of all key stakeholders in maintaining security. The government agencies in charge of community policing should consider ensuring that community leaders have the skills and competency of resolving security matters..

**KEY WORDS:** Community Leadership, monitoring and evaluating of community safety, Lamu West Sub-County.

## 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. Collaborative working helps maximise problem-solving in relation to crime prevention and disruption, enabling a proactive response to the top priorities and particular issues that are having the most negative impact on communities as they arise. Being motivated to this philosophy police emphasize community-



based policing under the community policing umbrella. But community policing is run in different ways in different countries like UK, USA, Singapore, and India (Islam, 2018).

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). Potential partners for community-based policing might include: Other government agencies, community leadership, traditional and community leaders, non-governmental / community-based service providers, and Private businesses (U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services, 2021).

Community leadership on the other hand is concerned with identification of key leaders in the society who would help in the implementation of community policing guidelines. Lawrence and McCarthy (2013) observed that leadership is key to the implementation of community policing and plays an integral role in the ensuring that there are opportunities for positive work. Lorie and Mary (2004) opined that community leaders have the responsibility of working closely with security agents to ensure that they keep their neighborhood safe. Community leaders are expected to stand firm against crime and foster crime prevention and intervention measures. Success of community policing requires sustained joint effort of community leaders working as the key opinion leaders in the community.

Research conducted by Azemi (2017) found that community leadership plays an integral role in building community partnership and also helps in addressing safety issues. Similarly, Zikhali (2019) in his study to evaluate the role of traditional leaders in community policing in Zimbabwe found that community policing is an important strategy for prevention of crime and promoting community safety and that community leaders play pivotal role in the success of community policing and crime prevention. Traditional leaders play an important role in the recruitment of members of the neighbourhood watch committee and ensure that business community cooperate with the police in the fight against crime and promoting community safety. Zikhali (2019) found that community leaders play integral role in organizing community members to attend crime awareness campaigns arranged by the police.

Wekesa and Muturi (2016) examined factors that affected the application of community policing as a strategy in crime prevention within Lamu West Sub- County. In the findings, key factors included transparency and poor training of community policing members hampered its implementation. Though this study looked at Lamu West Sub-County, it focused on factors that affected the application of community policing as a strategy in crime prevention but failed to examine community policing indicators on monitoring and evaluating community safety. This study therefore sought to fill this gap. Nevertheless, little is known with respect to role played by community leaders in monitoring and evaluating community safety.

The Kenya government 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).

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 leadership 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 leadership 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.

### 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 Leadership

The study investigated the effect of community leadership in monitoring and evaluating community safety in Lamu West Sub-County. The findings are presented in Table 2.

There was consensus among the study participants that community leadership is fundamental in enhancing community policing in Lamu West Sub-County. However, only 27% of the respondents agreed that their community leaders are in the forefront of spearheading community safety. This finding resonated with 31.3% of those who reported that their community leaders cooperate well with the police in ensuring peace and harmony prevails all the



time. This implies that there are still weaknesses in the ability of community leaders to spearhead community safety. According to UNHCR report of (2008) a community-based approach can help communities work to prevent social problems and to deal directly with those that do arise, instead of having external actors' step in and assume these responsibilities. It supports persons of concern in re-establishing familiar cultural patterns and support structures.

Community leadership has a central role in evolution and cultivating peace and coexistence in the community. From the study finding, it was observed that 28.5% of respondents agreed that their community leaders have ensured that peace methodology are in accordance with the laws of the land. However, 26.4% of respondents disagreed that their community leaders have the skills and competency of resolving security matters. This could affect the extent to which monitoring and evaluating community safety is achieved. According to Kolzow (2014), successful leaders have the self-discipline and perseverance to "keep the course." Effective leadership is also about developing character that strives to make a positive change in the organization so that the organization can make a positive difference in the community or region it serves.

These findings are consistent with the work of Mutanna and Bukaliva (2015) who found that community leaders have an instrumental role to play in ensuring that societal values and norms are preserved during community policing initiatives. Wekesa and Muturi (2016) also found that lack of transparency and poor training of community policing members hampered its implementation. As such, community leadership is fundamental in the success of community policing. These findings have suggested that the role of community leaders in community policing is key and strategic. The study found that the roles of community leadership is fundamental in the event that social institutions are under pressure to meet the increasing community expectations. Community expectation is the community leadership will work closely with the police to ensure a safe and crime free environment. Lamu West sub-county needs to identify community leaders who will work together with police department to identify problems and challenges communities are facing and coming up with solutions to these problems.

**Table 1: Community Leadership**

Statement	SD	D	U	A	SA	Mean	Std. Dev.
My community leaders are in the forefront of spearheading community safety	15.6%	27.6%	11.7%	27.0%	18.1%	3.04	1.37
My community leaders cooperate well with the police in ensuring peace and harmony prevails all the time	10.1%	34.0%	16.0%	31.3%	8.6%	2.94	1.18
My community leaders have ensured that peace methodology are in accordance with the laws of the land	12.3%	25.8%	20.6%	28.5%	12.9%	3.03	1.24
My community leaders have the skills and competency of resolving security matters	14.7%	26.4%	17.5%	25.2%	16.3%	3.01	1.32
<b>Overall mean Index</b>						<b>3.01</b>	<b>1.04</b>
<b>Valid N (listwise)</b>						<b>326</b>	

### Monitoring and Evaluating Community Safety

Monitoring and evaluating community safety is critical in documenting safety concerns in a community. The findings indicates 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, on the other hand, encounters a number of roadblocks, one of which is a clash of values and priorities followed by social institutions.

**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	1.30
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
<b>Overall mean Index</b>						<b>3.02</b>	<b>0.89</b>
<b>Valid N (listwise)</b>						<b>326</b>	

**Descriptive Statistics for Community Leadership, and Monitoring and Evaluating Community Safety**

Using mean computations for the specific independent variables scores and dependent variable scores. The average mean scores for the variables were then used as input data for correlations. The mean scores were computed as shown in Table 3. The results show that the mean scores for Community leadership was 3.01, while that of Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Safety was 3.03. When rounded off all the scores were 3.0, the neutral score. All the mean score were close to the neutral score, implying that both variables needed to be enhanced in Lamu West Sub County.

**Table 3: Community Leadership, and Monitoring and Evaluating Community Safety**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Community Leadership	326	1	5	3.01	1.048
Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Safety	326	1	5	3.03	.897
Valid N (listwise)	326				

**Association between Community Leadership and Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Safety**

A Pearson correlation analysis was run to determine the nature and significance of relationship that existed between the independent and dependent variables of the study. The results were as presented in Table 4. It was found that there was a positive Pearson correlation between community problem solving and monitoring and evaluation of community safety at  $r = 0.579$ ;  $p = 0.000$ . Given that  $p$  is less than 0.05, the results are interpreted to be statistically significant. This implies that a unit increase in community leadership attracts an increase of 0.579 in monitoring and evaluation of community safety.

This suggests that when leadership that is people centered, accountability and with accessibility is advocated, monitoring, and evaluating community safety will improve in the community. As such, the findings of this study imply that community policing in Lamu West Sub-County can be enhanced by having in place appropriate community leadership which can work closely with police department in security matters.



**Table 4: Association between Community Leadership and Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Safety**

		Community Leadership	Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Safety
Community Leadership	Pearson Correlation	1	.579**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	326	326
Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Safety	Pearson Correlation	.579**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	326	326

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

### Regression Analysis

A linear regression was computed to determine the influence of Community Leadership, and Monitoring and Evaluation of Community. The findings are presented in the Model Summary, ANOVA and Beta coefficients sections.

### Model Summary

The results shows that the adjusted R Square value of 0.335 ( $r^2 = 33.5\%$ ) indicates that up to 33.5% in monitoring and evaluating community safety is explained by community problem solving. This leaves 66.5% as unexplained variation that can be elucidated by other factors outside the model.

**Table 5: Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.579 <sup>a</sup>	.335	.333	.732

a. Predictors: (Constant), Community Leadership

### Model Robustness

The strength of the model was tested at 0.05 alpha by using the independent variable and dependent variable. The results are presented in Table 6. The results indicates that the regression model was statistically significant in predicting monitoring and evaluating community safety using community leadership at 0.05 alpha levels,  $r^2 = 0.579$ ,  $F(1,324) = 163.434$ ;  $p < 0.05$ .

**Table 6: ANOVA**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	87.599	1	87.599	163.434	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	173.661	324	.536		
	Total	261.260	325			

a. Dependent Variable: Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Safety

b. Predictors: (Constant), Community Leadership

### The coefficients

The strength and significance of each independent variable was analyzed and presented in Table 7. The results show that community leadership significantly influence monitoring and evaluating community safety ( $\beta = 0.495$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ). This infers that a unit increase in community leadership increases monitoring and evaluating community safety by 0.106 positive units.

The overall model of the research:

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

$$Y = 1.536 + 0.495(\text{community leadership}) + 0.124$$



**Table 7: Beta Coefficients**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1 (Constant)	1.536	.124		12.438	.000
Community Leadership	.495	.039	.579	12.784	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Monitoring and Evaluation of Community Safety

**Conclusion**

The study concludes that community leadership significantly influences monitoring and evaluating community safety ( $\beta=0.495$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). In other words, community leadership is a significant predictor to successful monitoring and evaluation of community safety. This suggests that when leadership that is people centered, accountability and with accessibility is advocated, monitoring, and evaluating community safety will improve in the community.

**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. It is recommended that community leadership should be people centered in order to enhance accountability that seeks to promote community safety.

There is need for more involvement of all key stakeholders in maintaining security. The government agencies in charge of community policing should consider ensuring that community leaders have the skills and competency of resolving security matters.

**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. Igbokwu, 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. 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*.
7. Carter, D. L. (2000). A Policy Paper Revised For The Regional Community Policing Institute. U.S: Regional Community Policing Training Institute.
8. 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*
9. Cross, C. (2013). Community Policing Through Local Collective Action in Tanzania:
10. Denney, L. & Jenkins, S. (2013). *Securing Communities: What and the How of Community Policing, Background Paper*. London, UK: Overseas Development Institute
11. Denney, L. & Jenkins, S. (2013). *Securing Communities: What and the How of Community Policing, Background Paper*. London, UK: Overseas Development Institute.
12. Dwayne L. (2002). *Community Policing: Building Relationships*, Detroit Police Department
13. Ferreira, D. (2001). *Cantoday's police organization effectively implement community policing? ‘‘*, in Rosenbaum, D.P. (Ed.), *The Challenge of Community Policing*, Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA, pp.249-57.
14. Gay, R. (1981). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and evaluation*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
15. Government of Kenya, (2005). *Message to the Nation by Hon. Mwai Kibaki, on the Launch of Community Policing at Ruai Police Station*,
16. 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.
17. Justus, K., (2002). *Understanding community Based Policing*, Kenya Police Review.



18. Kalunta-Crumpton, A. (2009). *Patterns of Community Policing In Britain*”, In D. Wisler and I. D. Onwudiwe (Eds), *Community Policing: International Patterns and Comparative Perspectives*, CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, Pp. 149-166.
19. Kelling, G. & Mark, M. (1988). *The evolving strategy of policing in perspective on policing*. Washington, D.C. National Institute of Justice
20. Kenya Government, (2014). *National Community Policing Policy; Draft Policy*. Kenya: National Police Service.
21. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, (2013). *Persons Reported to Have Committed Offences Against Morality Other Persons By Gender, 2007-2012*.
22. Lawrence P. R. and Lorsch. J.W. (1967). *Differentiation and Integration in Complex Organizations*. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 12, (1967), 1-30
23. 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.
24. Lorie, F. & Mary, A. (2004). *Community Policing in the past the present*, library of Congress, Washington.
25. Mazerolle, P., Adams, K., Budz, D., Cockerill, C. And Vance, M. (2003). *On The Beat: An Evaluation of Beat Policing in Queensland*. Brisbane: Crime and Misconduct Commission.
26. Miller, M. (2003). *Content Validity*, November, 2003. National Police Service Act, (2011). PART XI-Community Policing Forums and committees Monitoring and Evaluation Report (3rd Ed). (2008). KEPSA and BAF Community Policing Project Stakeholder Organization and Forward-Looking Strategies Nairobi Province Kenya.
27. Mugenda, M. & Mugenda, G. (2003). *Research Methods. Quantitative and Qualitative approaches*. African Center for Technology Studies Press. Nairobi, Kenya.
28. Mutanana N and Gasva D (2015) *Barriers to and consequences of reporting rape in a rural community of Zimbabwe*. *Developing Country Studies* 5(14), 15–21.
29. 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.
30. 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.
31. Qwetu News (January 7, 2022). *Learning Paralysed in Lamu as Insecurity Levels Heighten*. <https://www.qwetunews.com/learning-paralysed-in-lamu-as-insecurity-levels-heighten/>
32. Peak, K. & Glensor, R. (2002). *Community policing and problem-solving: Strategies and practices*. Upper Saddle River, N. J: Prentice Hall
33. Sherman, L.W. (2001). *Attacking Crime: Police and Crime Control*. In M. Tonry and N. Morris (eds.), *Modern Policing*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
34. *The Constitution of Kenya* (2010). Published by the National Council for Law Reporting with the Authority of the Attorney-General.
35. United Nations Office on drugs and Crime (2009), *World drug report Objects and Functions of the National Police Service*. P148
36. Ursula, W. (2010). *What solutions do you propose? What is a Pilot study?* Ed in boro University of Penny slvania. *The Daily Nation, Special Feature*.
37. 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](https://vrnclearinghousefiles.blob.core.windows.net/documents/COPS_Advancing%20Public%20Safety%20through%20Community%20Policing.pdf)
38. 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