

Systematically Review and Synthesize Police Community Relations to Jointly Combat Crime Through Community Policing, Community-Oriented Policing, and Problem-Oriented Policing

Dr. John Motsamai Modise
South African Police Service

Abstract:- The article systematically review and synthesize police community relations to jointly combat crime through community policing, community-oriented policing, and problem-oriented policing. The first section explains how community policing has become more popular as a method of enhancing safety and security for the general populace. In order to resolve security issues and other issues with social order, it aims to change how policing organizations solve problems by moving away from relying on criminal law and processes and toward using cooperative extra-legal approaches.

The second segment examines problem-oriented policing, which uses analysis to create crime-reduction strategies. To assess crime issues and create effective solutions, this technique makes use of theories of criminal opportunity, such as rational choice and routine behaviours. This flexible and dynamic analytic method, which frequently goes by the name scanning, analysis, response, and assessment [SARA] model, employs a fundamental iterative process of problem identification, analysis, response, assessment, and adjustment of the response to provide a framework for revealing the intricate mechanisms underlying crime problems and for creating individualized interventions to address the underlying causes of crime problems. The final paragraph explains the policing of shattered windows below. Police agencies adopt a perspective of their role that goes beyond simply responding to and processing crimes when they practice community-oriented policing, which has been referred to as both an organizational approach and a policing philosophy. This vision typically incorporates the participation of neighbourhood organizations and individuals in the coproduction of safety, crime prevention, and solutions to neighbourhood issues by police agencies.

Keywords:- Community; Community Policing, Crime; Partnership; Participation, Policing; Crime Prevention; Problem Solving Strategy; Perceptions, Police Officers.

I. INTRODUCTION

"Community policing is a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systematic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public

safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime," according to a statement from the National Community Policing Association. Currently, community policing is the most effective kind of policing, and the police should focus their efforts on building partnerships with the community. (Abebe, 2000:4).

To prevent crime, community policing is a difficult endeavour. The ability and credibility of officers and other community policing players to identify criminal activity, crimes, and assure the capture of suspects can, on the other hand, be significantly improved by community policing. Instead of affecting the officers' abilities to fight crime, it enhances citizens' communication, knowledge, and skills. Although some of these tactics may be used specifically in community policing, community policing is a collective effort by all stakeholders to reduce crime in any general area of a community. It does not imply the presence of a satellite police station in the community area, nor does it mean a program that only focuses on that one area. It should be obvious that this change has not been the result of a single program or project when any government official claims to have practiced community policing in the recent past (Shaftoe, 2004).

Contrary to traditional policing, which focuses on law enforcement and order maintenance, community-oriented policing (COP) places an emphasis on community involvement in crime prevention initiatives. Although previous narrative studies (Sherman and Eck 2002; Skogan and Frydl 2004; Weisburd and Eck 2004) found modest effects of COP on reducing crime, they do imply that it may have advantages for other outcomes, such as public satisfaction and trust in the police. Assessing the efficacy of COP presents a number of difficulties, including the lack of a clear logic model or widely acknowledged implementation structure, a broad interpretation of its scope, and the great variation in the sorts of methods that are categorized as COP. Therefore, we carried out a systematic review in an effort to identify and combine the various COP techniques.

The core of problem-oriented policing is that it requires law enforcement to examine issues, which may entail knowing more about both victims and offenders, and to carefully consider why they came together in the places that they did. Examining and recording the connections between people, places, and seemingly unconnected

occurrences is necessary. Police must then devise responses that might go beyond conventional police procedures. Finally, problem-oriented policing mandates that officers evaluate their performance. Did it succeed? What exactly did work? Did they have a bad idea that they failed to implement well, or did they have a good idea that they failed to implement adequately (Skogan & Frydl, 2004: 91).

Kaiser (1990) defined crime prevention or reduction as all actions taken with the specific goal of reducing the scope and severity of offending, whether by reducing chances for criminal activity or by influencing potential offenders and the broader public. According to Kaiser (1990), crime prevention results from lowering the likelihood of victimization while raising the likelihood of being detected. By doing this, the potential for victimization is diminished and the potential for social integration on a legal basis is increased. The desire to commit crimes must be decreased, while the desire to contribute to the betterment of society must be increased.

II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The broken windows theory and the social disorganization hypothesis, which are often two separate theories of crime, were the foundation for this article (Reisig, 2010; National Research Council, 2018). Both examine how the local environment influences crime and disorder. In accordance to the Broken Windows Theory (Wilson and Kelling, 1982), minor manifestations of physical and social disorder can develop into more major crimes and urban blight if ignored. Visual indicators of disorder (such broken windows in abandoned buildings, graffiti, and trash on the street) might make residents fearful and withdrawn. This in turn signals a lack of social control in the neighborhood or a significant decline in it, which can attract higher levels of disorder and crime (Hinkle and Weisburd, 2008). In reaction, the police maintain order by regulating minor violations and disturbances in order to safeguard the community and create control.

The four components of the shattered windows technique, initiatives based on this strategy may reduce crime (Kelling and Coles, 1996). According to this hypothesis, degraded regions with abandoned houses and shattered windows encourage greater deterioration by demonstrating to locals that no one respects property (Wilson & Kelling, 1982). Based on this idea, broken windows policing aims to deter minor offenses while also reducing total crime by preventing more significant ones. The first reason is that addressing disorderly behaviour puts authorities in contact with persons who conduct more serious crimes. Second, potential criminals are deterred from committing crimes by police's strong exposure. Third, locals take charge of their communities, which deters crime. Finally, crime is dealt with holistically as issues of disorder and crime fall under the purview of both the community and the police. According to the broken windows theory, local business owners and citizens are frequently involved in the identification of disorder problems as well as the

development and implementation of a solution (Braga, Welsh, and Schnell, 2015).

Social disorganization: As stated by Kubrin and Weitzer (2003), this theory focuses on how neighbourhood structure and crime interact to determine whether conditions are favourable or unfavourable for crime and delinquency. Social disorganization is the incapacity of a community to achieve shared objectives and address persistent issues. With regard to the social disorganization theory, neighbourhood characteristics like poverty, residential mobility, a lack of shared values, and weak social networks reduce a neighbourhood's ability to control its residents' public behaviour, increasing the likelihood of crime (Kornhauser, 1978; Shaw and McKay, 1969). Two examples of how researchers have conceived community policing using various applications of the social disorganization theory are the systemic model and collective efficacy (Reisig, 2010).

The systemic model emphasizes on the social controls that relational and social networks can perform to counteract the negative consequences of structural limitations such concentrated poverty and home instability. The model outlines three social order controls with escalating levels of influence: 1) private, which includes immediate family and close friends; 2) parochial, which includes neighbors and civic organizations; and 3) public, which includes law enforcement (Bursik & Grasmick, 1993; Hunter, 1985).

By collaborating with locals to create more robust regulatory mechanisms at the parochial and public levels, community policing initiatives based on the systemic model can improve informal social controls (Resig, 2010). Social disarray can be reduced by collective efficacy, which is referred to as social cohesiveness and unofficial social controls. By implementing measures that strengthen police legitimacy in the community and encourage procedurally equitable collaborations, community policing can foster collective efficacy by motivating citizens to take ownership of public places and activate local social controls (Resig, 2010).

III. THE FORMATION OF COMMUNITY POLICY

In several countries, community policing has become a major issue. The London Metropolitan Police District was established in 1829, marking the beginning of modern law enforcement organizations. The creation of a modern police force in Britain was a strategy employed by British legislators to deal with the growing criminal activity in and around the nation's capital city, which was influenced by a rapid increase in urbanization, illegal immigration, a high unemployment rate, alcoholism, violent political parties, subpar infrastructure, neglected children, and lenient punishment.

Sir Robert Peel, the head of the London Metropolitan Police, adopted modern practices, and his new "constables" put them into practice by showing the British and American police organizations how they operated (Friedman, 2000). The aforementioned guidelines put an emphasis on the

importance of adequate recruitment, selection, and training in order to support the stakeholders in community policing in their efficient performance. It was crucial that the public could visit police headquarters and/or centers.

Partnerships between municipal organizations, corporate groups, people, non-governmental organizations, and social media are a part of community policing and are used to build community policing strategies (Kucukuysal & Beyhan, 2011). The aforementioned organizations must cooperate to combat illicit activity and lessen crime. The entire community is expected to take steps to reduce crime, therefore community policing is not the sole job of the police. Rather, it should be seen as a collaborative obligation of all stakeholders in the fight against crime.

Community policing began as a result of police officers' increased visibility in local communities, which aimed to discourage criminal behaviour and decrease criminal activity. The contemporary form of community policing emerged in the 1960s and was later successfully applied in Britain to calm gang violence and urban unrest. At that point, police brutality in the face of crimes had harmed the public's perception of the police and strained relations with the general populace. Some police agencies realized that community people were present in places where police presence was required and that their engagement would restore faith after the public lost trust in the police departments. In turn, this helped the police rebuild their reputation by establishing and bolstering their presence in the neighbourhood (Jonyo & Buchere, 2011).

Community policing became the new form of crime prevention methods in the 1970s and 1980s as more police officers patrolled neighbourhoods across the United States and in nations in Europe. Additionally, the police started interacting with local residents, companies, and government agencies. This partnership's goal was to fight crime by working together to address the common issues that plague communities. However, strong concepts were put out to create "beast" strategies for regular patrol regions. Police personnel only arrived at the scene of a crime before 1829.

➤ *Patrols mostly concentrated on a small number of reported cases. Any arrests of suspects or attempts to dissuade crime were virtually by accident (Van der Spuy & Lever, 2010). In order to hold his police officers accountable for crime prevention and crime suppression within the confines of their policing zones, Peel was forced to position them in specific geographic locations. His 1829 plan was founded on his fervent expectation that the constables would:*

- Become well-liked and well-known among the people they serve who may be able to provide information on criminal behaviour.
- Get to know the residents and landmarks in the area they are police.
- Always be visible and take their responsibilities seriously when trying to stop criminals from conducting crimes nearby.

Peel introduced his second plan, the paramilitary command structure, to effectively carry out his neighbourhood patrol strategy of 1829. In addition to his belief in general civilian control, Peel also had faith in the paramilitary command structure to make sure that police constables would actually carry out their police team patrols and enforce the law on London's major streets and roads, something that their non-Para-military predecessors were unable to do (Friedman, 2000).

The approach used in community policing is quite labour-intensive. Because it was a less effective way to provide a police service, foot patrols were one of the primary elements that community policing agents abandoned before the new police generation. In order to properly deploy community policing, the city of Portland realized that it would be required to add 200 police constables to its existing 750-person force. The city of Houston abandoned its equally ambitious plan in the 1990s after being forced to fire 655 of its 4500 police constables due to financial cuts. Because Houston's tax base was shrinking, the government was forced to approve only a little amount of money for the expansion needed to make community policing successful (Murphy, 2000).

One of the key goals of police formation is the acknowledgement of good change brought about by both the police and community people working together. Since its inception, the police formation has recognized that in order to succeed in community policing, the police require a climate of trust and confidence in their relationship with the community, a willingness to learn from experience and share knowledge with other members of the structure on both an internal and external level, and—perhaps most crucially—a consideration of the shared interest the entire community has in better police services. The study that led to the old model of professional law enforcement being questioned and toward a new perspective on policing has been heavily emphasized by the police foundation. One might highlight the current widespread adoption of a community orientation. According to Berg & Shearing (2011), the foundation discovered in Kansas City that random preventative patrols might not be effective at deterring offenders. The foundation was the first to recognize how the police response time to a reported crime could affect whether or not a burglar or robber is apprehended.

The foundation was also responsible for helping the police in Houston and Newark to realize the benefits of door-to-door and foot patrolling in reducing public fear of crime and disturbance. The "broken windows" notion was developed as a result of the Newark Foot Patrol experiment conducted by the police foundation. There are good plans, many of which are new, while others have been used in the past, according to various research studies. However, none of them were able to lower perceived crime and disorder levels, lessen fear and concern about crime, increase community member satisfaction with the police service, decrease fear of crime, and, in some cases, actually lower

crime rates by staying in close contact with the people they serve.

➤ *Local issues can be recognized by the police, who can then quickly address them in cooperation with locals. This newly developed policing paradigm goes by various names; in some locations it is referred to as community or community-oriented policing, while in others it is known as problem-oriented policing. However, it has been identified as such and seeks to be based on some widely held convictions by both police and community members, such as:*

- The police have a duty to know about issues and not merely respond to incidents when they are reported.
- In addition to major crimes, the police should be concerned with issues that include commotion and discontent.
- The reduction of crime and management of disorder need constant cooperation to identify concerns of crime, to solicit help and to solve problems.
- Since the police are the most noticeable local government entity and are required to be on duty around-the-clock, they must be ready to act as mobilizing agents for other city/town agencies and services.

➤ *Community Policing*

As stated by Skogan (2006), Virta (2006), Innes (2003), Tilley (2003), and Fridell (2004), community policing has become a popular modern policing strategy in response to the public's declining trust in the police and mounting evidence that police forces cannot combat crime on their own. Community policing has undergone numerous definitions, interpretations, and implementations over the course of its evolution (Brookes, 2006; Palmiotto, 2000; Young and Tinsley, 1998), making it challenging to define.

Adams et al. (2002) argues that community policing is:

"... a concept that encourages organizational tactics that enable the methodical application of alliances and problem-solving methods to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues including crime, social disorder, and fear of crime. There is consensus that the ultimate objective should be to raise resident happiness and safety perceptions, but much else is still up for debate (Stein & Griffith, 2015).

In order to address the root causes of crime, fear of crime, physical and social disorder, and neighbourhood decay, it is generally acknowledged that community policing entails problem-solving and community engagement (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990; Palmiotto, 2000). In accordance to the literature, community policing's main goal is to foster good police-community relations, which is accomplished by including the community and emphasizing cooperation and prevention (Cordner and Biebel Perkins, 2005). By comparing patrol officers to the "society's emergency room physician" who responds quickly to an incident, Bucqueroux (2007) compares patrol officers to "family physicians who have the time and opportunity to not

only treat an illness but to prevent disease and promote good health."

In contrast to broken window policing, community policing, which is founded on the principle of collective efficacy, maintains that crime is best managed by a partnership between law enforcement and community members (Stamper, 2016). As the success of the collaboration depends on the development of strong, mutually trusting relationships, interpersonal skills are a major component of community policing training.

Partnerships between different stakeholders are used in community policing to establish policing strategies, which frequently leads to successful community policing implementation. Instead of leaving it up to the police to handle on their own, the community and police should work together to confront all illegal behaviour and curtail criminal activity. Additionally, under community policing, the police and the community must collaborate to find solutions to problems. In order to improve both the general quality of life and crime prevention in particular, community policing emphasizes the value of an active relationship between the police, civil society, and other government agencies. According to Deluca and Stone (1994:85), the goal of community policing is to bring law enforcement closer to the people whose lives and property are meant to be protected.

Community-based police agencies are aware that they must collaborate with people who have a shared responsibility for finding solutions to problems in order to effectively address these challenges. Community policing places a strong emphasis on prevention, early detection, and prompt response to address problems before they grow out of control. Individual officers typically perform the roles of generalists who combine public and private resources to produce results. Officers are urged to invest a lot of time and energy in establishing and upholding personal connections with residents, businesses, educational institutions, and community organizations (Radcliffe, 2004).

Community policing is democracy in action, according to the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA, 1994). Local government, business and civic leaders, public and private organizations, citizens, churches, schools, and hospitals must all actively participate. Police officers and everyone else who cares about the welfare of the community should collaborate. The aforementioned organizations must unite in their opposition to crime, violence, and disobedience of the law and pledge to stepping up their efforts in crime prevention and intervention (BJA, 1994:4).

In order to resolve disputes and address residents' worries, community stakeholders should frequently consult with the community's residents. However, due to the lack of execution and understanding of the necessity of community and police cooperation, the notion of community policing is still largely unknown. Understanding what members have to say and ensuring that there is a method to get that to the policy and implementation level are the responsibilities of

all parties involved in crime prevention. According to Ryan (2004), the results of the compilation would serve as the foundation for the community policing implementation approach, which would then be cascaded to the community for input.

Additionally, despecialization within the police force is encouraged by advocates of community policing, which leads to a decrease in the number of specialist units (Sloan et al., 2000). Line officers can become generalists with a wide range of problem-solving skills thanks to despecialization. Additionally, proponents of community policing suggest lowering formalization, which would lead to fewer formal written policies (Maguire, 1997). Due to the various and ever-changing nature of campus communities' populations and demands, less formalization enables officers to respond to community needs in a flexible and tailored fashion rather than utilizing a one-size-fits-all approach that may result from formal policy. The end result will be to incorporate community input to enhance police service because, unlike the police as an organization, which typically maintains peace and order through the use of tanks, forces, and checkpoints, the community's definition of peace is much closer to home.

Understanding the concept of community policing requires realizing that the role of the police officer shifts from that of a law enforcement officer only focused on crime reduction to one of a peace officer. It is clear that a police officer needs a broad range of knowledge and abilities because they are called upon to uphold the law when it doesn't appear to be being followed, to prevent crime, to guarantee the preservation of public order, to settle disputes between community members, to improve and promote police-community relations, and to provide necessary services and assistance to the general public.

For better policing, community policing should adopt a proactive manner. A proactive focus on crime prevention, resolving community issues, and addressing the causes of crime and disorder replaces the police's previous reactive concentration on major crime and subsequent overemphasis on law enforcement. Community policing, which employs all available resources to combat crime, addresses the causes of crime and disorder in collaboration with the community, and activates the community as a source of support and information, constitutes smart policing that mobilizes community members to act against crime (Faull & Rose, 2012).

Community police should adopt a more problem-oriented methodology in order to transition from a reactive to a proactive form of policing. This means that the key determinants of how police resources should be spent are no longer reported crimes, filed complaints, and phone calls. Police officers are still required to respond to individual complaints, but they are also encouraged to detect problems and make an effort to address reoccurring issues rather than waiting for community people to contact them (Van der Spuy, 2010).

Another component of best practices for neighbourhood policing is to develop swift reactions to crimes that are being committed and make an effort to find and pinpoint hidden sources of issues that call for police intervention before it is too late. Police services are not solely limited to a law enforcement type of policing that prioritizes arresting offenders and being visible in communities. To deal with criminal behaviour, a multitude of techniques and tactical measures have been implemented. By taking these steps, crime would actually be prevented and long-term remedies to it made possible. Furthermore, community policing acknowledges that law enforcement officials will never entirely eradicate criminal activity on their own. Police should set up platforms to build trusting connections with the community in order to jointly fight crime if community policing is to work.

In order to mobilize all residents, including community leaders, businesswomen, teachers, students, and government workers to fight crime, police must forge partnerships with various stakeholders at all levels. To minimize or eliminate crime and to give the community high-quality services, all of these members are viewed as equal and significant participants (Shaftoe, 2004).

Many nations throughout the world use the term "community policing" to describe the policing situation in any given environment. Problem-oriented policing, neighbourhood-oriented policing, or community-oriented policing are all terms used to describe measures used to deal with crime reduction tactics (Steinberg, 2011). The implementation of community policing was unsuccessful for a number of reasons, including misunderstanding of the idea of community policing, negative attitudes in the community toward crime prevention, and a lack of committees with various responsibilities for reducing crime.

The focus of community policing was on issue solutions rather than rapid incident response and quantitative performance without success. Additionally, it trespassed on the grounds of detectives and other specialized units, broke the established chain of command, and entered the functional domains of other authorities. Dissel and Frank (2012) emphasize that policing the community has garnered strong support at many levels, including from politicians, academics, officials at various ministries and government departments, and the media, despite the fact that the supporting evidence is mostly made up of unimportant facts. The police must take into account important strategic considerations including police-community consultation in accordance with the cooperation and relationship between the police and the community.

Community policing is a term used to describe a set of attitudes and methods that involve both the police and members of the public. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005), community policing is a technique that varies depending on the needs and potential solutions of the public and the police involved in the partnership. During policing activities, many people's major concerns and cooperative efforts are straightforward.

Community policing is a term used to describe a set of attitudes and methods that involve both the police and members of the public. According to Denzin and Lincoln (2005), community policing is a technique that varies depending on the needs and potential solutions of the public and the police involved in the partnership. During policing activities, many people's major concerns and cooperative efforts are straightforward. For the sake of this study, preventing crime is a method that is implemented and necessitates the involvement of both community members and police officers. It comprises a variety of fundamental and practical measures.

The definition of community policing is "a collaborative effort between the police and the community that identifies problems of crime and disorder and involves all elements of the community in the search for solutions to these problems" (Community Policing, 2005, para. 2). The Community Policing Consortium asserts that the three necessary and complimentary basic elements of community policing are problem-solving, community cooperation, and change management. In ways that traditional policing fails to do, community policing hinges on maximizing good interactions between patrol officers and members of the community.

Police administrators are coming to the conclusion that simply tweaking old management and operational procedures won't be enough to make the shift to community policing. Community policing is still developing and involves a range of theoretical and practical techniques (National Criminal Justice Reference, 1994, para. 2). The foundation of community policing is the idea that in order for problems to be identified and resolved, both the police and the community must work together (Bucqueroux & Trojanowicz).

Typical police definitions of community are found inside jurisdictional lines, particularly in those regions where crime figures are high and police resources are in high demand. Beyond the strict notion of groupings having demographic, social, and economic characteristics, people frequently have their own conceptions of community. The majority of these segments' members are unaware of their shared characteristics or that they normally belong to a distinct group (Carter, 2004). In contrast, one of the goals of community policing is to support the community in creating and maintaining a safe and secure environment as well as in securing it and catching criminals. Although they are some of the main objectives of community policing, they are not always the most crucial ones. According to Brown (2000), community policing is concerned with fighting the crime that the community is worried about, as well as with finding solutions to citizens' problems by collaborating with them and winning their support.

Among other things, coordinating with the police, government agencies, residents, and local businesses to handle issues that affect the neighbourhood is one of the most crucial objectives. The police should support community members in a variety of methods, including

surveys, meetings with the general public, events, and forums with interested participants. These are used by the police to ascertain the requirements of the community and what they are willing to do to address the issues they confront. When police officers and community people agree on a clear mission and goals, this is one way to assess whether community policing is effective.

Participation at all levels is crucial to securing commitment and achieving achievement after these precise goals have been established (Scott, 2002). The police department's aims should be understood by all community policing participants and police officers as representing their requirements. These goals' aims and objectives need to be periodically reevaluated in order to measure the progress made by stakeholders (Brogden & Nijhar, 2005). Community policing is set up very differently than the police are. Assets are redirected to establish precise guidelines that emphasize problem-solving methods and strategies so that the police can offer alternatives to conventional law enforcement.

➤ *Essential Factors of Community Policing*

The following key aspects of community policing's philosophy have been compiled from a variety of sources. Police must deliver a high-quality policing service that is effective and efficient—a concept known as service orientation. There must be equity in service delivery, as stated in the writings of Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994:9). This means that regardless of colour, gender, ethnicity, religious preference, income, sexual preference, or other distinctions, all residents will be required to receive adequate police service. According to the St. Petersburg Police Department (1992:35), being "service-oriented" is to be "other-oriented," not in the sense of abandoning your wants for those of others, but rather, in the sense of taking both your needs and the needs of others into account. It benefits both parties. To "serve" means to strive to "include" rather than to "exclude." It involves recognizing and upholding diversity, individual distinctions, and fundamental human rights.

Community cooperation, which entails adopting a police viewpoint that goes beyond the usual law enforcement emphasis, is another characteristic of community policing (Skogan, 2004: xxiv). In order to effectively share information with the community and conduct police activity, community policing urges the police and other organizations to build partnerships with the community. Partnerships "appear under a variety of headings and involve police in a wide range of capabilities to address specific problems," according to Lab (2004:201). Additionally, Radelet emphasizes cooperation or interprofessional approaches to solve community problems in his book *Community Participation...* Consider the crime issue. The police are obviously concerned about it. The judiciary and other criminal justice organizations are as well (Radelet, 1986:27).

In order to generate effective solutions that are rigorously assessed, problem resolution involves proactive

and methodical study of recognized issues (Trojanowicz, 1990). In order to solve the specific problems of the community and their causes, it is also a collaborative analytical process and strategy (Bullock & Tilley, 2003:143-5). So, another important characteristic of community policing is issue solving. Community empowerment is a crucial component of community policing. It refers to the methods by which individuals unite, achieve a common goal, and discover their own inner strength. The members of an empowered community must be willing to use that structure, it must be accountable to the community, and it must be constructed in a way that gives members the opportunity to participate in community activities (Palmiotto, 2000:157). Empowerment, according to Whisenand and Ferguson (2002:109), is about power sharing. Power sharing encourages participation, completion of the task, good performance, and high standards of service.

Disorder and deterioration in the neighbourhood foster crime. Law-abiding citizens feel powerless to change their surroundings as they see the situations around them deteriorate. Decay and disarray give criminals more power, and when they take over, crime rates start to rise. The community police officer's job is to give law-abiding citizens the tools they need to regain control of their surroundings. The empowerment process entail. Establishing a highly visible police presence in the neighbourhood with the intention of discouraging the local criminal element, serving as a catalyst to mobilize other city services as necessary to improve the neighbourhood's physical conditions, collaborating with residents to support them in taking action to improve their personal safety and the safety of their property, and establishing Neighbourhood Associations and Crime Watch associations to facilitate the development of a cohesive neighbourhood identity are all examples of measures that can be taken.

Making police accountable for attending to the needs and concerns of the community they serve is one way to achieve accountability (South Africa, 1997:2). If the accountability of police is formed or achieved, police officers must understand they will be held directly responsible for their acts and must answer individually for whatever they do. By contributing the essential data, responding to police inquiries, and getting involved in all facets of police work, the community can also be held accountable (Trojanowicz, 1998:1). According to Gaines and Kappler in Peak et al. (2004:170), accountability also relates to whether or not resources are used for appropriate reasons and implies that because police are public servants, they should offer services that address the needs and concerns of the general public.

Therefore, accountability means that both the police and the community are accountable for improving the quality of life in the community. These only occur when each individual police officer and member of the community takes personal responsibility for it and conducts their lives in accordance with community policing ideas. The aforementioned ideas suggest that community policing is defined by offering quick, effective service that aims to

address issues that the community encounters through tight community police-partnership. When society became more empowered, this partnership was born. For individual actions and omissions in community policing efforts, both the police and the community must take responsibility.

IV. THE FUNDAMENTALS OF COMMUNITY POLICING

The community policing paradigm is founded on the following key ideas. These guidelines must be followed by any police organization, regardless of size, that intends to implement a community policing strategy:

➤ *Change:*

The word "change" is a constant that influences how an organization views the shift to community policing as well as how each individual acts. According to Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994:8), change is a crucial principle that must be followed when a police agency tries to integrate community policing. According to Wilkinson and Rosenbaum (in Lab, 2004:195), community policing represents a fundamental shift in the fundamental role of the police officer, including adjustments to that officer's abilities, motivations, and opportunities for problem-solving and forging new relationships with influential members of the community.

➤ *Leadership:*

Leaders use their position to influence and inform people about community policing. They set an example for others by taking calculated risks and establishing working partnerships. According to Stevens (2003:104), leadership is the activity of controlling and influencing others' behaviour. Peak et al. (2004:60) make a similar argument that leadership is a process of controlling and influencing others' behaviour to achieve goals.

➤ *Decentralized and Personalized Police Service:*

To improve community policing, police agencies must develop a new type of line officer, who serves as a direct point of contact between the police and members of the community. In the end, community policing should be used by all police officers (Abebe, 2000:11). According to Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1994), in order to offer a successful and efficient community police service, the officers make touch with the people they serve in a well-defined beat or region. It is understood that the police cannot impose order on the community from without, but it is nonetheless important to promote the idea that the police are a resource that may be used to address current community issues.

Community policing is a commitment to offering local communities a decentralized and individualized police service. Decentralized organization and power are thus another tenet of community policing. The ability to contribute to decision-making considerably increases. This gives both individual officers and residents more power and gives them a voice in local decision-making.

➤ *Community policing benefits*

The advantages of community policing are as follows. It is defined as the peculiarities of the community and the police and the shared advantages of the community-policing method. Problem-solving collaboration between the police and the community is essential for community policing to be successful (Ziembo-Vogl & Woods, 1996:1). Whisenand and Ferguson (2002:207); are a few scholars whose works summarize the advantages of community policing.

Following are some advantages for a community engaged in community policing initiatives:

- It is dedicated to preventing crime and concentrates on the most effective ways to respond to situations.
- It promotes transparency, individualized police service, community organization, and mobilization and authority to recognize and address issues.
- As they are prioritized and dealt with, the challenges and concerns it faces decrease.
- The local physical and social environment has improved, and there has been a rise in supportive views toward law enforcement.
- It has less of a fear of crime.

Police organizations in general and personnel in particular gain when community policing is successfully implemented. According to Dempsey (Whisenand & Ferguson (2002:207).

V. CRIME PREVENTION

Crime prevention is a strategy that focuses on specific populations that run the risk of being suspects or targets of crime, such as the most vulnerable members of society, including children, the elderly, and people with disabilities. The goal of crime prevention is to create plans that address the needs of the vulnerable as well as initiatives that aim to lower the likelihood that someone would commit a crime in the near and distant future. According to Murphy (2000), preventing crime not only aims to address the root causes of offenses but may also do it in the long run in the most economical manner.

The term "crime prevention" or "crime reduction" is used by Kaiser (1990) to describe all actions that are specifically intended to reduce the scope and severity of crime, whether by reducing opportunities for crime or by influencing potential criminals and the broader public. According to Kaiser (1990), crime prevention also results from raising the risk of getting detected while decreasing the risk of victimization. By doing this, the likelihood of victimization is decreased and the likelihood of assimilating into society is increased. In order to reduce crime, one must simultaneously increase motivation to help the community and decrease motivation to commit crimes.

The philosophy of community policing, stronger partnerships between the police and the community will lessen public fear of crime, enhance police-community ties, and enable more efficient responses to societal issues.

However, community policing has disadvantages as well, such as hostility between the police and residents of the neighbourhood, which can stymie fruitful partnerships, increases in officers' decision-making autonomy, which can result in more opportunities for police corruption, and resistance within the police organization, which can thwart community policing's implementation (Wong, 2009). Crime prevention refers to efforts to stop criminal conduct either before it starts or before it spreads (Lab, 1997:19). The NCPI views crime prevention as a useful strategy for the immediate management of crime. In order to lessen criminal chances and limit the risk of crime, it entails studying criminal attack strategies and developing targeted activities inside the settings of possible victims (NCPI, 2001:7).

Crime prevention includes all actions taken to lessen, discourage, or stop the commission of specific crimes. These actions include first changing the circumstances that led to the crime, then changing the circumstances that are believed to have caused it, and finally introducing a strong deterrent through a robust criminal justice system (Shiner, Thom, & MacGregor, 2004). Crime is any unlawful behaviour that harms another person physically or morally. Crime is the failure to perform a legal obligation that subjects the offender to penalty (Stevens, 2003:37).

Criminal activity encompasses a variety of complicated emotional, psychological, social, and environmental elements and is not just a physical issue with a single direct cause. The factors that contribute to crime include societal norms, socioeconomic conditions, a lack of self-discipline, approaches to raising children, and the role models that parents and educators provide for young people. Because there are many contributing factors to crime, preventing it is difficult and necessitates a multifaceted, multi-sectoral approach (Super, 2010). It is ineffective to prevent crime merely through the efforts of police officers without community involvement. To effectively combat crime, police and the community must work together well. The model that split crime prevention into primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention was another well-liked approach to preventing crime. The criminal problem was handled at various stages of development thanks to this developmental paradigm (Spalek, 2008).

➤ *Primary Prevention:*

Primary prevention refers to the identification of conditions in current circumstances and community settings that create potential for crime. To stop crime, many organizations, the police, and the criminal justice system should cooperate. Primary preventative strategies include things like highly visible policing, enough leisure activities, and effective socialization in schools (Hancock, 2001). In the context of criminal justice, primary prevention entails identifying the elements of the physical and social environment that enable or encourage criminal behaviour (Lab, 2004:24).

According to Tilley (2005:766), it is the averting of criminal incidents. Additionally, broader social issues connected to crime and deviance are included in primary

crime prevention. Test results: It exists in a wide spectrum of social structures and takes on a variety of shapes. Environmental planning, neighbourhood watch, broad deterrence, private security, and instruction in crime and crime prevention are all included (Lab, 2004:20). Eliminating factors in the physical and social environment that encourage aberrant behaviour is the focus of primary prevention. The program deals with broader, more tangible, and social elements that can lead to deviation (Lab, 2004:33).

Furthermore, according to Lab, this strategy used the inherent costs and benefits of action to influence potential offenders. It demonstrates how the target, danger, and effort payoff determine the criminal opportunity (Lab, 2004:37). In general, the primary prevention strategy also takes into account more extensive socioeconomic problems connected to crime and deviance. Lab also notes that social prevention is another name for primary prevention. By addressing the reasons of aberrant behaviour, initiatives to address unemployment, inadequate education, poverty, and comparable societal evils may lessen crime and fear (Lab, 2004:24).

➤ *Secondary Prevention:*

Secondary prevention works to identify potential offenders and victims early on and to take action before a crime is committed. The responsibility for secondary crime prevention largely falls on local institutions like parents, instructors, and schools. Prior to the crime being committed, these groups must recognize possible issue places and vulnerable populations and take appropriate action (Hubschle & Van der Spuy, 2012).

The adoption of suitable crime prevention strategies prior to the deviant behaviour would be made possible by the identification of individuals who are on the verge of becoming future juvenile or adult criminals (Lab, 2004:175). It is also directed at a specific group that has been determined through demographic classification such as age, gender, education, ethnicity, socioeconomic circumstance, or a combination of these to be most at risk of either committing or becoming a victim of a specific sort of crime (Pelser 2002:3). Additionally, Lab discovers that secondary prevention involves addressing pre-delinquents or deviant behaviour that results in harmful criminal action (Lab, 2004:22). Lab elaborates on this idea by noting that secondary crime prevention involves the early identification and forecasting of potential offenders, locations, and circumstances that have a higher possibility of criminal conduct. In addition to deterring potential criminals, it also aims to take action before any illegal behaviour is carried out (Lab, 2004:25).

When secondary crime prevention focuses on addressing specific risk factors linked to criminal motivation and community involvement in crime, it is community- or neighbourhood-oriented (Pelser, 2002:4). It could be beneficial to focus prevention efforts on the victim rather than the potential offender. Any method that helps eliminate possible targets or victims would provide information on the

where and when of prevention measures. By identifying and anticipating problem areas and possible offenders and attempting to prevent these in advance, it also aids in crime prevention (Lab, 2004:177).

➤ *Tertiary Prevention:*

After a crime has been committed, tertiary prevention addresses the actual offenders (Renauer, 2007). The judicial system, which includes the police, courts, and prisons, would perform the main roles. The principal role players should take some disciplinary measures against the violators in order to properly administer law and order. These methods include things like targeted deterrent, incarceration, and rehabilitation, among others.

Tertiary prevention deals with the real offenders and involves intervention so that offenders won't commit more crime, as Bringham and Faust argue in Lab (2004:3). The criminal justice system's operations account for the majority of tertiary prevention. Tertiary prevention encompasses the actions of arrest, prosecution, jail, and rehabilitation (Lab, 1997:22–23). Tertiary prevention, in accordance with Lab (2004:251) and Pelser (2002:3), focuses on preventing recidivism on the side of the offender. Pelser and Lab both concur that rehabilitation can enhance a person's worldview and sense of self. While rehabilitation is underway, delinquent or criminal behaviour should be stopped or reduced (Lab, 2004:291; Pelser, 2002:4).

➤ *Police in the Community and Preventing Crime*

The qualities of community policing are distinctive. According to Kelling and Moore (1988), community-oriented policing has seven key qualities.

- In community-based policing, the community is the source of authority;
- Crime control, crime prevention, and issue solving are balanced as the major responsibilities of community-oriented police forces;
- To avoid and address criminal issues, agencies implementing community-oriented policing have decentralized, task-oriented organizational designs that make use of matrix structures;
- The relationship to the external environment is consultative, where the police defend values of law and professionalism, but listen to community concerns;
- Organizations using the community-oriented policing strategy direct calls for emergency assistance to the police through examination of underlying issues instead;
- The chosen strategies and equipment of neighbourhood-focused police departments mostly consist of foot patrols and problem-solving techniques; and
- Quality of life outcomes and citizen satisfaction, not the quantity of arrests or other indications of crime control, are used to gauge an organization's performance.

➤ *The Fundamental Ideas that Guide the Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime*

The Guidelines for the Prevention of Crime similarly outlined eight fundamental concepts that should guide the creation of crime prevention plans, as follows:

- Government leadership. All levels of government should take the initiative to design humane and efficient crime prevention plans as well as to build and maintain institutional structures for their execution and evaluation.
- Socioeconomic development and inclusion. Crime prevention issues should be taken into account in all pertinent social and economic policies and programs, including those that address employment, education, health, housing, urban planning, and poverty. Communities, families, children, and young people who are at risk should receive special attention.
- Partnerships: Given the diversity of the causes of crime and the expertise and responsibilities needed to address them, partnerships should be a crucial component of effective crime prevention. This involves collaborations between departments and authorities, as well as between businesses, non-profits, community groups, and individuals.
- Sustainability: In order to be sustained, crime prevention requires enough resources, including money for structures and activities. Funding, implementation, evaluation, and the fulfilment of intended goals should all be clearly accountable.
- Knowledge base: Crime prevention strategies, policies, programs, and activities should be founded on a comprehensive, multidisciplinary foundation of information on crime problems, their many causes, and effective and promising techniques.
- Human rights, the rule of law, and a culture of lawfulness; in all facets of crime prevention, the rule of law and those human rights that are recognized in international agreements to which Member States are parties must be upheld. In order to deter crime, a culture of lawfulness needs to be actively cultivated.
- Interdependence: Where appropriate, national crime prevention diagnostics and strategies should take into account the connections between local criminal issues and preventing international organized crime.
- Differentiation; crime prevention measures should, when necessary, take into account the disparities between men's and women's needs as well as the unique requirements of disadvantaged people in society (UN office on drugs and crime Vienna).

In general, the aforementioned ideas provided the framework for deterring crime. All pertinent socioeconomic policies and programs must include sound crime prevention measures, and these tactics must be implemented in collaboration with all stakeholders. Additionally, in order to ensure its sustainability, prevention efforts should be supported by proper information and resources. The rule of law and fundamental human rights must not be jeopardized in the course of taking crime prevention measures.

VI. BASICS OF COMMUNITY-ORIENTED POLICE

Impacting how communities and locals view crime and police performance is the primary goal of community-oriented policing. This type of law enforcement gained acceptance since it assisted the police in "shedding their

image of an occupying army" (Cordner, 2014: 150). Community-oriented policing (COP), also called community policing, is defined by the federal Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services as "a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies that support the systemic use of partnerships and problem-solving techniques to proactively address the immediate conditions that give rise to public safety issues such as crime, social disorder, and fear of crime" (Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services, 2012:3).

This policing method is centered on fostering relationships with local residents to address local issues, increasing social resilience and group effectiveness, and bolstering the framework for crime prevention. COP also places a strong emphasis on proactive, preventive policing. According to this strategy, officers should focus on resolving crime and disorder issues in neighbourhoods rather than only responding to calls for assistance. Because sources of physical and social disorder are of interest as well as crimes, this model significantly broadens the scope of policing efforts (Weisburd et al., 2008).

An additional benefit of community-oriented police over traditional enforcement is that the latter "can alienate minority members in poor neighbourhoods" (Zhao, 2015: 355). The idea of African Americans and police officers collaborating to make their communities safer appears great in a minority area. However, according to some research, it is ineffectual because police personnel are too invasive or don't care about community-oriented policing (Weitzer, Tuch, & Skogan, 2007). However, other research (Weitzer et al., 2007) indicate to more encouraging results with foot-and-bike patrols, community forums, and other kinds of community policing operations. Quality-of-life policing (QOL) is an additional method of community policing that emphasizes "positive interactions between police and local residents, particularly minority residents" and incorporates problem-solving techniques (Zhao, 2015: 355). The Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 established the federal Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services and stated the objective of placing 100,000 more community police officers on the streets. According to research conducted in 2013 on law enforcement organizations in the United States that serve a population of 25,000 or more, 9 out of 10 of these organizations used some form of community policing technique (Reaves, 2015).

➤ *In accordance with the Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services (2012), COP consists of three essential parts:*

- Partnerships in the community. COP promotes collaboration with community stakeholders, including other government organizations (prosecutors, health and human services, child support services, and schools); community members volunteers, activists, residents, and other people interested in the community; non-profits/service providers advocacy organizations, victim groups, and community development corporations); and

private companies. The media is a crucial tool that the police utilize to interact with the public.

- Changes inside the organization. In order to promote the idea, COP emphasizes the alignment of administration, structure, personnel, and information systems within police agencies. Increased openness, COP values-reinforcing leadership, targeted regional deployment, training, and data availability are a few examples of these developments.
- Problem-Solving. The last essential element of COP is proactive, systematic, routine problem-solving. Instead of only responding to crimes as they happen, COP urges law enforcement to create remedies for the underlying issues that contribute to public safety issues. One significant conceptual model of problem-solving that police might utilize is the SARA model, which stands for Scanning, Analysis, Response, and Assessment for a detailed explanation of the SARA model, see Problem-Oriented Policing. Redefining the relationship between the police and the community so that they work together to recognize and address community issues is at the core of COP. By working together, the community can identify and understand the social issues that lead to crime, disorder, and fear in the neighbourhood, which makes the community a "co-producer" of public safety (Skolnick and Bayley, 1988; Gill et al., 2014; National Research Council, 2018).

COP is not a single cohesive program; rather, it refers to a number of initiatives or tactics built on the tenet that community involvement in policing is essential. The empowerment of the community, the belief in a broad police function, the reliance of police on citizens for authority, information, and collaboration, the use of specific tactics (or tactics targeted at particular problems, such as focused deterrence strategies) as opposed to general tactics or tactics targeted at the general population, such as preventive patrol), and decentralized authority to respond to incidents are all typical components associated with COP programs. Officer attendance at community meetings, bicycle patrols, citizen volunteers, foot patrols, police "mini-stations" and neighbourhood storefront offices were some of the most popular COP activities, according to a Major Cities Chiefs Association (MCCA) survey of MCCA members (National Research Council, 2018).

Participating community members in COP initiatives often speak favourably about them. For instance, compared to residents who did not get visits, residents who received house visits from police officers as part of a COP intervention indicated high confidence in police and warmth toward officers (Peyton et al., 2019). However, it should be noted that not every member of the community may engage in COP-related events such community meetings (Somerville, 2008). Even those who are aware of COP activities in their communities may decide not to take part (Adams, Rohe, and Arcury, 2005). Additionally, maintaining community involvement might be challenging. Community members may not be paid for their participation, unlike police officers, and it may take some time for them to get involved.

➤ *Community-Oriented Policing Types*

Programs that involve the community can take many different shapes because COP is such a wide approach. For instance, certain COP initiatives might be conducted in a single location like a community center, a school, or a police substation. Other COP-based initiatives can cover the entire community, including police foot patrol programs. The following are various illustrations of particular COP program kinds and how they might influence young people in a community.

A frequent COP initiative in schools is the use of School Resource Officers (SROs). SROs are uniformed, armed, police department-badged, and trained police officers with the authority to make arrests. To improve safety and security, they have the duty to remain present at schools (Stern and Petrosino, 2018). Although SRO programs originally arose in the 1950s, their use greatly increased in the 1990s in reaction to high-profile cases of extreme school violence and the ensuing policy changes (Broll and Howells, 2019). SRO programs are not a recent development. SROs can perform a range of tasks. According to Thomas et al. (2013), they are meant to build a positive school climate, foster positive relationships between law enforcement, educators, and kids, and prevent and address school-based crime.

The National Association of School Resource Officers (NASRO), the largest professional organization of SROs, formally defines the SRO roles using a "triad model," which is consistent with community policing models (May et al., 2004). This model includes the three primary functions of SROs: 1) upholding the law; 2) educating students, school staff, and the community; and 3) serving as an informal counsellor or mentor (Broll and Howells, 2019; Fisher and Hennessy, 2016). As these tasks and responsibilities are typically outlined in a memorandum of understanding between the local law enforcement agency and the school district, there may be considerable variation in how they are balanced (Fisher and Hennessy, 2016).

Due to their location at the nexus of the juvenile justice system and the education system, which frequently have competing cultures and authority structures, there may still be tensions and ambiguities inherent to the SRO position, even with the formal definition of their duties (Fisher and Hennessy, 2016). Problematic behaviours may be seen as crimes by SROs because they are police officers, whereas educators see them as barriers to learning. Another area of uncertainty is the SRO's expectation to serve as a student's informal counsellor and mentor, which could provide a conflict of interest if an adolescent discloses information about engaging in unlawful activity.

The effectiveness of SRO presence in schools has been subject to varying degrees of evaluation. According to certain research, SROs in schools are associated with lower levels of significant violence and other behaviours, such as disorderly events (Zhang, 2019) and serious violence (Sorensen, Shen, and Bushway, 2021). Others have linked the presence of SROs in schools with increases in drug-

related offenses (Gottfredson et al., 2020; Zhang, 2019), while other studies have found no differences in bullying (Broll and Lafferty, 2018; Devlin, Santos, and Gottfredson, 2018). One meta-analysis (Fisher and Hennessy, 2016) looked at the connection between exclusionary discipline and the presence of SROs in U.S. high schools in terms of school discipline.

When SROs were present, rates of school-based disciplinary occurrences were 21 percent higher than they were prior to the implementation of an SRO program, according to an analysis of the seven qualifying pretest-posttest design studies. The presence of SROs was not linked to school-related disciplinary results in another study of primary schools, albeit these outcomes ranged from minor ones like a warning or timeout to more significant ones like suspension from school (Curran et al., 2021).

Additionally, a number of research have been done on how SROs affect students' attitudes and emotions. A study of middle and high school students (Theriot and Orme, 2016) indicated, for instance, that having more interactions with SROs boosted students' favourable sentiments of SROs but lowered school connectedness and was unrelated to perceptions of safety. On the other hand, results from a student survey on the impact of students' awareness and perceptions of SROs on school safety and disciplinary experiences showed that students' awareness of SROs' presence and their perceptions of SROs were linked to higher levels of safety and a slight decrease in disciplinary measures. However, compared to white students, students from racial and ethnic minority groups reported fewer benefits from SROs (Pentek and Eisenberg, 2018).

Another program that makes use of COP components is Foot Patrol. Police officers conduct neighbourhood sweeps while on foot patrol. It is a police strategy that entails movement inside a predetermined space for the sake of security and observation (Ratcliffe et al., 2011). The main objectives of foot patrol are to raise the visibility of police officers in a neighbourhood and to interact more with and build trust among locals. In addition to responding to calls for assistance in their designated districts and visiting businesses on their beat, police officers also get to know their neighbourhoods well.

Additionally, by fostering a sense of safety in the neighbourhood, police officers on foot patrols may provide a certain amount of "citizen reassurance" to members of the community and reduce residents' fears of crime (Katz, 2017). Engaging youth in the community is another responsibility of foot patrol officers, and some are told to make special efforts to engage vulnerable youth. For instance, an officer may stop and strike up a casual chat with a group of young people hanging out on a street corner in an effort to establish rapport (Cowell and Kringen, 2016).

Although a foot patrol limits how quickly an officer may respond to a complaint (compared to a patrol in a vehicle), studies has shown that neighbourhood residents are more at ease with police presence in the area. If an officer is

observed walking, residents are more likely to perceive them as "being there for the neighbourhood" (Cordner, 2010). Even though research on the effectiveness of foot patrols in reducing crime is conflicting (Piza and O'Hara, 2012), strengthened community ties are one of the main advantages. According to research, foot patrols strengthen bonds of trust, familiarity, and approachability between citizens and police officers (Dlugolenski 2018). On officers, foot patrols can also be beneficial. According to research (Wakefield, 2006; Walker and Katz, 2017), officers who engage in foot patrol methods report greater work satisfaction and a sense of accomplishment.

Mini-Stations are police stations that prioritize the needs of the local community and increase community members' access to the police. Mini-stations, also referred to as substations, community storefronts, and other names, can be established in a variety of locations, including small shops, eateries, or community centers. They can be staffed by law enforcement personnel, civilian workers, volunteers, or a combination of these individuals, and they typically have fewer officers stationed there than full-fledged police stations (Maguire et al., 2003). These stations enable individual's quicker access to file reports and voice community concerns while enabling cops to strengthen existing relationships with local businesses.

They provide for greater spatial distinction and allow a police agency to serve a larger region without incurring the expense of opening a new district station (Maguire et al., 2003). Residents can also visit mini-stations to pick up brochures and information about fresh community policing initiatives and activities. Police personnel spend more time overall in their designated patrol zones because to police mini-stations. The idea of mini-stations was inspired by Japanese kobans, which became well-known in the late 1980s. Officers stationed in kobans got to know the area they patrolled very well and were frequently within ten minutes of private residences, making them very approachable to the public (Young, 2022).

Mini-stations might be beneficial for local youth as well. The Eisenhower Foundation, for instance, has installed Youth Safe Haven mini-stations in ten locations. Originally created in the 1980s, these mini-stations are now found in many places that cater to young people, such as community centers and educational institutions (Eisenhower Foundation, 2011). The objectives of youth-oriented mini-stations include homework assistance, recreational activities, giving refreshments, and teaching social skills, in addition to criminal outcomes like reduced crime and the fear of crime.

It is possible to train older youth to volunteer as mentors and advocates for younger youth. There are conflicting results regarding the impact of mini-stations on crime rates, but research has shown that adults and older youth who participate in community programs at mini-stations (or have children who do) are more likely to report crimes, and younger youth are more at ease speaking with police (Eisenhower Foundation, 2011).

➤ *Problem Orientated Policing*

According to Braga et al. (2001), Hinkle et al. (2020), and the National Research Council (2004), problem-oriented policing (POP) is a framework that gives law enforcement agencies an iterative approach to identifying, analyzing, and addressing the underlying causes of crime and disorder in the community. They can then assess and modify their response as necessary. Police must concentrate their efforts on problems rather than events when using the POP strategy (Cordner and Biebel, 2005). The National Research Council (2004) defines problems as "chronic conditions or clusters of events that have become the responsibility of the police, either because they have been reported to them, or because they have been discovered by proactive police investigation, or because the problems have been found in an investigation of police records.

The POP technique stands in contrast to incident-driven approaches to crime prevention, which concentrate on a single criminal act. Instead, POP gives law enforcement an adaptive tool for looking at the complex causes of crime and disorder and creating specialized responses to those causes (National Research Council, 2018). As previously mentioned, the POP approach was inspired by observations that law enforcement agencies appeared to be more concerned with the means than the ends of policing, or what is known as the "means-over-ends syndrome" (Goldstein, 1979; Eck, 2006; MacDonald, 2002). This work was further developed in 1990 to carefully define and explain what it meant to apply POP techniques in policing. POP methods were first put into practice by law enforcement agencies in the US and other nations (including Australia, Canada, and the UK) in the 1990s (Scott, 2000).

The four processes that make up the SARA model, a conventional conceptual framework for problem-solving in POP, are as follows (Weisburd et al., 2010; Hinkle et al., 2020; National Research Council, 2004):

- *Scanning.*

Police track out issues that could be causing crimes and disturbances. Depending on a number of variables, such as the problem's size or community feedback, they may rank these issues in order of importance.

- *Analysis.*

Police use a number of data sources, such as crime databases or surveys of the local population, to research information on the identified problem or problems. They look at data on crime victims, perpetrators, and crime scenes, among other things. The information on responses to incidents is then combined with data from other sources to help police understand the issue or issues better.

- *Response.*

By thinking "outside the box" of conventional police enforcement tactics and forming alliances with other agencies, community organizations, or individuals of the community, depending on the situation, police design and implement customised strategies to address the identified problems. Target hardening, area clean-up, increased patrol,

crime prevention through environmental design measures, multiagency cooperation, and annoyance abatement are a few examples of reactions in POP interventions.

- *Assessment.*

Police analyze the effectiveness of the reaction using self-evaluations as well as other techniques like process or result evaluations to ascertain what has been done (or not) as well as how successfully the response has been carried out. Depending on the outcomes of the evaluation, this phase can also involve adjusting the response.

A POP study that was carried out in Newport News, Virginia, in the 1980s is credited with developing the SARA model. The four-stage approach to issue solving was created by the Newport News Task Force. The SARA model was developed as a result of the officers and their supervisors identifying issues, analyzing them, and taking appropriate action, according to a case study of the project (Eck and Spelman, 1987).

Other models have been constructed since the conception and evolution of SARA, in part to address certain recognized shortcomings of the original model, such as an oversimplification of complicated processes or a process where problem-solving is nonlinear. These other models comprise the following. the 5I's (Intelligence, Intervention, Implementation, Involvement, and Impact); and 3) the ID partners (Identify the demand; Drivers; Problem; Aim; Research and analysis; Think creatively; Negotiate and initiate responses; Evaluate; Review; and Success) are acronyms for problem, cause, tactic or treatment, output, and result, proctor (which stands for); and the 5I's (Intelligence, Intervention, Implementation, Involvement, and 2010 (Sidebottom and Tilley, 2010). However, in contrast to these models, agencies that take a POP approach to law enforcement appear to adopt the SARA model more frequently (Borrion et al., 2020).

Law enforcement organizations can adopt a POP strategy to deal with youth-related issues, including crimes perpetrated by young people like gun violence, vandalism, graffiti, and other youth-specific actions like evading custody or underage drinking. For instance, graffiti affected around one-third of public schools in the 2019–20 academic year (Wang et al., 2022). If a police agency wished to address the issue of school vandalism, which is frequently committed by young people, they could use the SARA model to identify the problem's scope, create a suitable response, and carry out an overall assessment of efforts. The actions law enforcement agencies can take to implement the SARA model and address the concerns of vandalism perpetrated specifically at schools are outlined in a problem-oriented handbook created by the Problem-Oriented Policing Center at Arizona State University (Johnson, 2005).

As a result, in the scanning phase of the SARA model, police would concentrate on the specific issue of school vandalism by looking at data from many sources, including information acquired from both police departments and school districts, in order to identify the problem. Police

would inquire about the specific school vandalism issues they are focusing on during the analysis step, including 1) how many and which schools reported vandalism to the police, 2) which schools were vandalized, 3) what characteristics, such as the age, gender, and percentage of youth who attended school, were associated with any youth identified as committing the vandalism, and 4) on what days and times the vandalism occurred. The analysis process should also incorporate data from a variety of data sources, such as official police records of occurrences of school vandalism, SRO interviews, and information from the pupils at the school (Johnson, 2005). Once the police had finished their investigation of the school vandalism issue and had a clear knowledge of the issue, they would move on to the reaction phase. What the police learn about the issue of vandalism in schools will determine the remedy. For instance, authorities may advise enhancing building security if they find that teenagers may easily access school property, especially after school hours.

Last but not least, police would assess the effectiveness of their response to school vandalism using a variety of success indicators, including a decline in the number of incidents, a reduction in the costs associated with repairing damaged property, and an increase in the number of incidents (when they do occur) in which the perpetrator(s) of the vandalism are identified and apprehended (Johnson, 2005). Focused deterrent tactics and hot-spot policing are just a couple of the qualities that POP has in common with other policing methods. Focusing police efforts on "hot spots" for crime, or places in a community where crimes frequently congregate, is known as hot-spots policing. Traditional law enforcement methods are frequently used in hotspot policing initiatives (National Research Council, 2004; Braga et al., 2019). The cornerstones of deterrence theory are adhered to by focused deterrence tactics, sometimes known as "pulling levers" policing. These methods concentrate on a certain type of criminal activity carried out by a small number of people who consistently violate the law and who are therefore more susceptible to sanctions and punishments (Braga, Weisburd, and Turchan, 2018).

There may be overlap in methods even if POP, concentrated deterrence, and hot areas policing are three separate policing strategies. The identification and targeting of crime hot spots, for instance, may be part of a POP approach if a community's crime issues are analyzed and scanned and it is found that crimes tend to congregate in particular places. In addition, a hot-spots policing intervention may employ a problem-oriented methodology to choose the best course of action for dealing with the crime in pinpointed hot areas.

Hot-spots policing, on the other hand, does not require the thorough analytical method employed in POP to determine which technique is appropriate to prevent or reduce crime (Hinkle et al., 2020). POP can instead go beyond investigation of place-based crime concerns. Similar to how focused deterrence tactics target particular crimes committed by well-known high-risk criminals, POP includes

allocating resources to specific, identifiable problems. While POP may engage a number of agencies and people of the community, focused deterrent techniques often rely primarily on police personnel to administer programs (National Research Council, 2004). The National Research Council (2004) found that although POP, focused deterrence, and hotspots policing have certain key differences (such as degree of emphasis and engagement of other agencies), they frequently overlap.

VII. CONCLUSION

Three general policing strategies community policing, community-oriented police, and police-oriented police share many traits but are nevertheless distinct from one another because of the emphasis on each strategy. Other goals, such as collective efficacy, police legitimacy, fear of crime, and other community-related outcomes are frequently disregarded or not correctly defined in COP and POP (Gill et al., 2014). COP and POP tend to focus on results linked to crime and disorder. Exploring additional community-related outcomes would be beneficial because both models heavily rely on community involvement.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adams, R. E., Rohe, W. M., & Arcury, T.A. 2005. Awareness of community-oriented policing and neighborhood perceptions in five small to midsize cities. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 33(1):43–54.
- [2]. Borrión, H., Eckblom, P., Alrajeh, D., Borrión, A.L., Keane, A., Koch, D., Mitchener–Nissen, T. & Toubaline, S. 2020. The problem with crime problem-solving: Towards a second-generation POP? *British Journal of Criminology* 60:219–240.
- [3]. Braga, A. A. 2008. *Problem-Oriented Policing and Crime Prevention*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- [4]. Braga, A. A. Welsh, B.C., & Schnell, C. 2015. Can policing disorder reduce crime? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 52(4):567–588.
- [5]. Braga, A. A., & Pierce, G. L. 2005. Disrupting illegal firearms markets in Boston: The effects of Operation Ceasefire on the supply of new handguns to criminals. *Criminology & Public Policy* 4(4):717–748.
- [6]. Braga, A. A., Hureau, D.M., & Papachristos, A. V. 2011. An ex post facto evaluation framework for place-based police interventions. *Evaluation Review* 35(6):592–626.
- [7]. Braga, A. A., Kennedy, D. Waring, E., & Piehl, A.M. 2001. Problem-oriented policing, deterrence, and youth violence: An evaluation of Boston's Operation Ceasefire. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 28(3):195–225.
- [8]. Braga, A. A., Turchan, B., Papachristos, A. V., & Hureau, D. M. 2019. Hot spots policing of small geographic areas effects on crime. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 15:e1046.

- [9]. Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D. L., Waring, E. J., Mazerolle, L. G., Spelman, W., & Gajewski, F. 1999. Problem-oriented policing in violent crime places: A randomized controlled experiment. *Criminology* 37(3):541–580.
- [10]. Braga, A. A., Weisburd, D.L., and Turchan, B. 2018. Focused deterrence strategies and crime control: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis of the empirical evidence. *Criminology & Public Policy* 17(1):202–250.
- [11]. Broll, R., & Howells, S. 2019. Community policing in schools: Relationship-building and the responsibilities of school resource officers. *Policing* 15(2):201–215.
- [12]. Broll, R., & Lafferty, R. 2018. Guardians of the hallways? School resources officers and bullying. *Safer Communities* doi: 10.1108/SC-06-2018-0018
- [13]. Brookes, S. 2006. 'Community Policing in Context', in *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, v8, n2, pp 104-117.
- [14]. Bucqueroux, B. 2007. What Community policing teaches us about Community Criminal Justice: <http://www.policing.com/articles/pdf/ccj.pdf> (accessed 28/058/2023).
- [15]. Bursik, R. J. Jr., and Grasmick, H. G. 1993. *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control*. Lanham, MD: Lexington.
- [16]. Clarke, R. V. 1995. *Situational Crime Prevention: Successful Case Studies*. Albany, NY: Harrow and Heston.
- [17]. Clarke, R. V. 2009. Situational crime prevention: Theoretical background and current practice. In *Handbook on Crime and Deviance*, edited by M.D. Krohn, A.J. Lizotte, and G.P Hall. New York, NY: Springer.
- [18]. Cohen, L., & Felson, M. 1979. Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review* 44:588–608.
- [19]. Coquilhat, J. 2008. *Community Policing: An International Literature Review*. Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Police Association Incorporated.
- [20]. Cordner, G. & Perkins, E., 2005. 'Problem-oriented policing in practice' in *Criminology and Public Policy*, v4, i2, pp155-180.
- [21]. Cordner, G. 2010. *Reducing Fear of Crime: Strategies for Police*, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), Office of Justice Programs (OJP), Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services.
- [22]. Cordner, G., & Biebel, E.P. 2005. Problem-oriented policing in practice. *Criminology* 4(2):155–180.
- [23]. Cornish, D. B., & Clarke, R. V., eds. 1986. *The Reasoning Criminal: Rational Choice Perspectives on Offending*. New York, NY: Springer.
- [24]. Cowell, B. M., & Kringen, A. L. 2016. *Engaging Communities One Step at a Time: Policing's Tradition of Foot Patrol as an Innovative Community Engagement Strategy*. Washington DC: Police Foundation.
- [25]. Curran, F. C., Viano, S., Kupchik, A., & Fisher, B.W. 2021. Do interactions with School Resource Officers predict students' likelihood of being disciplined and feelings of safety? Mixed-methods evidence from two school districts. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 43(2):183–361.
- [26]. Devlin, D. N., Santos, M. R., and Gottfredson, D. C. 2018. An evaluation of police officers in schools as a bullying intervention. *Evaluation and Program Planning* 71:12–21.
- [27]. Eck, J. E. 2006. Advocate: Science, values, and problem-oriented policing: Why problem-oriented policing? In *Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives*, edited by D. L. Weisburd and A.A Braga. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, pp. 117–132.
- [28]. Eck, J. E., & Madensen, T. D. 2012. Situational crime prevention makes problem-oriented policing work. In *The Reasoning Criminologist: Essays in Honour of Ronald V. Clarke*, edited by N. Tilley and G. Farrell. New York, NY: Routledge.
- [29]. Eck, J. E., and Spelman, W. 1987. *Problem-Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
- [30]. Eck, J.E. 2003. Police problems: The complexity of problem theory, research, and evaluation. In *Problem-Oriented Policing: From Innovation to Mainstream*, edited by J. Knutsson. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press, pp. 79–113.
- [31]. Eisenhower Foundation. 1999. *Youth Investment and Police Mentoring Final HUD Evaluation*. Washington, DC.
- [32]. Eisenhower Foundation. 2011. *Youth Investment and Police Mentoring: The Third Generation Principal Findings*. Washington, DC.
- [33]. Eve, R. A., Rodeheaver, D. G., Eve, S.B., Hockenberger, M., Perez, R., Burton, K., Boyd, L., Phillips, S., & Walker, S.L. 2003. Community-oriented policing in a multicultural milieu: The case of loitering and disorderly conduct in East Arlington, Texas. *International Journal of Police Science & Management* 5(4):245–264.
- [34]. Fisher, B. W., & Hennessy, E. A. 2016. School resources officers and exclusionary discipline in U.S. high schools: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Adolescent Research Review* 1:217–233.
- [35]. Forman Jr., J. 2004. Community policing and youth as assets. *Criminal Law & Criminology* 95(1):1–48.
- [36]. Fridell, L. 2004 'The Defining Characteristics of Community Policing' in *Community Policing: The Past, Present, and Future*, eds L Fridell and M Wycoff, Police Executive Research Forum: Washington, pp 3-12
- [37]. Gill, C., Weisburd, D. L., Telep, C. W., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. 2014. Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder, and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 10(4):399–428.

- [38]. Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Vitter, Z., Shader, C.G., Nelson-Zager, T., & Spain, L. 2018. Collaborative problem-solving at youth crime hot spots: A pilot study. *Policing: An International Journal* 41(3):325–338.
- [39]. Goldstein, H. 1979. Improving policing: A problem-oriented approach. *Crime and Delinquency* 25:236–258.
- [40]. Gottfredson, D. C., Crosse, S., Tang, Z., Bauer, E.L., Harmon, M.A. Hagen, C.A., & Greene A.D. 2020. Effects of school resource officers on school crime and responses to school crime. *Criminology and Public Policy* 19(3):905–940.
- [41]. Greene, J. R. 2000. *Community Policing in America: Changing the Nature, Structure, and Function of the Police—Vol. 3: Policies, Processes, and Decisions of the Criminal Justice System*: Washington, DC: DOJ, OJP, National Institute of Justice (NIJ).
- [42]. Gul, S. 2009. An evaluation of rational choice theory in criminology. *Girne American University Journal of Sociology and Applied Science* 4(8):36–44.
- [43]. Hinkle, J. C., & Weisburd, D. L. 2008. The irony of broken windows policing: A micro-place study of the relationship between disorder, focused police crackdowns, and fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 36:503–512.
- [44]. Hinkle, J. C., Weisburd, D., Telep, C. W., & Petersen, K. 2020. Problem-oriented policing for reducing crime and disorder: An updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews* 16:e1089.
- [45]. Hunter, A. 1985. Private, parochial, and public social orders: The problem of crime and incivility in urban communities. In *The Challenge of Social Control: Citizenship and Institution Building*, edited by G.D. Suttles and M.N. Zald. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- [46]. Innes, M. 2003. *Understanding Social Control: Deviance, Crime and Social Order*, McGraw-Hill International: New York.
- [47]. Javdani, S. 2019. Policing education: An empirical review of the challenges and impact of the work of school police officers. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 63:252–269.
- [48]. Johnson, K. D. 2005. *School vandalism and break-ins. Problem-Oriented Guides for Police, Problem-Specific Guides Series. No. 35*. Washington, DC: Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services.
- [49]. Kargın, V. 2010. Does problem-oriented policing prevent crime? *Polis Bilimleri Dergisi* 12(3).
- [50]. Kelling, G. L. 1999. *Broken Windows and Police Discretion*. Research Report. Washington, DC: DOJ, OJP, NIJ.
- [51]. Kelling, G.L., & Coles, C.M. 1996. *Fixing Broken Windows*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- [52]. Kim, S.Y., & Skogan, W. G. 2003. *Community Policing Working Paper 27: Statistical Analysis of Time Series Data on Problem Solving*. Chicago, IL: Illinois Criminal Justice Informational Authority.
- [53]. Kornhauser, R. R. 1978. *Social Sources of Delinquency: An Appraisal of Analytic Models*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- [54]. Kringen, J. A., Sedelmaier, C. M., & Dlugolenski, E. 2018. Foot patrol: The impact of continuity, outreach, and traditional policing activities. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice* 14:218–227.
- [55]. Kubrin, C. E., & Weitzer, C. 2003. New directions in social disorganization theory. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 40(4):374–402.
- [56]. Lindberg, M. 2015. False sense of security: Police make schools safer—right? *Teaching Tolerance Spring*: 22–25.
- [57]. MacDonald, J. M. 2002. The effectiveness of community policing in reducing urban violence. *Crime & Delinquency* 48(4):592–618.
- [58]. Maguire, E. R., Y. Sin, S. Zhao, & K.D. Hassell. 2003. Structural change in large police agencies during the 1990s. *Policing: An International Journal* 26(2):251–275.
- [59]. May, D. C., Fessel, S .D. & Means, S. 2004. Predictors of principals’ perceptions of School Resource Officer effectiveness in Kentucky. *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 29:75–92.
- [60]. McGarrell, E. F.; Freilich, J. D. & Chermak, S.M., 2007. Intelligence-led policing as a framework for responding to terrorism. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* 23(2):142–158.
- [61]. Miró-Llinares, F. 2014. Routine activity theory. *The Encyclopedia of Theoretical Criminology*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 1–7.
- [62]. National Research Council. 2004. *Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing: The Evidence*. Washington, DC: National Academics Press.
- [63]. National Research Council. 2018. *Proactive Policing: Effects on Crime and Communities*. Washington, DC: National Academics Press.
- [64]. Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services. 2012. *Community-Oriented Policing Defined*. Washington, DC: DOJ, Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services.
- [65]. Paez, R. A., & Dierenfeldt, R. 2020. Community policing and youth offending: A comparison of large and small jurisdictions in the United States. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth* 25(1):140–153.
- [66]. Palmiotto, M. 2000. *Community Policing: A Policing Strategy for the 21st Century*, Jones and Bartlett Publishers: Boston.
- [67]. Pentek, C., & Eisenberg, M.E. 2018. School Resources Officers, safety, and discipline: Perceptions and experiences across racial/ethnic groups in Minnesota secondary schools. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 88:141–148.
- [68]. Peyton, K., Sierra-Arévalo, M., & Rand, D. G. 2019a. A field experiment on community policing and police legitimacy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116(40):19894–19898.
- [69]. Piza, E. L., & O’Hara, B. A. 2012. Saturation foot-patrol in a high-violence area: A quasi-experimental evaluation. *Justice Quarterly* 31(4):693–718.

- [70]. Rabois, D., & Haaga, D. A. F. 2002. Facilitating police–minority youth attitude change: The effects of cooperation within a competitive context and exposure to typical exemplars. *Journal of Community Psychology* 30(2):189–195.
- [71]. Ratcliffe, J. H., Taniguchi, T., Groff, E. R., and Wood, J.D. 2011. The Philadelphia foot patrol experiment: A randomized controlled trial of police patrol effectiveness in violent crime hotspots. *Criminology* 49(3):795–831.
- [72]. Reaves, B. A. 2015. *Local Police Departments, 2013: Personnel, Policies, and Practices*. Washington, DC: DOJ, OJP, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- [73]. Reisig, M. D. 2010. Community and problem-oriented policing. *Crime and Justice* 39(1):1–53.
- [74]. Scott, M. 2000. *Problem-Oriented Policing: Reflections on the First 20 years*. Washington, DC: DOJ, Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services.
- [75]. Scrivner, E., & Stephens, D. W. 2015. *Community Policing in the New Economy*. Washington, DC: DOJ, Office of Community-Oriented Policing Services.
- [76]. Shaw, C.R., & McKay, H. 1969. 1942. *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- [77]. Sidebottom, A., & Tilley, N. 2010. Improving problem-oriented policing: The need for a new model? *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*.
- [78]. Skogan, W. 1996. *Evaluating Problem Solving Policing: The Chicago Experience*, Institute for Policy Research: North western University, Illinois http://www.northwestern.edu/ipr/publications/policin_g_papers/caps17.pdf (accessed. 03/05/2023).
- [79]. Skogan, W.G. 1996. *Evaluating Problem-Solving Policing: The Chicago Experience*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, Institute for Policy Research.
- [80]. Skolnick, J. K., & Bayley, D .H. 1988. Theme and variation in community policing. In *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, edited by M. Tonry and N. Morris. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- [81]. Somerville, P. 2008. Understanding community policing. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management* 32(2):261–277.
- [82]. Sorensen, L. C., Shen, Y., & Bushway, S. D. 2021. Making schools safer and/or escalating disciplinary response: A study of police officers in North Carolina schools. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 43(4):495–519.
- [83]. Stern, A., & Petrosino, A. 2018. *What Do We Know About the Effects of School-Based Law Enforcement on School Safety?* San Francisco, CA: WestEd.
- [84]. Theriot, M.T., and Orme, J.G. 2016. School Resource Officers and students' feelings of safety at school. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice* 14(2):130–146.
- [85]. Thomas, B., Towvim, L., Rosiak, J., & Anderson, K. 2013. *School Resource Officers: Steps to Effective School-Based Law Enforcement*. Arlington, VA: National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention.
- [86]. Tilley, N. 2004. 'Community Policing and Problem Solving', in *Community Policing (Can it work)*, Wadsworth: Toronto, pp165-184.
- [87]. Tillyer, M.S., & Eck, J.E. 2011. Getting a handle on crime: A further extension of routine activities theory. *Security Journal* 24(2):179–193.
- [88]. Trojanowicz, R. & Bucqueroux, B. 1990. *Community Policing: A contemporary perspective*, Anderson Publishing Co: Ohio.
- [89]. Virta, S, 2006. 'Community Policing' in the *Sage Dictionary of Criminology*, eds. McLaughlin, E., and Muncie, J., Sage: London.
- [90]. Wakefield, A. 2006. *The Value of Foot Patrol: A Review of Research*. London, England: Police Foundation.
- [91]. Walker, S., & Katz, C.M. 2017. *The Police in America: An Introduction*, 9th ed. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- [92]. Wang, K., Kemp, J., & Burr, R. 2022. *Crime, Violence, Discipline, and Safety in U.S. Public Schools in 2019–20: Findings from the School Survey on Crime and Safety*. NCES 2022–029. Washington, DC: U.S Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.
- [93]. Weisburd, D. L., Telep, C. W., Hinkle, J. C., & Eck, J. E. 2010. Is problem-oriented policing effective in reducing crime and disorder? *Criminology & Public Policy* 9(1):139–172.
- [94]. Weisburd, D. L., Telep, C. W., Hinkle, J. C., & Eck, J.E. 2008. The effects of problem-oriented policing on crime and disorder. In *Campbell Systematic Reviews*, edited by M.W. Lipsey, A. Bjørndal, D.B. Wilson, C. Nye, R. Schlosser, J. Littell, G. Macdonald, and K.T. Hammerstrøm. Oslo, Norway: Campbell Corporation.
- [95]. Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. 1982. Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety. *Atlantic Monthly* 29–38.
- [96]. Young, A. 2022. Architecture as affective law enforcement: Theorising the Japanese koban. *Crime, Media, Culture* 18(2):183-202.
- [97]. Zhang, J. S. 2019. The effects of a school policing program on crime, discipline, and disorder: A quasi-experimental evaluation. *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 44:45–62.
- [98]. Zhao, J. S., He, N., & Lovrich, N.P. 2003. Community policing: Did it change the basic functions of policing in the 1990s? A national follow-up study. *Justice Quarterly* 20(4):697–724.