Community Policing and Crime Prevention in Kampala Central Division

Twesigye Nduhura[1], Mamerito Nturanabo[2] Shamusi Nakajubi[3] Professor Wafula O John [4]

Correspondence:
Twesigye   Nduhura, Department Business Management, College of Economics and Management Sciences, Kampala International University,
Email: twesigye.nduhura@kiu.ac.ug , Tel . No :+256786388199

[2]Mamerito Nturanabo -College of humanities and social sciences, Kampala International University

[3]Shamusi Nakajubi - College of Mathematics and computing, Kampala International University

[4] Professor Magero Wafula O John, Dean, School of Business and Management Studies, Director , HRM, Kampala University

Abstract: The study investigated the relationship between Community Policing and Crime Prevention in Kampala Central Division, taking a case of Central Division. Specifically, the study investigated the how community participation in identifying crimes, sensitization about crimes and patrolling affects crime reduction. The study adopted a case study of Kampala Division and utilized a sample of 120 respondents selected using purposive and simple random sampling techniques. Data was collected using questionnaires and interviews guides. Quantitative Data was analyzed using correlation and multiple regression to establish the relationship between community policing and crime prevention. The study findings revealed criminal preventions was significantly related with community participation in identifying crimes, sensitization of crimes as well as patrolling and crime reduction in Kampala central division. The study concluded that community policing contributes to crime prevention in Kampala central division. The study recommended the need to improve management practices in community policing. This change management requires a clear recognition that forging community policing partnerships and implementing problem-solving activities will necessitate changes in the organizational structure of policing. Community policing needs to allow law enforcement to get back to the principles upon which it was founded, to integrate itself once again into the fabric of the community so that the people come to the police for counsel and help before a serious problem arises, not after the fact.

Keywords: Community Policing; Crime Prevention;   Kampala Central Division Community; Policing; Crime

1.0 Introduction
This study was investigation of the relationship between Community Policing and Crime Prevention in Kampala in Kampala Central. Community Policing was the independent variable while Crime Prevention was the dependent variable in the study.

1.1 Background of the study
The concept of crime prevention dates back to about 250 years ago. Henry Fielding, who started his adult life as a writer, became a justice of the peace in England in 1748, Fielding had two goals, stamp out existing crime, and prevent outbreaks of crime in the future. Henry further created the first neighborhood watch and got to be referred as the "Father of Crime Prevention." The first police department was the metropolitan police of London. It was formed in 1829 by Sir Robert Peel who continued the work of Fielding. Peel felt that the efficiency of the police should be judged by the absence or presence of crime. He also felt that the distribution of crime information is essential to public safety. The officers of the metro police were called "Peelers" and "Bobbies", after their founder (Kelling, 1998).

In the United States, the first crime prevention division was formed in Berkley, California on July 15, 1925. It was the first of its kind in police history. It was originally formed as a crime prevention/juvenile unit. It was staffed with women that had social work backgrounds. The goal was to become involved at the beginning of behavior deviation to thwart anti-social behavior. The police became involved with behavior modification (Kelling, 1998).

In Uganda, Community policing programmes had their beginning in old Kampala and Katwe Police divisions but due to lack of logistics and proper management it almost came to a halt by 1993. The programme however resumed in October 1993 with the assistance of the British government through its department for international development. The British police officer was seconded to coordinate the implementation of the programme on a nationwide basis for 18 months. The programme was then reinvigorated with the following objectives: to establish the effective and efficient policing system with the assistance of the public to prevent

crime; to sensitise communities on crime and its control; to promote open and honest relations between police and the public; and to improve the quality of police services and integrate them in police life (Kasingye, 2001).

The police force in Uganda was introduced in 1906 by the colonial government as an instrument of oppression and not as service to the public and it was made accountable to the colonial government. The post colonial police was also accountable to the state rather than the public. Between 1966 and 1986, Uganda was characterized by political turmoil and the state resorted to the use of its machinery and apparatus to suppress people. The political and social strife crippled government's efforts to control crime. The capacity of the police to deal with these crimes was low due inadequate logistics, trained manpower and limited trust of the general public in the police (Kasingye, 2001).

Community-based police departments recognize the fact that the police cannot effectively deal with such issues alone, and must partner with others who share a mutual responsibility for resolving problems. Community policing stresses prevention, early identification, and timely intervention to deal with issues before they become unwieldy problems. Individual officers tend to function as general-purpose practitioners who bring together both government and private resources to achieve results. Officers are encouraged to spend considerable time and effort in developing and maintaining personal relationships with citizens, businesses, schools, and community organizations (Radcliffe, 2004).

Local leaders in many areas of the city are always worried about the out-of-control incidences of drug abuse in their areas whereby hundreds of youth are engaged in smoking and abusing drugs. And if drastic efforts are not taken, the situation will worsen. The slums across the city are ruled by bhang smoking youth, who decide who should or should not move at night. Drug abuse has become a pastime for these redundant youth and students, thus spurring crime across the country and cases of murder, rape and robberies have ravaged the different parts of Kampala (Joshua, 2008).

2.0 Literature Review

Theoretical review

The study was based on one of the situational theory of crime prevention. The concept of situational crime started to gain recognition in the late 1940s when Edwin Sutherland (1947) argued that crime was either "historical" – influenced by previous personal history, or "situational" – the environmental factors encompassing the crime scene. Although acknowledged by the majority of criminologists, the concept of "situation" was not their primary focus and remained ignored up until the 1970s when it regained interest. Michael Gottfredson and Travis Hirschi, for instance, asserted that although criminality is a necessary condition, it alone is not sufficient for a crime to be committed: crime requires situational incentives found in the form of motivation and opportunity (Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1986).

Among the most important contributors to the theory, however, is Ronald Clarke, who in 1983, defined the core of the theory and focused entirely his new approach on the event of the crime – the immediate physical and social settings, as well as wider societal arrangements –, instead of the perpetrator.

Conceptual background

According to Jeremy (2005), a community is a group of people- men and women of all ages, drawn from all socio-economic classes- who live within one locality and who share some common significant factors such as geographical area, relations of a given kind, common needs and even family ties. This means that people living in one housing estate, village or other common location constitute a community.

Policing is the "administration and enforcement" of laws and regulations and the maintenance of public order. Community policing therefore is a partnership between the members of the public and the police to confront crime in society. It identifies problems associated with crime and involves members of the community in identifying solutions to those problems. It is based on the recognition that the police alone cannot guarantee sustainable security (Forman, 2004).

Adams et al. (2002), Community policing is a philosophy that promotes organizational strategies, which 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. Crime is an act or omission that violates the law and is punishable upon conviction. It includes Criminal Code offences against a person or property, drug offences, motor vehicle offences and other provincial or federal statute offences.

According to Kaiser (1990), crime prevention or reduction refers to all those measures which have the specific intention of minimizing the breadth and severity of offending, whether via a reduction in opportunities to commit crime or by influencing potential offenders and the general public. Kaiser (1990) further observes that crime prevention arises from reducing the risk of victimization while increasing the risk of being caught. In so doing, the opportunities for victimization are reduced while increasing opportunities for fitting legitimately into society. Crime prevention also entails reducing the desire to commit crimes while increasing the desire to contribute to improvement of the society.

Community Participation in Identifying crime and crime prevention

Under community policing the relationship between citizens and the police is supposed to improve if they are to curb crime. It does appear that increased cooperation between the police and local residents increases satisfaction with police services on both sides, although this is not universal. In a study done in St. Petersburg, Florida, 85 percent of those residents who lived in community-policing areas of the city reported being "very" or "somewhat" satisfied with their neighborhood police services (Mastrofski *et al.*, 1999).

Community policing promises that closer alliances between the police and the community will help reduce citizen fear of crime, improve police-community relations, and facilitate more effective responses to community problems. But there are also drawbacks associated with community policing including hostility between the police and neighborhood residents, which can hinder productive partnerships, increases in officers' decision making autonomy can lead to greater opportunities for police corruption and resistance within the police organization can hamper community policing's successful implementation (Wong, 2009).

Community participation in sensitization and crime prevention

In San Diego, police officials adopted the theory and operating principles of community policing, structuring police-citizen interactions in a manner that was intended to strengthen informal control and thus prevent crime. The police focused on prevention efforts, and used arrest only after other methods failed. In the late 1980s, San Diego began an experiment with the community policing philosophy. In 1993, the whole police department was reorganized and the entire force retrained to implement community policing (Fagan, 2002).

Englewood (2002) noted that crimes grow faster than the number of police does in a society. Between 1970 and 1990 the number of full-time police officers in the United States rose by 70.7%, serious crimes rose by 78.8% and violent crimes by 147%. So, the only option left to the citizen in this concern is to individually get involved in and take responsibility of the police activities, thus community policing.

Community participation in Patrolling and Crime Prevention

Directing officers to patrol hot spots of crime within a specific area, while leaving adjacent areas that are relatively untouched by criminal activity unmanned, is not necessarily that most efficient use of limited police resources if the majority of calls received from the area only require one officer to respond. The utilization of a large number of one-officer cars in conjunction with a smaller number of two-officer cars can be used to help spread officer resources further without risking increased crime levels or increased officer risk. Two-officer cars can be used within areas that experience the highest levels of crime where two officers will be more routinely needed while one-officer cars can be used in the areas with less crime where two officers are not as routinely needed at a call (Kessler, 1985). In addition, one-officer cars can be utilized more during the times when citizens are most likely to be home when it has been found that preventive patrol has it's greatest effect. Utilizing one-officer cars from 4 p.m. to midnight and during the summer months will give citizens a better idea of the levels of patrol and help to lower their fears of being victimized (Larson, 1975).

3.0 Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted a case study research design. A Case study is advantageous because it allows a lot of detail to be collected that would not normally be easily obtained by other research designs. The data collected is normally a lot richer and of greater depth than can be found through other experimental designs (Gerring, 2005). Qualitative techniques helped the researcher to come up with conclusions on variables that could not be measured quantitatively while quantitative techniques facilitated establishing values attached to numerical variables.

Population of the Study

The study population included Police men and Women of all the Police Stations within Kampala central division. These were the 4 District Police Commanders (DPCs), 4 OC station officers, 4 OC traffic officers, 4 OC CID officers, 4 Community Liason Officers, 8 Community leaders, 47 staff from traffic department, 47 staff from general duties as well as 43 staff from CID department. In total, the population of the study was 165 (Uganda Police Records, 2013).

Sample size and selection

A total of 120 respondents was selected for the study using purposive sampling as well as simple random sampling. Table 1 below presents a summary of the sample size selected by category of responsants. Alongside, the sampling technique used is also presented.

Table 1: Category of respondents

Category	Population	Sample size	Sampling technique
DPC	5	4	Purposive sampling
OC Station	5	4	Purposive sampling
OC Traffic	5	4	Purposive sampling
OC CID	5	4	Purposive sampling
Community Liason Officer	5	4	Purposive sampling

General Duties	47	33	Simple random sampling
Traffic department	47	33	Simple random sampling
CID department	43	30	Simple random sampling
Community leaders	8	4	Purposive sampling
Total	**170**	**120**	

Source: Uganda Police Records

The sample size was determined based on Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size determination table. Purposive sampling was applied to ensure that respondents with knowledge regarding the topic of investigation are included. After purposive sampling, simple random sampling was applied. This was done by using papers written on numbers from 0 to 200 and all the persons who picked odd numbers were considered until the required sample of 120 respondents was reached.

Sampling techniques/procedures
Purposive sampling followed that the researcher targeted a specific group of police officers in the selected Police stations in Kampala region especially those who have been involved in the implementation of community policing because they were believed to be reliable and knowledgeable about the topic and so they were in position to give dependable and detailed information about the topic of investigation. The study purposively selected 10 officers per police station.

Data Collection Methods
Data collection methods used included interviews and questioning.

Data collection Instruments
Data collection instruments were open and close ended questionnaires as well as interview guides.
Validity and Reliability
Validity
Validity is the accuracy and meaningfulness of inferences, which are based on the research results (Mugenda & Mugenda 1999). According to Gay (1996) validity over an instrument is refined based on expert advice. Validity of instruments was ascertained by discussing the questionnaire and interview schedule drafts with the superiors.
Reliability
According to (Mugenda & Mugenda 1999), reliability is a measure of the degree to which a research instrument yields consistent results or data after repeated trials. Reliability was censured by pre-testing the research instrument on 10% of the selected sample. The samples were correlated using Cronbach's alpha analysis (Amin 2005) and the questionnaire was reviewed by the supervisor before it was administered to respondents.
Data Analysis
Quantitative analysis
Data from the questionnaires was coded, entered, edited for consistency and analyzed quantitatively using Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS). This analysis generated, descriptive correlational and multiple regression statistics. The statistics tested the relationship between community policing and crime prevention in Kampala central division, Uganda.
Qualitative analysis
In qualitative analysis, content analysis was used to edit the data from interviews and reorganize it into meaningful shorter sentences. This was then be presented to supplement the quantitative data in order to have a clear interpretation of the results.
Ethical Considerations
Permission to do the study was sought from Uganda Management Institute. The researcher first sought the consent of the respondents to conduct the study. Strict confidentiality was observed. Names of study participants was not recorded on questionnaires and interview guides. Filled questionnaires were kept under lock and only the researcher had access to the keys.

4.0 Results and Discussion of the Findings

Response rate

The study achieved 100% response rate given the technique the researcher used. In order to achieve this, re-visits were made to the respective police stations because officers rescheduled interviews to other days because they would found busy on certain days. With continuous visits to the stations, the required sample size was attained, thus achieving 100% response rate.

Empirical findings

Community Participation in Identifying Crime and Crime prevention

This is the first objective of the study and respondents were asked to show their level of agreement regarding community participation in identifying crimes and crime prevention in Kampala and the responses are shown in Table.

Table: Community Participation in Identifying Crime and Crime prevention

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree
Community participation in identifying crimes helps taking protective measures against it	15(12.5%)	18(15%)	6(5%)	47(39.2%)	34(28.3%)
Community partnerships in crime identification help to know crime spots	12(10%)	35(29.2%)	9(7.5%)	43(35.8%)	21(17.5%)
Community participation helps in reporting of crimes where they prevail	12(10%)	13(10.8%)	11(9.2%)	56(46.7%)	28(23.3%)
Partnerships help in crime prevention in the communities	12(10%)	34(28.5%)	27(22.5%)	26(21.7%)	21(17.5%)
Participation promotes primary crime prevention responses	10(8.3%)	28(23.3%)	6(5%)	36(30%)	40(33.3%)

Source: Primary data

The majority of respondents (67.5%) agreed to the idea that Community participation in identifying crimes helps taking protective measures whereas 27.5% disagreed with the idea and only 5% were undecided about the idea. This result generally indicated that community participation in identifying crimes helps the community members to take protective measures especially regarding the security as it increases awareness and knowledge about crime spots.

More so, 53.3% of the respondents acknowledged that community partnerships in crime identification help to detect crimes whereas 39.2% disagreed with the idea but 7.5% were not sure about the idea. This is therefore means that actually community participation in identifying crimes eases its detection. This implied that once crimes are first hand detected, it goes a long way in reducing the level of crime in communities, thus crime prevention.

These findings all together mean that community policing is a collaborative effort between the police and the community that identifies crimes and disorders within their respective communities and later come up with way a forward to eliminate the identified crimes and all elements related to it in the community. It also means that the collaborative efforts is based on mutual trust sending an indication that community policing is ineffective if there is no trust between the police and communities.

Correlation between Community participation in Identifying crimes and Crime Prevention

Correlations

		Crime reduction	Community Participation in Identifying Crimes	
Crime reduction	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.365*	*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.078	
	N	120	120	
Community Participation in Identifying Crimes	Pearson Correlation	-.365*	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.0078		
	N	120	120	

Correlation is significant at 10% significance level (2- tailed)
The correlation analysis above shows that there was a negative (r = -0.365*) and significant (P=0.0078) relationship community participation in identifying crimes and crime Prevention in Kampala central division. The results thus implied that we can only be 95% confident that community participation in identifying crimes prevents crime in Kampala central division. The negative result of the correlation means that continuous participation of the communities in identifying crimes (IV) reduces the level of crime in Kampala (DV) and vice versa. We reject the null hypothesis which stated that there is no relationship between Community Participation in identifying crimes and crime prevention in Kampala Central Division and accept the alternative hypothesis and conclude that there is a negative relationship between Community Participation in identifying crimes and crime prevention in Kampala Central Division.

Community Participation in Sensitization and Crime prevention

This is the second objective of the study and respondents were asked to show their level of agreement regarding community participation in patrolling and crime prevention in Kampala and the responses are shown in Table .

Table: Effect of Community Participation in Sensitization on Crime prevention in Kampala Central Division

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree
Community participation helps in crime identification	-	32(26.7%)	14(11.7%)	47(39.2%)	27(22.5%)
Community participations ensures effective crime mitigation once the community embraces the activities	2(1.7%)	39(22.5%)	13(10.8%)	40(33.3%)	26(21.7%)
Participation ensures effective coordination with the community	28(23.3%)	22(18.3%)	23(19.2%)	24(20%)	23(19.2%)
There is effective supervision of the whole process of community policing	-	33(27.5%)	6(5%)	44(36.7%)	37(30.8%)
Public participation makes the concerned entities to effectively monitor the policing process	19(15.8%)	11(9.2%)	11(9.2%)	63(52.5%)	16(13.3%)
collaboration enhances exchange of information on violence prevention.	13(10.8%)	26(21.7%)	6(5%)	38(31.7%)	37(30.8%)
The strategy creates, implements and monitors a national action plan for crime prevention.	22(18.3%)	7(5.8%)	7(5.8%)	44(36.7%)	40(33.3%)
Community participation also enhances capacity for collecting data on violence.	7(5.8%)	18(15%)	17(14.2%)	42(35%)	36(30%)

Source: Primary data

Regarding community participation in sensitization and crime prevention in Kampala Central Division, 61.7% of the respondents revealed that community participation in sensitization helps in crime identification whereas 26.7% disagreed with the idea and only 11.7% were un decided on the idea. More so, 55% noted that community participation in sensitizing ensures effective crime mitigation once the community embraces policing activities but 24.2% disagreed with the idea. The above findings generally mean that effective participation in sensitization about crimes helps in identifying crimes. This also goes without saying therefore that Kampala central division police must engage communities in sensitizing about crimes for this make the communities embrace their activities which will mitigate the causal factors that later lead to crime hence, crime reduction in the communities.

Correlation between Community participation in Sensitization on crimes and Crime Prevention

Correlations

		Crime reduction	Community Participation in sensitization on Crimes
Crime reduction	Pearson Correlation	1	-.316*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.099
	N	120	120
Community Participation in sensitization on Crimes	Pearson Correlation	-.316*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.099	
	N	120	120

* Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (1- tailed)

The correlation analysis also indicated a negative (r = -0.316*) and significant (P=0.099) relationship between community participation in sensitization on crime and Crime Prevention. . This means that the participation in sensitizing crimes negatively relates to crime, which indicates that increased participation in sensitization about crimes reduces crime and vice versa. The findings however call for the rejection of the null hypothesis which stated that community participation in sensitization does not ensure crime prevention in Kampala Central Division and conclude that community participation in sensitization effectively ensures crime prevention in Kampala Central Division.

Community pparticipation in ppatrolling and ccrime prevention

This is the third objective of the study and respondents were asked to show their level of agreement regarding community participation in patrolling and crime prevention in Kampala and the responses are shown in Table .

Table: Effect of Community Participation in Patrolling on Crime prevention in Kampala Central Division

Statement	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Not sure	Agree	Strongly agree
The strategy ensures effective problem identification	3(2.5%)	8(6.7%)	16(13.3%)	59(49.2%)	34(28.3%)
The strategy also enables the community to carry out problem evaluation	8(6.7%)	27(22.5%)	23(19.2%)	31(25.8%)	31(25.8%)
It also helps the community in prioritizing problems	8(6.7%)	19(15.8%)	28(23.3%)	40(33.3%)	25(20.8%)
The strategy ensures effective research about the problems	12(10%)	15(12.5%)	9(7.5%)	46(38.3%)	38(31.7%)
It is also a stepping stone to developing solutions to problems	8(6.7%)	19(15.8%)	2(1.7%)	63(52.5%)	28(23.3%)
It also helps in evaluating the success of the responses	-	14(11.7%)	22(18.3%)	53(44.2%)	31(25.8%)
There is strengthening responses for victims of violence.	-	20(16.7%)	6(5%)	50(41.7%)	44(36.7%0

Source: Primary data

On the issue of community participation in patrolling and crime prevention in Kampala Central Division, majority of the respondents (77.5%) revealed that community participation in patrolling ensures effective problem identification within the respective communities in Central division but 9.2% disagreed with the idea. More so, 51.6% of the respondents noted that participating in patrolling also enables the community to carry out problem evaluation within the communities but 29.2% disagreed with the idea. These findings mean that patrolling will ensure the criminals are scared of participating in any form of crime because they can see their fellow community members patrolling with the police. This will eventually reduce the crime rate because criminals are scared to steal, kill or do any bad act that contravenes the law, thus leading to reduction in crime rate.

Furthermore, 54.1% noted that participation in patrolling by communities also helps the community in prioritizing problems whereas 23.3% were not sure about the idea but 22.5% of the respondents disagreed with the idea. Community participation in community patrolling ensures effective research about the problem as shown by 70% of the respondents whereas 22.5% disagreed with the idea, only 7.5% were not sure about the idea. The above findings mean that with effective police foot patrols, it leads to formation of more organized groups and initiatives in the communities with a primary focus on crime prevention and foot patrols also may increase levels of awareness which is another essential part in community policing and crime prevention in society and Kampala central division in particular.

In an interview with one of the DPC's on the issue of patrols, he was quoted saying;

> *"By maintaining high visibility patrols by both the junior and senior citizens within their residential communities, the police officers as well as the whole community effectively reduce crime in society because the communities as well as the police officers are key participants in struggle to curb crime in community".*

The higher visibility patrols offer the communities a significant service given that both the communities and police officers on duty participate, an indication that ineffective visibility patrols will favour occurrence of crime in the communities.

Participating in patrolling is key if police is to reduce crime in Kampala central division because when community members patrol alongside the police, it helps in key areas like notifying the police spots where criminals are likely to hide.

Furthermore, 75.8% of the respondents noted that community participation in patrolling is a stepping stone to developing solutions to problems facing the communities whereas 22.5% disagreed with the idea and only 1.7% were not sure about the idea. Community participation in patrolling helps in evaluating the success of the responses within the communities as shown by 70% of the respondents. More so, community participating in patrols helps in strengthening responses for victims of violence as revealed by 78.4% of the respondents. The above findings mean that community participation in patrols helps significantly in monitoring and prevention of crimes in Kampala central division.

In an interview with one of the Community Liason Officers, she was quoted saying;

> *"Patrol officers and deputies are the primary providers of police services in community policing efforts but it's effectively done once communities participate in patrolling. Community participation in daily patrols helps the police officers on duty to handle the daily policing needs of the community in matters of crime identification and control. This is because effective community policing depends on optimizing contact between patrol officers and community members so that the officer develops an intimate knowledge of the day-to-day operations of the community and becomes a familiar figure to community members".*

Joint patrols enhance knowledge of police and day to day life of communities which is very vital if the police is to effectively curb crimes in such vicinity. Indeed community participation in community patrols with the police officers helps a big deal in reducing crime in Kampala central division.

Correlation between Community participation in Patrolling on crimes and Crime Prevention

Correlations

		Crime reduction	Community Participation in patrolling
Crime reduction	Pearson Correlation	1	-0.510**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.017
	N	120	120
Community Participation in patrolling	Pearson Correlation	-0.510**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.017	
	N	120	120

* Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (1- tailed)

The correlation analysis also showed that Community participation in Community Patrolling negatively affects crime prevention (r = -5.10**). This means that with effective participation of the community in patrolling), crime will be significantly reduced. The study also shows that community participation in patrolling significantly (P=0.017) affects crime prevention in Kampala central division in a sense that when communities participate in moving around their residences with the police officers or even moving on patrol cars in an effort to curb crime, it will scare away criminals or even those who intend to commit crime.

Therefore, the findings may therefore confirm at 99% confidence level that efficiency and effectiveness in engaging communities in patrols with other police officers improves crime prevention within communities in Kampala central division. Thus, the study still rejects the null hypothesis that stated that community Participation in Patrolling does not affect crime prevention in Kampala Central Division accepts the alternative hypothesis and conclude Community Participation in Patrolling significantly reduces crime in Kampala Central Division.

Table: Multiple regression and interpretation of coefficients

Coefficientsᵃ

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.539	.336		1.604	.112
	Community participation in identifying crimes	.283	.116	-.203	2.439	.016
	Community participation in sensitization on crime prevention	.164	.101	-.136	1.615	.109
	Community participation in Community Patrolling	.518	.122	-.380	4.242	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Crime prevention in Kampala Central Division

Table 13 above shows the regression analysis depicting the effect of community participation in identifying, community participation in sensitization and community participation in patrolling and crime prevention in Kampala central division. The hypothetical regression model that guided by the multiple regression equation shown below;

$$Y = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \ldots + \beta_n X_n$$

Where:

Y is the dependant variable (Crime Prevention)

"α" is a regression constant

$\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3$ and β_n are the beta coefficients

and $X_1, X_2, X_3,$ and Xn are the independent (predicators) variables.

Therefore, standardized beta coefficients were substituted in the hypothesized regression equation and Crime Prevention in Kampala central division is thus predicated as:

$$Y = 0.895 - .103\ X_1 - .136\ X_2 - .131 X_3$$

Where:

Y is Crime Prevention in Kampala central Division; 0.539 is a regression constant, *X₁,* is Community participation in identifying crimes; *X₂,* is Community participation in Crime sensitization, and *X₃* is Community participation in police patrolling. The regression shows that Community Policing (community participation in identifying crimes, sensitizing about crimes and police patrols) positively and significantly affect crime retention in Kampala central division. This is represented by (0.203 for participation in identifying crimes, 0.136 for participation in sensitization about crimes as well as 0.308 for community participation in police patrols). The findings therefore can lead to conclusion that approximately 41.1% of the variation (adjusted $R^2 = 0.41.1$) in the rate of Crime Prevention in Kampala central division is brought about the efficiency and effectiveness in community policing using community participation in identifying crimes, community participation in sensitization about crimes as well as community participation in police patrols. The above findings implied that community policing using participation in identifying crimes, sensitization about crimes and patrolling increase the possibility of reducing or preventing crimes in Kampala central division.

Discussion of findings

Community participation in identifying crimes and crime prevention

The study revealed that community participation in identifying crimes helps taking protective measures. This is in agreement with Fagan (2002) who argued that it is duty of the community to involve in identifying crime as this increases protective measures against crime. This implies if communities participate in identifying crimes, they will be protecting themselves from the "would be" criminals since they are already aware in matters concerning crime identification, hence reducing crime in the long run.

Furthermore, majority of the respondents noted that there is effective reporting of crimes where there is community participation. This means that participation of community members in identifying crimes is also very important because once community members identify crimes, they report such crimes to the relevant authorities, that is, the police officers who thereafter counter such crimes and find a lasting solution to the identified crimes. The findings are in agreement with Forman (2004) who also found out that community participation in crime related activities increases crime reporting and once a crime is reported, there is s higher chance that it can be

prevented or intercepted. This implies that participation of communities increases crime reporting and this later reduces the levels of crime in communities.

Further more, community partnerships in identifying crimes helps in crime prevention in the communities which later leads to the promotion of primary prevention responses while carrying out community policing. The findings are in agreement with Jeremy (2005) who noted that participation in crime prevention by communities is a primary crime prevention measure since it is stepping stone towards identification crime spots within communities. The above findings mean that community participation in identifying crimes in Kampala central division promotes crime prevention within the region.

The correlation analysis also revealed that community participation in identifying crimes significantly reduces crimes in Kampala central division because the correlation value was negative. This means that increasing community participation in identification crimes reduces the levels of crime in communities. The findings are in agreement with Fagan (2002) who found out that 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. It agrees with this study because most dimensions of identifying crimes like engaging the community members in identifying crimes has been found to play a significant part in the reduction and control of crimes in Kampala central division which was found out by Fagan, hence the study agrees with his findings. This therefore implies that that effective participation of community members in identifying crimes plays a vital and pivotal role in ensuring free movements of the people in their communities without fear of any criminal acts, living peacefully in their houses as well as the community being sure or certain that their properties are safe.

. Community participation in sensitization and crime prevention in Kampala Central

The study showed that community participation in sensitization helps in crime identification. The findings are in agreement with Kasingye (2009) who found out that crimes cannot be identified within communities if these communities don't help the police through participation in crime prevention activities. The study findings are also in agreement with Mastrofski *et al.* (1999) who also argued that it is only community participation that leads to crime identification in communities. This therefore implies that its sensitization that enables the people to know how to handle criminals, how to report criminals and how to mitigate any criminal acts within their societies, hence reducing the level of crime.

More so, majority of the respondents noted that community participation in sensitizing ensures the community embraces the crime prevention activities and it also ensures effective coordination with the community. The findings are in agreement in Lloyd (2008) who argued that community sensitization activities ensure effective coordination and supervision of the whole process of community policing once community engage in sensitization. This in a long run helps to reduce crime in communities. This therefore implies that coordination and supervision are also key in community policing because they are key in fighting crime in society.

More so, findings showed that public participation in sensitization makes the concerned entities to effectively monitor the policing process which means that that there is increased collaboration and exchange of information on crime prevention in communities. This in agreement with Sousa (2006) who noted that crime prevention in society must be a collaborative effort between the communities and the police since this involves exchange of vital information regarding how crime can be prevented. The findings implied that collaborative effort during community sensitization about crime plays a significant role in crime reduction in communities heavily affected by crime.

The study further employed a correlation analysis and it was found out that community participation in sensitization was negatively related to crime in Kampala central division meaning that increasing community participation in sensitizations about crime will automatically reduce the crime levels in communities around Kampala. This study therefore is in agreement with Wong, (2009) who argued that once community participates in sensitization about crimes in their own societies, this will add value to reducing the crime rates in society. This is because people understand why they need to cater for their own security and safety before the police comes in. This alone reduces temptations for those intending to commit crime because people are sensitized about ensuring their own safety an implication that the community members are ready for any criminal acts. So, criminals tend to also be cautious before going to carry out any acts, which reduces crime.

Community participation in sensitization enhances capacity of the police for collecting data on criminal acts because the community members readily avail the crime acts to the police only when they are sensitized on how important it is through their own active participation.

Community Participation in Patrolling and Crime prevention in Kampala Central

The study found out that community participation in patrolling ensures effective problem identification within the respective communities in Central division and it also enables the community to carry out problem evaluation within the communities. This is in agreement with Adams *et al.* (2005) who revealed that community participation in patrolling ensures identification and evaluation of problems facing the community. This means that its either foot and vehicle patrols that have enabled the community members to feel at ease because they are at least convinced that the security around them is good and have less worries about the safety of their

lives and property. This implies that problem identification and evaluation during patrols play a significant contribution to the fight against crime on communities.

Furthermore, majority of the respondents said that participation in patrolling by communities also helps the community in prioritizing problems as well as ensuring effective research about the problem. This is similar to Kelling (2006) who argued that community participation in crime related activities helps the police in prioritizing their problems as well as thorough research about the problems relating to crime. This means that the people or community members involved in patrolling help to provide information on which crime spots the police should normally put emphasis since they community members know such areas. The findings implied that prioritizing problems of the community during community policing is also an important factor that helps in crime reduction in most communities.

Furthermore, the study findings revealed that community participation in patrolling is a stepping stone to developing solutions to problems facing the communities as well as evaluating the success of the responses within the communities. More so, community participating in patrols helps in strengthening responses for victims of violence. The study findings are also in agreement with Mastrofski *et al.* (1999) who noted that under community policing the relationship between citizens and the police is supposed to improve if they are to curb crime but participation in patrols will help to significantly identify crime hubs for the police to always focus on during patrols, thus reducing crime in the long run. This is further in agreement with most of scholars reviewed in the literature as it was cited that majority of the scholars found a negative relationship between community policing techniques of identification, sensitization and patrolling with crime reduction in society.

This study is also in agreement with the arguments put forward in the situation theory of crime prevention also pin points how crime situations are easily countered or mitigated with the participation of the main stakeholders in community policing including the police and the people being protected by the police.

The above findings implied that community participation which involves prioritizing community problems, developing solutions for crime related challenges as well as evaluating success responses regarding crimes significantly helps in reducing crime in various community setups.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

1. Community participation in identifying crime and crime prevention

The study concludes that there is a negative relationship between community participation and crime rates because involving taking protective measures, effective reporting of crimes, and promotion of primary prevention play a significant role in crime reduction. Therefore, community participation in identifying crimes significantly reduces crimes in Kampala central division.

2. Community participation in sensitization and crime prevention

The study concludes that there is a negative relationship between community participation in sensitization and crime prevention since participation especially through effective coordination and collaborations. The study therefore means that participation in sensitizations about crime will automatically reduce the crime levels in communities around Kampala.

3. Community Participation in Patrolling and Crime prevention

The study also found a negative relationship between community participation in patrolling and crime reduction. This is because patrolling ensures effective problem identification within the respective communities in Central division and it also enables the community to carry out problem evaluation within the communities. In a nutshell, community participation police patrols reduce crime in communities.

Recommendations

1. Community participation in identifying crimes and crime prevention

There is need for the police especially the community liaison office to have training sessions for the communities in effective reporting of crimes because the study found out that effective reporting is the basis for primary crime during crime identification in communities.

However much participation in crime identification is important in crime prevention, the communities need to be trained on taking protective measures because identifying crime may not be very easy as the people in the community think as criminals may be more prepared than some of the community members.

2. Community participation in sensitization and crime prevention

There is need to put channels to be used by the communities and police such that there is increased collaboration and exchange of information on crime prevention in communities since collaboration was found to be key in fighting crime especially through community sensitization campaigns.

More so, there is need for proper coordination between the police and communities during crime prevention. This can be done through community members who will continuously be contact persons for the police in case of any rising cases of crimes as identified by the community members.

3. Community Participation in Patrolling and Crime prevention

Since problem evaluation is vital during patrolling, there is need for communities together with the police to carry out problem evaluation more consistently. This can be done during foot patrols, car patrols or in any other form of patrolling.

More community research needs to be done by the police especially concerning the reported problems facing communities. During patrols, research can be done through techniques like situation observation using mere eyes as well as other gadgets like taking photos among others such that research becomes a basis for crime prevention.

References

Adams, R.E.(2002), *Implementing Community-Oriented Policing: Organizational Change and Street Officer Attitudes. (eds)* Crime and Delinquency 48:399-430, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Allan Y. J, (1998). *Matching Police-Community Expectations.* Journal of Criminal Justice, Vol. 26. No. 4, Washington Press, Washington, USA.

Angell, J.E. and Miller, R.C. (Winter 1993). "Community Policing." *Alaska Justice Forum* 9(4): 3-5, Praeger Publishers, Alaska, USA.

Bayley, D.H. (1988). 'Community Policing: A Report from the Devil's Advocate', in Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality, eds J.R. Greene & S.D. Mastrofski, Praeger Publishers, New York, USA.
Citizen Satisfaction and the Importance of Police Attributes. Police Quarterly, 4, (4),
Criminology, 2004, Vol. 95 Issue 1.

Egon B., E. (1975), *The Impact of Police-Community Relations on the Police System.*Community Relations and the Administration of Justice, Wiley&Sons, New York, USA.

Englewood Cliffs, N.J., (2002). Zhao Jihong, et al. *Community Policing,* Cambridge University Press, UK.

Forman, J. (2004). *Community Policing and Youth as Assets.* Journal of Criminal Law, Sage Publications, New York, USA.

Friedman R,(1992). Community Policing: Comparative Perspective and Prospects, Harvestor- Wheatsheaf Printing Press, New York, USA.
Galbraith K.J. (1973). *Designing Complex Organizations*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, London, UK.

Gerring, John. (2005) *Case Study Research*. New York: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-67656-4

Greene, J. (1998) "Evaluating Planned Change Strategies in Modern Law Enforcement: Implementing Community-Based Policing" in JP. Sage Publications, New York.

International City Management Association (ICMA), Local Government Police Management, 3d. ed, Washington Press, Washington DC, USA.
Jeremy M. W. (2005). *Determinants of Community Policing: An Open Systems Model of Implementation.*Unpublished report prepared for the United States Department of Justice, Washington Press, USA.

Kelling, G.L.& Moore, M.H. (1998). *The Evolving Strategy of Policing.* Perspectives on Policing, Sage Publications, New York, USA.

Kasingye A. (2001), Implementation of Community Policing in Uganda: A Case Study of Kampala and Luwero Districts, Thesis for Master of Arts (Public Administration and Management) 2001, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.

Kenya Human Rights Commission, A Citizen's Handbook on Community Policing, 2006.

Lloyd ,S. (2008), Introduction to Community Policing Model of Law Enforcement, Department of Justice, Office of Community Orientated Policing Services, New York, USA.

Marie S. and Ratcliffe, J. (2004), Community policing : A descriptive Overview, 2004, Australian Institute of Criminology, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Mukherjee, S.K. (1987), 'Neighbourhood Watch: Myth or Reality. The Manufacturing of Crime', in Proceedings of the 8th Annual Congress of the Australian and New Zealand Association of Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, eds E. Berah & D. Greig, Melbourne, Australia.

New Vision, July (2008), Uganda: Drug Abuse Behind Kampala's High Crime Rates, *By Joshua Kato, 16 July 2008.*

Scott,W.R.(1990), *Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems,* 5th ed., Prentice Hall, Washington DC, USA.

Sherman, L.W (2001).*Consent of the Governed: Police, Democracy, and Diversity*. In Policing Security, and Democracy. eds. Huntsville, 5th ed., Prentice Hall publishers, Washington DC, USA.

Skolnick, J.H (1976)"The Police and the Urban Ghetto," The Ambivalent Force, Perspectives on Police, (2nd edn), Mastrofski, Praeger Publishers, New York, USA.

Sousa, W.H. & Kelling, G.L. (2006). Of "broken windows," criminology, and criminal justice. In D. Weisburd & A. A. Braga (Eds.), Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives (pp.77-97). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, UK.

Trojanowicz , C.R. & Pollard, B. (1990), Community Policing: The Line Officer's Perspective, National Center for Community Policing, School of Criminal Justice , Michigan State University, USA.

Trojanowicz, R. & Bucqueroux, B. (1990) *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective.*Cincinnati, Oh: Andersen Publishing Company, Oslo, Norway.

Westley G. S. (1998), *Community Participation and Community Policing*. In Brodeur, J.- P. (Eds), 5th ed., Prentice Hall, Washington DC, USA.

Wong, K.C. (2009) "Chapter 8: Chinese Theory of Community Policing," *Chinese Policing: History and Reform, (eds)* Wesley Publishing Company, New York, USA.