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ABSTRACT

The paper examines the level of community policing implementation by security agencies in Njoro sub-county, Nakuru, Kenya. A cross-sectional survey in Njoro Sub-County was undertaken and data collected from 138 sample respondents using interview schedules. The study targeted three security agencies: the National Government Administration, Kenya Police Service and Administration Police Service; whose officers were the sample respondents. The study conducted focused group discussions with 22 chiefs’ elders and administered interviews to the Sub-County Security and Intelligence Committee members as Key informants. The three security agencies formed the strata from where officers were selected by simple random sampling. The study concludes that there is a clear indication that the three security agencies in Njoro Sub-County were implementing community policing. There is need to allocate funds for the conduct of community surveys by security agencies, and ensure that the necessary structural and management style reforms are undertaken in the face of community policing implementation. These findings inform policy on the ongoing security sector reforms especially on the structural and management reforms that are required to transform the country’s security sector in Kenya.

Key words: Community Policing, Security, implementation.

INTRODUCTION

The end of the cold war had serious implications on security in Africa, Kenya included. Beginning 1990, Kenya experienced a marked decay in human security; from rising petty crimes to the advent of ethnic clashes. Corruption and abuse of office and the manipulation of the constitution were rampant. The deteriorating human security and the politicization of the security apparatus led to intense feelings of insecurity in the country. This led to the emergence of private security firms to provide security to the affluent, the formation of private militia groups by politicians for political patronage, and the formation of vigilante groups in rural areas and urban slums. Examples of such militia and groups include the mungiki among the Kikuyu, Jeshi la mzee in Nairobi, Chinkororo among the Kisi, Sungusungu among the Kuria, and kaya bombo at the coast, among other illegal groups (Jonyo and Buchere, 2011, National Taxpayers Association [NTA], 2010).
Community policing facilitates partnership so that the public can seek assistance from law enforcement agencies. It operates on the premise that crime perpetrators and their accomplices live within the communities in which they unleash crime. The criminals are known to their neighbours and this vital resource can be tapped to reduce crime. (Republic of Kenya, 2004).

Community policing is perhaps the most popular and the most demanded policing method among law enforcement authorities, and has been implemented by many countries in recent years. Its adoption and implementation was expected to bring a paradigm shift in the management of public security, with the introduction of partnership and teamwork between the security agencies and the community in a problem solving policing. Despite the expected benefits of the strategy in policing and the success in the pilot sites, there are still major obstacles to security reform in Kenya. Crime rates are still high, there is wide spread accusation of corruption, and policing approaches and actors are often politicized. Njoro Sub-County in particular, has experienced ethnic clashes since the advent of mult-party politics in the early 1990s.

Crime statistics indicate that the Sub-County recorded a total of 475 crime cases in the last twelve months with the prevalent crimes being assault, offences against the person, breakings, rape/attempted rape, general stealing and stock theft. (Source: Njoro Sub-County Crime Statistics, 2013. Illicit brews cases were also reported in the Sub-county. Cattle rustling cases between the Kalenjin in Mauche Division and Maasai from Narok North Sub-County have also been recorded. Also, ethnic tensions due the evictions/resettlement of Mau forest residents have impacted negatively on the Sub-County’s security situation. As such, much of the expected benefits of CP are yet to be realized in the Sub-County. When CP was officially launched in Kenya in 2005, it was lauded as the solution to Kenya’s policing problems.

Furthermore, community policing was supposed to introduce partnership and problem-solving approaches aimed at improving the relations between the security agencies and the community and to subsequently improve quality of police services, notably reduced crime levels. However, the fruits of the much praised and publicized strategy have not been forthcoming in many parts of Kenya where it was rolled out, Njoro Sub-County included. Crime levels are still high. There are wide spread accusations of corruption among security agencies and mistrust between the community and security officers. It also is not known to what extent the Security Agencies in Njoro Sub-County have implemented the community policing strategy, whether the strategy is working as expected. Specifically, the study intended to establish the level of community policing implementation by security agencies in Njoro Sub-County.

METHODOLOGY

The study used a cross-sectional descriptive survey research design. A descriptive survey design was suited for the study since the study aimed at collecting and analyzing data in order to describe and report on the implementation of community policing strategy among security agencies in Njoro Sub-County. This design was appropriate as it involves collection of information from a cross section of respondents selected in the study area and it offers a researcher the advantage of focusing on specific description or characteristics. It is also suitable where attitudes and opinions of respondents towards a given phenomenon are being sought. The study used a combination of qualitative and quantitative data. The quantitative paradigm is said to have an objective and outcome-oriented (Mwanje, 2001) while the qualitative paradigm subscribes to an inductive, holistic and subjective world view.

The respondents were selected using a stratified random sampling procedure and were interviewed once. The three security agencies were designated as the strata and formed the sampling frame from which a random sample of 138 officers was selected from each stratum. The names of the officers were listed and numbered in each stratum and a table of random numbers used to draw the sample. In addition, purposive sampling was used to select six key informants and twenty two participants for focused group discussions from the study area. Purposive sampling allowed the researcher to use cases that had the required information with respect to the objectives of the study. The Key informants were the members of the Sub-County Security and Intelligence Committee (Sub-CSIC) who included the deputy county commissioner, the senior assistant county commissioner, the officer commanding police division, the sub-county administration police commander, the sub-county criminal investigation officer and the sub-regional intelligence coordinator.
The participants for the focused group discussions comprised chiefs’ elders from Njoro, Mukungugu and Gichobo locations. At a significance level of 0.05, standard deviation at 1.095 and proportion of population required characteristics at 50%, a sample size of 92 security officers was arrived, derived from the following formula (Kothari, 2004):

\[ n = Z^2 \frac{pq}{d^2} \]

Where:
- \( n \) = the desired sample size (if target population is greater than 10,000)
- \( Z \) = the standard normal deviation at the required confidence level
- \( P \) = the proportion in the target population estimated to have the characteristics being measured
- \( q \) = 1 - \( P \)
- \( d \) = the level of statistical significance set

Therefore, the desired sample size \( n = (1.095)^2(0.5)(1-0.5)\) / (0.05)^2 = 120

However, the population of 394 is less than 10,000. Therefore, the sample size was calculated by the following formula:

\[ n_f = \frac{n}{1 + n/N} \]

Where:
- \( n_f \) = the desired sample size when population is less than 10,000
- \( n \) = the desired sample size when population is over 10,000
- \( n \) = the estimate of the population size

\[ n_f = \frac{120}{1+120/394} \]

\( n_f = 92 \)

In order to ensure that the sample was a representative of the three strata, the subjects were proportionally selected within each stratum as follows: From NGA = (71/394)92 = 17, APS = (169/394)92 = 39, and KPS = (154/394)92 = 36

However, during the data collection time, more officers than anticipated were willing and available to participate in the study. As such, a total of 138 security officers were interviewed. Additionally, members of the Sub-County Security and intelligence committee (Sub-CSIC), who are six in number, were interviewed as key informants, as well as twenty two (22) chiefs’ elders from three locations who participated in focused group discussions.

The study used interview schedules and focused group discussions to collect data for this research. Interview schedules were administered face to face on the respondents. The original interview schedule (Appendix A) was pretested and changes made to form the final schedule that was used to collect data for this research. The study used both quantitative and qualitative data analysis approaches. Qualitative method was used to analyze data from the key informant interviews and focused group discussions, while quantitative method was used to analyze data obtained from sample respondent interview schedules. Both descriptive and inferential statistics were used. Descriptive statistics helps in explaining the findings of the study by use of mean, mode, medians, frequency tables, percentages, and pie charts. Inferential analysis involved the use of regression and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA).

**FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

**Level of Community Policing Implementation by Security Agencies**

The objective of the study was to establish the level of CP strategy implementation by security agencies in Njoro Sub-County. The aim of this objective was to establish the level of community policing strategy implemented by the three agencies that are charged with CP implementation (National Government Administration, Kenya Police Service and Administration police Service) in Njoro Sub-County.

**Measuring the Level of CP Implementation**

The implementation index is based on Maguire’s (2003) Operationalization of task routineness and MacDonald’s (2002) and Morabito’s (2008) measurement of community policing and on the theoretical CP literature (as cited by Morabito, 2008). The variable was developed as an index, which combined eleven indicators. The indicators represent the scope of community policing activities performed by each agency, as was reported by the officer completing the survey.
The eleven indicators composing the index included the following: (i) indicating implementation of CP activities in the last 12 months, (ii) training of new recruits in CP, (iii) training of serving officers in CP, (iv) training of citizens in CP, (v) conducting community surveys, (vi) giving patrol officers geographic responsibility for an area, (vii) actively encouraging SARA problem solving processes (that is, scanning, analysis, response, assessment), (viii) including problem solving in performance evaluations, (ix) forming formal problem solving multidisciplinary partnerships with community partners (including other government agencies, non-profit and community-based groups, businesses, the media, and individuals), (x) existing partnerships bringing appropriate resources and level of commitment to CP activities, and (xi) the level of interaction between law enforcement agency and community partners. The respondents were asked to answer either yes or no to these questions, apart from the level of interaction, where they were asked to rate level of interaction between their department and community partners as either high, average or low.

The number and the percentage of the respondents who were positive to the survey items are given in Table 1.1

Table 1.1: Positive Responses to Survey Items Making the Level of CP Implementation Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of CP activities in the last 12 months</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>93.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of new recruits in CP</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>67.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of citizens in CP</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>68.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of serving officers in CP</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>71.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting community survey</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving patrol officers specific geographical areas</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>60.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging SARA processes</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>60.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including problem solving process in performance evaluation</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>63.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forming problem solving partnerships</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>68.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The positive responses to the survey items show that among the items highly implemented are training in CP for new recruits (67.39%), serving officers (68.84%) and citizens (71.74%) in that order. Other items that received high positive responses were the high level of interaction between security agencies and the community (86.23%) and indicating to have implemented CP in the last 12 months (93.48%). On the other hand, items that had received low positive responses were conducting community surveys (50.72) and partnership bringing resources and increased commitment to CP (57.25%).

The eleven indicators were coded as follows: level of interaction between law enforcement agency and community partners: high=3, Average=2 and low=1. The other ten indicators were dichotomous and were thus coded according to whether the agency engages in the activity (1) or not (0), meaning that all the “yes” responses were assigned a score of 1 and the “no” responses were assigned a score of 0. The eleven items were then summed to create an additive index ranging from 1 to 13. The changed variables were then added together to form an index depicting the different levels of community policing implementation attained by the security agencies in Njoro Sub-County. Higher index values indicated that the agency engages in more CP activities (Duman, 2007; Mehmet, 2008; Morabito, 2008, Wilson, 2002).

The descriptive statistics and the frequency distribution of this index of level of community policing implementation are given in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2: Descriptive Statistics and Frequency Distribution for the Index of the Level of Community Policing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Index</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The created index of the level of community policing had a mean of 8.60±0.264, mode of 11, and a median of 9. The scale ranged between 1, the lowest, to 13, the highest score, having implemented all the eleven activities analyzed. The index (8.60 out of 13.00) represents 66.15% level of community policing implementation among the security agencies in the Sub-County. Interviews with key informants also revealed that security officers in the Sub-County are doing several activities that show they are implementing CP. They cited specific activities such as conducting regular meetings with community members, carrying out joint projects between CP committee and police such as the building of a structure at Njoro police station proposed by the area CP committee.

Majority of the respondents (30.44%) scored the index of community policing at 11 and 12, while 1.45% of the respondents scored it at index 1. The wide range of distribution of the index of community policing in the Sub-County indicates that there were areas and/or some agencies within the Sub-County whose implementation of CP was very low (index score of 1) and in areas and/or some agencies where the implementation level was high (index score of 13).

The CP implementation index was further divided into 3 categories: low level (between 1 and 4), medium level (level 5 to 9) and high level (level 10 to 13) as given in Table 1.2. This was to make it easy to survey the CP implementation level.

### Table 1.3: Level of Community Policing Implementation in Njoro Sub-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low (1-4)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium (5-9)</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High (10-13)</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Field data, 2014)

Table 1.3 shows that majority of the respondents (60.1%) scored the level of community policing as high (score 10-13) meaning that they had implemented more than 76.9% of all the activities required for successful implementation of community policing, while 26.1% had a medium level and 13.8% had a low level. These results indicate that 39.9% of the respondents indicated a CP implementation level of 69% and below.

### Mean Comparison of the Level of Community Policing Implementation among the Security Agencies

The level of implementation of community policing among the three security agencies was analyzed based on the index of community policing developed. The comparison of the levels of implementation among the three agencies was done using a one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to compare the means of the three security agencies and the results are given in Table 1.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Security Agency</th>
<th>Level of community policing implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Police Service (APS)</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Police Service (KPS)</td>
<td>8.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Government Administration (NGA)</td>
<td>7.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Agencies</strong></td>
<td><strong>8.60</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANOVA F=3.331, p<0.05
(Source: Field data, 2014)

Table 1.4 shows that the Administration Police Service had the highest level of CP implementation, followed by Kenya Police Service and finally National Government Administration. The mean difference of the level of community policing
implementation for the three security agencies were compared using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). It was found out that there was a significant effect of the independent variable mean of the community policing on the dependent variable security agencies ($p \leq 0.05$). This was supported by results from the FGDs. A participant in the discussion reported,

“The Administration Police officers are good. They assist us grassroots leaders so much. They also live with us in the villages”

Table 1.5 ANOVA Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>62.117</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31.059</td>
<td>3.331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1258.752</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>9.324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1320.870</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>9.324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: Field data, 2014)

The mean for the level of community policing of the Administration police service appeared to indicate a higher value than the one of the Kenya Police Service and National Government Administration respectively and these differences were statistically significant ($p \leq 0.05$). This implied that the Administration Police Service had implemented more community policing activities than the other two agencies (Kenya Police Service and National Government Administration).

CONCLUSION

The objective of the study was to establish the level of community policing implementation by security agencies in Njoro Sub-County. The study found that the level of community policing implementation by the three security agencies was 66.15%. This is a relatively high percentage indicating that security agencies in the Sub-county are currently implementing community policing. The items indicating CP implementation that received highest positive responses were the high level of interaction between security agencies and the community (86.23%) and indicating to have implemented CP in the last 12 months (93.48%) while those that received lowest positive responses were conducting community surveys (50.72) and partnership bringing resources and increased commitment to CP (57.25%). Across the agencies, the results indicated that the Administration Police Service (APS) had the highest CP implementation level of 71.77% (9.33), followed by the Kenya Police Service (KPS) at 67.54% (8.78), then lastly by the National Government Administration (NGA) with a level 59.62% (7.75).

When the mean difference of the level of community policing implementation for the three security agencies were compared using a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), it was found out that there was a significant effect of the independent variable mean of the community policing implementation on the dependent variable security agencies. This implied that the Administration police service had implemented more community policing activities than the other two agencies (Kenya Police Service and National Government Administration).
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