

## OMNIPRESENCE OF POLICE AND MILITARY IN JOINT PATROL: EFFECTS ON CRIME AND SAFETY

Lee Bee Phang<sup>1</sup> and Kim-Leng Goh<sup>2</sup>

### ABSTRACT

*The Malaysian government adopted the Blue Ocean Strategy in its strategic planning and operation to transform the country towards an advanced nation by 2020. This study aims to find out the effectiveness of a National Blue Ocean Strategy (NBOS) initiative, namely, the Police and Military Joint Patrol in preventing crime and improving the public feel safe factor. At the same time, other issues of crime prevention and safety are also explored. This study uses data collected by the Institute of Public Security of Malaysia (IPSOM) through a survey that included a total of 271 respondents residing or working in 12 areas under the surveillance of the Joint Patrol Initiative. The survey was conducted 3 years after the implementation of this initiative. The study has two objectives. First is to gauge the correlation between public awareness towards crime and safety, effective measures to prevent crime, and public views on the Joint Patrol with personal safety issues after the implementation of the Joint Patrol Initiative. The second objective is to explore views on the perception of personal safety and feeling safe with the implementation of Joint Patrol, how they differ across groups, as well as other issues related to crime and safety. The results showed that personal safety and feel safe factor vary significantly with the demographic and socio-economic factors including gender, age, income, place of residence, family size and type of dwelling units. The evidence suggests that the public was of the view that the Joint Patrol by Police and Military is effective in crime prevention. The majority of the residents agreed that the Joint Patrol initiative had improved the feel safe factor with the omnipresence of police and military. On safety and crime issues, the study highlights that the lack of public confidence in the initiatives to reduce crime is a challenge that needs to be addressed.*

**Keywords:** *Crime Prevention, Crime Reduction, Feel Safe Factor, National Blue Ocean Strategy (NBOS), Police and Military Joint Patrol.*

---

<sup>1</sup> DCP Dato' Dr. Lee Bee Phang is currently the Chief Executive Officer of Institute of Public Security of Malaysia (IPSOM), Ministry of Home Affairs, Putrajaya. Email: bee\_phang@moha.gov.my

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Kim-Leng Goh is Professor at the Faculty of Economics and Administration, University of Malaya. Email: klghoh.um@um.edu.my

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Crime rate in Malaysia was on the upward trajectory in the period 2000-2009 (Sundramoorthy, 2014). Over a period of time since the new millennium, the progressive increase in the crime rate resulted a negative perception towards personal safety and security in general. The situation was made worse with the frequent occurrence of crimes such as snatch theft, vehicle theft, and housebreaking which directly affected the citizenry. Reducing crime and more importantly, making sure Malaysians and foreign visitors feel safe in Malaysia are the two main challenges confronting the Royal Malaysia Police (Ahmad Zahid, 2015). In view of the problems, the Government identified 'reducing crime' as a National Key Result Area (NKRA) under the Government Transformation Programme to be anchored by the Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) in 2009. To effectively achieve the targets set in this NKRA, initiatives based on the principles of Blue Ocean Strategy (Kim & Mauborgne, 2005) were formulated in the same year, and they are known as the National Blue Ocean Strategy (NBOS).

NBOS aims to empower the Government Transformation Programme (GTP) through a variety of creative and innovative approaches for national development to achieve the status of a developed nation by the year 2020. The main focus in the implementation of the NBOS is to achieve high-impact results through collaboration among agencies using existing resources and keeping costs to a minimum. Police and Military are the two main agencies entrusted with the responsibility of keeping the country safe. Realizing that crime has become increasingly serious and aggravated fearfulness in the society (Lee & Rasiah, 2014), one of the Government's rapid execution strategy is a creative collaboration between the Royal Malaysia Police (RMP) with the Malaysian Armed Forces (MAF) as a NBOS response in view of the urgency to combat crime.

The collaboration between RMP and MAF is not new in defence and security fronts in Malaysia. It is common knowledge that men in blue (police) and men in green (military) had been fighting against communist threats in the jungles or borders of Malaysia, and during time of crisis or disasters. The rebranding of such collaboration as part of the NBOS initiatives since being implemented in 2009 has brought the cooperation between the two forces to the next level, a prominent outcome of which is the introduction of Joint Patrol by police and military to fight crime at various hot spots. The omnipresence of police and military side by side in public places represents a new definition of the collaboration for safeguarding public safety. The first phase of Police and Military Joint Patrol was launched in 2011 in four (4) areas, and the initiative was later extended to 70 designated areas by 2014.

After three years of implementation, the Institute of Public Security of Malaysia (IPSOM) conducted an impact study to determine the effectiveness of the RMP-MAF collaboration in terms of cost, time and impact through a survey on the public. Specifically, the study seeks to establish if the Joint Patrol by Police and Military has any impact on (i) crime prevention, (ii) reduction of crime and (iii) 'feel safe' factor and the safety perception among the community in the areas where the Joint Patrol initiative was implemented. The results are useful for assessing whether the RMP-MAF collaboration provides positive outcome to the cost, time and human resources invested in this initiative. Thus the study serves as a guideline and reference to policy makers in deciding whether this initiative need to be repealed or be continued with modifications.

Drawing on the data of the survey, the objectives of this paper are to:

- (i) Gauge the correlation between public awareness towards crime and safety, effective measures to prevent crime, and public views on the Joint Patrol with personal safety issues and the feel safe factor after the implementation of the Joint Patrol Initiative.
- (ii) The second objective is to explore views on the perception of personal safety and feeling safe with the implementation of Joint Patrol, how they differ across groups, as well as other issues related to crime and safety. These issues include awareness of crime and safety, effective measures of crime prevention, initiatives taken by the police in crime prevention and factors that affect the feeling of safety.

The remaining of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 of this paper presents a brief background on the NBOS of Joint Patrol by Police and Military. The section that follows provides details on the survey conducted by IPSOM. Section 4 discusses the analysis and results. The last section concludes the study.

## **2. JOINT PATROL BY POLICE AND MILITARY**

For many years, the Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) and Ministry of Defence (MINDEF) have worked together to enhance the total security system of Malaysia and to support national security efforts. Many of the cooperations between the two agencies were implemented through strategic collaborations between RMP, the main law enforcement agency under the purview of MOHA, and MAF, the main security force under the purview of MINDEF. Since 2009, the collaboration was brought to the next level through the National Blue Ocean Strategy (NBOS)

initiatives. Under the NBOS initiatives, RMP and MAF is working closely to support the Government's effort to reduce crime in Malaysia. During the NBOS Summit, several initiatives were outlined for implementation by both RMP and MAF which included (i) military taking over duty or operation at Malaysia-Thailand borders to allow the General Operation Force (GOF) personnel to be deployed to fight crime in urban areas, (ii) training of new police recruits using military facilities, (iii) recruitment of ex-military personnel as policemen, and (iv) joint patrol by the police and military at crime hot spots.

Joint Patrol by RMP and MAF is an initiative under the Malaysian National Blue Ocean Strategy (NBOS) categorized as NBOS 2. For easy reference, this initiative is also known as **Police and Military Joint Patrol** or **Joint Patrol Initiative**, which would be used interchangeably throughout this article. This initiative was created in January 2011 in support of Government's effort to reduce crime rate in Malaysia with the adoption of the Blue Ocean Strategy (BOS) framework that emphasizes high impact results using existing resources while keeping cost at its minimum, and that the strategy could be executed immediately and sustainable over time (Kim and Mauborgne, 2005). In order to fight crime effectively, strong omnipresence of security offices is necessary. The readily available military personnel to be deployed together with the police for street patrol serves this purpose well.

The main objective of the Police and Military Joint Patrol is to protect public safety through the presence of security forces in public as well as to strengthen the working relationship between the Police and Military. The Joint Patrol Initiative was first launched in two states, namely Negeri Sembilan and Perak, and conducted in areas near the military bases in Seremban, Port Dickson, Ipoh and Taiping. The coverage was later extended to the states of Selangor, Johor, Pulau Pinang and Kedah. In June 2011, the Joint Patrol Initiative was expanded to Kelantan (Kota Bharu and Kubang Kerian), Kuala Lumpur International Airport, Penang (Bayan Baru and Bayan Lepas), Selangor (Melawati, Hulu Kelang, Kota Damansara and Sungai Buluh), and Johor (Johor Bharu Selatan)

The military personnel were required to undergo two weeks of orientation and training programme at police training centres to equip them with the knowledge and skills for their duties and tasks. They were later assigned to districts and police stations where the joint patrol initiatives were implemented. There are five types of joint patrol efforts – foot patrol, motorcycle patrol (URB), car patrol (MPV), road blocks and spot checks. The working principle is that the police and military will perform the patrol together in a team. The deployment uses a ratio of 2:1 i.e. two police and a military personnel at any given time. Time of deployment is between the hours of 7.00 am to 6.00 pm.

### 3. THE SURVEY

This paper uses data collected by IPSOM to gather information on the public's perception of security and the effectiveness of the Police and Military Joint Patrol through a survey. The survey was conducted in 12 designated areas where the Joint Patrol Initiative was introduced during the duration of January to March 2014 by a group of IPSOM<sup>3</sup> staff in stages. After three years of implementation, it was considered appropriate for an impact study to be carried out to gauge the effectiveness of the Joint Patrol Initiative. A questionnaire was designed for the survey.

#### 3.1 Coverage of the Survey

Twelve areas jointly patrolled by the Police and Military were randomly selected for this study. These areas included 7 from Perak i.e. Taiping, Pokok Asam, Simpang, Aulong, Kamunting, Pekan Baru Ipoh and Sg.Senam; 1 from Negeri Sembilan i.e. Seremban; 2 from Selangor i.e. Damansara and Kota Damansara, and 2 from Johor i.e. Pelangi Indah and Taman Setia Indah. The detailed breakdown of number of respondents interviewed in each selected areas are given in Table 1. A total of 271 respondents residing or working in the patrolled areas were interviewed. Of these, 150 (55%) of the respondents are from Perak, 36 (13.3%) from Negeri Sembilan, 33 (12.2%) from Selangor, and 52 (19.2%) from Johor. Due to time and budget constraints, this study covered only 12 of the 70 patrolled areas.

---

<sup>3</sup> The authors gratefully thank the following officers that were involved in the survey: (i) Mohd Fairuze B. Mohd Fadzil, Siti Habsah Bt. Abu Yazid and Muhd Adzir Putra B. Mahadzir, who are presently still serving in IPSOM; and (ii) Dato' Dr. Hashim Harun, Surayati Ibrahim, Wan Husbi Wan Mohd, Rosni, and Nurul Shahidah Masjudi, who had since transferred to other agencies.

**Table 1: Total Number of Respondents in the Patrolled Areas**

| State           | Area              | Number (%) of Respondents |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------------|
| Perak           | Taiping           | 12 (4.4%)                 |
|                 | Pokok Asam        | 16 (5.9%)                 |
|                 | Simpang           | 14 (5.2%)                 |
|                 | Aulong            | 24 (8.9%)                 |
|                 | Kamunting         | 12 (4.4%)                 |
|                 | Pekan Baru Ipoh   | 37 (13.7%)                |
|                 | Sg. Senam         | 35 (12.9%)                |
| Negeri Sembilan | Seremban          | 36 (13.3%)                |
| Selangor        | Damansara         | 2 (0.7%)                  |
|                 | Kota Damansara    | 31 (11.4%)                |
| Johor           | Pelangi Indah     | 16 (5.9%)                 |
|                 | Taman Setia Indah | 36 (13.3%)                |
| <b>Total</b>    |                   | <b>271 (100.0%)</b>       |

Source: Authors, 2016.

### 3.2 Profile the Respondents

Table 2 summarizes the profile of the respondents by demographic and socio-economic factors as well as type of residence. Majority of the respondents are male (81.9%). About half of them are Chinese (47%), while 37% and 14% of them are Malay and Indian respondents, respectively. The distribution by age group is fairly uniform. About 80% of the respondents were married, and close to 18% of them are singles.

**Table 2: Frequency (%) Distribution by Demographic and Socioeconomic Factors**

| No. | Variable  | Category | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----|-----------|----------|-----------|------------|
| 1   | Gender    | Male     | 222       | 81.9       |
|     |           | Female   | 49        | 18.1       |
| 2   | Ethnicity | Malay    | 100       | 36.9       |
|     |           | Chinese  | 128       | 47.2       |
|     |           | Indian   | 39        | 14.4       |
|     |           | Others   | 4         | 1.5        |

| No. | Variable          | Category                | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----|-------------------|-------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 3   | Age Group         | < 30 years old          | 54        | 19.9       |
|     |                   | 31 – 40 years old       | 45        | 16.6       |
|     |                   | 41 – 50 years old       | 62        | 22.9       |
|     |                   | 51 – 60 years old       | 61        | 22.5       |
|     |                   | > 60 years old          | 49        | 18.1       |
| 4   | Marital Status    | Married                 | 214       | 79.0       |
|     |                   | Single                  | 47        | 17.3       |
|     |                   | Widow/Widower           | 10        | 3.7        |
| 5   | Education Level   | No Formal Education     | 2         | 0.8        |
|     |                   | Primary Education       | 26        | 9.6        |
|     |                   | Secondary               | 162       | 59.8       |
|     |                   | Diploma                 | 46        | 17.0       |
|     |                   | Degree                  | 26        | 9.6        |
|     |                   | Masters                 | 9         | 3.3        |
| 6   | Occupation        | Self-employed           | 95        | 35.1       |
|     |                   | Private Sector          | 88        | 32.5       |
|     |                   | Government Sector       | 17        | 6.3        |
|     |                   | Pensioners              | 50        | 18.5       |
|     |                   | Housewife               | 13        | 4.8        |
|     |                   | Students/Undergraduates | 7         | 2.6        |
|     |                   | Others                  | 1         | 0.4        |
| 7   | Monthly Income    | No Income at all        | 20        | 7.4        |
|     |                   | < RM900                 | 42        | 15.5       |
|     |                   | RM901 – RM3000          | 142       | 52.4       |
|     |                   | RM3001 – RM5000         | 46        | 17.0       |
|     |                   | > RM5000.00             | 21        | 7.7        |
| 8   | Type of Dwelling  | Own House               | 187       | 69.0       |
|     |                   | Rented Room/House       | 76        | 28.0       |
|     |                   | Others                  | 8         | 2.9        |
| 9   | Type of Occupancy | Staying with Family     | 238       | 87.8       |
|     |                   | Staying with Friends    | 16        | 5.9        |
|     |                   | Staying Alone           | 15        | 5.5        |
|     |                   | Others                  | 2         | 0.7        |
| 10  | Type of House     | Single Terrace House    | 99        | 36.5       |
|     |                   | Double Terrace House    | 55        | 20.3       |
|     |                   | Single Storey Semi-D    | 19        | 7.0        |
|     |                   | Double Storey Semi-D    | 18        | 6.6        |
|     |                   | Bungalow                | 34        | 12.5       |
|     |                   | Condominium             | 6         | 2.2        |
|     |                   | Apartment               | 16        | 5.9        |
|     |                   | Flat                    | 24        | 8.9        |

| No. | Variable       | Category      | Frequency | Percentage |
|-----|----------------|---------------|-----------|------------|
| 11  | Household Size | One Person    | 17        | 6.3        |
|     |                | Two Persons   | 35        | 12.9       |
|     |                | 3 – 4 Persons | 104       | 38.4       |
|     |                | 5 – 6 Persons | 96        | 35.4       |

Source: Authors, 2016.

Very few of the respondents have no education, and less than 10% have only primary school education. Most of them (60%) attained secondary school education, 17% have diploma, and 13% are university graduates with at least a bachelor degree. Majority of them are self-employed (35%), or working in the private sector (32%), some 7% work in the public sector, while the remaining are outside the work force. Of those who are working, most of them receive a monthly income between RM901 to RM3000 (52%) or RM3001 to RM5000 (17%).

In terms of place of residence, 69% of the respondents are staying in their own house, while 28% stay in rented property. Majority of them live with their family (88%). Single (36%) and double storey terrace houses (20%) are the most common type of residence. On the other hand, about 12% of the respondents stay in bungalow, 14% stay in semi-detached houses, while 17% stay in flat, apartment or condominium. Most of the respondents live in household with 3-4 (38%) or 5-6 (35%) persons, while about one fifth of the respondents live either alone or with another person.

### 3.3 Instruments

The survey was conducted using a set of questionnaire adapted from existing research models. A pilot study was undertaken in a patrolled area in Port Dickson, Negeri Sembilan with a total of 30 respondents to determine the validity and reliability of the questionnaire instrument. The questionnaire consists of six parts, namely Part A (Respondent's Background), Part B (Awareness of Crime and Safety), Part C (Details on Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF), Part D (Feel Safe Perception towards Joint Patrol Initiative), Part E (Several Other Measures Undertaken by RMP in Crime Prevention) and Part F (Feel Safe Factor).

The validity and reliability analysis on all the 9 factors on level of security, 5 factors on measures effective for crime prevention, 6 factors on perceptions towards Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF, 15 factors on safety issues after the implementation of RMP-MAF Joint Patrol, and 8 factors influencing Feeling Safe showed validity (over 0.26) and reliability (Cronbach's alpha value exceeds 0.6) measures that are



acceptable (Salleh & Zaidatun, 2001). In this regard, the Cronbach's alpha for Part B is 0.843 for the level of security and 0.807 for measures deemed effective to prevent crime. The reliability measure for Part C, D and F yields the alpha value of 0.920, 0.937 and 0.879, respectively.

#### 4. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

This section reports the results of the analysis. The data collected on Part B, C, D, E and F are analyzed in detail.

##### 4.1 Correlation between Variables

Correlation analysis is used to examine the strength and direction of the relationship between the variables in the study. The results are shown in table 3. The variables in the table are computed by taking the average of all the factors for each variable. Some items were reverse-coded to obtain measures that are consistent.

**Table 3: Correlation between Selected Variables**

|   | Awareness of Crime and Safety | Effective Measures of Crime Prevention | Perception Assessment on Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF |
|---|-------------------------------|--|--|
| Assessment of personal safety after implimentation of Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF | .164**                        | .286**                                 | .405**   |
| Feel Safe Factor  |                               | .217**                                 |  |

\*\* Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Source: Authors, 2016

The following variables, (i) awareness of crime and safety in general, (ii) effective measures of crime prevention, and (iii) perception assessment on Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF are significantly and positively correlated with the assessment on personal safety issue after implimentation of Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF. The coefficient of correlation is highest ( $r = 0.41$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ) for the variable on perception towards Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF. The correlation is second highest with effective measures of crime prevention ( $r = 0.29$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ), followed by awareness of crime and personal safety in general ( $r = 0.16$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). Meanwhile, the feel safe factor is also positively correlated with effective measures of crime prevention ( $r = 0.24$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ). The results show that whether individuals feel safe

after the implementation of the RMP-MAF Joint Patrol is significantly related to their awareness of safety, whether they think crime prevention measures are effective, and if they had positive views of the Joint Patrol. The findings suggest that public confidence of measures taken by the Government is important in determining whether they feel safe.

#### 4.2 Differences Across Groups

ANOVA analysis is performed to test if differences across groups are significant in two variables, namely, assessment of personal safety issue after implementation of Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF, and feeling safe. The results are presented in Table 4. The first variable varies significantly according to age, type of dwelling, type of house and household size. The variables that affect the variation in feeling safe significantly are gender, age, income and type of dwelling.

**Table 4: Differences Across Group in Assessment of Personal Safety After Implementation of Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF and Feeling Safe**

| Demographical factors | Assessment of personal safety after implementation of Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF |    |             |       |             | Feeling Safe   |    |             |       |             |
|-----------------------|---|----|-------------|-------|-------------|----------------|----|-------------|-------|-------------|
|                       | Sum of Squares  | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.        | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.        |
| Gender                | 4.861   | 18 | .270        | 1.629 | .053        | 3.897          | 13 | .300        | 1.803 | <b>.043</b> |
| Ethnicity             | 13.154  | 18 | .731        | 1.401 | .131        | 6.269          | 13 | .482        | .896  | .558        |
| Age                   | 56.929  | 18 | 3.163       | 1.729 | <b>.035</b> | 49.965         | 13 | 3.843       | 2.111 | <b>.014</b> |
| Marital Status        | 3.742   | 18 | .208        | .813  | .685        | 4.027          | 13 | .310        | 1.240 | .251        |
| Education             | 22.909  | 18 | 1.273       | 1.495 | .092        | 7.787          | 13 | .599        | .670  | .791        |
| Occupation            | 31.678  | 18 | 1.760       | .997  | .464        | 30.109         | 13 | 2.316       | 1.333 | .193        |
| Income                | 24.829  | 18 | 1.379       | 1.217 | .248        | 31.777         | 13 | 2.444       | 2.254 | <b>.008</b> |
| Type of Dwelling      | 388.070   | 18 | 21.559      | 2.734 | <b>.000</b> | 228.423        | 13 | 17.571      | 2.104 | <b>.014</b> |
| Type of Occupancy     | 5.353   | 18 | .297        | .458  | .973        | 1.182          | 13 | .091        | .335  | .986        |
| Type of House         | 147.330   | 18 | 8.185       | 2.030 | <b>.009</b> | 55.166         | 13 | 4.244       | .984  | .467        |
| Household Size        | 28.984  | 18 | 1.610       | 1.761 | <b>.030</b> | 4.969          | 13 | .382        | .386  | .973        |

Source: Authors, 2016.

The study shows that there are differences in both the assessment of personal safety and feeling safe among the respondents. The female respondents generally feel safer if they see the presence of Joint Patrol or knowing there is police and military patrolling in the vicinity of their place of residence. Those staying in bungalows, and the households that have small number of members have a better safe feeling with the presence of joint patrol by the Police and Military in their place of residence. The joint patrols are also more reassuring of safety especially among those who are older and those with a higher monthly income.

### 4.3 Awareness towards Crime and Safety

A series of questions were included in the survey to gauge the level of awareness among the respondents on the occurrence of different types of crime and unrests. The results of a descriptive analysis on their responses are tabulated in Table 5. Close to one quarter of them said that drug abuse has frequently occurred. This is followed by motorcycle theft (18%), snatch theft (16%), house break-ins (14%), quarrel (11%), car-theft (7%), robbery (6%), rape (1.5%) and murder (1.5%).

**Table 5: Level of Awareness Towards Crime and Safety**

| No. | Types of Crime   | Never Happen   | Seldom         | Sometime       | Often         | Very Often  | Total         |
|-----|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1   | Snatch Theft     | 33<br>(12.2%)  | 72<br>(26.6%)  | 122<br>(45.0%) | 43<br>(15.9%) | 1<br>(0.4%) | 271<br>(100%) |
| 2   | Robbery          | 55<br>(20.3%)  | 121<br>(44.6%) | 78<br>(28.8%)  | 16<br>(5.9%)  | 1<br>(0.4%) | 271<br>(100%) |
| 3   | House Break-in   | 36<br>(13.3%)  | 89<br>(32.8%)  | 108<br>(39.9%) | 37<br>(13.7%) | 1<br>(0.4%) | 271<br>(100%) |
| 4   | Motorcycle theft | 56<br>(20.7%)  | 66<br>(24.4%)  | 98<br>(36.2%)  | 49<br>(18.1%) | 2<br>(0.7%) | 271<br>(100%) |
| 5   | Car Theft        | 68<br>(25.1%)  | 88<br>(32.5%)  | 96<br>(35.4%)  | 19<br>(7.0%)  | -           | 271<br>(100%) |
| 6   | Quarrel          | 74<br>(27.3%)  | 105<br>(38.7%) | 61<br>(22.5%)  | 29<br>(10.7%) | 2<br>(0.7%) | 271<br>(100%) |
| 7   | Drugs            | 86<br>(31.7%)  | 62<br>(22.9%)  | 61<br>(22.5%)  | 60<br>(22.1%) | 2<br>(0.7%) | 271<br>(100%) |
| 8   | Rape             | 174<br>(64.2%) | 85<br>(31.4%)  | 8<br>(3.0%)    | 4<br>(1.5%)   | -           | 271<br>(100%) |
| 9   | Murder           | 187<br>(69.0%) | 65<br>(24.0%)  | 15<br>(5.5%)   | 4<br>(1.5%)   | -           | 271<br>(100%) |

Source: Authors, 2016.

In terms of crime situation, majority of the respondents (42%) are of the views that there is a slight decrease in the incidence of crime in their area, and 16% said the crime has indeed decreased. While close to 20% think that the crime situation is the same, the other 12% are of the opinion that crime has increased slightly, and 10% said crime rate is on the rise. These results suggest that a bigger proportion of the community feels that the crime situation is improving.

Regarding their sources of information on crime occurrence, 39% of the respondents get to know them from the neighborhood, 20% from newspapers or through friends, 14% through television, 12% through the police, 7% through Village Heads or residential committees, 4% from the internet, 2% from the family of victims, and 2% from other sources. News from the neighborhood seems to be the most common source of information. This would also mean that it is important to ensure that accurate information are being disseminated to avoid panic and to reduce feeling of unsafety.

The respondents were also asked if they are ready to help in reducing crime in their respective areas. The results showed that 90% of them are ready to help in reducing crime as opposed to 9% who are not ready and 0.4% who are not sure. In other words, most Malaysians are concerned about crime and safety in Malaysia and they are ready to play their parts in crime reduction.

#### **4.4 Effective Measures of Crime Prevention**

The respondents were given 5 items of crime prevention measures and asked if they agree that each of them is effective. The results in Table 6 showed the majority of them either agree or strongly agree (99%) that these measures are effective for crime prevention. Providing information of crime to the police, creating police and army patrolling, and taking care of own personal safety and property are some of the effective measures to prevent crime. The respondents are also of the view that hiring private security guards in their housing areas as well as special operations by the police are effective ways to prevent crime in their area. These clearly shows that the community acknowledged that multiple measures are needed to prevent crime and to maintain safety and peace. The involvement of individuals and community in making the environment safer is consistent with situational crime prevention suggested by Gason and Wilson (1988) in which measures are taken to remove or reduce the opportunity for crime to take place.

**Table 6: Effective Measures of Crime Prevention**

| No. | Statement                                   | Strongly Disagreed | Disagreed   | Agreed         | Strongly Agreed | Total         |
|-----|---|--------------------|-------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|
| 1   | Provide information on crime to police      | 2<br>(0.7%)        | -           | 154<br>(56.8%) | 115<br>(42.4%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 2   | Establish patrolling by Police & Military   | 2<br>(0.7%)        | -           | 125<br>(46.1%) | 144<br>(53.15%) | 271<br>(100%) |
| 3   | Engage private security guards              | 1<br>(0.4%)        | 2<br>(0.7%) | 206<br>(76.0%) | 62<br>(22.9%)   | 271<br>(100%) |
| 4   | Taking care of personal safety and property | 1<br>(0.4%)        | 1<br>(0.4%) | 144<br>(53.1%) | 125<br>(46.1%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 5   | Conduct <i>Ops. Cantas Khas</i> by police.  | 2<br>(0.7%)        | 1<br>(0.4%) | 128<br>(47.2%) | 140<br>(51.7%)  | 271<br>(100%) |

Source: Authors, 2016.

Who are the parties responsible for crime reduction? Table 7 shows that majority of the respondents (99.6%) agreed or strongly agreed that efforts to reduce crime should be carried out with the cooperation of the local residents. At the same time, other efforts and parties such as joint patrol by army, police, RELA (*Jabatan Sukarelawan Malaysia*, or, People's Volunteer Corps) and JPAM (*Jabatan Pertahanan Awam Malaysia*, or, the Malaysia Civil Defence Department) (99%), safeguarding personal safety (98%) and police (95%) are equally important. This again highlights that multifaceted involvement from individuals, the community and the authority is necessary for reducing and preventing crime.

**Table 7: The Party Responsible for Reducing Crime**

| No. | Statement  | Strongly Disagree | Disagree     | Agree          | Strongly Agree | Total         |
|-----|--|-------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| 1   | Police   | 2<br>(0.7%)       | 12<br>(4.4%) | 210<br>(77.5%) | 47<br>(17.3%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 2   | Joint Patrol by Military, Police, <i>Rela &amp; JPAM</i> | -                 | 2<br>(0.7%)  | 141<br>(52.0%) | 128<br>(47.2%) | 271<br>(100%) |
| 3   | Cooperation from community                               | -                 | 1<br>(0.4%)  | 178<br>(65.7%) | 92<br>(33.9%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 4   | Taking care of personal safety                           | 1<br>(0.4%)       | 4<br>(1.5%)  | 188<br>(69.4%) | 78<br>(28.8%)  | 271<br>(100%) |

Source: Authors, 2016.

#### 4.5 Police and Military Joint Patrol Initiative

The survey included questions to gather views on the NBOS initiatives introduced by the Government. The survey results indicated that a total of 77% of the respondents have not heard of NBOS, or do not know of it, and 23% are not sure. This shows that the level of awareness regarding the existence of NBOS is quite low. More efforts need to be taken to create awareness among the public through publicity of these Government initiatives.

On the other hand, 61% are aware of the Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF as an initiative by the Government to prevent crime, despite 19% who do not know about it and 20% that are uncertain. In addition, close to three quarter of the respondents have seen Joint Patrol by Police and Army in their areas. From the above analysis, the omnipresence of Police and Military is felt by a majority of the community. The challenge that remains is to raise public awareness of the commitment by Government in tackling crime. Further results on perceptions and views on the Joint Patrol are shown in Table 9.

**Table 9: Perception on Implementation of Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF**

| No. | Statement   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree      | Agree          | Strongly Agree | Total         |
|-----|---|-------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| 1   | As if Malaysia is in an emergency state   | 19<br>(7.0%)      | 38<br>(14.0%) | 199<br>(73.4%) | 15<br>(5.5%)   | 271<br>(100%) |
| 2   | Police is not capable in tackling crime   | 23<br>(8.5%)      | 36<br>(13.3%) | 206<br>(76.0%) | 6<br>(2.2%)    | 271<br>(100%) |
| 3   | I feel safer with the presence of police and military                             | 15<br>(5.5%)      | 37<br>(13.7%) | 144<br>(53.1%) | 75<br>(27.7%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 4   | I accept well the idea of having police & military in joint patrols of the street | 18<br>(6.6%)      | 34<br>(12.5%) | 119<br>(43.9%) | 100<br>(36.9%) | 271<br>(100%) |
| 5   | Crime rate has reduced in my area with the presence of Joint Patrol               | 15<br>(5.5%)      | 40<br>(14.8%) | 177<br>(65.3%) | 39<br>(14.4%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 6   | To my view, patrolling is the sole responsibility of police                       | 18<br>(6.6%)      | 43<br>(15.9%) | 175<br>(64.6%) | 35<br>(12.9%)  | 271<br>(100%) |

Source: Authors, 2016.

About 81% of the respondents agree or strongly agree that they feel safer with the presence of police and army patrolling in their areas. The level of acceptance of the concept of Joint Patrol Initiative is also very high (80%). Furthermore, 80%

of the respondents are of the view that crime rate in their area has decreased after the implementation of Joint Patrol by the Police and Military. However, a high percentage (78%) also have the impression that the police's ability to solve crime problems is limited with the presence of military forces on the streets. In fact, a high proportion of them (77%) feel that security patrols are the sole responsibility of the police. Against this backdrop, 79% also opined that as if the country is in a situation of emergency with the police and military walking side by side in public areas. The findings of the omnipresence of police and military is well accepted and make the public feel safer suggest that the initiative has been viewed by the public as an effective method of crime prevention. However, this initiative itself must be clarified to avoid affecting public confidence of the ability of police to solve crime related problems. The public uneasiness on the presence of military on the street is also a concern that needs to be tackled by the authority.

#### 4.6 Perception on Personal Safety and Feeling Safe

The survey is also interested to find out perceptions towards personal safety and the feel safe factor for different activities of the respondents during the day and night time with the existence of the Joint Patrol by RMP-MAF. The related results are shown in Table 10.

**Table 10: Perception on Personal Safety with the Implementation of Joint Patrol by RMP -MAF**

| No. | Statement  | Feeling Not Safe | Less Safe      | Quite Safe     | Very Safe     | Total         |
|-----|--|------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1   | Walking alone during day time                      | 30<br>(11.1%)    | 59<br>(21.8%)  | 157<br>(57.9%) | 25<br>(9.2%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 2   | Walking alone during night time                    | 47<br>(17.3%)    | 114<br>(42.1%) | 98<br>(36.2%)  | 12<br>(4.4%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 3   | Driving alone during day time                      | 24<br>(8.9%)     | 55<br>(20.3%)  | 148<br>(54.6%) | 44<br>(16.2%) | 271<br>(100%) |
| 4   | Driving alone during night time                    | 5<br>(12.9%)     | 100<br>(36.9%) | 119<br>(43.9%) | 17<br>(6.3%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 5   | Going alone to unfamiliar places during day time   | 28<br>(10.3%)    | 83<br>(30.6%)  | 140<br>(51.7%) | 20<br>(7.4%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 6   | Going alone to unfamiliar places during night time | 71<br>(26.2%)    | 93<br>(34.3%)  | 93<br>(34.3%)  | 14<br>(5.2%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 7   | Boarding a taxi alone during day time              | 24<br>(8.9%)     | 54<br>(19.9%)  | 161<br>(59.4%) | 32<br>(11.8%) | 271<br>(100%) |

| No. | Statement   | Feeling Not Safe | Less Safe      | Quite Safe     | Very Safe     | Total         |
|-----|---|------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| 8   | Boarding a taxi alone during night time                         | 45<br>(16.6%)    | 115<br>(42.4%) | 91<br>(33.6%)  | 20<br>(7.4%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 9   | Taking a lift from a stranger upon invitation during day time   | 79<br>(29.2%)    | 96<br>(35.4%)  | 84<br>(31.0%)  | 12<br>(4.4%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 10  | Taking a lift from a stranger upon invitation during night time | 104<br>(38.4%)   | 98<br>(36.2%)  | 54<br>(19.9%)  | 15<br>(5.5%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 11  | Walking alone in a quiet place                                  | 80<br>(29.5%)    | 103<br>(38.0%) | 72<br>(26.6%)  | 16<br>(5.9%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 12  | Boarding a public transportation alone during day time          | 26<br>(9.6%)     | 62<br>(22.9%)  | 152<br>(56.1%) | 31<br>(11.4%) | 271<br>(100%) |
| 13  | Boarding a public transportation alone during night time        | 44<br>(16.2%)    | 107<br>(39.5%) | 107<br>(39.5%) | 13<br>(4.8%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 14  | Leaving the working place/ office alone on late night           | 52<br>(19.2%)    | 132<br>(48.7%) | 76<br>(28.0%)  | 11<br>(4.1%)  | 271<br>(100%) |
| 15  | Wondering around alone in public gardens                        | 34<br>(12.5%)    | 83<br>(30.6%)  | 139<br>(51.3%) | 15<br>(5.5%)  | 271<br>(100%) |

Source: Authors, 2016.

About 67% of the respondents feel safe walking alone during the day compared to 41% feeling safe walking alone at night. A lower proportion of 59% of the respondents feel safe going to unfamiliar places alone in the day compared to 40% in the night. However, only 32% of respondents feel safe when walking alone in a quiet place. Similarly, only 32% of the respondents feel safe when leaving their work place alone on late night. Around 57% of them feel safe when wondering around alone in public gardens. On feeling safe to drive alone, the corresponding proportions are 71% compared to 50% for doing so in the day and night. Some 71% of the respondents feel safe when boarding taxi in day time, but only 41% respondents feel to do so in the night. Quite similarly, 67% and 44% of the respondents feel safe when boarding a public transportation alone during the day and night respectively. A low 35% and 25% of the respondents feel safe to take a lift from a stranger upon invitation during the day and night time respectively. Generally, the results suggest that only about 70% or lower of the respondents feel safe in doing normal daily activities such as walking, driving or using the public transportation alone in the day. The proportion drops sharply by 30 percentage points if such activities are during the night. By comparison, for example, the proportion of 60% of respondents who do not feel safe to walk alone at night is higher than the range of 30% to 50% reported by Warr (1995,



Figure 1) for U.S. The statistics indicate that the feel safe factor is not strong among the public, even for activities that are very much part of daily life. Again, the issue of confidence of public safety needs to be addressed.

#### 4.7 Other Initiatives Undertaken by Police in Crime Prevention

The police is also providing some other services to the public as an effort to deal with crime. The information gathered through the survey indicated that a high percentage of the respondents are aware of these initiatives taken by the police. About 85% of them know about the Police Hotline, 84% are aware of the Police Control Booth, 77% know of the Police Mobile Station and 64% know that SMS can be sent to police for help or giving information on crime. However, close to two thirds are not aware of the AMANITA (or 'Peace Lady') Initiative and a similar proportion also do not know about the Go To Safety Point Initiative. Both of these are NBOS initiatives undertaken by the police. This endorses the earlier results that call for more publicity to raise public awareness on NBOS initiatives.

Do such initiatives contribute to crime prevention in the eyes of the public? Table 11 provides some assessment. The proportion of respondents with the view that crime could be reduced through these initiatives is 58% for the Police Hotline, 65% for the Police Control Booth, 69% for the Mobile Police Station, 64% for SMS to police, 48% for AMANITA and 47% for Go To Safety Point. While these statistics are encouraging, more could be done to convince the public of the effectiveness of such initiatives. Such efforts will help to promote the use of these initiatives for combating crime.

**Table 11: Other Initiatives by Police to Prevent Crime**

| No. | Statement  | Crime increasing | Slight increase | Same          | Slight decrease | Crime Decreasing |
|-----|--|------------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 1   | Police hotline could help to reduce crime                      | 19<br>(7.0%)     | 28<br>(10.3%)   | 66<br>(24.4%) | 141<br>(52.0%)  | 17<br>(6.3%)     |
| 2   | Police Control Booth could help to reduce crime                | 14<br>(5.2%)     | 40<br>(14.8%)   | 41<br>(15.1%) | 153<br>(56.5%)  | 23<br>(8.5%)     |
| 3   | Mobile Police Station could help to reduce crime               | 13<br>(4.8%)     | 35<br>(12.9%)   | 34<br>(12.5%) | 154<br>(56.8%)  | 35<br>(12.9%)    |
| 4   | SMS Police could help to reduce crime                          | 16<br>(5.9%)     | 30<br>(11.1%)   | 52<br>(19.2%) | 155<br>(57.2%)  | 18<br>(6.6%)     |
| 5   | NBOS Initiative: AMANITA could help to reduce crime            | 26<br>(9.6%)     | 32<br>(11.8%)   | 83<br>(30.6%) | 110<br>(40.6%)  | 20<br>(7.4%)     |
| 6   | NBOS Initiative: Go To Safety Point could help to reduce crime | 28<br>(10.3%)    | 35<br>(12.9%)   | 80<br>(29.5%) | 107<br>(39.5%)  | 21<br>(7.7%)     |

Source: Authors, 2016.

#### 4.8 Perception on Factors that Affect Feeling of Safety

The survey included a series of items that might influence perception on public safety. Table 12 lists these items, and the extent of the respondents' agreement if they affect the feel safe factor. All the items are high on the list of factors that would influence the feeling safe perception. Only 3% or less disagree that these items will affect the feel safe factor. Generally, 97% or more agree or strongly agree that social media, newspaper coverage, family and friend's crime experiences, repeated broadcast of television coverage on crime, personal experience, phone messages (SMS, MMS, Whatsapp, etc), instigation by irresponsible parties and words of mouth are factors that will influence individuals on whether they feel safe and their views about public safety. The results indicate a high level of vulnerability of the public to news and information. This highlights the importance of educating the public on responsible dissemination of news and information related to crime.

**Table 12: Factors Influencing Perception of Feeling Safe**

| No. | Statement   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree    | Agree          | Strongly Agree |
|-----|---|-------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| 1   | Newspaper coverage including color and terrifying pictures of crime scene | 4<br>(1.5%)       | 3<br>(1.1%) | 241<br>(88.9%) | 23<br>(8.5%)   |
| 2   | Television news on crime repeatedly shown                                 | 1<br>(0.4%)       | 3<br>(1.1%) | 237<br>(87.5%) | 30<br>(11.1%)  |
| 3   | Social media  | 1<br>(0.4%)       | 2<br>(0.7%) | 240<br>(88.6%) | 28<br>(10.3%)  |
| 4   | Words of mouth  | 2<br>(0.7%)       | 5<br>(1.8%) | 247<br>(91.1%) | 17<br>(6.3%)   |
| 5   | Self experience   | 1<br>(0.4%)       | 3<br>(1.1%) | 245<br>(90.4%) | 22<br>(8.1%)   |
| 6   | Experience from family members and closed friends                         | 1<br>(0.4%)       | 2<br>(0.7%) | 245<br>(90.4%) | 23<br>(8.5%)   |
| 7   | Through hand phone (SMS, MMS, Whatsapp)                                   | 1<br>(0.4%)       | 4<br>(1.5%) | 246<br>(90.8%) | 20<br>(7.4%)   |
| 8   | Instigation by irresponsible parties                                      | 4<br>(1.5%)       | 5<br>(1.8%) | 241<br>(88.9%) | 21<br>(7.7%)   |

Source: Authors, 2016.

## 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The Joint Patrol Initiative by Police and Military in hot spot areas is one of the Government NBOS initiatives to reduce crime rate. This study examines the safety and crime issues in relation to the effectiveness of the Joint Patrol Initiative in reducing crime and more importantly to create safe feeling among the public. Data from the survey conducted by IPSOM provides the means to conduct this impact study. Although awareness of the existence and concept of NBOS is low among the public, they generally know of the Joint Patrol Initiative from witnessing the presence of police and military on the street. The public also welcomes the Joint Patrol Initiative taken by Government to help to prevent crime, and most agreed that the crime situation has improved. At one point, they were skeptical about the presence of military in public places which is unusual in Malaysia, giving the false impression that the country is in a state of emergency. The public was also doubtful about the ability of police in solving crime problem when army was seen patrolling with the police. Such unnecessary alarm could be addressed through better publicity of the Joint Patrol Initiative. These negative views were later over taken by the positive impacts of the presence of the two forces working together to safeguard peace and safety.

The survey shows that the frequency of drug abuse, motor cycle theft, snatch theft and house break-in is a cause of concern among the public. Their level of awareness of crime is considered high. This finding suggests that collaboration between the police and community will yield positive results because “people who have a sense of emergent crisis with regards to the safety of their communities tend to take community crime prevention as their own issue and to be willing to participate in such activities” (Shibata et al., 2011, p. 26). This is confirmed by the survey that found a high level of willingness for the public to work together with the enforcement authority to maintain safety. Further, the respondents agreed that the individuals and community can play their part by engaging private security guards in their housing area and to be vigilant of own personal safety.

The public agreed that providing crime information to police, having more police and army patrols, special operations of police are some effective measures for preventing crime. Despite to a lesser extent, the public is also of the view that some measures undertaken by RMP such as the setting up of Police Hotline, Police Control Booth, Mobile Police Station, and Police SMS are effective ways for reducing crime. Other NBOS initiatives like AMANITA and Go To Safety Points are less known of by the public, but a sizeable proportion of the respondents agreed that these are also effective methods. These preventive measures could lead to reduction of crime and fear of crime. In light of these positive responses, more could be done to convince the public of the effectiveness of such initiatives, as such efforts will also help to promote the use of these initiatives for combating crime.

On perception towards personal safety, the results suggest that a majority of the respondents feel safe in doing normal daily activities such as walking, driving or using the public transportation alone in the day, but they have greater reservation if these activities are to be performed in the night. There is also concern on leaving the workplace late in the night, or walking alone in quiet and unfamiliar places. These findings highlight the need to address the issue of public confidence in safety and security.

Despite positive results were achieved in the reduction of crime index especially street crime and violent crime, the public safety perception remains low. The survey results indicate a high level of vulnerability of the public to news and information spread through phone messages, word of mouth and coverage in the mainstream and other social media, which are the factors that are seen to influence the perception on public safety. It must be recognized that “perceptions of the quality of police services ..... are strongly associated with experiences ..... to reports of crime” (“Sense of Safety”, n.d.), and that “social participation, vulnerability, victimization and disorder affect residents’ perception of safety” (Okunola and Amole, 2013, p. 55). Safety perception could be aggravated by the abuse of social media (Amin, 2015). This highlights the importance of educating the public on responsible dissemination of news and information related to crime. Action should be taken against those who irresponsibly instill fear among the public by spreading alarmingly false information. Some fear of unsafety is due to experience of friends and relatives or own self being a victim of crime. The enforcement authority could play their role in helping the crime victims to alleviate their fear in these instances. Satisfactory help obtained from the police by victims of crime can boost confidence in the enforcement agency (“Sense of Safety”, n.d.).

The rising crime rate in Malaysia in the new millennium could have gone out of control if not handled rapidly. In view of the urgency, a new approach needs to be put in place. The strategic collaboration between the two security forces, i.e. RMP and MAF, are called in to make rapid execution with the existing resources possible. Overall, the IPSOM survey conducted from the community perspective shows that the implementation of NBOS Joint Patrol Initiative has proven to be an effective strategy in crime prevention. It has also led to reduction of crime rate in the patrolled areas. The initiative has contributed to better feel safe factor among the community with the omnipresence of police and military in public places. Based on its positive impact, the authority could consider expanding such initiatives and extending the coverage of the areas under patrol.

The effectiveness of this initiative could be further enhanced by improving the availability of logistical support such as firearms and equipment, walkie talkies and CCTV as well as infrastructure to police. There is also a need to step up

publicity efforts to promote NBOS initiatives to the public to raise the visibility of the initiatives, to make the public more aware of such efforts, and to engage better involvement of the public to play their role in these initiatives. It must be recognized that the police, community and citizens share responsibility for crime prevention (Geason and Wilson, 1988). This can be done by organizing programmes such as the NBOS Day at national level held on 23-24 May 2015 at KLCC, Kuala Lumpur and the oncoming International Conference on Blue Ocean Strategy (ICBOS) in Putrajaya, Malaysia to be held on 14-16 August 2016.

To improve public perception and their confidence on safety and security, it is important for the authority to reach out to the community and to convince them of their commitment in combating crime. At the same time, the spread of false information that instill public fear must be curbed. There is a need to educate the public on responsible dissemination of news and information related to crime. Measures to ensure ethical and responsible reporting by any form of media when dealing with crime and safety issues shall be implemented. The aim is to ensure that the abuse by inaccurate and incorrect reporting is not dispersed widely.

For future research, it is suggested that studies from the perspective of the implementers, e.g., members of the police and military forces are to be conducted to provide insights for improvement of the initiatives to prevent and reduce crime.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmad Zahid, Hamidi. (2015). Our crime journey: The way forward. *Journal of Public Security and Safety. Institute of Public Security of Malaysia*, 3(1), 1-18.
- Amin, Khan. (2015). Hitting the target but missing the point. *Journal of Public Security and Safety. Institute of Public Security of Malaysia*, 4(2), 21-42.
- Geason, S. & Wilson, P.R. (1988). *Crime prevention: Theory and practice*. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Kim, W.C., & Mauborgne, R. (2005). *Blue Ocean Strategy: How to create uncontested market space and make the competition irrelevant*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Lee, Bee Phang, & Rasiah, Rajah (2014). Juvenile and youth crime in Malaysia. *Journal of Public Security and Safety. Institute of Public Security of Malaysia*, 2(2), 31-48.
- Okunola, S., & Amole, D. (2013). Explanatory models of perception of safety in a public housing estate, Lagos, Nigeria, *Journal of Asian Behavioural Studies*, 3(8), 47-57.

- Sense of safety (n.d.). Malcolm Wiener Centre for Social Policy, Harvard Kennedy School. Retrieved from <https://www.hks.harvard.edu/programs/criminaljustice/research-publications/measuring-the-performance-of-criminal-justice-systems/indicators-in-development-safety-and-justice/>.
- Shibata, S., Hanyu, K., Asakawa, T., Shimada, T., & Omata, K. (2011). People's crime perception and attitude toward community crime prevention activities in Japan. *Journal of Asian Behavioural Studies*, 1(2), 21-31.
- Sundramoorthy, P. (2014). Crime control strategies in Malaysia: National Key Result Area (NKRA) on reducing crime. *Journal of Public Security and Safety. Institute of Public Security of Malaysia*, 2(2), 67-90.
- Warr, M. (1995). Public opinion on crime and punishment. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 59, 296-310.