

ANALYSIS OF MACEDONIAN TRANSLATIONAL EQUIVALENTS OF THE ENGLISH TERMS “PUBLIC POLICING” AND “PRIVATE POLICING”

Vesna Trajkovska, PhD

Saše Gerasimoski, PhD

Faculty of Security, Skopje, University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, North Macedonia

Abstract: The paper analyses the semantic aspects of the English terms “public policing” and “private policing” and their Macedonian counterparts. The analysis relies on information retrieved from a survey involving two groups of students from the Faculty of Security in Skopje who were asked to translate these terms from English into Macedonian. The students were divided into two groups. Both groups of students had attended the classes in English language, while one of the groups also attended the classes in System of Private Security. The paper attempts to document the students’ understanding of “public policing” and “private policing”. It further wishes to map the differences regarding the distribution of acceptable and unacceptable Macedonian equivalents for these terms in both groups. The authors’ hypothesis that knowledge of contents in both subjects is linked to better understanding of these two terms related to their prospective profession will be either confirmed or challenged.

Key words: public policing, private policing, translation, English, Macedonian.

INTRODUCTION

Debate over public policing and private policing has oftentimes turned into a debate over the public and the private. Throughout the history of humankind these two aspects of life have interchangeably gained dominance one over the other and they were to a great extent intertwined (Hess, 2009: 65). Considering the very dynamics of society, the public and private distinction has come to historical scene in the so called stratified societies. At the earliest stage of primordial societies, the public dominated over the private owing to the absence of societal stratification. But, as the societies evolved towards the stratified ones, the private has appeared and gradually developed to the point where nowadays we have a real boom of the private over the public. The debate over public and private policing has mostly followed the development of the general public over private de-

bate, but in the area of security. Since the public policing-private policing debate is a security one and fairly tangled, there are very contradictory stances over the questions such as which one of them has appeared first in history, which one is more important and what the future is of the nexus public policing-private policing (Claassen, 2009: 1-7).

Because the generic notion of policing is quite extensive, as it encompasses many security functions carried out by the public security institutions in the nation-states during the era of modern societies, we have to be very careful when using the term policing for determining the security functions within contemporary postmodern and globalized societies. This caution is essentially needed due to the fact that nowadays security has neither been guaranteed anymore nor enabled only by state and public security providers, such as police. With seemingly irreversible process of security privatization, the private security entities have occupied significant part of contemporary security space, with security functions directly derived and transferred from public and state security institutions (Бакрески, Герасимоски и други, 2014: 130). In many democratic countries of the world, these non-state security providers are mostly associated with the term private policing and considering their growth in size, scope and powers, there are many countries, especially from the Western hemisphere, like the U.S.A., Canada or Great Britain, where the distinction between the so called public policing and private policing has been blurred and it is not always apparent where 'public' areas end and 'private' areas begin (Button, 2007: 37; Sarre, 2005: 61).

What is defining and crucial for the distinction between public policing and private policing today is not merely the very size of the private security sector (subsystem) throughout the world in terms of material and human resources, but it is the range of security functions that private security entities exert. In other words, the notion of public policing in many developed countries has been almost entirely consumed by private policing and reached the point of development where it is almost irrelevant who exerts the security functions (police or private security), since there are virtually no or very slight differences between them in terms of security functions they carry out. It can be clearly seen in the private policing in some of the most developed Western countries, where private security entities exert powers in crime and loss prevention, securing public places, developing public-private security partnerships, securing and managing prisons, assisting in detention of persons, routine sharing of security information, critical-infrastructure protection, leading corporate private investigations and so on. As Elizabeth Joh insightfully remarks, the security officers have become very police-like (Joh, 2006: 49).

DISTINCTION BETWEEN PUBLIC POLICING AND PRIVATE POLICING

In order to understand the entire complexity of debate over public and private policing and their conceptual differentiation, it is necessary to define the basic concepts of private and public policing. The key term is the term *policing* (*policiranje* or simply *polising*, roughly translated in Macedonian), which does not have an adequate translational equivalent in the modern Macedonian language and is most often either not translated or when it is done it is translated with the phrase *exertion of police affairs – vršenje policiski raboti* (Мјypeј и Мек Ким, 2003: 636). As the great private security connoisseur Les Johnston thinks, the term policing in Ancient Greece was used in a socio-political sense as a whole of organizing and governing functions at the level of the social community, while starting from the mid-18th century, the notion began to receive the current meaning of the unity of regulatory security functions, specifically with the police as an exponent of public security in contemporary civil societies (Johnston, 1992: 4). Policing lies at the heart of any order, comments Clifford Shearing, so it has to be understood only in terms of exerting security functions that maintain the societal order (Shearing, 1992: 426).

The present term *policing* denotes all the functions that the police, as a carrier of public security, carry out in modern states, such as regulation of public order and peace; guaranteeing fundamental human rights and freedoms; protection of life, personal safety and property of the citizens; prevention and fight against crime and so on. In the police and security sciences, there is a distinction between *public policing* and *private policing*, i.e. *javno policiranje* and *privatno policiranje*. The distinction is basically performed according to the criterion of the status of the public in relation to private security in the society and within the security system, as well as in terms of providing resources for their work. Thus, public policing is funded by the state whilst private by non-state (private) sources of funding (van Steden, 2007: 15-16; Bayley & Shearing, 2001: 5). The definition of *policing*, and within that framework, *public* and *private policing*, becomes elusive if we know that it has transcended the borders of states and became transnational, largely differentiated and pluralized in the epoch of the globalized and postmodern society (Sheptycki, 2002: 323; Dempsey, 2011: 27).

The transfer of security functions primarily refers to the relation between public security (police) - private security. In western scientific thought there is a special notion that denotes the police powers that are subject to transfer, and for them, a special term policing has been developed. Policing implies exercising police affairs, i.e. powers originally belonging to public security (the police). What the generic notion private security usually means, especially in earlier phases of its development, like in Macedonia for instance, is that it mainly includes private security activity and private detective activity, both with powers that are not close, let alone equal to the powers of public and state security institutions. That is why

we do not speak in terms of private policing and public policing in Macedonia and in the countries of the Balkans in general, but we mainly use the term private security. To our knowledge, no relevant scholarly paper or legal document ever mentioned the term private policing in Macedonia, as can be seen in the Strategy for development of private security in Republic of Macedonia (Комора на Република Македонија за приватно обезбедување, 2016).

In order to better differentiate the very process of transferring (delegating, outsourcing) the powers from public and state towards private security subsystem (sector), the terms public policing and private policing have been coined (Bayley & Nixon, 2010: 1-6; Bayley & Shearing, 2001; Bayley & Shearing, 1996). According to many seminal researchers of private security and policing, today we have a state of so-called plural policing, that is, powers that were once inherent in the police (public) security only, nowadays are carried out by many other security entities, mostly by the private security entities (Johnston, 1992; van Steden, 2007; Bayley & Shearing, 2001; Sheptycki, 2002; Stenning, 2010; Stenning, 1989; Jones & Newburn, 2006; Blackstone & Hakim, 2009; Kempa, Carrier, Wood & Shearing, 1999; Sarre & Prenzler, 2011; Swol, 1999; Спасески, Аслимоски, Герасимоски, 2017: 27).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Taking into consideration the complexity of the terms *private policing* and *public policing* and their relevance to the field of private security, we decided to assess the familiarity with these two terms of the students from the Faculty of Security in Skopje. We designed a questionnaire that was distributed to 80 students. They were divided into 2 groups, namely, Group A (40 students who have attended only English Language classes), and Group B (40 students who have attended classes in both English Language and System of Private Security). They were given a paragraph in English that contained, inter alia, the terms *public policing* and *private policing*, and its translation into Macedonian where they were asked to insert only the Macedonian translational equivalents for these two terms. The questionnaire was designed in Macedonian, using the Cyrillic script, but in this paper we used the Latin script both for the presentation of the excerpt from the questionnaire and the research results, i.e. the Macedonian lexical solutions offered by the students.

The following is the English paragraph:

PRIVATE POLICING is quite popular in the USA and in some European countries. This means hiring a **PRIVATE DETECTIVE** and conducting a private investigation for certain offences. However, this is mainly used for resolving personal or family issues, such as love affairs, embezzlement of family businesses, etc. For serious crimes, such as burglaries or murders, which are of general public concern, the systems of **PUBLIC POLICING** have to deal with the issue.

The Macedonian translation with the missing words is given below:

_____ e mošne popularno vo SAD i vo neкои evropski državi. Toa podrazbira angažiranje _____ i sproveduvanje privatna istraga za određeni prestapi. Sepak, vakvata praktika glavno se koristi za rešavanje problemi od lična priroda, kako na primer ljubovni aferi, pronevera na pari od semeen biznis itn. Za spravuvanje so seriozni krivični dela od tipot na provalni kražbi ili ubistva, koišto se od javen interes, se zadolženi sistemite za _____.

The goal of our research was twofold. On the one hand, we attempted to assess students' level of familiarity with these two concepts in general, while on the other hand we wanted to see whether the number of subjects whose classes were attended at the Faculty would influence the students' knowledge of the meanings of *private policing* and *public policing*. Our hypothesis was that the students from Group B (those who attended classes in both English Language and System of Private Security) would show better understanding of these terms, and would offer more appropriate Macedonian translational equivalents.

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Private policing

Regarding the term *private policing*, we obtained the following results:

Table 1: *Distribution of Macedonian lexical equivalents for private policing in both groups of students, and their classification.*

Translational equivalent	Group A	Group B
Acceptable translational equivalent	Total: 7 (17.5%)	Total: 17 (42.5%)
prajvat polising	-	1 (2.5%)
privatna bezbednost	5 (12.5%)	16 (40%)
privatno polisiranje	1 (2.5)	-
privatno policisko rabotenje	1 (2.5%)	-
Translational equivalent acceptable in a broader sense	Total: 24 (60%)	Total: 15 (37.5%)
privatna policija	17 (42.5%)	2 (5%)
privatno gonjenje/istraga	1 (2.5%)	-
privatno istraživanje	2 (5%)	-
privatno obezbeduvanje	4 (10%)	13 (32.5%)

Unacceptable translational equivalent	Total: 9 (22.5%)	Total: (15%)
Polising	-	1 (2.5%)
privaten detektiv	1 (2.5%)	-
privatna polisa	3 (7.5%)	1 (2.5%)
privatna služba	2 (5%)	-
privatni agencii	-	1 (2.5%)
privatno obezbeduvanje (bezbednost)	-	1 (2.5%)
privatno osiguruvanje	2 (5%)	1 (2.5%)
tajna policija	1 (2.5%)	1 (2.5%)
No answer	Total: 0 (0%)	Total: 2 (5%)
	-	2 (5%)

The Macedonian lexical repertoire does not have a one-word equivalent for *policing*. Macedonian scientists, experts and practitioners either use the anglicism *policiranje* in the gerund form, or a longer descriptive phrase such as *vršenje policiskih radova* or other synonymous phrases. In the Macedonian Law on Police, the actions of the police officers that cover the notion of the English term *policing* are actually referred to as *policisko rabotenje* and are extensively elaborated in Article 5 (Закон за полиција, 2006). Bearing this in mind, we were not surprised by the diversity of the students' answers. However, we were surprised that none of the students from Group B (i.e. those who have studied both English and System of Private Security) answered with *privatno policiranje/policisko rabotenje*. There was only one student who literally transcribed the term *private policing* as *prajvat polising*. As far as Group A (i.e. the students who have attended only English classes) is concerned, only one student provided the answer *privatno polisiranje* which was counted as accurate translation although *policing* was not adapted to the Macedonian phonetic system, so instead of *policing* the student used the phonetically transcribed form *polising* based on the pronunciation of the original English term. Also, there was only one student who translated *private policing* as *privatno policisko rabotenje*.

12.5% of the students from the "English-only" group and even 40% from the students who attended classes in both subjects chose *privatna bezbednost* as an equivalent for *private policing*. We included this term into the group of acceptable answers, taking into account the fact that *privatna bezbednost* covers the activities that are encompassed by private policing, i.e. private security activities and private detective activities.

However, the term *private policing* can also be translated with other Macedonian lexical equivalents, when perceived in a broader sense. Bearing this in mind,

we extended the group of acceptable translational equivalents for *private policing*, and classified all the obtained answers into four categories.

The extended group of acceptable Macedonian counterparts for *private policing* includes the terms *privatno obezbeduvanje*, *privatno gonenje/istraga* and *privatno istraživanje*. They correspond to the English terms *private security* and *private investigation*, respectively, and cover specific segments of private policing which means that when used in a specific context addressing those specific segments they can be accepted as its Macedonian translational equivalents. The students may have chosen these equivalents taking into consideration the specific paragraph which provides examples covered by these terms as hyponyms of *private security*.

Another interesting example from this group is the term *privatna policija* which was offered as translation for *private policing* by students in both groups. In this case, the students were not able to distinguish between the nouns *police* and *policing*. If we translate *privatna policija* back to English, we will get the term *private police*, which is a very interesting concept when it comes to its semantic analysis in English and Macedonian. Thus, for instance, in the USA *private police* may be used as a synonym for *private policing*, while in Macedonian context the term *privatna policija* has acquired a negative meaning and is usually linked to the abuse of the police for private goals, i.e. for the benefit of individuals, where policing is viewed as privatized instead of private. Therefore, when translating texts addressing private policing in the US context, *privatna policija* may be accepted as adequate translational equivalent.

Finally, we encountered some answers that we considered totally unacceptable. Thus, for instance, there was a student from the “English only” group who translated *private policing* with *privaten detektiv* (*private detective*), in spite of the completely different referents linked to these two notions, namely, *detektiv* (*detective*) refers to a specific person, i.e. professional carrying out detective work, while *policing* does not have a person as its referent.

Privatna polisa is another interesting example. In this case, the students obviously wrongly associated the root of *policing* with the noun *policy*, and consequently translated *policing* as *polisa*. The Macedonian word *polisa* is the equivalent of the English noun *policy* referring to “contract of insurance”¹ and is specifically used in the context of insurance. Some students went even further, translating *private policing* with *privatno osiguruvanje*, using the gerund *osiguruvanje* as the Macedonian lexical counterpart of the English noun *insurance*.

Some students translated *private policing* as *tajna policija*, which is also a wrong translation of *private policing*. The Macedonian term *tajna policija* is translated into English as *secret police*. It is mainly used colloquially with reference to the Macedonian Agency for Security and Counterintelligence. The notion it covers in Macedonian is totally unrelated to the notion of the English term *private policing*,

¹ Source: <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/policy>

since *tajna policija* is a state service, and consequently cannot be modified with *private*.

2. Public policing

The answers obtained from the students with regards to the Macedonian translation of the term *public policing* are presented in the table below:

Table 2: *Distribution of Macedonian lexical equivalents for public policing in both groups of students, and their classification.*

Translational equivalent	Group A	Group B
Acceptable translational equivalent	Total: 7 (17.5%)	Total: 23 (57.5%)
javna bezbednost	5 (12.5%)	21 (52.5%)
javna policija/javen bezbednosni sistem	0	1 (2.5%)
javno polisiranje	1 (2.5%)	0
javno policiskno rabotenje	1 (2.5%)	0
publik polising	0	1 (2.5%)
Translational equivalent acceptable in a broader sense	Total: 20 (50%)	Total: 6 (15%)
javna policija	16 (40%)	4 (10%)
javno obezbeđivanje	4 (10%)	2 (5%)
Unacceptable translational equivalent	Total: 13 (32.5%)	Total: 8 (20%)
gonenje po službeni dužnost	1 (2.5%)	0
državna, javna bezbednost	0	1 (2.5%)
državna (javna) policija, državni bezbednosni sistem	0	1 (2.5%)
državna policija	1 (2.5%)	0
javen nadzor	1 (2.5%)	0
javna bezbednost (državna) kako MVR i sl.	0	1 (2.5%)
javna polisa	2 (5%)	1 (2.5%)
javna služba	2 (5%)	0
javno istraživanje	1 (2.5%)	0
javno osigurivanje	1 (2.5%)	1 (2.5%)
javno pravosuđe	1 (2.5%)	0
opštestvena polisa	1 (2.5%)	0
otvorena policija	1 (2.5%)	0
policiskno pravo	0	1 (2.5%)
privatna bezbednost	0	2 (5%)
republička policija	1 (2.5%)	0
NO ANSWER	0	3 (7.5%)
no answer	0	3 (7.5%)

Following the analogy with *private policing*, we can agree that the nearest Macedonian translational equivalents for *public policing* are the ones containing the gerund *policiranje* or other descriptive phrases that denote exertion of police powers. This was the case with *javno polisiranje* (although *polisiranje* was not used in its phonologically adapted form *policiranje*) as well as *javno policisko rabotenje*. Also, the term *pablik polising*, as a literally transcribed form based on the original pronunciation of *public policing* was counted as acceptable answer, reflecting the practice of some Macedonian speakers to phonetically replicate the original English words.

Most of the students from Group B (52.5%) translated *public policing* as *javna bezbednost*, as well as 12.5% of the students from Group A (i.e. the “English-only” group). Literally translated, the English equivalent of *javna bezbednost* is *public security*. In Macedonian context the defining semantic component of *public policing* are the police powers, i.e. the total of all police powers of public security. Consequently, the terms *public policing* and *public security* are often used interchangeably as synonyms. This accounts for counting *javna bezbednost* as an acceptable lexical solution in Macedonian.

We also added *javna policija/javen bezbednosen potsistem* as an acceptable answer, taking into consideration the explanation of the notion *javna policija* as perceived by the student who provided the answer, namely, *javen bezbednosen potsistem* or its English counterpart *public security subsystem* which actually describes what public policing refers to.

However, we extended the number of acceptable answers, taking into consideration the notion of *public security* viewed from a broader perspective. Following the same analogy with the equivalents for *private policing* elaborated above, all the obtained answers for *public policing* were also classified in the categories presented above.

As can be seen from the table, we also classified *javna policija* and *javno obezbeduvanje* as possible translational equivalents for *public policing*, within the broader meaning of the concept. In Macedonian, we do not usually use the term *javna policija*, but when looking up the meaning of *public policing* in English one can observe that in many texts *public policing* is used interchangeably with *public police*. Further research will be necessary to assess the students’ motivation for such choice, but one possible assumption might be the influence of the English use of the term *public police*. As far as *javno obezbeduvanje* is concerned, it is a hyponym of *public policing*, i.e. it contains part of the notion covered by this term, and consequently might be considered as its acceptable equivalent.

Also, there was a group of answers that we considered unacceptable for various reasons. We were surprised to learn that in some cases *public policing* was translated as *državna/javna bezbednost* (=state/public security) and *javna bezbednost (državna) kako MVR i sl.* (=public (state)security) such as the MoI etc.), which is an indicator that there are still students who are unable to differentiate between *public security* and *state security* and use them as synonyms, although they are

completely different semantically. In Macedonian context *public security* refers to the security of all citizens, as opposed to *state security* which refers to the security of certain institutions such as, for instance, the President of the country. In other words, they differ in that they protect/safeguard different values, and cannot be used interchangeably.

Gonenje po službena dolžnost is another interesting term, but it actually refers to *ex-officio prosecution*, i.e. prosecution carried out by relevant authorities mainly with reference to serious crimes as stipulated by the respective laws.

Finally, the answer *javna služba* denotes a very board concept, literally translated in English as *public service*, and covers a wide range of professions and activities that fall within this category. Therefore, it cannot be accepted as equivalent for *public policing*.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As it can be inferred from the research results, the students who studied both English and System of Private Security showed greater familiarity with the terms *private policing* and *public policing* and provided the answers that may be considered acceptable in a narrower or broader context of the given notions, compared to the students who studied only English. When it comes to their familiarity with these two terms in general, when perceived as a whole, the majority of both groups showed familiarity with the meanings of both *public policing* and *private policing* in a narrower and broader sense.

Based on the research results, we recommend the following:

- The terms *private policing* and *public policing* should be addressed more thoroughly in both subjects, taking into consideration the overall results and the distribution of answers in all categories.

- Taking into account the obvious tendency for interchangeably using the generic terms private/public policing and the specific terms derived from them, we recommend that this distinction should be accentuated in both subjects.

- The distinction between *state security* and *public security* should also be given particular attention, not only in the English classroom and the syllabus of the System of Private Security, but also in the syllabi of other security-related subjects. The failure of some students to distinguish between these fundamental security concepts as opposed to *private policing* and *public policing* as relatively new concepts is an indicator that they have not mastered some basic security terminology which was a surprising fact.

- Further research (based on interview with the students) should be carried out in order to determine the influence of the possible factors on the perception of the given terms and the choice of the adequate translational equivalents.

REFERENCES

1. Bayley, David H. & Nixon, Christine (2010), "The Changing Environment for Policing, 1985-2008", *New Perspectives in Policing*, pp: 1-16
2. Bayley, David H. & Shearing, Clifford D. (2001), *The New Structure of Policing: Description, Conceptualization and Research Agenda*, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice
3. Bayley, David H. & Shearing, Clifford D. (1996), "The Future of Policing", *Law & Society Review*, Vol. 30, No.3, pp: 585-606
4. Бакрески Оливер, Герасимоски Саше, Ванковска Билјана, Стојановски Душко, Деаноска-Трендафилова Александра, Славески Стојан, Кузев Стојан (2014), *Коментар на Законот за приватно обезбедување*, Скопје: Комора на Република Македонија за приватно обезбедување
5. Blackstone, Erwin A. & Hakim, Simon (2009), *Private Policing: Experiences, Evaluation and Future Direction*, Temple: Temple University
6. Button, Mark (2007), *Security Officers and Policing: Powers, Culture and Control in the Governance of Private Space*, Burlington: Ashgate
7. Dempsey, John D. (2011), *Introduction to Private Security*, Belmont CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning
8. Kempa Michael, Carrier Ryan, Wood Jennifer & Shearing Clifford (1999), "Reflections on the Evolving Concept of 'Private Policing'", *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 7, pp: 197-223
9. Claassen, Rutger (2009), "The useful myth of state security: Reflections on the state's special role in security provision", *Res Publica*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp: 1-7
10. Комора на Република Македонија за приватно обезбедување (2016), *Стратегија за развојот на приватното обезбедување*, Скопје: Комора на Република Македонија за приватно обезбедување
11. Мјуреј, Тонита и Мек Ким, Ерика (2003), „Полиција и сектор приватне безбедности: шта доноси будућност“, *Безбедност*, Бр. 4., cc: 635-646
12. Спасески Јордан, Аслимоски Пере, Герасимоски Саше (2017), *Основи на приватната безбедност*, Скопје: Факултет за безбедност
13. Sarre, Rick & Prenzler, Tim (2011), *Private Security and Public Interest: Exploring Private Security Trends and Directions for Reform in the New Era of Plural Policing*, Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology
14. Sarre, Rick (2005), "Researching Private Policing: Challenges and Agendas for Researchers", *Security Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 3, pp: 57-70
15. Swol, Karen (1999), "Private Security and Public Policing", *Perspectives*, pp: 34-42
16. Stenning, Phillip (2010), "Private Policing: Some Recent Myths, Developments and Trends", *The Issues: Private Policing*, Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology, pp: 145-155

17. Stenning, Phillip (1989), „Private Police and Public Police: Toward a Redefinition of the Police Role“, in Loree, D.J.(eds.), *Future Issues in Policing*, Symposium Proceedings, Ottawa: Ministry of Supply & Services, pp: 169-192
18. Storm, Kevin et al. (2010), *The Private Security Industry: A Review of the Definitions, Available Data Sources and Paths Moving Forward: Literature Review and Secondary Data Analysis*, NC: RTI International, Research Triangle Park
19. Hess, Kären M. (2009), *Introduction to Private Security*, Belmont CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning
20. Jones, Trevor & Newburn, Tim (2006), „Understanding plural policing“, in Jones, Trevor & Newburn, Tim (eds.), *Plural policing: A comparative perspective*, London & New York: Routledge, pp: 1-11
21. Joh, Elizabeth E. (2004), „The Paradox of Private Policing“, *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, Vol. 95, No. 1, pp: 49-131
22. Johnston, Les (1992), *The Rebirth of Private Policing*, London & New York: Routledge
23. Shearing, Clifford D. (1992), „The Relation between Public and Private Policing“, *Crime and Justice*, Vol. 15, pp: 399-434
24. Sheptycki, James (2002), „Accountability Across the Policing Field: Towards a General Cartography of Accountability for Post-modern Policing“, *Policing and Society*, Vol. 12, No. 4, pp: 323-338
25. Закон за полиција, Сл.Весник на Р.Македонија бр.114 од 03.11.2006
26. <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/policy>