

# Why Do Citizens Participate in Community Crime Prevention Activities?

Kwan Choi,<sup>1</sup> Ju-lak Lee,<sup>2</sup> Yong-tae Chun<sup>3</sup>

The contemporary police cannot improve community safety effectively without the support from community and community residents, which makes citizen engagement in community safety activities a significant issue in criminal justice. The purpose of this study is to examine what stimulates citizen participation in the community crime prevention activities in the British context. The research data was collected from 200 residents of London who provided support for the police as Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs). The data collected was analysed through Chi-Square test and regression analysis.

Data analysis showed that the concerns about community safety and individual victimisation experiences prompted British citizens to consider becoming a participant of community crime prevention activities as a PCSO. The research findings also revealed that the British people who had victimisation experiences were more likely to become PCSOs compared to the cohorts who had not had individual experiences related to crime. Furthermore, those who had a higher level for fear of crime were more likely to engage in community policing activities. Additionally, the present research suggests that the decisions to take part in community crime prevention activities were based on the cultural background of Britain, namely individualism.

**Keywords:** citizen participation, crime prevention, Police Community Support Officers, individualism, Britain

UDC: 351.78(41)

## 1 Introduction

According to Pepinsky (1989), community residents expect to see four general results from the police work. They want a reduced level of fear of crime, various disputes to be mediated, different services to be provided (e.g. searching for a missing person and navigation service), and the police to be accountable to their communities. Among these, reduced 'fear of crime' has been regarded as the most important component. Meško, Fallshore, Rep, and Huisman (2007) also argues that fear of crime is currently one of the most significant and researched topics in international criminology fields. The researcher argues that fear of crime is an expression of an individual's sense of social isolation. Fear levels may vary among individuals, but it is likely to increase and decrease according

to the degree of isolation that each person experiences. As a result, it is one of the most commonly studied topics in the field of Criminology and Criminal Justice.

Percy (1987) points out that fear of crime and victimisation experience tend to increase collective community crime prevention activities (e.g. neighbourhood watch and citizen police academy). This study explores the reasons why the individuals from the United Kingdom choose to serve as Police Community Support Officers. The reasons provided will be interpreted in the light of two key themes: Individual victimisation experiences and people's sensitivity to the issues of community safety and crime. This research also aims to explore the correlation between citizen involvement and fear of crime in relation to British community police programmes.

## 2 Literature Review

### 2.1 What is the British PCSO?

British Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), also known as Community Support Officers (CSOs), were created to reduce the 'reassurance gap' between the public confidence in the police and crime rates, and to increase the

<sup>1</sup> Kwan Choi, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice, Department of Police Administration, Hansei University, South Korea. E-mail: kwanchoi@hansei.ac.kr (First Author)

<sup>2</sup> Ju-lak Lee, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Criminal Justice, Department of Security Management, Kyonggi University, South Korea. E-mail: julaklee@kgu.ac.kr (Corresponding Author)

<sup>3</sup> Yong-tae Chun, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice, Department of Security Management, Kyonggi University, South Korea. E-mail: chunyoungtae@naver.com

visible presence of policing activities through foot patrolling which was implemented by the British Police Reform Act 2002 (Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary, 2002, 2004). British PCSOs are the citizen support group of the British Police body and the uniformed non-warranted officer groups. As the features for police supporters, British PCSOs work alongside police officers and have lesser power than regular officers. For example, they are only authorised to issue fixed penalty notices for anti-social behaviour by employing the 'stop and search' procedure only in certain circumstances. Generally, citizen policing services are intended to pre-empt crime and disorder with law enforcement activities within the community. Therefore, the duties of the British PCSOs include crime prevention activities by the citizens. It can be argued that they can not only take preventive measures but also react to criminal behaviour. To illustrate, they can take part in making arrests and investigations with regular police. According to Cooper, Anscombe, Avenell, McLean, & Morris (2006), the PCSOs support the work of their local police forces and provide a visible and re-assuring presence on the streets.

## 2.2 Motivation for Citizen Participation in Crime Prevention Activities

The philosophy of citizen involvement in crime prevention activities, as one part of community policing activities, is based on the theory of normative sponsorship which states that policing serves to make a better community environment and to increase the quality of life. It cannot be successful without enlisting broad-based community support (Trojanowicz, 1972). Sower, Holland, Tiedke, & Freeman (1957) further support the claim that the efficacy of normative sponsorship theory depends on broad-based community support. According to Trojanowicz and Dixon (1974), effective citizen participation in crime prevention activities requires the police to work together with the community in solving community issues related to social structural problems.

There are several factors that motivate citizen participation in crime prevention activities. Some scholars (Carr, 2003; Drury & Leech, 2009; Hess & Orthmann, 2012; Meško et al., 2007; Pattavina, Byrne, & Garcia, 2006; Wallace, in press) argue that confidence in the police can serve as a significant motivator for participation. However, other scholars (McKernan & McWhirter, 2009; Sampson & Morenoff, 2006) posit that personal gain may be a motivator for engaging in citizen involvement for community safety.

Other factors such as attachment to the area (Ren, Zhao, Lovrich, & Gaffney, 2006; Pattavina et al., 2006) and crime problems in the community (Drury & Leech, 2009; Hess &

Orthmann, 2012; Pattavina et al., 2006) also motivate citizens to engage in activities that promote community safety.

According to Perkins and Taylor (1996), however, fear is a most serious individual and community level issue in contemporary society, influencing the boundaries in which individuals travel and move about on a regular basis. Ferraro (1994) argues that it is influenced by individuals' emotional responses and concerns about vulnerability in high-risk conditions, or the possibility of victimisation. Garofalo (1981) claims that fear is an emotional reaction which is characterised by the sense of risk, danger, anxiety, and worry. The researcher further argues that these senses are created by the threat of 'physical harm'. The fear created by physical harm has to be elicited by the perceived causes in the environment that a person relates to crime and disorder.

It can be argued that fear can be identified as a perception about sensitivity of crime and disorder and the evaluation of their particular types at the individual level of experience. Therefore, contemporary criminology and criminal justice tend to focus on individual traits with regard to fear and concern rather than on environmental and situational conditions. There are a number of key factors contributing to fear, including:

“(a) vulnerability, (b) environmental clues and conditions, (c) personal knowledge of crime and victimisation, (d) faith in the police and other criminal justice agencies, (e) perceptions of personal risk, and (f) seriousness of various offences” (Box, Half, & Andrews, 1988: 341).

Some studies show that vulnerable groups of people include the elderly (Giles-Saimes, 1984), women (Warr, 1985), the poor (Clarke & Lewis, 1982) and ethnic minorities (Taylor & Hale, 1986; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003), who may feel unable to protect themselves due to physical and economic reasons. For instance, vulnerability may arise because they are unable to access solid locks or windows because of high prices and live in high crime area because of low housing prices.

The perception of such environmental clues and conditions by community residents has strong negative impacts such as economic decline and a community changing for the worse (Box et al., 1988). Environmental clues and conditions such as noisy neighbours, loud parties, groups of youths, vandalism, graffiti, and drunken people may induce a fear of crime and disorder in a given neighbourhood (Hunter & Baumer, 1982; Maxfield, 1984; Taylor & Hale, 1986; Wilson & Kelling, 1982). These may further produce not only a generalised worry and anxiety but a specific fear of crime and disorder.

Individual fear of crime can be tightly linked to their knowledge about crime and victimisation (Balkin, 1979; Box et al., 1988; Hough, 1985; Linquist & Duke, 1982; Skogan, 1987; Stafford & Galle, 1984). It can be stated that people who know effective ways to prevent and avoid crime, disorder, and victimisation, will be less likely to fear and worry less about crime than those unable to utilise their experience or knowledge.

If individuals in the community believe that the police and other criminal justice agencies are effective in preventing and controlling crimes, they will actively support their work. Further, they will be less likely to be worried about the crime-related issues (Baker, Nienstedt, Everett, & McClery, 1983; Krahn & Kennedy, 1985).

Two factors, “perceptions of personal risk” and “seriousness of various offences” are described by Warr and Stafford (1983: 1033) as “proximate causes”. They argue that when individuals feel that they are at risk of being victimised, fear of crime may elevate. As a result, even if the risk of crime victimisation is highly recognised, it would not generate fear or concern if it is specifically evaluated “as being trivial” (Box et al., 1988: 342).

### 2.3 Previous Research

Many studies have attempted to identify the types of individuals who are more likely to participate in citizen co-production of community crime prevention activities (Hope & Lab, 2001; Lab, 1990; Lavrakas et al., 1981; Menard & Covey, 1987; Pattavina et al., 2006; Pennell, 1978; Scheider, Rowell, & Bezdikian, 2003; Skogan, 1987; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981; Taylor, Taub, & Peterson, 1987). Participatory factors that are investigated most often include the victimisation experience and heightened sense of crime. However, various analyses provide mixed results.

Personal experiences and fear of crime are also a subject of disputes. Some studies (Hope & Lab, 2001; Pennell, 1978; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981; Taylor et al., 1987) emphasise that people who have had a personal experience of crime or have a sense of fear of crime are more likely to join the citizen patrol group. Additionally, Skogan (1987) and other scholars (Lavrakas et al., 1981; Menard & Covey, 1987) have found that a person who has been victimised or has felt a sense of fear of crime are likely to participate in citizen patrol activities. On the other hand, Lim (2001) and other scholars (Baumer & DuBow, 1975; Lavrakas & Herz, 1982; Lavrakas et al., 1981; Podolefsky & DuBow, 1981; Rohe & Greenberg, 1982) fail to find a significant relationship between joining patrol activities and either personal experience with, or fear of, crime and disorder.

It can be argued that the disputed outcomes of previous researches such as Cunningham and Wagstaff’s study (2006) about citizen involvement in crime prevention activities with the police may be due to recognisable points. Firstly, the majority of the studies often review different populations. According to Lab (1990), all studies depend on the urban subjects but considerable diversity exists within the urban regions. Inner-city residents living in high-crime areas are examined in some studies, and others have used the subjects from consistent middle-class zones. Moreover, small areas and people in rural neighbourhoods also have been studied. The unit of analysis is also one of the variations in sampling. Majority of the researches have focused on individuals, whereas a few have reviewed groups of individuals or organisations. These might be reflecting differing utilisation of data and study purposes. Even though more than one approach is correct, comparing and reviewing them helps explain the diversity mentioned earlier.

Aspects of quantitative research such as operationalisation of the variables present another possible issue in defining citizen patrol participant (Lab, 1990). Citizen patrol with police as one of the citizen co-production in community crime prevention activities is practiced in several ways with various researches, and also with many other models such as Neighbourhood Watch and the installation of locks. Moreover, security surveys are used personally and in units as police crime prevention measures in various reviews. It is based on the differences between existing programmes and newly started programmes, thus the variation creates the outcomes that are difficult to compare.

However, these categorises of citizen patrol participants are not based on the outcomes of empirical research. For instance, Lavrakas and Lewis (1980) try to isolate it empirically through secondary data such as a government report. However, they fail to identify a relationship between surveillance and citizen participation. According to Lab (1990), although the study supports to clarify the realms of citizen patrol participant, it does not subsequently use the identified dimensions to determine who participate in a positive manner in the various types of citizen co-production in community safety activities.

One can argue that previous studies and discussions on participatory factors of citizen co-production in community crime prevention activities indicate the need for further research. This study extended previous work in a number of ways. First, previous studies have depended on the theory-based categories, but this study focused on isolating varying participatory factors of citizen co-production in community crime prevention activities through an empirical approach and analysing them according to the categories that were proposed in previous studies. Second, the analysis of the pres-

ent research used a more reliable data than the past studies; whereas previous researches used multiple surveys or data from various sources, this study employed one standardised survey instrument on British PCSOs. Therefore, it can sort out the issues that are inherent in the attempts to make generalisation from diverse instruments and subject groups.

### 3 Research Methodology

Before attempting to analyse citizen co-production of community crime prevention activities in the UK, utilisation of a rational measurement tool was necessary. Especially, considering the larger number of the British PCSOs, more than 24,000, a survey method was deemed advantageous over others for a study in the international context. Therefore, survey method was used as it was an effective means to collect data for quantitative research.

The questionnaires were distributed between June and October 2013. The process of carrying out the research proved to be more problematic than anticipated, partly because of the linguistic issues and gaining research permission from London Metropolitan police authority. This required working through the intermediaries and their extensive networks in the United Kingdom.

Two hundred survey questionnaires, eighty-two per cent of the total possible respondents, were collected from the citizens who had participated in and represented PCSOs. The

survey participants were not randomly selected; distribution of the instrument relied on working through individual officers and making use of existing social networks. It was not clear how the police officers in charge of individual stations chose people to complete the questionnaires, or what instructions they gave to the prospective participants. However, while the sampling was not random, it could be considered as a representative group for the current citizen police officers in London. The fact that the questionnaires were completed by 200 participants from twenty different police stations in London enhanced the validity of the study.

The quantitative data was coded and analysed with the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) 21.0. The research used two types of statistical procedures. First, a Chi-Square test for independence was performed to determine whether there was a significant association between the two variables for successful collective community crime prevention activities. Second, a regression analysis was carried out to assess which factors (walking alone after getting dark; walking alone during the day; staying home alone at night; the level of fear of crime; victimisation experience by any crime; concern about victimisation) best predicted citizen involvement in the community crime prevention activities.

The background information of the respondents, including age, job status, marital status, educational level, and their overall monthly household incomes (including Tax) are described below.

**Table 1:** Background characteristic of the respondents

Category	Section	Frequency	%	Category	Section	Frequency	%	
Age	20-29	93	46.5	Job Situation	In paid employment	200	100.0	
	30-39	67	33.5			Total	200	100.0
	40-49	40	20.0		Overall Monthly Household Income (Including Tax)		£830-£1,249	72
	Total	200	100.0			£1,250-£1,649	68	34.0
Educational Level	First degree	49	24.5	£1,650-£2,099		57	28.5	
	Diploma in higher education / other HE qualification	63	31.5	£2,100-£2,499		3	1.5	
	FE College qualification	48	24.0	Total	200	100.0		
	Secondary	40	20.0		Marital Status	Male	131	65.5
	Total	200	100.0	Female		69	34.5	
Marital Status	Male	131	65.5	Total		200	100.0	
	Female	69	34.5					
	Total	200	100.0					

First, it was revealed that the participants serving as PCSOs were generally in their 20s or 30s. People in their 20s constituted 46.5 per cent of the total sample while only 20.0 per cent of the respondents were in their 40s. People in their 50s and older did not join the citizen co-production of community crime prevention activities. Second, everyone that joined the PCSOs held a paid job as their main duties. Third, 65.5 per cent of the respondents were male and 34.5 per cent were female. Additionally, 31.5 per cent of the respondents had received either a degree in higher education (HE) or earned other HE qualifications. Moreover, 24.5 per cent had a first degree and 24.0 per cent held further education (FE) College qualifications, while only 20.0 per cent had secondary diplomas. Furthermore, 36.0 per cent of the respondents earned £830 to £1,249 per month while 34.0 per cent had incomes that ranged from £1,250 to £1,649. Finally, 28.5 per cent of the respondents reported making £1,650 to £2,099 per month as overall monthly household income while only a tiny 1.5 per cent earned salaries in the range of £2,100 to £2,499.

Based on the data in PCSOs activities, it can be argued that males in their 20s and holding paid jobs with higher education or other HE qualifications are more likely to earn a salary in the range of £830 to £1,249. Especially, the reason for a high level of participation by this age group is due to their being engaged in 'paid employment'.

#### 4 Research Findings

A series of Chi-Square tests were conducted. Table 2 indicates that the experiences of victimisation are correlated with collective crime prevention activities.

Pattavina *et al.* (2006) have argued that there is a strong correlation between citizen participation in crime prevention activities and individual victimisation experience. They have found that the victims of crime were more likely to participate than those who with no victimisation experiences. Also, in the present study (see Table 1), most research respondents (139 PCSOs) stated that they had been a victim of crime. Moreover, 157 PCSOs chose the answer choices, 'most important' or 'important' when asked about 'the effect of having been a victim of crime on the decision to be a PCSO (see Table 2).

A Chi-Square test was performed to evaluate the relationship between 'victims of crime' and citizen involvement. Research respondents who reported that they had been a victim of crime were more likely to participate in community crime prevention activities than the individuals who had never been victimised. This suggests that an individual's experiences as a victim of crime served as an important stimulus for involvement in community crime prevention activities.

A series of Chi-Square tests were conducted to assess the responses in the questionnaire. Table 3 indicates that the sensitivity to the issues of community safety and crime is a significant factor for joining the community crime prevention activities.

**Table 2:** Participants' personal victimisation experiences

Category		Frequency	Chi-square test for independence
Experience as victims to crime	Yes	139	$\chi^2(1, N = 200) = 30.42, p < .001$
	No	61	
'Victims of crime' as a motivator	Most important – important	157	$\chi^2(4, N = 200) = 36.25, p < .001$
	Neutral – not important at all	43	

**Table 3:** Participants’ sensitivity to the issues of community safety and crime

Category		Frequency	Chi-square test for independence
Walk alone after dark	Very unsafe – safe	142	$\chi^2(4, N = 200) = 15.03, p = .005$
	Neutral – very safe	58	
Walk alone during the day	Very unsafe – safe	62	$\chi^2(4, N = 200) = 16.54, p = .002$
	Neutral – very safe	138	
Stay alone in your own home at night	Very unsafe – safe	81	$\chi^2(4, N = 200) = 19.47, p = .002$
	Neutral – very safe	119	
Worry about becoming victims of crime	Very worried – quite worried	143	$\chi^2(4, N = 200) = 34.79, p < .001$
	Neutral – not worried at all	57	
A level of fear of crime	Very afraid – afraid	128	$\chi^2(4, N = 200) = 57.08, p < .001$
	Not very worried – do not know	72	
Personal fear of crime	Most important – important	134	$\chi^2(4, N = 200) = 66.55, p < .001$
	Neutral – not important at all	64	

Hope and Lab (2001) argue that there is a strong correlation between citizen involvement and sensitivity to the issues of community safety and crime. They note that people who positively get involved in community crime prevention activities do so because of a heightened sense of crime and disorder. The findings of the present study are clear. Table 3 highlights that most respondents have answered ‘very afraid’ or ‘afraid’ to all the questions above. Most research respondents answered ‘very afraid’ or ‘afraid’ when asked, ‘if possible, how would you rate your level of fear of crime?’ They also answered ‘most important’ or ‘important’ to the question about the importance of ‘personal fear of crime on the decision to be a PCSO. Additionally, most PCSOs chose ‘very worried’ or ‘quite worried’ for the question, ‘How worried are you about becoming a victim of crime?’ It was shown that a majority of the individual respondents had a high sense of fear and concern about being victimised. These findings suggest that personal fear of crime is a key motivator for increasing community crime prevention activities.

From the results, it is also revealed that citizen involvement in community crime prevention activities in the UK is both the outcome of high level of fear and concern about becoming a crime victim. A high level of fear could be a significant factor in individual involvement in community crime prevention activities; and in regard to victimisation, the cohorts reported being concerned about becoming a victim of crime and disorder.

Multiple Linear Regression (MLR) analysis was used to examine the factors that were significant predictors for citizen involvement in community crime prevention activities.

In the analysis, the seven predictor variables were subject to a forward stepwise entry to minimise the multicollinearity issue. Collinearity tests were conducted to assess the correlations between possible predictor variables, and no issues were discovered. Only the variables that were most predictive of citizen involvement in community crime prevention activities were retained. The MLR analysis identified two items that predicted citizen involvement in community crime prevention activities (i.e., ‘walking alone after dark’ and ‘staying home alone at night’) (see Table 4).

**Table 4:** MLR analysis to examine the reasons for becoming a PCSO

Section	Un-standardised Coefficient		Standardised Coefficient	T	p
	B	Standard Error	$\beta$ (Beta)		
Walk alone after dark	-.324	.148	-.247	-2.191	.030*
Walk alone during the day	.231	.140	.176	1.652	.100
Stay alone in your one home at night	.267	.135	.231	1.971	.050*
A level of fear of crime	-.007	.098	-.006	-.074	.941
Victim experience of any crime	-.266	.201	-.098	-1.325	.187
Worry about becoming victims of crime	.077	.111	.052	.690	.491

## 5 Discussion

### 5.1 Personal Experience with Crime

The study found statistically meaningful relationships between the first key theme, 'an individual's experiences as a victim of crime', and involvement in community crime prevention activities. The finding was in line with the observations of the scholars including, Pattavina et al. (2006) and Scheider et al. (2003). However, it contradicted the conclusions of the studies by Lim (2001), Rohe and Greenberg (1982), and Lavrakas and Herz's (1982) who stated that people who had no personal experiences as a victim of crime would still participate in citizen cooperation of community crime prevention activities such as community policing. This study supported the view that people who had a personal experience as a crime victim would participate in citizen involvement activities proactively (Hope & Lab, 2001; Menard & Covery, 1987; Skogan, 1987). Furthermore, as the researches by Rohe and Greenberg (1982), Lavrakas & Herz (1982), Podolefsky & DuBow (1981), and Baumer & DuBow (1975), this study's findings suggested that the people who were involved in voluntary community crime prevention activities were likely to have been negatively affected by crime or disorder.

The findings also supported Shernock's (1986) claim that there were significant associations between personal victimisation experiences and involvement in crime prevention activities; and they were not consistent with Skogan and Maxfield's (1981) observation that there was a weak relationship between victimisation and citizen involvement in anti-crime groups. Contrary to Washnis' (1976) findings that the experiences of crime victimisation tended to become a motivator for citizen participation, the present study revealed that people who had some personal experiences with crime and disorder issues were more likely to participate as a volunteer

in community crime prevention activities compared to those who had never been victimised.

The results of this study challenged Biderman, Johnson, McIntyre, & Weir's (1967) argument that there were no significant relationships between victimisation history and citizen involvement in community safety activities. Smith and Hawkins (1973) also stated that personal experiences of victimisation did not affect individuals' support for community crime prevention activities.

On the other hand, the findings of this research supported Percy's (1987) claim that personal victimisation increased citizen participation in collective crime prevention activities. Percy argued that personal victimisation increased the likelihood that community residents would buy and carry guns and volunteer in community safety programmes. Personal experiences that may change people's lifestyles such as crime experience may induce citizen cooperation in community crime prevention activities (Pyo, 2001). This is particularly true in the context where community structural problems and the fear of community crimes persist. If community residents feel intimidated by serious issues, including crimes, anti-social behaviours, and deviancy, they will be involved in community groups or create a group for community safety to help manage the existing issues; and this study's results support this proposition.

It can be argued that there is a significant correlation between victimisation and citizen involvement in community crime prevention programmes in the UK. If community individuals have experiences of crime victimisation, they are not the only ones affected by it; other residents who have lived in the same community for longer periods of time tend to be affected indirectly by the stories of their neighbours as they may have opportunities to meet and interact with other residents. As a result, it encourages citizen involvement in collective crime prevention activities.

## 5.2 Sensitivity to the Issues of Crime and Safety

It was found that the second key theme, 'sensitivity to issues of community safety and crime' also had a strong relationship with citizen involvement in community crime prevention activities. In other words, fear contributed as a factor in promoting citizen involvement of community crime prevention activities.

These findings suggested that the participants showed a high level of fear in 'walking alone after dark' compared to 'walking alone during the day' and 'staying alone in their own home at night'. It supported Grabosky's (1995) conclusion that people were more fearful of walking in their communities at night. Moore and Trojanowicz (1988) also argued that walking alone at night significantly increased fear of crime and disorder. If individuals walked alone at night, there would be few ways to seek support, thus people would be more likely to have a higher degree of fear of crime and disorder than those who walked alone during the day.

The findings of this study showed that 'walking alone during the day' did not increase fear of crime and disorder in the UK. Therefore, 'night' as a variable of fear is more significant than other factors such as 'walking alone' and 'staying alone at home'. Meier and Miethe (1993) also argued that night time activities in particular could bring people into a situation of crime and disorder, which could increase the risk levels of crime and victimisation than other times of the day. Gabriel and Greve (2003) also mentioned that crime tended to be distinguished according to the circumstances under which it was occurred (indoor versus outdoor and daytime versus nighttime by a stranger or an acquaintance). Specific situations tended to be associated with certain types of offence (being alone or outdoor after dark with becoming a victim of robbery or rape) (Tyler & Rasinski, 1984).

The results demonstrated that when individuals were alone in their own home at night, they felt less fear than when walking outside alone at night. However, people who walked alone during the day were less likely to show fear of crime and disorder compared to those who were alone in their own home at night. Moreover, Mesch (2000) found that time spent in one's home decreased the risk of crime victimisation and fear of crime, while time spent in public during the day or at night increased the risk and fear. It could be said that 'night time' had a strong impact on increasing fear of crime and disorder, and 'staying home' significantly decreased the risk of fear of crime and victimisation among the respondents.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice (President's Commission on Law

Enforcement and Administration of Justice, 1967) in the United States stated that there were two types of crime victimisation: direct and indirect. Direct victimisation referred to crimes and disorders such as murder, sexual assaults, and property crime. Sometimes, these crimes may be affected by the victim's inattentiveness such as leaving a window open or participation in the social dynamics that culminate in an offence or a disorder (e.g. arguing with an individual with a criminal record).

Indirect victimisation occurs when an individual is negatively affected by crime and disorder in which he or she has not directly participated in. During the time of widespread social concern with crime issues, it is likely that crime and disorder will become known to the community than would be the case during the time of peace (Conklin, 1971). To the extent that crimes or disorders become widely known, people not directly victimised can also be affected, resulting in indirect victimisations.

The findings of the present study suggest that both direct and indirect victimisations are significant factors that affect the behaviour of people. 69.5 per cent of the respondents had experiences of crime victimisation (see Table 2), yet 71.5 per cent of them mentioned that they were worried about becoming a victim of crime (see Table 3). This can be explained that direct and indirect victimisations play key roles for increasing fear of crime victimisation. Community residents who fear crime and disorder change their attitudes and behaviours to prevent and reduce the opportunities of victimisation; therefore, people volunteer in collective crime prevention activities. It is a positive impact for citizen involvement activities.

The levels of 'concern about victimisation' (71.5%) and 'fear' (64.0%) both had impacts on the social lives of individuals (See Table 3). These findings were also supported by Warr and Stafford's (1983) claim that only where community individuals felt they are highly at risk of being victimised, it was likely that fear of crime and victimisation would exist. It can be argued that fear of crime is associated with victimisation. The association between the two factors is seen most closely in the aggregate patterns across time and space. Therefore, people who live in the communities with high crime levels experience a high degree of fear and thus prepare more preventive actions compared to the cohorts living in the communities where the risk of victimisation is lower.

The findings of the current study differ from that of Shernock (1986) which claims that there is no relationship between crime prevention activism and fear of crime. However, it supports Washnis' (1976) conclusion that the organised neighbourhood groups that watch out for each other report



crimes and suspicious activities and work together to improve the quality of life reflects community residents' fear of crime and disorder. Therefore, the findings of the present study showed that a person's fear of crime and disorder is necessarily a significant motivator for citizen involvement in community crime prevention activities.

This study presented results that challenged the view of Lim (2001), Lab (1990), Bennett (1998), Greenberg et al. (1985), Lavrakas & Herz (1982), Rohe & Greenberg (1982), Lavrakas et al. (1981), Podolefsky & DuBow (1981), and Baumer & DuBow (1975); the relationship between participation in crime prevention and the fear of crime was not found. Conversely, this study upheld the view (DuBow, McCade, Kaplan, 1979; Hope & Lab, 2001; Lavrakas et al., 1981; Menard & Covery, 1987; Pattavina et al., 2006; Pennell, 1978; Skogan, 1987; Skogan & Maxfield, 1981; Taylor et al., 1987) that people who positively participated in citizen involvement of community crime prevention programmes did so because of a heightened sense of crime.

As noted by the Criminology Research Council (1998), it could be argued that many citizens have a heightened sense of crime and disorder and this is a necessary condition for citizen involvement in community crime prevention activities, which is also found in the present study. Situations and feelings that may threaten people's lifestyles may elicit citizen cooperation work. Thus, if citizens perceive to be threatened by community safety issues, they will organise community groups or cooperate with government agencies such as the police to combat crimes and disorders. Therefore, this study showed that positive participation of citizens to reduce 'sensitivity to issues of community safety and crime' was significant in the British context.

## 6 Conclusion

The present research analysed whether and to what extent 'sensitivity to issues of community safety and crime' and 'an individual's experiences as a victim of crime' motivated citizens to engage in community crime prevention activities in the UK. The study highlighted that while a minority of the research respondents who had been a victim of crime, consistently reported sensitivity to the issues of crime and or the matters of community safety, they did not attribute their decisions to participate in the community crime prevention activities solely to these factors.

If we were to generalise that 'personal experiences of victimisation' and 'fear of crime' will likely to be the strong motivators, then we would say that the decisions to engage in com-

munity crime prevention activities are based on the cultural background, namely individualism. According to Clarke and Lewis (1982: 52–53), "culture is the way the social relations of a group are structured and shaped; but it is also the way those relations are experienced, understood and interpreted". Culture is the way individuals make sense of the world they inhabit. The culture of individualism prevails in western society such as Britain. Individualism insists that individuals are independent and their freedoms cannot be disturbed by others (Dalley, 1996). An individual is considered an independent human being and as the master of the self. Those in Britain see community as representing the sum of private individuals acting together in their own interests in opposition to the overarching community and state. It can be argued that responsabilisation for self-safety in society is a primary motivator for citizen participation in community safety activities. Some scholars (Hope, 1995; Meško & Lobnikar, 2004) highlighted that a majority of individuals are motivated to participate in community crime prevention activities based on authoritarian communitarianism or moral minimalism. According to European Communities (2004), urban residents are more likely to inform crime and to engage in community safety activities than rural residents. Meško et al. (2007: 79) further argue that rural communities, compared to urban communities, tend to be more of "communitarian societies" based on the "network of individual interdependencies with strong cultural commitment to mutuality of obligations". It can be argued that crimes and disorders in rural communities strongly evoke fear within communities. As a result, crime prevention activities in rural areas are more likely to be based on communitarianism than moral minimalism.

Hope (1995) argues that, on the other hand, urban areas such as London are characterised by weak social ties. Urban residents appear to be less attached to their respective community areas, and this inclination applies to the whole community. As a result, privacy of individuals plays a more significant role than communalism. Therefore, urban cohorts' participation in community crime prevention activities are based less on communitarianism. Meško et al. (2007) and Hope (1995) support findings of the present study that moral minimalism is a more likely significant motivator than communitarianism for urban residents such PCSOs in London.

Survey data was examined in this present research, which made it the first empirical study related to citizen co-production through community safety activities. The results suggest that the concerns about community safety and individual experiences as victims of crime in relation to individual safety issues may prompt the citizens to consider becoming involved in community crime prevention activities. It can be argued that the individualist outlook based on culture plays a key role as a motivator for the collective crime prevention activities in Britain.

## References

1. Baker, M. H., Nienstedt, B. C., Everett, R. S., & McClery, R. (1983). The impact of a crime wave: Perceptions, fear and confidence in the police. *Law and Society Review*, 17(2), 319–335.
2. Balkin, S. (1979). Victimization rates, safety and fear of crime. *Social Problems*, 26(3), 343–358.
3. Baumer, T. L., & DuBow, F. (1975). *Fear of crime in the polls: What they do and do not tell us*. United States: National Institute of Justice.
4. Bennett, T. (1998). Factors related to participation in neighbourhood watch schemes. *British Journal of Criminology*, 29(3), 207–218.
5. Biderman, A. D., Johnson, L. A., McIntyre, J., & Weir, A. W. (1967). *Report on a pilot study in the District of Columbia on victimisation and attitudes toward law enforcement*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
6. Box, S., Half, C., & Andrews, G. (1988). Explaining fear of crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 28(3), 340–355.
7. Carr, P. (2003). The new parochialism: The implications of the beltway case for arguments concerning informal social control. *American Journal of Sociology*, 108(6), 1249–1291.
8. Clarke, A. M., & Lewis, M. (1982). Fear of crime among the elderly. *British Journal of Criminology*, 22(1), 49–62.
9. Conklin, J. E. (1971). Dimensions of community response to the crime problem. *Social Problems*, 18(3), 373–385.
10. Cooper, C., Anscombe, J., Avenell, J., McLean, F., & Morris, J. (2006). *A national evaluation of community support officers* (Home Office Research Study No. 297). London: Home Office.
11. Criminology Research Council. (1998). *Fear of Crime: Audit of the literature and community programmes* (Vol. 1). Canberra: Criminology Research Council.
12. Cunningham, S., & Wagstaff, M. (2006). *Diversity of police community support officer recruits compared to police officer recruits in the Metropolitan Police Service*. London: Metropolitan Police Authority.
13. Dalley, G. (1996). *Ideologies of caring: Rethinking community and collectivism*. London: Macmillan.
14. Drury, B., & Leech, T. G. J. (2009). *The potential of community-oriented policing: A report to the mid-north public safety committee*. Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.iupui.edu/bitstream/handle/1805/1940/COPS%20.pdf?sequence=1>
15. DuBow, F., McCade, E., & Kaplan, G. (1979). *Reaction to Crime: A critical review of the literature*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
16. European Communities. (2004). *A review of scientifically evaluated good practices for reducing feeling of insecurity or fear of crime in the EU member states*. Retrieved from [http://www.eucpn.org/pubdocs/review\\_reducing\\_feelings\\_insecurities\\_fear\\_crime\\_en.pdf](http://www.eucpn.org/pubdocs/review_reducing_feelings_insecurities_fear_crime_en.pdf)
17. Ferraro, K. F. (1994). *Fear of crime: Interpreting victimisation risk*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
18. Gabriel, U., & Greve, W. (2003). The psychology of fear of crime: Conceptual and methodological perspectives. *British Journal of Criminology*, 43(3), 600–614.
19. Garofalo, J. (1981). The fear of crime: Causes and consequences. *The Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 72(2), 839–857.
20. Giles-Saimes, A. (1984). A multivariate analysis of perceived likelihood of victimisation and degree of worry about crime among older people. *Victimology*, 9(2), 222–233.
21. Grabosky, P. N. (1995). Fear of crime and fear reduction strategies. *Current Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, 7(1), 7–19.
22. Greenberg, S. W., Rohe, W. M., & Williams, J. R. (1985). *Informal citizen action and crime prevention at the neighbourhood level: Synthesis and assessment of the research*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
23. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary. (2002). *Training matters*. London: Home Office.
24. Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary. (2004). *Modernising the police service: A thematic inspection of workforce modernisation – the role, management and deployment of police staff in the police service of England and Wales*. London: Home Office.
25. Hess, K. M., & Orthmann, C. H. (2012). *Introduction to law enforcement and criminal justice* (10th ed.). New York: Delmar Cengage Learning.
26. Hope, T. (1995). Building A Safer Society: Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention. In M. Tonry, D. P. Farrington (Eds.), *Crime and justice* (pp. 21–89). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
27. Hope, T., & Lab, S. P. (2001). Variation in crime prevention participation: Evidence from the British Crime Survey. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety*, 3(1), 11–22.
28. Hough, M. (1985). The impact of victimisation: Findings from the BCS. *Victimology*, 10(1–4), 488–497.
29. Hunter, A. & Baumer, T. L. (1982). Street traffic, social integration, and fear of crime. *Sociological Inquiry*, 52(2), 122–131.
30. Krahn, H., & Kennedy, L.W. (1985). Producing personal safety. *Criminology*, 23(4), 697–710.
31. Lab, S. P. (1990). Citizen crime prevention: Domains and participation. *Justice Quarterly*, 7(3), 467–491.
32. Lavrakas, P. J., & Herz, E. J. (1982). Citizen participation in neighbourhood crime prevention. *Criminology*, 20(3–4), 479–498.
33. Lavrakas, P. J., & Lewis, D. A. (1980). The conceptualization and measurement of citizens' crime prevention behaviours. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 17(2), 254–272.
34. Lavrakas, P. J., Normoyle, J., Skogan, W. G., Herz, E. J., Salem, G., & Lewis, D. A. (1981). *Factors related to citizen involvement in personal, household, and neighbourhood anti-crime measures*. Washington: National Institute of Justice.
35. Lim, C. H. (2001). *A study on participation factors of citizen patrol for voluntary crime prevention* (Doctoral dissertation). Seoul: Dongguk University.
36. Linquist, J. H., & Duke, J. M. (1982). The elderly victim 'at risk': Explaining the fear – victimisation of the impact of crime. *Criminology*, 20(1), 115–126.
37. Maxfield, M. (1984). *Fear of crime in England and Wales* (Home Office Research Study, No. 78). London: H.M.S.O.
38. McKernan, H., & McWhirter, D. (2009). *Policing communities in Vietnam: Intercultural lessons for community policing with Vietnamese Australians*. Retrieved from <http://www.tasa.org.au/conferences/conferencepapers09/papers/McKernan,%20Helen.pdf>
39. Meier, R. F., & Miethe, T. D. (1993). Understanding theories of criminal victimisation. *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research*, 17(2), 459–499.
40. Menard, S., & Covey, H. C. (1987). Patterns of victimization, fear of crime, and crime precautions in non-metropolitan new mexico. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, 10(1), 71–100.
41. Mesch, G. S. (2000). Perceptions of risk, lifestyle activities, and fear of crime. *Deviant Behaviour*, 21(1), 47–62.
42. Meško, G., & Lobnikar, B. (2004) The contribution of local safety councils to local responsibility in crime prevention and provision

- of safety. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 28(2), 353–373.
43. Meško, G., & Maver, D. (2011). Think globally, solve locally: Security threats – from public opinion to a proper response. In M. Guzman, A. M. Das, & D. K. Das (Eds.), *Strategic responses to crime: Thinking locally, acting globally* (pp. 27–42). Boca Raton: CRC Press.
  44. Meško, G., Fallshore, M., Rep, M., & Huisman, A. (2007). Police efforts in the reduction of fear of crime in local communities: Big expectations and questionable effects. *Sociologija, Mintis ir veiksmas*, 20(2), 70–91.
  45. Moore, M., & Trojanowicz, R. C. (1988). *Policing and the fear of crime*. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice.
  46. Pattavina, A., Byrne, J. M., & Garcia, L. (2006). An examination of citizen involvement in crime prevention in high-risk versus low- to moderate- risk neighbourhoods. *Crime and Delinquency*, 52(2), 203–231.
  47. Pennell, F. E. (1978). Private vs collective strategies for coping with crime: The consequences for citizen perceptions of crime, attitudes toward the police and neighbourhood activity. *Journal of Voluntary Action Research*, 7(1–2), 59–74.
  48. Pepinsky, H. (1989). Issues of citizen involvement in policing. *Crime & Delinquency*, 35(3), 458–470.
  49. Percy, S. L. (1987). Citizen involvement in co-producing safety and security in the community. *Public Productivity Review*, 10(4), 83–93.
  50. Perkins, D. D., & Taylor, R. B. (1996). Ecological assessments of community disorder: Their relationship to fear of crime and theoretical implications. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 24(1), 63–107.
  51. Podolefsky, A., & DuBow, F. (1981). *Strategies for community crime prevention*. Springfield: Thomas.
  52. President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. (1967). *Task force report: Crime and its impact: An assessment*. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
  53. Pyo, C. (2001). Policing: The present and future. *Crime & Justice International*, 17(51), 7–8.
  54. Ren, L., Zhao, J. S., Lovrich, N. P., & Gaffney, M. J. (2006). Participation community crime prevention: Who volunteers for police work? *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 29(3), 464–481.
  55. Rohe, W., & Greenberg, S. (1982). *Participation in community crime prevention programs*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina
  56. Sampson, R. J., & Morenoff, J. (2006). Durable inequality: Spatial dynamics, social processes, and the persistence of poverty in Chicago neighbourhoods. In S. Bowles, S. Durlauf, & K. Hoff (Eds.), *Poverty traps*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
  57. Scheider, M. C., Rowell, T., & Bezdikian, V. (2003). The impact of citizen perceptions of community policing on fear of crime: Findings from twelve cities. *Police Quarterly*, 6(4), 363–386.
  58. Shernock, S. K. (1986). A profile of the citizen crime prevention activist. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 14(3), 211–228.
  59. Skogan, W. G. (1987). *Disorder and community decline*. Evanston: Northwestern University.
  60. Skogan, W. G., & Maxfield, M. G. (1981). *Coping with crime: Individual and neighbourhood reactions*. Beverly Hills: Sage.
  61. Smith, P. E., & Hawkins, R. O. (1973). Victimization, types of citizen-police contacts, and attitudes toward the police. *Law & Society Review*, 8(1), 135–152.
  62. Sower, C., Holland, J., Tiedke, K., & Freeman, W. (1957). *Community involvement*. Glencoe: The Free Press.
  63. Stafford, M. C., & Galle, O. R. (1984). Victimization rates, exposure to risk, and fear of crime. *Criminology*, 22(2), 173–185.
  64. Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in public support for policing. *Law and Society Review*, 37(3), 513–548.
  65. Taylor, D. G., Taub, R. P., & Peterson, B. L. (1987). Crime, community organization, and causes of neighborhood decline. In R. M. Figlio, S. Hakim, & G. R. Rengert (Eds.), *Metropolitan crime patterns* (pp. 161–177). Monsey: Criminal Justice Press.
  66. Taylor, R. B., & Hale, M. (1986). Testing alternative models of fear of crime. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 77(1), 151–189.
  67. Trojanowicz, R. C. (1972). Police-community relations. *Criminology*, 9(4), 401–423.
  68. Trojanowicz, R. C., & Dixon, S. L. (1974). *Criminal justice and the community*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.
  69. Tyler, T. R., & Rasinski, K. (1984). Comparing psychological images of the social perceiver: Role of perceived informativeness, memorability and affect in mediating the impact of crime victimisation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46(2), 308–329.
  70. Wallace, D. (in press). A test of the routine activities and neighbourhood attachment explanations for bias in disorder perceptions. *Crime & Delinquency*. doi 10.1177/0011128711426538
  71. Warr, M. (1985). Fear of rape among urban women. *Social Problems*, 32(3), 238–250.
  72. Warr, M., & Stafford, M. (1983). Fear of victimisation: A look at the proximate causes. *Social Forces*, 61(4), 1033–1043.
  73. Washnis, G. J. (1976). *Citizen involvement in crime prevention*. Lexington: Heath.
  74. Wilson, J. G., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). The police and neighbourhood safety: Broken windows. *Atlantic Monthly*, 243(1), 29–38.

## **Zakaj državljani sodelujejo v aktivnostih preprečevanja kriminalitete v skupnosti?**

Dr. Kwan Choi, docent za kazensko pravosodje, Department of Police Administration, Hansei University, South Korea. E-pošta: kwanchoi@hansei.ac.kr

Dr. Ju-lak Lee, docent za kazensko pravosodje, Department of Security Management, Kyonggi University, South Korea. E-pošta: julaklee@kgu.ac.kr

Dr. Yong-tae Chun, docent za kazensko pravosodje, Department of Security Management, Kyonggi University, South Korea. E-pošta: chunyoungtae@naver.com

Sodobna policija ne more učinkovito izboljšati varnosti v skupnosti brez podpore skupnosti in njenih prebivalcev, kar postavlja sodelovanje državljanov v dejavnostih za varnost v skupnosti na pomembno mesto v kazenskem pravosodju. Namen študije je preučiti, kaj spodbuja sodelovanje državljanov Velike Britanije pri dejavnostih za preprečevanje kriminalitete v skupnosti. Podatki raziskave so bili zbrani med 200 prebivalci Londona, ki so sodelovali s policijo kot '*police community support officers – PCSOs*' (policijsko podporno osebe, zadolženo za povezovanje policije in skupnosti). Zbrani podatki so bili analizirani s hi-kvadrat testom in regresijsko analizo.

Rezultati raziskave so pokazali, da je za Britance, ki so bili v preteklosti viktimizirani, v primerjavi s tistimi, ki niso imeli individualne izkušnje s kriminaliteto, veliko bolj verjetno, da bodo postali PCSO. Poleg tega je za tiste, ki so imeli višjo stopnjo strahu pred kriminaliteto, veliko bolj verjetno, da se vključijo v dejavnosti policijskega dela v skupnosti. Pričujoča raziskava pokaže, da so bile odločitve glede sodelovanja pri kriminalno-preventivnih dejavnostih v skupnosti zasnovane na kulturnem ozadju Velike Britanije, in sicer individualizmu.

**Ključne besede:** sodelovanje državljanov, preprečevanje kriminalitete, individualizem, Velika Britanija

**UDK:** 351.78(41)