

# Comparative Analysis of the Quality of Policing in Local Slovenian and Croatian Multicultural Communities

Branko Lobnikar<sup>1</sup>, Barbara Prprović<sup>2</sup>, Nikolina Nemeč<sup>3</sup>, Emanuel Banutai<sup>4</sup>, Kaja Prislan<sup>5</sup>, Irena Cajner Mraović<sup>6</sup>

Policing multicultural communities represents an important and contemporary challenge for police, since culturally diversified local environments raise many social and organisational issues regarding community relationships, problem-solving and ensuring safety and security. Furthermore, the quality of policing in local communities is an important research topic in the field of police studies and requires special competencies. The estimation of the quality of police work gives an insight into which extent the strategic goals of police organisations are met and what the next steps towards improving their efficiency and legitimacy are. The purpose of this paper is to compare the results of community policing strategies in Slovenia and Croatia. The research was conducted in two municipalities (Lendava municipality in Slovenia and Čakovec municipality in Croatia), divided by national borders, whereas both populations consist of different cultural groups, such as Roma, Slovenian, Hungarian and Croatian residents. The goal was to analyse the quality of policing from four perspectives, which include topics regarding the quality of police officers' work: inhabitants' contacts, the perception of crime and disorder, fear of victimisation and level of community cohesion. The authors discovered differences between perceptions of police work between Roma and non-Roma populations, as well as differences between the Slovenian and Croatian subsample regarding relationship quality between local police and civil population. Overall findings indicate that members of the Roma community perceive problems regarding disorder and crime as less severe than non-Roma, while members of Croatian municipality express more satisfaction with police work in general. The comparative approach represents an original contribution to studies in the field of community policing, especially considering the inclusion of minorities and the fact that police work in multicultural communities remains under-researched.

**Keywords:** quality measurement, community policing, multicultural communities, police competencies, Roma, Slovenia, Croatia, comparative analysis

UDC: 351.741

## 1 Introduction

"The police are a reflection of the societies in which they exist, and the culture in liberal democratic societies has moved

toward a greater tolerance for diversity and demand for equality. Police practices and policies are moving with that change, and there is a new balancing of priorities among the functions of the police. Fighting crime is not always the highest priority. Maintaining racial and ethnic peace is seen as outweighing the enforcement of law" (McDonald, 2003: 242). However, the current global social situation is rather a paradox, since we see expanded efforts on international and institutional levels regarding promotion of tolerance on one side, but on the other stereotypes amongst members of society and racial hatred are very much present.

DeGeneste and Sullivan (1997) suggested that police organisations in different countries face many challenges in contemporary multicultural communities to which various socioeconomic factors, urbanisation, migration, and increasing multiculturalism in the community have a strong impact. Policing in diverse, multicultural communities is a challenge for a contemporary police organisation, and the interaction between them is often burdened by tensions due to language

<sup>1</sup> Branko Lobnikar, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, University of Maribor, Slovenia. E-mail: branko.lobnikar@fvv.uni-mb.si

<sup>2</sup> Barbara Prprović, M. A., Centre for Croatian Studies, University of Zagreb, Croatia. E-mail: nikolina.barbara@gmail.com

<sup>3</sup> Nikolina Nemeč, M. A., Centre for Croatian Studies, University of Zagreb, Croatia. E-mail: nikolina.barbara@gmail.com

<sup>4</sup> Emanuel Banutai, M. A., Institute for Security Strategies, Slovenia. E-mail: emanuel.banutai@gmail.com

<sup>5</sup> Kaja Prislan, M. A., Assistant, Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, University of Maribor, Slovenia. E-mail: kaja.prislan@fvv.uni-mb.si

<sup>6</sup> Irena Cajner Mraović, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Centre for Croatian Studies, University of Zagreb, Croatia. E-mail: icajner@hrstud.hr

barriers, distorted cultural understanding on both sides, or out of fear of external authority with marginalised groups. The population in the local community is entitled to protection and security, but when they are deprived of this right and the feeling of insecurity occurs, population engagement on community activities is lacking, especially in dealing with the police (Radetić-Paić, Ružić Baf, & Opašić, 2010).

As the largest ethnic minority in Europe, the Roma have historically been the target of persistent persecution and other forms of discrimination (Lobnikar, Šuklje, Hozjan, & Banutai, 2013) and according to the World Dictionary of Minorities and Indigenous Peoples (2015), the Roma population is the most discriminated minority in Croatia as well. Therefore, the relationship between the police and Roma communities is of great importance. On the one hand, the Roma community must have a complete reliance on police work in the service of protection (and complete investigation) of crimes motivated by hate. On the other, the police are faced with the challenge of efficient work with the Roma population, which often perceive their work with suspicion and disbelief considering the long history of abuse and discrimination, by the various state institutions (OSCE, 2010).

According to Cajner Mraović (2002), many do not understand the lifestyle and culture of the Roma, and therefore they have mainly cultivated prejudices and resistance towards this minority group. Moreover, such stereotypical attitudes become the main generators of extreme violence. This kind of situation is very unfavourable especially for the police, who are one of the significant players in keeping the peace and tolerance among community members. Police organisations are under extreme pressures to prove themselves objective and socially sensitive. In this context, they have to find ways to bridge cultural divides and to win the trust of people whose experience led them to mistrust (McDonald, 2003).

In combating extreme violence directed against certain minority groups, the police joined the realisation of those activities that are aimed at the development and enhancement of co-existence of different ethnic, racial, religious and other groups in the community. This model of policing is called the concept of "community policing", and the focus is on the relationship between the police and citizens.

This paper aims to evaluate the public views of community policing in Croatia and Slovenia, in particular, it investigates the quality of policing in two different municipalities, divided by a national border between Slovenia and Croatia. The survey in Lendava municipality (in the eastern Pomurje region of Slovenia) was conducted on subsamples consisting of members of Roma, and non-Roma (Hungarian, Croatian

and Slovenian) communities. The survey in Čakovec municipality was performed on two subsamples of Roma and Croatian community members. The purpose of this study was to analyse the quality of policing in multi-ethnic communities from four perspectives: quality of police contact; perception of level of crime and disorder; fear of victimisation and level of community cohesion.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows: In the second section, we present the Roma situation in Slovenia and Croatia, as well as the process of implementing community policing models in both countries. The third section describes the methodology of analysing the quality of community policing, and in this regard, we explain the research objectives, hypotheses, samples and summarise main results of the comparative study. The last section consists of the interpretation of research results and suggestions for further work in the police and research area.

## **2 Policing Multicultural Communities in Croatia and Slovenia**

### **2.1 Roma in Croatia and Slovenia**

Roma and non-Roma relations represent a challenge to European national police forces in general. As multicultural environments are found throughout the world, developing the most effective ways of training and educating police in understanding the diverse cultural backgrounds of the people they serve has become a key ingredient in maintaining successful police-community relations (Strobl, 2013). Slovenia and Croatia have a long history with Roma minorities, so their experiences in trying to solve related problems can serve as an example in identifying good and less good practices.

In Croatia, the legal status of Roma is governed by the Croatian Constitution (Ustav Republike Hrvatske, 1992), the Constitutional Law on National Minorities in the Republic of Croatia (Ustavni zakon o pravima nacionalnih manjina Republike Hrvatska, 2002), and the National Program for Roma of the Republic of Croatia (Vlada Republike Hrvatske, 2003). Roma rights as minorities are also protected by the Discrimination Act of the Republic of Croatia (Zakon o suzbijanju diskriminacije Republike Hrvatske, 2008) and international regulations such as the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (United Nations, 1969) and the European Convention on Human Rights (Council of Europe, 1950). In Slovenia, the Roma community is a minority community recognised by the Slovenian constitution as well (Ustava Republike Slovenije, 1991); it does not, however, have the status of a national mi-

nority, but is a minority community specially mentioned in the Constitution and granted special protection by the law. It is recognised as a special community or minority with particular ethnic and cultural characteristics (its own language, culture and history) that may be preserved in accordance with constitutional provisions, taking into consideration the needs that the community itself expressly puts forward. The constitutional provision was realised by the adoption of the Roma Community in the Republic of Slovenia Act (Zakon o romski skupnosti v Republiki Sloveniji, 2007). The protection of the Roma community is also provided for in other laws. Aside from legislation, care for the realization of special rights of the Roma community and the improvement of its status is incorporated in numerous programs, strategies and resolutions in different social areas; for example – the National Programme of Measures for Roma of the Government of the Republic of Slovenia for the period 2010–2015 (Vlada Republike Slovenije, 2010).

As noted by Štambuk (2000), in Croatia, Roma are generally not related to the "typical" types of settlements, but are spatially dispersed. The Roma usually populate poorly equipped suburbs, most often they live in villages, usually in separate, so-called *Gypsy settlements* (Hrvatić & Ivančić, 2000). According to the census of 2011, most of the Roma population live in the area of Međimurje (Državni zavod za statistiku Republike Hrvatske, 2011).<sup>7</sup> Lapat and Šlezak (2010) reported that Roma-inhabited Međimurje County during the last decades of the 19th century. Furthermore, Škiljan and Babić (2014) explain that the Roma population migrated from Romania and Hungary after 1855, when the Romanian authorities allowed them free movement. The Roma population in Međimurje County is also known as Roma Koritar, a name they got for their primary trade – making items out of wood. Due to the fact that most of the Roma population live in the area of Međimurje and also the notion that the Roma minority is the largest national minority in Međimurje County (4.49% of the total population in the county), geographic coverage of this study is limited to Međimurje County (UNPD, 2014). Because of its size, the Roma settlement of Parag and Piškorovec in the last census in 2011, were expressed as an independent settlement (Škiljan & Babić, 2014).

Roma inhabitation of Slovenia followed a similar pattern to the Croatian example described above. They lived in Slovenia since the 15th century and approximately 85% of the Roma currently in Slovenia were born in the country.

The Government of the Republic of Slovenia estimates that there are between 7,000 and 10,000 members of the Roma ethnic group, mostly in the Prekmurje and Dolenjska, the Bela Krajina and Posavje regions. Štrukelj (2004) states that there are four groups of the Roma population in Slovenia: Roma in Maribor, in the Dolenjska region, the Prekmurje and Gorenjska regions, while the concentration of Roma population in Slovenia is the largest in the Dolenjska region and Prekmurje (Žagar, 2001). The Roma population in the Prekmurje region, which is a part of this study, came from Hungary and Austria. By occupation, they were mainly musicians and farmers and were also very keen horsemen (Štrukelj, 2004). They speak a different Romani dialect than the Roma people in Dolenjska and Maribor (sometimes these groups do not even understand each other). Roma representatives in Prekmurje are, to be said, better integrated into the majority population than the Roma in the Dolenjska region (Lobnikar et al., 2013).

Škiljan and Babić (2014) wrote that migration of Roma in the 9th century from India to Europe, has resulted in the occurrence of the European sociospatial ambience of great ethnic diversity. The Roma way of life, language and colour is significantly different from the other ethnic groups in the local population. Štambuk (2000) points out that transnationality of their identity and the lack of a Roma national state exposes the danger of assimilation and weakening memory of themselves. However, Škiljan and Babić (2014) believe that Roma are able to keep their own identity and resist assimilation processes resulting in a slow, difficult and even disabling process of integration into Croatian society. Lapat and Šlezak (2010) agree and claim that the Roma population is not inclined to change their way of life due to the tradition that plays an important role in their lives and therefore are an ethnic group that is the least integrated into modern societies. Cajner Mraović (2002) said that the largest part of the Croatian population does not even know or understand the lifestyle and culture of the Roma, and therefore to this minority group generally have a prejudice and resistance. It is understandable that life itself in segregated and ghettoised communities results in the increased social marginalisation of Roma in Croatia (Šučur, 2000). According to Škiljan and Babić (2014), status of certain ethnic groups in the society is a result of the interrelationship between the community with other similar communities correlated with the dynamics of socio-political developments in the long term and their institutional regulation.

Like other countries in Europe, Slovenia has also experienced anti-Roma crimes, Roma discrimination and negative public opinion about Roma culture. The living conditions in Roma settlements in Slovenia are mostly below the minimum

<sup>7</sup> Data taken from the Census of Population, Households and Dwellings 2011: Population by nationality, ethnicity, religion and native language published by the National Bureau of Statistics of the Republic of Croatia.

standards in the country, so the Roma ethnic group is considered a marginal and/or vulnerable group in society. Lobnikar et al. (2013) describe how the Roma population suffers many stereotypes and prejudices by the majority population, which are often supported by the media themselves who present the Roma in a negative context. Some examples of such stereotyping of Roma members include generalisations about them as being deviant, a threat to society, non-conforming regarding cultural integration, and discriminatory statements (that social system favours Roma who in turn live better than other members of community, that have to work hard for decent living) (Erjavec, Hrvatin, & Kelbl, 2000).

The negative social climate in a diverse community is easy to create and maintain, so this is a common occurrence. When a majority inherits stereotypes, minority members will expect it and they can become overaggressive to compensate for the feeling of insecurity. Alternatively, when minorities see the police as being aggressive or rude in their initial demands, this in turn can incite hostility and non-cooperation, which affects not only relationships but problem/crime solving as well (Meliala, 2001).

The Roma population is aware of these negative prejudices of the majority, which leads to assimilation, the process in which many Roma in our case take on traditional Slovenian names and surnames. In this way, they try to conceal their ethnic identity and assimilate into the majority population, who on the other hand often does not accept them. Therefore, Roma try to conceal their origin, so official statistics in Slovenia are not representative (Strobl, 2013). Škiljan and Babić (2014) report that Roma in Croatia resort to hiding their ethnic identity or, as it is called “*ethnomimicry*”, so that they do not declare themselves as Roma, but in accordance with the socio-political events they take appropriate identities. The same applies for Slovenian Roma groups, also mentioned by Lobnikar et al. (2013). This implies that the actual number of Roma in Croatia and Slovenia can only be estimated.

## 2.2 Policing Multi-Ethnic Communities Using the Community-Policing Model

The biggest challenge for police in multi-ethnic, liberal and democratic societies is to find the correct balance among the public goods at stake. Police must enforce the law, but also maintain racial and ethnic peace, and these goals are incompatible to some extent. Enforcing the law may disrupt the peace, since the preventive activities demand a lot of time and constant on-site presence. Keeping the peace may therefore require forgoing opportunities to prevent crime or apprehend criminals (McDonald, 2003). Therefore, in addition to crime control, providing social services is a part of policing.

Appropriate social services create a friendly and constructive context for the development of mutual understanding between police and ethnic communities, which is vital for successful policing in a multicultural society (Chui & Ip, 2005).

The police in multicultural communities try to build bridges between themselves and the sociocultural variety, where efforts need to be shown on both sides – police and community members (Ibarra, 2003). The latter is especially difficult to achieve because cooperation is conditioned by people’s willingness and trust, while decisive and often unpopular actions are necessary for police officers to maintain peace in multicultural communities. Policing multicultural communities is therefore a step further or an upgrade of community policing, since it is more characterised by opposing opinions, discrimination and other stereotypes, especially related to policing and “favouring” sides.

The community policing model is trying to strike a balance between reactive and proactive responses to solve problems, especially as to the causes of crime and disorder. The very essence of the model of community policing is a partnership between citizens and the police, and this partnership means the intervention of the police and the citizens, and common sense of safety (Bitaliwo, 2014). Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1998) gave the following definition of community policing (summarised according to Cajner Mraović, Faber, & Volarević, 2003):

*Community policing is a new philosophy of policing based on the idea that police officers and citizens work together and that the different creative ways of solving current problems at the local level that are related to crime, fear of crime and various forms of social disorder. It is a philosophy that has its core, the belief that the achievement of these objectives requires police development of new quality of relations with citizens who respect the laws under which then these same people get the opportunity to identify priorities and to engage in various activities in order to improve overall quality of life in the area where they live.*

Cajner Mraović et al. (2003) point out that the police in the community extend the responsibility of the police organisation, while at the same time initiating the responsibility of citizens for the quality of their lives, which gives them the opportunity to work on their improvement. The community policing model has a significant impact on community structure. Its implementation encourages changes in the behaviour of citizens and police officers, and also transformations in the system of values, beliefs, attitudes and ultimately the identity.

The model also provides social cohesion and collective efficiency of the communities and citizens who work in it. The community policing model, therefore, is not possible without

the community. Miller and Hess (2008) define community as a defined geographic area in which the police and law enforcement agencies operate in cooperation with members of the community. Schools, public and private agencies, churches and social groups are all vital parts of the community. Also of great importance are the individual values, cultural principles of the common interests shared by members of the community. The idea is that by knowing the specifics of a community, addressing locals' definitions of neighbourhood problems, the police can re-specify the tactics and aims of their policing street by street and thus be viewed as responsive to local concerns and worthy of the community's confidence and trust (Ibarra, 2003).

Community policing involves the participation of community members to solve problems. Cooperation between police and citizens is increasing social cohesion and social capital of the community. Citizens develop a close relationship with police officers, and therefore inherit the idea of community responsibility of preventing crime. As written in "Understanding Community Policing" (Miller & Hess, 2008: 73): "*Community policing is democracy in action. It requires the active participation of local government, civic and business leaders, public and private agencies, residents, churches, schools and hospitals. All who share a concern for the welfare of the neighbourhood should bear the responsibility to protect the well-being.*"

Croatian police increasingly recognise the need to approach the Roma as a particularly sensitive, minority group in the population, but often measures and policies of combating discrimination and discrimination motivated violence are more administrative than operational nature (Cajner Mraović, 2002). The new provisions of the police laws in both countries promote cooperation between the police and the public, between the police and other stakeholders in the community and the ability to form partnerships in order to achieve security (Kovčo Vukadin, Borovec, & Ljubin Golub, 2013). The aim of community policing is to reduce crime and improve the quality of life at the local level by involving all available resources (Cajner Mraović et al., 2003), which emphasises the relationship between the police officers and the population. The purpose of this model is that every citizen has his "cop" to turn to and through which establishes a quality relationship with the police as an institution.

In Slovenia, police departments carry out different tasks related to the implementation of community policing, where the most notable figure is the police officer in the community – CPO (community policing officer). As in Croatia, the police officer in the community is a safe partner to which citizens can turn to for advice or assistance. Candidates for contact-cop have years of experience and developed communication skills (Lobnikar, Cajner Mraović, & Faber, 2015).

We could say that Slovenia went a step further in 2003, where the Murska Sobota Police Directorate submitted a proposal to the National Police Academy to start the program of training between the police and the Roma in response to previous incidents that resulted in tension relations (Ivančić, 2011). A Slovenian Police Academy project "Policing in a multi-ethnic community" was an intensive training program carried out for staff from different police directorates, and approximately 1,700 officers have participated in the joint training program throughout Slovenia. All training activities occurred in areas with Roma communities, while Roma councillors and other representatives of the Roma population participated actively (Strobl, 2013). Since 2003, the program has trained police officers in the fields of Roma dialect, culture and traditions, raising awareness of anti-Roma prejudice in society and helping to build bridges of trust ("Trust bridges") between police officers and Roma at the local level.

According to Lobnikar et al. (2015), this model of community policing is a friendly, modern concept of police organizations in Slovenia and Croatia, but problems arise in the ways of checking whether the model gives really good results. Meško (2009) notes that despite optimistic goals, there were some implementation problems. This model of community policing was in the past, largely hindered by legal regulations and the fact that the strategy did not adjust accordingly to the countries in which it was implemented. The problems were and still are mainly associated with the lack of flexibility in dealing with complex situations and with rigid and legalistic mentality of the majority of police officers.

Despite all of the obstacles regarding the legalities and police culture, Slovenia and Croatia very actively continued to adapt their public service, awareness and integration policies concerning Roma communities, with the intention to combat systematic discrimination and to promote Roma inclusion. To better understand the adaptive process, the main obstacles, and areas of success so far, we conducted a more thorough analysis of policing multicultural communities in both countries. For this purpose, we first present the methodology and then results of the evaluation of the quality of police work in the next section.

### 3 Methodology

#### 3.1 The Objectives of the Work and the Main Hypothesis

The main objective of this paper is to analyse the quality of policing in multi-ethnic communities that are inhabited by heterogeneous populations. The question is whether the

model of community policing works and whether it has any implications. An additional objective is to compare the results of Slovenian and Croatian studies regarding the same subject using the same methodology.

It should be noted that assessing the quality of police work differs according to the type of work being conducted. In the field of traditional police work, performance indicators are relatively clear (e.g. crime statistics, number of successful investigations, number of traffic accidents, the use of police powers, etc.) while defining indicators for evaluation of preventive police work and community policing is much harder. In this respect, cooperation between police and community members and their feelings are more important indicators. Some of the most significant factors that influence the quality of community policing include satisfaction with the police by the public, fear of crime, perception of risk, quality of life in the community, perception of legitimacy and police efficiency in problem solving activities (Trojanowicz & Carter, 1988; Kelling & Wycoff, 2001; Lobnikar & Meško, 2010).

Due to the pre-defined research objectives, as well as the results of previous studies, we hypothesized that: a) there are significant differences between the Roma and the majority population regarding the evaluation of community policing in their place of residence, b) that there are no statistically significant differences between the Roma in Croatia and Roma in Slovenia regarding the evaluation of community policing in their place of residence, and c) that there are no statistically significant differences between the majority population in Croatia and the majority population in Slovenia regarding the evaluation of community policing in their place of residence.

### 3.2 The sample and a description of the variables

The study was conducted on two subsamples. The first consisted of 212 residents of Medimurje County in Croatia (51 Roma, 161 non-Roma), and this area was chosen because this is the Croatian county with the highest percentage of Roma population. The sample included residents of two Roma settlements (Parag and Piškorovec) which, as noted in the introduction, were recognised as independent Roma settlements, according to the last census in 2011. The control group consists of people of Croatian nationality who live nearby the aforementioned Roma settlements. With the purpose of comparing results, this subsample is adapted to the research evaluation of community policing carried out in Slovenia; a subsample of this study consisted of Roma ( $n = 51$ ) in the area of municipality of Lendava (belonging to the informal region Prekmurje) and a control group of non-Roma ( $n = 283$ ) population in their vicinity. The total sample included 546 respondents, 102 of whom were Roma.

Descriptive statistics show that the average age of the respondents of Roma in Croatia is 35.61 years, while the average age of the control group was 38.95 years. The largest number of subjects in the control group completed secondary education (39.8%) and 47.1% of Roma completed at least primary school. The highest percentage of Roma is unemployed (82.4% of them) while 70.8% of the control group are employed. The average age of the respondents of Roma in Slovenia is 34.73 years and the average age of the control group was 35.51 years. 44.6% of the control group has completed secondary education, while the largest number of Roma (27.5%) completed primary school. Regarding business status, 45.1% of the Roma respondents are unemployed, while the unemployment rate of inhabitants of Lendava was 11.8%.

### 3.3 Methods of data gathering and processing

The evaluation was conducted in late 2012, 2013 (Slovenia) and in 2015 (Croatia). We used the questionnaire for evaluating community policing developed and validated by Adam J. McKee (2001) as the basis for our questionnaire. The questionnaire contains four sets of questions on the inter-related concepts: a) the quality of contact between the police and the local population, b) the perception of the level of crime and disorder, c) fear of victimisation, and d) the degree of community cohesion. The last set of questions allowed us to collect demographic data. The statements of the original questionnaire were adjusted to suit the Croatian and Slovenian cultural environments. Respondents rated their satisfaction with community policing using a Likert scale from 1 to 5, where a higher value in the first set of questions (*quality of contact between the police and the citizens*) means that the respondents believe the police have good quality contacts with citizens; in the second set of questions (*perception of crime and disorder*) a higher value means that the respondents do not see crime and disorder as a problem in their community. In the third set of questions (*fear of victimisation*), a higher value means that the respondents are not afraid of victimisation in their community, while in the fourth set of questions (*community integration*) a higher value means a higher level of community integration. For a total of 20 surveyed variables of the questionnaire, the value of Cronbach alpha is 0.822, which means that this part of the questionnaire is reliable. The reliability of the questionnaire refers to its quality to the repeated measurements of the same characteristics gives the same results for the same person (Šifrer & Bren, 2011).

The data were analysed in the software package IBM SPSS Statistics 22. Differences in the perception of the quality of community policing were calculated by univariate analysis of variance (ANOVA) and post hoc test Dunnett's T3. Dunnett's T3 test is used to promptly determine between which groups are statistically significant differences.

## 4 Results

In the following tables, results of the quality of policing in multi-ethnic communities along the four McKee's (2001) subscales of community policing are presented. We will start with the evaluation of quality of police-people contacts (Table 1).

be assumed that this appears as a result of implementing community policing strategies in both countries that encourage co-operation between the police and the public (Kovčo Vukadin, Borovec, & Ljubin Golub, 2013). In the Slovenian subsample, we didn't find significant mean differences in the perception of the quality of the contact between the police and citizens

**Table 1:** Quality of police contact

	How good of a job do you think the police in this area are doing in helping people out after they have been victims of crime? (M)	In general, how polite are the police in this area when dealing with people around here? (M)	In general, how helpful are the police in this area when dealing with the people around here? (M)	In general, how fair are the police when dealing with people around here? (M)	How good a job are the police doing in keeping order on the streets and public places? (M)
<b>The Roma in Croatia</b>	3.92	3.71	4.14	3.63	3.94
<b>Non-Roma in Croatia</b>	2.94	3.35	2.99	3.09	3.17
<b>The Roma in Slovenia</b>	3.20	2.92	3.10	2.96	3.22
<b>Non-Roma in Slovenia</b>	3.02	3.06	3.01	3.13	2.95

The Table 1 shows that the Roma in Croatia perceive the quality of contacts between police and citizens better than they are perceived by the majority population in Croatia, and the observed consistency in their estimates show that more than half of the Roma respondents from Croatia assessed the quality of contacts between police and citizens as positive. It can

of Roma in Slovenia and the majority population in Slovenia. This can be explained by the fact that the engaged initiation of a police program that seeks to improve contacts and partnership between citizens and police officers, started only recently and that there is still some room for improvement.

**Table 2:** Perception of crime and disorder

	How big of a problem is people breaking windows out of buildings in the area? (M)	How big of a problem is people drinking in public places in this area? (M)	How big of a problem is people being attacked or beaten up by strangers in this area? (M)	How big of a problem is people being robbed or having their money, purses or wallets taken? (M)	How big of a problem is vacant lots filled with trash and junk in this area? (M)
<b>The Roma in Croatia</b>	2.53	2.27	2.63	2.61	1.82
<b>Non-Roma in Croatia</b>	2.99	2.99	3.67	2.80	2.88
<b>The Roma in Slovenia</b>	3.43	3.37	3.59	4.14	3.22
<b>Non-Roma in Slovenia</b>	3.03	3.97	3.63	3.40	2.80

As outlined in the Table 2, the results show inconsistency in the perceptions of Roma in Croatia regarding the level of crime and disorder. In Croatia, the non-Roma population is more satisfied with resolving crime and disorder issues in their communities, where in Slovenia the situation is mostly reversed. At the same time, Roma respondents in Slovenia perceived problems of disorder and crime as minor and due to this, there is a need to compare official crime statistics and victimisation studies with these perceptions in future studies. We should consider whether the differences in the perception of crime and disorder are the result of the real situation or just subjective opinions and feelings of respondents. For that, more comprehensive studies with bigger sample would be needed.

Roma from other villages) due to the fact that Roma settlements in which the research was conducted have more than a thousand inhabitants. This shows that the Roma in Croatia mostly relate their fear of victimisation with members of their own community, and less so with other, non-Roma members. In Slovenia, the results for Roma and non-Roma population are not much different, except in the case of physical violence where Roma members are more afraid than other members of community. It is also interesting that Roma report higher fear about burglaries than others, since this could indicate a lower level of cohesion between Roma communities than non-Roma.

**Table 3:** Personal fear of victimisation

	How worried are you that someone will try to rob you or steal something from you when you are outside in this area? (M)	How worried are you that someone will try to break into your home while someone is there? (M)	How worried are you that someone will attack you or beat you up when you are outside in this area? (M)	How worried are you that someone will try to steal or damage your car in this area? (M)	How worried are you that someone will try to break into your house while no one is there? (M)
<b>The Roma in Croatia</b>	3.00	3.63	3.49	3.27	2.61
<b>Non-Roma in Croatia</b>	3.30	3.48	3.87	3.58	2.86
<b>The Roma in Slovenia</b>	3.65	3.53	3.27	3.02	3.52
<b>Non-Roma in Slovenia</b>	3.55	3.69	3.86	3.29	3.23

The results seen in Table 3 show that there were no significant mean differences in the perception of the fear of victimisation among the surveyed groups. Nevertheless, data point to the fact that the Roma in Croatia are more concerned that they will be the victims of an attack in their neighbourhood. While answering questions about the fear of victimisation by strangers, the Roma in Croatia perceived “strangers” as unknown members of their own settlement – Roma village (i.e.



**Table 4:** Community cohesion

	If I were sick I could count on my neighbours to shop for me at the supermarket or go to the drug store. (M)	When I am away from home, I can count on some of my neighbours to keep their eyes open for possible trouble. (M)	If I had to borrow 25 euros for an emergency, I could turn to my neighbours. (M)	The people in this area work together to solve problems. (M)	I know several people in this area well enough to ask for a favour. (M)
<b>The Roma in Croatia</b>	3.27	3.43	3.43	3.08	3.78
<b>Non-Roma in Croatia</b>	3.73	3.80	3.73	2.75	3.64
<b>The Roma in Slovenia</b>	3.02	2.86	3.06	3.16	2.96
<b>Non-Roma in Slovenia</b>	3.60	3.72	3.71	3.31	3.70

In a sample of Roma in Croatia and a majority of the population in Croatia, significant mean differences in the perception of social cohesion were not found while in Slovenia, we have found such differences between Roma in Slovenia and the majority population in Slovenia (Table 4). The authors note that Roma are considered less integrated into the local community (a community that includes both Roma and non-Roma population) in comparison to the majority population of Slovenia. Perhaps this is a consequence of stereotypes and prejudices of the majority population encouraged by the media themselves who often present Roma in a negative

context (Erjavec et al., 2000). From this it can be seen that Roma in Croatia feel integrated into the majority population. However, it is necessary to bear in mind the possibility that the Roma in Croatia feel social cohesion oriented exclusively to the Roma community.

Analysis of variance (univariate ANOVA) was used to determine differences in the perception of the quality of community policing between Roma and the majority population in Croatia and the Roma and the majority population in Slovenia. The results are shown in Table 5.

**Table 5:** Differences in the perception of the quality of community policing

Scale	The criterion of nationality (total for all groups)	
	F	P
Quality of police contact	16.00	0.00
Perception of crime and disorder	17.49	0.00
Fear of victimisation	1.90	0.13
Community cohesion	5.11	0.00

Since the univariate ANOVA showed statistically significant differences between the observed groups of respondents in the perception of the quality of contact between the police and the local population ( $F = 16.00$ ;  $df = 3$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ), the perception of crime and disorder ( $F = 17.49$ ;  $df = 3$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ) and in the perception of community cohesion ( $F = 5.11$ ;  $df = 3$ ;  $p = 0.00$ ), we used Dunnett's T3 post-hoc test to accurately identify between which groups of respondents there are statistically significant differences (Table 6). Statistically significant differences between the observed four groups of respondents have not been established only in a set of scales that describe the fear of victimisation respondents.

majority population in Croatia and the majority population in Slovenia were not found.

Furthermore, in Table 6 we observed statistically significant differences in the perception of crime and disorder between Roma in Croatia and the majority population in Croatia ( $p = 0.00$ ). The same situation was seen in Slovenia: Roma and the majority population are statistically significantly different in their perception of crime and disorder ( $p = 0.01$ ). We can also see significant differences in the perception of crime and disorder among the Roma in Croatia and the Roma in Slovenia ( $p = 0.00$ ). However, statistically significant

**Table 6:** Differences in the perception of the quality of community policing

Scale questionnaire	Croatia (Majority population in Croatia vs. Roma in Croatia)		Slovenia (Majority population in Slovenia vs. Roma in Slovenia)		Croatia and Slovenia (Roma in Croatia vs. Roma in Slovenia)		Croatia and Slovenia (Majority population in Croatia vs. majority population in Slovenia)	
	Mean Difference	P	Mean Difference	P	Mean Difference	P	Mean Difference	P
Quality of police contact	0.05	0.00	0.73	0.99	3.75	0.00	0.36	0.92
Perception of crime and disorder	3.47	0.00	2.05	0.01	6.03	0.00	0.52	0.78
Fear of victimisation	1.09	0.78	0.78	0.84	0.85	0.96	0.55	0.81
Community cohesion	0.65	0.98	3.15	0.00	2.12	0.27	0.38	0.98

The data in Table 6 show that there is a statistically significant difference in the perception of the quality of contact between the police and the local population between the Roma people in Croatia and the control group of the majority in Croatia ( $p = 0.00$ ). However, a statistically significant difference in the perception of the quality of contact between the police and the local population between Roma in Slovenia and the majority population in Slovenia has not been established. If we compare the perception of Roma in Croatia of the quality of contact between the police and the local population with the perception of the Roma in Slovenia, we can observe significant variations ( $p = 0.00$ ). Statistically significant differences in the perception of the quality of contact between the police and the local population between the

differences in the perception of crime and disorder between the majority population in Croatia and the majority population in Slovenia were not found.

As in Table 5, Table 6 shows that in a set of scales that describe the fear of victimisation, statistically significant differences observed between the four groups of subjects are not found.

In a set of scales that describe community cohesion, statistically significant differences between Roma in Slovenia and the majority population in Slovenia were found ( $p = 0.00$ ), whereas no statistically significant differences were found between the other groups (Table 6).

## 5 Discussion

This paper evaluated the public views of community policing in Croatia and Slovenia, and analysed the quality of policing in two different municipalities divided by a national border. The community policing model is a multi-layered and complex idea which is in different countries differently applied. In modern times, states take a multi-ethnic character and there is a need for a sensitive approach to problem-solving within a heterogeneous community. The authors therefore analysed two related countries and assessed different, but still very similar approaches for the purpose of identifying the success of the newly applied police strategies.

The survey was based on the hypothesis that there are significant differences in the evaluation of the model of community policing between Roma and the majority population in Croatia and Slovenia observed on four scales: quality of contacts between police and citizens; the perception of disorder and crime; fear of victimisation and community cohesion. Furthermore, it was assumed that there was no statistically significant difference in the assessment model of community policing among Roma in Croatia and Roma in Slovenia and among the majority of the population in both countries, also on all four scales.

The results show that the Roma in Croatia perceive the quality of contacts between police and citizens better than they are perceived by the majority population in Croatia, and the observed consistency in their estimates show that more than half of the Roma in Croatia assessed the quality of contacts between police and citizens as positive. But regardless of the improving relations between police and Roma in Croatia, there are observed inconsistencies in the assessment of the performance of the local police in maintaining law and order since Roma, at the same time, recognise the problems of disorder and crime within their settlements. On the other hand, the majority population in Croatia mostly considers that these problems in their neighbourhoods are not present. In relation to the perceived problems of disorder and crime, Roma in Croatia are more concerned that they will be the victim of an attack in their neighbourhood, but the data could indicate that the Roma in Croatia express the fear of victimisation by the majority in Croatia. Conversely, the Slovenian survey confirmed statistically significant differences between Roma and non-Roma in the perceptions of crime and social cohesion. The Roma in Slovenia were the most optimistic about crime and disorder to all other analysed groups, where non-Roma population in Slovenia expressed more optimistic opinions than Roma members in regard social cohesion of their communities.

When explaining people's opinion about crime perception in such multi-ethnic communities it should be noted that members of the majority population rarely come to these settlements in general. The point is that the access to these settlements is to some extent disabled for members of the majority population (e.g. the location is usually remote or hard to access, while access points are high under surveillance regarding social control from Roma members). Therefore, the fear that our respondents expressed in relation to the attacks by these strangers is possibly not related to the hate crime but with the way of life in Roma settlements that supports and sometimes even favours violent models of behaviour. Unlike Roma in Croatia, the Roma in Slovenia do not consider crime and disorder as a major problem which can be interpreted by the claim that their tolerance of deviant behaviour is relatively higher than the prevailing standards. Overall, Roma in Croatia gave better feedback about police work in their community than the Slovenian Roma population.

Regardless of how the Roma in Croatia estimate their locality as a place where there are major problems of crime and disorder, they still show a high degree of social cohesion within their settlements. In contrast to Roma in Croatia, the Roma in Slovenia vary considerably in the estimates of social cohesion in the community, and the Slovenian subsample is considered less integrated into the community in comparison to the majority population of Slovenia. One explanation would be that this is a consequence of stereotypes and prejudices of the majority population which puts Roma members into a negative context. The other option is that some Roma willingly reject full integration and wish to continue the tradition of (certain level of) community contact isolation and cultural separation.

This survey partially confirms the hypothesis that there are significant differences between the Roma and the majority population in Slovenia and Croatia with regard to the evaluation of community policing in their place of residence. In both cases, we found some statistically significant differences. Further, the results partially confirmed the second hypothesis, since no statistically significant differences between the Roma in either country were found due to the fear of victimization and community cohesion. The survey results fully confirmed the third hypothesis because the comparison showed that there are no differences between the majority population in Croatia and the majority population in Slovenia with regard to the evaluation of community policing in their place of residence. Among these groups, there are no statistically significant differences considering the all four scale of the community policing evaluation questionnaire.

Specific statistical significant differences were found in the area of quality of police contacts, perception of crime and disorder and in the area of community cohesion, whereas fear of victimization is not any different between the observed groups. In the first area, differences are seen between the majority population and Roma in Croatia, and between Roma in Slovenia and Croatia. In this regard, the majority in Croatia estimates quality of contacts lower than Roma, when comparing Roma in Slovenia and Croatia, the latter are more satisfied with police officers contacts. In the second area, the Croatian majority is more satisfied with crime control, whereas the Slovenian Roma population gives better estimates than majority. In the fourth area, the majority of Slovenian population reports higher integration than Roma population, which is understandable, whereas Croatian survey showed no statistical relevant results.

This study represents a unique contribution to the verification of the basic assumptions of the model of community policing which is important given the fact that its conceptualization is complex. Therefore, a comparative aspect of research can also be useful since it was carried out in two very similar countries where roughly at the same time the implementation of the model of community policing started and that have approximately similar multi-ethnic problems. We believe that comparative approach to survey allows more precise and more critical examination of models of community policing in multi-ethnic neighbourhoods. The results of this study recognise some contradicting outcomes of public policies aimed at the protection of ethnic minorities in Croatia and Slovenia including the Roma. Such policies are certainly important in the modern democratic society, but sometimes they can result in some unexpected and even undesirable effects. For example, the general public is often dissatisfied and even hostile to ethnic minorities, since they are perceived as overly privileged and protected. Of course, such standpoint cannot be justified, and this kind of comparative surveys allow us to better understand the phenomena. The survey results presented herein, for example, clearly showed that Roma appreciate the willingness and positive actions from the society and are not indifferent or immune to the overall community worries, fears and problems. High levels of their concern could be to some extent an indicator (indirectly) of their desire for better organisation and coordination in problem-solving activities.

Our research showed positive attitudes and quality contacts of Roma in both countries with local police which is certainly valuable data that support the high marks of police work with ethnic minorities. However, these results implicate the place for improvement of the quality of the contact between the police and the majority population. The results

of this study have some practical implications due to the fact they confirm particular problems that have already been observed in the multi-ethnic communities. We should not lose sight of the fact that some of the results obtained here point to certain specific problems within the Roma community. The resolution is not solely in the domain of the body of formal social control but requires co-operation with civil organisations, public institutions and policies. We could assume that there is a need for intensive work with members of ethnic minorities in various other spheres of life which would contribute to their better integration into society, and the reduction of certain forms of behaviour that apparently burden their communities. To conclude, we could say that public policies and ongoing changes are welcomed in Roma communities to strengthen collective efficacy and mechanisms of informal social control.

## References

1. Bitaliwo, O. (2014). Conceptualization of community policing in the Uganda police force. *International Journal of Peace and Conflict Studies*, 2(2), 58–65.
2. Cajner Mraović, I. (2002). *Aktualno stanje i prijedlog mjera za nediskriminaciju Roma* [Current situation and proposed measures for non-discrimination of Roma]. Zagreb: Radni material.
3. Cajner Mraović, I., Faber, V., & Volarević, G. (2003). *Strategija djelovanja "Policija u zajednici"* [Action strategy "community policing"]. Zagreb: Ministarstvo unutarnjih poslova Republike Hrvatske.
4. Chui, W. H., & Ip, L. K. R. (2005). Policing in a multicultural society: A Queensland case study. *Police Practice and Research*, 6(3), 279–293.
5. Council of Europe. (1950). *European Convention on Human Rights*. Amended by Protocols Nos. 11 and 14, supplemented by Protocols No. 1, 4, 6, 7, 12 and 13. Retrieved from [http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention\\_ENG.pdf](http://www.echr.coe.int/Documents/Convention_ENG.pdf)
6. DeGeneste, H. J., & Sullivan, J. (1997). *Policing a multicultural community*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.
7. Državni zavod za statistiku Republike Hrvatske. (2011). *Popis stanovništva, kućanstava i stanova 2011. Stanovništvo prema državljanstvu, narodnosti, vjeri i materinskom jeziku* [The census of population, households and dwellings 2011. Population by nationality, ethnicity, religion and native language]. Statistička izvješća, n.1469. Retrieved from <http://www.dzs.hr/>
8. Erjavec, K., Hrvatin, S. B., & Kelbl, B. (2000). *Mi o Romih: Diskriminatorni diskurz v medijih v Sloveniji* [We about the Roma: Discriminatory discourse in the media in Slovenia]. Ljubljana: Open Society Institute.
9. Hrvatić, N., & Ivančić, S. (2000). Povijesno-socijalna obilježja Roma u Hrvatskoj [Historical and social characteristics of the Roma in Croatia]. *Društvena istraživanja*, 46/47, 251–266.
10. Ibarra, P. R. (2003). USA: Contacts with the Police: Patterns and Meanings in a Multicultural Realm. *Police & Society*, 7, 133–164.
11. Ivančić, D. (2011). *Sodelovanje lokalne skupnosti in policije v Pomurju* (Magistrsko delo) [Cooperation between the local community and the police in Prekmurje (Master thesis)]. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za varnostne vede Univerze v Mariboru.

12. Kelling, G. L., & Wycoff, M. A. (2001). *Evolving strategy of policing: Case studies of strategic change: Research report*. Rockville: National Institute of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/grants/198029.pdf>
13. Kappeler, V. E., & Gaines, L. K. (2009). *Community policing: A contemporary perspective* (5th ed.). Newark: LexisNexis Group.
14. Kovčič Vukadin, I., Borovec, K., & Ljubin Golub, T. (2013). Policing in Croatia: The main challenges on the path to democratic policing. In G. Meško, C. B. Fields, B. Lobnikar, & A. Sotlar (Eds.), *Handbook on Policing in Central and Eastern Europe* (pp. 31–55). New York: Springer.
15. Lapat, G., & Šlezak, H. (2010). The Roma students' perception of the importance of education. *Metodički obzori*, 11(6), 81–93.
16. Lobnikar, B., & Meško, G. (2010). Responses of police and local authorities to security issues in Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia. In M. Cools, S. De Kimpe, & M. Easton (Eds.), *Police, policing, policy and the city in Europe* (pp. 161–179). The Hague: Eleven International Publishing.
17. Lobnikar, B., Cajner Mraović, I., & Faber, V. (2015). The community policing evaluation: The pilot study in the Slovenian and the Croatian urban community. In K. Butorac (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 4th International scientific and professional conference "Police college research days in Zagreb"*, (pp. 511–524). Zagreb: Ministarstvo unutarnjih poslova Republike Hrvatske.
18. Lobnikar, B., Šuklje, T., Hozjan, U., & Banutai, E. (2013). Policing a multicultural community: A case study of the Roma community in Northeastern Slovenia. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 38(2), 191–209.
19. McDonald, W. F. (2003). The emerging paradigm for policing multiethnic societies: Glimpses from the American Experience. *Journal of Police & Society. An Interdisciplinary Israeli Journal of Law Enforcement & Criminology*, 7 (Special Issue: "Policing a Multicultural Society"), 231–253.
20. McKee, A. J. (2001). The community policing evaluation survey: Reliability, validity and structure. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 25(2), 199–209.
21. Meliala, A. (2001). The notion of sensitivity in policing. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 29, 99–111.
22. Meško, G. (2009). Transfer of crime control ideas – Introductory reflections. In G. Meško, & H. Kury (Eds.), *Crime policy, crime control and crime prevention – Slovenian perspectives* (pp. 5–19). Ljubljana: Tipografija.
23. Miller, L. S., & Hess, K. M. (2008). *Community policing partnership for problem solving* (5th ed.). Southport: Cengage Learning.
24. OSCE. (2010). *Police and Roma and Sinti: Good Practices in Building Trust and Understanding*. SPMU Publication Series Vol. 9. Vienna: The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. Retrieved from <http://www.osce.org/odihr/67843?download=true>
25. Radetić-Paić, M., Ružić Baf, M., & Opašić, V. (2010). Percepcija učinkovitosti policije i obilježja policijskih službenika [The perception of the effectiveness of the police and the characteristics of police officers]. *Policajska sigurnost*, 19(3), 309–325.
26. Šifer, J., & Bren, M. (2011). *SPSS – Multivariate metode v varstvoslojju* [SPSS – Multivariate methods in criminal justice and security]. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za varnostne vede, Univerza v Mariboru.
27. Škiljan, F., & Babić, D. (2014). Romi u Podravini i Međimurju i uključenost u hrvatsko društvo: Od predrasuda i stigmatizacije do socijalne distance i diskriminacije [Roma in Podravina and Međimurje and inclusion in Croatian society: From prejudice and stigma to social distance and discrimination]. *Podravina*, 13(25), 141–159.
28. Štambuk, M. (2000). Romi u društvenom prostoru Hrvatske [Roma in the social space of Croatia]. *Društvena istraživanja*, 9(46/47), 197–210.
29. Strobl, S. (2013). *Police-Roma cooperation in Slovenia: Effects of a multi-cultural training program*. Retrieved from <https://www.irex.org/sites/default/files/Strobl%202012-2013%20STG%20Scholar%20Research%20Brief-Final.pdf>
30. Strobl, S., Banutai, E., Duque, S., & Haberfeld, M. R. (2014). Nothing to be done about them without them: The Slovenian National Police and Roma joint-training program. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 38(2), 211–233.
31. Štrukelj, P. (2004). *Tisočletne podobe nemirnih nomadov: Zgodovina in kultura Romov v Sloveniji* [A millennium of restless nomads: History and culture of Roma people in Slovenia]. Ljubljana: Družina.
32. Šučur, Z. (2000). Romi kao marginalna skupina [Roma as a marginal group]. *Društvena istraživanja*, 9(46/47), 211–227.
33. Trojanowicz, R. C., & Carter, D. (1988). *The philosophy and role of community policing*. East Lansing: The National Neighborhood Foot Patrol Center.
34. Trojanowicz, R., & Bucqueroux B. (1998). *Community policing: How to get started*. Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing.
35. United Nations. (1969). *International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination*. Retrieved from <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CERD.aspx>
36. UNPD. (2014). *Atlas romskih naselja Međimurske županije* [Atlas of Roma settlements of Međimurje County]. UNDP-ov projekt „Platforma za uključivanje roma u Međimurskoj županiji”. Retrieved from <http://www.hr.undp.org/content/dam/croatia/docs/Research%20and%20publications/socialinclusion/UNDP-HR-ATLAS-ROMA-MEDJIMURJE-2014.pdf>
37. Ustav Republike Hrvatske [The Constitution of the Republic of Croatia]. (1992). *Narodne novine RH*, (56/92).
38. Ustava Republike Slovenije [The Constitution of the Republic of Slovenia]. (1991). *Uradni list RS*, (33/91).
39. Ustavni zakon o pravima nacionalnih manjina Republike Hrvatske [Constitutional Law on National Minorities in the Republic of Croatia]. (2002). *Narodne novine RH*, (155/02).
40. Vlada Republike Hrvatske. (2003). *Nacionalni program za Rome Republike Hrvatske* [National Program for Roma of the Republic of Croatia]. Retrieved from <http://www.umrh.hr/Nacionalni%20program%20za%20Rome.pdf>
41. Vlada Republike Slovenije. (2010). *Nacionalni program ukrepov za rome vlade Republike Slovenije za obdobje 2010–2015* [National Programme of Measures for Roma of the Government of the Republic of Slovenia for the period 2010–2015]. Retrieved from [http://www.arhiv.uvn.gov.si/fileadmin/uvn.gov.si/pageuploads/pdf\\_datoteke/NPUR\\_2010-2015-en-18.3.2010.pdf](http://www.arhiv.uvn.gov.si/fileadmin/uvn.gov.si/pageuploads/pdf_datoteke/NPUR_2010-2015-en-18.3.2010.pdf)
42. World Dictionary of Minorities and Indigenous People. (2015). *Croatia – Roma*. Minority Rights Group International. Retrieved from <http://minorityrights.org/minorities/roma-4/>
43. Žagar, M. (2001). Položaj i prava nacionalnih manjina u Republici Sloveniji [The position and rights of national minorities in the Republic of Slovenia]. *Politička misao*, 37(3), 106–121.
44. Zakon o romskih skupnostih v Republici Sloveniji [Roma Community in the Republic of Slovenia Act]. (2007). *Uradni list RS*, (33/07).
45. Zakon o suzbijanju diskriminacije Republike Hrvatske [Anti-discrimination Act of the Republic of Croatia]. (2008). *Narodne novine RH*, (85/08).

## Primerjalna analiza kakovosti policijske dejavnosti v večkulturnih skupnostih v Sloveniji in Hrvaški

Dr. Branko Lobnikar, izredni profesor, Fakulteta za varnostne vede Univerze v Mariboru, Slovenija.  
E-pošta: branko.lobnikar@fvv.uni-mb.si

Barbara Prprović, mag., Center za Hrvaške študije Univerze v Zagrebu, Hrvaška.  
E-pošta: nikolina.barbara@gmail.com

Nikolina Nemeč, mag., Center za Hrvaške študije Univerze v Zagrebu, Hrvaška.  
E-pošta: nikolina.barbara@gmail.com

Emanuel Banutai, mag. var., Inštitut za varnostne strategije, Slovenija.  
E-pošta: emanuel.banutai@gmail.com

Kaja Prisljan, mag. var., asistentka, Fakulteta za varnostne vede Univerze v Mariboru, Slovenija.  
E-pošta: kaja.prisljan@fvv.uni-mb.si

Dr. Irena Cajner Mraović, izredna profesorica, Center za Hrvaške študije Univerze v Zagrebu, Hrvaška.  
E-pošta: icajner@hrstud.hr

Izvajanje policijske dejavnosti v večkulturni skupnosti predstavlja pomemben izziv za sodobne policijske organizacije, saj kulturno raznolike skupnosti pomembno vplivajo na naravo interakcije, ki jih ima policija s pripadniki takšnih skupnosti, še posebej v okviru reševanja problemov in zagotavljanja varnosti v teh skupnostih. Analiziranje kakovosti stikov, ki jih imajo policisti s člani različnih skupnosti, je pomembna raziskovalna tema, saj je prav razumevanje kakovosti odnosov policije s skupnostmi eden od pomembnih kazalnikov, ali policiji uspeva dosegati svoje strateške cilje, ki so na eni strani povezani z njeno učinkovitostjo in po drugi s stopnjo njene legitimnosti. Namen prispevka je analizirati stopnjo implementacije policijskega dela v skupnosti v Sloveniji in na Hrvaškem v večkulturnih skupnostih. Raziskava je bila opravljena na vzorcu prebivalcev dveh občin ( $n = 546$ ), in sicer na območju občine Lendava v Sloveniji in na območju občine Čakovec na Hrvaškem. Čeprav občini ločuje državna meja, pa je zanju značilna večkulturna skupnost prebivalcev – na območju obeh občin živijo Romi, Madžari, Hrvati in Slovenci. Kakovost policijskega dela v skupnosti so avtorji analizirali skozi prizmo štirih dejavnikov: ocene kakovosti stikov policistov s prebivalci lokalnih skupnosti, percepcije stopnje kriminalitete in nereda, strahu pred viktimiziranostjo ter ocene stopnje skupnostne povezanosti. Ugotovili so, da se mnenja Romov pomembno razlikujejo od mnenj drugih prebivalcev, kar se je še posebej pokazalo pri anketirancih iz Hrvaške, med sabo pa so se pomembno razlikovali tudi rezultati ocene kakovosti implementacije policijskega dela v skupnosti slovenskega in hrvaškega vzorca anketiranih. Prebivalci romskih naselij redkeje poročajo o neredu in kriminaliteti kot ostali anketiranci (Slovenci, Hrvati in Madžari), s policijskim delom pa so bolj zadovoljni prebivalci hrvaške občine. Raziskava v večkulturnem okolju v dveh sosednjih občinah dveh držav predstavlja izviren vpogled v stopnjo implementacije policijskega dela v skupnosti, s posebnim poudarkom na oceni kakovosti tega policijskega pristopa v manjšinskih skupnostih (romska skupnost v obeh državah, madžarska narodna in hrvaška kulturna skupnost v Sloveniji). Pri tem pa avtorji ugotavljajo, da je tovrstnih raziskav, ki bi proučevale kakovost policijskega dela v manjšinskih okoljih, še vedno premalo.

**Ključne besede:** merjenje kakovosti, policijsko delo v skupnosti, večkulturna skupnost, kompetence za policijsko delo, Romi, Slovenija, Hrvaška, primerjalna analiza

UDK: 351.741