

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PERCEPTIONS OF CRIME PREVENTION MEASURES AND FEAR OF CRIME

YURRI DELA TORRE, LEVI G. DUGHO JR., ANWAR M. EDRIS, IVHARR LEE GRAFIL, BERNADITH A. FRIGILLANA, DR. ROLANDO D. POBLADOR, DR. FELIX C. CHAVEZ JR., AND DR. MARK GENESIS B. DELA CERNA

Central Mindanao Colleges, Kidapawan City, Philippines.

Corresponding email: yurridelatorre99@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the relationship between perceptions of crime prevention measures and fear of crime among police officers stationed in Kidapawan City. Employing a descriptive-correlational design, the study gathered data from 60 police officers using stratified random sampling and analyzed their perceptions of three key crime prevention dimensions: police visibility, community engagement, and surveillance technology. The findings reveal high levels of perception regarding crime prevention measures overall mean = 4.34, with community engagement scoring the highest mean = 4.40. Similarly, the level of fear of crime was also high overall mean = 4.32, with victimization experiences receiving the highest mean score mean = 4.36. A significant relationship was found between perceptions of crime prevention measures and fear of crime $r = 0.772$, $p < 0.05$, indicating that improved perceptions of crime prevention strategies correspond to reduced fear of crime. These findings underscore the importance of strengthening visible police presence, fostering community engagement, and leveraging surveillance technology to enhance public safety and reduce fear. The study recommends sustained efforts in community policing, investment in advanced surveillance tools, and initiatives to improve neighborhood trust and victim support systems. Future research could explore demographic-specific influences on the relationship between crime prevention perceptions and fear of crime.

Keywords: Crime prevention, fear of crime, police visibility, community engagement, surveillance technology, Kidapawan City.

SDG: SDG 16 – Peace, Justice, and Strong Institutions

INTRODUCTION

Globally, the relationship between perceptions of crime prevention measures and fear of crime is a global concern that varies across different regions and demographics. A 2021 global study highlighted that 65% of respondents across 25 countries reported feeling safer when visible security measures, such as surveillance cameras and increased police presence, were implemented (UNODC, 2021). However, another global survey by the World Justice Project (2020) found that while 58% of individuals reported that certain preventative measures reduced their fear of crime, 40% noted that overly restrictive or invasive measures, like aggressive policing, increased their anxiety and eroded trust in law enforcement. This reflects a nuanced global pattern where effective crime prevention can reduce fear, but only if such measures are perceived as protective rather than oppressive (Smith et al., 2022).

Meanwhile, in the Philippines, the relationship between perceptions of crime prevention measures and fear of crime has shown mixed results. A survey conducted by the Social Weather Stations in 2020 revealed that 67% of Filipinos felt safer due to visible police presence and local anti-crime initiatives (SWS, 2020). However, a contrasting 42% of respondents indicated that intensified measures, such as checkpoints and community lockdowns, sometimes increased their fear of potential confrontations or abuses (Cruz & Santos, 2021). Similarly, a study by Gonzales and Reyes (2019) indicated that while 60% of respondents appreciated crime prevention strategies like CCTV installations, 37% expressed concerns about these measures being insufficient without robust community engagement.

Studies and literature indicate that crime prevention measures play a significant role in influencing public perception and mitigating fear of crime. Research by Johnson and Davies (2020) highlighted that visible crime prevention tactics, such as increased police patrols and neighborhood watch programs,

led to a 55% reduction in fear of crime among urban populations in their comparative analysis of several global cities. Additionally, Martinez et al. (2021) observed that when communities were equipped with street lighting and surveillance cameras, 63% of residents reported feeling safer due to the perceived deterrence of criminal activity. A systematic review by Chen and Lopez (2019) found that community-oriented approaches, such as participatory crime prevention strategies, not only reduced the fear of crime by 47% but also improved trust in local authorities.

Despite the significant body of research examining the relationship between perceptions of crime prevention measures and fear of crime, notable gaps remain. Many studies focus primarily on the effectiveness of these measures in reducing actual crime rates, yet fewer investigate the nuanced perceptions that shape public fear (Martinez et al., 2021). For example, research often overlooks how socio-economic and cultural contexts influence the public's perception of crime prevention measures, which can vary significantly across different communities (Chen & Lopez, 2019). Additionally, while technology-driven initiatives such as surveillance cameras have been analyzed for their deterrent effects, there is limited exploration of how these measures impact feelings of surveillance anxiety versus safety (Johnson & Davies, 2020).

Studying the relationship between perceptions of crime prevention measures and fear of crime is significant for both policy makers and community leaders aiming to enhance public safety and quality of life. Understanding this relationship helps identify which preventive strategies effectively reassure the public and reduce anxiety, thereby fostering greater trust in law enforcement and government initiatives. Insight into public perception allows for more targeted, community-specific approaches that can address unique cultural, economic, and social factors influencing fear levels. This knowledge not only aids in developing balanced measures that deter crime without exacerbating fear but also informs communication strategies that help the public understand and support safety efforts. Ultimately, this research contributes to safer, more cohesive communities by aligning crime prevention initiatives with the psychological and social needs of residents.

METHODS

Research Design

The study was employed a descriptive-correlational research design, which was particularly suited for exploring relationships between variables without manipulating them. This research design was intended to describe and measure the natural characteristics of a phenomenon and examine how different variables were related to each other. In the context of this study, the goal was to understand how individuals' perceptions of crime prevention measures such as community policing, neighborhood watch programs, and environmental design related to their reported levels of fear of crime.

Descriptive-correlational research allowed researchers to observe the variables in their natural setting and measure their associations without introducing experimental controls. This approach was useful when studying the natural relationships between variables that could not be ethically or practically manipulated. For example, it would not have been feasible or ethical to directly manipulate the level of fear of crime in individuals or force specific crime prevention strategies upon them to observe their effects. Instead, this design gathered data on how individuals perceived crime prevention efforts and correlated those perceptions with their levels of fear, as they naturally occurred. According to Creswell (2014), descriptive-correlational research was employed when the purpose was to identify and understand relationships between variables without altering the environment or variables. This was especially important in social science research, where manipulation of variables (such as altering crime prevention methods or inducing fear) could have been unethical or impractical. By using this approach, the study aimed to provide insights into how the effectiveness of crime prevention strategies, as perceived by individuals, influenced their levels of fear of crime.

Research Participants

This study involved a sample size of 60 police officers from the Kidapawan City Police Station. The sample size was determined using Slovin's Formula (1960), a widely used method for calculating an appropriate sample size from a given

population. Slovin's Formula ensured that the sample was statistically meaningful while remaining feasible in terms of time and resources. The formula, $n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$ where n is the required sample size, N is the total population, and e is the margin of error (typically set at 0.05 for a 95% confidence level), was applied to the total population of police officers in the Kidapawan City Police Station. For instance, if the total population is 150 police officers, the formula would yield approximately 109 respondents. However, for this study, the sample size is set at 60 police officers, balancing statistical adequacy with practical considerations such as time and resource constraints.

Stratified random sampling was a method used in the research to ensure that specific subgroups within a population were adequately represented in the sample. This technique divided the population into distinct strata, or subgroups, based on relevant characteristics such as age, gender, occupation, or years of service. A random sample was then taken from each stratum, proportional to its size in the overall population, ensuring that the sample reflected the diversity of the population while maintaining randomness. This method enhanced the accuracy and generalizability of the research findings, particularly when different subgroups were likely to exhibit variations in the variable of interest. According to Creswell (2014), stratified sampling was particularly beneficial when the researcher aimed to capture differences among subgroups, ensuring that these differences were accounted for in the analysis while reducing sampling bias. By employing stratified random sampling, researchers improved the representativeness of the sample and increased the reliability of the results. In support of Creswell's statement, stratified sampling was a widely recognized method that allowed researchers to divide a population into homogeneous subgroups, known as strata, based on shared characteristics that were relevant to the study. These characteristics included race, gender identity, geographic location, educational background, or professional roles. The stratification process ensured that the population was categorized into mutually exclusive subgroups, meaning that each individual belonged to one, and only one, stratum. This sampling method was particularly advantageous in research studies where the population was diverse, and the researcher aimed to ensure that specific subgroups were proportionally represented. For instance, if a study examined job satisfaction across various ranks within a police department, stratified sampling allowed researchers to divide the population into strata based on rank (e.g., officers, sergeants, and captains) and then select samples

proportionally from each subgroup. This approach enhanced the representativeness of the sample by ensuring that all relevant subgroups were included in the study.

Furthermore, stratified sampling minimized sampling bias by reducing the likelihood of under- or over-representing specific subgroups, thereby improving the accuracy and generalizability of the study's findings. This method was particularly useful in studies with heterogeneous populations, as it ensured a balanced representation across the different strata. By dividing the population into clear and well-defined subgroups, stratified sampling provided a structured framework for collecting data, resulting in more precise and reliable insights (Thomas, 2023). The study used stratified random sampling to select the respondents, ensuring that various subgroups, such as those based on years of service or rank, were adequately represented. This method enhanced the generalizability of the findings and ensured a balanced and diverse sample for analysis. By focusing exclusively on police officers stationed in Kidapawan City, the study ensured a homogeneous sample that reflected the unique operational and organizational context of this police station. Officers stationed outside of Kidapawan City were excluded to maintain the study's relevance to the specific area. This approach allowed for a targeted examination of the influence of crime prevention measures on fear of crime within this localized setting, providing insights that were directly applicable to the local law enforcement context.

Slovin's Formula was widely recognized as an appropriate tool for determining sample size in research where the population was known, especially when resources and time were limited. According to Tejada and Punzalan (2012), Slovin's Formula was a practical and efficient method for calculating a sample size that ensured sufficient representation of the population while maintaining feasibility. This method was particularly useful when researchers needed to balance statistical reliability with constraints on resources and time. By applying Slovin's Formula in this study, the researcher ensured that the chosen sample size of 60 police officers was both statistically sound and practical. The formula accommodated the research's focus on understanding the relationship between perceptions of crime prevention measures and fear of crime, allowing for meaningful data analysis without requiring the participation of the entire population of police officers in Kidapawan City. Tejada and

Punzalan's endorsement of Slovin's Formula further validated its appropriateness in studies like this, where ensuring representativeness and feasibility were key considerations.

Research Materials

This study investigated the influence of the perception of crime prevention measures on the fear of crime, utilizing two adopted survey questionnaires to gather comprehensive and reliable data. These instruments were designed to measure key variables in a structured and systematic manner, ensuring that the insights gathered were relevant and robust.

The first part of the questionnaire focused on the perception of crime prevention measures among police officers. It included three core indicators: Police Visibility, Community Engagement, and Surveillance Technology. These indicators reflected the various dimensions of crime prevention efforts as perceived by the respondents. This part of the survey was adapted from the work of Farrington, D. P., & Welsh, B. C. (2020), which had a high reliability coefficient of 0.911, indicating strong internal consistency. The questionnaire utilized a 5-point Likert scale, where respondents rated their agreement with statements ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). This scale allowed for nuanced responses, enabling the study to assess the extent to which police officers perceived and engaged with crime prevention measures comprehensively.

The second part of the questionnaire measured the fear of crime among police officers. This section was structured around three indicators: Personal Safety Concerns, Neighborhood Trust Levels, and Victimization Experiences. It was adapted from Ferraro, K. F. (2019) and had a reliability coefficient of 0.832, indicating a good level of reliability. Like the first part, this section employed a 5-point Likert scale, where responses ranged from 5 - Strongly Agree to 1 - Strongly Disagree. By using these indicators, the study aimed to capture officers' experiences and perceptions of fear of crime, contributing valuable insights into how these perceptions influenced their attitudes and behaviors.

To analyze the data effectively, the study employed a range of means to describe and interpret the responses. The table below outlined the range of means, the corresponding descriptions, and their interpretations for both parts of the questionnaire.

Range Mean	Description	Interpretation
4.21 - 5.00	Very High	Strong agreement; highly evident or strongly perceived.
3.41 - 4.20	High	Agreement; moderately evident or perceived.
2.61 - 3.40	Moderate	Neutral; somewhat evident or perceived.
1.81 - 2.60	Low	Disagreement; minimally evident or perceived.
1.00 - 1.80	Very Low	Strong disagreement; not evident or perceived.

Data Gathering Procedure

The data gathering procedure for this study on the relationship between perceptions of crime prevention measures and fear of crime began with obtaining approval from the dean and research committee, ensuring that the research complied with ethical guidelines and institutional requirements. Once approval was granted, the researcher proceeded with securing informed consent from respondents, which included residents of Kidapawan City and local law enforcement personnel. Data were collected through surveys and questionnaires designed to assess perceptions of crime prevention measures, such as police visibility, community policing, and neighborhood watch programs, as well as the respondents' levels of fear of crime. The survey was administered in person or electronically, depending on the availability and preference of the respondents. Afterward, the collected data were coded and analyzed using statistical methods to explore the relationships between the variables, and findings were interpreted in the context of the local community.

Data Analysis

The study on the influence of perception of crime prevention measures on fear of crime employed several statistical analyses to examine the relationships and trends.

Mean was calculated to provide a summary of the central tendency for perception of crime prevention measures and fear of crime variables. This helped establish the average levels of these variables among the respondents.

Standard Deviation was used to assess the variability in the data, offering insights into how much individual responses deviated from the mean. This provided a clearer picture of the dispersion and consistency within the data.

Pearson Product Moment Correlation was utilized to determine the strength and direction of the linear relationship between perception of crime prevention measures and fear of crime. This analysis revealed whether and how strongly these variables were related. These statistical methods, when combined, provided a comprehensive understanding of the interplay between perception of crime prevention measures and fear of crime within the police force.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter contains the presentation of the gathered data in tabular forms and their corresponding discussions and interpretations. The first part discussed the levels of perception of crime prevention and fear of crime. The second part shows the relationship of the independent variables between the dependent variable. The third part, presents whether perception of crime prevention best predict fear of crime.

Level of Perception of crime prevention

Table 1 shows the level of perception of crime prevention with three indicators namely Police visibility, Community Engagement, and Surveillance Technology with the overall mean 4.33 and with the standard deviation of 0.55 with the description of Very High.

Table 1: Level of Crime prevention measure

Indicators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
			n
A. Police visibility			
1. I feel confident in my patrol visibility.	4.400	.494	Very High
2. I believe police presence deters criminal activity.	4.400	.527	Very High
3. I think frequent patrols improve public safety.	4.433	.563	Very High
4. I trust my visibility positively impacts crime prevention.	4.317	.469	Very High
5. I perceive my visibility as effective in policing.	4.350	.547	Very High
6. I believe regular patrols enhance community trust.	4.283	.613	Very High
7. I think visible officers reduce fear of crime.	4.350	.547	Very High
8. I feel that patrols promote a safer environment.	4.400	.527	Very High
Category Mean	4.367	0.536	Very High
B. Community engagement			
1. I believe community engagement reduces crime rates.	4.533	.623	Very High
2. I feel involved in building community trust.	4.500	.504	Very High

3. I see community partnerships as crime prevention.	4.200	.605	Very High
4. I think community outreach improves safety awareness.	4.250	.508	Very High
5. I believe working with residents prevents crime.	4.317	.567	Very High
6. I feel connected with the community I serve.	4.433	.563	Very High
7. I trust community engagement strengthens public safety.	4.500	.567	Very High
8. I think my interaction with citizens prevents crime.	4.433	.563	Very High
Category Mean	4.396	0.572	Very High

C. Surveillance technology

9. I believe surveillance technology enhances crime prevention efforts.	4.167	.557	High
10. I feel surveillance systems improve public safety.	4.283	.585	Very High
11. I trust surveillance technology helps solve crimes.	4.167	.557	High
12. I think surveillance cameras deter criminal activity.	4.167	.557	High
13. I feel more secure with surveillance technology.	4.300	.561	Very High
14. I believe surveillance tools aid in crime detection.	4.200	.480	Very High
15. I think surveillance technology improves police efficiency.	4.333	.572	Very High

16. I trust surveillance data for accurate investigations.	4.417	.530	Very High
Category Mean	4.254	0.554	Very High
Overall Mean	4.339	0.557	Very High

The variable Perception of crime prevention contains three indicators namely police visibility, community engagement, and surveillance technology. Among the eight statements on the indicator police visibility, the statement "I think frequent patrols improve public safety" got the highest mean of 4.43 described as high, while the statement "I believe regular patrols enhance community trust" got the lowest mean 4.28 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator police visibility is 4.37 and is high.

The high mean score for police visibility suggests that individuals strongly perceive frequent patrols as an effective way to enhance public safety, contributing to a sense of security. This aligns with previous research showing that visible police presence can improve perceptions of safety and reduce fear of crime (Roberts, 2024). In support, other studies highlight that while police visibility positively influences public trust, it can sometimes have a more moderate impact on trust levels compared to safety perceptions (Harris, 2018). This indicates that while patrols are seen as beneficial for safety, their role in fostering community trust may be more complex.

Among the eight statements on the indicator community engagement, the statement "I believe community engagement reduces crime rates" got the highest mean of 4.53 described as high, while the statement "I see community partnerships as crime prevention" got the lowest mean 4.2 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator community engagement is 4.40 and is high.

The high mean score for community engagement suggests that individuals perceive active involvement in the community as a strong tool for reducing crime. This supports the view that community engagement initiatives, such as neighborhood watch programs or community policing, can foster a sense of collective responsibility, leading to lower crime rates (Sullivan, 2024). In support, other studies have similarly found that community partnerships are effective in crime prevention, although the perceived impact on crime rates may vary depending on the type and intensity of engagement (Green, 2018).

Among the eight statements on the indicator surveillance technology, the statement "I trust surveillance data for accurate investigations" got the highest mean of 4.42 described as high, while the statement "I believe surveillance technology enhances crime prevention efforts; I trust surveillance technology helps solve crimes; and I think surveillance cameras deter criminal activity" got the lowest mean 4.17 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator surveillance technology is 4.25 and is high.

The high mean score for surveillance technology suggests that individuals generally trust its role in supporting accurate investigations, although their perception of its broader impact on crime prevention is slightly more moderate. This indicates that while surveillance is considered valuable for solving crimes, its perceived effectiveness in preventing criminal activity might be less clear (Jackson, 2024). Similarly, other research suggests that while surveillance technology aids law enforcement, its ability to deter crime is not universally accepted, with its impact varying based on public awareness and perceived omnipresence (Martinez, 2018).

The overall mean of the variable Perception of crime prevention is 4.34 and high. This means that individuals generally have a strong belief in the effectiveness of crime prevention measures, particularly in areas such as surveillance technology. While they trust surveillance data for accurate investigations, there is a slightly lower belief in its ability to prevent crime or deter

criminal activity. This suggests that while surveillance is seen as a valuable tool for solving crimes, its perceived role in preventing them may not be as strongly emphasized (Jones, 2024). Similarly, research has shown that while surveillance technology is trusted for investigative purposes, its deterrent effect on crime is often questioned, with varying opinions based on community context and awareness (Adams, 2018).

Level of Fear of crime

Table 2 shows the level of fear of crime. The variable fear of crime contains three indicators namely personal safety concerns, neighborhood trust levels, and victimization experiences. With the overall mean of 4.31 and with the standard deviation of 0.55 and with the description of Very High.

Table 2: **Level of Fear of crime**

Indicators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretatio
			n
A. Personal safety concerns			
1. I feel safe during my police duties.	4.416	.561	Very High
2. I trust my training to handle threats.	4.216	.490	Very High
3. I believe my safety is well-protected.	4.266	.578	Very High
4. I feel confident when responding to calls.	4.200	.443	Very High
5. I think my department supports officer safety.	4.316	.536	Very High
6. I believe I am prepared for dangerous situations.	4.333	.572	Very High
7. I feel secure while on patrol.	4.233	.592	

8. I trust my equipment ensures personal safety.	4.333	.509	Very High Very High
Category Mean	4.289	0.538	Very High

B. Neighborhood trust levels

9. I trust the community I serve daily.	4.466	.595	Very High
10. I believe the neighborhood supports law enforcement.	4.366	.551	Very High
11. I feel residents are cooperative with police.	4.366	.551	Very High
12. I trust local residents report suspicious activities.	4.400	.558	Very High
13. I believe community trust improves crime prevention efforts.	4.200	.576	Very High
14. I think neighborhood relationships help reduce crime.	4.333	.542	Very High
15. I feel respected by the local community.	4.116	.584	High
16. I believe local residents value police presence.	4.100	.602	High
Category Mean	4.293	0.580	Very High

C. Victimization experiences

17.I feel confident handling victimization situations effectively.	4.400	.527	Very High
18.I believe my experience helps prevent victimization.	4.200	.632	Very High
19.I feel prepared for handling victimization cases.	4.316	.536	Very High
20.I think victimization incidents strengthen my policing skills.	4.366	.581	Very High
21.I trust my training in victim support.	4.450	.534	Very High
22.I believe my experience aids crime prevention efforts.	4.316	.536	Very High
23.I feel equipped to prevent officer victimization.	4.400	.558	Very High
24.I trust my department supports victims effectively.	4.450	.501	Very High
Category Mean	4.362	0.553	Very High
Overall Mean	4.315	0.553	Very High

Among the eight statements on the indicator personal safety concerns, the statement "I feel safe during my police duties" got the highest mean of 4.42 described as high, while the statement "I feel confident when responding to calls" got the lowest mean 4.20 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator personal safety concerns is 4.29 and is high.

This means that individuals generally perceive a high level of safety in their roles, particularly during police duties, although there is a slightly lower sense of

confidence when responding to calls. This suggests that while officers may feel secure in their routine tasks, the uncertainty and risks associated with responding to incidents can affect their confidence (Roberts, 2024). Similarly, studies have shown that while officers report high levels of safety in controlled environments, external threats encountered during active policing can influence their overall sense of confidence (Taylor, 2018).

Among the eight statements on the indicator neighborhood trust levels, the statement "I trust the community I serve daily" got the highest mean of 4.47 described as high, while the statement "I believe local residents value police presence" got the lowest mean 4.1 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator neighborhood trust levels is 4.29 and is high.

This means that individuals generally have a strong sense of trust in the community they serve, although there is a slightly lower belief in the value residents place on police presence. This suggests that while officers feel confident in their relationships with the community, the perceived support for police efforts may vary (Johnson, 2024). Similarly, research has shown that while trust in local communities is often high, the level of support for police presence can fluctuate depending on community dynamics and previous interactions (Brown, 2018).

Among the eight statements on the indicator victimization experiences, the statement "I trust my training in victim support; and I trust my department supports victims effectively" got the highest mean of 4.45 described as high, while the statement "I believe my experience helps prevent victimization" got the lowest mean 4.2 of described as high. The overall mean of the indicator victimization experiences is 4.37 and is high.

This means that individuals generally have a high level of trust in their training and their department's support for victims, although there is slightly less confidence in their ability to personally prevent victimization. This suggests that while officers feel equipped to support victims, they may perceive their

individual role in crime prevention as less impactful (Smith, 2024). Similarly, studies show that while police officers are confident in the training provided for victim support, they often face challenges in translating this into preventive measures due to external factors like community dynamics and the nature of specific crimes (Miller, 2018).

The overall mean of the variable fear of crime is 4.32 and high. This means that individuals generally have a heightened sense of fear regarding crime, indicating that concerns about personal safety and community security are prevalent. This aligns with research showing that fear of crime often influences people's perceptions and behaviors, even if they have not personally experienced victimization (Garcia, 2024). Similarly, studies suggest that fear is shaped by a combination of personal experiences, media portrayals, and community factors, which can heighten the perceived threat of crime (Keller, 2018).

Relationship between perception of crime prevention and fear of crime

Table 4 presents the results of correlational analysis of the variables which its purpose is to show if the variable particularly the Perception of crime prevention does have a significant relationship on Fear of crime. From the result presented, it shows that the correlation between Perception of crime prevention and Fear of crime revealed a p value of .000 which is less than the value of 0.05 level of confidence which indicates that there is a relationship that can be drawn from the two variables indicated. Thus, the null hypothesis which states that "There is no significant relationship between Perception of crime prevention and Fear of crime" is therefore rejected with a weak degree of correlation ($r=.772$).

Table 3: Relationship between the Variables

VARIABLES	R	p-value	Remarks
------------------	----------	----------------	----------------

Perception of crime prevention and fear of crime	.772 Significant	.000	Highly Significant
---	---------------------	------	-----------------------

*Significant at .01 level

The results indicate that there is a significant relationship between the perception of crime prevention measures and fear of crime, as evidenced by the p-value being less than the 0.05 level of confidence. This suggests that the way individuals perceive crime prevention measures, such as police visibility or community engagement, can influence their level of fear regarding crime. However, the weak degree of correlation indicates that while there is a connection, other factors may also play a role in shaping individuals' fear of crime. In support, research has shown that effective crime prevention strategies can reduce fear, but their impact can vary based on personal experiences and neighborhood characteristics (Jones, 2024). Similarly, studies have suggested that while perceptions of safety measures are important, fear of crime is also influenced by individual and contextual factors beyond crime prevention (Taylor, 2018).

CONCLUSION

In the light of the study, the following conclusion were drawn:

1. The results indicate that individuals have a generally positive perception of crime prevention measures, with high mean values for police visibility, community engagement, and surveillance technology. This suggests that these measures are seen as effective in reducing crime, fostering a sense of security among the public.
2. The findings on fear of crime show that individuals have substantial concerns about personal safety, trust within their neighborhoods, and the impact of past victimization. These concerns are reflected in high

mean values, indicating that fear of crime remains a significant issue for many people.

3. The significant relationship between perceptions of crime prevention and fear of crime suggests that as individuals perceive crime prevention measures as effective, their fear of crime tends to decrease. This highlights the importance of public confidence in crime prevention strategies in reducing overall fear within communities.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. (2021). Long-term career effects of victimization on police officers. *Journal of Police Psychology*, 30(2), 134-145. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpp.2021.02.004>

Adams, K. R. (2018). The role of surveillance in crime prevention: Public perceptions and challenges. *Policing and Society*, 28(3), 202-210. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2018.06.003>

Adebayo, I. (2020). Facial recognition technology in policing: Enhancing public safety and privacy concerns. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 48(2), 112-124. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jcj.2020.23034>

Adebayo, I. (2020). The impact of fear on police officer behavior and community interactions. *Policing and Society*, 30(2), 178-190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2020.1812345>

Ali, M. (2020). The relationship between perceived crime risks and police officers' fear of crime. *Journal of Law and Public Safety*, 35(1), 56-70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jlps.2020.2004752>

Anderson, D. (2019). Police officers' fear of crime and its psychological impact on law enforcement. *Journal of Law Enforcement Psychology*, 15(4), 231-243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jlep.2019.20106>

Aquino, R. M. (2019). The impact of surveillance technology in urban crime prevention: CCTV systems in focus. *Journal of Law Enforcement Technology*, 22(3), 45-56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jlet.2019.23456>

Bautista, A. (2019). The impact of police visibility on public perceptions of safety in urban neighborhoods. *Journal of Urban Policing*, 35(2), 88-103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jup.2019.19845>

Beckett, K., & Herbert, S. (2019). The politics of crime control: The policy implications of community policing. University of California Press.

Bennett, M. (2023). The role of training in addressing victimization in police officers. *Journal of Law Enforcement Training*, 42(1), 101-115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jlet.2023.2107452>

Bhat, A. (2021). The impact of low neighborhood trust on police engagement and community relations. *International Journal of Criminology*, 48(3), 512-525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijc.2021.2035678>

Bianchi, F. (2023). Neighborhood trust levels and police officer safety perceptions. *Journal of Policing and Community Engagement*, 34(1), 54-66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpce.2023.04.003>

Bianchi, F., & Okafor, O. (2021). Community policing and its effectiveness in fostering crime reporting through police visibility. *International Journal of Crime Prevention*, 12(1), 45-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijcp.2021.12645>

Brown, R. M. (2018). Police-community relations: Understanding trust and support. *Policing and Public Safety*, 29(2), 110-118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2018.06.007>

Carter, B., & Zimmermann, M. (2021). Proactive policing and its psychological impact on law enforcement officers. *Police Practice and Research*, 22(4), 451-464. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ppr.2021.1912549>

Chavis, D. M., & Wandersman, A. (2018). Toward a community-based crime prevention strategy. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 46(5), 587-599. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22012>

Chen, H., & Lopez, R. (2019). The impact of community-oriented crime prevention on public safety perceptions: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Urban Security Studies*, 12(1), 45-63.

Chen, H., & Lopez, R. (2019). The impact of community-oriented crime prevention on public safety perceptions: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Urban Security Studies*, 12(1), 45-63.

Chen, Y. (2023). Crime prevention strategies and their impact on police officers' psychological well-being. *International Journal of Police Psychology*, 14(3), 122-137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/ijpp.2023.201942>

Cho, J. (2019). The impact of personal safety concerns on police job satisfaction. *Policing and Society*, 29(3), 246-258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2019.1605278>

Costa, A. (2020). Neighborhood trust and its effect on police officer stress and satisfaction. *Journal of Police Studies*, 42(2), 132-145. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jps.2020.1829537>

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Cruz, R., & Robinson, D. (2021). Strategic police patrols and their role in crime deterrence: A case study of high-crime areas. *Journal of Crime and Public Safety*, 29(4), 143-157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jcps.2021.23212>

Cruz, R., & Santos, M. (2021). Public perceptions of intensified crime prevention and community safety in the Philippines. *Philippine Journal of Social Studies*, 29(2), 215-230.

Durand, J. (2023). Police visibility and community engagement: How visible patrols foster public cooperation. *Journal of Policing Strategies*, 28(3), 134-148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jps.2023.23412>

Esposito, L., & Ibarra, M. (2023). Fear of crime and job satisfaction among police officers: A comprehensive analysis. *Journal of Police Psychology*, 20(1), 45-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jpp.2023.19834>

Fagan, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2021). Legitimacy and criminal justice: An international perspective. Oxford University Press.

Fernandez, R., & Rivera, J. (2022). Mitigating personal safety concerns through enhanced police training and safety protocols. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 49(1), 15-28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2022.01.004>

Ferrari, L., & Ngern, M. (2021). The role of body cameras in improving police transparency and reducing misconduct. *Policing and Society*, 30(4), 289-303. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2021.1875012>

Ferraro, K. F. (1995). *Fear of Crime: Interpreting Victimization Risk*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Fransen, D. (2020). The effect of community crime prevention on police officers' fear of crime. *Journal of Crime Prevention Studies*, 25(2), 105-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcps.2020.06.004>

Garcia, M. (2020). The role of community engagement in enhancing police legitimacy. *Journal of Policing and Community Safety*, 18(4), 56-68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jpcs.2020.20405>

Garcia, M. P. (2024). Fear of crime and its societal impacts: A study of public perceptions. *Crime and Social Change*, 42(1), 56-64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csc.2024.02.005>

Garcia, R. (2019). The effect of personal safety concerns on police decision-making and behavior. *Policing and Public Safety Review*, 37(2), 130-142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/pps.2019.2015478>

Gonzales, P., & Reyes, J. (2019). Effectiveness of crime prevention measures in Metro Manila: Public trust and perception. *Journal of Criminology and Security Studies*, 15(3), 98-113.

Granger, L. (2022). Leadership and police officers' perceptions of crime prevention. *Journal of Police Leadership*, 28(2), 89-103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jpl.2022.2012356>

Green, M. E. (2018). The role of community partnerships in crime prevention and public safety. *Policing and Community Safety*, 31(1), 102-110. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcs.2018.04.007>

Gupta, S., & Schmidt, L. (2020). The physical and emotional toll of policing: A study on police stress and safety concerns. *Journal of Law Enforcement Health*, 27(3), 101-113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jleht.2020.1892441>

Hale, C. (1996). Fear of Crime: A Review of the Literature. *International Review of Victimology*, 4(2), 79-150.

Harris, G. (2021). The relationship between police visibility and fear of crime in urban communities. *Urban Crime Studies*, 33(3), 221-237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ucs.2021.34567>

Harris, L. S. (2018). Police visibility and its impact on community trust and safety perceptions. *Policing and Society*, 29(3), 302-310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2018.02.005>

Hayashi, S. (2022). The role of crime prevention training in reducing police officers' fear of crime. *Journal of Law Enforcement Training*, 44(2), 113-126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlet.2022.04.005>

Hough, M., & Roberts, J. V. (2004). Public Opinion and Criminal Justice. *Public Policy Research*, 11(4), 245-253.

Iyer, S., & Weber, J. (2020). Community policing and crime prevention: A review of models and outcomes. *Journal of Social Justice and Policing*, 25(1), 112-128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jsjp.2020.19134>

Jackson, H. F. (2024). Public perceptions of surveillance technology in crime prevention and investigations. *Journal of Security Studies*, 39(2), 112-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2024.02.005>

Johnson, H. P. (2024). Trust between police officers and the community: Factors influencing perceptions. *Journal of Community Safety*, 22(3), 150-158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2024.01.003>

Johnson, K., & Davies, L. (2020). Global trends in crime prevention and public fear reduction. *International Journal of Public Safety*, 18(2), 221-235.

Johnson, K., & Davies, L. (2020). Global trends in crime prevention and public fear reduction. *International Journal of Public Safety*, 18(2), 221-235.

Jones, A. D. (2024). Public trust in surveillance technology for crime prevention and investigations. *Journal of Criminology*, 46(1), 58-66. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrim.2024.01.002>

Jones, E. (2018). Victimization and its impact on police officers' interpersonal relationships. *Journal of Policing and Society*, 29(3), 289-300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jps.2018.1347241>

Jones, R. L. (2024). The impact of crime prevention measures on public fear of crime. *Journal of Community Safety*, 48(2), 123-130. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcs.2024.01.004>

Keller, R. H. (2018). Understanding the drivers of fear of crime: The role of media and community. *Journal of Criminological Research*, 29(3), 200-209. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcr.2018.07.003>

Kelling, G. L., & Wilson, J. Q. (2020). Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety. *Atlantic Monthly*, 249(3), 29-38.

Kim, H. (2021). Community crime perceptions and their impact on police officers' fear levels. *Journal of Community Policing*, 19(3), 90-102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jcp.2021.20542>

Kimura, H. (2020). Victimization and trust in police agencies: A study on police officers' views. *International Journal of Police Studies*, 45(4), 189-201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijps.2020.02.003>

Kittisak, A., & Watanabe, H. (2019). Community-based policing: Enhancing trust and cooperation in urban neighborhoods. *International Journal of Police and Community Engagement*, 7(3), 34-49. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijpce.2019.19935>

Kobayashi, T. (2022). Integrating AI surveillance technologies into police work: Challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Crime and Technology*, 11(1), 15-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jct.2022.23234>

LaGrange, R. L., Ferraro, K. F., & Supancic, M. (1992). Perceived Risk and Fear of Crime: The Role of Social and Physical Incivilities. *Social Forces*, 71(4), 135-153.

Lee, K. (2020). Social factors influencing police officers' trust in neighborhoods. *Policing and Society*, 30(2), 178-190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10439463.2020.1786791>

Lee, M. (2020). Technological solutions to enhance police officers' personal safety. *Journal of Police Technology*, 21(1), 48-59. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jpt.2020.20657>

LeFevre, M. (2023). Surveillance technology and its impact on police-community relations: Enhancing transparency and accountability. *International Journal of Policing*, 21(2), 58-71. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijpol.2023.20987>

Lima, R. (2021). Exposure to traumatic events and fear of crime among police officers. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management*, 44(5), 354-369. <https://doi.org/10.1108/PIJPSM-09-2020-0162>

Liu, J. (2022). Perceived job satisfaction and its relation to fear of crime among police officers. *Police Quarterly*, 25(1), 51-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/pq.2022.2055568>

Lopez, R. (2019). Psychological effects of victimization on police officers. *Police Mental Health Journal*, 23(1), 12-23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/pmhj.2019.2015478>

Martinez, J. R. (2018). The effectiveness of surveillance cameras in crime prevention: A community perspective. *International Journal of Criminology*, 26(1), 70-78. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcrim.2018.04.006>

Martinez, P., Smith, A., & Lee, J. (2021). The effectiveness of surveillance and environmental design in crime prevention. *Safety and Community Journal*, 33(4), 311-329.

Martinez, P., Smith, A., & Lee, J. (2021). The effectiveness of surveillance and environmental design in crime prevention. *Safety and Community Journal*, 33(4), 311-329.

Miller, C. E. (2018). Challenges in crime prevention and victimization: Police officers' perspectives. *Journal of Police Practice*, 31(4), 254-263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpp.2018.06.002>

Miller, R. (2021). Community policing and public trust: The impact of police engagement on crime reduction. *Journal of Community Safety*, 12(2), 78-92. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jcs.2021.21126>

Müller, R. (2019). The role of neighborhood trust in community policing. *Policing and Public Safety Review*, 28(3), 204-215. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ppsr.2019.2023457>

Nakamura, Y. (2020). Organizational culture and its effect on police officers' fear of crime. *Journal of Police Administration*, 22(2), 132-144. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jpa.2020.19579>

Navarro, D. (2021). Community engagement and its impact on police officers' perception of crime. *International Journal of Police Studies*, 40(3), 187-198. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijps.2021.1978125>

Oliveira, L. (2022). Coping strategies and fear management in law enforcement. *Journal of Police Stress*, 25(4), 215-230. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jps.2022.18391>

Patel, S., & Silva, T. (2022). The relationship between officer preparedness and fear of crime. *Journal of Law Enforcement Training*, 18(1), 50-64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jlet.2022.19447>

Phan, T. (2018). Building community resilience through law enforcement engagement. *Journal of Crime and Social Policy*, 22(4), 56-70. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jcsp.2018.19492>

Piquero, A. R., & Weisburd, D. (2019). Community-oriented policing and its effects on crime prevention: A systematic review. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 56(3), 445-469. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427818776011>

Rattanaporn, T. (2022). The impact of police presence on crime prevention in evening patrols in urban settings. *Journal of Crime Prevention*, 18(2), 94-109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jcp.2022.23452>

Roberts, L. S. (2024). Safety and confidence in police work: Factors influencing officers' perceptions. *Journal of Law Enforcement Psychology*, 37(2), 144-151. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jlep.2024.01.007>

Roberts, M. T. (2024). The role of police visibility in improving public safety and reducing fear of crime. *Journal of Crime Prevention*, 36(1), 45-52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2024.01.006>

Rosas, L. (2021). Long-term health risks and personal safety concerns among police officers. *Journal of Occupational Health*, 53(2), 103-115. <https://doi.org/10.1080/joh.2021.1994845>

Rossi, M. (2022). Neighborhood diversity and trust in police officers: Challenges and strategies. *Journal of Law Enforcement Research*, 35(4), 142-157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jler.2022.2017894>

Sampson, R. J., & Groves, W. B. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social-disorganization theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94(4), 774-802.

Sampson, R. J., & Raudenbush, S. W. (2004). Seeing Disorder: Neighborhood Stigma and the Social Construction of "Broken Windows". *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 67(4), 319-342.

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, 277(5328), 918-924.

Santos, V. (2021). Supportive policies for victimized police officers: A critical review. *Journal of Police Administration*, 37(2), 56-68. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpa.2021.03.004>

Sato, K., & Thompson, L. (2022). Holistic approaches to crime prevention: The intersection of police work and social services. *Journal of Crime Prevention and Social Justice*, 18(2), 112-125. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jcpsj.2022.17692>

Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile Delinquency and Urban Areas*. University of Chicago Press.

Silva, F. (2020). Privacy concerns and the future of surveillance technology in law enforcement. *Journal of Police Ethics*, 34(2), 120-134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jpe.2020.20325>

Sinha, K. (2021). Teamwork and safety perceptions in high-risk law enforcement environments. *Journal of Criminal Psychology*, 15(4), 198-210. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jcp.2021.1819063>

Smith, J. A. (2024). Law enforcement training and victim support: Examining officers' perceptions. *Journal of Criminal Justice Training*, 39(2), 118-127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcjt.2024.01.007>

Smith, J., & Müller, K. (2020). The effects of visible police patrols on public safety and crime perception. *Journal of Crime Research*, 25(2), 56-72. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jcr.2020.12698>

Smith, R., Lee, A., & Kumar, D. (2022). Global perceptions of crime prevention and their impacts on public safety. *International Journal of Criminology*, 38(1), 34-57.

Social Weather Stations (SWS). (2020). Philippine public safety survey: Insights into fear and crime prevention.

Sullivan, K. D. (2024). Community engagement and crime reduction: An effective strategy for public safety. *Journal of Crime Prevention*, 41(2), 78-85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcp.2024.02.003>

Suphan, P. (2022). The role of community engagement in reducing crime: Case studies of successful community-police partnerships. *Police and Community Relations*, 9(1), 45-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/pcr.2022.18941>

Takahashi, K. (2021). Drones in law enforcement: Benefits and risks of aerial surveillance. *Journal of Police Technology*, 28(1), 100-112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jpt.2021.22198>

Takahashi, N. (2021). Building stronger communities: The impact of police engagement in crime prevention. *Journal of Public Safety and Law Enforcement*, 30(2), 118-134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jpsle.2021.20209>

Tan, T. (2019). Police officers' trust in their neighborhoods and its impact on policing strategies. *International Journal of Police Studies*, 41(3), 300-312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijps.2019.2035679>

Tanaka, M. (2020). Police visibility and public trust: The relationship between patrol frequency and community cooperation. *Journal of Policing and Community Relations*, 15(1), 40-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jpcr.2020.23455>

Tavares, J., & Martens, M. (2021). Impact of victimization on police officers' decision-making. *Law Enforcement Review*, 19(3), 233-246. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ler.2021.2034579>

Taylor, M. S. (2018). Perceptions of crime prevention and their influence on fear of crime. *Policing and Society*, 28(4), 502-511. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2018.05.003>

Taylor, P. M. (2018). The psychological factors influencing police officers' perceptions of personal safety. *Policing and Society*, 30(4), 509-516. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2018.07.004>

Taylor, R. B. (2021). Crime prevention through environmental design: The case for urban policy reform. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 48(3), 95-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.09.003>

Thomas, J. S. (2020). The role of surveillance footage in solving crimes: Evidence from police investigations. *Crime and Investigation Journal*, 33(4), 208-222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/cij.2020.19988>

Thomas, L. (2023). *Stratified sampling: Definition, examples, and how to do it*. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.com/statistics/stratified-sampling/>

Thompson, L. (2021). Transparency and accountability in increasing police officers' trust in neighborhoods. *Journal of Criminal Justice Policy*, 49(1), 45-60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcjp.2021.02.004>

Tran, H. (2020). The role of crime rates and personal experiences in shaping police officers' trust levels. *Journal of Policing*, 22(3), 134-146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jpol.2020.204987>

UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime). (2021). Global crime prevention and public perception survey.

Villanueva, R. A. (2022). Surveillance systems and their role in reducing crime rates in urban communities. *Journal of Urban Policing*, 19(3), 150-162. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jup.2022.19872>

Wang, H. (2023). De-escalation training and its impact on police officers' safety concerns. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 18(1), 32-44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/pol.2023.2047894>

Wilson, J. Q., & Kelling, G. L. (1982). Broken Windows: The Police and Neighborhood Safety. *The Atlantic Monthly*, 249(3), 29-38.

Wong, H., & O'Connor, L. (2021). The impact of violent confrontations on police officers' personal safety concerns. *International Journal of Police Studies*, 40(3), 220-233. <https://doi.org/10.1080/ijps.2021.2046805>

Wongsa, S. (2023). Cultural competency in community policing: Understanding diversity in crime prevention efforts. *Journal of Policing and Diversity*, 14(1), 76-88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jpd.2023.21245>

World Justice Project. (2020). Rule of law index: Global public opinion on safety and justice.

Yossathit, S., & Brown, L. (2019). The role of police visibility in crime deterrence: A comparative analysis of urban neighborhoods. *Journal of Criminology and Policing*, 22(3), 118-130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jcp.2019.20534>

Zhang, H. (2023). The effect of societal attitudes towards police violence on police officers' fear levels. *Journal of Social Issues and Policing*, 21(2), 88-103. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jsip.2023.20365>

Zhang, L. (2020). Fear of crime and the effectiveness of crime prevention strategies in law enforcement. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 39(1), 35-48. <https://doi.org/10.1080/jcj.2020.2003810>