BASIC CRIME PREVENTION PRACTICES AMONG RESIDENTS IN POBLACION PIKIT, COTABATO

Muharisan T. Kadatuan
Jhamsid S. Laguiban
Saudin A. Lipusen
Farok M. Macalampao
Jonaid Al-Jasher O. Murray
Joesel B. Villegas

ABSTRACT

The study was conducted on April 2021 to identify the Basic Crime Prevention Practices among Residents in Poblacion, Pikit, Cotabato. Specifically it aimed to answer the following objectives: determine the socio-demographic profile of the respondents in terms of age, sex, educational attainment, and crime prevention seminar attended; determine the level of basic crime prevention practices of resident; and determine the significant differences in the basic crime prevention practices of residents when grouped according to profile.

Descriptive research design was used to describe the socio-economic profile and determine the level of the Basic Crime Prevention Practices.Correlational research design determined the significant differences in the basic crime prevention practices of residents when grouped according to their profile.

The needed data were gathered through the use of survey personal questionnaire.

The data analysis such as frequency count, percentage and weighted mean were used in the analysis of the descriptive data.

Lastly, the study revealed that the socio-economic profile and the seminars attended by the respondents have no significance to their crime prevention practices,

except for the variable *Age* that shows highly significant to their prevention practices for crime.

Keywords:*Basic Crime Prevention Practices, Pearson Product Moment Correlational Research Design,Descriptive-Correlation*

INTRODUCTION

Community crime prevention programs or strategies target changes in community infrastructure, culture, or the physical environment in order to reduce crime. The diversity of approaches includes neighborhood watch, community policing, urban or physical design, and comprehensive or multi-disciplinary efforts. These strategies may seek to engage residents, community and faith-based organizations, and local government agencies in addressing the factors that contribute to the community's crime, delinquency, and disorder. However, burglars are becoming more sophisticated that most of them are wearing decent clothes posing as sales people to evade watchful eyes (Byrne, 2015).

Many residents however clamor to change the law because homeowners may accuse anybody they have invited inside to be burglars and that would be very abusive (Mawby, 2013).

In the Philippines, discussions about crime and safety for expats living in the Philippines seem to generate big, passionate differences of opinion. Some feel that foreigners are prime crime targets. This view is supported by many news reports of foreigners being killed, mostly in home intrusions. Others have never experienced crime during their stay in the Philippines, feel very safe, that the dangers are overblown and

that it's safer in the Philippines than their home country. However, there are many foreigners who became victims of burglary and have died because they resisted in the Philippines, even if the place is safe, criminals usually are committing crimes far from their own places and foreigners are the target because they have more money compare to the locals (Cundry, 2013).

In Pikit, Cotabato, there are cases of stealing inside homes but residents in most cases do not bother reporting the crimes because most of stolen things are not really valuable, wherein many believe that only juvenile delinquents are involve and a waste of time because they will be released anyway. However, there are instances where valuable things are stolen and perpetrators are not juveniles, which must be addressed by the law enforcers with the help of the community. There is a research gap on the topic in Pikit prompting the proponents to pursue the study concerning the basic crime prevention employed by community residents of Poblacion, Pikit to counter crime against property.

Statement of the Problem

This study determined the relationship between socio-demographic profile and Crime Prevention Practices. More specifically, it sought answers to the following questions:

1. What is the level of socio-demographic profile in terms of:
    1.1. Sex
    1.2. Age

1.3. Educational Attainment

1.4. Crime Prevention Seminar Attended

2. What is the level of Crime Prevention Practices in terms of:

   2.1 Technology

   2.2 Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)

   2.3 Physical Monitoring

   2.4Counter Crime Against property

3. Is there a significant relationship between socio-demographic profile and Crime Prevention Practices?
4. Do socio-demographic profile significantly predict the Crime Prevention Practices?

Theoretical Framework

The study is anchored to Routine Activity Theory developed by Cohen and Felson (1979). It is probably one of the most known criminological theories discussed and used countless times. This theory was formulated in order to analyze crime trends. The premise of the theory is founded on three main components that make committing a crime possible: a motivated offender, a suitable target and an absence of a capable guardian. These components have to converge in time and space in order for a criminal

act to happen. The authors mean that a criminal act cannot occur in case one of these components is removed from the equation.

Routine Activity Theory is established on two principle ideas: (1) that the structure of routine activities in a society influences what kind of situations (person–environment interactions) emerge; and (2) that people commit acts of crime in response to situational conditions (opportunities) (Wikström,Oberwittler, Treiber&Hardie, 2012). This theory suggests that individual level efforts to increase the security, surveillance, or guardianship provided tone's home should decrease burglary victimization risk. If people's routine activities require them to spend more time outside their homes, then the probability of offenders meeting their targets without any capable guardian present will increase. Domestic burglary relates positively to the amount of non-household activities people engage in (Wilcox, Madensen&Tillyer, 2007). Figure 1 disclosed the conceptual framework of the study consisting of the variable basic crime prevention: Tips to secure house and belongings with indicators technology, crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) and physical monitoring. The moderator variable is age, sex and occupation.

METHODOLOGY

This chapter presents the research design, respondents of the study, locale of the study, research instruments, data gathering procedure and the data analysis used in the conduct of the study.

Research Design

The study used the descriptive method. Strauss and Corbin (2003) stressed that the purpose of this method is to find new truths which may have different forms such as increased quality of knowledge, a new generalization or a new law, an increased insight into factors which are operating the discovery of the significant difference, a more accurate formulation of the problem to be solved and many others. Descriptive survey is valuable in providing facts on which scientific judgments may be based. It was used in this study to determine the basic crime prevention employed by community residents of Poblacion, Pikit, Cotabato to counter crime against property.

Research Locale

This particular study was conducted at Poblacion, Pikit, Cotabato. Barangay Poblacion is the center of the economic activity of the municipality

Research Respondents

The study conducted in Poblacion, Pikit, Cotabato took the house owners as respondents of the study. Fifty (50) house owners was surveyed by the used of simple random sampling technique and the criteria included the following. The homeowners should be at least more than 5 years' resident of Poblacion, Pikit, Cotabato, and they own the house.

Research Instruments

The study used the researcher-made questionnaires primary sources of data. The questionnaire is composed of two parts. Part 1 were the socio-demographic profile

of the respondents and Part 2 wasthe elicit information on the basic crime prevention strategies employed by the residents of Poblacion, Pikit, Cotabato. The authors of the said survey questionnaire are Phillis Wheatley and Anne Tyler. The instrument of this study was validated by the panel of experts who are knowledgeable in the said study. It was pre- tested to non-participant respondents to determine the reliability. To determine the reliability, the data to be gathered was analyzed using the Chronbach alpha.

Research Procedures

The study was permitted upon the approval of the School President, Vice President for Academic, Dean, down to the respondents by the use of a unified permission letter. Upon approval of the school personals to conduct a survey the letterwas forwarded and addressed to the barangay captain of the Poblacion. The researchersprovided a letter to ask permission to the gather data from the participants. Researchers distributed the questionnaires to the participants explaining to them the purpose of conducting the study. The questionnaires was retrieved by the researchers after the participants answered it. The data was tallied for statistical analysis.

Statistical Tools

The data was analyzed by transcription and coding. Simple descriptive statistics such as frequency counts and percent were used to summarize the data. Mean and Standard deviation were used to measure the level of basic crime prevention practices among residents in Poblacion, Pikit, Cotabato and Pearson Products Moment

Correlation to validate the significance between the Dependent Variable and the Independent variables.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the Philippines, discussions about crime and safety for expats living in the Philippines seem to generate big, passionate differences of opinion. Some feel that foreigners are prime crime targets. This view is supported by many news reports of foreigners being killed, mostly in home intrusions. Others have never experienced crime during their stay in the Philippines, feel very safe, that the dangers are overblown and that it's safer in the Philippines than their home country. However, there are many foreigners who became victims of burglary and have died because they resisted in the Philippines, even if the place is safe, criminals usually are committing crimes far from their own places and foreigners are the target because they have more money compare to the locals (Cundry, 2013).

In Pikit, Cotabato, there are cases of stealing inside homes but residents in most cases do not bother reporting the crimes because most of stolen things are not really valuable, wherein many believe that only juvenile delinquents are involve and a waste of time because they will be released anyway. However, there are instances where valuable things are stolen and perpetrators are not juveniles, which must be addressed by the law enforcers with the help of the community. There is a research gap on the topic in Pikit prompting the proponents to pursue the study concerning the basic crime prevention employed by community residents of Poblacion, Pikit to counter crime against property. This chapter presents the findings gathered from the 50 households

on Basic Crime Prevention Practices and Counter Crime against Property among residents of Poblacion, Pikit, Cotabato.

	Frequency	Percentage
Sex		
Male	29	58.0
Female	21	42.0
Total	**50**	**100**

Table 1 shows the socio-demographic profile of the respondents among residents of Poblacion, Pikit, Cotabato. Out of 50 respondents, 29 response (58%) were Male and 21 (42%) were Female.

	Frequency	Percentage
Age		
20 Below	0	0.0
21- 25 years	2	4.0
26 - 30 years	11	22.0
31 – 35 years	16	32.0
36 and above	21	42.0
Total	**50**	**100**

As per age bracket, most of the respondents were from the age ranges of 36 years old and above, gathering the percentage of 42 with 21 respondents, 32% were from the age of 31 to 35 years old with 16 respondents, 22% were from the age of 26 to 30 with 11 respondents and 4% were from 21 to 25 years old.

	Frequency	Percentage
Educational Attainment		
Elementary Level	3	6.0
High School Level	11	22.0
College Level	32	64.0
Post Graduate Level	4	8.0
Others	0	0.0
Total	**50**	**100**

Majorities of them were in college level with the percentage of 64 and 32 responses, 22% from high school level with 11 responses, 8% graduated from college with 4 responses and 6% from elementary level with 3 responses.

	Frequency	Percentage
Crime Prevention Seminar Attended		
Crime Related Seminar	23	46.0
Violence Related Seminar	5	10.0
Murder Related Seminar	0	0.0
Property Crime Related Seminar	2	4.0
Organized Crime Related Seminar	0	0.0
Robbery Related Seminar	6	12.0
Gun Related Seminar	9	18.0
Sexual Related Seminar	5	10.0
Total	**50**	**100.0**

With the list of seminars provided we have able to identify which seminars they have usually attended with regards to Crime Prevention, those are as follows: 46% with 23 respondents have attended Crime Related Seminar, 18% with 9 respondents in Gun Related Seminar, 12% with 6 respondents in Robbery Related Seminar, both 10% with 5 respondents each in Sexual Related Seminar and Violence Related Seminar, and 4% with 2 respondents in Property Crime Related Seminar.

Table 2 Level of Crime Prevention Practices

Indicators	Mean	Std. Deviation	Interpretation
A. Technology			
1. I install CCTV camera facing the front gate.	4.27	.715	Agree
2. I save CCTV Footages in the hard disk of the computer.	4.02	.767	Agree
3. I install tracking chips to vehicles and appliances.	3.87	.911	Agree
4. I install security lightings on doors, gates and other entrances.	3.77	.831	Agree

5. I install CCTV inside the house.	4.20	.757	Agree
Average Mean	**4.03**	**.797**	**High**
B. Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)			
1. I could not see the inside of the house compound when I am outside.	4.05	.749	Agree
2. I close gates abd doors all the time.	3.82	1.15	Agree
3. I build spaces that are more open and visible to security personnel.	4.02	.973	Agree
4.I decrease landscaping so that attackers cannot hide themselves.	4.17	.594	Agree
5. I use single, clearly identifiable point of entry.	3.62	.952	Agree
Average Mean	**3.94**	**.884**	**High**
C. Physical Monitoring			
1. I work with local public agencies and other organizations (neighborhood based or community wide) on solving common problem.	4.71	.985	Agree
2. I raise dogs as pet to deter thieves from entering the compound.	4.07	.899	Agree
3. I give incentives to Barangay Tanods to guard the place during night time.	4.05	.899	Agree
4. I report crime or suspicious activity immediately to the police.	3.76	.752	Agree
5. I check properties every day.	4.24	.664	Agree
Counter Crime Against property			
Average Mean	**4.16**	**.839**	**High**
D. Counter Crime Against property			
1.I expect that police patrols had a knowledge on self- defense	4.79	.408	Agree
2. I am trained in self- defense	4.57	.496	Agree
3. I equipped with cameras in my cellphone	3.02	1.71	Neutral
4.I am always aware on crime against property.	4.55	.498	Agree
5. I would make sure that Their unit number (in a multifamily housing development) is clearly visible from paths in the development.	3.52	1.20	Agree
6. I attend police patrol weekly lecture or monthly lecture regarding crime against property.	3.67	1.08	Agree
7. Our chairman of the community make policies against who seize.	4.58	.495	Strongly Agree
8. Our police patrols are always aware on the residents. Always check every	4.56	.497	Strongly Agree

Barangay.			
9. I remove loose rocks and other objects that could be used to vandalize their property.	4.29	.694	Agree
10. I need to provide the PVEPD with an entry code if their home is gated or if they live in a gated apartment complex.	4.45	.563	Agree
Average Mean	**4.20**	**.767**	**High**
Overall Mean	**4.08**	**.822**	**High Level of Crime Prevention Practices**

Level of Crime Prevention Practices

In the Philippines, discussions about crime and safety for expats living in the Philippines seem to generate big, passionate differences of opinion. Some feel that foreigners are prime crime targets. This view is supported by many news reports of foreigners being killed, mostly in home intrusions. Others have never experienced crime during their stay in the Philippines, feel very safe, that the dangers are overblown and that it's safer in the Philippines than their home country. However, there are many foreigners who became victims of burglary and have died because they resisted in the Philippines, even if the place is safe, criminals usually are committing crimes far from their own places and foreigners are the target because they have more money compare to the locals (Cundry, 2013).

Through this research study, we were able to evaluate the level of crime prevention practices among the residents of Poblacion, Pikit, North Cotabato.

It was shown in this table the four program characteristics indicators given, which measured with the following scale: Highly Disagree, Disagree, Neutral, Agree, and Highly Agree with assigned values of 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 respectively.

The four indicators given got the overall mean of 4.08 with the standard deviation of .822 and interpreted as High Level of Crime Prevention Practices.

Among the four indicators Counter Crime Against Property got the highest average mean of 4.20 with the standard deviation of .767 and the interpretation is High Level of Crime Prevention. Among the statements under this indicator, number 1 have the highest rate of 4.79 with the standard deviation of .408 and the interpretation is Agree; and the lowest is statement number 3 which got the mean of 3.02 with the standard deviation of 1.71 and the interpretation is Neutral.

Followed by Physical Monitoring with the mean of 4.16 and the standard deviation is .839, interpreted as High. Under this indicator, statement number five got the highest with the mean of 4.24 and the standard deviation is .664 and interpreted as Agree; and the lowest is the statement number 4 which got the mean of 3.76 with the standard deviation of .752 and the interpretation is Agree.

Indicator Technology got the average mean of 4.03 with the standard deviation of .797 and the interpretation is *High*. Under this indicator, statement number 1 got the highest mean of 4.27 with standard deviation of .715 and the interpretation is Agree.

“The effectiveness of the technology was supported by the study of Hempel, 2011, which stated that “Until the mid-eighties, the deployment of CCTV systems had largely been limited to private spaces. The appearance of these systems in settings typically considered ‘public’ is a more recent phenomenon; and, it is one which occurred with considerable alacrity in many countries. A diverse array of aims and objectives has motivated the introduction of CCTV into public spaces including: public safety, deterrence, enhanced detection and increased response times. In the contemporary

context, the predominant uses of CCTV in public spaces are in the management of risks, traffic jams, fire, accidents and crime prevention (Hempel, 2011)".

And lastly,the indicator Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) got the mean of 3.94 with the standard deviation of .884 and the interpretation is High. Among the 5 statements under this indicator, statement number 4 got the highest with mean of 4.17 and the standard deviation is .594, interpreted as Agree.

"Crime prevention through environmental design strategies are most successful when they inconvenience the end user the least and when the crime prevention through environmental design process relies upon the combined efforts of environmental designers, land managers, community activists, and law enforcement professionals. The strategies listed above can't be fulfilled without the community's help and it requires the whole community in the location to make the environment a safer place to live (O'Grady, 2011). A meta-analysis of multiple-component crime prevention through environmental design initiatives in the United States has found that they have decreased robberies between 30 and 84%. In terms of effectiveness, a more accurate title for the strategy would be crime deterrence through environmental design. Research demonstrates that offenders cannot be literally prevented from committing crimes by using crime prevention through environmental design. Crime prevention through environmental design relies upon changes to the physical environment that will cause an offender to make certain behavioral decisions. Those changes are crafted so as to encourage behavior, and thus they deter rather than conclusively "prevent" behavior (Sorensen, Hayes, WalshandMyhre , 2009)."

The Significant Differences In The Basic Crime Prevention Practices Of Residents When Grouped According To Their Profile.

Table 3. Test for Significant Difference between the Ages of the Respondents with respect to their Crime Prevention Practices.

Dependent Variable	Age	Mean	SD	F-value	p-value	Remarks
Crime Prevention Practices	20 Below	3.53	1.29	10.861	0.000**	Highly Significant
	21 – 25 Years	3.31	1.01			
	26 – 30 Years	2.87	.987			
	31 – 36 Years	2.43	.786			
	36 Years Above	1.42	.317			

** Significant at 0.01
*Highly Significant at 0.05

Table 3 shows the significant difference between the Ages of the respondents with respect to their Crime Prevention Practices. Under the age of 20 and below the mean is 3.53 with the standard deviation of 1.29, age 21-25 years old got the mean of 3.31 with the standard deviation of 1.01, 26-30 years old got the mean of 2.87 with the standard deviation of .987, 31-36 years got the mean of 2.43 with the standard deviation of .786 and lastly, 36 years and above got the mean of 1.42 with the standard deviation of .317. Overall, the result of the study shows that the Ages variable is Highly Significant with respect to their Crime Prevention Practices.

Table 4. Test for Significant Difference between the Sexes of the Respondents with respect to their Crime Prevention Practices.

Dependent Variable	Age	Mean	SD	F-value	p-value	Remarks
Crime Prevention Practices	Male	2.176	.285	7.261	0.060	Not Significant
	Female	2.537	.485			

** Significant at 0.01
*Highly Significant at 0.05

Table 4 shows the significant difference between the Sexes of the respondents with respect to their Crime Prevention Practices. Where, Male respondents got the mean of 2.17 with the standard deviation of .285 and Female got the mean of 2.53 with the standard deviation of .485. Furthermore, the result of the study shows that the Sex variable is Not Significant with respect to their Crime Prevention Practices.

Table 5. Test for Significant Difference between the Educational Attainment of the Respondents with respect to their Crime Prevention Practices.

Dependent Variable	Age	Mean	SD	F-value	p-value	Remarks
Crime Prevention Practices	Elementary Graduate	2.43	1.20	6.011	0.210	Not Significant
	High School Graduate	3.11	1.02			
	College Graduate	1.80	.977			
	Post Graduate	1.52	.685			
	Others	1.41	.341			

** Significant at 0.01
*Highly Significant at 0.05

Table 5 shows the significant difference of the variable Educational Attainment of the respondents with respect to their Crime Prevention Practices. Where, the respondent from Elementary graduates got the mean of 2.43 with the standard deviation of 1.20, High School graduates got the mean of 3.11 with the standard deviation of 1.02,College graduates got the mean of 1.80 with the standard deviation of .977, post graduates got the mean of 1.52 with the standard deviation of .685, and others got the mean of 1.41 with the standard deviation of .341. Overall, the result of the study shows that the Educational Attainment of the respondents is Not Significant with respect to their Crime Prevention Practices.

Table 6. Test for Significant Difference between the Seminars Attended of the Respondents with respect to their Crime Prevention Practices.

Dependent Variable	Age	Mean	SD	F-value	p-value	Remarks
Crime Prevention Practices	Crime Related Seminar	3.61	.115	5.711	0.203	Not Significant
	Violence Related Seminar	1.12	.788			
	Murder Related Seminar	0.00	0.00			
	Property Crime Related Seminar	2.10	.531			
	Organized Crime	0.00	0.00			

Related Seminar		
Robbery Related Seminar	0.00	0.00
Gun Related Seminar	2.50	.947
Sexual Related Seminar	3.22	.585
Others	3.10	.441

** Significant at 0.01
*Highly Significant at 0.05

Table 6 shows the test for Significant Difference between the Seminars Attended of the Respondents with respect to their Crime Prevention Practices. Where Crime Related Seminar got the highest with the mean of 3.61 and the standard deviation is .115 while the lowest are the following seminars Murder Related, Organized Crime Related and Robbery Related Seminar which got zero mean and zero standard deviation. Manifestation that there is no one among the respondents got to attend in these list of seminars. Overall, the results shows the Seminars Attended by Respondents is Not Significant with respect to their Crime Prevention Practices.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CONCLUSION

Based on the result of this study the researchers therefore concludes:

1. Most of the respondents highly agreed that through the following Prevention Practices for crime: Technology, Crime Prevention through Environmental Design

(CPTED, Physical Monitoring, and Counter Crime Against property we can effectively prevent and avoid crimes that might occur in our daily lives.

2. Most of the respondents hilly agreed that among the given practices to prevent crimes, Counter Crime Against Properties is the most effective one which includes the following variable observability stating; I expect that police patrols had a knowledge on self- defense, I am trained in self- defense, I equipped with cameras in my cellphone, I am always aware on crime against property, I would make sure that Their unit number (in a multifamily housing development) is clearly visible from paths in the development, I attend police patrol weekly lecture or monthly lecture regarding crime against property, Our chairman of the community make policies against who seize, Our police patrols are always aware on the residents. Always check every Barangay, I remove loose rocks and other objects that could be used to vandalize their property, and I need to provide the PVEPD with an entry code if their home is gated or if they live in a gated apartment complex.
3. The socio-demographic profile of the respondents has no significant to their preventions practices for crime, except for the variable *Age* which shows high significant.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. This study proved that almost all the respondents in behalf of the populations from Poblacion, Pikit, Cotabato were following practices to prevent crime within their vicinities. Technology, Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED),

and Physical Monitoring, Counter Crime against property was just the following practices that have been proven for its effectiveness in preventing delinquencies. The study further support this fact.

2. Henceforth, this study was highly recommended to be revealed in order to educate more locals from Poblacion, Pikit, Cotabato and contribute for its benefits in preventing future crimes.
3. This study will also be a benefits to support future studies related to Crime Prevention Practices. Thus, it is ideal to be a used as a source for the researchers.

REFERENCES

Byrne, G.L. (2015). Community crime prevention strategies. Crime & Crime Prevention. Retrieved on October 22, 2015 from https://www.crimesolutions.gov/TopicDetails.aspx?ID=10

Cohen, L. E. &Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activities approach. American Sociological Review, p. 608.

Cundry, R.L. (2013). Our Philippine house: Security and crime prevention. Retrieved on October 20, 2015 from http://myphilippinelife.com/our-philippine-house-project-security/

Gordon, L. A. (2013). A byte out of crime. ABA Journal. Grannsamverkan,

Grove, L. (2011). Preventing repeat domestic burglary: A meta-evaluation of studies from Australia, the UK, and the United States. Victims & Offenders: An International Journal of Evidence-based Research, Policy, and Practice. p. 385.

Hirschfield, F., Newton, L. &Rogerson, D. (2010). Linking burglary and target hardening at the property level: New insights into victimization and burglary protection. Criminal Justice Policy Review. p. 337.

Johnson, S. D., Bowers, K. J. & Pease, K. (2012). Towards the modest predictability of daily burglary counts. Policing. p. 176.

Mawby R I, (2013) Burglary.Willan Publishing. p. 26

Millie, A. & Hough, M. (2007). Assessing the impact of the reducing burglary Initiative in southern England and Wales. Home Office Online Report.

Pira, K. (2008). Vad vet viombostadsinbrott? 20 gärningspersonerssvar. Polismyndigheten I Stockholmslän.

Perry, W. L., McInnis, B., Price, C. C., Smith, S. C. &Hollywood , J.S. (2013). Predictive policing: The role of crime forecasting in law enforcement operations. Rand Corporation.

Robinson, M. B. (2007). From research to policy: Preventing residential burglary through a systems approach. American Journal Of Criminal Justice, p.179.

Shover, N, (2007) Burglary. crime and justice. p. 113.

Sorensen, D. (2007). Scandinavian prospects for a place-based randomized experiment on burglary reduction. Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention. p. 112.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (2003), Basics of qualitative research; Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory. Thousand oak: Sage publications.

Tseloni, A., Thompson, R., Grove, L., Tilley, N. & Farrell, G. (2014). The effectiveness of burglary security devices. Security Journal.

Tseloni A, Wittebrood K, Farrell G, & Pease K, (2009). Burglary victimization in England and Wales, the United States and the Netherlands: A cross-national comparative test of routine activities and lifestyle theories. The British Journal of Criminology, p. 91.

Wikström, P.O, Oberwittler, D., Treiber, K. &Hardie, B. (2012). Breaking rules: The social and situational dynamics of young people's urban crime. Oxford: OxfordUniversity Press.

Wilcox, P., Madensen, T. &Tillyer, M. (2007). Guardianship in context: Implications for burglary victimization risk and prevention. Criminology. p. 803.

Yu, S. V. &Maxfield, M. G. (2014). Ordinary business: Impacts on commercial and residential burglary. The British Journal of Criminology, p. 320

Clarke, R. V. (2009). Hot Products: understanding, anticipating and reducing demand for stolen goods. Police Research Series, Paper 112. Home Office, Policing and Reducing Crime Unit.

Klaus, P. (2006). National crime victimization survey - Crime and the nation's households. Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Sutton, A. (2007). Property crime prevention: The future. Burglary and Car Theft: Is Your Property Safe?, Melbourne, Australia.

Freiberg, A. (2008). Cadillac Escalade SUV is top theft target & has worst overall insurance theft losses. Highway Data Loss Institute.

Douglas, J.E., Burgess, A.G. and Ressler, R.K. (2006). Crime Classification Manual. Wiley. pp. 42 and 287.

Hempel, L. (2011). Urbaneye: Inception Report-Working Paper No. 1' Berlin:Centre for Technology and SocietyTechnicalUniversity.

O'Grady, W. (2011). Crime in canadian context: Debates and controversies. (2nd ed.) Oxford University Press. p. 126.

Atlas, R. (2008). 21st Century Security and CPTED: Designing for critical infrastructure protection and crime prevention. CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Ltd. p. 85

Sorensen, S., Hayes, J.G., Walsh, E.W. and Myhre, M. (2009). Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED): Workbook. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Safety and Conservation Division; Washington, DC.