

Examine the Role of Effective Urban Factors in the Context and Reduction of Crime Opportunities and Insecurity in Urban Environments

Salman Hasanvand¹, Mohammad Amin Khojasteh Ghamari², Saeed Hadizadeh Firozjaee³

¹Department of Art and Architecture, Science and Research branch, Islamic Azad University, Tehran, Iran

²Department of Architecture, Young Researchers and Elite Club, Tabriz branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran

³Department of Art and Architecture, Art University, Isfahan, Iran

Abstract: Today, through a spatial representation of criminal acts, and combining these data with spatial data, where possible, identify crimes and crime centers, where Halle predicted probability of abnormalities within the city limits is provided. Ultimately, this information can effectively reduce the crime rate in the city and reduce the factors underlying crime in urban environments be effective. Delinquency and crime problems and disorders that affect the entire community and each of the communities, large amounts of wealth and human capital has been spent fighting this social phenomenon. The origin of this phenomenon in the social structure, economy and environment from which they sought which there's a time and place that in the context of suitable, criminal background and repeat it provides and it a crime hotspot go on geographical environment makes. Hence, the specific features and structures of the urban environment have a significant impact on the incidence of crime and changes in the spatial structure and environmental conditions will lead to changes in patterns of criminal behavior. So three times, places, and people have a fundamental role in shaping criminal factors, such as differences in location, time and behavioral characteristics leads to the type and extent of crime in the city limits, take on different spatial and temporal patterns. Research methodology and descriptive - analytic study. This study intend to analysis effective factors in urban crime event and insecurity and also it give strategies for reduction of crime in urban environments . In this study, the knowledge and the corresponding definitions of crime and urban indicators, to examine the theoretical principles and theories of scholars addressed; then, identifying the factors and indicators and analysis of existing studies and After identifying strengths and weaknesses, and the constraints and opportunities provide guidelines and recommendations on how to improve areas of their proper shape to reduce crime, and the insecurity.

Keywords: crime, land use, lighting, focus of crime, insecurity and delinquency

Introduction

Urbanization in developing countries compared with developed countries, growth has been very steeply. Accordance, cities in developing countries with additional problems such as unemployment, the informal economy, informal housing, violence, crime, delinquency, social deviance and crime have faced. Although in developed countries show high rates of urban crime, but it would figure in developing countries, growth is higher. For example, in urban America since the 1960s, with frequent violent acts such as theft, pick pocketing, murder and gangs were a threat. The high crime rate is very terrible, because the impact on the ability of people to urban areas. Public spaces such as parks, squares and streets of the city are very attractive features. When these spaces cannot be used because of the offense, the appeal will affect lives negatively. Nowadays most public spaces in urban areas is limited. The

crime causes immense bear the costs at the individual level, the social and national. Urban violence and insecurity issues and create a feeling of insecurity that followed is occurring; such an argument is almost identical to the communities - whether developed or developing – has observed. Studies show that, as the context factors causing crime, crime, and violence directed toward persons shall, subject to the special conditions of his victim or crime of violence is delivered.

In our time, the violence has taken on a new dimension and has been a great expansion of such violence with special mobility, urban environments has been increasing public insecurity. In recent years, increasing population and the need for housing has led to the development of the building industry and towers, industrial profitability is based more on the actual needs of the crime, in particular's urban



Salman Hasanvand (Correspondence)



saman_hasani.1987@yahoo.com



+

violence. So if we say that in cities - especially in the big cities - their urban background urban violence has created a phenomenon, nothing extravagant. Thus, city-oriented, urban and non-normative development of the cities, there is an increase in population variables such as unemployment and the like, now residents of the metropolitan cities and urban violence casts feel insecure. Tall buildings rise above violence and those who live the sixth floor, more than the others committed they are violent. In these studies it was found that living in large urban complexes and high-rise buildings and towers, the city has played a major role in the occurrence of the phenomenon of violence. (Newman: 1972).

Problems defined

It is a very complex social phenomenon of crime and insecurity. The complexity of the different structures of peripheral origin, Jetty social, economic and environmental returns. Because of the presence of spatial and temporal context conducive ground for crime and repeat it offered and geographic time a crime to be a focus convert it is. Over the past two decades to improve the security of crime prevention through environmental modification and physical characteristics, land use and functions of these places is very important; Because fundamental changes in location factors causing and facilitating opportunities for crime and to design physical spaces resistant deformity while increasing security, crime rates will decrease and thereby control, prevention of abnormalities of city to be brought (Gharayi: 1389). Tehran as the country's largest metropolitan masculine due to special circumstances the physical, demographic, social, cultural and economic have the highest delinquency rate in the country. One of the main problems of metropolitan Tehran Currently, high incidence of crime and insecurity in neighborhoods and districts of Tehran urban environments, particularly in areas that are worn out tissue. Some environmental factors somatogenic the as crime obvious is effective. Line with the structure and elements of space, including adequate lighting, pathways, recreation and leisure centers, buildings and urban design and planning, environmental engineering and landscape design as well as the tools and technologies can occur Preventing crime in the neighborhood. Violence and insecurity issues and problems that new content is not unique to our community. Since the day man put into existence, the phenomenon of violence he was born. Today, the concern is what civilized societies provide the breadth and scope of the phenomenon of urban violence and insecurity. This is such a tragedy that human societies and it requires immediate assistance.

Research needs

The phenomenon of violence and insecurity in urban environments is a universal phenomenon and due to

the great similarity of this phenomenon everywhere in the world, Using the experiences of others with regard to the realities of the society in which they live is a good way to deal with this phenomenon (Hasanvand: 1391). This study has tried this phenomenon as much as possible to reduce the theoretical and conceptual ambiguity and stating the scientific definition of the practical solutions tailored to provide community facilities. One of the important aspects of crime and the role of urban centers in which they occur, it's case which This approach uses qualitative and quantitative methods to understand the factors and conditions that lead to the formation of the setting range is available will help. Using these results the formation of zones or areas where crime can be prevented in the future there is the possibility of contamination are identified and under control.

Methodology

Research methodology and descriptive - analytic study. This study intend to analysis effective factors in urban crime event and insecurity and also it give strategies for reduction of crime in urban environments. In this study, the knowledge and the corresponding definitions of crime and urban indicators, to examine the theoretical principles and theories of scholars addressed; then, identifying the factors and indicators and analysis of existing studies and After identifying strengths and weaknesses, and the constraints and opportunities provide guidelines and recommendations on how to improve areas of their proper shape to reduce crime, and the insecurity.

Theoretical principles

The past two decades have seen a growing recognition by policy makers, policing agencies, and researchers that understanding the context of crime—the where and when of a criminal event—is key to understanding how crime can be controlled and prevented. Consequently, the purpose of the present research is to explore how the geographies of different crimes intersect with the geographies of social, economic, and demographic characteristics in urban places and to develop an understanding of the implications of specific contexts of crime and the spatial relationships between those contexts. The research presented here will further our understanding of the context of crime by testing the spatial relationships between crime and various neighborhood characteristics. As such, this research contributes to the environmental criminology literature, the goal of which is an understanding of the criminal event and, among other factors, “the legal, social, psychological, and physical backcloth against which crime occurs.” (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1998, p. 31). The focus then is the environment in which crime occurs, referred to by various researchers as the backcloth, context, or situation (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1998;

Wilcox et al., 2003; Felson, 1998). Specifically, the focus of this research is on the context of criminal opportunity, a term that will be discussed theoretically below. This concept provides a lens through which macro social elements of criminal context can be studied. Considering macro social explanations of crime, the present research combines techniques and knowledge from two major fields of study: urban place and criminology, and also incorporates public policy findings. Macro social levels of explanation look to organizations, systems, structures and cultures of communities for an explanation of differential rates of deviant behavior (Byrne and Sampson, 1986; Bursik, 1988; Short, 1997). This type of research is guided by a search for those characteristics of communities that are associated with high rates of violence. Macrosocial studies also attempt to discern between levels of crime associated with aggregations of criminal individuals and levels of crime associated with characteristics of the communities themselves that may be criminogenic (Sampson and Lauritsen, 1994). As such, macrosocial studies do not consider individual motivations to commit crimes. The literature is replete with studies using a variety of methods to determine both the location and character of clusters of crimes (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1997; Craglia et al., 2000; Eck et al., 2000; Messner et al., 1999). The methods are increasingly sophisticated, with the development of new techniques for identifying crime “hot spots” (Ratcliffe and McCullagh, 1999) or taking into account the relationships between and among different places and the crime that occurs there. Techniques do exist, however, that improve upon simple point maps (that display crime locations) or rate maps (that display levels of crime standardized by population or another measure) and identify an area’s crime profile, or the particular mix of crimes that dominate different areas. One technique employed here is the development of location quotients, a technique used mainly by economists and regional scientists that has recently been proposed for spatial analyses of crime (Brantingham and Brantingham, 1995, 1997; Carcach and Muscat, 1998). This technique for identifying an area’s crime profile has been overlooked despite its simplicity and utility to planners and police agencies. After determining the location and character of different areas of specialization within the study area, the second question will be addressed. Here, the goal is to see if certain neighborhood types are invariably associated with certain clusters of crime types. This question will be addressed through the development of a body of statistical models of crime. The study of crime on an intra-region or intra-urban level began with Henry Shaw’s, and later, Clifford McKay’s studies of Chicago. During the early-to-mid twentieth century, the research undertaken by Shaw and his

associates became the best known of this genre (Shaw, 1929; Shaw and McKay, 1942, 1969). Their work in Chicago, rooted in the human ecology model (Park et al., 1925), was motivated by the belief that human behavior was best viewed as being situated. Among other things, this meant that the geographic context of human behavior was very important in sociological studies (Shaw, 1929). The last two decades in criminology have seen a strengthening of the sub-discipline of environmental criminology. The focus expanded from the earliest studies in this tradition and now considers a range of aspects of a criminal event.

Theorizing geographies of crime

While the majority of criminological theories currently used by researchers focus on individual offenders, a considerable number of theorists have advocated some variation of the ecological approach to crime studies such as Bursik and Grasmik, 1993; Cohen and Felson, 1979; Miethe and Meier, 1994; Sampson and Groves, 1989; Shaw and McKay, 1969; Stark, 1996; Wilcox et al., 2003). The basic thrust of this modern stream of research is the pervasive belief that crime cannot be understood without having accurate knowledge of the full context—demographic, economic, geographic, and social—in which it occurs. The most immediate geographic contexts are the neighborhoods in which people live and the places where their lifestyles frequently situate them. Wider geographic contexts, reflecting variation in both individual-level resources and society-wide norms, are determined by the different activities, both routine and non-routine, in which these people engage. For most of the last two decades, ecological studies of crime have been informed by two somewhat different perspectives: (1) social control-disorganization theory and (2) routine activities theory. Although the two schools of thought are closely related, an important distinction can be made. Social control-disorganization theory focuses on the ability (or lack thereof) of residents of some geographic unit (e.g. a neighborhood) to come together to achieve a common goal, like reducing predatory crime. Alternatively, routine activities theory focuses on the presence of opportunities for crime in an area, as shaped by residents’ daily activities. In addition, the two theories suggest different levels of analysis: social control theory considers community explanations for crime, while routine activities theory is often interpreted as focusing on the individual. However, the difference between the two perspectives can be reconciled, and an integration of the two theories provides the most robust theoretical explanation for ecological studies of crime. Wilcox, Land, and Hunt’s (2003) recent articulation of the integration of social control-disorganization and routine activities theories into a

criminal opportunity perspective provides the most successful attempt yet.

The New Opportunity Theories

A remarkable convergence of crime opportunity theories is in progress. Perhaps the word “theory” is a bit grandiose, since so many loose ends remain to be tied.

Strictly speaking, it makes more sense to refer to them as “approaches,” since none of them is a complete and formal theory. Indeed, each of the three examines crime opportunities from a different direction and yet they arrive at the same place. We discuss the features of the three approaches in turn.

1. The Routine Activity Approach

The routine activity approach started as an explanation of predatory crimes. It assumed that for such crimes to occur there must be a convergence in time and space of three minimal elements: a likely offender, a suitable target, and the absence of a capable guardian against crime. The approach took the likely offender as given and focused on the other elements. The guardian was not usually a police officer or security guard but rather anybody whose presence or proximity would discourage a crime from happening. Thus a housewife or doorman, a neighbor or co-worker would tend, simply by being present, to serve as guardian. Guardianship is often inadvertent, yet still has a powerful impact against crime. Most important, when guardians are absent, a target is especially subject to the risk of criminal attack.

In the routine activity approach, the term target is preferred over victim, who might be completely absent from the scene of the crime. Thus the owner of a TV is normally away when a burglar takes it. The TV is the target and it is the absence of the owner and other guardians that makes the theft easier. Targets of crime can be a person or an object, whose position in space or time puts it at more or less risk of criminal attack. Four main elements influence a target’s risk of criminal attack, as summed by the acronym VIVA:

- Value
- Inertia
- Visibility
- Access

All four of these dimensions are considered from an offender’s viewpoint. Offenders will only be interested in targets that they value, for whatever reason. Thus the latest popular CD hit will be stolen more from record stores than a Beethoven CD of roughly equal monetary value, since most offenders would like to have the former but not the latter. Inertias simply the weight of the item. Thus small electronic goods are stolen more than weighty items, unless these latter are wheeled or motorized to

overcome their weight. Visibility refers to the exposure of theft targets to offenders, as when someone flashes money in public or puts valuable goods by the window. Access refers to street patterns, placement of goods near the door, or other features of everyday life making it easy for offenders to get to targets.

2. Crime Pattern Theory

Local crime patterns can tell us much about how people interact with their physical environment, producing more crime opportunity or less. Crime pattern theory, a central component of environmental criminology, considers how people and things involved in crime move about in space and time. Fitting well with the routine activity approach, this theory has three main concepts: nodes, paths, and edges. “Nodes”, which is a term from transportation, refers to where people travel to and from. Such places not only can generate crime within, but also nearby. For example a tough bar may generate more crime outside the premises than inside. Thus the word “node” conveys a sense of movement and hence carries extra meaning about crime opportunities. Each offender searches for crime targets around personal activity nodes (such as home, school and entertainment area) and the paths among them. In addition, the paths that people take in their everyday activities are closely related to where they fall victim to crime. This is why crime pattern theory pays so much attention to the geographical distribution of crime and the daily rhythm of activity. For example, it generates crime maps for different hours of the day and days of the week, linking crime to commuter flows, school children being let out, bars closing, or any other process that moves people among nodes and along paths.

The third concept of crime pattern theory, edges, refers to the boundaries of areas where people live, work, shop or seek entertainment. Some crimes are more likely to occur at the edges – such as racial attacks, robberies, or shoplifting – because people from different neighborhoods who do not know each other come together at edges. The distinction between insiders and outsiders helps underscore the importance of edges, since insiders usually commit crimes closer to their own neighborhoods, while outsiders find it safer to offend at the edges, then to retreat to their own areas. Most importantly, crime pattern theorists and other environmental criminologists have shown that the design and management of town, city, and business areas can produce major shifts in crime rates. For example, it is possible to reduce crime by calming traffic and orienting windows so people can better supervise their own streets.

3. The Rational Choice Perspective

The rational choice perspective focuses upon the offender's decision making. Its main assumption is that offending is purposive behavior, designed to benefit the offender in some way. Offenders have goals when they commit crimes, even if these goals are short sighted and take into account only a few benefits and risks at a time. These constraints on thinking limit an offender's rationality. It is also limited by the amount of time and effort that offenders can give to the decision and by the quality of the information available to them. They rarely have a full picture of all the various costs and benefits of the crime.

To understand crime choices, one must always analyze highly specific categories of offence. The reason for this specificity is that offences have such different purposes and are influenced by very different situational factors. For example, car thieves are of several different kinds, including joy riders, people stealing components or things left in the car, those stealing cars for resale or to dismantle for spare parts, those wanting a car to use for another crime, and those simply wanting to drive home. This is not to say that those who commit one type of car theft never commit another; it merely states that car theft for one purpose is quite different from car theft for an entirely different purpose and must be analyzed accordingly.

Each of these offenders has to make a different calculus. Joyriders may pick a car with good acceleration that is fun to drive, while parts "choppers" may pick an older car whose parts may be valuable for resale. Those stealing a car for resale might pick a luxury car though not one so exotic as to draw immediate police attention. In choosing a vehicle for use in another crime, an offender will probably consider its performance and reliability. Those simply wanting to drive home may pick the car most convenient to steal.

Now that we have presented the three main theories of crime opportunity, it should be evident that they do more than overlap – they have many of the same assumptions. Each one treats crime opportunity as generating crime and each pays close attention to what offenders actually do in the course of a crime. The three theories of crime opportunity can be put in order according to where they give most attention, ranging from the larger society (routine activities) to the local area (crime pattern theory) to the individual (rational choice). Together they tell us that the society and locality can change crime opportunity, while the individual offender makes decisions in response to these changes. Altering the volume of crime opportunities at any level will produce a change in criminal outcomes. Town planning, defensible space architecture, problem oriented policing, situational prevention – all of these offer

methods for reducing crime opportunities. None of these methods is the focus of the current publication but any success they might have serves as a demonstration of our basic theoretical point, that opportunity is a cause of crime.

CPTED

Crime prevention through environmental design is an approach to problem-solving that considers environmental conditions and the opportunities they offer for crime or other unintended and undesirable behaviors. CPTED attempts to reduce or eliminate those opportunities by using elements of the environment to (1) control access; (2) provide opportunities to see and be seen; and (3) define ownership and encourage the maintenance of territory.

CPTED is unusual when compared with other crime prevention or security measures because it specifically focuses on aspects of the design, while the other measures tend to be directed at target hardening, i.e., denying access to a target using locks and bars, or using sensors and cameras to detect and identify an offender, supported by security guards.

CPTED is unusual also when compared to some police activities. This is because CPTED encourages prevention and considers design and place, while policing has traditionally valued an efficient and effective response to incidents, and the identification and arrest of offenders. CPTED may be distinctly different from traditional policing, yet it is very consistent with problem-oriented policing, in four ways:

1. It considers a broad array of problems, not just crime.
2. It requires a systematic analysis of crime events and the conditions and factors that contribute to opportunities for crime.
3. It results in a set of programs or strategies that are proactive and tailored to the problem and the location.
4. It engages an array of citizens, government agencies, and local institutions, each of which has a role to play in defining the problem and deciding upon an appropriate solution, as well as some accountability for long-term improvements.

Environmental crime prevention emerged in the 1960s with Jane Jacob's *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961) and Elizabeth Wood's *Social Aspects of Housing in Urban Development* (1967). Jacob's book was the first influential work to suggest that active street life could cut down opportunities for crime.

The early 1970s saw a surge of interest in the possibilities of manipulating the built environment to prevent delinquency and crime. Two works were

particularly influential - C. Ray Jeffery's *Crime Prevention through Environmental Design* (1971), and Oscar Newman's *Defensible Space* (1972).

In *Crime Prevention through Environmental Design* Jeffery suggested urban design, including the design of streets, parks, terminals, super highways, etc, could prevent crime by reducing the "opportunities". This "opportunity theory" of crime prevention and control was expanded by Mayhew, Clarke, Sturman and Hough (1976) and Clarke and Mayhew (1980) in their work for the UK Home Office Research Unit, and by Canadian researchers Brantingham and Brantingham (1981).

Oscar Newman's study of public housing and crime in New York City, *Defensible Space*, established a definite relationship between urban design and crime rates. He found that high-rise buildings with lobbies, elevators, fire escapes, roofs and corridors isolated from public view had much higher crime rates than low-rise buildings. His solution was to redesign apartment blocks so that areas in public use would be under public surveillance at all times. In his analysis of the relationship between design and crime in public housing, Newman came up with three crucial factors: territoriality, natural surveillance and image and milieu.

Territoriality: Newman's defensible space theory assumed that people need to mark out and defend their territory. He believed a good design would encourage people to express these territorial urges; that is, they would defend their territory from outsiders. A well-designed housing project, therefore, would make clear which spaces belonged to whom - some would be completely private, some could be shared with permission from the owner, and others would be public.

An important aspect of this is household allocation. This requires management to assign groups in a housing project to environments they can best use and control, taking into consideration ages, lifestyles, backgrounds, incomes and family structures.

Natural surveillance: in which residents casually observe and monitor public and semi-public spaces in their environment and intercept those who do not belong. Residents would only do this if they had developed a territorial instinct about their housing project and felt responsible for its safety practically, people must be able to see all the non-private parts of the housing development if they are to help prevent crime.

Image and milieu: Newman believed defensible space design could counteract the negative effects on residents of the bad image that housing projects often have in the community. The notion of "milieu" is part

of this, as it insists on the need for harmony between a housing estate and its immediate neighborhood.

Indicators:

Crime

Seems to warrant a straightforward answer in that one can simply suggest that "crime is something that is against the law." For those who adopt such a strict definition or a legal-consensus approach to crime (see, for example, Tappan 1947), studying the law as it is written is sufficient for understanding what society considers harmful behavior. However, if we take a step back from this literal interpretation to consider the broader social processes that help give meaning to crime and its control, it quickly becomes apparent that there is much more to the question than simply referring to what is written in the law. As Comack and Brickey (1991, 15) remind us, "[l]aw can be said to have a distinctly social basis; it both shapes - and is shaped by - the society in which it operates" (emphasis in the original).

Crime is certainly not a novel endeavor. For decades academics from numerous disciplines (such as law, sociology, and criminology) have struggled to understand various aspects of this question. From studies that examine the factors contributing to the enactment of certain prohibitions or the impact of law and its enforcement, to studies that focus on the events that precede the decriminalization of certain behavior, there are countless examples of scholarly work dedicated to exploring the nature of crime and its control. In the last half of the twentieth century, various scholars noted that crime is not an objective phenomenon and that the way in which certain behavior is understood and responded to is more a reflection of how society is structured than an indication of any inherent problems with those individuals regarded as criminals.

The concept of crime involves the idea of a public as opposed to a private wrong with the consequent intervention between the criminal and injured party by an agency representing the community as whole. Crime is thus the intentional commission of an act deemed socially harmful; or dangerous and the reason for making any given act a crime is the public injury that would result from its frequent participation. The society therefore takes steps for its prevention by prescribing specific punishments for each crime.

Delinquency domain

The domain of delinquency and crime covers a wide range of behaviors, from truancy and running away from home to aggravated assault and homicide. If the general domain of delinquent and criminal behavior is to be represented in a self-report scale, it is necessary for the scale to cover that same wide array

of human activity. Simply asking about a handful of these behaviors does not accurately represent the theoretical construct of crime. In addition, empirical evidence suggests that crime does not have a clear one-dimensional structure that would facilitate the sampling of a few items from a theoretically large pool to represent adequately the entire domain. These considerations suggest that an adequate self-report scale for delinquency will be relatively lengthy. A large number of individual items are required to represent the entire domain of delinquent behavior, to represent each of its sub domains, and to ensure that each sub domain e.g., violence, drug use—is itself adequately represented.

When frequency responses are used, a number of specific indicators can be constructed from the basic inventory. The three most common are prevalence, incidence, and variety. Prevalence refers to the proportion or percentage of people who report involvement in delinquency—the percentage of the sample who answer “yes.” Incidence (also called frequency) refers to the number of delinquent acts reported—the total number of times the person reports committing.

Different acts. Variety refers to the number of different types of delinquency reported by the person. For example, if the index has six items (offense types), the variety score can vary from 0 to 6. Each of these basic measures can also be created for different time periods. One of the most common is a “lifetime” or “ever” measure; for example, an “ever-prevalence” measure of marijuana use would indicate the percentage of the people who had ever used marijuana. Most measures are time-limited; for example, referring to offenses committed during the past year or past 6 months.

Insecurity

The study of attitudes relating to insecurity factors of the community required the use of empirically proven concepts. Since (in)security, despite all the extensions already implied has a great deal to do with crime, it presented itself to check the concepts used in fear of- crime research and adopt them should they be appropriate for our purposes. This, of course, was easier said than done. In view of research on what should be understood by security or insecurity, one was continuously coming up against the problem of a clean cut operationalisation of the relevant terms. In English, for example, referring to: insecurity, uncertainty, unsafely, worry, concern, uneasiness, angry, anxiety, fear, dread (in German referring to: Unsicherheit, Ungewissheit, Schutzlosigkeit, Beunruhigung, Unbehagen, Unwohlsein, Verunsicherung, Irritation, Betroffenheit, Vorsicht, Sorge, Angst, Furcht). The complexity multiplied itself when the theoretical connections had to be

made—that is to dangers, risks, problems, or threats. To this also came the social space in which such attitudes arise and receive their meaning, differentiated according to the world, the city or just the neighbourhood. Finally, looking at the internationalism of the project the problem of a valid comparability had to be observed.

Fear of crime

“Fear of crime is now bigger than General Motors” (Ditton et al. 1999, 83). Indeed, a whole research and prevention industry as well as the political arena have taken this phenomenon over, making it their own, with an enormous output of fear and related feelings resulting. Hereby it is becoming ever more obscure as to how far this output is due to rising crime, to research or to certain policies which needed and used it for its maneuvers. At first it was an element of a growing crime discourse in the USA in the 1960's, triggered by a dramatic growth of offences seen in police statistics and victim surveys. Initially, a moderate idea was to knock the bottom out of it by better education and upbringing, fighting poverty and redeveloping the inner cities.

Urban violence

Violence is usually defined as the use of physical force, which causes hurt to others. Broader definitions include psychological hurt and material deprivation. Most definitions recognize that violence involves the exercise of power to legitimize the use of force for specific gains. Definitions of violence often overlap with those of conflict and crime, although there are important distinctions. Conflict-based power struggles do not necessarily inflict physical or mental harm on others, while violence by its very nature does. Crime, similarly, does not have to entail violence.

Violence may not always be just a physical act but also “structural”, as explained by Galtung, who extended the notion of violence beyond overt brutality to include the exploitation, exclusion, inequality and injustice implicit in social structures.

Although Accelerating Rates of violence and crime are not only urban problems, they are particularly problematic in many urban areas. The sheer scale of violence in many poor areas or slums means that it has become “reutilized” or “normalized” into daily life, provoking references to “failed cities” and “cities of chaos”. Fear and insecurity pervade people’s lives, with serious implications for trust and well-being among communities and individuals. What Tausig calls “terror as usual” can exhibit itself through street crime, a growing gang culture and high levels of violence in the private realm? The range of types of urban violence and crime is both complex and context specific. In an urban Jamaican

community, for instance, local residents listed 19 types of violence; the average number identified in nine Guatemalan poor urban communities was 41, while in Colombia the comparable average was 25. Despite the high prevalence of rural violence in the past, violence is commonly most severe in large urban areas. City-level differences in homicide levels can be striking. In Latin America in 2000, rates ranged from 6.4 per 100,000 per year in Buenos Aires to 248 per 100,000 in Medellín. Violence is not manifested in the same way in different cities, even within the same nation. For example, in Brazil, between 1979 and 1998, the homicide rate in Metropolitan Rio de Janeiro rose by 35 per cent, but in Metropolitan São Paulo it increased by 103 per cent. Differences in rural–urban violence levels are less marked in post-conflict countries, where rural violence is often still more extreme than in urban areas. In El Salvador, 76 per cent of homicides occur in rural areas, as against only 24 per cent in urban areas.

Density

Demographic World Urban Areas provides average urban population density data. It is not possible to perfectly coordinate the dates of current population estimates with land area estimates. As a result, population densities (calculated using current estimates) are expressed in rounded numbers (to the nearest 100). Thus, the urban population densities should be considered reasonable approximations, rather than as precise.

The role of population density as a generator or inhibitor of crime has been the subject of research and debate for decades. Unfortunately, the debate has been confounded by variations in definitions of density, as well as variations in the types of crimes related to it. Nominally, density refers to the number of persons per unit area, whether kilometers² or hectares. However, various modifications can be made in the hope of producing more refined measures. A common metric is persons per room in dwellings, presumed to be a reasonable measure of crowding, which in turn may lead to assumptions relating to levels of poverty and the likelihood of criminal activity. Other Possibilities include the calculation of density based only on residential land use, on the assumption that population density in industrial areas in American cities is likely to be low owing to the separation of land uses produced by the so-called zoning process. Zoning is intended to segregate various types of land uses, and particularly to ensure that residences are unlikely to be located amongst noxious industrial activities.

Lighting

Improved street lighting serves many purposes, one of them being the prevention of crime. While street

lighting improvements may not often be implemented with the expressed aim of preventing crime – pedestrian safety and traffic safety may be viewed as more important aims – and the notion of lighting streets to deter lurking criminals may be too simplistic, its relevance to the prevention of crime has been suggested in urban centers, residential areas, and other places frequented by criminals and potential victims.

Explanations of the way street lighting improvements could prevent crime can be grouped into two main perspectives:

1. As a situational crime prevention measure that focuses on reducing opportunity and increasing perceived risk through modification of the physical environment (Clarke, 1995), such as Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (Jeffery, 1977).
2. As a method of strengthening informal social control and community cohesion through more effective street use (Angel, 1968; Jacobs, 1961) and investment in neighborhood conditions (Taub et al., 1984; Taylor and Gottfredson, 1986).

Where street lighting has been improved or implemented, cost–benefit analysis indicates that its benefits hugely exceed its costs. The review found that two UK studies⁶ provided cost benefit analysis, both showing that the financial savings from reduced crimes greatly exceeded the financial costs of the improved street lighting. They found that investing in improved street lighting led to:

- A significant reduction in crime.
 - Fewer property crimes resulted in less property being stolen,
 - Fewer properties requiring repairs,
 - Fewer insurance claims, and
 - a reduction in the wider impacts upon some victims (e.g. lost days at work to deal with the incident).
- Obviously, these benefits accrued over time; they were not instant.

Walkability:

The “walkability” of a community may be thought of as the extent to which characteristics of the built environment and land use may or may not be conducive to neighborhood residents walking for either leisure, exercise, to access services, or to get to work (Leslie et al 2005). Walkability is affected by the design of the built environment and its many features. Relevant community characteristics typically reflect distance between places (proximity) and ease of travel between places (connectivity) (Norman 2006). San Francisco possesses attributes indicative of traditional, urban neighborhoods of the 1930s, which emphasize this proximity and connectivity. It was around this time that much of the city’s development took place and the current built

environment features were established. People living in such traditional communities – characterized by higher residential density, a mixture of land uses (residential and commercial), and grid-like street patterns with short block lengths – engage in more walking than do people in sprawling areas (Saelens 2003). These characteristics emphasize the importance of density, diversity, and connectivity of neighborhood environments when measuring walkability. Residential density, street connectivity, public transit, crime, and land use mix are significant environmental attributes most often used to measure neighborhood walkability (Cervero and Kockelman 1997).

The role of environmental factors in reducing of crime, with an emphasis on walkability:

1-Residential density

-High-density neighborhoods encourages mixed-use development (improves accessibility to variety of interests and increases utility).

-Associated with increase in retail/services variety (results in shorter, more walkable distances between interests).

2-Street connectivity

-High intersection densities provide more potential routes for walking and greater accessibility.

-Greater neighborhood connectivity, shorter distances to destinations.

3-Public transit density

-High public transit density provides shorter, more walkable distances to alternate modes of transportation (buses, etc).

-Use of more accessible bus stops encourages walking between leisure, work, and home.

4-Crime density

-High-density crime discourages walking in neighborhood.

-Sense of lack of pedestrian safety encourages more protected automobile use and alternate transportation methods.

5-Land use mix

-Multiple and diverse retail/services opportunities encourage more specialized, frequent, and shorter shopping trips by foot.

-More land use mix means more varied and interesting built environment, creating neighborhoods conducive to walking.

10 Principles of Opportunity and Crime

We have already stated the general principle of this publication, that opportunity causes crime. This has generated ten sub-principles of crime opportunity. We devote a section to each and offer illustrations within each section.

1. Opportunities play a role in causing all crime

2. Crime opportunities are highly specific

3. Crime opportunities are concentrated in time and space

4. Crime opportunities depend on everyday movements

5. One crime produces opportunities for another

6. Some products offer more tempting crime opportunities

7. Social and technological changes produce new crime opportunities

8. Opportunities for crime can be reduced

9. Reducing opportunities does not usually displace crime

10. Focused opportunity reduction can produce wider declines in crime

1. Opportunities play a role in causing all crime.

Many of the early examples linking opportunity to crime dealt with theft and burglary. As a result, some observers mistakenly concluded that opportunity applies only to the more common property offences. We believe that opportunity has an important part to play in every class of offence, including violence.

Home Office research has already demonstrated how to reduce the opportunity for robbing post offices, and other research has applied similar principles to convenience stores and banks. A greater challenge is to explain why people get into foolish fights and attack others with no apparent gain. Why would such violent offences reflect crime opportunities? Theorists for many years explained such violence as irrational and expressive, hence not influenced by decisions or opportunities. More recently, theorists have begun to argue that all violence involves some sort of decision. Fights are not as senseless as they may seem later or to people not involved. To understand we need to look at the offender's viewpoint and to focus on the moment of the offence and just before it. At that time, the violent person may have a grievance and the attack may be made to remedy a perceived injustice. Or the offender may wish to preserve self esteem after a perceived insult. For example, someone in a pub goes to the toilet and comes back to find his chair taken. The person who took it has made him look weak in front of others. Having had too much to drink, he impolitely asks for his chair back and gets an equally impolite response. This escalates into a fight. Although the outcome may seem silly later, it makes sense at the time to those involved.

Studies of bars and pubs have shown that their design and management can lead to violence or its absence. Violent opportunities in pubs increase when they are larger in size; are dominated by young males; have clienteles that do not know each other; make it difficult to avoid jostling others; and have untrained and inexperienced bar staff. Liquor policy can have a major impact on the opportunity for violence within pubs and in the area outside. Happy hours, late closing, pub concentration and bar hopping – all of

these have an impact on the opportunity for violence. The structure of conflicts has been studied not only in barroom settings but also in the laboratory, where researchers have shown that a young male insulting another in front of an audience will tend to receive back an insulting or aggressive response. Changing the composition of persons present – such as increasing the number of middle-aged persons and females – leads to less risk of an aggressive response. Other research confirms the commonsense notion that bigger people are more likely to hit little people, and that larger numbers of offenders are more likely to attack smaller numbers. In short, violence is strongly influenced by opportunity.

2. Crime opportunities are highly specific

We do not believe in a single crime opportunity factor applying to all crimes. Indeed, our point is exactly the opposite. Crime opportunities are highly specific to each offence and offender subset. As a rule, crime analysts should not define the offence in legal terms, since that is not usually what the offender considers when making a decision about a crime. Among the latter, some use what they have stolen themselves, others sell it to an acquaintance, others find second-hand stores, and yet others go to the pub or flea market to offload the stolen goods. As discussed earlier, several types of car thieves commit exactly the same legal offence but with very different goals in mind and hence different *modus operandi*. This is not to say that offenders are pure specialists, since they may go looking for crime opportunities and take whichever ones come up. Even those who have one thing in mind one day may shift their attention on another day. In general, the opportunity for crime must be evaluated for very specific categories of offence. Thus robbery of post offices, banks, people on the streets or in the stairwells of council housing, are all different crimes from the standpoint of crime opportunity theory. Their *modus operandi* will differ, along with the methods for reducing the opportunity. Even within these categories, smaller opportunity categories are needed. Thus the “inside-job” bank robbery must be distinguished from more common “stick ups”. To be sure, some opportunity principles may fit all crimes. But even these need to be applied taking into account the specific setting and *modus operandi*. Because offences differ, reductions in opportunity are also highly specific.

3. Crime opportunities are concentrated in time and space.

Indeed, the spatial and temporal distribution of people and things is highly uneven and sets the stage for crime to occur at particular times and places. This helps explain why a community bustling with activity does not necessarily generate crime everywhere and at every time. A street robber might be able to attack

a weaker victim at daytime or dusk if he can find a moment when others are absent. But for attacking a stronger victim he might need a darker time and a more aggressive mode of attack. A residential burglary can find abandoned residential streets in the day and kick a door in, but at night he will have to be more quiet. Researchers have recently begun to study crime “hot spots,” namely address which draw many more calls for police service than others. Hot spots can drive up a local crime rate. Even though most people and places in the area are largely free from crime, their reputation is tarnished by the near-by hot spots. Removing one or two drug houses or badly-run pubs can thus change the whole complexion of a neighborhood.

4. Crime opportunities depend on everyday movements of activity

If vendors of snacks and drinks seek crowds, so do pickpockets, luggage thieves, and bag snatchers. Other offenders pay closer attention to the absence of people. For example, the flow of people to work generates a counter flow of burglars to residential areas, taking advantage of their absence. The flow of workers home at night and on weekends produces a counter flow a few hours later of commercial and industrial burglars to take advantage of the situation. Those who use the Underground for trips to crime go to places they know using the lines they know, finding targets along the way or at the familiar destinations. Changes in transportation lines can have a major impact on crime opportunities. Thus new roads or railway lines establish new crime risks in areas they touch, while closing down crime opportunities in areas they cut off. Pathways to and from school are essential features of crime opportunity in an area. If such pathways are not constructed or planned, youths will find their own routes, sometimes with significant consequences for crime.

5. One crime produces opportunities for another

some minor offences provide camouflage for those that are more serious. Loitering, streetwalking, illegal vending, and minor drug selling can all hide pick pocketing, serious drug sales, and setting people up for robbery. Many laws are aimed to attack earlier links in the chain of criminal events, drug paraphernalia or burglary tools. Even loitering and trespassing laws can be interpreted, in part, as removing pre-criminal conditions.

In sum, individual offenders might dig themselves deeper into crime in at least eight ways:

1. Blowing illegal gains on drugs or prostitutes.
2. Repeating the offence later against the same victim or target.
3. Spending time with co-offenders, who lead them into more crime.

4. Spending time with dangerous people, who then victimize them.
5. Spending more time in dangerous settings at dangerous hours.
6. Provoking others to attack them.
7. Developing expensive drug dependencies, leading to criminal acts.
8. Impairing judgment through substance abuse, then taking more risks.

In each of these ways, one crime produces the opportunity for the individual to commit another. But the process of compounding crime opportunities occurs also for local areas. Sometimes minor crime simply adds up, and its impact is focused in a harmful way. For example, painting one piece of graffiti probably will not lead directly to rape, murder, and kidnapping. On the other hand, hundreds of pieces of graffiti within a very small area could help destroy social control and contribute to more serious crime later. This “broken windows” theory contends that the proliferation of minor crime can serve to destroy a neighborhood. Perceiving that social controls have broken down, criminals from outside move in to take control.

6. Some products offer more tempting crime opportunities

When Willie Sutton, the notorious criminal, was asked why he robbed banks, he is said to have answered, “That’s where the money is”. Cash is a very convenient object of theft, since it has high value per pound and is generally convertible. Yet new, marked, or consecutively numbered bank notes reduce the opportunity for theft.

The VIVA model stated earlier offers a starting point for evaluating which things make better crime targets. For example, videocassette players have made good targets because they are high in value and low in inertia, that is, they have high value propound. They are also highly visible and accessible. Numerous other examples exist of such “hot products”, consumer items that seem particularly at risk of theft:

- Research in many countries, including recent Home Office work, has shown that particular models of car are at much greater risk of theft than others.
- A recent Home Office study has shown that livestock carriers have the highest rates of theft of any commercial vehicles.
- Studies in the retail industry, both of employee theft and shoplifting, have consistently shown that certain items are much more likely to be stolen than others. For example, a Home Office project of a few years ago showed that “popular” records and tapes were much more likely to be stolen from the HMV store in Oxford Street than classical recordings.

7. Social and technological changes produce new crime opportunities

Technology frequently works to produce new products, but many of these are not especially suitable for theft, since they have no mass market or are too difficult to use. Other products become targets for theft. Even these often go through a life cycle and may become no longer attractive to thieves. In general, mass-produced consumer goods pass through a life cycle of four stages:

1. Innovation Stage.
2. Growth Stage
3. Mass Market Stage
4. Saturation Stage

In the innovation stage, the product is sold to a special group of consumers. It may be expensive, difficult to use, relatively heavy and awkward. That explains why the early computers were not likely to be stolen. Even the early home video cassette players were not supported by a wide selection of available movies from nearby video stores. So why steal them? In the growth stage, products becomes easier to use, cheaper to buy, lighter and less awkward to carry. More people know how to use them and want one, and thefts there f o re accelerate. That is just what happened as the desk computer became more popular and as video cassette players and CD players gained ground. In the mass market stage, the product gains further in appeal. More units are sold and theft becomes endemic.

8. Crime can be prevented by reducing opportunities

If it were not true that reducing opportunities helps prevent crime, no-one would bother to take routine precautions such as locking their cars and houses, keeping their money in safe places, counseling their children to avoid strangers, and watching the neighbors’ home when they are away. In fact, we all take these kinds of precautions every day of our lives. These actions might sometimes displace the risk of criminal attack to others. To avoid this and achieve more general reductions in risks of crime, wider action to reduce opportunities must be taken by the police, by government and by other agencies. Similar thinking guides several approaches to crime prevention, including:

- Problem-oriented policing
- Defensible space architecture
- Crime prevention through environmental design
- Situational crime prevention.

Despite their differences, each seeks to reduce opportunities for crime for particular kinds of targets, places, and classes of victims. Each is concerned with preventing very specific kinds of crime. None of the four attempts to improve human character. Most important, all four seek to block crime in practical,

natural, and simple ways, at low social and economic costs.

9. Reducing opportunities does not usually displace crime

Those who assume that displacement is inevitable overestimate its capacity to occur. This shown by the example of drug markets. It is frequently assumed that closing down a particular drug market will result in dealers simply moving to another nearby location where they can continue their trade. But this ignores the reasons why the original location was chosen in the first place. It might:

- be easy for drug purchasers to reach by car;
- be easy to find and to drive to from distant parts of the city or suburbs;
- be near a bus stop for those who have to travel by public transport;
- be near the dealers' homes and particularly convenient for them;
- be near a pub or corner store that provides dealers with refreshments and a betting shop that provides entertainment;
- The council improved street lighting for a run-down housing estate in the Midlands; the declining crime, was not displaced to the estate nearby.
- Lighting and rearranging stalls substantially lessened thefts at covered markets in Birmingham, but no evidence was found of displacement to nearby markets.
- When a package of security improvements reduced thefts in a multi-story car park in Dover, there was no evidence that thefts were displaced to other nearby car parks.

10. Focused opportunity reduction can produce wider declines in crime

Apart from showing that displacement is not the threat once thought, studies of displacement have yielded an additional dividend. They have found that sometimes the reverse of displacement can occur. Rather than crime being exported to other times and places by prevention measures, it is the benefits of focused prevention measures that can spread beyond the targets of intervention. Many examples now exist, including the following: 1 When CCTV cameras were introduced to monitor three car parks at the University of Surrey, crime declined not only in these car parks but also in one other that was not given surveillance by the cameras.

-When CCTV cameras were installed on five double-decker buses belonging to fleet of 80 in the North of England, vandalism by schoolchildren dropped for the whole fleet, not just those with cameras (three of which were fitted only with dummy cameras).

- When books in an University of Wisconsin library were electronically tagged to sound an alarm if they were removed illegitimately, not only did thefts of

books decline but also of video-cassettes and other materials that had not been tagged.

-When a New Jersey discount electronic retailer introduced a regime of daily counting of valuable merchandise in the warehouse, not only did thefts of these items plummet, but also of those of other items not repeatedly counted.

Conclusion

One feature of the present civilization, segregated neighborhoods in the city and each neighborhood is assigned to a particular class of people, three factors have contributed to the breakdown of the first factor, high land prices and land speculation caused by complications. The second factor in the effective resolution measures the Architecture and Urban Planning. They are building a new neighborhood, economic and financial aspects into other directions and maps to help NIB and many of its neighborhoods, especially newly-established neighborhoods, parts of it, is allocated. The third factor is the government's actions; the authorities were forced to intervene in the housing crisis and high prices of land and house to find a solution to this big problem. Making his policy of building a house cheap, especially in marginal areas, was approved. In terms of quantity, the program was successful, but the government plans and policies to assist in building and Failure to anticipate the necessary space for housing and housing construction, and finally an extraordinarily high rate of homelessness, the problems caused by the separation and quantification of the neighborhood to provide more. Given the demographic situation in our society, culture and economy of urban violence and insecurity, particularly against children and adolescents has become more widespread and prevent them from happening again is only possible through the use of police powers and the need for multilateral action based on extensive scientific research to prevent and reduce the extent of this phenomenon, no doubt about it will not leave.

Evaluation of physical characteristics, socio-economic, cultural and residents, land use and core functionality of this site and trying to make fundamental changes in the factors that create and facilitate opportunities for crime and robust design of physical spaces the urban anomaly obtained. In fact, you could say some of the physical and social indicators are effective crime. By changing the structure of space, including street lighting, recreation and leisure centers, buildings and urban design plans, engineering design and landscape environments, the presence of police surveillance, monitoring tools and new technologies in certain situations when on a particular location, can be caused crime prevention. At present the city of two factors, population density and distribution of other

things there are notable. As we know the population density is the most common indicators used to explain the population distribution; obviously, the higher the population density in the city is more of a social aberration rates will be higher. As stated earlier, the urban areas are centers for the accumulation of human and social interactions. No doubt the quality of the urban landscape orientation to the citizens of this tissue is very important. Therefore, in the context of urban design and landscape formation neighborhoods to improve the quality of our attention. The State must be providing the benefit of citizens living in an environment free of crime and insecurity for the people. Also the government is providing and obstruction of basic measures to control crime in an urban environment to take action. The government should take advantage of vulnerable people affected by crime and delinquency environment and the rehabilitation and social protection, employment, leisure, protection of rights, social and family to provide them.

These projects can then bring some of failures the ability to destroy the crime prevention and with proper placement and reasonable and appropriate way of providing housing and street orientation some of the factors that cause damage to the city and residents are through strategies for eliminating hotbeds of crime reduction. In the present design parameters that cause crime are identified and position with regard to the areas with the assistance of other agencies involved in the peace community to

take action to reduce insecurity in the region. It is hoped that this project is a part of vulnerability factors that cause people to be denied the comfort of residents and the ease of having a beautiful and clean city consider alternatives.

It must be found Spaces are to be missing yesterday, and be strengthened, but this time in a different realm than yesterday.

Reference

- 1) Apraxine Pierre, Anne Duquenne, Sabine Feta and Damien Helly(2012) "urban violence and humanitarian challenges"; European union institute for security studies.
- 2) Etemadifar, Ehsan(2012) "The role of urban lighting and security lighting designer in Tehran". (With emphasis on correct lighting, urban landscape); Second Comprehensive Conference of city Safety in Tehran.
- 3) Felson, M. Ronald, Clarke(1998) "Opportunity makes the thief"; Research, Development and Statistics Directorate 50 Queen Anne's Gate London SW1H 9AT.
- 4) Gharayi, F and Nafise rad(2010) "Review and assess the sense of safety in urban areas"; "Armanshahr journal"; No4. Spring and Summer 2010.
- 5) Geason, S and Paul R. Wilson (1989) "Crime prevention through environmental design"; Australian Institute of Criminology.
- 6) Joel B. Plant and Michael S. Scott(2009) "**Effective Policing and Crime Prevention**"; U.S. Department of Justice Office of Community Oriented Policing Services(COPS).
- 7) LAW COMMISSION OF CANADA(2004) "What Is a Crime? "Defining Criminal Conduct in Contemporary Society"; UBS press. vancouver.toronto.
- 8) Zahm, D(2007) "Using Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design in Problem-Solving"; U.S. Department of Justice.