



Open Access Repository

www.ssoar.info

Societal Perception regarding Situational Crime Prevention

Ayaz, Muhammad; Ullah, Farhat

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Ayaz, M., & Ullah, F. (2018). Societal Perception regarding Situational Crime Prevention. *Pakistan Administrative Review*, 2(4), 397-406. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-62342-8>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see:

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

Societal Perception regarding Situational Crime Prevention

Muhammad Ayaz

Department of Social Work
University of Sargodha
Punjab, Pakistan
ayaz.sajan91@gmail.com

Farhat Ullah

Department of Social Work & Sociology
Kohat University of Science & Technology (KUST)
Kohat, Khyber Pakhtoonkhawa, Pakistan
farhatullah@kust.edu.pk

Abstract: In this modern era, the situational crime prevention is one of the most emphasised and key concern of whole world. Devil exists almost everywhere in a society, to do wrongs or committing crimes. Therefore, a society must have some strict policies and techniques to contain these evils. The current research highlights societal perception regarding situational crime prevention. The main objectives of the study was to find out the effects of two most commonly used tools (i.e. CCTV and Street lights) on the situational crime prevention. To cater these objectives, quantitative research was conducted through survey questionnaire from Faculty of Social Sciences, Crime reporter and Criminal lawyers. In current research, data was collected form 134 respondents from participants of these three different backgrounds. On the basis of collected data, the study finds that both tools i.e. CCTV and Street lights play a key role in situational crime prevention. The study concluded that government organizations should install the CCTVs and Street lights in order to prevent the situational crime rate.

Keywords: Societal perception, situational, crime, prevention, street lights, CCTVs

Reference: Reference to this article should be made as: Ayaz, M, & Ullah, F.(2018). Societal Perception regarding Situational Crime Prevention. *Pakistan Administrative Review*, 2(4), 397-406.

1. Introduction

Situational crime prevention is that crime which might be controlled if the chances to participate in that crime are diminished (Clarke, 1983). Situational crime avoidance is characterized as “the utilization of measures coordinated at exceptionally particular types of crimes which include the administration, plan or control of the prompt condition in which these violations happen in order to decrease the open doors for these violations” (Hough et al, 1980).

Hughes, (1998) indicated, as quoted by Newman (1972), the new physical type of the urban condition is conceivably the most apt partner the criminal has in his exploitation of society.

The concept of crime prevention innovation is currently as noticeable as it is being practically implemented to show up at universal level, especially in the cutting edge urban scene (Crawford,

1998; Loader, 1997; Krahn and Kennedy, 1985). People and organizations are progressively swinging to security equipment, for example, alerts, shades, and bars at entryways, dividers, and lighting and observation cameras, to sustain and secure homes, retail and modern property (Loader, 2015).

2. Literature Review

Research has demonstrated that situational prevention systems have brought about unmistakable diminishing of crimes victories (Pease, 1997). Pease (1997) has noticed that the consideration given to the quick setting of a crime, for example, what shapes prompt conduct, has ended up being “surprisingly productive in creating crime counteractive action thoughts”.

Various scholars have started to concentrate on “security systems” and the “commoditisation” of security systems and security policing (Jones and Newburn, 2002). As Loader (2015) compresses, “Security should now be taken to allude to an entire scope of advances and practices, not just by providing to open bodies, for example, the police or neighbourhood specialists, yet in addition by providing to business concerns contending in the commercial centre”. It has been contended that there is an “inflationary rationale” innate in the commoditisation of security (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997). New advances of security may themselves fortify frailty and further requests for assurance. “Divider, monitors, obvious security gadgets and so forth partition as opposed to assemble groups by isolating and secluding their individuals” (Wortley, 1996).

Despite of the fact that security equipment is “sold” on the premise that by means of discouragement it expands wellbeing, the very deceivability of such equipment is a normal indication of “instability” (Minton, 2009). It is consequently that Davis (1990) contends: - “*The social impression of danger turns into an element of the security assembly itself, not crime rates*”.

Rosenbaum's (1988) investigate prove affirms this view. In the event that crime prevention through circumstance decrease turns into a basic piece of regular daily existence, it will just convey how transient and unexpected security truly is (Zedner, 2003; Crawford, 1998). The quest for security has turned into an undertaking in its own privilege with a dynamic unmistakable from crime rates. In this setting the “tension market” creates its own jumpy request (Lee, 2007).

Information shows that the private security segment covers a scope of exercises including criminal alerts, examination administrations, process serving, obligation and lease accumulation, security consultancy, safes and locks, get to control and Closed Circuit TV (Newburn, 2001). It is this last administration that has seen the most sensational development as of late (Norris and Armstrong, 1999) and is the most unmistakable distinction between security in English urban communities and those in most other propelled economies (Urbaneye, 2004).

Nonetheless, there is worry that situational approaches, particularly in their “Target hardening” classifications, breed a “post society” driving individuals progressively to withdraw behind bolted entryways, doors and screens, in “Faultless spaces”. It might support what Norris, et. Al (2004) has alluded to as “privatise”, a type of thoughtful pre-occupation with the security and care of the self, bringing about both social and spatial withdrawal.

Closed Circuit TV frameworks are intended to serve various capacities (Williams, 2007; Gill and Spriggs, 2005), with decreases of dread of crime being an expressed target since commencement (Minton, 2009). Gill and Spriggs (2005) portray lessening FOC as one of Close Circuit TV's “Primary destinations”. Nonetheless, discoveries in connection to Close Circuit TV and open

consolation are unpredictable and blended. For instance, Ditton (2000) found that respondents tentatively evaluated a diminishment in dread of crime (security) after the acquaintance of Close Circuit TV with Glasgow downtown area. Regardless of this, when the framework was introduced no huge contrasts developed in dread of crime; an example that paralleled brings about two other control areas. Curiously in any case, “recorded” crime expanded in Glasgow after Close Circuit TV was introduced there.

All the more as of late, Gill and Spriggs (2005) embraced a noteworthy assessment of Close Circuit TV at 14 locales crosswise over Britain and Ridges. General outcomes indicated individuals did not feel more secure after the establishment of Close Circuit TV and ostensibly dread must be decreased when subjects know that cameras are set up. Familiarity with CCTV changed in the destinations contemplated in the vicinity of 61 and 97 for every penny and a similar research gave extremely differentiating proof. The individuals who were more mindful of the cameras were more stressed over crime, not the inverse, proposing this might be because of the path in which the expected requirement for crime counteractive action measures is characteristic of a high restricted crime rate. Then again, Smith and Norris, et al, (2004) trust this might be on account of cameras frequently supplant individuals. The general population are uncertain of the response time of innovation, rather than a police or security nearness (Gill and Spriggs, 2005).

3. Significance of the study

The current research has significant contribution in academic research as well as practical world. This empirical research filled a research gap that revealed by current literature and it is an aid in the field of situational crime prevention. While current research will also be helpful for the government organizations to reduce the crime by using CCTV and street lights in public and private places.

4. Objectives of the study

- To find out the role of CCTV in situational crime prevention
- To find out the role of Street lights in situational crime prevention

5. Methodology

The universe of our study was District Kohat, KPK, Pakistan which is composed of Two Tehsil, Kohat and Lachi. Kohat is a District of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Out of which Lawyers, Crime reporters and Faculty members of Social sciences was selected for data collection.

For data collection, proportionate stratified random sampling technique was adopted. The population was trifurcated into strata like Academicians, Crime Reporter (Journalists) and Advocates as shown in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Breakup of Composite Sample Size

S. No	Sample Groups	Population Size	Sample Size
1	Faculty of Social Sciences (KUST).	35	23
2	Crime Reporter	15	10
3	Criminal Lawyer	153	101
	Total	203	134

Sources: Registrar Office, KUST, Kohat Press Club and Kohat Bar Council, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa

Closed structure Questionnaire was used for data collection from the respondents. The Questionnaire contained Four (4) sections. Section A contained personal information of the respondents. Section B, C, and D represented the questions designed for each variable for data collection. After collection of data from respondents, the data were put into SPSS and analysis was done by using frequency distribution and percentage proportion. After this result were summarized and conclusion and recommendation were put forwarded.

6. Results and Discussion

This part deals with respondent basic information and different aspect of the study situational crime prevention, role of CCTV and role of Street lights in situational crime prevention. The information is divided into different tables.

Table 2: Demographic Information of the Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percentage
21-25 years	13	9.7%
25-30 years	36	26.9%
30-35 years	41	30.6%
Above 35 years	44	32.8%
Total	134	100.0%
Gender status	Frequency	Percentage
Male	116	86.6%
Female	18	13.4%
Total	134	100.0%
Discipline	Frequency	Percentage
Faculty of Social Sciences (KUST)	23	17.2%
Criminal Lawyers	101	75.4%
Crime Reporter	10	7.5%
Total	134	100.0%
Educational status	Frequency	Percentage
BA/B.Sc	60	44.8%
BS/ M.Sc	43	32.1%
MS/ MPhil	27	20.1%
PhD	4	3.0%
Total	134	100.0%
Area of Resident	Frequency	Percentage
Rural area	25	18.7%
Urban area	109	81.3%
Total	134	100.0%
Family Types	Frequency	Percentage
Nuclear family	33	24.6%
Joint family	85	63.4%
Extended family	16	11.9%
Total	134	100.0%
Marital status	Frequency	Percentage
Married	104	77.6%
Unmarried	30	22.4%

Total	134	100.0%
--------------	------------	---------------

Table 2 shows demographic information of the respondents that included age, gender, discipline, education, area of residence, family type and marital status. Out of total 134(100.0%) respondents 13(9.7%) respondents were in the age group of 21-25 years, while 36(26.9%) respondents were the age group between 25-30 years and 41(30.6%) respondents were in the age group of 31-35 years, while remaining 44(32.8%) respondents were above 35 years. 116(86.6%) respondents were male and 18(13.4%) were female respondents. 23(17.2%) respondents were Faculty of Social Sciences KUST, 101(75.4%) respondents were Criminal Lawyers and 10(7.5%) respondents were Crime Reporter. Furthermore 60(44.8%) respondents having BA/ B.Sc, 43(32.1%) respondents having BS/ M.Sc, 27(20.1%) respondents having MS/ MPhil and 4(3.0%) respondents having PhD level. Moreover 25(18.7%) respondents were from rural area and 109(81.3%) respondents were from urban area. Similarly 33(24.6%) respondents were having nuclear family, 85(63.4%) were having joint family and 16(11.9%) respondents were living in extended family. While 104(77.6%) respondents were married and 30(22.4%) were unmarried.

Table 3: Situational Crime Prevention

S. no.	Statements	Yes	No	Uncertain
1	Situational crime anticipation includes opportunity diminishing measures.	111 (82.8%)	19 (14.2%)	4 (3.0%)
2	Situational measures must be customized to exceptionally particular classifications of crime.	105 (78.4%)	25 (18.7%)	4 (3.0%)
3	Burglary happened for the most part in more seasoned homes close to city.	76 (56.7%)	50 (37.3%)	8 (6.0%)
4	The lay-out of lodging in the more current rural areas permitted situational crime.	78 (58.2%)	44 (32.8%)	12 (9.0%)
5	To avoid theft in the inward city concentrated more on enhancing security.	99 (73.9%)	30 (22.4%)	5 (3.7%)
6	The need to tailor measures to specific offenses ought not to be taken.	63 (47.0%)	60 (44.8%)	11 (8.2%)
7	Crime depends vitally on a group of stars of specific ecological open doors.	70 (52.2%)	55 (41.0%)	9 (6.7%)
9	Situational regions have some likelihood of carrying out crime relying upon the conditions in which they get themselves.	92 (68.7%)	27 (20.1%)	15 (11.2%)
10	Situational avoidance does not draw hard refinements amongst lawbreakers and others.	97 (72.4%)	34 (25.4%)	3 (2.2%)

Table 3 shows the reasons for situational crime prevention. The above table show that, out of 134(100%) respondents 111(82.8%) respondents were agree that Situational crime anticipation includes opportunity diminishing measures, while 19(14.2%) respondents were disagree and the remaining 4(3.0%) respondents have no idea. In the same way 105(78.4%) respondents were agree

that Situational measures must be customized to exceptionally particular classifications of crime, while 25(18.7%) respondents were disagree and 4(3.0%) respondents were do not know. Similarly Burglary happened for the most part in more seasoned homes close to city, 76(56.7%) respondents were agree with this, while 50(37.3%) respondents were disagree and 8(6.0%) respondents not give answer of this statement. Furthermore the lay-out of lodging in the more current rural areas permitted situational crime, 78(58.2%) respondents answered in “Yes”, 44(32.8%) respondents in “No” and 12(9.0%) respondents in “Uncertain”. Similarly 99(73.9%) respondents were agree that to avoid theft in the inward city concentrated more on enhancing security, while 30(22.4%) respondents were not agree and 5(3.7%) have no knowledge about the statement. Furthermore 63(47.0%) respondents were agree that the need to tailor measures to specific offenses ought not to be taken, while 60(44.8%) were disagree and 11(8.2%) have no idea. Same like Crime depends vitally on a group of stars of specific ecological open doors, 70(52.2%) respondents favour the statement, while 55(41.0%) respondents were not in favour of that statement and 9(6.7%) respondents have no idea. Furthermore 74(55.2%) respondents were agreeing that Situational avoidance is the certain acknowledgment that an extensive variety of guilty parties, while 49(36.6%) respondents were disagreeing and 11(8.2%) respondents do not know. Situational regions have some likelihood of carrying out crime relying upon the conditions in which they get themselves, 92(68.7%) respondents have answered “Yes”, while 27(20.1%) respondents have answered in “No” and 15(11.2%) respondents were answered they so not know about the statement. In the same way 97(72.4%) respondents were agree that Situational avoidance does not draw hard refinements amongst lawbreakers and others, while 34(25.4%) respondents were disagree and 3(2.2%) respondents have no knowledge.

Table 4: Role of CCTV in Situational Crime Prevention

S. No	Statements	Yes	No	Uncertain
1	CCTV cameras utilized as an instrument to security.	117(87.3%)	15(11.2%)	2(1.5%)
2	CCTV is fundamentally used to diminish the situational crime.	109(81.3%)	21(15.7%)	4(3.0%)
3	CCTV secures the general population from crime.	98(73.1%)	31(23.1%)	5(3.7%)
4	CCTV recognizes the genuine criminal.	108(80.6%)	22(16.4%)	4(3.0%)
5	CCTV can diminish the likelihood of situational offence.	108(80.6%)	22(16.4%)	4(3.0%)
6	CCTV can keep the situational offence.	93(69.4%)	34(25.4%)	7(5.2%)
7	CCTV likewise plays out an observation part by goodness of their position.	108(80.6%)	20(14.9%)	6(4.5%)
8	CCTV may encourage potential victims to take security precautions.	106(79.1%)	22(16.4%)	6(4.5%)
9	CCTV encourages the police to distinguish the real criminal.	114(85.1%)	15(11.2%)	5(3.7%)
10	CCTV can keep the situational crime.	99(73.9%)	28(20.9%)	7(5.2%)

Table 4 shows the role of CCTV in situational crime prevention. The above table show that, out of 134(100%) respondents 117(87.3%) respondents agree that CCTV cameras utilized as an instrument to security, while 15(11.2%) respondents were disagree and the remaining 2(1.5%) respondent have no idea. In the same way 109(81.3%) respondents were agree that CCTV is fundamentally used to diminish the situational crime, while 21(15.7%) respondents were disagree and 4(3.0%) respondents were do not know. Similarly CCTV secures the general population from crime, 98(73.1%) respondents were agree with this, while 31(23.1%) respondents were disagree and 5(3.7%) respondents not give answer of this statement. Furthermore the CCTV recognizes the genuine criminal, 108(80.6%) respondents answered in “Yes”, while 22(16.4%) respondents in “No” and 4(3.0%) respondents in “Uncertain”. Similarly 108(80.6%) respondents were agree that CCTV can diminish the likelihood of situational offence, while 22(16.4%) respondents were not agree and 6(4.5%) have no knowledge about the statement. Furthermore 93(69.4%) respondents were agree that CCTV can keep the situational offence, while 34(25.4%) were disagree and 7(5.2%) have no idea. Same like CCTV likewise plays out an observation part by goodness of their position, 108(80.6%) respondents favour the statement, while 20(14.9%) respondents were not in favour of that statement and 6(4.5%) respondents have no idea. Furthermore 106(79.1%) respondents were agreeing that CCTV may encourage potential victims to take security precautions, while 22(16.4%) respondents were disagreeing and 6(4.5%) respondents do not know. CCTV encourages the police to distinguish the real criminal, 103(76.9%) respondents have answered “Yes”, while 15(11.2%) respondents have answered in “No” and 5(3.7%) respondents were answered they so not know about the statement. In the same way 99(73.9%) respondents were agree that CCTV can keep the situational crime, while 28(20.9%) respondents were disagree and 7(5.2%) respondents have no knowledge.

Table 5: Role of Street Lights in Situational Crime Prevention

S. No	Statements	Yes	No	Uncertain
1	Street lights point is to avert situational crime.	84(62.7%)	44(32.8%)	6(4.5%)
2	Street lights centre around diminishing chance of crime.	86(64.2%)	43(32.1%)	5(3.7%)
3	Street lights are to control and group attachment through more compelling street utilize.	81(60.4%)	45(33.6%)	8(6.0%)
4	Crime can be anticipated by in circumstance of street lights.	72(53.7%)	55(41.0%)	7(5.2%)
5	Improved street lighting may diminish crime.	85(63.4%)	45(33.6%)	4(3.0%)
6	Street lights have a more positive picture of the zone and to have expanded society.	103(76.9%)	27(20.1%)	4(3.0%)
7	Street lighting constitutes a physical obstruction to crime.	98(73.1%)	34(25.4%)	2(1.5%)
8	Improvement of road lighting could diminish open doors for crime.	101(75.4%)	29(21.6%)	4(3.0%)
9	Street lights assume a part in situational crime avoidance.	109(81.3%)	21(15.7%)	4(3.0%)

10	Defective lights in lanes are should have been evacuated or repair.	127(94.8%)	5(3.7%)	2(1.5%)
----	---	------------	---------	---------

Table 5 shows the role of Street lights in situational crime prevention. The above table show that out of 134(100%) respondents, 84(62.7%) respondents were agree that Street lights point is to avert situational crime, while 44(32.8%) respondents were disagree and the remaining 6(4.5%) respondent have no idea. In the same way 86(64.2%) respondents were agree that Street lights centre around diminishing chance of crime, while 43(32.1%) respondents were disagree and 5(3.7%) respondents were do not know. Similarly Street lights are to control and group attachment through more compelling street utilize, 81(64.4%) respondents were agree with this, while 45(33.6%) respondents were disagree and 8(6.0%) respondents not give answer of this statement. Furthermore the Crime can be anticipated by in circumstance of street lights, 72(53.7%) respondents answered in “Yes”, while 55(41.0%) respondents answered in “No” and 7(5.2%) respondents answered in “Uncertain”. Similarly 85(63.4%) respondents were agree that Improved street lighting may diminish crime, while 45(33.6%) respondents were not agree and 4(3.0%) have no knowledge about the statement. Furthermore 103(76.9%) respondents were agree that Street lights have a more positive picture of the zone and to have expanded society, while 27(20.1%) respondents were disagree and 4(3.0%) have no idea. Same like Street lighting constitutes a physical obstruction to crime, 98 (73.1%) respondents favour the statement, while 34(25.4%) respondents were not in favour of that statement and 2(1.5%) respondents have no idea. Furthermore 101(75.4%) respondents were agreeing that Improvement of road lighting could diminish open doors for crime, while 29(21.6%) respondents were disagreeing and 4(3.0%) respondents do not know. Street lights assume a part in situational crime avoidance, 109(81.3%) respondents have answered “Yes”, while 21(15.7%) respondents have answered in “No” and 4(3.0%) respondents were answered they were not know about the statement. In the same way 127(94.8%) respondents were agree that defective lights in lanes are should have been evacuated or repair, while 5(3.7%) respondents were disagree and 2(1.5%) respondents have no knowledge.

7. Conclusion and Recommendations

Although the antecedence of crime is not easy to determine, but anyhow few very common factors like morale values, social and economical condition of world can be resulted in crime. To overcome and control the crime, literature revealed several techniques but in current research study the researcher has taken CCTV and Street lights as a tool for situational crime prevention. As Clarke and Homel’s stated that CCTV is a technique of formal surveillance, because potential offenders are deterred by their increased subjective probability of detection. Similarly Street lights build physical environment more difficult for offenders to do crime as street lights constitute a physical barrier to crime. Current study also aimed at situational crime prevention through empirically test the effectiveness of CCTV and Street lights. To cater to this objective the data was collective from 134 respondents from the Faculty of Social Sciences; Kohat University of Science & Technology, Crime Reports Kohat Press Club and Criminal lawyers Kohat Bar Council, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa lived in district Kohat. The collected data was analysed through SPSS software, the result shows that in both CCTV and Street lights have significant role in situational crime prevention. It can be evident from the analysis that 78% crime can be prevented through CCTV cameras, whereas the Street lights contribution in situational crime reduction is 70.6%. Therefore researcher recommends installing CCTV and Street lights in public and private places, in order to control and reduce the situational crime prevention.

In future, researcher should also examine the effects of other techniques like entry screener or increasing policing on situational crime prevention. Further more in future, researcher should also consider the perspective of ordinary people of society.

References

- Clarke, R.V.G. (1983). Situational crime prevention: Its theoretical basis and practical scope, in: Tonry, M. & Norris, N. (eds) *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research, Volume, 4*, 225-256, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Crawford, A. (1998). *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: Politics, Policies and Practices*, Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Davis, M. (1990). *City of Quartz: Excavating the Future in Los Angeles*, London: Verso.
- Ditton, J. (2000). Crime and the city: public attitudes towards open-street CCTV in Glasgow, *British Journal of Criminology*, 40, 692-709
- Ericson, R. & Haggerty, K. (1997). *Policing the Risk Society*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Gill, M. & Spriggs, A. (2005). Assessing the impact of CCTV. Home Office Research Study 292, Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate
- Hough, M.J., Clarke, R.V.G. & Mayhew, P. (1980). Introduction, in: Clarke, R.V.G. & Mayhew, P. (eds) *Designing Out Crime*. London: HMSO.
- Hughes, G. (1998). *Understanding crime prevention: Social control, risk and late-Modernity*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Jones, T. & Newburn, T. (2002). The Transformation of Policing? Understanding Current Trends in Policing Systems. *British Journal of Criminology*, 42(1), 129-146.
- Krahn, H. & Kennedy, L.W. (1985). Producing Personal Safety: The Effects of Crime Rates, Police Force Size, and Fear of Crime. *Criminology*, 23(4), 697-710.
- Lee, M. (2007). *Inventing Fear of Crime: Criminology and the politics of anxiety*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Loader, I. (2015). Private Security and the Demand for Protection in Contemporary Britain. *Policing and Society*, 7(3), 143-162.
- Minton, A. (2009) *Ground Control: Fear and happiness in the twenty-first city*, London: Penguin Group.
- Newburn, T. (2001). The Commodification of Policing: Security Networks in the Late Modern City. *Urban Studies*, 38(5/6), 829-848.
- Newman, O. (1972). *Defensible Space: Crime Prevention Through Urban Design*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Norris, C. & Armstrong, G. (1999). *The Maximum Surveillance Society: The Rise of CCTV*. Oxford: Berg Publishers.
- Norris, C., McCahill, M. & Wood, D. (2004). The Growth of CCTV: a global perspective on the international diffusion of video surveillance in publicly accessible space. *Surveillance and Society*, 2(2/3), 110-135.
- Pascoe, T. & Topping, P. (1997). Secured by Design: Assessing the Basis of the Scheme. *International Journal of Risk, Security and Crime Prevention*, 2(3), 161-173.
- Rosenbaum, D.P. (1988). Community Crime Prevention: A Review and Synthesis of the Literature. *Justice Quarterly*, 5(3), 323-393.
- Urbaneye (2004). *On the Threshold to Urban Panopticon? Analysing the Employment of CCTV in European Cities and Assessing its Social and Political Impacts*, Final Report to the European Union, Technical University of Berlin.

- Williams, D. A., & Ahmed, J. (September, 2007) Person Perception In the Context of Public CCTV Systems: Trusting the 'Other' in the Modern Surveillance Society. Presentation given at the BPS Division of Social Psychology Conference Kent University, UK
- Wortley, R. (1996). Guilt, shame and Situational Crime Prevention", in: Homel, R. (ed) (1996), *The Politics and Practise of Situational Crime Prevention: Crime Prevention Studies*, **5**, 115-132, Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Zedner. L. (2003). Too much security?. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 31(3), 155-184.