Perceptions of Security Issues, Social Processes, and the Police in Urban Neighbourhoods – The Case of Ljubljana[1]

Urška Pirnat[2], Gorazd Meško[3]

This paper presents perceptions of residents in urban neighbourhoods regarding security issues, social processes, and the police. In 2017, a community survey was implemented in the city of Ljubljana, the largest urban area in Slovenia, and face-to-face interviews were conducted with 1.000 residents living in low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods. The data analysis showed differences in residents' perceptions among low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods, where residents of low-risk neighbourhoods perceived less crime and neighbourhood disorder. Regarding social processes in neighbourhoods, residents of low-risk neighbourhoods expressed a higher level of social cohesion, more positive attitudes toward migrants and less perceived youth deviance. In the examination of perceptions of police, residents of low-risk neighbourhoods experienced more procedural justice, greater effectiveness of the police, and were more willing to cooperate with them. In the discussion, the findings of the study are summarized, the main limitations of the study are outlined, and implications for further research are proposed.

Keywords: security, urban communities, residents, perceptions, Slovenia

UDC: 343.9+351.78(497.4)

1 Introduction

The process of urbanisation rapidly increased industrialisation and in the twentieth century, as now, more than half of the world's population live in urban areas, mainly in highly-dense cities. It is predicted that by 2050, 68% of the world's population will live in urban areas (Ritchie & Roser, 2018). Characteristics of urban areas can be explained based on the following factors: 1) population – urban areas are characterised by a large number of residents, 2) population density – high number of residents must live in a restricted area (high density of settlement), and 3) residents' heterogeneity – heterogeneity can be the consequence of a higher number of residents or the fact that the urban population does not reproduce itself and must be inhabited by migrants from other areas or countries (Rebernik, 2008; Wirth, 1938). Based on the combination of those three factors, social life in urban areas can be described as an organic society with the following characteristics: 1) frequent contacts among residents, 2) impersonal relations, 3) lacking common interests, 4) lacking a sense of belonging, and 5) residents do not know each other. From a sociological perspective, central urban areas are characterised by the following issues: 1) housing problems, 2) unemployment, 3) cultural friction, and 4) crime (Rebernik, 2008; Shaw & McKay, 1942). In examining crime from an environmental perspective, it can be seen as the central issue of urban areas, as rates of crime are the highest in urban residential areas (Glaeser & Sacerdote, 1999).

In the twentieth century, Europe experienced severe inequalities and disparities, mainly in the form of a large increase in unemployment, which drove European residents into a state of anxiety, weakening the social fabric, and lack of trust in the future. This crisis threatened social cohesion and solidarity, and furthermore, enhanced selfishness and individualism. Due to these reasons, the European Forum for Urban Security opened a public discourse on crime prevention in Europe and developed the concept of urban security that is still present today, by promoting urban security to local organisations and authorities (European Forum for Urban Security, 2000, 2019). The concept of urban security gives importance to the victimisation aspect and suggests a comprehensive approach in

[2] Urška Pirnat, M.A., Assistant in Criminology, Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, University of Maribor, Slovenia. E-mail: urska.pirnat@fvv.uni-mb.si

[3] Gorazd Meško, Ph.D., Professor of Criminology, Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, University of Maribor, Slovenia. E-mail: gorazd.mesko@fvv.uni-mb.si

solving security issues which must be focused not only on the role of police and criminal justice, but on the role of cities in security provision, as well (Alvazzi del Frate & van Kesteren, 2004). The European Urban Charter (2008) emphasises security as one of the fundamental human rights, and further exposes principles in security provision in urban areas that must include: 1) a coherent crime prevention policy, 2) up-to-date comprehensive information and crime data, 3) an involvement of all community members in crime prevention, 4) close co-operation between police and the local community, 5) a defined and applied local anti-drug policy, 6) developing alternatives to incarceration, 7) assistance for crime victims, and 8) prioritising crime prevention and increasing financial resources (The European Urban Charter, 2008).

Based on European guidelines, measuring security in urban local communities must include information from various perspectives, such as: 1) demography of local communities, 2) data on crime, distribution of crime, and distribution of disorder, 3) identifying causes of crime, 4) defining consequences of criminal victimisation, 5) residents' perceptions of crime and sources of threats, 6) defining the level of quality of life, and 7) identifying institutions which are responsible for providing security at the local level (European Forum for Urban Security, 2007, 2016). The aim of the paper is to present perceptions of residents regarding various security aspects in the city of Ljubljana, the largest urban area in Slovenia, as proposed by European guidelines. The paper is organised as follows: in the theoretical part, causes of crime in Ljubljana and an overview of studies on crime, victimisation, and fear of crime are presented. Secondly, crime and disorder in urban areas and their perceptions are discussed. Thirdly, the role of social cohesion in urban crime is presented, and the last section of the theoretical part of the paper examines the role of the police in urban communities. In the empirical section, the study on perceptions in urban neighbourhoods is represented, followed by the results of the study. In the discussion, conclusions and directions for further research in the field of perceptions in urban neighbourhoods are provided.

2 Causes of Crime in Urban Areas – The Case of Ljubljana

Studies on crime in urban areas in Slovenia focused mainly on exploring crime in the capital city of Ljubljana, as the largest urban area in the country. In 1975, Pečar (1975) conducted the first study on crime distribution in Ljubljana. In the examination of the relationship between deviant behaviour and demographic characteristics, the findings suggested that: 1) an important security issue is presented by alcoholics concentrated in old buildings in the city centre, 2)

the concentration of deviant behaviour was higher in partly-urbanised areas, and 3) residential areas on the outskirts of the city were characterised by increased youth deviance and increased offences against the public order and peace. The author emphasised that the concentration of crime and offenders is unequally distributed in the city, and are more concentrated in the city centre (Pečar, 1975). Unequal distribution of crime was subsequently also confirmed by Klinkon, Meško and Rebernik (2004). They examined the relationships among the spatial distribution of social groups and crime, and confirmed a positive correlation between: 1) age and crime, 2) gender (female) and crime (thefts and robberies), and 3) income and crime, as well as negative correlation between education and violent crime (murder and rape). The third study revealed patterns of the most common forms of crime in the city. Among overall crime, property crime represented the majority of reported crime in Ljubljana and within it, the most commonly reported were small property criminal offences, followed by larceny, burglary, and robbery. By spatial analysis of crime, characteristic for most commonly reported forms of crime (larceny, burglary, and robbery) were identified as a concentric decline from the city centre to the outskirts, with the highest crime rate within a radius of approximately 1 kilometre. The lowest level of crime was detected at the outer edges of the city in areas that were most recently urbanised. Property crimes were distributed in the areas characterised by the highest daily flows of people, the proximity of a highway, and anonymity (Meško, Maver, & Klinkon, 2010). Hacin and Eman (2016) conducted a study on crime in urban environments and analysed data on reported property crime in Ljubljana for the period 2008–2013. In the year 2013, 26.336 crimes were reported, with property crime representing 81% of overall crime. In the observed period, property crime increased by 4.3%; the most common forms of property crime in the year 2013 represented theft (83%), followed by damaged or destroyed property (9%), fraud (3%), and robbery (0.6%). The areas with the highest distribution of property crimes were characterised by: 1) a large flow and daily migration of people carrying money and credit cards, 2) insufficient security in the parking areas and shortage of security staff, 3) inattentiveness of people, and 4) a high concentration of students and tourists that are easy targets for pickpockets and thieves (Hacin & Eman, 2016).

2.1 An Overview of Studies on Crime, Victimisation and Fear of Crime in Ljubljana

Slovenia joined the International Crime Victim Survey and in the framework of it, the victimisation survey in Ljubljana was conducted in 1992, 1997, 2001, and 2008. The findings of the most recent victimisation study indicated an increase in vehicle vandalism, theft of bicycles and theft from

vehicles. The most common forms of victimisation of property crimes were vehicle vandalism (11%), theft of bicycles (6%), theft from vehicles (5%), and burglary (2.5%). The majority of unreported crimes represented vehicle vandalism, attempted burglary and robbery and in contrast, thefts from vehicles and theft of vehicles were the highest reported crimes to the police (Statistični urad Republike Slovenije, 2009). Lobnikar and Meško (2010) conducted an analysis of the security state in Ljubljana and responses of local institutions. The main security issues were identified as traffic security, neighbourhood disorder, crime hotspots, and organised crime. The findings related to promoting security in the city emphasised implementation of community policing, establishment of safety audits and enhancing the role of municipal wardens. Additionally, perceptions of crime and disorder suggested that within overall crime, residents perceived problematic assaults, theft and robbery, and within disorder, the most problematic were vandalism, garbage on the streets, and drinking in public places (Lobnikar, Prislan, & Modic, 2016).

Research findings based on the socio-psychological and demographic model of fear of crime in Ljubljana suggested correlations between fear of crime, and: 1) certain perceptions of dangerous people and areas – strangers and unknown places, 2) gender – women were more fearful, 3) age – the elderly expressed higher rates of fear of crime, 4) the socio-economic situation of an individual, 5) social networks, and 6) previous victimisation (Meško & Areh, 2003; Meško & Šifrer, 2008). A study on a comparison of fear of crime in urban and rural areas showed that fear of crime is higher in urban areas. Residents of Ljubljana associated fear of crime with physical and social incivilities, which were more frequent in urban areas. Additionally, residents of Ljubljana expressed lower amounts of social cohesion, confidence and social networks than residents living in rural areas (Meško, Šifrer, & Vošnjak, 2012). A comparison of fear of crime in two post-socialist capital cities (Ljubljana and Sarajevo) was conducted and it was found that residents of Ljubljana felt safer because: 1) they were more willing to walk alone in the dark, 2) women in Ljubljana were less fearful, 3) they considered themselves more likely to chase a potential assailant, and 4) they imagined someone crossing their path only rarely (Meško, Fallshore, Muratbegović, & Fields, 2008). Meško, Fallshore and Jevšek (2007) highlighted the role of community policing as the appropriate policing style in reducing feelings of vulnerability. It was emphasised that planning a safe urban environment in communities was one of the key measures in reducing fear of crime. Removal of physical and social disorder, appropriate lighting of the streets, open spaces, and organised visual image of area indicate that the environment in which residents live is safe.

3 Crime and Disorder in Urban Areas

Focusing on crime in urban areas, the International Crime Victim Survey provides an insight into the extent and forms of victimisation in urban areas, independently of police statistics, which can be adequate due to the level of unreported crime to the police (Alvazzi del Frate & van Kesteren, 2004). The main findings of previous victimisation studies in European urban areas suggested that property crime and crime related to vehicles represented the most common forms of urban crime. Within property crime, the most common victimisation are theft and burglary; within crime related to vehicles, vandalism, theft from vehicles, and theft of vehicles were the most common. Among contact crimes, robberies and assaults were the most common overall although contact crime is not frequent across urban areas (Alvazzi del Frate & van Kesteren, 2004; Pavlović, 1993; van Dijk, van Kesteren, & Smith, 2007). Furthermore, hate speech has become more and more recognised as a form of victimisation, and studies measured the scope of hate speech in the context of intolerance against migrants (van Dijk et al., 2007; van Dijk, Manchin, van Kesteren, & Hideg, 2005).

Besides crime and victimisation, a model of antisocial behaviour explains signs of the disorder as a source of threats in residential neighbourhoods. Signs of disorder are a constant reminder of social issues and the possible risk of victimisation (Covington & Taylor, 1991; Perkins, Meeks, & Taylor, 1992; Raudenbush & Sampson, 1999). Studies focused on measuring neighbourhood disorder occurs in two forms, namely social and physical disorder. Social disorder presents antisocial behaviours that are unpredictable and potentially dangerous, whereas physical disorder reflects abandoned living environments and visible consequences of deviant behaviour (Kelling & Wilson, 1982; Raudenbush & Sampson, 1999; Skogan, 2011).

Perception of crime by residents in the neighbourhood indicates the presence of criminogenic risks and reflects weak social control. Signs of crime can influence residents' behaviour in three aspects: 1) the emotional aspect – changes their feelings, 2) the cognitive aspect – changes their thinking, and 3) the behavioural aspect – changes their behaviour (Innes, 2004). Perceptions of crime is associated with the perception of the quality of life while residents share the belief that maintaining neighbourhood disorder and reducing crime is seen as one of the aspects of quality of life (Reisig & Parks, 2000). Although the perception of crime influence feelings of vulnerability, studies showed that perceptions of neighbourhood disorder present the more powerful source of threats while residents perceive signs of disorder more often than crime (Innes, 2004). Perceived neighbourhood disorder is associated with feelings of vulnerability, fear of crime, and is a reminder of the failure of social control mechanisms (Gau & Pratt, 2010).

4 The Role of Social Cohesion

Community crime prevention programmes addresses the need to: 1) increase the sense of security of residents, 2) respond to community concerns and crime issues, and 3) increase social cohesion and social capital in the communities (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, 2010). The focus is set on the establishment of social cohesion in the community and enhancing the quality of life of residents (International Centre for the Prevention of Crime, 2010). Sampson & Groves (1989) emphasised the importance of the formation of social ties in the manner of effective informal social control to fight crime. The key factor of social ties to be activated in enhancing informal social control was seen in the concept of collective efficacy, defined as a connection of mutual trust and the willingness of residents to intervene for the common good (Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls, 1997: 921). The first component of collective efficacy presents the willingness of residents to intervene for the common good in the community, as the degree to which actual behaviours are undertaken as a means to address crime. The second component is a combination of mutual trust and social cohesion. Cohesive communities with mutual trust among residents have a higher likelihood of acknowledging issues in the community, addressing those issues, and solving them collectively (Sampson et al., 1997). The effect of collective efficacy on crime rates was further empirically tested, and findings supported it as a robust predictor of crime rates (Pratt & Cullen, 2005; Sampson, 2006).

The most relevant factor of informal social control was identified by Shaw & McKay (1942), reflected in the family, which maintains social norms and values. The family has more difficulties in maintaining social norms and values when challenged with delinquent patterns presented in disadvantaged neighbourhoods. The responsibility for weakened social control does not lie solely with the family but also in disadvantaged communities with inadequate possibilities for solving social issues. Perceived youth deviant behaviour reminds residents of an inability to share the same values in a community and to keep effective social control (Sampson & Groves, 1989). The effective supervision of youth in the manner of primary socialisation and consequently prevention of youth deviant behaviour represent one of the aspects of quality of life. Moreover, supervision by residents affects socially appropriate behaviours of the young (Haynie, 2001).

Keeping in mind urban areas as the agglomerate of residents of various nationalities and ethnicities, the ability to coexist among heterogeneous social groups in the communities is another reflection of social cohesion. It can be observed as the level of mutual trust, solidarity and established norms and values among heterogeneous groups in the communities (Laurence, 2011). Based on Blumer's (1958) theory of perceptions of migrants on a group level, attitudes toward migrants, especially prejudice against migrants, can be explained. Migrants in their new residential areas represent the subordinated group while local residents represent the dominant group. The dominant group share a sense of their social position and can develop the following feelings: 1) a feeling of superiority, 2) a feeling that subordinate group is different, 3) a feeling of proprietary claim an advantage, and 4) fear and suspicion against the subordinate group (Black, 1958).

Studies that examined the role of social cohesion in relation to security in communities indicated that higher levels of trust, solidarity and established common norms and values among residents, positively influenced a reduction of crime through higher levels of informal social control in those communities (Lee, 2000; Reisig & Cancino, 2004). A higher level of social cohesion also impacted the willingness of residents to cooperate with police in reporting crime and suspicious activities to the police and participation in crime prevention activities (Goudriaan et al., 2006).

5 The Role and Perception of Police in Urban Communities

Police are recognised as the primary institution of formal social control in providing security in urban communities. Due to the fact that urban areas have specific characteristics (high density of settlement and resident heterogeneity) and moreover, have a specific social life (organic society), police can often feel alienated and have poor relations with residents. Police can combat crime through traditional police work[4] or use alternative strategies for controlling crime such as problem-oriented policing or community policing (United Nations, 2011). Community policing[5] can play an essential role in building trust and partnerships among police and residents. Studies indicated that community policing can lead to less perceived neighbourhood disorder, increased feelings of safety, perceived effectiveness of the police, and residents' satisfaction with the police (Gill et al., 2014; Meško, Sotlar, Lobnikar, Jere, & Tominc, 2012; Reisig, 2010).

Police legitimacy can be defined as the feeling that authority or institutions are entitled to be referred to and obeyed. In

---

[4] Traditional police work is reactive – after the crime has happened.

[5] Community policing is by Trojanowicz and Bucquerox (1991) defined as a new philosophy of policing based on the concept that police officers and residents work together in creative ways, which can help to solve contemporary community issues related to crime, fear of crime, physical and social disorder, and neighbourhood decay.

other words, it means acceptance by people of the need to adapt their behaviour to the expectations of the authority (Tyler, 1990: 25). The perception of police legitimacy consists of the following aspects: 1) the instrumental aspect, and 2) the normative aspect (Hough, Jackson, & Bradford, 2013; Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1990). The latter emphasises the role of procedural justice in police procedures, whereas procedural justice is seen as fairness in the procedures during decision-making between police and residents. While the police are seen as the authority, residents evaluate the fairness of procedures based on two key assumptions: 1) how decisions were made, and 2) the quality of treatment they received as individuals (Blader & Tyler, 2003; Tyler, 1990). The decision-making aspect refers to unbiased police decision-making, neutrality, objectivity in the procedure, and consistency in exercising authority. The quality of treatment refers to the behaviour of police officers in procedures whereas residents assess if they were treated politely, with respect and dignity (Tyler, 2003). The instrumental aspect of police legitimacy gives importance to the effectiveness of police as the key factor in assessing legitimacy. When police are seen as effective in combating crime and in maintaining public order, residents perceived the police as a legitimate authority (Tankebe, 2008; Tyler, 1990). In Slovenia, the normative model of legitimacy was examined in urban areas and confirmed that residents perceived police on the basis of procedural justice (Meško, Tankebe, Jere, Eman, & Reisig, 2014).

The model of police accountability explains perceptions by residents of police effectiveness through the central role of police work. Residents view the primary function of police as combating and controlling crime and maintaining public order (Skogan, 2009), and therefore, they assess the performance of the police based on their perception of crime and disorder in the neighbourhood. Based on the police accountability model, perceptions of crime and disorder had a negative impact on evaluating the effectiveness of the police (Weitzer & Tuch, 2005).

Motivation to cooperate with the police can be explained based on two models: 1) an instrumental model, and 2) a legitimacy model. The first model argues that resident's willingness to cooperate is motivated by self-interest based on the assumption that if residents view police as effective in managing crime, they are more likely to cooperate with them (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003). The legitimacy model hypothesises that perceptions of police legitimacy and the law have an impact on their willingness to cooperation (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003; Tyler & Fagan, 2008). If residents view police as fair and legitimate, their willingness to cooperate is higher. Procedural justice represents an essential role in explaining the willingness to cooperate as perceptions of fairness influence their confidence in the police, which consequently leads to a willingness to cooperate (Hough et al., 2013; Tyler, 1990). Slovenian researchers examined willingness

to cooperate with the police and the importance of perceived legitimacy of police in explaining cooperation with them. The findings of the study showed that: 1) perceived legitimacy influenced self-reported compliance with the law, and 2) perceived procedural justice shaped the perceptions of police legitimacy (Reisig, Tankebe, & Meško, 2014). Significance of police legitimacy and consequently willingness to cooperate with the police also predicts the newest Slovenian police strategy focused on community-oriented policing. The strategy highlighted greater partnership among police and residents, greater visibility of police officers in the local community that lead to greater feelings of safety, confidence in police, and satisfaction with police work (Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve RS, 2014).

6   Study on Perceptions in Urban Neighbourhoods in Ljubljana

As a part of the research project on local security in Slovenia (2015–2018), a study[6] on perceptions was carried out in the urban areas of the municipality of Ljubljana. The city of Ljubljana is populated by 288.919 residents, with a population density of 1.048 residents per km², and covers an area of 279.44 km² (Ljubljana v številkah, 2017). In the period between 1945 and 1991, the population rapidly increased from 123.000 to 272.000 residents. Approximately two-thirds of migrants came from rural parts of the country and one-third from the republics of Yugoslavia. After 1991, deconcentration of the population from Ljubljana to the periphery regions occurred, and until 2005, the population was decreasing. Subsequently, an increase in population was again recorded, mainly due to the growth of housing construction in the city. The main reasons of residents migrating to Ljubljana were better employment possibilities and a wider range of jobs in the city (Rebernik, 2014).

By the newest European criteria on the degree of urbanisation, Ljubljana is considered a densely populated urban area (European Commission, 2014), and is one of the 58 largest European cities (European Commission, 2016). Compared to the capital cities around the world, it is known as one of the safest capital cities with a high quality of life (World's Capital Cities, 2017). Satisfaction by residents with living in Ljubljana is high when compared to other European cities. Ljubljana ranked high in various categories of residents' perceptions; 91% residents in Ljubljana felt totally safe in their neighbourhoods, 76% of them were satisfied with the physical appearance of buildings and streets, and 86 % of residents were satisfied with the quality of life in the city and with the quality of the environment (European Commission, 2016). Among

---

institutional trust, residents of Ljubljana expressed the highest rates of trust in police authority (Weziak Bialowska & Dijkstra, 2015). It is essential to also mention the results of European survey on quality of life on the perception of social cohesion; 65% respondents of Ljubljana agreed that they can trust people in their communities, and 81% of them trusted people in their neighbourhood (European Commission, 2016). Moreover, in 2016, Ljubljana was designated as the European Green Capital based on good air and water quality, user-friendly public transportation, a green environment, and sustainable tourism (Green Ljubljana, 2016).

Ljubljana is under the administrative area of the Ljubljana Police Directorate, which covers the 4.290 km². In the territory of the city of Ljubljana, five police stations, a traffic police station, a mounted police station and a dog handler station are located for the provision of security of the city (Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve RS, Police, n. d.). Within the Ljubljana Police Directorate, 28.174 criminal offences were recorded in the

year 2016, and 75% of them recorded in the city of Ljubljana (Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve RS, 2017). The law on police organisation states that for providing safety and security in local communities, the police must cooperate with the representatives of the municipalities and public society. Furthermore, the law foresees the establishment of consultative bodies in local communities for ensuring local safety and promotion of participation in security measures by residents (Zakon o organiziranosti in delu v policiji, 2013). The most common forms of such consultative bodies are security councils, which are established within the local community. In the year 2015, twelve security councils were active in the area of the municipality of Ljubljana (Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve RS, 2015).

6.1 Sampling and Data Gathering

We conducted a community survey in urban neighbourhoods in Ljubljana. Ten neighbourhoods were divided into five low-risk neighbourhoods and five high-risk neighbour-

Legend:
Low-risk neighbourhoods are numbered as 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10.
High-risk neighbourhoods are numbered as 1, 3, 5, 7, and 9.

Figure 1: Geographical location of selected urban neighbourhoods
for the community survey

hoods in each of Ljubljana's five police districts.[7] In Figure 1, the geographic location of selected urban neighbourhoods is illustrated. After selecting the neighbourhoods, blocks of houses and apartments were randomly selected in each neighbourhood for interviews, and Quota sampling was used to reach 100 respondents in each neighbourhood.

Face-to-face survey interviews with individuals 18 years old and older residing in ten different neighbourhoods in Ljubljana were conducted in the period from October to December, 2016, by trained students of the Faculty of Criminal Justice and Security, at the University of Maribor. Before beginning the interviews, residents were invited to participate in the study and were informed that participation is voluntary and strictly confidential. Before surveying, the context of the study was presented to participants. The interview usually took around 30 minutes to complete.

6.2 Questionnaire

The questionnaire consisted of various dimensions of security that measured: 1) social processes in neighbourhoods, 2) perceptions of crime and disorder in neighbourhoods, 3) various perceptions of the police, and 4) demographic data. Each response was measured on a 4-point Likert scale, with the value 1 – very unlikely, 2 – unlikely, 3 – likely, and 4 – very likely. Factor analysis of the questionnaire (Principal Axis Factoring and Varimax

rotation) showed high reliability of the questionnaire (Cronbach α = 0.855, KMO = 0.910), and it eliminated factors which demonstrated the perceptions of security issues in neighbourhoods, social processes, and perception of police in neighbourhoods.

6.3 Sample Characteristics

The sample[8] consisted of 1.000 individuals 18 years of age or older, which were residing in ten different neighbourhoods in Ljubljana. In low-risk neighbourhoods, the sample consisted of 48.2% male and 51.6% female respondents, and in high-risk neighbourhoods, 51.8% of respondents were male and 48.4% female. Regarding age, the majority of respondents belonged to the first and second age groups (18–29 and 30–44 years) in both risk neighbourhoods, with the third age group (65 years or more) representing the smallest proportion. Almost half of the respondents in both types of neighbourhoods have completed university education, whereas 25.2% of respondents from low-risk neighbourhoods and 22.4% respondents of high-risk neighbourhood achieved middle school education. In both types of neighbourhoods, the largest proportion of respondents represented residents living in their neighbourhoods for more than 20 years (43.8% in low-risk neighbourhoods and 51.4% in high-risk neighbourhoods), and the smallest proportion of residents living in the neighbourhoods from 5 to 19 years (26.8% in low-risk neighbourhoods and 30.6% in high-risk neighbourhoods).

Table 1: Sample characteristics

		Low-risk neighbourhoods		High-risk neighbourhoods	
		n	%	*n*	%
Gender	Male	226	48.2	243	51.8
	Female	274	51.6	257	48.4
Age	18-29	189	37.9	186	37.3
	30-44	134	26.9	118	23.6
	45-64	117	23.4	149	29.9
	65 <	59	11.8	46	9.2
Education	Middle School	126	25.2	122	22.4
	High School	150	30.0	153	30.6
	University or more	224	44.8	235	47.0
Period of residence	Up to 4 years	147	29.4	90	18.0
	5-19 years	134	26.8	153	30.6
	20 years <	219	43.8	257	51.4

---

[7]   Neighbourhoods were selected based on the number of police-recorded criminal and public disorder offences. Based on the observation of selected neighbourhoods, high-risk neighbourhoods, they were characterised by a high rate of residential mobility, and opportunities for offenders to commit a crime (higher number of bars and stores). Low-risk neighbourhoods reflected calm residential areas with a higher number of houses.

[8]   A comparison between proportion of gender and age for sample and statistical data for each neighbourhood was conducted. The greatest deviation between the sample and statistical data in gender was 4%, and in age groups 10%. Consideration must be taken before generalising results overall population of neighbourhoods.

6.4 Results

Perceptions of different security factors is represented by factors obtained utilising the factor analysis of the questionnaire responses. We analysed whether perceptions of different factors are independent of low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods. A Chi-square test of independence was calculated comparing the frequency of perceptions in low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods. Before that, we recoded variables with values 1 – very unlikely, 2 – unlikely, 3 – likely, and 4 – very likely, to 1 – unlikely (very unlikely and unlikely) and 2 – likely (likely and very likely). In table 2, differences among perceptions of crime and neighbourhood disorder among residents in low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods are presented. In

low-risk neighbourhoods. The results further indicated statistically significant differences in the perception of *drunk people making noise* (X^2 = 54.9; $p < 0.001$), *urination in public places* (X^2 = 45.0; $p < 0.001$), *harassment in the neighbourhood* (X^2 = 38.0; $p < 0.001$), *garbage in the streets* (X^2 = 32.0; $p < 0.001$), *sleeping in public places* (X^2 = 61.8; $p < 0.001$), and *drug use/drug dealing* (X^2 = 102.3; $p < 0.001$). Residents of high-risk neighbourhoods perceived more neighbourhood disorder with the greatest difference observed in the perception of *drug use/drug dealing in public places*, while 45.5% residents of high-risk neighbourhoods likely perceived it, whereas only 15.9% of residents of low-risk neighbourhoods likely perceived drug use/drug dealing in public places.

Table 2: Differences in perceptions of security issues in low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods

	Low-risk neighbourhoods		High-risk neighbourhoods		X^2
	Unlikely (%)	Likely (%)	Unlikely (%)	Likely (%)	
Crime in the neighbourhood					
A robbery or mugging.	92.2	7.1	89.0	11.0	4.5*
Houses being broken.	88.0	12.0	77.4	22.6	19.3***
Cars being broken.	89.4	10.6	74.9	25.1	35.7***
Personal property damaged or destroyed.	81.9	18.1	65.5	34.5	34.4***
Neighbourhood disorder					
Drunk people making noise in the neighbourhood.	77.4	22.6	55.2	44.8	54.9***
People urinating in public places.	79.8	20.2	60.4	39.6	45.0***
Harassment in the neighbourhood.	95.7	4.3	83.9	16.1	38.0***
Garbage in the streets.	75.6	24.4	58.7	41.3	32.0***
Sleeping in public places, like on park benches.	93.9	6.1	76.0	24.0	61.8***
Drug use or drug dealing in public places.	84.1	15.9	54.5	45.5	102.3***

* p < 0,05; ** p < 0,01; *** p < 0,001.

relation to perceived crime, the results of the Chi-square test showed a statistically significant difference in perceptions of crime, whereas residents of high-risk neighbourhoods more likely perceived *robbery/mugging* (X^2 = 4.5; $p < 0.05$), *houses being broken* (X^2 = 19.3; $p < 0.001$), *cars being broken into* (X^2 = 35.7; $p < 0.001$), and *damaged/destroyed property* (X^2 = 34.4; $p < 0.001$), than residents of low-risk neighbourhoods. The greatest difference was found in the perception of *personal property damaged/destroyed*, whereas 34.5% of residents of high-risk neighbourhoods likely perceived this type of offence, and in contrast, it was perceived of 18.1% residents of

The results of the Chi-square test for perceptions of social processes in the neighbourhoods are presented in table 3. The results showed statistically significant differences in perception of social cohesion, whereas residents of high-risk neighbourhoods more unlikely perceived social cohesion in all variables; *willingness to help each other* (X^2 = 14.4; $p < 0.001$), *trust* (X^2 = 12.9; $p < 0.001$), *getting along with each other* (X^2 = 4.4; $p < 0.05$), and *sharing the same values* (X^2 = 5.7; $p < 0.05$), as residents of low-risk neighbourhoods. The greatest difference was noticed in *trusting people in the neighbourhood* while 56.1% residents of high-risk neighbourhoods likely trusted

people in the neighbourhood and 67.2% residents of low-risk neighbourhoods likely trusted them. In relation to youth deviance, the results showed statistically significant differences in perceptions of youth deviance, while residents of high-risk neighbourhoods more likely perceived *children skipping school* (X^2 = 13.7; p < 0.001), *disrespected behaviour* (X^2 = 16.0; p < 0.001), and *fighting children on the streets* (X^2 = 25.8; p < 0.001), as residents of low-risk neighbourhoods. In examining differences of perceived youth deviance, the greatest difference was observed in *children showing disrespect to an adult*, whereas 32.7% residents of high-risk neighbourhoods likely perceived it and only 21.4% of residents of low-risk neighbourhoods likely perceived it. Furthermore, residents of low-risk neighbourhoods expressed statistically significant better attitudes toward migrants in the following variables; *migrants taking jobs* (X^2 = 17.3; p < 0.01), *migrants bringing diseases* (X^2 = 11.8; p < 0.01), and *migrants raising taxes* (X^2 = 5.6; p < 0.05), than residents of high-risk neighbourhoods. The greatest difference was found in the variable *migrants take job from Slovenians,* whereas 14.1 % residents of low-risk neighbourhoods likely expressed it, and in contrast, 24.5% residents of high-risk neighbourhoods do so.

In table 4, differences among perceptions of police in low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods are illustrated. The results indicated statistically significant difference in the perception of procedural justice, while residents of low-risk neighbourhoods likely perceived more procedural justice in the following variables; *trusting police to do their jobs well* (X^2 = 6.0; p < 0.05), *police are courteous* (X^2 = 7.0; p < 0.01), *police takes time to listen to people* (X^2 = 4.2; p < 0.05), *police can be trusted to make right decisions* (X^2 = 8.0; p < 0.01), *police explain their decisions* (X^2 = 2.08; p < 0.05), and *sharing the same expectations with police in maintain order in neighbourhood* (X^2 = 0.73; p < 0.05), as residents of high-risk neighbourhoods. The greatest difference was identified in the variable *the police can be trusted that they make the right decisions*, whereas 66.5% residents of low-risk neighbourhoods likely viewed police in this way and 57.8% residents of high-risk neighbourhoods shared this view. The results of perceived effectiveness of police demonstrated that residents of low-risk neighbourhoods viewed police as more effective at *maintaining order* (X^2 = 10.3; p < 0.01) than residents of high-risk neighbourhoods. 66.8% residents of low-risk neighbourhoods likely viewed police as effective in *maintaining order*, whereas 56.9% residents of high-risk

Table 3: Differences in social processes in low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods

	Low-risk neighbourhoods		High-risk neighbourhoods		X^2
	Unlikely (%)	Likely (%)	Unlikely (%)	Likely (%)	
Social cohesion in the neighbourhood					
People in your neighbourhood are willing to help each other.	23.0	77.0	33.9	66.1	14.4***
People in your neighbourhood can be trusted.	32.8	67.2	43.9	56.1	12.9***
People in your neighbourhood generally get along with each other.	25.9	74.1	31.9	68.1	4.4*
People in your neighbourhood generally share the same values.	47.0	53.0	54.6	45.4	5.7*
Youth deviance					
Children skipping school and hanging out on a street corner.	76.4	23.6	65.7	34.3	13.7***
Children showing disrespect to an adult.	78.6	21.4	67.3	32.7	16.0***
Children fighting in front of the buildings.	94.9	5.1	85.3	14.7	25.8***
Attitudes toward migrants					
Migrants take job from Slovenians.	85.9	14.1	75.5	24.5	17.3***
Migrants have lower education than us.	65.6	34.4	61.1	38.9	2.2
Migrants bring disease into the country.	78.4	21.6	68.8	31.2	11.8**
Migrants raise taxes in Slovenia.	80.2	19.8	73.9	26.1	5.6*
Migrants increase crime.	57.4	42.6	54.3	45.7	0.9

* p < 0,05; ** p < 0,01; *** p < 0,001

neighbourhoods viewed it as effective. Moreover, residents of low-risk neighbourhoods statistically significant expressed higher willingness to cooperate with police in *reporting crime* ($X^2 = 11.1$; $p < 0.01$), *reporting suspicious activity* ($X^2 = 13.7$; $p < 0.001$), *provide information about a suspected criminal* ($X^2 = 5.5$; $p < 0.05$), and *serving as a witness in a criminal court* ($X^2 = 5.6$; $p < 0.05$). A comparison between perceptions revealed that 67.3% residents of low-risk neighbourhoods were likely willing to *call the police to report suspicious activity* and in contrast, 55.9% residents of high-risk neighbourhoods were likely to call.

7 Discussion

For the purpose of studying perceptions in urban neighbourhoods, a community survey in Ljubljana, the largest urban area in Slovenia, was implemented. The analysis confirmed several differences of perceptions in low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods, although a few factors reflecting perceptions (moral identification, traditional values, obeying the police, and social prevention) did not show significant differences between residents of low-risk and high-risk neighbour-

Table 4: Difference in perceptions of police in low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods

	Low-risk neighbourhoods		High-risk neighbourhoods		X^2
	Unlikely (%)	Likely (%)	Unlikely (%)	Likely (%)	
Procedural justice					
The police in your community are trustworthy.	22.0	78.0	26.9	73.1	3.3
The police can be trusted to do their jobs well.	25.5	74.5	32.5	67.5	6.0*
The police are courteous to people they come into contact with.	20.2	79.8	27.3	72.7	7.0**
When police handle problems, they make fair decisions.	35.4	64.6	35.8	64.2	0.1
The police treat citizens with respect.	20.0	80.0	26.3	73.7	5.7*
The police take time to listen to people.	33.8	66.2	40.1	59.9	4.2*
The police can be trusted that they make the right decisions.	33.5	66.5	42.2	57.8	8.0**
The police protect values that are important to me.	25.3	74.7	31.3	68.7	4.5*
The police have the same sense of right and wrong that you do.	41.3	58.7	44.1	55.9	0.7
The police explain their decisions to the citizens they deal with.	36.1	63.9	39.1	60.9	0.9
The values of the police are similar to your own.	41.8	58.2	43.1	56.9	0.2
I believe the police to act according to the law.	12.6	87.4	17.9	82.1	5.4*
Mine expectations about maintaining order in the neighbourhood are the same as police expectations.	32.6	67.4	36.3	63.7	1.5
The effectiveness of police					
The police do a good job at controlling crime.	44.8	55.2	51.0	49.0	3.8
The police do a good job at preventing crime.	52.2	47.8	55.5	44.5	1.1
The police do a good job at maintaining order.	33.2	66.8	43.1	56.9	10.3**
Cooperation with police					
Call the police to report a crime that I witnessed.	15.5	84.5	23.9	76.1	11.1**
Call the police to report suspicious activity I observed in my neighbourhood.	32.7	67.3	44.1	55.9	13.7***
Call the police to report an accident that I saw happen.	15.7	84.3	20.1	79.9	3.3
Provide information to the police about a suspected criminal.	14.9	85.1	20.6	79.4	5.5*
To serve as a witness in a criminal court case involving a crime that I witnessed.	27.6	72.4	34.5	65.5	5.6*

* $p < 0,05$; ** $p < 0,01$; *** $p < 0,001$.

hoods (Pirnat & Meško, 2018). Concerning security issues in neighbourhoods, results showed that residents of high-risk neighbourhoods perceived more signs of neighbourhood disorder and more crime generally. This finding confirms the notion that perceived security issues were equivalent to actual security problems in neighbourhoods and not the opposite, as some studies suggested (Hipp, 2010; Innes, 2004). In examining differences among perceived neighbourhood disorder and crime, the difference in perceptions of neighbourhood disorder in high-risk and low-risk neighbourhoods is more noticeable. Moreover, the results showed that residents of both types of neighbourhoods perceived more neighbourhood disorder than crime. This finding is consistent with Sampson's (2009) explanation that residents noticed neighbourhood disorder on the streets in everyday life, whereas facing crime only on rare occasions.

In examining social cohesion in our study, residents of high-risk neighbourhoods expressed a lower level of social cohesion in the neighbourhoods. We cannot conclude with certainty that social cohesion has an impact on crime rates, because this relationship was not examined, but we can suggest that level of social cohesion in neighbourhoods is an indicator of the crime rate. As already confirmed in previous studies, social cohesion positively influences the reduction of crime through a higher level of informal social control (Lee, 2000; Reisig & Cancino, 2004). Perceptions of youth deviance is another reminder of an inability to share the same values and norms in the neighbourhood (Sampson & Groves, 1989). Results of our study showed that high-risk neighbourhoods were characterised by more perceived youth deviance than low-risk neighbourhoods. Another social process in the the neighbourhoods can be observed as the ability of coexistence among heterogeneous social groups in neighbourhoods (Laurence, 2011). Our findings show that residents of low-risk neighbourhoods express more positive opinions on migrants which suggested a higher level of solidarity among heterogeneous groups in neighbourhoods. In examining attitudes toward migrants, an interesting finding emerged. There were almost no differences on the opinion that migrants increase crime among low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods and moreover, this variable reached the highest percentage of likeliness (42.6% in low-risk and 45.7% in high-risk neighbourhoods). On the one hand, we can observe more positive attitudes toward migrants in low-risk neighbourhoods, but on the other hand, attitudes toward the opinion that migrants increase crime is almost the same in low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods.

The differences in perceptions of police among neighbourhoods were observed in perceived procedural justice, the effectiveness of police and willingness to cooperate with the police. In regards to perceived procedural justice, residents of low-risk neighbourhoods felt a higher level of procedural justice. As it was already confirmed that residents of urban areas perceived police legitimacy based on procedural justice (Meško et al., 2014), this finding raises new questions. If the perception of procedural justice is also the result of neighbourhood characteristics regarding security, the instrumental model of legitimacy cannot be overlooked. In examining the perceptions of the effectiveness of police, results show that the difference between factors which reflected police perceptions among different neighbourhoods was the strongest in perceived effectiveness. Residents of low-risk neighbourhoods perceived the police as more effective than residents of high-risk neighbourhoods. This finding speaks in favour of the police accountability model, while residents of high-risk neighbourhoods perceived more crime and disorder, which could have a negative impact on an evaluation of the effectiveness of police (Weitzer & Tuch, 2005). Among variables that measured the effectiveness of the police, the only significant difference in neighbourhoods was noticed for maintaining order in neighbourhoods, which could also indicate residents' evaluation of the effectiveness of the police based on the perceptions of disorder and the presence of police in their neighbourhoods. Concerning the difference in the willingness to cooperate with police, residents of low-risk neighbourhoods expressed a higher level of cooperation with police that confirms the instrumental model of motivation to cooperate with the police (Sunshine & Tyler, 2003).

The main limitation of this research concerned methodological issues. The willingness of residents to cooperate in the study could influence the formation of a representative sample. Moreover, it is essential not to generalise findings of the study to the whole population of urban areas, while the community survey was implemented at the neighbourhood level. An additional limitation of this study is seen in generalising results to the overall population of neighbourhoods while the sample did not reflect the real demographic structure in all chosen neighbourhoods. Based on the findings of this study, future research should focus on examining different impacts of security factors in low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods. Additional analyses of predicting procedural justice of the police and their effectiveness showed that different factors influenced the perception of police in low-risk and high-risk neighbourhoods. Regarding the perceptions of procedural justice in low-risk neighbourhoods, moral identification, effectiveness of police, cooperation with the police, and obeying the police had an impact on perceived procedural justice, whereas in high-risk neighbourhoods, moral identification, effectiveness of police, neighbourhood disorder, cooperation with police, traditional values, and youth deviance impacted perceived procedural justice. In relation to perceived effectiveness of the police in

low-risk neighbourhoods, procedural justice, moral identification, and neighbourhood disorder impacted perceived effectiveness of police, whereas in high-risk neighbourhoods, procedural justice, moral identification, neighbourhood disorder, social cohesion, and obeying the police influenced perceived effectiveness (Pirnat & Meško, 2018).

References

1. Alvazzi del Frate, A., & van Kesteren, J. (2004). *Criminal victimisation in urban Europe – Key findings of the 2000 International crime victim surveys.* Turin: UNICRI.

2. Black, M. (1958). Notes on the meaning of 'rule'. *Theoria, 24*, 139–161.

3. Blader, S. L., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). A four-component model of procedural justice: Defining the meaning of a 'fair' process. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(6), 747–758.

4. Blumer, H. (1985). Race. Prejudice as a sense of group position. *Pacific Sociological Review*, 1, 3–7.

5. Covington, J., & Taylor, R. B. (1991). Fear of crime in urban residential neighborhoods: Implication of between – and within – neighborhood sources for current models. *The Sociological Quarterly, 32*(2), 231–249.

6. European Commission. (2014). *A harmonised definition of cities and rural areas: the new degree of urbanisation. Regional Working Paper 2014.* Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/sources/docgener/work/2014_01_new_urban.pdf

7. European Commission. (2016). *Quality of life in European cities 2015.* Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

8. European Forum for Urban Security. (2000). *Safety and democracy: The cities' manifesto.* Paris: European Forum for Urban Security.

9. European Forum for Urban Security. (2007). *Guidance on local safety audits: A compendium of international practice.* Paris: European Forum for Urban Security.

10. European Forum for Urban Security. (2016). *Methods and tools for a strategic approach to urban security.* Paris: European Forum for Urban Security.

11. European Forum for Urban Security. (2019). *European Forum for Urban Security (Efus).* Retrieved from https://efus.eu/en/about-us/about-efus/public/1450/

12. Gau, J. M., & Pratt, T. C. (2010). Revisiting broken windows theory: Examining the sources of the discriminant validity of perceived disorder and crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, (38), 758–766.

13. Gill, C., Weisburd, D., Telep, W. C., Vitter, Z., & Bennett, T. (2014). Community-oriented policing to reduce crime, disorder and fear and increase satisfaction and legitimacy among citizens: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 10*(4), 399–428.

14. Glaeser, L. E., & Sacerdote, B. (1999). Why is there more crime in cities? *Journal of Political Economy. 107*(6), 225–258.

15. Goudriaan, H., Witterbrood, K., & Nieuwbeerta, P. (2006). Neighbourhood characteristics and reporting crime: Effects of social cohesion, confidence in police effectiveness and socio-economic disadvantage. *British Journal of Criminology, 46*(4), 719–742.

16. Green Ljubljana. (2016). *Welcome to Ljubljana: European Green capital 2016.* Retrieved from http://www.greenljubljana.com/

17. Hacin, R., & Eman, K. (2016). Uporaba metod policijske analitike pri preprečevanju premoženjske kriminalitete v slovenskih urbanih okoljih [The use of police analytics for the prevention of property crime in Slovene urban environments]. In G. Meško, K. Eman, & U. Pirnat (Eds.). *Varnost v lokalnih skupnostih: (konferenčni zbornik)* (pp. 109–118). Maribor: Univerzitetna založba Univerze.

18. Haynie. D. L. (2001). Delinquent peers revisited: does network structure matter? *American Journal of Sociology, 106*, 1013–1057.

19. Hipp, J. R. (2010). Resident perceptions of crime and disorder: How much is 'bias' and how much is social environment differences? *Criminology, 48*(2), 475–508.

20. Hough, M., Jackson, J., & Bradford, B. (2013). Legitimacy, trust and compliance: An empirical test of procedural justice theory using the European social survey. In J. Tankebe & A. Liebling (Eds.), *Legitimacy and criminal justice: An International exploration* (pp. 1–27). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

21. Innes, M. (2004). Signal crimes and signal disorders: Notes on deviance as communicative action. *The British Journal of Sociology, 55*(3), 335–355.

22. International Centre for the Prevention of Crime. (2010). *International report on crime prevention and community safety: Trends and perspectives, 2010.* Montreal, Quebec: International Centre for the Prevention of Crime.

23. Kelling. G. L., & Wilson, J. Q. (1982). Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety. *The Atlantic, 294*(3), 29–38.

24. Klinkon, I., Meško, G., & Rebernik, D. (2004). *Vpliv socialnodemografskih dejavnikov na razvoj kriminalitete v Ljubljani: Rezultati preliminarnega raziskovanja* [The impact of sociodemographic factors on the developemnt of crime in Ljubljana: Results of a preliminary research]. In B. Lobnikar (Ed.), *5. slovenski dnevi varstvoslovja* (pp. 836–847). Ljubljana: Fakulteta za varnostne vede.

25. Laurence, J. (2011). The effect of ethnic diversity and community disadvantage on social cohesion: A multi-level analysis of social capital and interethnic relations in UK communities. *European Social Review, 27*(1), 70–89.

26. Lee, M. R. (2000). Community cohesion and violent predatory victimization: A theoretical extension and cross-national test of opportunity theory. *Social Forces, 79*(2), 683–706.

27. *Ljubljana.si.* Ljubljana v številkah. (2017). Retrieved from https://www.ljubljana.si/sl/o-ljubljani/ljubljana-v-stevilkah/

28. Lobnikar, B., & Meško, G. (2010). Responses of police and local authorities to security issues in Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia. In M. Cools (Ed.), *Police, policing, policy and the city in Europe* (pp. 161–179). The Hague: Eleven International Publishing.

29. Lobnikar. B., Prislan, K., & Modic, M. (2016). Merjenje uspešnosti implementacije policijskega dela v skupnosti v Sloveniji [Measuring the effectiveness of implementing community policing in Slovenia]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo, 67*(2), 89–110.

30. Meško, G., & Areh, I. (2003). Strah pred kriminaliteto v urbanih okoljih [Fear of crime in urban environment]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo, 54*(3), 144–152.

31. Meško, G., & Šifrer, J. (2008). Strah pred kriminaliteto v mestnem okolju – raziskava [Fear of crime in urban environment - research]. *Varstvoslovje, 10*(4), 539–560.

32. Meško, G., Fallshore, M., & Jevšek, A. (2007). Policija in strah pred kriminaliteto [Police and fear of crime]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo, 58*(4), 340–351.

33. Meško, G., Fallshore, M., Muratbegović. E., & Fields, C. (2008). Fear of crime in two post-socialist capital cities – Ljubljana, Slovenia and Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 36*(6), 546–553.

34. Meško, G., Maver, D., & Klinkon, I. (2010). Urban crime and criminal investigation in Slovenia. In G. Cordner, A. Cordner, & D. K.

Das (Eds.), *Urbanization, policing and security: global perspectives* (pp. 301–322). Boca Raton, London, New York: Taylor & Francis Group.

35. Meško, G., Sotlar, A., Lobnikar, B., Jere, M., & Tominc, B. (2012). *Občutek ogroženosti in vloga policije pri zagotavljanju varnosti na lokalni ravni: raziskovalno poročilo* [Feelings of insecurity and the role of police in ensuring safety on local level: Research report]. Ljubljana: Fakulteta za varnostne vede.

36. Meško, G., Šifrer, A., & Vošnjak, L. (2013). Strah pred kriminaliteto v mestnih in vaških okoljih v Sloveniji [Fear of crime urban and rural environments in Slovenia]. *Varstvoslovje, 14*(3), 259–276.

37. Meško, G., Tankebe, J., Jere, M., Eman. K., & Reisig, M. D. (2014). Vpliv postopkovne pravičnosti in legitimnosti policijske dejavnosti na spoštovanje zakonov pri slovenskih mladostnikih [Impact of procedural justice and police legitimacy on compliance with law among Slovenian adolescents]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo, 65*(1), 35–47.

38. Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve RS. (2014). *Poročilo o delu policije za 2013* [Annual report of police work for 2013]. Retrieved from https://vrs-3.vlada.si/MANDAT13/VLADNAGRADIVA.NSF/18a6b9887c33a0bdc12570e50034eb54/d23b09715da3480fc1257ced0040d1c4/$FILE/LetnoPorocilo2013.pdf

39. Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve RS. (2015). *Posvetovalna telesa* [Consultative bodies]. Retrieved from https://www.policija.si/index.php/policijske-uprave/pu-ljubljana/posvetovalna-telesa

40. Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve RS. (2017). *Letno poročilo o delu policije za 2016* [Annual report of police work for 2016]. Retrieved from https://www.policija.si/images/stories/Statistika/LetnaPorocila/PDF/LetnoPorocilo2016.pdf

41. Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve RS, Policija. (n. d.). *Prikaz območja, splošni podatki* [General information of the area]. Retrieved from https://www.policija.si/index.php/policijske-uprave/pu-ljubljana/obmoje-uprave

42. Pavlović, Z. (1993). Mednarodna anketa o viktimizaciji: Ljubljana 1992 [International Crime Survey – Ljubljana 1992]. *Revija za kriminalistiko in kriminologijo, 44*(2), 129–138.

43. Pečar, J. (1975). *Gostitve nekaterih deviantnih pojavov v Ljubljani* [The concentration of some deviant behaviour in Ljubljana]. Ljubljana: Inštitut za kriminologijo pri Pravni fakulteti.

44. Perkins, D. P., Meeks, J. W., & Taylor, R. B. (1992). The physical environment of street blocks and resident perception of crime and disorder: Implications for theory and measurement. *Journal of Environmental Psychology, 12*(1), 21–34.

45. Pirnat, U., & Meško, G. (2018). Varnost v urbanih lokalnih skupnostih – primerjava med soseskami v Ljubljani [Safety and security in urban local communities – a comparison between neighbourhoods in Ljubljana]. In G. Meško, A. Sotlar, & B. Lobnikar (Eds.), *4. Nacionalna konferenca o varnosti v lokalnih skupnostih: Sklepne ugotovitve raziskovanja (2015–2018)* (pp. 141–175). Maribor: Univerzitetna založba Univerze.

46. Pratt, T. C., & Cullen, F.T. (2005). Assessing macro-level predictors and theories of crime: A meta-analysis. In M. Tony (Ed.), *Crime and justice: A review of research* (pp. 373–450). Chicago: University of Chicago.

47. Raudenbush, S. W., & Sampson, R. J (1999). Ecometrics: Toward a science of assessing ecological settings, with application to the systematic social observation of neighborhoods. *Sociological Methodology, 29*(1), 1–41.

48. Rebernik, D. (2008). *Urbana geografija: Geografske značilnosti mest in urbanizacije v svetu* [Urban geography: geographical characteristics of cities and urbanisation in the world]. Ljubljana: Znanstvenoraziskovalni Inštitut Filozofske fakultete.

49. Rebernik, D. (2014). Population and spatial development of settlements in Ljubljana urban region after 2002. *Dela, 42*, 75–93.

50. Reisig, M. D. (2010). Community and problem-oriented policing. *Crime and Justice, 39*(1), 1–53.

51. Reisig, M. D., & Cancino, J. M. (2004). Incivilities in nonmetropolitan communities: The effects of structural constraints, social conditions, and crime. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 32*, 15–29.

52. Reisig, M. D., & Parks, R. B. (2000). Experience, quality of life, and neighbourhood context: A hierarchical analysis of satisfaction with police. *Justice Quarterly, 17*(3), 607–630.

53. Reisig, M. D., Tankebe, J., & Meško, G. (2014). Compliance with the law in Slovenia: The role of procedural justice and police legitimacy. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research, 20*(2), 259–276.

54. Ritchie, H., & Roser, M. (2018). Urbanization. *Ourworldindata.org*. Retrieved from https://ourworldindata.org/urbanization

55. Sampson, R.J. (2006). Collective efficacy theory: Lessons learned and directions for future inquiry. In F. T. Cullen, J. P. Wright, & K. Blevins (Eds.), *Taking stock: The status of criminological theory* (pp. 149–167). New Brunswick: Transaction.

56. Sampson, R. J. (2009). Analytic approaches to disorder. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 60(1), 83–93.

57. Sampson, R. J., & Groves. W. B. (1989). Community structure and crime: Testing social–disorganization theory. *American Sociological Review, 94*(4), 774–802.

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

59. Shaw, C. R., & McKay, H. D. (1942). *Juvenile delinquency and urban areas: A study of rates of delinquents in relation to differential characteristics of local communities in American cities.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

60. Skogan, W. G. (2009). Concern about crime and confidence in the police: Reassurance or accountability? *Police Quarterly, 12*(3), 301–318.

61. Skogan, W. G. (2011). Disorder and crime. In B. C. Welsh, & D. P. Farrington (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of crime prevention* (pp. 173–188). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

62. Sunshine, J., & Tyler, T. R. (2003). The role of procedural justice and legitimacy in shaping public support for policing. *Law & Society Review, 37*(3), 513–548.

63. Statistični urad Republike Slovenije. (2009). *Pilotna anketa o žrtvah kriminala, 2009* [A pilot study on victims of crime]. Retrieved from http://www.stat.si/StatWeb/glavnanavigacija/podatki/prikazistaronovico?IdNovice=3035

64. Tankebe, J. (2008). Police effectiveness and police trustworthiness in Ghana: An empirical appraisal. *Criminology and Criminal Justice, 8*(2), 185–202.

65. The European Urban Charter. (2008). *Congress of local and regional authorities of the council of Europe.* Retrieved from at https://5cidade.files.wordpress.com/2008/11/the-european-urban-charter.pdf

66. Trojanowicz, R., & Bucquerox, B. (1991). *Community policing and the challenge of diversity.* Rockville: National Institute of Justice.

67. Tyler, T. R. (1990). *Why people obey the law*. London: Yale University Press.

68. Tyler, T. R. (2003). Procedural justice, legitimacy, and the effective rule of law. *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research, 30*(1), 283–357.

69. Tyler, T. R., & Fagan, J. (2008). Legitimacy and cooperation: Why do people help the police fight crime in their communities? *Journal of Criminal Law, 6*, 231–275.

70. United Nations. (2011). *Introductory handbook on policing in urban space*. United nations office on drugs and crime (UNODC): New York. Retrieved from https://www.unodc.org/pdf/criminal_justice/Introductory_Handbook_on_Policing_Urban_Space.pdf

71. United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. (2010). *Handbook on the crime prevention guidelines: Making them work*. Vienna: United Nations.

72. van Dijk, J. J. M., Manchin, R., van Kesteren, J., & Hideg, G. (2005). *The burden of crime in the EU. Research report: A comparative analysis of the European survey of crime and safety* (EU ICS) 2005. Haag: WODC.

73. van Dijk, J. J. M., van Kesteren, J., & Smit, P. (2007). *Criminal victimisation & International perspective: Key findings from the 2004–2005 ICVS and EU ICS*. Haag: WODC.

74. Weitzer, R., & Tuch, S. A. (2005). Determinants of public satisfaction with the police. *Police Quarterly, 8*(3), 279–297.

75. Weziak Bialowska, D., & Dijkstra, L. (2015). *Trust, local governance and quality of public service in EU regions and cities*. Luxemburg: Publications Office of the European Union.

76. Wirth, L. (1938). Urbanism as a way of Life. *The American Journal of Sociology, 44*(1), 1–24.

77. World's Capital Cities. (2017). World's Safest Capital Cities. *Worldscapitalcities.com*. Retrieved from https://www.worldscapitalcities.com/worlds-safest-capital-cities/

78. Zakon o organiziranosti in delu v policiji [Law on Organisation and Work of the Police]. (2013). *Uradni list RS, 15*/13.

Zaznave varnostnih problemov, družbenih procesov in policije v urbanih soseskah – primer Ljubljane

Urška Pirnat, mag. varst., asistentka in mlada raziskovalka, Fakulteta za varnostne vede, Univerza v Mariboru, Slovenija.
E-pošta: urska.pirnat@fvv.uni-mb.si

Dr. Gorazd Meško, redni profesor za kriminologijo, Fakulteta za varnostne vede, Univerza v Mariboru, Slovenija.
E-pošta: gorazd.mesko@fvv.uni-mb.si

V prispevku predstavljamo zaznave varnostnih problemov, družbenih procesov in policije v urbanih soseskah. Leta 2017 je bila izvedena skupnostna anketa v Ljubljani, ki predstavlja največje urbano okolje v Sloveniji. Izvedenih je bilo 1.000 intervjujev s prebivalci, ki živijo v manj in bolj problematičnih soseskah. Analiza podatkov je pokazala razlike med zaznavami prebivalcev, ki živijo v manj in bolj problematičnih soseskah, glede različnih dejavnikov. Prebivalci manj problematičnih sosesk so zaznali manj kriminalitete in nereda v soseski. Glede družbenih procesov v soseskah so prebivalci manj problematičnih sosesk izrazili višjo stopnjo socialne kohezije, boljše mnenje o migrantih in manj zaznane odklonskosti mladih kot prebivalci bolj problematičnih sosesk. V preučevanju zaznav policije so prebivalci manj problematičnih sosesk zaznali več postopkovne pravičnosti, večjo učinkovitost policije in so bili bolj pripravljeni sodelovati s policijo. V sklepu razpravljamo o ugotovitvah študije, predstavljamo glavne omejitve študije in podajamo predloge za nadaljnje raziskovanje.

Ključne besede: varnost, urbane skupnosti, prebivalci, zaznave, Slovenija

UDK: 343.9+351.78(497.4)