POLICE OFFICERS' PERSPECTIVES ON SOCIAL COHESION IN THE NEIGHBOURHOOD

AUTHORS: ANA NOVAK, EVA ZAVRŠNIK

Univerza v Mariboru
Fakulteta za varnostne vede

arrs
JAVNA AGENCIJA ZA RAZISKOVALNO DEJAVNOST
REPUBLIKE SLOVENIJE

UNIVERZITET CRNE GORE
PRAVNI FAKULTET

UCG

VARNOST V LOKALNIH SKUPNOSTIH

Student conference on Security and Safety in local communities, Podgorica, Montenegro, 9. 4. 2019

Understanding social cohesion

- **Model of social quality**

1. **Social and economic security**

2. **Social inclusion**

3. **Community cohesion**

4. **Strengthening individuals' capacities**

Social cohesion is an important factor that affects individuals' perception of safety in their local neighbourhood (Eman and Hacin, 2018).

Results – factor analysis

Social cohesion in the neighbourhood	F.L.*	M	S.D.**	Median	Mode
(M = 2,87; S.D. = 0.78; α = 0.83; KMO = 0.91; var. = 66.09%) [a]					
Residents help each other.	0.84	2.83	0.94	3.00	3
The neighbourhood is closely connected.	0.83	2.60	0.86	3.00	3
Residents trust each other.	0.85	2.57	0.86	3.00	3
Residents know each other.	0.78	3.11	1.07	3.00	3
Residents, if necessary, come together and solve common problems.	0.81	2.96	0.92	3.00	3
When someone is not at home, he can rely on neighbours to look after his home or possible problems.	0.81	3.05	1.00	3.00	3
If someone in need would have needed 25 EUR, neighbours would lend it to him.	0.78	2.84	1.09	3.00	3

Principal component factoring; rotation Varimax.
* F.L. – Factor loading.
** S.D. – Standard deviation.
[a] Scale: from 1 – Strongly disagree to 5 – Strongly agree.

Results – factor analysis

Social cohesion in the neighbourhood	F.L.*	M	S.D.**	Median	Mode
(M = 2,87; S.D. = 0.78; α = 0.83; KMO = 0.91; var. = 66.09%) [a]					
Residents help each other.	0.84	2.83	0.94	3.00	3
The neighbourhood is closely connected.	0.83	2.60	0.86	3.00	3
Residents trust each other.	0.85	2.57	0.86	3.00	3
Residents know each other.	0.78	3.11	1.07	3.00	3
Residents, if necessary, come together and solve common problems.	0.81	2.96	0.92	3.00	3
When someone is not at home, he can rely on neighbours to look after his home or possible problems.	0.81	3.05	1.00	3.00	3
If someone in need would have needed 25 EUR, neighbours would lend it to him.	0.78	2.84	1.09	3.00	3

Principal component factoring; rotation Varimax.
* F.L. – Factor loading.
** S.D. – Standard deviation.
[a] Scale: from 1 – Strongly disagree to 5 – Strongly agree.

Results – discriminant analysis

Variable	Small police station n = 159		Medium police station n = 110		Large police station n = 240		Wilks' Lambda	F
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.		
Social cohesion in the neighbourhood	3.16	0.72	2.90	0.76	2.69	0.76	0.93	19.01***
Residents help each other.	3.12	0.94	2.87	0.91	2.63	0.91	0.95	13.57***
The neighbourhood is closely connected.	2.76	0.83	2.56	0.81	2.51	0.88	0.98	4.37*
Residents trust each other.	2.81	0.85	2.50	0.84	2.45	0.85	0.97	9.00***
Residents know each other.	3.57	0.97	3.20	1.12	2.77	1.00	0.89	30.08***
Residents, if necessary, come together and solve common problems.	3.15	0.90	3.02	0.98	2.84	0.87	0.98	5.74**
When someone is not at home, he can rely on neighbours to look after his home or possible problems.	3.35	0.98	3.18	0.95	2.80	0.98	0.94	16.84***
If someone in need would have needed 25 EUR, neighbours would lend it to him.	3.08	1.11	2.85	1.06	2.69	1.07	0.98	6.06**
Wilks' Lambda	0.86***							

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.

Results – discriminant analysis

Variable	Small police station n = 159		Medium police station n = 110		Large police station n = 240		Wilks' Lambda	F
	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.		
Social cohesion in the neighbourhood	3.16	0.72	2.90	0.76	2.69	0.76	0.93	19.01***
Residents help each other.	3.12	0.94	2.87	0.91	2.63	0.91	0.95	13.57***
The neighbourhood is closely connected.	2.76	0.83	2.56	0.81	2.51	0.88	0.98	4.37*
Residents trust each other.	2.81	0.85	2.50	0.84	2.45	0.85	0.97	9.00***
Residents know each other.	3.57	0.97	3.20	1.12	2.77	1.00	0.89	30.08***
Residents, if necessary, come together and solve common problems.	3.15	0.90	3.02	0.98	2.84	0.87	0.98	5.74**
When someone is not at home, he can rely on neighbours to look after his home or possible problems.	3.35	0.98	3.18	0.95	2.80	0.98	0.94	16.84***
If someone in need would have needed 25 EUR, neighbours would lend it to him.	3.08	1.11	2.85	1.06	2.69	1.07	0.98	6.06**
Wilks' Lambda	0.86***							

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001.

Discussion

- The level of fear of crime and sense of security

- Public expectations for police work can be different

- Rural areas have more community oriented societies, that is, a more dense network of individual interconnections based on mutual cultural obligations (Meško, 2018).

Discussion

- The research on security in local communities has shown that we find the strongest correlation between the sense of security among citizens and social cohesion, which is present in the neighborhood (Pirnat, Hacin and Meško, 2018).

- The inhabitants of the local community perceive higher social cohesion than police officers.

- We think that this is due to two reasons:
  - nature of police work
  - lack of community oriented police work

Conclusion

- The welfare state has a strong influence on increasing the sense of security, increasing social cohesion and trust, and lowering the risk in vital areas.

- The social capital that we need for it is produced through the connection and integration of people into local events. With more people of different occupations the more trust can be established between them (Dragoš and Leskošek, 2018).

THANKS FOR YOUR ATTENTION

ANY QUESTIONS?

NO? GREAT!

KeepCalmAndPosters.com