

Review of: "Evaluating Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Principles in Educational Institutions: Occupant Insights"

Romina Fucà¹

¹ University of Verona

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The study focuses on a surveyed assessment of Indian educational institutions according to the principles of **Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) theory**. Educational institutions are therefore viewed from the perspective of how much safe they are and/or can be considered for the people studying in them. CPTED is a theory that focuses on modifying the physical environment to reduce opportunities for crime and enhance community safety. It emphasizes the role of urban design, architecture, and land use planning in deterring criminal behavior. R. Jeffery (1970s) prominent scholars in the field of CPTED because has enhanced together with Ron Clarke the fact that **SCP (Situational Crime Prevention)** interventions must be tailored to specific types of crimes or criminal activities. Literature examples include i. installing security cameras, ii. improving lighting in crime-prone areas, or iii. using access control measures to restrict entry to certain places. This means that CPTED strategies can be more effective in reducing crime, when combined with other community-based approaches, such as law enforcement efforts and social programs. The authors mentioned in this paper enhanced **PMH (Place Management Hypothesis)**, it focuses on the management and maintenance of public spaces to prevent disorder and crime. It emphasizes the role of place managers, such as property owners, landlords, and community organizations, in creating safe and well-maintained environments. Finally, **Rational Choice Perspective (RCP)**, the **Routine Activity Approach (RAA)**, and the **Crime Pattern Theory (CPT)**, often all grounded in the *Rational Choice Theory (RCT)*, suggest that potential offenders make decisions based on the perceived benefits and risks of engaging in criminal behaviour other than on the specific circumstances of the situation (Smith & Clarke, 2012).

The social-ecological model promoted by the authors in their conclusions acknowledges that violence prevention is not solely about addressing individual behaviours or isolated incidents. It recognizes the importance of creating a campus environment that promotes safety and well-being by addressing these multiple interconnected factors. This model recognizes that violence and negative behaviours within a campus environment are influenced by a complex interplay of various factors, such as:

- **Physical factors:** These include the physical layout and design of the campus. This can encompass factors like lighting, building security, access control, and the overall environmental design. By modifying these physical elements, campuses can reduce opportunities for violence and enhance safety.
- **Social factors:** The social environment within a campus, including the relationships and interactions among individuals,

plays a crucial role in violence prevention. Promoting positive social interactions, fostering a sense of community, and addressing issues like bullying and harassment are part of this dimension.

- Legal factors: Campus violence prevention involves adhering to and enforcing relevant laws, policies, and regulations. Legal measures can be put in place to deter and address violent behaviors, such as implementing disciplinary policies and procedures.
- Economic factors: Economic factors can influence campus violence in various ways. For example, financial stress among students or disparities in economic opportunities can contribute to tensions and conflicts. Addressing economic disparities and providing support to economically disadvantaged students can be part of a violence prevention strategy.

A list of accidents happened in three Indian colleges is shown in **Table 1**. These accidents are mostly related to violence has a political underground, and do not compelling relate with sexual-physical attacks against women. The list is blurred because authors have changed of idea during this proceeding on Qeios platform. In the previous version there were attacks were not really clear whether classical examples of violence against people and/or violence due to special geographical/contextual locations (example: monkeys and snakes attacks).

Sub-section 2.2. is an overview of CPTED concept and principles. Table 1 is a summary of the key features along the three CPTED generations, which represents the three steps its concept and principles have known from the 1960s until nowadays. A list of organizations and institutions promoting CPTED in India is then mentioned, with some technological institutes, such as the IIT Delhi, interested in implementing and developing an approach at CPTED be either architectural—as it discusses landscaping, lighting, and other “layout of spaces” can be relevant to the promotion of safety in the built environment—and one is keen on exploration of the underlying cultural and community needs for feeling safe.

Section 3 is a literature review of CPTED strategies generally put into effect in educational institutions. It is a hard bargaining between strict control of people movements by one side and the sense of autonomy as felt by students and implicitly involving their proficiency and goodwill in studies by the other side. Sections 4 and 5 are devoted to the empirical attempt of authors to inquire into eighteen Indian educational institutions through a survey questionnaire. Their location is shown in Table 3. Bar Chart 01 illustrates the types of occupants who participated in the online survey. The student in Lucknow responding to the survey seems to be the only people characterized by the label “yes” (3.3% on the total of the surveyed 30 people).

Students made up the highest percentage of survey participants at 14%, followed by faculty at 7%, and other groups such as professionals, professors, and non-staff residents at approximately 3.3%. The total number of random samples collected for the study was 61. Bar Chart 02 lists various institutions with which the survey participants are associated. These institutions are likely the locations where the study was conducted. The survey was designed in three phases. Phase 1: Case Study Approach involved a checklist and the collection of photographs through observational methods, guided by the literature study. Phase 2: Survey 1 focused on analyzing whether the principles of CPTED are applied in the built environment of institutional spaces. The survey includes questions related to i. the perception of occupants regarding safety, ii. the impact of mental health in relation to spaces, iii. reactions to the existing safety scenario in educational institutions, and iv. the awareness and application of CPTED principles within the campus. These

details indicate that the study involved a multi-phase approach to gather data and assess the application of CPTED principles in various educational institutions across India.

The submitted questions are shown in pie charts 14.2.1 to 14.2.5. Other questions are shown in pie charts 14.3.1 to 14.3.3, and from 14.4.1 to 14.4.3. Questions are essentially related to i. lightning, ii. surveillance cameras' presence, and iii. maintenance of public spaces.

Amendments:

- Figure/Table 1 Analysis of type, level, factors,... is worst than in the previous version of your submission. Please restore the preceding figure or delete it,
- Please uniform style at Table 01's title, putting the double points after 01 as you did in "Table 02:",
- Sub-section 11c. Please put in capital letter the first word in the title "Check ...",
- Samples of Questionnaire 01 and 02 at **Section 12. Primary Data** are blurred and not really legible. I guess this is just a matter with the online version before submitting to a Journal,
- Figure 02: Field Observation Check List and Figure 11d. Parameters for questionnaire survey 01 are both tables and not figures. Please amend and check all Figures/Tables numbering in your submitted writing,
- Please identify the list of the eighteen Indian educational institutions you have inquired through survey questionnaires as Table 3, and mention its appearance in the main body previously or after the Table. Please check the numbering order at Tables/Figures along the paper,
- Samples of Questionnaire 01 and 02 at **Section 12. Primary Data** are blurred and not really legible. I guess this is just a matter with the online version before submitting to a Journal,
- Bar Chart 01: Analysed Report with various parameters with respect to entry and exit at **Section 15. Findings** is blurred and not really legible. I guess this is just a matter with the online version before submitting to a Journal.

References:

- Andersson, E., Haase, D., Anderson, P. *et al.* (2021). What are the traits of a social-ecological system: towards a framework in support of urban sustainability. *npj Urban Sustain* **1**, 14. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42949-020-00008-4>
- Kilanowski, J. F. *et al.* (2017). Breadth of the Socio-Ecological Model, *Journal of Agromedicine*, 22:4, 295-297, doi: [10.1080/1059924X.2017.1358971](https://doi.org/10.1080/1059924X.2017.1358971)
- Peguero, A.A., Hong, J.S. (2020). The Relevance of the Social-Ecological Model and the Significance of Stratification. In: *School Bullying. Springer Series on Child and Family Studies*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-64367-6_2
- Salihu, H. M., Wilson, R. E., King, L. M., Marty, P. J., & Whiteman, V. E. (2015). Socio-ecological Model as a Framework for Overcoming Barriers and Challenges in Randomized Control Trials in Minority and Underserved Communities. *International journal of MCH and AIDS*, 3(1), 85–95.
- Salmon, J., Hesketh, K., Arundell, L., Downing, K., & Biddle, S. (2020). Changing Behavior Using Ecological Models. In M.

Hagger, L. Cameron, K. Hamilton, N. Hankonen, & T. Lintunen (Eds.), *The Handbook of Behavior Change* (Cambridge Handbooks in Psychology, pp. 237-250). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. doi: 10.1017/9781108677318.017.