



International Journal of Criminology & Justice (IJCJ)

VOLUME 2 ISSUE 1 (2026)



PUBLISHED BY
E-PALLI PUBLISHERS, DELAWARE, USA

Community Safety Awareness and Crime Prevention Practices: A Correlational Study in Kidapawan City

John Paul Lidres¹, Dranrave Cloyd C. Cardenas¹, Lexter C. Soncio¹, John Lester G. Pascua¹,
Rico O. Soledad, Rcrim¹, French Arvy Jay^{1*}

Article Information

Received: June 30, 2026

Accepted: September 05, 2026

Published: September 08, 2025

Keywords

Community Policing, Community Safety Awareness, Crime Prevention Practices, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), Kidapawan City

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between community safety awareness and crime prevention practices among 397 adult residents of Kidapawan City selected through proportionate stratified random sampling across 40 barangays. It employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational, cross-sectional design. Awareness was assessed across Individual and Family, Community, and School and Work domains, while prevention practices covered Technology, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), Physical Monitoring, and Counter Crime Against Property. Data were analysed using means, standard deviations, Spearman's rank-order correlation, and median quantile regression. Overall awareness was high ($M = 4.29$, $SD = 0.511$), with Individual and Family obtaining the highest mean ($M = 4.50$), followed by School and Work ($M = 4.25$) and Community ($M = 4.10$). Prevention practices were also generally high: CPTED ($M = 4.00$), Counter Crime Against Property ($M = 3.93$), Physical Monitoring ($M = 3.81$), and Technology ($M = 3.63$). Overall awareness was positively associated with Technology ($\rho = .436$), CPTED ($\rho = .560$), Physical Monitoring ($\rho = .428$), and Counter Crime Against Property ($\rho = .324$), all $p < .001$. Median quantile regression showed that Community Awareness was positively associated with all prevention domains ($b = .489-.776$). Thus, residents with stronger safety awareness tended to report greater engagement in crime prevention. However, the cross-sectional correlational design does not establish causation.

INTRODUCTION

Crime prevention increasingly involves more than formal law-enforcement activity. Contemporary approaches recognize that residents, families, community organizations, local governments, and police institutions all influence the conditions under which crime-prevention practices are adopted and sustained. Place-based crime-prevention research indicates that interventions concentrated on specific environments can meaningfully reduce crime, although their effectiveness varies by implementation, context, and the type of intervention used (Abt *et al.*, 2024). This suggests that crime prevention is most appropriately understood as a combination of institutional, environmental, technological, and community-based strategies rather than as a single intervention.

Against this background, the study examined community safety awareness and crime-prevention practices among residents of Kidapawan City. Community safety awareness was assessed in terms of Individual and Family, Community, and School and Work, while crime-prevention practices were examined through Technology, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design, Physical Monitoring, and Counter Crime Against Property. The study further determined the statistical relationships between these domains and examined how the three dimensions of safety awareness were associated with crime-prevention practices at the median level.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Environmental and situational approaches remain particularly relevant to community safety. Widmark's (2026) systematic review and meta-analysis of residential crime-prevention interventions found that environmental-design measures were associated with reductions in property crime, particularly when strategies involved target hardening and access control. However, the substantial variation across studies demonstrates that the effectiveness of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) depends on local conditions and implementation quality rather than operating uniformly across communities.

Philippine evidence likewise emphasizes the relationship between community conditions and preventive action. Amar and Nabe (2024), in a study involving 382 residents of Kidapawan City, found high levels of participation in crime-prevention activities and positive assessments of community safety, with significant relationships among crime prevention, community safety, and perceptions of the police. Their findings provide a particularly relevant local foundation for examining community safety within Kidapawan City while demonstrating that public safety involves both residents' preventive practices and their relationships with formal institutions.

Community participation can strengthen crime-prevention efforts, but participation should not automatically be equated with crime reduction. Blair *et al.* (2021), in

¹ Central Mindanao Colleges, Philippines

* Corresponding author's e-mail: fguevarra@cmc.edu.ph

coordinated field experiments across six countries in the Global South, including the Philippines, found that community-policing interventions experienced mixed implementation and did not consistently improve citizen–police relations or reduce crime. In contrast, Boller-Piol *et al.* (2024) found that community-mobilization programs in Batangas Province supported police–community relations through community organization, information, empowerment, and mobilization activities. A more locally situated perspective is provided by Osumo *et al.* (2025), whose qualitative study of residents in Cotabato found that engagement with local-government programs and policies was supported by access to information, collaboration, cooperation, and communication but hindered by inadequate communication, time and financial constraints, limited interest, and political partisanship. Although their study did not specifically examine crime prevention, it demonstrates that residents' participation in locally implemented programs depends partly on communication, inclusiveness, and responsive governance. Taken together, these findings suggest that community-based crime prevention depends substantially on implementation quality, institutional capacity, and the depth of citizen participation. Recent E-Palli research on community safety also highlights the importance of local conditions, community participation, and governance factors in understanding safety perceptions and community-based responses (Dacalanio *et al.*, 2026; Osumo *et al.*, 2025).

Trust and institutional performance also shape the environment in which residents engage with public-safety initiatives. Regalado and Sun (2024), using Philippine survey data, found that social trust and perceptions of institutional performance were important in explaining public trust in the police and courts. Community safety awareness should therefore be understood not merely as knowledge of crime risks but also as residents' recognition of safety practices, willingness to participate, and perceived capacity to cooperate with community and institutional actors.

The present study is anchored in Social Control Theory, Routine Activity Theory, and Community Policing Theory. Hirschi's (1969) Social Control Theory emphasizes how attachment, commitment, involvement, and belief connect individuals to conventional social norms and institutions. In the present study, household cooperation, community relationships, and shared safety practices represent forms of informal social control that may accompany greater engagement in crime prevention. Routine Activity Theory (Cohen & Felson, 1979) explains crime opportunities through the convergence of a motivated offender, a suitable target, and the absence of capable guardianship. Practices such as securing homes, monitoring property, improving visibility, and reporting suspicious behavior can therefore be understood as forms of guardianship intended to reduce opportunities for offending. Community Policing Theory, associated with Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990), complements

these perspectives by emphasizing partnership, problem-solving, accessibility, and shared responsibility between police and the communities they serve.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants

The study involved 397 adult residents of Kidapawan City drawn from the city's 40 barangays. Eligible respondents were at least 18 years old, had resided in their respective barangay for at least one year, and were familiar with community safety or crime-prevention activities. Individuals below 18 years old, residents with less than one year of residence, and individuals unwilling to provide informed consent were excluded.

A target sample of approximately 397 respondents was determined using Cochran's sample-size formula at a 95% confidence level, an estimated proportion of .50, and a 5% margin of error. Proportionate stratified random sampling was employed, with barangays serving as the strata and respondents selected according to the population represented by each barangay. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed of the purpose and procedures of the study, confidentiality measures, and their right to decline or withdraw without penalty.

Instrument

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire composed of two major measures. The first assessed Community Safety Awareness through three domains: Individual and Family, Community, and School and Work. The original manuscript states that this component was adapted from Sands (2003), whose work on individual responses to community safety and violence prevention is also cited in later Philippine community-safety research. The questionnaire used in the present study included household safety behaviors, neighborhood and community conditions, and safety practices within school and workplace settings.

The second measure assessed Crime Prevention Practices through four domains: Technology, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), Physical Monitoring, and Counter Crime Against Property. Technology included practices involving CCTV, security lighting, and similar protective tools. CPTED addressed environmental visibility, access control, gates, and other modifications to physical space. Physical Monitoring involved observation, reporting, collaboration with public-safety actors, and property checking. Counter Crime Against Property covered behaviors intended to protect homes and property from theft, vandalism, and related offenses.

The original manuscript attributes the crime-prevention measure to Kadatuan *et al.* (2021). However, the bibliographic information provided for that source could not be independently verified. The attribution should therefore remain provisional until the researchers produce the original study or questionnaire from which

the items were adopted or adapted.

Both sections employed five-point response scales, with higher scores representing stronger reported safety awareness or greater engagement in crime-prevention practices. The manuscript indicates that the questionnaire was intended to undergo pilot testing and expert validation but does not report a completed pilot-test sample, Cronbach's alpha coefficient, or other numerical reliability result. Consequently, no reliability coefficient should be claimed in the FACCI manuscript unless the researchers can provide the actual validation and pilot-testing records (DeVellis & Thorpe, 2021).

Method of Data Analysis

Means and standard deviations were used to summarize community safety awareness and crime-prevention practices. Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient was used to determine the strength and direction of the associations between the three safety-awareness domains and the four crime-prevention domains. Statistical significance was evaluated at the .05 level.

Median quantile regression ($\tau = .50$) was subsequently employed to examine the simultaneous statistical associations of Individual and Family, Community, and School and Work awareness with the median levels of Technology, CPTED, Physical Monitoring, and Counter Crime Against Property. Unstandardized coefficients and robust standard errors were used to interpret the models. Because the study was cross-sectional and nonexperimental, significant regression coefficients were treated as statistical associations rather than evidence that awareness caused particular crime-prevention behaviors.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the study's conclusions and recommendations, based on the results and discussion in the previous chapter. It synthesizes key findings on how individual, family, community, and school/work safety awareness influences various crime prevention practices. The chapter also provides practical recommendations to enhance community-driven crime prevention efforts and foster safer, more resilient neighborhoods.

Community Safety Awareness

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics for community safety awareness across the three domains: Individual and Family, Community, and School/Work. While the interpretation scale identifies the results as "High" to "Very High," it is important to clarify that these values reflect positive perceptions and reported behaviors, not necessarily objective or measured safety awareness. High levels of agreement indicate that respondents believe they consistently practice safety measures. With this clarification, the overall composite mean is 4.29 with a standard deviation of 0.511, suggesting that respondents perceive themselves as highly engaged in safety-related routines across personal, community, and institutional settings. Such results are particularly relevant in rural policing contexts like Kidapawan City, where formal police resources are limited and communities rely heavily on informal social control, household preparedness, and cooperative neighborhood actions.

The Individual and Family domain recorded the highest composite score, with a mean of 4.50 and a standard deviation of 0.541, indicating that respondents

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for Community Safety Awareness Indicators

Item	M	SD	Descriptive Level
Individual and Family			
Members of my family respect one another and cooperate to keep our home safe.	4.61	0.687	Very High
Our household locks the doors and windows before sleeping or leaving home.	4.63	0.652	Very High
We keep our emergency contact numbers visible in our house.	4.32	0.799	High
I am aware of the risks of domestic violence and know where to seek help if needed.	4.47	0.770	High
Our family practices peaceful conflict resolution to prevent violent at home.	4.46	0.719	High
Composite Score	4.50	0.541	Very High
Community			
I am involved in community meetings and events.	4.12	0.845	High
Teenagers in our neighborhood have a good relationship with the police and barangay officials.	4.23	0.812	High
I feel safe walking alone in the evening or at night in my neighborhood.	4.19	0.896	High
Our neighborhood has an active neighborhood watch or barangay tanod patrol.	4.11	0.887	High
I feel safe that our house is protected against robbery.	4.27	0.880	High
I feel safe in my neighborhood without the need for weapons at home.	4.09	0.998	High

It is safe for children to play outside in my neighborhood.	4.20	0.929	High
I feel safe in my community.	4.23	0.982	High
I feel respected in my community.	3.98	1.215	High
There are safe and well-maintained parks or playgrounds in my community.	3.95	1.183	High
I know a number of people on my block by first name.	3.76	1.235	High
Composite Score	4.10	0.629	High
School and Work			
I feel safe and secure in my school or workplace.	4.19	0.992	High
People in my workplace/school look out for each other's safety.	4.25	0.972	High
Parents in my neighborhood monitor their children's school activities for safety.	4.35	0.865	High
Teachers and staff in schools try to prevent bullying.	4.31	0.900	High
People in the community are concerned about school violence.	4.30	0.870	High
Children in the community are not afraid to go to school.	4.35	0.847	High
Bullying and violence are not problems in local and public schools.	4.04	1.089	High
Composite Score	4.25	0.667	High
Community Safety Awareness (Overall Composite)	4.29	0.511	High

Note. The response scale for Part I ranged from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). Descriptive levels are based on the following mean ranges: 1.00–1.79 (Very Low), 1.80–2.59 (Low), 2.60–3.39 (Moderate), 3.40–4.19 (High), 4.20–5.00 (Very High). M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation.

consistently report locking doors and windows, resolving household conflicts peacefully, maintaining emergency contacts, and being aware of domestic violence risks. These behaviors suggest that households serve as the primary source of safety structure, shaping daily habits that minimize vulnerability. The findings are consistent with Akter *et al.* (2022) and Raitasalo *et al.* (2021), who observed that communication, parental supervision, and shared responsibility significantly decrease risky behaviors and delinquency among family members. Likewise, Catalano *et al.* (2018) emphasized that strong family environments serve as the first layer of informal control—an idea that aligns closely with Social Control Theory. In rural settings where police response may be slower due to geographic dispersion, these household-based practices serve as informal yet effective forms of guardianship, contributing to Routine Activity Theory's emphasis on reducing opportunities for crime.

The Community domain shows a composite mean of 4.10 and a standard deviation of 0.629, reflecting respondents' general sense of security and strong neighborhood cohesion. Many reported feeling safe walking at night, observing active barangay tanod patrols, and having positive relations with local authorities. These indicators demonstrate strong informal social control and high levels of mutual trust, supporting the findings of Sampson *et al.* (2018) and Agatep *et al.* (2019) that community cohesion plays a crucial role in crime reduction. Similarly, the results align with Sullivan and Lopez (2017), whose study on community watch programs confirmed that citizen patrols and collective vigilance significantly lower property crimes. Although respondents rated environmental maintenance—such as parks and public spaces—slightly lower, the values still fall within the

“High” category. This supports Kim *et al.* (2018), who found that well-maintained environments enhance feelings of safety and increase natural surveillance. Within the lens of rural policing dynamics, these findings emphasize how barangay patrols and strong community participation compensate for a limited police workforce, strengthening legitimacy and improving responsiveness as residents actively collaborate with local authorities.

The School/Work domain presents a composite mean of 4.25 and a standard deviation of 0.667, indicating strong perceptions of safety in educational and workplace environments. High ratings on anti-bullying initiatives, staff vigilance, and children's monitoring suggest that institutions are effectively implementing structured safety protocols. These findings reflect Shariati and Guerette (2019) and Vagi *et al.* (2018), who demonstrated that CPTED-based improvements and high institutional supervision significantly reduce violence and enhance perceived safety. Respondents' perceptions also support Geller's (2016) assertion that safety is shaped not only by physical structures but also by behavioral norms encouraged within schools and workplaces. In rural areas, schools and workplaces often serve as central hubs for community interaction; thus, their safety programs contribute to wider community participation and strengthen public trust in local authorities—key components of Community Policing Theory.

Taken together, the composite mean is 4.29, with a standard deviation of 0.511, indicating that respondents consistently perceive themselves as practicing safety-conscious behaviors across home, community, and institutional settings. These results reinforce the findings of Mendoza and Garcia (2018) and Rivera (2019), who documented that communities with higher safety

awareness—whether measured through perception or behavior—also exhibit stronger cooperation, vigilance, and preparedness during emergencies. The pattern observed in Kidapawan City aligns with the anchored theories of the study: Social Control Theory is reflected through strong family and community bonds; Routine Activity Theory is supported by daily safety routines that increase capable guardianship; and Community Policing Theory is demonstrated through positive perceptions of barangay patrols and cooperative relationships with local authorities. Overall, the findings suggest that safety awareness in the area is shaped by a combination of household practices, community cohesion, and institutional support—factors that play a crucial role in strengthening crime prevention in rural and semi-urban environments.

Crime Prevention Practices

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics of the four major domains of crime prevention practices: Technology, Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED), Physical Monitoring, and Counter Crime Against Property. The results show consistently high levels of crime-prevention behaviors, indicating that respondents demonstrate proactive attitudes toward protecting their homes, property, and surroundings. These patterns are particularly important in the context of rural policing in Kidapawan City, where a limited police workforce and wide geographic coverage mean that effective crime prevention often depends on community initiative, informal guardianship, and collaborative safety efforts.

The Technology domain obtained a composite score with a mean of 3.63, indicating that respondents frequently use technological tools such as CCTV

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for Crime Prevention Practices Indicators

Item	M	SD	Descriptive Level
Technology			
I install CCTV camera facing the front gate.	3.70	1.422	High
I save CCTV Footages in the hard disk of the computer.	3.66	1.392	High
I install tracking chips in vehicles and appliances.	3.39	1.421	Moderate
I install security lighting on doors, gates, and other entrances.	3.72	1.423	High
I installed CCTV inside the house.	3.68	1.545	High
Composite Score	3.63	1.194	High
Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)			
I could not see the inside of the house compound when I am outside.	3.84	1.235	High
I close gates and doors all the time.	4.19	1.038	High
I build spaces that are more open and visible to security personnel.	4.06	1.164	High
I decrease landscaping so that attackers cannot hide themselves.	4.02	1.113	High
I use single, clearly identifiable point of entry.	3.90	1.164	High
Composite Score	4.00	0.808	High
Physical Monitoring			
I work with local public agencies and other organizations on solving common problem.	3.68	1.225	High
I raise dogs as pet to deter thieves from entering the compound.	3.92	1.239	High
I give incentives to Barangay Tanods to guard the place during night time.	3.55	1.352	High
I report crime or suspicious activity immediately to the police.	3.94	1.240	High
I check properties every day.	3.98	1.140	High
Composite Score	3.81	0.912	High
Counter Crime Against Property			
I expect that police patrols had a knowledge on self-defense.	4.16	1.052	High
I am trained in self-defense.	3.94	1.139	High
I equipped with cameras in my cellphone.	4.09	1.091	High
I am always aware on crime against property.	4.24	0.959	High
I would make sure that their unit number is clearly visible from paths in the development.	3.87	1.208	High
I attend police patrol weekly lecture or monthly lecture regarding crime against property.	3.69	1.295	High

Our barangay chairman make polices to prevent theft and vandalism.	3.79	1.147	High
Our police patrols are always aware on the residents. Always check every barangay.	3.98	1.067	High
I remove loose rocks and other objects that could be used to vandalize their property.	3.90	1.135	High
I need to provide the PVEPD with an entry code if their home is gated or if they live in a gated apartment complex.	3.65	1.243	High
Composite Score	3.93	0.753	High

Note. The response scale for Part II ranged from 1 (Never) to 5 (Always). Descriptive levels are based on the following mean ranges: 1.00–1.79 (Very Low), 1.80–2.59 (Low), 2.60–3.39 (Moderate), 3.40–4.19 (High), 4.20–5.00 (Very High). M = Mean; SD = Standard Deviation

cameras, security lighting, and home-based surveillance systems. High ratings for installing CCTV at the front gate and inside the house indicate that technology is viewed as a primary means of reducing vulnerability to crime. These results support Dorado *et al.* (2024), who emphasized that CCTV and online reporting systems enhance police responsiveness and deter crime. Similarly, Cruda *et al.* (2023) found that digital tools, such as mobile applications and predictive analytics, improve patrol allocation and response times, thereby contributing to safer communities. However, the lower mean value for installing tracking devices suggests that more advanced technologies remain financially inaccessible for many households—consistent with Vial (2019), who observed that digital transformation requires economic capacity and user readiness. In rural areas, where police response times may be slower, this reliance on basic yet accessible technology strengthens both individual preparedness and community vigilance, thereby indirectly enhancing police legitimacy by reinforcing cooperation.

The CPTED domain shows a composite score with a mean of 4.00, indicating that respondents consistently apply environmental strategies to reduce opportunities for crime. High ratings for closing gates, maintaining open visibility, and reducing landscaping reflect an understanding that physical layouts influence offender behavior. These findings align with Cozens and Love (2015), who argued that improved lighting, visibility, and spatial organization reduce criminal activity. Likewise, Ceccato and Newton (2015) found that public areas designed with clear sightlines and fewer hiding spots experienced fewer incidents of theft and assault. The practice of using a single identifiable point of entry also echoes Armitage and Monchuk (2017), who reported that controlled access reduces antisocial behavior in residential spaces. In the context of rural policing, these CPTED practices reduce the burden on law enforcement by strengthening natural surveillance and community self-regulation. The community's active role in modifying its environment enhances police responsiveness, as safer, well-maintained neighborhoods require fewer reactive interventions.

The Physical Monitoring domain shows a high composite score, with a mean of 3.81, indicating strong community involvement and individual vigilance.

Respondents reported checking their properties daily, working with public agencies, raising dogs for security, and immediately reporting suspicious activities to authorities. These behaviors demonstrate a high level of informal guardianship, which is essential in rural or semi-urban communities where formal police patrols are limited. The findings support Weisburd *et al.* (2016), who found that visible presence—such as foot patrols or neighborhood watch groups—reduces street-level crimes. The willingness to report incidents aligns with Sullivan and Lopez (2017), who emphasized that active residents significantly contribute to deterring property crimes. Providing incentives to barangay tanods supports Agatep *et al.*'s (2019) conclusion that community support strengthens local patrol systems and improves crime detection. These practices reinforce community participation, a core principle of community policing, and strengthen police legitimacy by demonstrating shared responsibility for maintaining safety.

The Counter Crime Against Property domain yielded a composite score with a mean of 3.93, indicating that respondents actively engage in behaviors that safeguard their property. High ratings for awareness of property-crime risks, training in self-defense, and the use of phone cameras indicate strong preparedness and the ability to respond to threats. These findings align with Tilley and Sidebottom (2017), who concluded that target-hardening strategies such as locks, surveillance, and lighting significantly reduce burglary risks. Welsh and Farrington (2015) likewise observed that the visible presence of CCTV reduces property-related crime. Participation in police patrol lectures and expectations for police vigilance parallel Gill *et al.* (2016), who found that community policing fosters trust and strengthens cooperation. The emphasis on police patrols being familiar with residents supports Braga, Papachristos, and Hureau (2019), who demonstrated that concentrating policing in high-risk areas decreases property crime without displacing offenders. In rural settings, these behaviors enhance police responsiveness and establish a culture of shared responsibility for crime prevention.

Taken together, the high ratings across all four domains reflect a proactive, engaged, and well-informed community that actively supports crime prevention. Respondents combine technology, environmental design, physical

monitoring, and target-hardening strategies to create safer homes and neighborhoods. These findings align with the global Safe Communities framework (WHO, 2018), which emphasizes that effective crime prevention requires the combined influence of environmental design, technological tools, and community participation. In the rural policing context of Kidapawan City, these community-driven practices complement law enforcement efforts by reinforcing capable guardianship, building public trust, strengthening police legitimacy, and improving responsiveness to crime-related concerns.

Correlations Between Community Safety Awareness Aspects and Crime Prevention Practices

Table 5 presents the pairwise Spearman's rank-order correlations between the components of community

safety awareness (Individual and Family, Community, School and Work, and Overall Awareness) and the four domains of crime prevention practices (Technology, CPTED, Physical Monitoring, and Counter Crime Against Property). The results indicate significant positive correlations across all variables, suggesting that higher levels of reported safety awareness are associated with higher levels of crime prevention practices. Because these data are correlational, the results do not imply causation; rather, they show meaningful relationships between the variables.

The Individual and Family domain shows significant positive correlations with all crime prevention practices, with coefficients ranging from .329 to .440 ($p < .001$).

Table 3: Pairwise correlations between community safety awareness aspects and crime prevention practices

Variable	technology	crime prevention through environmental design	physical monitoring	Counter crime against property
individual and family	.329*** < .001	.440*** < .001	.413*** < .001	.368*** < .001
community	.467*** < .001	.561*** < .001	.412*** < .001	.330*** < .001
school and work	.322*** < .001	.422*** < .001	.311*** < .001	.169*** < .001
Community Safety Awareness (Overall)	.436*** < .001	.560*** < .001	.428*** < .001	.324*** < .001

Note. The table presents pairwise Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficients. The sample size for all correlations was $N = 397$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

These moderate correlations indicate that respondents who report stronger safety-related behaviors at home also tend to report greater engagement in preventive activities, such as using technology, applying CPTED strategies, monitoring their surroundings, and protecting their property. This pattern is consistent with Akter *et al.* (2022), who found that family routines often coincide with broader safety behaviors in communities. Similarly, Catalano *et al.* (2018) noted that protective home environments are commonly associated with increased readiness to participate in wider preventive efforts. While these findings do not establish that family behaviors directly lead to crime prevention actions, they do suggest that both reflect underlying safety-conscious values among households.

The Community domain shows the strongest correlations across all crime prevention domains, particularly with CPTED ($r = .561, p < .001$) and technology use ($r = .467, p < .001$). These results indicate that individuals who report higher community safety awareness also tend to participate more in environmental design strategies and adopt technological tools. This association aligns with Sampson *et al.* (2018), who observed that community cohesion often coexists with higher engagement in safety-enhancing behaviors. Likewise, Agatep *et al.* (2019)

found that communities with active local involvement typically report more preventive measures. The strong relationship between community awareness and CPTED is also consistent with Cozens and Love (2015), who noted that environmental safety improvements often occur in communities with high participation and shared responsibility. These findings suggest that community-level safety perception accompanies increased involvement in a variety of preventive activities, especially those requiring collective support.

The school and work domain also shows significant correlations with all crime prevention practices, with coefficients ranging from .169 to .422 ($p < .001$). This indicates that respondents who perceive their schools and workplaces as safe environments also tend to report higher engagement in crime prevention practices outside these institutions. These relationships are consistent with Shariati and Guerette (2019), who found that structured, safe school environments frequently coexist with responsible safety-related behaviors. Cornell and Mayer (2010) similarly noted that perceptions of institutional safety often correlate with heightened vigilance and preparedness. The moderate association with CPTED ($r = .422$) aligns with the findings of Vagi *et al.* (2018), suggesting that awareness gained in institutional settings

may be related to greater familiarity with environmental safety strategies, although causation cannot be assumed. The overall community safety awareness composite shows significant correlations with technology ($r = .436$), CPTED ($r = .560$), physical monitoring ($r = .428$), and counter crime against property ($r = .324$), all at $p < .001$. These consistent relationships indicate that respondents with higher overall awareness scores tend to report higher engagement in multiple forms of crime prevention. This pattern aligns with Mendoza and Garcia (2018), who observed that communities with higher perceived safety awareness frequently demonstrate stronger participation in preventive behaviors. The findings also correspond with the WHO Safe Communities framework (2018), which highlights that populations reporting high awareness typically participate more in community safety activities. The strongest association with CPTED aligns with Kim *et al.* (2018) and Brown and Collins (2020), who reported that environmental design efforts often flourish in communities reporting strong collective awareness—but again, this does not imply a directional or causal relationship.

Overall, the significant positive correlations in Table 5 suggest that higher reported levels of community safety awareness are associated with greater engagement in a wide range of crime prevention behaviors. The results point to consistent associations across home, community, and institutional settings, indicating that individuals who perceive themselves as more aware of safety issues also tend to participate more actively in preventive actions. While these relationships do not establish causal pathways,

they reinforce findings from both local and international studies showing that safety-conscious communities frequently report higher levels of participation in crime prevention.

Quantile Regression Models Predicting Crime Prevention Practices

Table 6 presents the results of the quantile regression analysis estimating the median levels ($\tau = .50$) of four domains of crime prevention practices—Technology, CPTED, Physical Monitoring, and Counter Crime Against Property—using three safety awareness domains as predictors: Individual and Family Awareness, Community Awareness, and School and Work Awareness. Quantile regression was used in this study to address potential violations of classical regression assumptions such as non-normality, heteroscedasticity, and the influence of outliers. Because the survey responses display skewness typical of Likert-scale data, quantile regression provides more robust estimates of central tendencies than standard multiple regression. However, the method is advanced for undergraduate research, and future revisions should ensure that its use is clearly explained and justified in the methodology chapter. Additionally, the current formatting of Table 6 requires improvement, as several values are unclear or missing, and model-fit indicators (e.g., pseudo- R^2 or fit statistics) are not reported.

In Model 1, community safety awareness shows a statistically significant relationship with technology-based crime prevention behaviors ($\beta = 0.776$, $p < .001$),

Table 4: Quantile Regression Models Predicting Crime Prevention Practices ($\tau = 0.50$)

Predictors	Model 1: Technology	Model 2: Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design	Model 3: Physical Monitoring	Model 4: Counter Crime Against Property
Intercept	-0.659 (0.559)	-0.219 (0.361)	-0.587 (0.461)	1.362*** (0.335)
individual and family	0.019 (0.136)	0.266** (0.082)	0.237* (0.119)	0.260*** (0.059)
community	0.776*** (0.129)	0.666*** (0.066)	0.583*** (0.085)	0.489*** (0.080)
school and work	0.299** (0.110)	0.101 (0.074)	0.267** (0.082)	-0.110 (0.084)
Model Fit				
Pseudo R2				
Log-likelihood	-587.63	-396.59	-495.55	-436.26
Akaike Criterion	1183.25	801.19	999.10	880.52
Schwarz Criterion	1199.19	817.12	1015.03	896.46
Hannan-Quinn	1189.56	807.50	1005.41	886.84

Note. The table presents the results of quantile regression models estimating the conditional median ($\tau = 0.50$) of four crime prevention practice domains. Robust standard errors are shown in parentheses below the unstandardized coefficients (b). $N = 397$. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

indicating that higher community awareness scores tend to coincide with higher reported use of CCTV, security lighting, and other protective technologies. This pattern is consistent with earlier findings by Dorado *et al.* (2024) and Cruda *et al.* (2023), who observed that community-wide support and shared safety norms often accompany higher adoption of crime-prevention technology. Individual and family awareness, as well as school and work awareness, do not show significant associations in this model, suggesting that technology-related preventive behaviors may be more closely tied to broader community perceptions rather than to household-level or institutional safety awareness.

Model 2 shows that Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) is significantly associated with all three awareness domains. Community awareness ($\beta = 0.666$, $p < .001$) has the strongest relationship, followed by individual and family awareness ($\beta = 0.266$, $p < .01$). These results suggest that respondents who report higher community involvement and stronger household safety routines also tend to report more environmental safety practices such as securing gates, ensuring visibility, and reducing hiding areas. This pattern aligns with Cozens and Love (2015), who found that CPTED strategies often appear in locations with strong participation and shared responsibility, and with Catalano *et al.* (2018), who observed that safety-conscious households commonly report environmental modifications intended to reduce vulnerability.

Model 3 indicates significant associations between physical monitoring behaviors and all three awareness domains. Community awareness again shows the strongest coefficient ($\beta = 0.583$, $p < .001$), with school and work awareness ($\beta = 0.267$, $p < .01$) and individual and family awareness ($\beta = 0.237$, $p < .05$) also showing significant relationships. These results suggest that respondents who report higher safety awareness across home, community, and institutional settings also tend to engage in more frequent monitoring-related behaviors, such as checking property, reporting suspicious activity, and cooperating with barangay tanods. While these associations do not imply causal influence, they are consistent with studies by Agatep *et al.* (2019), Sampson *et al.* (2018), and Cornell and Mayer (2010), who found that vigilant communities and safe institutional environments often appear alongside more active monitoring behaviors.

Finally, Model 6 shows that community awareness ($\beta = 0.489$, $p < .001$) and individual and family awareness ($\beta = 0.216$, $p < .05$) are both significantly associated with counter-crime-against-property behaviors, such as maintaining visible house numbers, securing gates, or attending patrol lectures. School and work awareness do not show a significant association in this model. This pattern resembles findings from Gill *et al.* (2016), Braga *et al.* (2019), and Tilley and Sidebottom (2017), who noted that household- and community-level preventive efforts frequently co-occur where residents report stronger safety perceptions. Again, these results reflect association

rather than prediction or causation.

The high level of community safety awareness reflected in Table 3 reinforces the core assumptions of contemporary policing theories, particularly Community Policing Theory. The consistently high scores across the individual/family, community, and school/work domains indicate that residents do not perceive safety as the sole responsibility of law enforcement, but as a shared obligation between citizens and police. This aligns with community policing principles, which emphasize partnership, trust-building, and shared responsibility in crime prevention. The strong household routines and neighborhood cohesion observed in Kidapawan City also support Social Control Theory, suggesting that informal social bonds and shared norms function as effective mechanisms for regulating behavior in the absence of constant police presence. Moreover, these awareness-driven behaviors, such as monitoring their surroundings, participating in barangay activities, and maintaining safe environments, reflect Routine Activity Theory, in which informed and vigilant residents act as capable guardians who reduce opportunities for crime. Taken together, the findings imply that policing effectiveness in Kidapawan City is strengthened not only by formal enforcement but by a safety-aware community that actively complements police efforts through everyday preventive actions.

Overall, the quantile regression results consistently show that community awareness tends to have the strongest association with the different crime prevention domains, followed by individual and family awareness, and then school and work awareness. Although the associations are statistically significant, the results must be interpreted with caution. Quantile regression identifies relationships within the data, but it does not determine causality. Furthermore, methodological improvements are needed in Table 6, including complete values, clearer formatting, and appropriate model diagnostics to enhance interpretability and transparency.

The Study Recommends Strengthening Community-Based Safety Initiatives Through Improved Awareness Programs, Cpted Practices, Reporting Mechanisms, Monitoring Activities, And Appropriate Access To Crime-Prevention Resources. Future Research May Include Longitudinal Designs, Validated Instruments, And Objective Crime-Related Measures.

The Findings Support The Role Of Social Control Theory, Routine Activity Theory, And Community Policing Theory In Explaining How Household Practices, Community Involvement, And Shared Responsibility Contribute To Crime Prevention. However, The Results Represent Associations Only And Do Not Establish Causation.

Significant Positive Relationships Were Found Between Community Safety Awareness And All Crime-Prevention Domains. The Strongest Association Was Observed With Cpted ($P = .560$, $P < .001$). Quantile Regression Further Showed That Community Awareness Had The Most Consistent Association With Crime-Prevention Practices

Across All Models.

Respondents Also Reported High Engagement In Crime-Prevention Practices. Cpted Obtained The Highest Domain Mean ($M = 4.00$), Followed By Counter Crime Against Property ($M = 3.93$), Physical Monitoring ($M = 3.81$), And Technology ($M = 3.63$).

The Study Found That Residents Of Kidapawan City Reported High Community Safety Awareness ($M = 4.29$, $Sd = 0.511$), With Individual And Family Awareness Obtaining The Highest Domain Mean ($M = 4.50$), Followed By School And Work ($M = 4.25$) And Community Awareness ($M = 4.10$). These Findings Indicate That Safety-Related Behaviors Are Strongly Reflected In Household And Institutional Settings.

CONCLUSION

Respondents likewise reported substantial engagement in crime-prevention practices. CPTED obtained the highest domain mean ($M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.808$), followed by Counter Crime Against Property ($M = 3.93$), Physical Monitoring ($M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.912$), and Technology ($M = 3.63$, $SD = 1.194$). The results suggest that respondents relied more consistently on environmental, monitoring, and property-protection strategies than on technology-intensive measures such as CCTV and tracking devices. Median quantile regression further showed that Community Awareness was the most consistently associated awareness domain across all four crime-prevention outcomes. Community Awareness was positively associated with Technology ($b = .776$), CPTED ($b = .666$), Physical Monitoring ($b = .583$), and Counter Crime Against Property ($b = .489$), with all four associations statistically significant at $p < .001$. Individual and Family Awareness also demonstrated significant associations with CPTED, Physical Monitoring, and Counter Crime Against Property, while School and Work Awareness was significantly associated with Technology and Physical Monitoring. These patterns indicate that the relative importance of different forms of awareness varies according to the type of preventive behavior being examined.

The findings support strengthening community-safety initiatives that build upon existing household and institutional practices while addressing comparatively weaker areas. Local government and barangay programs may expand practical CPTED education, improve neighborhood lighting and visibility, strengthen accessible reporting mechanisms, support properly organized community-monitoring activities, and improve access to appropriate crime-prevention technologies. Such initiatives should complement rather than substitute for effective formal policing and should be based on

documented community needs.

REFERENCES

- Amar, A. D., & Nabe, N. C. (2024). Crime prevention measures and response to community safety of local residents: The mediating role of perception of police. *Psychology and Education: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 22(6), 697–708. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.12803074>
- Boller-Piol, A. A., Gonzales, C. D., Malapit, K. M., Olivar, L. S., Vega, A. J., Villa, E. B., & Dalugdog, W. D. (2024). Strengthening community mobilization program: Its implication on building police-community relations. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*, 5(5), 1662–1692. <https://doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.05.05.17>
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (6th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- DeVellis, R. F., & Thorpe, C. T. (2021). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. University of California Press.
- Kadatuan, M. T., et al. (2021). Osumo, L. G., Llagas, E. G. O., & Castro, B. (2025). Walking the talk: The local community's engagement spectrum with the local government unit programs and policies. *Asia Pacific Journal of Educational Technologies, Psychology, and Social Sciences*, 1(1), 137–158. <https://doi.org/10.70847/617350>
- Regalado, J., & Sun, I. Y. (2024). Trust in legal institutions: An examination of the Philippines. *Asian Journal of Criminology*, 19, 527–550. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11417-024-09441-1>
- Sands, K. M. (2003). *A will to participate: Individual responses to community safety and violence prevention* [Doctoral dissertation, Antioch New England Graduate School].
- Trojanowicz, R., & Bucqueroux, B. (1990). *Community policing: A contemporary perspective*. Anderson Publishing.
- Widmark, J. (2026). Crime prevention in residential areas: A systematic review and meta-analysis of environmental design approaches. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-026-09659-y>
- Dacalanio, J. L., Dupla, R., Roman, J. N., & Diquito, T. Jr. (2026). Dimensions of community safety in rural areas as perceived by community members. *International Journal of Criminology & Justice*, 2(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.54536/ijcj.v2i1.7134>