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COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN COMMUNITY-BASED CRIME PREVENTION EXPERIENCES\(^1\) IN LATIN AMERICA AND AFRICA

INTRODUCTION

The ELLA Research Design and Methods Papers are working documents produced by the Latin American-African research pairing, as the first stage in the conduct of their joint research. Production of the papers was aimed at fostering a shared framework and approach to the research, owned by both partners in the research pairing. As the centres proceed to the research itself, the design will inevitably evolve to address issues arising. As such these Design and Methods papers should be seen as an approximation towards the intended research direction.

In recent years the importance of Community-Based Crime Prevention Projects (CBCP) has been pointed out in literature. However there are few studies which systematically analyze their main features, outputs and outcomes. In this study, on the one hand we aim to provide a better understanding about this type of interventions for crime prevention, analyzing the specific contexts in which they emerged in Latin America and Africa. On the other hand we aim to analyze the type of community participation within the framework of the CBCP experiences and more importantly, we seek to explore if the type of community participation has an effect on the outcomes of these experiences in Latin America and Africa.

1. LITERATURE REVIEW

According to the data from the UNODC (2014) about intentional homicide, the report states that this was the cause of death of almost half a million people (437,000) across the world in 2012. More than a third of those (36 per cent) occurred in the Americas, 31 per cent in Africa and 28 per cent in Asia, while Europe (5 per cent) and Oceania (0.3 per cent) accounted for the lowest shares of homicide at the regional level. What is more disturbing is that in many of the countries, there is a rise in the rates when compared with data obtained in previous years (Institute for Security Studies & Africa Check, 2014; PNUD 2013).

\(^1\) For the purposes of this research "projects" will be analyzed in the case of El Salvador and “practices” in the Nigerian case.
During 2012, Nigeria’s homicide rate was 20.0 per 100,000 people (UNODC, 2013: 124). However, other forms of violence are found. In particular, the Nigerian Police continue to report increases in crimes against the governments, organisations and individuals (Nigerian Police, 2009).

On the side of Latin America, the entire population of the Central America region is approximately the same as that of Spain; nevertheless while Spain registered 336 murders in 2006, Central America witnessed 14,257 homicides during the same year, almost 40 per day (World Bank, 2011). In El Salvador during 2011, homicides rates reached alarming proportions of 70.1, thefts rates of 92.8 and robbery rates of 174.9 per 100,000 inhabitants respectively (Fundaungo, 2013).

The continuous rise in crime rates has two interconnected implications: first, it is often a demonstration of the failure of the state to perform one of its statutory roles, which is, provision of security for its citizens and foreigners within its jurisdiction; second, it is the reason that citizens resort to non-state sources of prevention, such as community-based sources (Dammert, 2005).

1.1 Crime Prevention

Crime prevention has different meanings to diverse actors; and at a conceptual level, meaningful differences still remain (Dammert y Lunecke, 2004). For the purpose of this investigation we borrow the concept of the Australian Institute for Criminology (2011), in the sense that crime prevention refers “to the range of strategies that are implemented by individuals, communities, businesses, non-government organizations and all levels of government to target the various social and environmental factors that increase the risk of crime, disorder and victimization”.

In addition, UNODC & UN-HABITAT (2009) include within the concept of prevention those interventions or measures that aim to reduce the fear of crime.

1.2 Levels of intervention on crime prevention

In recent years one of the most common approaches in Latin America to identify target populations that require intervention is based on the epidemiological public health approach developed by Leavell and Clark in 1976 (quoted by Calvalho and Buss, 2008) utilized by the World Health Organization and the Pan American Health Organization (2002) and later on by other social sciences (PNUD, 2009). According to the Centre of citizen security studies (CESC²: 2004) there

---

² CESC, for its acronym in Spanish.
are three levels of interventions: (a) Primary prevention, (b) Secondary prevention and (c) Tertiary prevention.

1.3 Areas of action for crime prevention

Crime prevention strategies can be grouped according to the scope of the intervention, meaning, this could be social, situational or communitarian. This is feasible by having in mind the types of risk factor addressed by each kind of intervention:

- **a. Social prevention** acts on personal, psychological and/or social risk factors. These experiences may be aimed at high social risk groups ranging from the family (early prevention of domestic violence) to education (conflict mediation in school) or health (children nutrition programs). Social prevention can be somewhat non-specific in their security dimension, because the security would be a long-term effect of concentrated efforts of a variety of public policies (CESC, 2004:4).

- **b. Situational prevention** unlike social prevention, its scope is oriented to the potential criminal, victim and the context (Clarke, 1997). In this sense it acts on proximity or environmental factors closely related to triggering violence and illegal situations. It covers urban areas (recovery of public spaces, better lighting) disarmament and surveillance, and can benefit the general population and be directed to specific groups (CESC, 2004:4). Situational prevention operates anticipating the reasoning of the aggressor, establishing greater difficulties in their actions, reducing the rewards and removing excuses, (Clarke,1997:4).

---

3 (a) Primary prevention: “aimed at the general population and commonly answers to nonspecific needs such as acting on the social and situational contexts that favour violence” (CESC, 2004: 4). It is supposed to intervene before a criminal or violent act occurs and operates through public policies such as, housing, employment, education and health.
(b) Secondary prevention: “aimed at specific risk groups and their needs (e.g. children, youth, women, potential offenders), who have suffered through problems resulting from violence and require treatment and support to avoid revictimization as well as to prevent them from becoming future victimizers” (CESC, 2004: 4). It is supposed to intervene where violence occurs and it therefore operates in a targeted manner through specific programs of medium and long term.
(c) Tertiary prevention: “aimed at specific groups of people who have committed infractions of the law, who have entered the criminal justice system, seeking to promote their rehabilitation and prevent recidivism” (CESC, 2004: 4). It is supposed to intervene after the crime occurs. Therefore, the offending person or repeated offenders (adult or child) are subjected to the intervention through various measures. It operates through specific short-term rehabilitation programs.
c. **Communitarian prevention** combines elements of both, the social and situational, and its more defining characteristic has been local participation, specially defined at the neighborhood. For example, the community policing experiences, the creation of monitoring committees and the involvement in short-range projects focused in social or situational prevention (CESC, 2004:4).

Selmini (2009) argues that a significant difference regarding communitarian prevention is that the community is seen as a space for intervention (object), but at the same time as the author of the intervention (subject). Compared to the social prevention approach, were the community is seen as a beneficiary of the social policy.

### 1.4 Community-Based Crime Prevention (CBCP)

The literature identifies that much can be done to address this issue of insecurity from the perspective of community crime prevention (ICPC, 2012: 82). According to Sherman (1998), communities are the central institution for crime prevention, the stage on which all other institutions perform: families, schools, labour markets, retail establishments, police and correctional must all confront the consequences of community life. Much of the success or failure of these other institutions is affected by the community context in which they operate.

Particularly, community-based crime prevention refers to the broad range of activities conducted with or by the community to control and prevent crime (Jenkins, 2013). In addition, Hope (1995: 21) defines community crime prevention as “actions intended to change the social conditions that are believed to sustain crime in residential communities.” Local social institutions are usually the mean by which these programs are delivered.

The CBCP experiences involve encouraging and facilitating efforts by the public to take protective measures on their own behalf. It grows out of the realization that the first line of defence against crime is not the police, but the potential victims (Bayley, 1986).

4 Crime prevention activities that involve communities can be very active, innovative, effective and sometimes inspired in their ability to transform neighborhoods and to respond to local problems. These efforts are likely to be able to change attitudes and behavior and provide a sense of ownership of the programme (UNODC, 2010: 104).

5 e.g., families, associations, churches, and youth clubs.
However, it was not always like this. By the middle of the 90s, when the academic sector recognized the relevance of the problem of crime and violence, the diagnostic was that the management model of public security, highly repressive and with scarce emphasis on prevention, was not satisfactory (Ribeiro & Maître, 2010: 9-10). This approach caused a sizeable increase in crime in the countries. This showed that the police as well as the judicial and penitentiary systems faced serious problems and deficiencies (Ribeiro & Maître, 2010: 9-10). The “iron fist” policies did not deliver the expected results.

In this matter Arriagada and Godoy (2000) stated that prevention or repression/control policies, is a false dilemma of citizen security, because of the multi-dimensional nature of the phenomena of violence and delinquency. It is required to combine both, control and prevention policies: “in Latin America, as well as in other parts of the world, it has been becoming increasingly clear that more integral approaches should be adopted, combining prevention (both primary and secondary) with control dealing with criminal violence” (Arriagada and Godoy, 2000: 133).

This shift in the focus of citizen security involved three things: (a) the recognition of the limited capacities of national governments to address this problem and therefore the need to advance towards coordination between different levels of government with the novelty of local governments participating in prevention, as well as generating partnership with other actors of society. (b) A comprehensive approach in terms of incorporating components of control, prevention and reintegration. Lastly (c) promoting community participation (Córdova, 2011).

Meanwhile, Dammert and Paulsson (2005) focus on the need for local governments to assume the topic of prevention of crime as one of its core areas of intervention. This represents a shift in the paradigm to approach crime in the region, moving the Latin American countries of the traditional policy that has as a central actor (almost exclusively) the police, toward the participation of local governments, and the inclusion of mechanisms for citizen participation in these experiences to ensure effective mechanisms for consolidation of social capital and reduce the problems of connivance at the local level.

Similar reasons for this shift of paradigm are found for the African case; as Cooper-Knock (2014) states, the failure of government to provide security and effective crime prevention has played a key role in Nigeria and South Africa, this is possibly due to poor training of police, corruption and poor politics. Thus, the prevalence of CBCP efforts in Latin America and Africa is such that has attracted scholarly attention from diverse disciplinary orientations. The literature shows that four major factors account for the proliferation of CBCP: i) failure of government to provide security
and effective crime prevention; ii) mistrust – many citizens do not trust the police and so would prefer to handle their crime matters in a way that does not involve the police (Owen and Cooper-Knock, 2014); iii) the residential nature of CBCP which promotes familiarity and in turn develops trust, confidence and cooperation (Nyaura and Ngugi, 2014); and iv) the higher speed with which “justice” is obtained (Lambert, Wu, Elechi and Jiang, 2012).

At this point, it is important to define what a community crime prevention strategy is. According to the National Crime Prevention Centre of South Africa (CSIR, 2000) is defined as:

b. A tool to bring together different actors involved in crime prevention.
c. A means of developing local crime and violence prevention partnerships.
d. A method to ensure coordination and management of crime prevention experiences.
e. A way to identify priority areas and tasks."

Finally, studies show that the expected outcomes of CBCP initiatives are not only centred in the reduction of crime rates, but also in the enhancement of citizens’ perception of security and in the promotion of smoother police-community relations (Baker, 2002; Gill, Weisburd, Telep, Vitter and Bennett, 2014).

This leads us to ask: does participation of the community influence the outcomes of these programmes and projects in Latin America and Africa?
2. COMMUNITY-BASED CRIME PREVENTION INITIATIVES AS A STUDY OBJECT

The review of the literature shows that CBCPs can be grouped according to the following typology (Bureau of Justice Assistance, n.d.)

- Community policing: a policing approach that promotes and supports strategies to address crime-related problems through police-community partnerships;
- Neighbourhood Watch: a community mobilization strategy in which citizen groups organize to prevent and report neighbourhood crime and disorder;
- Comprehensive programmes: to promote the involvement of local and state governments, the private sector, and neighbourhoods to respond to violent crime and drug abuse and improve the quality of life in communities by incorporating multiple approaches;
- Ad hoc law enforcement activities related to crime prevention.

In turn, Dammert (2005: 139) identifies four areas of community initiatives in crime prevention in Latin America: (a) Police-community relationship; (b) Community organization for surveillance activities; (c) Work in public spaces; and (d) Public-private partnership.

From the literature review and for the purpose of this research two major types of CBCP have been established: (a) community policing, and (b) comprehensive.

2.1. Community Policing

Denney (2015) analyzing the approach of community policing in the experience of several developing countries, particularly in Africa, warns about “the conceptual confusion surrounding community policing”. This is due to the community policing referring to a wide range of forms such as “alternative dispute resolution, police-community forums, joint police-community patrols,
community outreach, the establishment of community policing as a police-wide philosophy and/or specific police units tasked with responsibility for community policing. In addition to these multiple forms, community policing is ascribed a diverse set of objectives by the different actors involved (governments, police, communities and donors), including reduce crime, improved police-community relations, increased police accountability and strengthened state-society relations“ (Denney, 2015: 6). But beyond the importance of understanding the specific contexts, the approach of community policing falls within the framework of broader police reform processes and assumes a variety of forms and different objectives which are assigned. In the literature, community policing “is often defined as both a philosophy and an organizational strategy that allows the police and the community to work together to solve community problems of crime, disorder and safety” (Denney, 2015: 9).

An important aspect highlighted by Denney (2015: 6), is that the community policing refers not only “to experiences between the formal police and communities, but can also refer to “informal” policing practices, whereby communities innovate their own strategies for dealing with local safety and security issues”.

In this sense, the community policing approach is somewhat problematic because it takes different forms, to reach multiple and different objectives as well as the diverse expectations of its results by different institutional actors. Going forward, to address this problem, a less ambitious scope on community policing is proposed: “community policing can thus play an important, but much more specific, role in addressing community safety and security needs, and tailoring the ambition to the realities of the context will help deliver more targeted and effective support” (Denney, 2015: 6).

For the purpose of this study, community policing is taken to mean all forms of security and crime prevention practices that are owned and managed by the community, with or without government or NGO assistance. These include neighbourhood watch and other forms of formal and informal policing. In Nigeria, these include the different forms of crime prevention measures adopted by residents’ associations in the various communities.

2.2. Some community policing experiences

In Karamoja (Uganda), the UNDP sponsored a community policing programme which trained hundreds of police men, and held over 40 community dialogues in two years. It was based in six Karamoja communities where violence and insecurity arising from cattle rustling had been very common. The dialogues have reached over 4,600 people in the region (UNDP, 2014).
South Africa has one example for this type of CBCP. It is a voluntary project that involves all neighbours. They are guided by the Neighbourhood Watch constitution of the Western Cape Province and work in partnership with the South African Police Service (SAPS), the Community Policing Forum (CPF), Local Authorities, and Security Service Providers.

Nevertheless, one of the major failures of CBCP in many African countries is that while they may be effective in reducing petty thievery and even homicides and armed robbery, in many cases they replace these crimes with another, notably mob justice and abuse of citizens’ rights (Baker, 2002; Alemika and Chukwuma, 2004; Brogden and Nijhar, 2005). In addition to this, some CBCP often isolate segments of the community – foreigners, those from other ethnic groups - and provoke the use of violence (Baker, 2008).

In Latin America there are some Community policing experiences. In Colombia, a Community Policing experience is the one entitled “Plan Nacional de Vigilancia Comunitaria por Cuadrantes (PNVCC)” which was promoted back in 2010. The main goal of this programme is to adopt a new model to deliver surveillance in 8 cities: Bogotá, Medellín, Cali, Barranquilla, Cartagena, Cúcuta, Bucaramanga and Pereira. This model is intended to optimize the Police service through the delimitation of the territory of these cities in small jurisdictions, called quadrants. In the PNVCC, the local communities play a strategic role in identifying problems in the area and in the construction of solutions, which often involve the participation of local authorities, such as municipalities or private institutions (Llorente, Bulla & Castillo, 2011: 26).

Other police forces in Latin America have incorporated the area of prevention. Countries such as Chile, Panama and Ecuador have chosen for a change in the operational work, incorporating new technologies into police work and a change of philosophy in relation to the community. (Frühling, 2012) For its part, Brazil started a restructuration in the early 1990s after the failure of the traditional model. Specifically, Belo Horizonte adopts the philosophy of community policing and create the “Community Safety Committees” whose purpose was to develop security strategies attached to the local reality and the incorporation of the community in prevention efforts (Frühling, 2003).

6 National Plan for Community Policing Quadrants.
2.3. Comprehensive

The literature review of such programs in Latin America shows a diversity of interventions with different characteristics. Some are more specific with actors such as youth or women; another way to address them has to do with the actors involved. In some cases local governments, entrepreneur, and churches some authors called it public-private partnership. Another way to analyze them is in terms of the actions they promote, such as work in public spaces.

After a detailed review of the experiences in Latin America and considering the projects to be analyzed in the case of El Salvador, for the purposes of this research the term comprehensive should be understood as those experiences that have the following features. (1) Promoting a more holistic approach in their interventions. In a continuum between specific ones and multiple ones, we are interested in those with a more holistic approach. (2) Requiring the participation of several actors that intervene in a complementary manner and are seeking to strengthen state capacities (national and local government), coordinating with public institutions that do not seek to replace or bypass them. (3) Incorporating community participation, although with different characteristics and forms.

2.4. Comprehensive projects/experiences

During recent years, USAID promoted a set of CBCP programmes in some of the Central American countries. They have designed and implemented a set of programmes to improve citizen security by strengthening community capacity to combat crime and by creating educational and employment opportunities for at-risk youth. USAID’s crime and violence prevention project (CVPP) has been implemented in four countries: El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Panama. The impact evaluation of these projects supports the idea that positive results in terms of crime reduction can be obtained by community based efforts (Berk-Seligson et al., 2014).

Although, many more experiences of this kind are found in the Latin American region7, another example for this continent is the Ciudades Seguras programme, fostered by the UNDP agency in El Salvador and carried out from 2005 to 2010. The participation of the community consisted in accompanying as partners in the creation of a diagnostic of violence and crime in the communities. The purpose of the project consisted in the formulation of a policy and a plan of

---

7 Additionally, a few experiences labeled under the Community-based terminology, such as: Disarmed campaigns (El Salvador and Brazil); Conflicts mediation (Brazil and El Salvador); actions of coexistence and civic culture (Bogotá, Colombia); Alcohol prohibition (Diadema, Brazil and Bogotá, Colombia); Sport and leisure projects for a culture of peace (Luta Pela Paz, Brazil; Programa Fica Vivo, Brasil); police and youth approach (Papo de Resposa, Jogos de Paz, Proyecto Policía y juventud, Brasil; Policía de Neuquén, Argentina); community security council (Nicaragua, Chile, El Salvador, Brazil). See Ribeiro & Maître, 2009.
security and connivance, intended to strengthen the local government capacity on safety affairs (Hayek-Weinmann et. al, 2014).

Finally, the *Tomorrow is a New Day* (TND) programme, is a UNDP experience designed to reduce crime and violence in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. It was run from 2012 to 2013. It has many aspects to it including employment schemes and skills acquisition programme. Another aspect of this experience was teaching communities to produce radio programmes as an alternative and peaceful way of expression. It was supported by many donor agencies and was implemented in seven communities. The aims of TND are multidimensional – violence and crime prevention is one of them.

### 2.5. Summarizing

From what was stated in the previous pages, the typology of the CBCPs that we are interested in analyzing in this study is presented in the following table (table 1). For each of the two types we identify its specific intervention, as well as its objectives.

In the case of Nigeria, primarily they are promoting experiences within the model of community policing. While in El Salvador there are some specific experiences aimed at what could be call community policing, but the most innovative approach in recent years is the one of comprehensive projects characteristics.

For the comprehensive type in El Salvador, we have focus in the main interventions in the two projects to be analyzed. One aspect to clarify is that a particular characteristic of this type of projects according to the criteria defined for the purposes of this study, is that actors involved coordinate and complement the efforts of the State (nationally and locally). In this case these are interventions at the local level that are articulated by the local government. These are not only experiences promoted by the local government, but rather implemented within the framework of the National Strategy for Social Prevention of Violence in Support of Municipalities (SAE\(^8\), 2010). In this more comprehensive approach, the Municipal Committees for Prevention of Violence (CMVP) were created; these are integrated by local government, civil society leaders, NGOs, relevant sectors of the municipality and representatives of national institutions with presence at the local level. The main function is to develop, follow-up and monitoring of municipal plans and diagnostics, managing resources as well, to support projects, channel the demands of the community and give political backing to the municipal plan. They are instances of citizen participation that seek for active role in the design, implementation and evaluation of municipal plans for violence prevention (SAE, 2010: 32-34).

---

\(^8\) Strategic Affairs Secretary, SAE for its acronym in Spanish.
For the purposes of this study, a working hypothesis behind why each country has chosen a model and not the other has to do basically with two variables. (a) The magnitude and intensity of the problem of crime and insecurity. (b) The presence and organization of the state in the territory to address the issue of insecurity and crime. Even though projects are promoted by international cooperation agencies (such as UNDP and USAID), the projects are implemented through local governments. More specifically by the CMPV as the key mechanism, which is the body representing various sectors (including local government) to promote community participation in the project.

Table 1: CBCP typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of CBCP</th>
<th>Principal components</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community policing</strong></td>
<td>Neigborhood watch (vigilantism)</td>
<td>Reduce crime, improved police-community relations, increased police accountability and strengthened state-society relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community forums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community outreach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>police-community relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>joint police-community patrols</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the establishment of community policing as a police-wide philosophy and/or specific police units tasked with responsibility for community policing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>alternative dispute resolution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive</strong></td>
<td>Municipal Violence Prevention Committees</td>
<td>Improve community infrastructure and connivance in the community (social capital); promote socio-economic inclusion of youth; reduce the perception of fear in the community; and reduce crime in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recovery of Public Spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for youth (education and employment)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School connivance improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of conditions for citizen connivance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.
3. SOCIAL CAPITAL AND COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION

3.1 Social Capital

When we talk about community involvement in crime prevention, the concept of social capital becomes important and refers to social relations, links and sociability. It refers to the links between the individual and society, social action, how to live together, how to act cooperatively to achieve shared goals, how to avoid fragmentation and atomization. Social capital is an addition to the traditionally recognized productive resources: natural resources, physical capital, financial capital and human capital; the latter comprises: education, experience, social skills, information and knowledge (Raczynski and Serrano, 2005, quoted in Concepts 19, 2010). It is the approach that seeks preventing crime through the development and strengthening of social capital as a direct way to address the risk factors that encourage criminal and violent behavior in society.

Putnam (2000) argues that the most general forms of social capital are trust and social participation. For Coleman (1988) it includes also part of informal, horizontal relations, local and hierarchical relationships. On a more institutional perspective North (1990) starts with a broader definition that includes social and political environment which allows the development of social norms and the social structures.

For purposes of this research, we understand as social capital, the set of rules, networks, values and organizations that promote trust, mutual support and cooperation in a society. Taking into consideration three variables: (a) Confidence among citizens, (b) Empowerment and social participation9 (UNDP, 2001) and, (c) Trust in public institutions.

9 Confidence among citizens. Interpersonal trust is important in the sense that facilitates the interactions among members of a community. But also it has a political significance. Trust is the platform on which the spaces of political activity -understood in a broad sense- helps people to organize. It is assumed that in a society where trust prevails among the people, the greater the possibility that they engage in “public” in an organized and reciprocal manner. Empowerment and social participation. The second element to tap is the strength of what constitutes a civic community is the involvement of citizens in organizations at the community level. These organizations may be the neighborhood council, the school committee, the football team, the religious group, among others.
For this matter in terms of crime reduction the more social capital a community possesses the higher the expected cost of committing crime, which reduces the probability to engage in criminal activities. So, given the probability of being caught and formal control, higher levels of social capital seem to reduce crime. (Akçomak & Weel, 2008).

There is broad theoretical debate among sociologists and criminologists to determine if the existence of social capital has a direct effect on levels of crime (Buonanno, Montolio and Vanin, 2009) without presenting conclusive evidence in previous comparative studies for Latin America or Africa. For this reason we intend to explore the relation between community participation\(^{10}\) and CBCP outcomes for the cases of Nigeria and El Salvador, seeing community participation as an important element of social capital as a broader category.

### 3.2 Community Participation

In development studies, the concept of participation, specifically community participation has been the subject of immense scholarly disquisitions. With the fall of the dominant, top-down development approach, ‘participation’ became the solve-all word, not just a remedy to the failures of the paradigm that preceded it. Worried about the growing misuse of the term, development scholars began to specify what participation truly means. Arnstein’s (1969) ladder of participation is most likely the first disambiguation of that concept.

Authors such as English, Cummings and Straton (2002) quoting Ekblom and Pease (1995), distinguish between action for the community, action through the community, and action with the community as key parts of any community-based crime prevention strategy. In fact the basic philosophy of community crime prevention is that social interaction and citizen familiarity play an important role in preventing, detecting, and reporting criminal behavior (Mukherjee, 1987, quoted in Waring, 1991).

According to Dammert (2005: 138-139) community participation in CBCP experiences can either be direct or indirect. The direct participation involves community members while the indirect type involves only the community leaders. Both approaches of participation can be active or passive depending on the role. The active role is linked to the cycle of public policies: design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of projects, while the passive role implies only receiving the outcomes of institutions, among others.

\(^{10}\) Understanding participation as a constitutive element of a broader category such as social capital.
Literature on CBCP shows varying levels of community participation. In some cases, communities are passive participants – reduced to mere gatherers of intelligence for partnering police or state authorities (Brogden and Nijjar, 2005; Dammert, 2005: 138); in others the community plays an active role from project conception to implementation and to evaluation (Dammert, 2005: 139).

What is missing in the literature on CBCP is an answer to the question of what kind of community participation contributes to the expected outcomes of CBCP. With this in mind, we will explore how participatory CBCP in Latin America and Africa are, and we will investigate if the type of community participation contributes to the expected outcomes of CBCP experiences.

Thus, we must consider the main elements of the strategies designed to achieve the reduction of the risk factors that cause crime, they can be, measures to address violence against women, prevention programs aimed at young people, particularly young men at risk, as well as the strengthening of social capital. This includes improving the ability of individuals, groups and communities as a whole to address the problems of crime and violence (Rezaei, 2012).

4. CENTRAL RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The elements mentioned in the previous sections support the need for studies on the Community-Based Crime Prevention experiences in Latin America and Africa. There are three different sets of questions that will guide this research. First, regarding a better understanding about the CBCPs: (i) What are the main features of the CBCP experiences, (ii) what are the main outputs and outcomes?, and (iii) what specific factors enable CBCP to work?

Second, regarding the type of community participation in the CBCP’s experiences: (i) Does the active participation of the community contribute to the expected outcomes of CBCP programmes and projects in Latin America and Africa?

Finally we try to understand if there is a relation between social capital and CBCP outcomes for the cases of Nigeria and El Salvador.
5. RESEARCH DESIGN

This project will be undertaken using a process tracing approach. We consider that this is the best design for this project since it will enable us to examine different CBCP experiences for each continent in parallel, so similarities and differences between them can be understood.

In each of the CBCP experience analyzed will be address three guiding questions: (i) What are the main features of the CBCP experiences, (ii) what are the main outputs and outcomes?, and (iii) what specific factors enable CBCP to work?

The analysis and description of the selected CBCP experiences will follow the next scheme as a reference for the Regional Evidence Paper:

i. What was the motivation/problem to be solved by the analyzed experience?
ii. What specific factors enable the analyzed CBCP experience to work?
iii. What did the analyzed experience set out to do?
iv. What was done during the implementation of the analyzed CBCP experience?
v. What type of community participation took place in the analyzed CBCP experience?
vi. What are the main results/outputs/outcomes achieve in the analyzed CBCP experience?
vii. Lessons to be learned from the analyzed CBCP experience?

For the case of Nigeria the categorization of CBCP’s into ‘Effective’ and ‘Not Effective’ was based on the perceptions of community members involved in an earlier survey as well as on observations of field workers who paid attention to the outputs of community’s CBCP efforts. An Effective CBCP is one so described by community members (as having positively influenced their perception of crime, the safety of their neighborhood and kept down the crime rate). It is also one in which visibilities of CBCP can be observed – erected gates, bars, meetings, written notices etc. The typology is presented below:
These selected 8 communities are paired up to enable us to carry out comparative analyses. As can be seen, the factors that matter are held constant across each pair varying only the effectiveness of their CBCP practices. Population density refers to how populated a neighborhood is while socio-economic profile of a community refers to whether it is largely upper class, middle class or lower class. Most communities have a mixture of this but there is always a dominant segment – that’s why we say ‘largely high or largely lower’. Population density can be determined by simply observing a neighborhood in the day and at night; socio-economic profile can be determined by observing the sizes and spacing of houses, other property and infrastructure.

Table 2: Nigeria CBCP Typology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Density</th>
<th>Effective CBCP</th>
<th>Ineffective CBCP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sasa</td>
<td>Orogun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Oladele II</td>
<td>Onireke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio- Economic Profile</td>
<td>Largely High</td>
<td>Old Bodija</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Largely Low</td>
<td>Apete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mapo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.

6. HYPOTHESIS

a. Active community participation in the CBCP experiences promotes the enhancement of citizens’ perception of security.

b. Active community participation in the CBCP experiences promotes improvements in the level of citizens’ satisfaction with police performance in the community.

c. The existence of social capital in the community promotes the community participation in CBCP initiatives.
Using previous impact evaluations data, the literature shows the following as some outcomes that are commonly documented in impact evaluations of CBCP interventions: reduction in crime rates, increased perception of security and smoother police-community relations.

7. CRITERIA FOR SELECTING THE CBCP EXPERIENCES

There are a large number of CBCP initiatives that have taken place in Africa and Latin America during the past decade, a study and even an enumeration of all these experiences is a task that goes beyond the scope of this study. Therefore, the researchers consider that selection criteria is required in order to narrow down the universe of CBCP experiences to be considered in the design. These criteria are described in the following paragraphs:

A. Temporality Criterion: experiences implemented from years 2008 to 2014 will be selected as part of the universe to study the CBCP. The main reason for selecting this period of time, is because even though in Latin America the first CBCP experiences appeared back in the decade of the 90’s, the research will require to undertake interviews with key actors and stakeholders that were involved in the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the selected CBCP projects/experiences in order to shed some light on the characteristics of these initiatives.

B. CBCP Typology/Geographical Criterion: as we have stated earlier, the literature suggests the following typology of CBCP experiences: i) Community Policing, and ii) Comprehensive projects/experiences.

C. Basic Documentation Criterion: for the case of El Salvador is desired that the CBCP programmes and projects count with the following documentation in order to be considered: i) Document of Project, ii) Base-line study, iii) diagnosis report, iv) systematization report of
the experience, and v) evaluation. These elements will allow the researchers to observe the implementation of the CBCP experiences selected and their outcomes.

Based on the prior criteria, we selected two projects for El Salvador: (i) the Community-Based Crime and Violence Prevention Project implemented by RTI with USAID funding, from 2008 to 2013; and (ii) “Prevention of violence and building social capital in El Salvador” Joint Programme implemented by the United Nations system in El Salvador, from 2009 to 2013.

In Nigeria, we focus on CBCP practices of communities. These practices have been in existence for as long as the communities have existed. They are self-help projects and though they may involve partnership with the police, they are not dependent on government for funding. Residents maintain these practices by paying dues and volunteering as patrol personnel.

8. RESEARCH METHODS

We will review the existing documentation of each selected CBCP experience, putting particular attention to the evidence-focused data available. We will use qualitative tools to collect primary data using: i) semi-structured interviews to stakeholders involved in the CBCP selected experiences and ii) focus group discussion with members of communities. Additionally, we will use quantitative tools, iii) a survey to community inhabitants will provide us with their assessments and perceptions of security, victimization rates and social capital. In terms of measuring social capital we will ask about belonging to communal organizations, trust among neighbors, and finally trust in government institutions. Additionally, to measure the type of community participation in the CBCP’s experiences, a research question has been formulated as a guide: Does active participation of the community contribute to the expected outcomes of CBCP programmes and projects in Latin America and Africa?

The questionnaire for both countries will be as similar as possible. From the quantitative and qualitative data, we are planning to write the Comparative Evidence Paper. The comparative part of the study will focus on exploring the existence of social capital at the community level; but also
in two other factors: (a) the perception and levels of crime victimization; and (b) the perception of insecurity in the community.

The description of these tasks is presented in the following sub-sections.

8.1 Semi-structured interviews with stakeholders involved in the selected CBCP experiences

We will collect information about community participation and its perception through semi-structured interviews. Also we are interested in exploring if some intervention outcomes are still being perceived in the community. Finally we are looking to explore the social capital in the community. These actors are described below:

**Community leaders:** identified as those people that have been appointed by the community inhabitants to represent them, act and speak in the name of the community.

**Technical Staff of the implementing agencies:** these are the officers in charge of the design, implementation and/or monitoring stages of the CBCP, most likely working for the cooperation agency or the governmental agency responsible of the execution of the CBCP.11

**Local entities and the police:** in El Salvador this category includes Municipal Violence Prevention Committees (CMPV –spanish acronym-), police officers at the local level, school principals and teachers.

**Faith-based organizations:** the people to be interviewed from this sector are those affiliated to religious organizations and other charitable organizations identified with one or more religious organizations, such as a religious congregation (church, mosque, synagogue, or temple), based on the community.12

In Nigeria, interviews will be conducted with the president/chairman of each resident association in each of the 8 chosen communities, and also with divisional police officers of each of the eight police stations that service the selected communities.

---

11 In the case of El Salvador, two officers from USAID and UNDP programs have been identified and contacted about CBCP projects implemented.
12 In El Salvador, the religious sector has driven many experiences related to citizen security and crime prevention; therefore these faith-based organizations play a key role.
In the case of El Salvador, will be making a total of twenty seven semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders: 8 members of the Municipal Committees for Violence Prevention (CMPV) in the municipality, 3 police officers, 12 technical personnel of the interventions, and 4 school personnel; as shown in table 3.

Table 3: Interviews with key actors El Salvador

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholders</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Committee for Violence Prevention (MCVP)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School personnel (Principals, psychologist/teacher)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical personnel (Entrepreneurship, infrastructure)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police officers</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical personnel of selected projects</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.

8.2 Focus group discussions with community members

Qualitative data will be obtained through Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with members of the communities where the selected CBCP experiences have taken place. This is needed to complement the information from documentations and interviews.

Involving the members of the community will help us not only to understand the type of community participation and the outcomes of CBCP experiences, but also to understand the pathway by which these two are possibly connected. The discussions are preferred to the questionnaire for community members due to low literacy levels in many African and Latin American communities.

In the case of El Salvador 4 FGD will be conducted with community leaders, community inhabitants, two in San Salvador and two in Nahuizalco. As shown in table 4:
Table 4: FGD El Salvador

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Actors</th>
<th>Focal Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community leaders.</td>
<td>2 FG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community inhabitants</td>
<td>2 FG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>4</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.

For the case of Nigeria, we will organise one FGD each in 8 selected communities. In four of these communities, CBCP practices are effective; in the other four, these practices are not effective.

### 8.3 Community inhabitants survey

In order to gather information about the community participation and social capital as well as victimization and security perceptions, a survey will be conducted in communities with and without the occurrence of the intervention. As much as possible, a similar questionnaire will be used in both countries in order to facilitate the comparison. For purposes of the study, we will select communities with and without the occurrence of the intervention. In the case of El Salvador, this implies the selection of communities in which project activities were implemented (5) and others were not (5). In Nigeria, the survey will be carried out in the 8 communities selected13. From each community, we will select 40 respondents.

In order to make possible to perform a comparative analysis from the survey of community members, the following scheme was agreed on:

---

13 See table 2.
Table 5: Communities in which the survey will be conducted in Nigeria and El Salvador

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>El Salvador Project Intervention</th>
<th>El Salvador No Project Intervention</th>
<th>Nigeria Effective CBCP</th>
<th>Nigeria Ineffective CBCP</th>
<th>Pop Density</th>
<th>Nigerian State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Salvador</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>High Pop Density</td>
<td>Oyo State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Libertad (a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low Pop Density</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mejicanos (a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mejicanos (b)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahuizalco</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Largely high SES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Libertad (b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Largely low SES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Antonio del Monte</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olocuilla</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Own elaboration.

We selected Oyo State, Nigeria and the selected city is Ibadan. Ibadan is selected for the study for its representativeness. The city is cosmopolitan, therefore, possessing a wide number of cultural and ethnic characteristics of the diverse ethnicity that makes up Nigeria. Secondly, it is midway between a traditional and a modern city, therefore, offering a greater chance of turning out findings that could apply to both traditional cities, and modern ones. Finally, Ibadan also offers a platform where the object of our study has widespread presence.
In the case of El Salvador 40 surveys will be conducted in each community, at the household level, giving a total of 200 surveys in the intervention communities and 200 in communities of non-intervention. In each of the 10 selected communities, 40 respondents will be chosen – one per household. This will give a total of 400 respondents to the survey.
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