# PREVENTION AMONG HOUSING RESIDENTS: THE UTILITY OF COLLECTIVE EFFICACY AS CRIME INFORMAL SOCIAL CONTROL IN THE CITY OF MAKASSAR

**Nur Fadhilah Mappaselleng[1], Abd. Kadir Ahmad[2], Sutiawati[3], Zul Khaidir Kadir[4]**

[1]Muslim University of Indonesia, Indonesia
[2]Center for Religious Research and Development, Ministry of Religious Affairs of The Republic of Indonesia,
[3]Muslim University of Indonesia, Indonesia
[4]Muslim University of Indonesia, Indonesia
[1]nurfadhilah.mappaselleng@umi.ac.id, [2]ahmadkadir56@gmail.com, [3]sutiawati.hukum@umi.ac.id,
[4]zulkhaidirkadir@gmail.com.

**Abstract.**

Recent researches show the importance of informal social control on crime prevention, especially in cities. This research focuses on crime prevention through informal control by looking at the level of collective efficacy of housing residents. Collective efficacy, is the willingness of citizens to intervene for the common good in the surrounding environment to prevent crime in the community. This study aims to describe the collective efficacy of citizens in the housing complexes and public housing in the City of Makassar. This research uses descriptive statistical analysis. There were 480 respondents taken as samples among housing residents. This study found that the level of collective efficacy of housing residents is generally. There is no difference of collective efficacy between the residents of public housing and those of housing complexes. This causes informal social control unable to prevent crime, which tends to increase from year to year in the City of Makassar.

**Keywords:** collective efficacy, crime prevention, housing residents, informal social control, Makassar City

## Introduction

Crime prevention in settlements and housing is one of the needs of citizens to live comfortably and safely. The ownership of a proper place of residence becomes the mandate of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia 1945. The constitution states that every person has the right to live in physical and spiritual prosperity, to live, and to have a good and healthy environment.

Regulation No.1 of year 2011 on Housing and Settlement Areas emphasizing the state is responsible for the entire nation of Indonesia through the implementation of housing and residential areas so that people are able to live and inhabit decent and affordable housing in healthy, safe, harmonious and sustainable housing.

As a residential area, Makassar has existed since the beginning of the 14th century [1], beginning with the emergence of the figure called Tumanurung [2] and became the capital of the kingdom of Makassar in the early 16th century [3]. Since the beginning Makassar had established relations with Australia before Europeans arrived[4].The historical romanticism of the discovery of Australia by the Makassar people is still admired today[5]. The Marege-Makassar relationship is still a cultural capital to build more intensive diplomatic relations between the two nations 6].

Since the beginning of the 17th century Makassar has become an international trading port. The open door policy by the Makassar Kingdom makes its population very heterogeneous. Various nations in the world came such as the Portuguese (early 17th century), England (1613), Denmark (1618), France (1622) China (1619), and Spain (1615)[7]. The Netherlands was represented by the VOC (Verenigde Oost-Indische Compagnie), which throughout the 17th century emerged as the strongest political force in the Malay-Indonesian Islands region[8], then conquered Makassar in 1667[9]. Following the fall of Malacca

in 1511, Malay traders also moved to Makassar[10], even playing an important role in the Makassar government 11].

There were around 25,000 houses in 1616 and 100,000 in 1640-1660, with a population of only a few thousand in the 1590s. This made Makassar one of the six largest cities in Southeast Asia, and as big as the European capital[7]. Together with the native population and Malays, until 1905 it was estimated that the total population of Makassar was 26,000 including 1,000 Europeans and 4,600 Chinese. In 1916, Europe numbered 1,500 and China 6,900; both again doubled in 1930[12].

Makassar since the end of the 19th century has become a city of the Dutch East Indies style with modern infrastructure. Modernity transformation continued during the Japanese occupation in 1942 until Indonesia's independence. Since the beginning of the independence era, government attention has been taken to reduce the chaos occurred, not much physical progress during the 1950s until the mid-1960s.

Now, Makassar is classified as a metropolitan city with an area of 17,577 ha (175.77 km2) and the population in 2017 amounts 1,489,011 people. This population increased by around 25 percent from 2000, which was recorded 1,112,688 inhabitants. The development of the city entered a new era since the New Order era in 1965.  The government established the Basic Pattern of Regional Development of the Makassar City of 1965-1970 with a focus on fulfillment of basic needs of the community covered enough employment, enough housing, enough drinking water and electricity, enough education and health, enough transportation, enough entertainment and sports. The 1970s became a starting point to realize the dream of a modern city[13].

By the 1990s more gated community typical housing with clustered model, fenced and guarded day and night built. Such

developments brought Makassar as it is today. In addition to the expansion of the city with natural housing growth, the housing complex is also developing. The development of such a complex city of Makassar led to concentric zones borrowing from Ernest Burgess and Robert Park. Both introduce five zones, namely (i) main business zones, (ii) transition zones; (iii) working-class zones, (iv) suburban zones, and (v) commuter zones[14]. The main concern of Burgess and Park is the transition zone as the most vulnerable area which is characterized by, among others, slums. Around 398.49 ha of slum area (around two percent of the city area) characterized by poor housing conditions, overcrowded population and inadequate environmental facilities still a part of the big city of Makassar [15].

Crime develops as part of the dynamics where social inequality, poverty, and unemployment still exist[16]. Based on Makassar City in Figures 2018, the number of criminal figures in Makassar City in 2017 was 13.119 cases, increased 32 percent from the previous three years (8.899 cases). The biggest cases in number were persecution (4.301 cases), theft (3.682 cases), and fraud (3.028 cases). Other cases were drug abuse (1.645 cases), murder (74 cases), and sexual crime (384 cases). Looking at the data, there is a tendency for crime to increase from year to year.

Attempts were made to prevent crime in the housing, both through formal social control and informal one. Formal social control in Indonesia is part of the main task of the police, while informal social control is carried out through community participation in the form of the Environmental Security System (Siskamling). One thing that is not yet known from informal social control is how every individual from the housing community has concern to prevent crime in their neighborhood.

Sampson introduced the theory of Collective efficacy, that is the willingness of citizens to intervene for the common good in the surrounding environment. The assumption is that the environment that has collective efficacy will intervene when facing problems, thereby reducing crime in the community[17].

## Research Methodology

The main problem answered in this study is whether the residents are willing to take certain actions to prevent crimes that take place within their neighborhood. The purpose is to describe the actions taken, among the various actions that are possible, by citizens when facing a problem in their housing area. The study uses quantitative methods with descriptive statistical analysis (frequency and chi-square). Samples were taken from residential housing both in housing complexes and public housing.

Public housing is used for residential areas, which is part of a residential environment consisting of more than one housing unit; while the housing complex is a collection of houses as part of the settlement, as a result of efforts to fulfill decent homes. A total of 480 samples representing households taken, 240 samples as representation of public housing and 240 others as representation of housing complexes.

The level of citizen involvement in preventing crime indicated by the level of intervention as a concept introduced by Sampson. Interventions are divided into direct and indirect intervention. Direct intervention is marked by the willingness of residents to admonish, advise, or assist people involved in anti-social actions both as perpetrators or victims. While the indirect intervention is marked by the willingness of residents to report events occurred to the housing security department or the parents of the children involved. Other choices that indicate citizens' indifference to the event that occurred are represented by permissive attitude or carelessness.

The answer to the direct intervention shows the level of concern of the residents exercising informal control by relying on their involvement in crime prevention. While the response to indirect intervention shows the level of concern of residents doing crime prevention in the form of formal control by relying on security forces. Then the response will determine the level of collective efficacy of local residents.

Seven case examples were submitted for confirmation by respondents to indicate the type and level of their intervention. The cases are around issues of "what residents do when they find": (1) children skipping school, (2) children drawing graffiti on housing walls, (3) children show dislike actions towards adults, (4) youth groups gathering late into the night, (5) someone involving in a fight in front of the house, (6) foreigners entering the housing area, (7) neighbors becoming victims of crime.

Three other questions needed to confirm to show the existence of cohesiveness among the housing residents. Those questions related to (1) mutual trust, (2) getting along with each other, (3),having the same expectations. The level of intervention and cohesiveness is indicated by the criteria <30: means low, 31-65: means moderate, and >66: means high.

## Social Control in Housing Area

The development of crime in big cities as Makassar requires various prevention efforts through social control mechanisms, both formal and informal. The police are the holders of formal control over public order. In Article 13 of the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia Act, No.1/2002 states that the main task of the police is to maintain public security and order.

When formal control from the police runs well the crime will be suppressed. Sampson, found, formal sanctions against citizens who commit crimes will bring a deterrent effect against criminal offenders and will reduce crime rates [18]. Increased detention affects the ability of the housing environment to perform their traditional social control functions[19].

Limited police personnel as a reason the government engages the community in maintaining security and public order (Kamtibmas), one of which is through the establishment of the Environmental Security System (Siskamling). Siskamling was formed based on agreement in community and on the spirit of local culture and mutual cooperation. The formation of the Siskamling is regulated in National Police Chief Regulation No. 23 of 2007 concerning the Environmental Safety System. This is also done by other countries, when the ability of the police is limited then control over anti-social behavior is taken over by the community through a legitimate representation system[20].

There are two approaches to protecting the environment from crime. First is the structuring of residents through informal control and second through the physical arrangement of housing. Informal social control is the most recommended way. Informal social control correlates significantly with one's attachment to their environment [21]. Attachment to the environment is a problem in itself and needs special attention, especially for people with a background of poverty, population diversity, and mobility which usually contribute to the decline in social informal control[22]. Therefore, the existence of informal social control in housing area is more effective in preventing crime rates[23]. Informal social control is seen as social capital to build and strengthen relationships between residents[24].

The voluntary application of security and control by residents to their environment is more effective than the police's activities of preventing crime. The physical arrangement and utilization of community infrastructure such as sidewalks for pedestrians, parks, shops and public places make it easy for residents to observe people who are committing crimes. This is called defensible space, which is the physical aspect of urban

housing that can help residents build better cooperation for their mutual protection[25]. Overcoming anti-social behavior requires crime control through the integration of housing and police management[26].

Although there are various programs developed to tackle crime at the neighborhood level, our knowledge base on the effectiveness of these efforts is still very limited. This is especially true for crime prevention efforts in and around public housing facilities[27]. The policy debate on how to overcome these problems has been dominated by the view that public housing design influences crime. Public housing experiences persistent crime problems because individuals, both economically and socially, are vulnerable to crime[28].

On security considerations, Malaysia has adopted a "safe city program", which is focused on creating cities free of violence and crime. It was designed using the CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) approach, for example in the residential area of Taman Melati, Kuala Lumpur City[29]. Globally, Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) is a crime prevention strategy that is increasingly popular in various countries [30].

Regarding informal social control, Sampson specifically introduced the theory of collective efficacy. Collective efficacy emphasizes informal social control functioning properly. The level of informal control exercised by residents will affect the problem of community crime. Informal social control requires proactive involvement from its inhabitants. When they see deviant behavior, spontaneity to prevent it arises from residents.

Collective efficacy is intended to build control so that they can rely on each other to agree in certain situations. The skills are intended to show that residents can rely on their co-inhabitants to act as a 'human agency' and do something to solve the problem. There are two components to collective efficacy. The first component is the willingness of residents to intervene for the common good in the surrounding environment. The second component is a combination of cohesion and mutual trust. Residents should not be selfish and careless about the wider community. That is, housing must activate social ties to prevent crime. This can be achieved when there is cohesion and mutual trust among the population, so that they will most likely reach consensus on how to overcome it, and will solve problems in a more collective way. In this case, cohesion and mutual trust are benchmarks of problem solving[17].

**Intervention of Housing Residents in Crime Prevention**

**Direct Intervention**

The first way to prevent crime or other anti-social behavior is by way of intervention or direct involvement of someone handling these actions, for example by admonishing children who do wrong, advising children who skip school, speaking at the presence of strangers in housing or breaking up children's fights, as well as helping victims of crime.

This study shows a willingness to intervene in stages according to the type of action or events happen. Residents have the highest level of intervention in children's behavior that shows dislike for adults. As many as 70 percent of respondents said they would advise children who do things like that. Statistical analysis shows that there is no relationship between housing status (public housing and housing complex) with the level of intervention on children which shows dislike for adults.

Seen from the perspective of criminology, children showing resistance to adults is an entry point for anti-social actions, for example juvenile delinquency. Children to be accepted into a group of naughty children must first show their abilities against the adults shown in front of the group leaders. From the perspective of culture, in South Sulawesi, specifically Bugis

Makassar, known as sipakatau (humanizing each other) culture as part of the concept of social ethics[31]. Adults must be respected by those who are younger and vice versa the younger ones are loved by adults.

The willingness of residents to intervene in housing problems is also high in the case of children found doodling on residential walls or drawing graffiti. As many as 65 percent of residents expressed this willingness. Just like the case above, there is no significant relationship between the desire for intervention in graffiti behavior with the background of the housing status of citizens. Citizens' concern for the neatness of the city is in accordance with the Makassar City Government Program which is popular with the *Mangkasara Tidak Rantasa* (Makassar is not chaotic and not dirty). The talent of young people drawing graffiti on residential walls and city alleys began to be directed to the beauty alleys, which is part of the Garden Alleys Program.

In addition, the level of residents intervention on deviant behavior for school children tends to be low. The willingness of residents to admonish children who skipped school was only responded by 47 percent of respondents. This was demonstrated by residents living in public housing and housing complexes. Skipping school can be seen as an early symptom of juvenile delinquency. Children who play truant have feelings of inferiority and are excluded from their peers. Students also have a disintegrated family background, tend to be naughty. They comprise a lower middle economic background and must help their parents make a living. Included in this case is the influence of peers and the influence of social media technology[32].

The same thing happened for foreigners entering housing. The level of willingness of residents to intervene in the case was only 42 percent as evidenced by the willingness to speak to a newcomer. Residents prefer other ways such as reporting to security or just allowing without suspicion. This applies to residents who live in public housing and housing complexes without significant differences based on statistical analysis.

One of the obligations of citizens in the context of the local environmental security system is to provide warnings to prevent, among others, the occurrence of crimes and provide information relating to environmental security and order. This is regulated in the Chief of Police Regulation No. 23 of 2007 concerning the Environmental Safety System. To tighten the environmental safety system the local government requires guests to report to the chief of RT (Neighborhood Association Organization) or RW (Community association organization) within the first 24 hours of their arrival time. Such a general attitude is certainly very vulnerable to the necessity to the demand of vigilance to anticipate various possibilities of crime.

The phenomenon of young people gathering in housing until late at night, becomes a problem for housing security. Amount 25 percent of respondents said they were willing to intervene directly to stop the habit. The form of direct intervention chosen was to admonish the youth involved in such behavior. Public housing and housing complexes do notdistinguish the behavior of residents to do so.
Faced with the case of people involved in a fight in housing, residents who are ready to intervene directly to break up and handle is 27 percent. There is no difference between housing variations and the willingness to do direct interventions. This shows the low level of awareness of citizens towards crime involving youth and adults in housing. A similar trend occurs when citizens are confronted with situations to help any crime victim or not. As many as 32 percent of respondents said they were ready to help victims.

Based on the criteria previously determined two cases were found to be between 65 and 70 percent, or regarded in high level. The other two cases were between 42-47 percent, meaning moderate level. The last three cases were between 25

- 32 percent, included in the criteria of low level A fairly high level is the willingness to advise children who behave disrespectfully to adults and reprimand children drawing graffiti on the housing walls. A fairly moderate case is a case of reprimanding a child who skipped school and strangers entered the housing. Meanwhile, those classified as low are young people gathering late at night in housing, breaking up fights, and handling victims of crime. Thus, it can be concluded that the willingness of residents to directly intervene in symptoms and crime is generally low, and some things are at moderate to high levels.

### Indirect Intervention

The complex housings prepare a 24-hour security system as a form of service. They also have limited access to enter housing which allows certain people to be easily detected when entering the complex. However, there are also relatively open housing without tight fences, for example Perumnas (National Public Housing) built by the government. This is due to the wide area coverage and tend to be massive. However, residents in certain blocks usually take the initiative to build their own security system with a portal that is guarded by security guards.

Security outside the housing complex is usually under the coordination of the Babinsa (Village Development Agency) of the TNI (Indonesian National Army). This body, among others, is responsible for reporting and monitoring the demographic and social conditions that affect the national security and defense. The security system is coordinated by the RT and RW.

Residents choose indirect intervention by reporting to the housing security related to risky crime cases, such as fighting. More than half of respondents (53 percent) take steps like that. This shows that in the case of crime with a certain level of risk they rely more on the formal control approach than informal control. Formal control has a repressive nature and is forced to realize security and order. This attitude does not distinguish between residents living in housing complexes or outside the housing complexes.

Community members also choose indirect intervention to the actions of a group of young people who gather in housing until late at night. This is shown by the attitude of not rebuking young people who gather late into the night in a residential environment. They rely more on the formal surveillance system by reporting to security (43 percent).

Based on the predetermined criteria, two cases were found to be between 43-53 percent, included in the criteria of moderate level. The remaining five cases are between 9-34 percent, fall under low level criteria. It can be concluded that the tendency to intervene indirectly related to cases of people fighting in the housing area and young people gathering late into the night. Both of these cases residents are more reliant on security. In this case citizens rely more on formal control than informal control. While in other cases residents rely less on formal control but expect to be handled through informal control mechanisms.

The problem with housing is that many residents do not do both. They choose a passive attitude. The case of residents who were victims of crime, for example, were responded to sympathy by most respondents but were not moved to provide assistance (34 percent). There are 8-19 percent of residents who show careless stance with variety of views and personal reasons.

### Social Cohesion

Another aspect recommended by Sampson in measuring collective efficacy in addition to willingness to intervene is the existence of social ties between citizens, which he calls social cohesion. Social cohesion is characterized by mutual trust between citizens, mutual friendship and mutual hope. All three are used as measures at the level of social cohesion where housing residents are located.

This research shows the attitude of mutual trust between residents is in the range of 50 percent. This level of mutual trust applies only to certain things, not to all matters. The opposite of mutual trust is suspicion. If there is suspicion between neighbors, it is difficult to hope that their neighbors will help each other even if they just entrust each other's house keys when one of them is not at home. Respondents who have faith in fellow citizens sincerely in all respects are supported by 15 percent of respondents. Even 11 percent of residents do not trust their neighbors at all. Residents have full trust in their long-term neighbors (25 percent).

Almost the same level of mutual trust is their habit of living their days in an atmosphere of mutual association. Respondents' acknowledgment showed that almost half (48 percent) of the residents were involved in relationships with their peers. More than half of the respondents stated that they interact with each other at certain times or there is no association at all for various reasons. Statistical analysis shows that there is a relationship between the background of housing and their social habits. The tendency to interact with each other is higher among residents living in housing complexes.

This was made possible by the situation and the layout of the houses in the housing complex designed to make it easier for people to meet each other. A good housing design is a housing complex arranged in such a way where entry is limited. The fewer shared entrances, the internal circulation system, and the presence of a shared courtyard, the more often the residents of the housing use these spaces to get along (33). Such a situation is not conditioned on public housing.

One aspect that helps strengthen the collective efficacy of residents if there is shared hope (sharing the same vision). At least 65 percent of respondents said that they shared their hopes with other housing residents. At least that hope is aimed at creating a safe and comfortable housing environment. The research shows no difference between residents of public housing and housing complexes in this case.

The three criteria to indicate the level of collective efficacy of housing residents are at moderate levels between 48 - 65 percent. Although the residents do not fully interact with each other, at least they have a basis of mutual trust and mutual hope to build a safe and comfortable life together.

### Conclusion

The study found, in general, informal social control among housing residents in Makassar is at a low level. They delegate the problem of crime prevention to the housing security and authority through formal social control mechanisms. That is why the crime rate in the city of Makassar tends to increase from year to year. Increasing informal social control is needed in situations of limited formal control by the police and other security authorities. It can be done by educating and encouraging people to own and improve their collective efficacy indicated by willingness to be directly involved voluntarily and spontaneously in crime prevention. Social capital that can be used to improve collective efficacy is the existence of social cohesion and mutual trust in the community. Shared hopes, religious and local cultural values can be used as a reference for developing social bonds and mutual trust among housing residents.

### Acknowledgement

## References

1. L.Y.Andaya, "Kingship-Adat Rivalry and the Role of Islam in South Sulawesi," Journal of Southeast Asian Study, vol.15, no.1, pp. 22–42, March, 1984

2. W. Cummings, "A Chain of Kings: The Makassarese chronicles of Gowa and Talloq," Leiden: KITLV Press, 2007.

3. Mattulada, "Menyusuri Jejak Kehadiran Makassar dalam Sejarah," Ujungpandang : Departemen Ilmu-ilmu Kemasyarakatan Fisbud Unhas,1978.

4. M. Clark and S.K.May, editor, "Macassan History and Heritage Journeys, Encounters and Influences," Canberra, Australia: Australian Nasional University, 2013.

5. A.D. Booy, "The Discovery of Australia's North-West Coast and an Incident at Macassar in 1616," Mariner's Mirror, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 21–33, March, 2013.

6. M. Brigg, "Old cultures and new possibilities: Marege'–Makassar diplomacy in Southeast Asia," Pacific Review, vol. 24, no. 5, pp. 601–623, December, 2011.

7. A. Reid, "Pluralism and progress in seventeenth-century Makassar," Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, Authority Enterprise Among Peoples Souths Sulawesi, vo. 156, no. 3, pp. 433–49, 2000.

8. G. Knaaf, "All About Money: Maritime Trade in Makassar and West Java, around 1775," Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient, vol.49, no. 4, pp. 482–508, 2006.

9. E. Amin, "Sja'ir Perang Mengkasar," Skinner C, editor. Leiden, S-Gravenhage-Martinus Nijhoff, 1963.

10. E. Morrell, "Strengthening the Local in National Reform: A Cultural Approach to Political Change," Journal of Southeast Asian Study, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 437–49, October, 2001.

11. W. Cumming, "The Melaka Malay Diaspora In Makassar, C. 1500-1669," Journal of Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, vol. 71, no. 1, pp. 106–21, 1998.

12. H. Sutherland, "Whose Makassar? Claiming Space in a Segmented City," Comparative Studies in Society and History, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 791–826, October, 2011.

13. I.D. Makkelo, "Menjadi Kota Modern: Transformasi Kota Makassar Pada Abad Ke-20," Jurnal Sejarah, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 46 – 64, 2018.

14. S. Walklate, "Understanding Criminology: Current Theoretical Debates, "New York: Open University Press, 2007.

15. B.P.Hasanuddin, "Implementasi Revitalisasi Permukiman Kumuh di Kota Makassar," Universitas Hasanuddin: 2014.

16. Ilham, "Penyeragaman dan Wajah Buram Modernitas di Kota Makassar pada Masa Orde Baru," Jurnal Sejarah Citra Lekha, Vol. 4, no. 1, PP. 15–35, Januari, 2019.

17. A. Piquero, "The Handbook of Criminological Theory," Wiley Blackwell, editor. Hoboken, 2016.

18. R.J. Sampson, S.W. Raudenbush, and F. Earls, "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy," Science, vol. 277, no. 5328, pp. 918–24, August, 1997.

19. J.P. Lynch and W.J. Sabol, "Assessing The Effects Of Mass Incarceration On Iinformal Social Control In Communities," Criminilogy &amp; Public Policy, vol. 3,no.2, March, 2006.

20. J.D. Brewer, B. Lockhart, and, P.Rodgers, "Informal Social Control and Crime Management in Belfast," British Journal of Sociology, vol. 49, no. 4, 1998.

21. E. Silver and L.L. Miller, "Sources Of Informal Social Control In Chicago Neighborhoods," Criminology, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 551-584, August,2004.

22. J.G. Warner and R.S. Wittner, editor, "Gatherings in Diaspora: Religious Communities and the New Immigration, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998.

23. J. Foster, "Informal Social Control And Community Crime Prevention," The British Journal of Criminology, Vol. 35, no. 4, pp. 563-583, October, 1995.

24. G. Bazemore, "Young People, Trouble, and Crime: Restorative Justice as a Normative Theory of Informal Social Control and Social Support, Sage Journals, December, 2001.

25. M. C. Musheno, J.P.Levine and D.J. Palumbo, "Television Surveillance And Crime Prevention: Evaluating An Attempat to Create Defencible Space In Public Housing,' Social Science Quarterly, vol.58, no. 4, March, 1978.

26. A.P. Brown, "Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime Control and Social Control," Howard Journal of Criminal Justice. Vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 203-221, May, 2004.

27. McGarrel EF, Giacomazzi AL and, Thurma QC. Reducing Disorder, Fear, and Crime in Public Housing: A Case Study of Place-Specific Crime Prevention. Sage Journals, December, 1999;

28. Weatherburn D, Lind B and, Ku S. "Hotbeds of Crime?" Crime and Public Housing in Urban Sydney, Crime and Delinquency, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 256-271, April 1999.

29. M.A. Mohit, and H.Elsawahli, "Crime and Housing in Malaysia: Case Study of Taman Melati Terrace Housing in Kuala Lumpur," Asian Journal of Environtment-Behaviour Studies, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 25-36, September, 2010.

30. P. Cozens, T. Love and, J.L.Nasar, "A Review and Current Status of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)," Journal of Planning Literatur, vol. 30, no, 4. pp. 1-19, August, 2015;

31. C. Pelras, "The Bugis," USA: Blackwell Publishers, 1996.

32. Damayanti, Feny Annisa dan Setiawati D. Studi tentang Perilaku Membolos pada Siswa SMA Swasta dI Surabaya. Journal BK UNESA, vol. 3, no. 01, pp. 454–61, 2013.