

URBAN MORPHOLOGY AND CRIME PATTERNS IN URBAN AREAS: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

***Idris Isah Iliyasu¹, Aldrin Abdullah² &
Massoomeh Hedayati Marzbali³**

***Corresponding author**

^{1,2,3}*School of Housing, Building and Planning,
Universiti Sains Malaysia,
11800 Penang, Malaysia*

iiiliyasu20@student.usm.my

aldrin@usm.my

hedayati@usm.my

Received: 24 August 2021

Accepted: 7 October 2021

Published: 31 March 2022

ABSTRACT

The emerging research on urban morphology provide sufficient explorations that result in a better understanding of crime areas and fear of crime in cities. Despite the effort so far, the existing literature on morphology of crime areas and pattern of crime presents different perspectives to the study of crime and spaces, reflecting the varied field of urban morphological research. There is a need to understand these perspectives in view of their directions and inherent limitations for effective understanding of crime pattern and urban morphogenesis in cities. The focus of the paper is on the understanding of different perspectives in the study of crime pattern and urban morphology in setting up an effective mechanism for crime prevention and control. Twenty (20) paper articles and six (6) theses published between 2010 - 2021 were selected based on the Environmental criminological research perspectives from the field of Geography, Urban Planning, Urban Design, Landscape Architecture and Architecture; and systematically reviewed based on their characteristics and then classified according to their relevance to environmental criminology for analysis and drawing of inferences. The findings indicated that, there is inadequate empirical research on the influence of urban morphology on crime pattern in cities. Therefore, the paper recommends for further research to focus on exploring the various links between elements of urban morphology and spatial distribution of crime in areas, and the explanations that could provide for effective crime prevention and control in cities.



Keywords: *Built environment, Crime pattern, Environmental criminology, Urban morphology*

INTRODUCTION

The greatest challenges facing the world in the 21st century are poverty, inequality, insecurity and climate change. With more than half of the world's population living in urban areas, the reality of the 21st century is that these issues will have a strong impact on cities as they are becoming the magnet of hope for the people. Several studies indicated that, the battle against these mutually reinforcing situations shall be won or lost in cities (UN-habitat, 2019a & 2020; Yunusa, 2011).

Urban crime threatens the quality of life, human rights, social and economic stability and sustainable development in cities around the world. This is especially true in developing countries that have high poverty rates and many informal settlements and this is manifested in the form of organized crime, banditry and property crimes. The poor are the worst affected by urban crime and violence, regardless of their geographical location (UN Habitat, 2019b). Other studies further attested to the fact that usually, areas of the city that are most blighted by violence also happen to be the poorest, unfortunately (Alemika & Chukuma (2012); Assiagio, 2017; Bernasco & Block, 2009; Umar et al., 2015b; Winton, 2004).

Different conceptions of crime in design practice, sociology, environmental psychology, and criminology indicated an extensive articulation of crime in relation to the built environment and urban form in the city. Five decades of different studies on urban crime, crime prevention through environmental design, and fear of crime indicated an implicit and gradual movement from deterministic to possibilistic propositions in exploring the relationships between urban crime and environmental design both in theory and practice (Carr, 2020; Cozens et al., 2019, & Umar et al., 2018). In this way, various dimensions of crime prevention in both theory and practice can be categorized into morphological, social, functional, and perceptual dimensions. While the social and perceptual dimensions of crime phenomenon have been widely addressed in criminology,

environmental psychology, and sociology disciplines in terms of fear of crime, sense of community, people participation, demographic profiling, socio-economic attributes, risk, and victimization. The morphological and functional dimensions of urban crime have been relatively less explored comprehensively as a complex combination of urban forms and functions in relation to social and perceptual outcomes (Eck & Weisburd, 1995; Wuschke, 2016, & 2018). Moreover, considering the complexity of the city as a combinational network of multi-scalar activities and emergence, the issue of urban crime needs to be explored in relation to various scales and dimensions of the city and urban environments.

Considering the large body of knowledge and research on the issue of crime in relation to the built environment in terms of spatial structure, demographic status, urban morphology, sociocultural and economic condition, it is probable to conceive an evolutionary process in which different approaches and trends advocate for a comprehensive articulation of the complex relation between crime and the city (Cozens, 2007; Perkins et.al, 2009; Salau & Lawanson, 2010; Silva & Li, 2020). Despite the fact that crime is one of the critical problems of cities worldwide, most of the previous studies have been conducted in sociology, criminology, and psychology in order to either explore the sociocultural and economic predictors of crime, whether in sociocultural context or individuals, or evaluate the proposed theories or propositions (Cozens, 2011). However, although the studies have gradually extended the crime discourse over the hedge of narrow-minded determinism that was implicitly embedded with the early trends of environmental research on the issue of crime, they have relatively ignored or reduced the “complexity of the city problems” (Jacobs, 1961; Jones & Fanek, 1997; Lamy & Madanipour, 2006; Hedayati et al., 2020) into crime statistics while abstracting crime from its urban context. However, whilst planners and designers need to adopt theories and propositions in relation to spatiality and sociality domains in order to forecast the social outcomes of their spatial amendments in the built environment, the efficiency of these propositions remains ambiguous while societies are paying the price and the challenge is overwhelmingly critical when “design-level” theories are needed for interventions (Hillier & Sahbaz, 2008; Ojo & Ojewale, 2019; Umar et al., 2020). Thus, conducting a theoretical review, the paper established the limitations of the previous research perspectives on crime and urban environment towards achieving effective crime prevention through

environmental design. The objective is to identify the way forward and the need to further explore urban morphology for understanding the pattern of crime and criminal activities in cities as the basis for drawing up a Planning and Design framework for developing crime resilient cities.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

Literature Search

This paper focused on the role of urban morphology in understanding crime pattern. It also attempted to review the influence of such findings in shaping crime prevention frameworks in cities. The research objectives were addressed by conducting a comprehensive systematic review of most recent literature that examines the influence of built environmental elements in understanding crime pattern in urban areas. A systematic and extensive search was conducted in several electronic databases, which include articles published from 2010 to 2021 as suggested in the PRISMA statement (Moher et.al., 2009). The literature search was conducted between August, 2019 to January, 2021; using the major databases, including Web of Science, Scopus, ScienceDirect and Sci-hub. The search keywords used include: ‘environmental criminology’, ‘urban morphology’, ‘Design out crime’, ‘crime pattern’, ‘crime and urban form’ and ‘crime prevention through environmental design’.

Literature Review Criteria

In the course of selecting publications to be included in the review and subsequent analysis, no geographical limit was set against inclusion or exclusion of materials, but rather adopted a worldwide domain. The selection process was conducted in two stages. The titles and abstracts were assessed, and then the whole text of selected articles were reviewed. A definition of inclusion criteria was conducted prior to the extensive search. The inclusion criteria for articles used include:

- published between 2010-2021,
- published in peer-reviewed journals and unpublished Thesis written in English,
- highly cited,

- relevancy to the objectives of the study,
- outcomes related to Sociological, Psychological and Economic aspects of crime were excluded,
- interconnection analysis and ability to answer research questions.

Our search identified 106,097 records. After the title screening process, approximately 312 articles were found to be appropriate. Consequently, further screening was carried out based on the content of the abstract, whereby 55 records were selected based on their appropriateness to the study focus. Finally, 20 records were selected for detailed content analysis. Unpublished thesis was also used, six (6) theses were purposively selected and analysed; the findings have been presented in the discussion.

LITERATURE REVIEW: CONCEPTS AND THEORIES EXPLAINING CRIME PATTERN IN URBAN AREAS

Concept of Urban Morphology

Before identifying urban morphology and urban form, it would be useful to look into the origin of the words. As stated in various dictionaries, morphology is constituted from the Latin words *morphe* (form) and *logos* (description); therefore, morphology is concisely the description of form. The Oxford English Dictionary defines morphology as the particular shape, form, or external structure of an organism, or landform. It is also described as the history of variation in form. Form is characterised as the general system of arrangement, whereas figure is defined by lines and angles. Ching (1996) defines form as a three-dimensional mass, which also concerns figure and shape; it is the external outline, internal structure, and the unity of the whole.

Urban morphology is defined as “the organized body of knowledge” and “integral part of urban geography”; it relates forms to their socio-economic context and historical development (Krieger, 2006; Psarra, 2012 & Whitehand, 1987). Urban morphology is about shapes, forms, spaces and places; it is also associated with the nature and scale of physical places and the connections between them. It can be both descriptive and classificatory. It also focuses on the question of “how and why settlements took the shape

they did” which includes analytical element of morphogenesis (Kalimapur, 2016). It is the study of the city as a human habitat (Moudon, 1997). Despite multiple definitions, briefly, urban morphology means the structure or the study of urban form (Kropf, 2005; Larkham, 2005; Whitehand, 2005).

Urban morphology was firstly defined in the geography literature. Geography deals with the morphological processes of settlements; and the main pioneers of this discipline are Conzen, Kropf, Larkham and Whitehand (Conzen, 1960; Kropf, 2001; Larkham, 2005; & Whitehand, 1987). Secondly, architecture tackles the typological processes of the subject and here we can mention Lefebvre, Malfroy, Moudon and Psarra as the forerunners (Lefebvre, 1994; Malfroy, 1986; Moudon, 1998; Psarra, 1997). Thirdly, philosophy, which tackles the philosophical processes within urban morphology, differs from the other disciplines in that it questions more the social issue of space. The key proponents of this approach are Harvey, Foucault, Lefebvre and Harvey (Madanipour, 1996). Fourth, urban design deals with the public space network, space and place issues, and (Krieger, 2006; Lynch, 1960 & 1981; Jacob, 1961) and many others can be mentioned here. Finally, by the late twentieth century, in terms of science, Geographical Information Systems GIS, Space Syntax by Hillier and his colleagues (1970s), and other mathematical models by (Alexander, 1977; Salingeros, 2000; Van Nes & Yamu, 2021) can be cited as recent quantitative approaches to the analysis of urban morphology (Case, 2019; Cozens, 2019; Sima & Zhang, 2009).

In addition, urban form is described as the basic element that gives character to cities. Urban form is composed of buildings, streets, squares, roads, and all the elements that make up the city. It is the outcome of a process that is formed by specific determining forces i.e., Geographical and Man-made factors (Alkim, 2006; Hipp et. al., 2018 & Larkham, 2005).

Therefore, urban morphology is related to the history of the city, spatial relations, social relations, economic relations, culture, traditions, various factors shaping that form, and its rural/urban landscape. It is about the people, institutions, regulations, and management. Therefore, it is an important phenomenon and an analytic tool, which helps cities to understand their development processes, and the characteristics of each element in the city.

Crime and Crime typology

A crime is defined as any act that is contrary to legal code or laws (Brantingham, 2015). In other words, crime and legality are social constructs that are fluid and change over time (Tibbetts, 2019). There are many different types of crimes, from crimes against persons to victimless crimes and violent crimes to white collar crimes. The study of crime and deviance is a large subfield within sociology, with much attention paid to who commits which types of crimes and the reason for the crime (Crossman, 2021). There are many different crimes, and what exactly constitutes a crime may vary from state to state. In general, crimes may be categorized into four broad categories (Cozens et al., 2019). The other categories are: cyber-crimes, white-collar crimes, organized crimes, sex crimes, hate crimes, property crimes (muggings, burglary, larceny-theft, motor vehicle theft and arson).

Crime and Urban Form

Exploration of crime and place is a rapidly evolving area of research in the 21st century. Some of the early works in the 1970s examined topological structure of neighborhoods, identifying a way to measure the permeability of edges of the neighborhood, allowing crime committed by non-residents to drift away from the usual location along major streets into roads toward the centers of neighborhoods (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993c). For decades, research focus on the understanding of crime and the urban environment, particularly how people live in and interact with the landscape (buildings, people, roads, and activities) that surrounds them. It advances understanding of crime within the urban landscape (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1995). Crime changes with urban development patterns. Opportunities for criminal activity emerge, disappear, or move as geography changes across the urban landscape (Weisburd et al., 2012). Patterns emerge, dissipate, or persist; but crimes are far more predictable by place of occurrence than by a particular offender (Umar et al., 2020).

Jacob's book *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961) was the first contemporary piece to show how an active street life could considerably reduce opportunities for crime. This was followed by Jeffery's book *Crime Prevention through Environmental Design* (1971 & 1977). Jeffery considered a broad array of environmental factors that influence

offenders, including the physical environment (urban form and design), the legal environment (reinforcing rules and regulations), the economic environment and social structures and social organization. The work stimulated researchers such as the Brantingham, Felson and Clarke, as well as professionals such as planners, geographers, sociologists, psychologists and architects to study crime in relation to environmental factors (Cozens et al., 2019).

Criminal events are inseparable from the environments in which they occur. The origins, pathways, and destinations of individuals are shaped by their physical surroundings. In urban environments, in particular, the built physical form of the city encourages (and often restricts) movement along specific, planned pathways, which connect the origin and destination points such as; residences, workplaces, schools, shopping and entertainment areas, to name a few (Abdul & Md Sakip, 2017; Boivin & D'Elia, 2017; Boivin & Felson, 2017; Frank et al. 2013). As urban structure shapes patterns of movement, so too does it shape patterns of criminal activity (Bowers, 2010; Boivin & D'Elia, 2017; Brantingham et.al. 2015; Johnson & Wuschke, 2007; Wuschke 2016; Wuschke & Bryan, 2018; Silva & li, 2020). Changes to the built urban environments, such as urban development, growth, decline or gentrification, are designed to shift the movement within and use of urban spaces; as such, these processes may have considerable impact on the distribution of criminal activity.

Theories Explaining Crime Pattern in Urban Areas

Studies in environmental criminology have also indicated that there is a strong relationship between the patterns of crime in a city and the urban form. In 1978, Paul and Patricia Brantingham studied how crime locations scatter themselves into specific patterns in relation to the variables that govern growth of cities. Older cities with concentric zonal forms have crime-locations concentrated towards the dense core of the city. The cities with mosaic patterns that are relatively newer seemed to have a scattered pattern of crime spots. The patterns of roads in a city also have a relation with the patterns of crime because the roads determine the accessibility to potential crime spots in a city. Cities built on gridiron patterns are known to have higher crime rates when compared to cities with naturally developed street layouts (Brantingham & Brantingham, 2008; Silva & Li, 2020).

Several theories have emerged over time to provide a comprehensive understanding on the inter play between crime and the environment. Table 1 has provided a summary of these theories and their fundamental assumptions and inherent limitations as observed by researchers.

Table 1. Theories Explaining Crime Pattern in Urban Areas

Theories	Author (s)	Assumptions	Emerging criticisms
Opportunity Theory	Clarke, 1983; Wortly, 2008, 2010	The theory proposes that urban crime analysts should search for concentrations of offence targets and reduce the chances of re-offending. The basic assumptions here is that more opportunities lead to more crime, easier opportunities attract more offenders and shape the lifestyle of crime within urban settings.	The theory attracts its own criticisms. It was considered counterproductive as it does not alter the disposition of criminals to continue offending and was also criticized on the grounds that it led to crime displacement across areas.
Social Disorganisation	(Park & burgess, 1928; Park et. al., 1969; Shaw & Mckay, 1942)	The effects of location and location specific characteristics of fragile communities such as poverty, ethnic heterogeneity, and weakened social stability influence the perpetuation of crime.	The theory has been criticized by environmental criminologist for being purely offender focused approach to investigating the occurrence of crime while ignoring the influence of built environment on crime - criminal events.
Rational Choice Theory	(Cornish & Clarke, 1986; 2008)	The theory assumes that criminals think exactly the same way as non-criminals. That crime perpetrators within urban settings intentionally choose to commit offence largely because they feel it would be more rewarding for them than non-criminal behaviour. The theory also, places greater emphasis on the influence of purposive behaviour in the risk-reward calculation of offenders.	The theory placed emphasis on impulsive behaviours of offenders in committing crime. Several critics argue that impulsive emotions can have significant effects on the predisposition to commit crime. Other criticisms of the theory show that other extenuating factors may influence offenders and that they may not always act rationally.
Routine Activity Theory	(Cohen & Felson, 1979; Eck, 1995; Felson, 1995; Felson & Clark, 1998; Felson, 2008)	The theory suggests that the organization of repetitive activities in urban settings creates opportunities for crime. The assumption here is that crime occurs when there is an offender who is motivated enough to commit a crime; presence of a target against which the motivated offender can strike; absence of a capable guardian and a place which provide opportunity for the crime.	The theory over time has attracted a number of criticisms. This includes the assumptions that: the offender has to be motivated; it contradicts the assumptions of other criminological theories such as crime pattern theory which focus on the spreading of crime.
Crime Pattern Theory	(Brantingham & Brantingham, 1993, 1995, 2008; Eck & Weisburd, 1994)	The underlying premise for the crime pattern theory is that crimes do not happen randomly or uniformly in time, urban space, across social groups and during daily or lifetime routines. Similarly, there are those offenders who repeatedly commit crimes within urban settings and there are targets (persons and places) that repeatedly fall victim to such crimes.	Although the theory has been popularized within the domain of environmental criminology, it still faces some criticisms. The underlying assumptions that are used to create the routine activities triangle comprising Nodes, Paths, and Edges focus largely on the behaviours of criminals and victims which can change from time to time.

Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)	(Cozens & Love, 2015; Jeffery,1971; Newman, 1972; Moffat, 1983)	The central assumptions made by CPTED is that the built environment represents an important underlying determinant of crime. The idea here is that an efficient and effective utilization of the physical environment helps to reduce crime. "There are no criminals...only environmental circumstances that result in criminal behaviour. Given the proper environmental structure, anyone will be a criminal or a non-criminal" (Jeffery, 1977, p.177).	CPTED has attracted a range of criticisms from criminologists. CPTED proposes environmental design methods such as target hardening and restrictions and control of access; some of these methods actually create urban fortresses which further entrench urban segregation. Another criticism of CPTED is that it also led to the displacement of crime.
---	---	---	---

Source: Author

The criminality of place is most often connected to the level of activity, ease of access, the presence of juveniles, and the presence of easy targets or victims. The sense of place is temporal by nature. People may feel fear in a dark parking lot at night, but completely safe in the same parking lot during the daytime. In essence, criminal places as well as criminal activities have a temporal dimension in accordance with environmental criminology (Meena, 2016; Md Sakip et al., 2019 & Perry, 2017).

Crime and urban form research have also explored potential offender decision making by arguing that crime is associated with offender awareness of space that led to decisions about target attractiveness. Crimes occur where and when the immediate environment makes the offender feel that a crime can be committed with reasonable safety and ease. Conversely, victim decision making can affect crime patterns. Victims’ choices about where to work, shop, or play affect their chances of coming in contact with offenders (Cozens, 2019 & Kim, 2018).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Perspectives of Research on Urban Morphology and Crime Pattern

It is clear that research on Environmental Criminology has largely focused on the relationship between patterns of crime and urban form and has gained considerable attention in the last four to five decades (Carr, 2020; Cozens, 2007; Meena, 2016 & Song et.al. 2016). Advances are evident

from theoretical perspectives, pointing at best approach to view and better understanding of crime events, management, prevention and control, and in terms of methodologies in conducting empirical research to test the validity of such theories. This trend has addressed a lot of pressing questions with some fascinating explanations as to why, where, when and how crimes occur. As new findings continue to emerge prompting new sets of questions, much research is still needed to provide more answers (Azande, 2015; Mihinjac & Saville, 2019; Umar et al., 2018; Zubairu, 2016).

It is important, however, to note that contributions to this field of research have been approached from different disciplinary perspectives, such as Geography, Urban Planning, Urban Design and Architecture which will help to explore the interaction of crime with space through the morphological analysis of places (Groff & Lockwood, 2014; Kamalipour et al., 2014; Perry, M.A., 2017). However, Table 2 indicated that, even within these professional disciplines there are numerous variations in context in terms of research focus.

Table 2. Perspectives of Research on Urban Morphology and Crime Pattern

Perspectives of Researches	Author(s)	Discussions	Limitations of the studies
Geographical	(Ahmed, 2010; Ackerman & Murray, 2004; Adel et al., 2016; Arthur, 1994; Appiahene-Gyamfi, 1999; Emamanuel et.al, 2015; Hillier & Shu, 2000; Isin, 2012; Ratcliffe, 2012; Rengert & Brain, 2009; Song, et al., 2013a. Umar, 2016, Umar et Al., 2020)	Urban form and pattern of crime largely focus on exploring the spatial pattern of crime in spaces over a period of time, with emphasis on macro scale of analysis for the understanding of the social and spatial environmental elements that could provide explanations of crime for effective crime prevention and control.	The studies are limited to the exploration of crime pattern over space and understanding of the influence of spatial forms at neighbourhood level of analysis, ignoring the role of social indices such as poverty level, education and land use mix in explaining crime events and pattern across areas of the city.
Urban Planning	(Cozens et al., 2020; Hillier, 2008; Heidarzadeh, 2014; Kim et al., 2017; Kim & Hipp, 2019; Lopez & Nes, 2007; Ojo & Ojewale, 2019; Salau & Lawanson, 2010; Satiawan et al., 2018; Summers & Johnson, 2017; Wuschke, 2016; Zubairu, 2017).	Urban form and pattern of crime research largely dwell on the impact of planning decisions on urban transformation with respect to land use change dynamics, social and physical infrastructures and safety and insecurity in cities. The focus here is on how these decisions explain crime events and distribution over space and how possible it is to plan for crime prevention and control in cities.	The studies mostly focused on micro to macro spatial design conditions which are relevant to spatial design intervention, spatial designer and spatial design prevention policy making. These explanations are limited in terms of scale of analysis to district levels without consideration to the wider city network of crime flow.

Urban design	(Abdul et al., 2017; Arabi et al., 2020; Armitage, 2004; Azande, 2015; Beavon et al., 1994; Bowers, 2013; Crowe, 2000; Curman et al., 2015; Dwidinita et al., 2018; Frank et al., 2013; Groff, 2014; Groff & McCord, 2012; Jeffery, 1992; Kinney et al., 2008; Lin, 2010; McCord & Ratcliffe, 2009; Newman, 1996)	Urban form and crime studies largely deals with the public space network, space and place issues with respect to crime prevention through urban design. The focus of urban design studies on morphology of space and pattern of crime is to reduce the opportunities for crime through alteration of situational factors or modification of physical settings at which a crime event is likely to occur, i.e., Crime prevention through Environmental Design.	These studies consider only the physical elements at the buildings and streets level (micro scale), without making reference to the social fabrics of the places of crime events. The studies are limited to the physical fabrics of the places in terms of target hardening, surveillance and image of the areas, ignoring the influence of macro form elements such as connectivity to other areas and land use dynamics of the city.
Architectural	(Bafna, 2012; Carr, 2020; Lefebvre, 1994; Legeby, 2009; Marcus, 2007; Marzbali et al., 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, 2019a & 2019b; Meena, 2016; Milinjac & Saville, 2019; Psarra, 2009; Siti & Abdullah, 2012)	Urban morphology and pattern of crime studies focus on typological process of buildings and opportunities they present to crime events in terms of attraction, prevention or control. The research concern here is on how building design and construction as well as organised open spaces attract crime or deter crime in areas in order to create a better design of buildings and spaces for crime prevention and control.	Most of these studies evaluated the role of Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) models in understanding the crime pattern, fear of crime and victimization across areas. The studies largely looked into the CPTED suitability and applicability in crime prevention while under plying the model's adaptability to different urban forms.

Sources: Authors.

Limitations of research on Urban morphology and Crime pattern

The review of several literature on the relationship between built environmental features and crime pattern and distribution in cities has established the availability of extensive research work had been carried out. Most of these studies were done for the purpose of understanding urban crime occurrences in relation to built environmental characteristics, and what possible implications it has on the future of urban planning and design strategies for cities. Moreover, most studies adopted different elements for consideration in the analysis from which explanations were drawn. For instance; Lynch (1960) and Jacobs (1961) have identified the critical role of urban planning in explaining urban crime, violence and juvenile as well as a profession that provides a viable opportunity and environment for prevention, management and control of deviance in urban areas (Brantingham & Brantingham, 1995). Since then, the study of crime has become a research interest to several urban researchers (Adel et al., 2016; Azande & Gyuse, 2017; Cozens et. al., 2019; Felson and Boivin, 2015; Hashim et.al., 2018; Kalimapour et.al., 2014; Kim, 2018 & Umar et al., 2020). Most of these studies examined crime in the context of urban

morphology and drawn an understanding on the explanation of crime events and pattern in urban areas. However, these studies vary in the context of morphological analysis and approaches adopted. According to (Abdullah et al., 2018; Carr, 2020; Cozens, 2011; Kumar & Borbor, 2018; Mazbali et al., 2016 & Nangia et al., 2019); the built environmental features provide opportunities for crime generation, attraction and detraction across space. Therefore, morphological research with the aim of establishing the effect of built form on crime pattern should consider the basic fundamental elements of urban morphology i.e., form, resolution and time (Brantingham et al., 2009; Case, 2019; Godwin & Stasko, 2017; Hodgkinson & Andresen, 2019). This will enable the drawing up of an effective understanding on the potential effects of urban form on crime pattern and distribution across cities.

In summary, a number of common themes emerged from the body of previous research on exploring crime within the context of built urban form. Though, consistencies exist across a number of urban areas, key environmental features can have different associations with various crime activities and varied spatial patterns across urban environments. Some have categorized crime activities and spatial patterns at the same spatial scale, while others have different crime activities with common spatial patterns and different spatial scales. However, while such findings have clear potential value to Planners, Urban designers, Landscape Architects, Architects and policy makers alike, there is still inadequate understanding of the influence of urban morphology on crime pattern in our cities as established in the previous studies. This is so because of the absence of an existing study that explored adequately the morphology of urban spaces and crime pattern in the context of form (planned and unplanned), scale (Micro, Meso and Macro) and time (histo-morphology). Therefore, the paper has identified these as the missing link in the existing body of literature with respect to the study of crime and urban environment. Hence, the paper recommends that future research should consider this as their focus of in-depth study, with the aim of providing a better understanding of emerging urban crime activities and its spatial pattern as influenced by the prevailing urban form in place for effective crime prevention and management in our towns and cities.

CONCLUSION

Urban crime has largely been addressed with different approaches to the conception of crime and its main initiatives. However, the growing body of knowledge in the studies of urban crime refers to the social and spatiality aspects of the problem in the cities worldwide. While different approaches to the study of crime do exist as identified in the paper, it is possible to denote that urban crime pattern cannot be thoroughly explored in the absence of social constructs and spatial features of spaces in the context of form, scale and time. Furthermore, the issue of urban crime is multidimensional. That is why any desire for planning and designing a safe place in cities should incorporate functional and morphological analysis of the urban environment. Therefore, there is a need for further research to focus on providing an explanation on the relationship between morphological character of spaces and the pattern of crime in places within the context of urban environment. This is with the view of actualizing the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and mainstreaming the mandates of the New urban Agenda towards realizing the safe city and crime resiliency in our towns and cities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors would like to thank Universiti Sains Malaysia for funding this research under Research University Grant (RUI), grant number 1001/PPBGN/8016111.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, A., Marzbali, M, H., Bahauddin, A., & Maghsoodi, M.J. (2018). Territorial attitudes and Victimization: A tale of two Neighbourhoods. *Journal of ASIAN Behavioural Studies*, 3(7).
- Abdul W. A. & Md Sakip, S. R. (2017). Design Out Crime in School-

- Measuring Validity and Reliability Sense of Safety in Secondary School: A Pilot Survey. In *Malaysian Journal of Sustainable Environment*, 2 (1), p. 87.
- Ackerman, W. V. & Murray, A. T. (2004). Assessing spatial patterns of crime in Lima, Ohio. *Cities*, 21(5): 423–437.
- Adel, H., Salheen, M., & Aliya, R.A. (2016). Crime in relation to urban design. Case study of the Greater Cairo Region. *Ain Shams Engineering Journal*. Vol. 7, pp. 925-938.
- Ahmed, Y. (2012). *Trend and Pattern of Urban Crime in Southwestern Nigeria*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.
- Alemika, E & Chukwuma I. (2012). *Criminal Victimization, Safety and Policing in Nigeria*. Lagos: CLEEN Foundation.
- Alexander, C., Ishikawa, S. & Silverstein, M. (1977). *A Pattern Language: Towns, Buildings, and Construction*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Alkim, H. (2006). *Urban Morphologic Analyses of Suleymaniye through Space Syntax*. An unpublished M.Sc. thesis submitted to the Department of Urban Design, Istanbul Technical University and Institute of Science and Technology.
- Appiahene-Gyamfi, J. (1999). *An Exploratory of the Spatial and Temporal Patterning and Distribution of Crime in Ghana with Emphasis on Accra*. An unpublished PhD. thesis, Simon Fraser University, Canada.
- Arabi, M., Naseri, T.S. & Jhdi, R. (2020). Use All Generation of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) for Design Urban Historical Fabric (Case Study: The Central Area of Tehran Metropolis, Eastern Oudlajan). *Ain Shams Engineering Journal*, .11, No.3, pp.519-533.
- Armitage, R. (2004). *Secured by Design: An investigation of its history, development and future role in crime prevention*. Unpublished PhD. thesis, University of Huddersfield.
- Arthur, J. A. (1994) Criminology and crime justice research in Africa:

problems and prospects. *International Review of Modern Sociology*, 24(1), 75 – 94.

Assiago, J. (2017). International Approach and Case studies on Safer Cities: A focus on Africa. A paper presented at the 2017 Town Planners Registration Council of Nigeria (TOPREC) Mandatory Continuing Professional Planning Education Programme (MCPPEP), with the theme: *Insecurity, Security and Urban Safety in Nigeria*. Held on 5th - 6th April, 2017; at NUT Endwel Conference Hotel, Mogadishu City Centre, Kaduna, Nigeria.

Azande, P. & Gyuse, T. (2015). Territoriality and Safety in Urban Residential Neighbourhoods in Nigeria. Paper presented at the *International Crime and Intelligence Analysis Conference*, held 26th-27th of February, 2015, at Manchester, UK.

Bafna, S. (2012a). 'Rethinking genotype: Comments on the sources of type in architecture'. In: *The Journal of Space Syntax*, 3(1), p.69-80.

Bafna, S. (2012b), The imaginative function of architecture: A clarification of some conceptual issues. In: Greene, M., Reyes, J. and Castro, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Eighth International Space Syntax Symposium*, Santiago de Chile: PUC, pp.8117.1-8117.19.

Bankoff, G. (1998). Bandits, Banditry and Landscapes of Crime in the Nineteenth-Century Philippines. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 29(2), pp. 319-339.

Beavon, D. J. K., Brantingham, P. L. & Brantingham, P. J. (1994). The influence of Street Networks on the Patterning of Property Offences. In: R. V. Clarke (ed.) *Crime Prevention studies*. Vol. 2, pp. 115-148, Monsey N.Y, Criminal justice Press.

Bernasco, W., & Block, R. (2009). Where offenders choose to attack: A discrete choice model of robberies in Chicago. *Criminology*, vol. 47, pp. 93-130.

Boivin, R. & D'Elia, M. (2017). A Network of Neighbourhoods: Predicting crime trips in a large Canadian City. *Journal of Research in Crime and delinquency*. 54(6), 824-846, SAGE publishers.

- Boivin, R. & Felson, M. (2017). "Crimes by Visitors versus Crimes by Residents: The Influence of Visitor Inflows." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. doi:10.1007/s10940-017-9341-1.
- Bolton, T., Froy, F., Khan, S.S. & Francis, N. (2017). *Crime Policy and Place layout*. Synthesis paper on "The impact of space syntax research on urban policy making: linking research into UK policy. Bartlett Enterprise Development Fund and Space Syntax Limited, UCL.
- Brantingham, P. L., & Brantingham, P. J. (1993a). Environment, routine, and situation: Toward a pattern theory of crime. In R. V. Clarke and M. Felson (Eds.), *Routine Activity and Rational Choice* (pp. 259-294). New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Brantingham, P. L., & Brantingham, P. J. (1993b). *Location quotients and crime hotspots in the city*. In C.B. Block, & M. Dabdoub (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Workshop on Crime Analysis Through Computer Mapping* (pp. 175). Illinois, August 22 – 25, 1993.
- Brantingham, P. L., & Brantingham, P. J. (1993c). Nodes, paths and edges: Considerations on the complexity of crime and the physical environment. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 13: 3-28.
- Brantingham, P. L., & Brantingham, P. J. (1995). Criminality of place: Crime generators and crime attractors. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 3(3):5-26.
- Brantingham, P. L., & Brantingham, P. J. (2008). *The rules of crime pattern theory*. In Wortley, R., and L. Mazerolle (Eds.) *Environmental Criminology and Crime Analysis*. Devon, U.K.: Willan Publishing.
- Brantingham, P. L., Brantingham, P. J., Vajihollahi, M., & Wuschke, K. (2009). *A topological technique for crime analysis at multiple scales of aggregation*. In D. Weisburd, W. Bernasco and G. Bruinsma (Eds.), *Putting Crime in its Place: Units of Analysis in Spatial Crime Research*. London: Springer-Verlag, 87-107.
- Brantingham, P. L., Wuschke, K., Frank, R., & Brantingham, P. J. (2015). *Crime emergence and simulation modelling*. In McGloin, J. and Kennedy, L. (Eds.). *When Crime Appears: The Role of Emergence*.

New York: Routledge, 197-224.

- Bruinsma, G. J. N., Pauwels, L. J. R., Weerman, F. M. & Bernasco, W. (2013). Social disorganization, social capital, collective efficacy and the spatial distribution of crime and offences. *British Journal of Criminology*, 53(5): 942–963.
- Carr, M. M. (2020). *Urban Hostility: CPTED, Hostile Architecture and the Erasure of Democratic Public Space*. An unpublished B.Sc. Architecture Thesis, submitted to School of Architecture, Portland State University, Oregon, USA.
- Case, B. S. (2019). *Urban Morphology as a Research Method, in Planning Knowledge and Research*. Sanchez, T. W. (ed.), Routledge publishers, US.
- Ching, F. (1996). *Architecture: form, space and order*; New York, Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Chiodi, S. I. (2016). Crime prevention through urban design and planning in the smart city era - The challenge of disseminating CP-UDP in Italy: learning from Europe. *Emerald Journal of Place Management and Development*, 9(2), pp. 137-152.
- Clarke, R. V. & Felson, M. (1993). *Routine Activity and Rational Choice*. Vol. 5, New Brunswick and London: Transaction publishers.
- Cohen, L. E. & Felson, M. (1979) Social change and crime rate trends: a routine activity approach. *American Sociological Review*, vol. 44, pp. 588–608.
- Conzen, M.R.G. (1960). “*Alnwick, Northumberland: A Study in Town-plan Analysis*”, Institute of British Geographers Publication 27, George Philip, London.
- Cornish, D. & Clarke, R. V. (1986). *The Reasoning Criminal*. New York, NY: Springer–Verlag.
- Crossman, A. (2021). “7 Different types of Crimes”. Thoughts.com/types-of-crimes-3026270.

- Cozens, P. (2007). *Planning, crime and urban sustainability*. Sustainable Development and Planning III, 1: 187-196.
- Cozens, P.M. (2011). Urban planning and Environmental criminology: Towards a new perspective for safer cities. *Planning Practice and research*, 26(4): 481-508.
- Cozens, P.M., Love, T. & Davern, B. (2019). Geographical Juxtaposition: A New Direction in CPTED. *Journal of Social Sciences*, .8(252), pp.2-22.
- Crowe, T. (2000). *Crime prevention through environmental design*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Stoneham, Massachusetts.
- Curman, A. S., Andresen, M. A., & Brantingham, P. J. (2015). Crime and place: A longitudinal examination of street segment patterns in Vancouver, BC. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 31(1): 127-147.
- Dwidinita, D., Sunarti, E.T. & Setijanti, P. (2018). Understanding the Relationship between Urban Morphology and Crime in South Krembangan, Surabaya. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*;8(7) pp.173-177.
- Eck, E. & Weisburd, D. (Eds.), (1994). *Crime and Place*. Monsey, NY: Willow Tree Press, 67 – 93.
- Eck, J. E., & Weisburd, D. (Eds.). (1995). *Crime prevention studies. Crime and place*, Vol. 4. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Emmanuel, A. O., Abdul-azeez, S. A. & David A. A. (2015). Spatial Analysis of Factors Responsible for Spread of Crime Activities in Akure, Nigeria, using GIS Techniques. *International Journal of Criminology and Sociological Theory*, 8(1).
- Erdogan, A. & Erkan, G.H. (2020). Proposal for a Typology in criminology from a Place-oriented perspectives. *Security Journal*, Springer Nature Limited.
- Felson, M. (1995). Those who discourage crime. In D. Weisburd and J. E. Eck (eds), *Crime and Place*, Monsey, New York: Criminal Justice Press, 53–66.

- Felson, M. (1998). *Crime and Everyday Life* (2nd Ed.). Thousand Oaks, California: Pine Forge Press.
- Felson, M. & Clarke, R.V. (1998). *Opportunity Makes the Thief: Practical theory for crime prevention*. Police Research Series, Paper 98. Home Office Policing and Reducing Crime Unit Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.
- Frank, R., Andresen, M. A., & Brantingham, P. L. (2013), Visualizing the directional bias in property crime incidents for five Canadian municipalities. *The Canadian Geographer*, 57: 31.
- Groff, E. R., & Lockwood, B. (2014). Criminogenic facilities and crime across street segments in Philadelphia: Uncovering evidence about the spatial extent of facility influence. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 51(3): 277-314.
- Groff, E., & McCord, E. S. (2012). The Role of Neighborhood Parks as Crime Generators. *Security Journal*, 25: 1.
- Godwin, A. & Stasko, J. T. (2017). Nodes, Paths, and Edges: Using Mental Maps to Augment Crime Data Analysis in Urban Spaces. *Proceedings of the Eurographics Conference on Visualization*.
- Hashim, H., Mohd, W.M.N.W., Sadek, E.S.S.M. & Dinyati, K.M. (2019). Modelling Urban crime patterns using spatial space Time and Regression Analysis. *Proceedings of the 6th International conference on Geomatics and Geospatial Technology* (GGT, 2019), 1-3 October, 2019, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- Heidarzadeh, Z. (2014). Achieving Sustainable Urban Security in insecure areas with CPTED approach (Case study: Javadieh Neighbourhood of Bojnourd). *International Journal of Scientific Engineering and Technology*, 3(8).1024-1030.
- Hedayati, M., Abdullah, A., & Maghsoodi Tilaki, M. J. (2020). The Impact of the Physical Environment on Residents' Self-Rated Health: a Case Study in Penang, Malaysia. *Malaysian Journal of Sustainable Environment*, 6(1), 109.
- Hillier, B. & Sahbaz O. (2008). *An Evidence based approach to crime and*

- urban design*. Bartlett School of Graduate University Collage, London.
- Hillier, B., & Shu, S. (2000). Crime and Urban Layout: The Need for Evidence. In S. Ballintyne, K. Pease, & V. McLaren (eds.), *Secure Foundations: Key Issues in Crime Prevention* (pp. 224-248). London: Crime Reduction and Community Safety, Institute of Public Policy Research.
- Hipp, J.R., Kim, Y. & Kane, K. (2018). The effects of the Physical Environment on Crime rates: Capturing housing age and housing type at varying scales. *Journal of Crime and Delinquency*, 65(11), pp. 1-31.
- Hodgkinson, T & Andresen, M. A. (2019). Changing spatial patterns of Residential burglary and the crime drop: The need for spatial data signatures. *Journal of Criminal Science*. 61, pp. 90-100.
- Isin, C. (2012). *In Between Space and social Interaction: A case study of three Neighbourhoods in Izmir*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, University of Nottingham.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House. Inc.
- Jones, M., & Fanek, M. (1997). Crime in the urban environment. M.D. Major, L. Amorim, F. Dufoux. Proceedings, 1st. *International Space Syntax Symposium*, Vol. II. London.
- Kamalipour, H. (2016). Urban Morphologies in informal settlements: A case study. *Contour Journal*, 1(2), pp. 1-10.
- Kamalipour, H., Memarian, G., & Faizi, M., (2014). Urban crime and Pattern conceptions: Departuring from Spatiality. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, vol. 2, pp. 441-450.
- Kim, S., KIM, D. & Jung, S. (2017). Analysis of the effects of Cul-de-sacs permeability factors in Low-rise Residential Areas on Burglary. *Journal of Asian Architecture and Building Engineering*. 16(3), pp.487-493.
- Kim, Y. (2018). *Activity Nodes, Pathways, and Edges: Examining Physical Environments, structural Characteristics and Crime patterns in Street segments*. An unpublished Ph.D. thesis submitted to the Department of

Criminology, Law and Society, University of California, Irvine, U.S.A.

- Kim, Y. & Hipp, J.R. (2019). Street Egohood: An alternative perspective of measuring Neighbourhood and Spatial pattern of Crime. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, Springer.
- Kinney, J. B, Brantingham, P.L, Wuschke, K.E, Kirk, M.G, & Brantingham, P.J. (2008). "Crime Attractors, Generator and Detractors: Land Use and Urban Crime Opportunities." *Built Environment* 34:62-74.
- Krieger, A. (2006). Territories of Urban Design, in Moor, M. and Rowland, J. (Eds) *Urban Design Futures*, pp. 18-19. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kropf, K. (1996) "Urban Tissue and the Character of Towns", *Urban Design International* ,1, 247-63.
- Kropf, K. S. (2001). Conceptions of change in the built environment, *Urban Morphology*. 5(1), pp. 29-42.
- Kropf, K. S. (2005). "The handling characteristics of urban form", Urban Design (Quarterly), *Urban Morphology*, Issue 93.
- Kropf, K.S. (1993) "*The Definition of Built Form in Urban Morphology*", unpublished PhD thesis, University of Birmingham.
- Kumar, M. & Borbor, J. (2018). Urban Crime: A Sociological Study of Johat Town. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 23(4), pp.53-59.
- Lamy R. T. & Madanipour, A. (2006). Crime and the City: Domestic Burglary and the Built Environment in Tehran. *Habitat International*, 10, 932-944.
- Larkham, P. (2005). "Understanding Urban Form", *Urban Design International*, 93, 22-4.
- Lawanson O.T, Soyinka, O.A & Omole, F.K (2013). *Achieving Safety and Security in Nigerian Cities: Matters Arising. Emerging Issues in Urban Planning and Development*. Pg. 132-148. Published by, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Faculty of Environmental Science,

University of Lagos.

Lefèbvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*, Wiley-Blackwell Publishers.

Legeby, A. (2009). 'From housing segregation to integration in public space'. In: Koch, D., Marcus, L. and Steen J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Space Syntax Symposium*, Stockholm: KTH Royal Institute of Technology, p.065.1-065.12.

Lin, X. (2010). *Exploring the relationship between Environmental Design and Crime: A case study of the Gonzaga University District*. Unpublished M.sc. Landscape Architecture Thesis, submitted to the Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture Washington.

Lynch, K. (1981). *A theory of Good City Form*, (Cambridge, Mass, London, MIT Press).

Lynch, K. G. (1960). *The image of the city*. Cambridge, MA: Technology Press.

Madanipour, A. (1996). *Design of Urban Space: An Inquiry into a Socio-Spatial Process*. John Wiley & Sons Publishers, Chichester, England.

Marcus, L. (2007). 'Social housing and segregation in Sweden – from residential segregation to social integration in public space'. In: Vaughan, L. (ed.), 'The spatial syntax of urban segregation', in *Progress in Planning*, Vol. 67, p.205-294.

Marzbali, M.H., Abdullah, A., Ignatius, J., & Maghsoodi, M.J. (2015). Examining the effects of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) on Residential Burglary. *International Journal of Law, Crime and Justice*, 46(3), 86-102.

Marzbali, M.H., Maghsoodi, M.J., & Abdullah, A. (2017). Assessing the effect of Neighbourhood structure on residents' perceptions of safety in gated communities: A case study of Iran. *Safer Communities*, 16(1), 3-19.

Marzbali, M.H., Abdullah, A., Ignatius, J., & Maghsoodi, M.J. (2016). Examining the effects of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) on Residential Burglary. *International Journal of*

Law, Crime and Justice, 46, 86-102.

- Marzbali, M.H., Abdullah, A., Ignatius, J., & Maghsoodi, M.J. (2019). Ethnic relations, Crime and Disorder in urban Neighbourhoods: Moderating role of Neighbourhood type in Penang, Malaysia, *Security Journal*.
- McCord, E. S., & Ratcliffe, J. H. (2007). A micro-spatial analysis of the demographic and criminogenic environment of drug markets in Philadelphia. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, 40: 43–63.
- McCord, E. S., & Ratcliffe, J. H. (2009). Intensity value analysis and the criminogenic effects of land use features on local crime patterns. *Crime Patterns and Analysis*, 2: 17–30.
- Md Sakip, S. R., Hassan, K., & Mansor, A. (2019). Community Happiness the Distinct Role of Environment Setting Relatedness. *Malaysian Journal of Sustainable Environment*, 1(1), 12.
- Meena, T. (2016). Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design: A critical perspectives of Environmental Criminology. *International Journal of Law*, 2(5), pp.1-20.
- Mihinjac, M. & Saville, G. (2019). Third-Generation Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED). *Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(182), pp.1-20.
- Morris, A. E. J. (1994). *History of Urban Form*, Harlow, Longman Scientific and Technical.
- Moudon, A. V. (1997). Urban Morphology as an Emerging Interdisciplinary Field. *Urban Morphology*, 1, 3-10.
- Moudon, A.V. (1998). The Changing Morphology of Suburban Neighbourhoods. *Urban Morphology*, 2, 11-29.
- Nangia, C., Sing, D.P., & Ali, S. (2019). Built Environment and its impact on Crimes related to Women in NCT of Delhi: A pilot Survey. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Engineering and Technology*, 10(3) pp. 57-68.

- Newman, O. (1996). *Creating defensible space*. US Department of Housing and Urban Development Office of Policy Development and Research. Washington, DC.
- Ojo, A. & Ojewale, O. (eds.) (2019). *Urbanization and Crime in Nigeria*. Published by Palgrave Macmillan, Springer Nature Publishers, Switzerland.
- Perkins, D., Florin, P., Rich, R., Wandersman, A., & Chavis, D. (2009). Participation and the social and physical environment of residential blocks: Crime and community context. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 18(1), 83e115.
- Perkins, D., Meeks, J., & Taylor, R. (1992). The physical environment of street blocks and resident perceptions of crime and disorder: Implications for theory and measurement. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 12(1), 21e34.
- Perry, M.A. (2017). *Influence of Physical Design*. In Fennelly, L.J. (ed.), *Effective Physical Security*, 5th edition, Elsevier Science and technology Books incorporation, pp. 55-65.
- Psarra, S. (1997). 'Geometry and space in the architecture of Le Corbusier and Mario Botta'. In: Major, M. D., Amorim, L. & Dufaux, D. (eds.), *Proceedings of the First International Space Syntax Symposium*, London: Univesrity College London, p.32.1-32.29.
- Psarra, S. (2009a). 'The ghost of conceived space: What kind of work does or should space syntax perform for architecture?'. In: Koch, D., Marcus, L. and Steen, J. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Space Syntax Symposium*, Stockholm: Royal Institute of Technology, p.089.1-089.10 and in *The Journal of Space Syntax* [e-journal], Vol. 1(1), p.17-29.
- Psarra, S. (2012). Spatial Morphology, Urban history and Design in Julienne Hanson's 'Urban transformation: A history of design ideas. *Journal of Space Syntax* 3(1), pp.7-19.
- Ratcliffe, J. H. (2012). The spatial extent of criminogenic places: a change point regression of violence around bars. *Geographical Analysis*, 44(4):

302-320.

- Rengert, G. F. & Brian L. (2009). "Geographical Units of Analysis and the Analysis of Crime." Pp. 109-22 in Putting Crime in Its Place: Units of Analysis in Geographic Criminology, edited by D. Weisburd, W. Bernasco, & G. J. N. Bruinsma. New York: Springer.
- Rengert, G.F., Piquero, A.R., & Jones, P.R. (1999). "Distance Decay Reexamined." *Criminology* 37:427-46.
- Salau.T.I & Lawanson T. (2010). *Urban Safety Management Approach to Crime Reduction in Lagos Metropolis, in Urban and Regional Planning Review*. Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University of Lagos 2 (1&2) pp 134 -143
- Salingaros, N. A. (2000). Complexity and Urban Coherence, *Journal of Urban Design*, 5, 291-316.
- Satiawan, P.R., Tucunan, K.P., & Azarine, R.Y. (2018). The Spatial Configuration of crime in Surabaya. *Proceedings of IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* 340, pp. 1-14.
- Savoie, J. (ed.) (2008). *Neighbourhood characteristics and the distribution of crime: Edmonton, Halifax and Thunder Bay* (Catalogue No 85-561-M2008010). Ottawa: Statistics. Canada.
- Silva, P. & Li, L. (2020). Urban crime occurrences in Association with Built Environment Characteristics: An African Case with Implications for Urban Design. *Journal of Sustainability*, 12(3056), pp.1-22.
- Siti R. S. & Abdullah, A. (2012). Measuring Crime Prevention through Environmental Design in a Gated Residential Area: A Pilot Survey, *Social and Behavioral Sciences* 42, pp.340-349
- Song, J., Andresen, M.A., Brantingham, P.L., and Spicer, V. (2016). *Crime on the edges: patterns of crime and land use change*. Cartography and Geographic Information Science, in press.
- Song, J., Spicer, V., & Brantingham, P. (2013a). The edge effect: Exploring high crime zones near residential neighborhoods. In Intelligence and Security Informatics (ISI), 2013 IEEE International Conference on

(pp. 245-250). IEEE.

- Song, J., Spicer, V., Brantingham, P. & Frank, R. (2013b). *Crime Ridges: Exploring the Relationship between Crime Attractors and Offender Movement*. Proceedings of the European Intelligence and Security Informatics Conference.
- Taylor, R.B. & Harrell, A.V. (1996). *Physical Environment and Crime*. Research report of the National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.
- Tibbets, S. G. (2019). *Criminology Theory: The Essentials*. 3rd edition, SAGE publishers.
- Twinam, T. (2017). Danger Zone: Land use and Geography of Neighbourhood Crime. *Journal of Urban Economics*. Vol. 100, pp. 104-119. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2017.05.006>
- Umar, F, Cheshire. J.A, & Johnson. S. D., (2015a). *Understanding the spatial pattern of urban crime: a developing country's perspective*, the 23rd Conference on GIS Research UK, 15th – 17th April, 2015, University of Leeds, Leeds - UK.
- Umar, F, Johnson. S. D. & Cheshire. J.A, (2015b). *Crime and Place: Perspectives from a developing country*, The 71st Annual Meeting of American Society of Criminology, 18th – 21st November, 2015, Washington DC, USA.
- Umar, F, Johnson. S. D. & Cheshire. J.A, (2015c). *Environmental Criminology: Perspectives from a developing country*, *The Stockholm Criminology Symposium*, 8th – 10th June, 2015, Stockholm – Sweden.
- Umar, F, (2016). *Understanding the spatial pattern of urban crime in a developing country*. An unpublished Ph.D. Thesis submitted to the Department of Geography, University College of London - UK.
- Umar, F, Johnson. S. D. & Cheshire. J.A, (2018). *Testing Theories of Social Disorganization in Nigeria*. In Bruinsma, G.J.N. & Johnson, S.D. (eds), *Oxford Handbook of Environmental Criminology*, Oxford University Press, pp.1-28.

- Umar, F, Johnson. S. D. & Cheshire. J.A, (2020). Assessing the Spatial Concentration of Urban Crime: An Insight from Nigeria. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10940-019-09448-3>.
- UN-Habitat (2016). *Urbanization and Development: Emerging futures*. World Cities Report, 2016. Nairobi Kenya: UN-Habitat.
- UN-Habitat (2019a). *Urban Impact*. Issue 08, 4th Quarter report, 2019. pp. 1-4. Nairobi Kenya: UN-Habitat.
- UN-Habitat (2019b). *Cities 2030, Cities for All: Implementing the New Urban Agenda*. Report of the Ninth Session of the world Urban Forum, held between 7th - 13th February, 2018 at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
- UN-Habitat (2020). *World Cities Report 2020*. The Sustainable Urbanization. Pp. 6-11. Nairobi Kenya: UN-Habitat.
- Van Nes, A. & Yamu, C. (2021). *Introduction to Space Syntax in Urban Studies*. Springer
- Weisburd, D, Groff, E.R, & Sue-Ming Y. (2012). *The Criminology of Place: Street Segments and Our Understanding of the Crime Problem*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Whitehand, J.W.R., (1987). "Background to the Urban Morphogenetic Tradition", J.W.R. Whitehand (Ed.), *The Urban Landscape: Historical Development and Management*, Institute of British Geographers Special Publication, 13 Academic Press, London, 1-24.
- Whitehand, J.W.R., (2005). "Urban Morphology, Urban Landscape Management and Fringe Belts", *Urban Design*, 93, 19-21.
- Winton, A. (2004). Urban Violence: A Guide, to the Literature. *Environment and Urbanization* 16 (2): 165-84.
- World Bank (2011) *Violence in the City: Understanding and Supporting Community Responses to Urban Violence*, Washington: World Bank.
- Wuschke, K. E. (2016). *Planning for Crime: Exploring the Connections between Urban space, Development and Patterns of crime*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, submitted to the School of Criminology, Simon

Fraser University, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada.

Wuschke, K. E. & Bryan, J.K. (2018). *Built Environment, Land use and crime*. In Bruinsma, G.J.N. & Johnson, S.D. (eds.). Oxford Handbook of Environmental Criminology. Pp. 1-30.

Yunusa, M. (2011). Planning Cities for Wealth Creation: Lecture delivered at the First Urban Dialogue Series of Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Faculty of Environmental Sciences, University of Lagos. www.ccsenet.org/jsd *Journal of Sustainable Development* 5 (2), Feb. 2012 Published by Canadian Center of Science and Education 75.

Zubairu. A.G. (2016). A comparative study of urban crime between Malaysia and Nigeria. Elsevier *Journal of Urban Management*. 6, 19-29.

