Citizen participation in the safety domain: exploring the role of moral appeal on reporting

behavior and intention to report and intervene

Z.C.M. Wessels, BSc.

Faculty of Behavioral, Management and Social Sciences. (BMS)

Psychology of Conflict, Risk and Safety

Supervisors:

W. Schreurs, MSc.

Prof. Dr. J.H. Kerstholt

UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE.

Acknowledgements

Abstract

Collaborating with citizens is an important aspect of modern day policing. Citizens appear to be a great resource of information for the police, information that can be used to solve crimes. This is one of the reasons that the police created programs like 'Crime Watch'. These programs offer the ability to ask the public for help on a large scale, with regard to solving crimes. The current study examines factors that influence the acceptance of messages spread through programs like 'Crime Watch'. A total of 100 Dutch citizens participated in this study. These participants were divided into four groups to measure if seeing a victim statement in the video or seeing a different type of crime had an effect on reporting and intention to report and intervene. No significant effects were found when comparing the different groups on reporting behavior and intention to report and intervene. Further results show that past behavior is a strong predictor for future behavior. In addition people who scored high on egoistic moral values were less inclined to report the offender. Also the more morally wrong a crime is perceived to be, leads to higher intentions to report and intervene. These results can be used in the design and testing of strategies to motivate citizens to participate in the police domain.

Keywords: Citizen participation, moral values, moral emotions, moral wrongness, police

Citizen participation in the safety domain: exploring the role of moral appeal on reporting

behavior and intention to report and intervene

"*Police asks public to become 'counter-terrorism citizens' to help stop attacks.*" –
Independent

"*Police discovers civilians as detectives.*" – *Gelderlander*

"*Citizens to Police: Let's Work Together.*" – *Huffington post*

These are some of the numerous newspaper headlines describing the evolving relation

between the police and citizens. In many countries across the world, police departments have

undergone restructuring, often including a reduction of workforces. These reductions cause a

strain on the ability of the police department to function properly and forces these departments to

mainly focus on their 'core functions', like fighting crime and enforcing law and order (Rogers

& Coliandris, 2015). This could lead to a problem. When solely focusing on core functions, the

police will have less resources left to invest in community-focused engagement (e.g. crime

prevention). If it is the case that the police does not have enough resources to invest in

community engagement, the community might not feel a connection with the police and might

not even appreciate their presence and/or activities. Besides that, it is a distinct possibility that

the members of the community might not 'feel' safe and secure, even though in reality they are

(McKee & Lewis, 2016). It eventually may turn out in a disturbed relationship between the

community and the police, which actually will work against 'core' policing values and activities

(e.g. fighting crime). According to Mckee and Lewis (2016) a focus on community policing will

be a great tool for the police to expand their capacity and strengthen their legitimacy. Because

communities often prove themselves as a valuable source of information, it is important for the

police to invest in relationships with these communities (Thomas, 2016). The current study

examines ways for the police to further utilize these relationships. It will look into the effects of

using moral appeals in official police messages. It is expected that inducing citizens with an appeal on their moral values and moral emotions will lead to more suspect reporting and a higher intention to report and intervene.

Evan (2016) states that investing in good relationships with the public and informing them is a fundamental activity of the police. One example of the police trying to interact and inform the public actively, on a large scale, is through media programs like 'Crime watch'. In these media programs citizens are asked to help and provide information regarding open criminal cases. Van Erp, Van Gastel and Webbink (2012) did research on the effectiveness of the Dutch version of 'Crime Watch'. The results showed that the contribution of the program in aspects of helping the police to solve a criminal case is 15% higher, in comparison with similar cases that are not shown to the public. Thanks to programs like these, the police receives valuable information they otherwise would be much less likely to gather. Van der Hoeven (2011) states that there is an important relationship between citizen participation and the effectiveness of investigative work. This is due to the fact that the police rarely has all the information that is needed to solve a crime. By activating citizens, they increase their eyes and ears on the streets. The more citizens are participating, the more information the police will receive. This increase in information will lead to better chances of solving crimes.

Puspitosari and Priambada (2018) proposed to define the core of criminal behavior as: human behavior that violates the criminal law (norms), harms other people and as a consequence creates victims. Often the rule of thumb is that the more serious the criminal law is violated and the more harm the crime has caused, the higher the punishment that the offender will receive. According to this rule of thumb there is a possibility to commit crimes that vary in seriousness and moral wrongness. But there arises a problem, what exactly is morally wrong behavior? It

could be that different people think differently of what is morally wrong behavior. This could have an impact on their decision making process. For example; when looking at citizens with different (social-demographic) backgrounds, it would not be surprising to find differences in perceived moral wrongness. There has been little to no research results on the connection between perceived moral wrongness of a crime and citizen's reporting behavior and intention to report and intervene, therefore the aim of this study is to shed more light on this subject.

Victims of a crime often have to give a statement to the police about what happened, the so-called 'victim statement'. After the victim informed the police about what happened, the police will investigate the crime and compare the information they collected with the statement given by the victim. To gain extra information and help from the public, the police might call in help of media programs like 'Crime Watch'. 'Crime Watch' can record a statement of the victim and broadcast this on the television to motivate citizens to help solve the crime (e.g. calling forth witnesses by urging the victim's perspective and the damage done). The effects of using victim statements in official police messages has currently not been researched. This study will incorporate the use of victim statements to look at what effects it has on citizen's reporting and intervention behavior.

Possibilities to participate regarding the safety domain

Schreurs, Kerstholt, De Vries and Giebels (in preparation) have done research on the possibilities for citizens to participate in the safety domain, based on their results several participation categories were proposed. The interest of this study lies in two of these categories, namely: responsive participation (e.g. calling the police) and detection (e.g. being a member of a neighborhood watch). De Vries and Giebels (2018) found in their research that the influence of the moral wrongness of a crime and the moral emotions it evoked was related to social control

and responsive participation. The current study will make use of these findings and examine whether reporting and intervention behavior increases when confronted with an offender.

With regard to participation in the safety domain, it might be noted that past behavior of citizens might shape future behaviors. For example someone who has successfully reported a crime to the police before, might be more willing to do it again in the future (Conner & Sparks, 2005).

Theoretical model

Morality

As Christian Smith, a well-known sociologist, has argued: all humans are moral, believing and narrating animals (Smith, 2003). But when people write about morality, what do they exactly mean? History shows different kind of definitions to the term morality. The definition used to explain morality in the current study was reasoned by Haidt (2008). Haidt proposes a society focused definition: *"Moral systems are interlocking sets of values, practices, institutions and evolved psychological mechanisms that work together or regulate selfishness and make social life possible"* (p. 70). This definition covers the fact that affecting the moral systems of an individual could lead to the individual changing his/her behavior with regard to anti- or pro-social acts. Besides that, Haidt found that in the human brain there are structures that enable us to experience moral emotions. These emotional reactions give direction towards what ought to be right and wrong (Wilson 1975). Programs like 'Crime Watch' are specifically designed to inform the citizens and motivate them to participate (e.g. by sharing information with the police). The program tries to make an appeal on the moral systems of individuals by stating how morally wrong the behavior of the suspect is, using victim statements to provoke pro-social emotions, emphasizing the harm inflicted by the offender and calling out for help to the public. It

tries to bolster pro-social behavior and activate the public into helping the police to find and arrest suspects. The next paragraphs will explain the underlying processes of morality and how moral appeals work.

Police and Morality

Morality and legality are intimately connected with each other (Herbert, 1996). Most of the legal rules created contain at their core a moral message, pointing to proper and non-proper behavior. The police can be seen as the cartographers of the state, defining and maintaining boundaries created by legal rules (Herbert 1996).

Moral wrongness

One might think that robbing an elderly woman is more morally wrong than stealing an unlocked bike from a garden. As having different beliefs about how wrong a certain crime is, individuals might (re)act in another way when confronted with certain levels of moral wrongness. In scientific research a link has been found between the moral values of an individual and their behavior (Steg, Perlaviciute, Van der Werff & Lurvink, 2012). Steg et al. (2012) made a distinction between different types of moral values people might have. This study has interest in two of those values, namely: altruistic and egoistic moral values. The researchers created a measuring tool to calculate how high these values were for participants and compared them with the choices the participants made. The results revealed a relation between moral values and behavior.

In another study conducted by Gómez-Miñambres and Schniter (2017) it is described how moral wrongness can lead to a shift in experiencing certain emotions. Gómez-Miñambres and Schniter (2017) state that negative emotions (e.g. regret, anger etc.) affect the dynamics of behavior. This is because people want to free their mind of experiencing these negative emotions

by compensating with actions (changing their behavior) that could alleviate them from experiencing these emotions.

Moral emotions

According to Haidt (2003) moral emotions are: emotions that do not directly affect the 'self' in social situations. Humans have a great tendency to spend a huge portion of their emotional life reacting to social events (e.g. comforting someone that is hurt) instead of events that touch the 'self'. Haidt (2003) made a distinction in different important moral emotions, these emotions can be categorized in three groups. The first group is called 'other-condemning moral emotions' and consists of: anger, contempt and disgust. The second group is called 'self-conscious moral emotions' and consists of: guilt, embarrassment, shame, fear and sympathy. The third and last group is called 'other-concerning moral emotions' and consists of: gratitude, awe and pride (Schreurs, Kerstholt, De Vries & Giebels, in preparation).

Moral emotions are of great importance for human beings (Tangney, Stuewig & Mashek, 2007). These emotions are a key element of our moral system, influencing the link between moral standards and activating moral behavior. As an example, Tangney, Stuewig and Mashek (2007) found that guilt can foster a lifelong pattern of moral behavior. Experiencing this moral emotion motivates individuals to accept responsibilities and take reparative actions if they have caused harm to others. Experiencing each of these moral emotions will lead to different kinds of behavior.

When an individual is exposed to witnessing someone getting hurt, the individual would most likely feel moral emotions (e.g. sympathy) that foster the need to comfort the victim. Also it will probably lead to negative moral emotions (e.g. anger) towards the offender. These emotions activate individuals and as shown by research above will have influence on their behavior. For

example when an individual witnesses an elderly woman being robbed, he/she might experience certain levels of the moral emotion 'anger'. This emotional experience could activate the individual to stop the offender. For the police and programs like 'Crime Watch' this relation between moral emotions and behavior is important to consider. The deduction can be made that appealing on certain moral emotions may lead to more pro-social behavior of individuals. Which in this case could result in citizens being more inclined to report the offender and raise the intention to report and intervene.

Present study

The main goal of this study is to explore the relation between moral values/emotions and the behavior of citizens. This relation gives insight in how to use moral appeals effectively to motivate citizens in terms of offender reporting and intention to report and intervene. The main research question is: To what extend do the type of crime and emotional appeal in the form of a victim statement affect reporting behavior and intention to report and intervene? The expectations are gathered in two hypothesis:

H1: Participants that see a video regarding a 'distraction burglary' will be more likely to report the offender and have a higher intention to report and intervene in the future, compared to participants that see a video regarding a 'bike theft and no victim statement'.

H2: Participants that receive an emotional appeal (in the form of a victim statement) are more likely to report the offender and have a higher intention to report and intervene in the future, than participants who do not receive an emotional appeal.

Method

Participants and design

For this study a total of 100 individuals participated (N = 100) on a voluntary basis. Of these 100 participants, 63 participants participated (N = 63) in the live experiment phase where the researchers were able to analyze actual reporting behavior (so 37 participants only filled in the questionnaire). The data collection was done in three cities in the province of Overijssel, The Netherlands (Deventer, Zwolle and Almelo). In these three cities there was a 'Mobile Media Lab' (MML) of the police that was used to collect the data. The MML is a large truck that is designed to function as an information point for the police. It was surrounded by police officers who actively engaged with the public, the researchers had a room in the MML to conduct their research. Participants were recruited by either the researchers or police officers present at the site. The total participant group consisted out of 56 male participants (56.0%) and 44 female participants (44.0%). The average age was 38.6 (SD = 17.2) and 84.0% of the participants lived in the province of Overijssel.

The design that was used in this study is a 2 (emotional appeal: victim statement vs. no victim statement) x 2 (type of crime: bike theft vs. distraction burglary) between-subjects design.

Procedure

Several materials were used to aid in this study. First off, in cooperation with 'Onder de loep' (regional Dutch version of 'Crime Watch') four videos were recorded that were used in this study. The videos were recorded the same way in practical sense (recorded in the studio where the actual regional 'Crime Watch' is also recorded), with the exception that two videos showed a victim statement vs. two videos that did not. The other manipulation was that two videos were

about a bike theft vs. two videos that were about a distraction burglary. Combining these two

manipulations resulted in four different videos (see research design in previous paragraph).

When the participants were recruited and accepted the invitation to participate in this

study, they received a set of Tobii eye-tracking glasses. These Tobii eye-tracking glasses served

two purposes. First to cover up the actual research intentions, the citizens thought that the

experiment was about measuring their gazing behavior. Secondly, it would give the researchers

information about whether the participants actually looked at the offender. After they put on the

eye-tracking glasses, the glasses were calibrated. The participant could then start with an online

questionnaire. This questionnaire was created in Qualtrics and started with the possibility for the

researchers to apply a number to the participant. This way it was possible to connect the online

questionnaire to the data that was collected after the questionnaire ended. Furthermore the

questionnaire consisted of an informed consent and some questions about the demographic

variables of the participant (e.g. gender, age and hometown). Then participants received

questions about their moral values, after which they were asked to watch the video. After

watching the video, they were asked to answer statements about the perceived moral wrongness

of the crime, their past participation behavior and intentions to report/intervene and a filler

question where the participant could give recommendations for the video they saw

(recommendations for the makers of the regional 'Crime Watch' to improve the video they saw).

The questionnaire ended with a thank you message and the possibility for participants to leave

their e-mail addresses to get the results of this study. All the questions and statements could be

scored on a 7-point-Likert scale (with an exception of some yes/no questions and the

demographic variables).

After the participant was finished with the questionnaire the researcher guided him/her outside where a second researcher was present. The offender of the video also was outside and stood approximately 7 meters from the participant and second researcher, looking in their direction and wearing the same clothing as in the videos. The second researcher who stood outside would use small-talk (e.g. asking about participant's experience of the experiment) for 1-2 minutes. During this time the participant was given the opportunity to see and report the offender on his/her own initiative. After the time expired and the participant did not see the offender, the researcher would ask if the participant noticed something particular in the surrounding area. Eventually pointing out the offender to the participant, which resulted in the ending of the experiment.

The data gathered through this questionnaire was analyzed with the help of SPSS V25. The eye-tracking glasses were used to analyze the gazing behavior of the participants. The data received from these glasses were analyzed by using the software called: 'Tobii Pro Lab'. Unfortunately the eye-tracking data was not fit to conduct any meaningful analysis on. This was due to a significant loss of gaze-data and recording malfunction (especially sunlight interference and software mismatches were the cause of data loss).

Measures

Dependent variables

Reporting the offender was measured during the small talk with the second researcher. The researcher observed whether participants reported recognizing the offender. This was noted by the researcher with a yes or no.

Intention to report and intervene was measured by asking the participant to score statements about their intentions to report and intervene. In total 7 statements had to be scored on

a 7-point-Likert scale, the Likert scale ranged from (1) not at all applicable to very much

applicable (7). The statements were derived from research done by Schreurs, Kerstholt, De Vries

and Giebels (in preparation). The Cronbach's alpha reliability measure of .86 indicated that

reliability for this scale is good. (Loewenthal, 2001).

Psychological drivers

Moral values were measured by asking participants how much they agreed with 9

statements about the importance of different moral values. The participants could score each

statement on a 7-point-Likert scale (1 = Not at all important, 7 = Very important). The

questionnaire that was created for this study used two categories designed by Steg et al. (2012),

namely: egoistic moral values (e.g. the importance to have power) and altruistic moral values

(e.g. the importance of social justice). A principal component factor analysis with varimax

rotation was computed to confirm that the items used consisted out of these two categories. The

factor analysis resulted in two factors (63% of variance explained): factor 1 being altruistic moral

values (α= .86) and factor 2 being egoistic moral values (α= .76). The Cronbach's alpha

reliability measure indicated that factor 1 has good reliability and factor 2 has acceptable

reliability (Loewenthal, 2001). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure was .76 which is above the

recommended value of .5 (Field, 2013). Respectively these factors explain 39% and 25% of the

variance. One remark to note, the item 'ambitious' was loaded quite high on both factors. But in

line with the theory provided by Steg et al. (2012) it was decided to add this item to the second

factor (egoistic values). The results of the individual factor loadings can be found in Table 1 in

the appendix.

Moral emotions were measured by asking participants how much they experienced 11

different moral emotions after seeing the video. The participant could score each moral emotion

on a 7-point-Likert scale (1 = Not at all, 7 = Very much). These moral emotions were drawn from the theory and principles argued by Haidt (2003). The Likert scale has been used to obtain participant's degree of experience of a certain moral emotion. To make sense of the results of these emotions, the scales reasoned by Schreurs, Kerstholt, De Vries and Giebels (in preparation) were used. Resulting in three factors: other-condemning moral emotions (anger, contempt and disgust; α = .86), self-conscious moral emotions (guilt, embarrassment, shame, fear and sympathy; α = .84) and other-concerning moral emotions (gratitude, awe and pride; α = .76). The Cronbach's alpha reliability measure indicated that reliability of other-concerning and self-conscious moral emotions are good, for other-concerning moral emotions the reliability was acceptable (Loewenthal, 2001).

Perceived moral wrongness was measured by asking the participant how much they agreed with the following statement: *"How wrong do you think that the behavior of the offender in the video is?"*. The participant could score this question on a 7-point-Likert scale (1 = Not at all wrong, 7 = Very wrong). This was a straight-forward measure with again a Likert scale to obtain the participant's degree of experiencing moral wrongness.

Past behavior was measured by asking participants to score 4 statements about their past behavior (e.g. in the past I have called to police to report a crime). The participant could score these statements on a 7-point-Likert scale (1 = Not at all applicable, 7 = Very applicable). The Cronbach's alpha reliability measure of this scale was .86, which indicated a good reliability (Loewenthal, 2001).

Neighborhood WhatsApp usage was measured by asking the participant three questions. First the participant was asked if they already were a member of a neighborhood WhatsApp group. If not, the participant was asked if they would like to join a neighborhood WhatsApp

group in the future. Next to these two questions the participant was also asked if they would like

to have a member of the police in a neighborhood WhatsApp group. These three questions could

be answered by 'yes' or 'no'. An important note to make is that this measure will not be used in

further analysis (besides correlation matrix), because it is outside the scope of this master thesis.

Results

Descriptive statistics and correlations

Means, standard deviations, reliabilities and correlations for all used variables are shown

in Table 3. Mean scores of all separate moral emotions and moral values can be found in Table 1

and Table 2.

For reporting the offender one significant negative correlation has been found. The

correlation between reporting offender and egoistic moral values, r = -.28, N = 63, p < .05. This

suggests that individuals who score high on having egoistic moral values are less likely to report

offenders. In total, 25.4% of the participants indicated to recognize the offender from the video,

within a timeframe of two minutes.

A significant correlation was found between moral values and intention to report and

intervene. For altruistic moral values there was a significant positive correlation, r = .38, N =

100, p < .01. And for egoistic moral values there was a significant negative correlation, r = -.33,

N = 100, p < .01. This supports the expectation that scoring high on having altruistic moral

values activates pro-social behavior and that scoring high on having egoistic moral values leads

to less pro-social behavior (in terms of intention to report and intervene). Next to that a

significant positive correlation between moral emotions and intentions to report and intervene

was found. For other-condemning moral emotions this correlation was, r = .29, N = 100, p <.01.

For self-conscious moral emotions this correlation was, r = .29, N = 100, p < .01. And for other-

concerning moral emotions this correlation was, r = .33, N = 100, $p < .01$. This supports the expectation that experiencing moral emotions tend to activate pro-social behavior. Also significant correlations were found between perceived moral wrongness and intention to report and intervene, r = .45, N = 100, $p = < .01$. This finding suggests that the more moral wrongness experienced, the more intentions the participant had to report and intervene in the future. A strong significant correlation was found between past behavior and intention to report and intervene, r = .54, N = 100, $p < .01$. This supports the expectation that when someone has already reported or intervened in the past, this person may be more motivated to intervene again in the future. Finally, a significant correlation was found between age and intention to report and intervene, r = .22, N = 100, $p < .05$. It seems that the older someone is, the more inclined this person is to report and intervene.

Analyzing reporting behavior

Reporting the offender did not meet the requirements to test with the ANOVA method. Therefore it was chosen to analyze the results with a Chi-Square test to examine the effects of type of crime and moral appeal on reporting behavior. Interpreting the results was done by looking at the Fisscher exact test score (2-sided). The results indicate no significant relations for any of the conditions: type of crime ($p = .15$), emotional appeal ($p = .16$) and the interaction effect ($p = .20$)

Analyzing intentions to report and intervene

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to examine the effects of type of crime and moral appeal on intentions to report and intervene. The relation does not appear to be significant for any of the conditions: type of crime $F(1, 96) = .29, p = .60$, emotional appeal $F(1,$

96) = 2.77, p = .10 and the interaction effect $F(1, 96)$ = .30, p = .59. Means and standard

deviations can be found in Table 4.

Regression analysis

To examine the relation between the independent variables and reporting the offender, a

logistic binary regression was computed (since reporting the offender was measured binary). The

results of this regression analysis can be found in Table 5. One significant effect was found on

the predictor 'egoistic moral values', $Wald(1)$ = 4.79, p < .05.

Next to that a linear regression analysis was conducted to examine the relation between

the independent variables and intention to report and intervene. Resulting in a significant model

between the predictors and intervention behavior, $F(7, 91)$ = 11.13, p < .01 (R Squared = .46).

When looking closer at each predictor apart from each other, two significant predictors were

found. The first one being past behavior, $t(91)$ = 4.72, p, < .01. and the second being moral

wrongness, $t(91)$ = 2.87, p < .01. The results of this regression can be found in Table 6.

Analyzing perceived moral wrongness

An independent samples T-test was computed to examine the relation between perceived

moral wrongness and the type of crime or the use of a victim statement. The results show that

neither type of crime ($t(98)$ = 1.26, p = .21) and using a victim statement ($t(98)$ = 1.00, p = .32)

had a significant effect on the perceived moral wrongness (further details can be found in tables

7 and 8).

Discussion

The aim of the current study was to shed light on the relation between moral appeal and

an emotional appeal on citizen's reporting and intervening behavior in the police domain. This

study looked into the different kind of moral emotions and values people have and measured the

effect of these emotions/values on participation behavior. The results indicated that showing a victim statement, and different types of crimes (bike theft or distraction burglary) did not have any effect on reporting behavior or the intention to report and intervene. This means that participants who had seen a video about a distraction burglary did not report the offender more and did not have more intentions to report and intervene, compared with participants who had seen a video about a bike theft (which means that hypothesis 1 was rejected). Additionally, this means that participants who had seen a video with a victim statement did not report the offender more or had higher intentions to report and intervene, compared to participants who had seen a video without a victim statement (which means that hypothesis 2 was rejected). These findings were not expected and are of importance for organizations like the police and/or 'Crime Watch' to consider. It may point out that they could save resources spent on recording victim statements for example. Also it is considerable to examine the current usage of police communication more methodologically, like testing assumptions about the usefulness of victim statements and/or framing perspectives.

While further analyzing the results, three items were found that had a significant effect on predicting reporting behavior and intention to report and intervene. First of all, it seems that participants who scored high on egoistic moral values were less likely to report the offender they saw in the video. Egoistic moral values were: ambitious, wealth, power, influence and authority. In general egoistic moral values go in the opposite direction of more pro-social moral values (altruistic values). In research it shows that individuals who score high on egoistic values show more behavior that have a negative environmental impact, not considerate to other people (anti-social). Whereas individuals who score high on altruistic values show more behavior that have a positive environmental impact, in other words that take other people in consideration (pro-social)

(Steg et al., 2012). So the results correspond with this theory, it seems that individuals who score high on egoistic moral values are less inclined to show pro-social behavior. When looking at the different moral values, some explanations can be formulated with regard to this finding. One explanation can be that individuals who strive for power, wealth and ambition have less time, energy and might be willing to put less effort on external matters, like helping out other people. This finding is certainly interesting enough to look into, it also requires more research to make in-depth claims.

Secondly, the results show that participants who perceived a higher moral wrongness of the crime were more inclined to show intention to report and intervene. So when participants experienced higher forms of moral wrongness they were more eager to report a crime to the police or intervene when witnessing a crime in the future. This is in line with our expectations that when an individual is confronted with a high form of moral wrongness, it will lead to the experience of moral emotions giving incentive to activate the individual. Unfortunately the types of crimes used in this study did not significantly influence the perceived levels of moral wrongness. It could be that the two crimes were too much related to each other, leading to a less than desired differentiative effect. This is because both crimes were from the same category, namely: 'property crimes'. Also the victim of the different crimes was the same. It is therefore recommended to experiment with different types of crimes and further look into this relation. At last, the results showed that past behavior is a strong predictor of intention to report and intervene. When participants already had participated in the police domain in the past, they were more likely to do so again. This is an important finding, as it is a variable that the police could have influence on. The suggestion would be to make it as easy as possible for citizens to participate in the police domain. So one idea could be to include options for citizens to use

certain apps on their phone to communicate with the police or that they can report crimes through WhatsApp. Besides that it could also be an idea to educate children about how they can participate in the police domain. For example, giving children and young adults training and education about the topic of reporting and intervening. If this was to be successful, our findings suggest that they would be more inclined to participate again in the future.

A surprising finding that stood out was that only 25.4% of the participants indicated to recognize the offender from the video. The expectation was that this percentage would be higher due to 'ideal' circumstances of this experiment. The participants literally just saw the video where there was clear footage of the offender. After that the offender walked clearly visible within 7 meters of the participant in the second part of the experiment. You could imagine that circumstances would probably be a lot less ideal in a common day situation. This leads to questions on how individuals recognize the offenders of the videos used in this experiment and also of videos that are used in general (e.g. videos from 'Crime Watch'). One explanation could be that the purpose of these videos is not to address all citizens, but more specifically the citizens that are in the social network of the offender. For these citizens it would be easier to recognize the offender, since they are more familiar to him/her. Because none of the participants were acquainted with the offender, this could explain the fact that the percentage of the participants who recognized the offender in this study was quite low. More research on this subject is recommended.

Also when looking at the results it showed that there is no correlation between actual reporting behavior and intention to report and intervene. This means that individuals who actually reported the offender might not even have had intentions to do so in the first place. Also individuals who were very eager to report the offender did not actually report the offender. The

last case could be due to the fact that they did not recognize the offender, explanations on that situation are described in the paragraph above. Nonetheless this finding is worth doing more research on.

The last finding that stood out while looking at the results was that 38% of the participants (N = 38) has been a victim of a crime in the past. This number is quite high. Unfortunately no questions were asked about specifying the types of crime, but at least it shows that citizens in our participant pool encountered criminal behavior quite often. This could be due to a number of reasons, one of them being that this study was subjected to selection bias. But it is certainly a given fact that trying to reduce these numbers and enhancing crime-solving rates is of great importance.

Limitations

Of course every study has it's limitations, this study is no exception to that rule. A first limitation is the use of a convenience sample. This sample might not be representative for the Dutch population, so no firm conclusions can be made based on the gathered results. Also due to the cooperation with the police, this study was dependent on gathering all participants in only three days. This led to a relatively small sample of participants, which obviously is not convenient in terms of effect sizes. Also the study could have been prone to selection bias. It could be the case that citizens who volunteered to participate possessed certain characteristics/motivations that made them different from non-participants. This would lead to skewed results when compared with the general public. Therefore the recommendation would be to replicate the study in the same setting but covering more days and more cities, this will lead to a more representative sample. Also because of the cooperation with the police, it may be the case that certain citizens were more interested than others. This could also lead to differences in

representation with regard to the population. It might be an option to do an extra study as

independent researchers, not affiliated with the police, to compare the results. Especially since

it's already proven that race/ethnicity has an effect on police-community relations and

willingness to participate (Wehrman & Angelis, 2011).

A second limitation is that the manipulations created for this study might not have

differed enough from each other. Since this is an exploratory study, there was no data that could

have been used as a framework for creating these manipulations. Instead this study combined the

expertise of the film crew and used underlying theory to come up with ways to manipulate the

participants. It is recommended to look further into the effects of using victim statements and

different type of crimes. Testing with greater samples and different kind of crimes will give more

valuable information on this research topic, it also might lead to more significant results.

Especially when looking at the fact that 'perceived moral wrongness' was of influence on

intentions to report and intervene.

A third limitation is the actor that was used in the study. The offender was not an official

actor but a master student of the behavioral, management and social sciences department. A

recommendation would be to use an official actor that can enact his/her role on a professional

level.

Conclusion

This study shows that there are certainly possibilities to discover regarding police communication with citizens. Although the results should be treated with caution, three significant psychological drivers were found. Individuals who scored high on having egoistic moral values were less inclined to report the offender. This finding makes it interesting to explore the possibilities to 'transfer' individuals from having egoistic to altruistic moral values. Next to that, past behavior shows to be a good predictor for intentions to report and intervene. This finding is in line with past behavior being a strong predictor of future behavior in other fields of psychology (Conner & Sparks, 2005). The perceived moral wrongness of a crime also predicts intentions to report and intervene. So when individuals experience strong feelings of moral wrongness, they are likely to have higher intentions to report a crime to the police and intervene when witnessing a crime. Besides the finding of these psychological drivers, it was found that different types of crimes did not have an effect on citizen's reporting behavior and intentions to report and intervene. Also using victim statements in videos used by the programs like 'Crime Watch' do not have an additional affect on citizen's reporting behavior and intentions to report and intervene. These findings can be used to come up with new ways and strategies to stimulate citizens to participate in the police domain.

References

Conner, M., & Sparks, P. (2005) The theory of planned behavior and health behavior. In M. Conner & P. Norman (Eds.), *Predicting health behavior: Research and practices with social cognition models* (pp. 170-222). Berkshire: Open University Press.

Dearden, L. (2018). Police ask public to become 'counter-terrorism citizens' to help stop attacks. Visited on 22 may 2018, from https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/police-public-counter-terrorism-citizens-stop-attacks-isis-met-neil-basu-westminster-anniversary-a8264981.html

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering statistics using ibm spss statistics*: Sage.

Gómez-Miñambres, J., & Schniter, E. (2017). Emotions and Behavior Regulation in Decision Dilemmas. *Games*, *8*(2), 22. https://doi.org/10.3390/g8020022

Haidt, J. (2003). The moral emotions. In R. J. Davidson, K. R. Scherer, & H. H. Goldsmith (Reds.), *Handbook of effective sciences* (Herz. ed., pp. 852–870). Oxford, Groot-Brittannië: Oxford University Press.

Haidt, J. (2008). Morality. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *3*(1), 65–72.

Herbert, S. (1996). Morality in Law Enforcement: Chasing "Bad Guys" with the Los Angeles Police Department. *Law & Society Review*, *30*(4), 799. https://doi.org/10.2307/3054118

Loewenthal, K. M. (2001). *An introduction to psychological tests and scales*: Psychology Press.

McKee, A. J., & Lewis, A. L. (2016). The New Community Policing: Developing a Partnership-Based Theoretical Foundation. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Partnership*, *3*(3). https://doi.org/10.24926/ijps.v3i3.141

Puspitosari, H., & Priambada, B. S. (2018). Victim Impact Statement Model in Criminal
       Justice System in Restorative Justice Perspective. SHS Web of Conferences, 54, 07006.
       https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/20185407006

Rogers, C., & Coliandris, G. (2015). The expert citizen: The key to future police legitimacy?
       Police Journal: Theory, Practise and Principles, 88(2), 95-105.

Schreurs, W., Kerstholt, J. H., De Vries, P. W., & Giebels, E. (in preparation). Citizen
       participation in the police domain: The role of citizens' attitude and morality. *Journal of
       Community Psychology*, *46*(6), 775-789.

Smith, C. (2003). *Moral, believing animals: Human personhood and culture.* Oxford, United
       Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Steg, L., Perlaviciute, G., Van der Werff, E., & Lurvink, J. (2012). The Significance of
       Hedonic Values for Environmentally Relevant Attitudes, Preferences, and Actions.
       Environment and Behavior, 46(2), 163–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916512454730

Tangney, J. P., Stuewig, J., & Mashek, D. J. (2007). Moral Emotions and Moral
       Behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *58*(1), 345–372.
       https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.56.091103.070145

Thomas, G. (2016). A case for local neighbourhood policing and community intelligence in
       counter terrorism. The Police Journal: Theory, Practice and Principles, 89(1), 31-54.

Van der Hoeven, L. (2011). *Samen sterker? Een onderzoek naar de wijze waarop
       burgerparticipatie de effectiviteit van de opsporing kan versterken*. From
       https://dspace.library.uu.nl/handle/1874/214423

Van Erp, J. G., Van Gastel, F., & Webbink, H. D. (2012). *Opsporing verzocht : een quasi-*

experimentele studie naar de bijdrage van het programma Opsporing Verzocht aan de
oplossing van delicten. From
https://www.politieenwetenschap.nl/cache/files/5b752d9eaa5b7Opsporing_Verzocht.pdf

Van Wijngaarden, L. (2011, 15 December). Politie ontdekt burger als rechercheur.
Visited on 22 may 2018, from https://www.gelderlander.nl/arnhem/politie-ontdekt-burger-
als-rechercheur~a7ed8e24/

Wehrman, M.M. & Angelis, J.D. (2011). Citizen willingness to participate in police-
Community partnerships: exploring the influence of race and neighborhood context.
Police Quarterly, 14(1), 48-69. doi: 10.1177/1098611110393134

Weis, J. (2015, 23 April). Citizens to police: Let's work together. Visited on 22 may
2018, from https://www.huffingtonpost.com/jody-weis-/citizens-to-police-lets-
w_b_7126788.html

Wilson, E.O. (1975). *Sociobiology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press

Tables

Table 1. *Factor loadings for 9 moral values from the questionnaire*

Items	M	SD	Altruistic values	Egoistic values
			α= .86	α= .76
Social Justice	5.64	1.49	**.89**	
Helpfulness	5.60	1.50	**.88**	
Peaceful world	6.28	1.26	**.77**	
Equality	6.17	1.22	**.77**	
Ambitious	5.26	1.46	.56	**.45**
Wealth	3.84	1.47		**.80**
Power	3.02	1.72		**.78**
Influence	4.19	1.49		**.74**
Authority	4.21	1.70		**.709**
Eigenvalue			3,482	2,249
Percentage of variance explained			38.69	24.99

Note. Means (M) and standard deviations (SD) are reported before standardization. Factor

loadings < .3 are suppressed, only items loading on factors with Eigenvalue > 1 are shown.

Table 2. *Means and standard deviations of moral emotions*

Items	M	SD
Disgust	4.37	2.09
Contempt	4.25	1.87
Compassion	5.37	1.59
Anger	4.55	1.90
Shame	3.11	1.99
Pride	2.13	1.69
Fear	2.22	1.78
Malicious joy	1.47	1.18
Guilt	2.60	1.96
Respect	2.53	1.68
Gratitude	2.59	1.91
Embarrassment	2.66	1.70

Note. Means (M) and standard deviations (SD) are reported before standardization.

Table 3. *Means, standard deviations, reliabilities and intercorrelations among variables*

Variables	M	SD	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Reporting offender	1.75	.44	---	---												
2. Intention to report and intervene	5.48	1.35	.86	.13	---											
3. Altruistic moral values	5.92	1.16	.86	-.19	.38**	---										
4. Egoistic moral values	4.10	1.12	.76	.28*	.33**	.23*	---									
5. Other-condemning emotions	4.39	1.73	.86	.04	.29**	.31**	.43**	---								
6. Self-conscious emotions	3.19	1.42	.84	.10	.29**	.20*	.42**	.62**	---							
7. Other-Concerning emotions	2.42	1.45	.76	.15	.33**	.09	.30**	.28**	.59**	---						
8. Past behavior	4.32	2.09	.86	-.01	.54**	.19	.34**	.08	.13	.27**	---					
9. Perceived moral wrongness	6.4	1.37	---	.02	.45**	.57**	.24*	.44**	.24*	.01	.19	---				
10. Member of neighborhood WhatsApp group (present)	1.73	.45	---	-.03	-.03	.20*	.04	.22*	.11	-.06	-.02	.24*	---			
11. Member of neighborhood WhatsApp group (intention)	1.32	.47	---	.02	-.25*	-.15	-.10	-.03	.01	.23	-.25*	.04	c	---		
12. Police joins neighborhood WhatsApp group	1.23	.43	---	-.03	-.11	.03	-.01	.06	-.05	-.05	-.21	.15	-.04	c	---	
13. Gender	---	---	---	-.16	-.06	.09	-.13	-.03	-.11	-.12	-.08	-.05	-.10	-.21	.19	---
14. Age	38.58	17.17	---	-.05	.22*	.18	-.04	.04	.17	.29**	..21*	.12	-.19	.12	-.16	-.09

Note. *p* <.05, ** *p* <.01, α = before standardizing, c = constant variable (no correlation possible)

Table 4. *Means and standard deviations of ANOVA analysis*

Victim statement	Crime	Mean	Std. Deviation
With victim statement	Distraction burglary	5,2870	1,17200
	Bike theft	5,2903	1,56004
	Total	5,2888	1,38111
Without victim statement	Distraction burglary	5,8947	1,01487
	Bike theft	5,5978	1,48236
	Total	5,7321	1,28594
Total	Distraction burglary	5,5380	1,13892
	Bike theft	5,4213	1,52094
	Total	5,4750	1,35331

a. Dependent variable: intention to report and intervene

Table 5. *Results of logistic regression test: independent variables vs. reporting offender*

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 0	Constant	1,078	,289	13.860	1	,000	2,937
Step 1	Altruistic values	-,673	,484	1,935	1	,164	,510
	Egoistic values	-,758	,346	4,786	1	,029	2,133
	Other condemning emotions	-,198	,254	,608	1	,435	,820
	Self-conscious emotions	-,104	,387	,072	1	,788	,901
	Other concerning emotions	,347	,345	1,008	1	,315	1,414
	Past behavior	-,126	,163	,597	1	,440	,882
	Moral wrongness	-,018	,363	,002	1	,961	,983
	Constant	3,299	4,010	,677	1	,411	27,098

Table 6. *Results of regression test: independent variables as predictors for intentions to report and intervene*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	1,101	,639		1,723	,088
Past behavior	,262	,056	,404	4,718	,000
Altruistic values	,126	,110	,107	1,137	,259
Egoistic values	,031	,112	,025	,273	,785
Other condemning emotions	,025	,085	,032	,294	,770
Self-conscious emotions	,003	,114	,003	,026	,980
Other concerning emotions	,175	,098	,179	1,782	,078
Moral wrongness	,285	,100	,291	2,866	,005

a. Dependent Variable: Intention to report and intervene

Table 7. *Results independent samples T test (including group statistics): Type of crime*

	Type of crime	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Perceived moral wrongness	Distraction burglary	46	6,59	1,066	,157
	Bike theft	54	6,24	1,577	,215

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Perceived moral wrongness	Equal variances assumed	3,301	,072	1,263	98	,210
	Equal variances not assumed			1,301	93,439	,196

Table 8. *Results independent samples T test (including group statistics): Victim statement*

Victim statement		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Perceived moral wrongness	Yes	58	6,52	1,217	,160
	No	42	6,24	1,559	,241

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means		
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Perceived moral wrongness	Equal variances assumed	2,087	,152	1,005	98	,317
	Equal variances not assumed			,967	74,733	,337