The Citizen Approach Against Undermining:

What Motivates Citizens to Report Suspicions of Marijuana Cultivations

Amber E. Mensink

Master Psychology: Conflict, Risk and Safety

Department of Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences, University of Twente

Supervisors:
Prof. dr. José H. Kersholt
Dr. ir. Peter W. De Vries

Abstract

More and more governments, businesses and citizens must deal with undermining, a form of crime that disrupts society and intertwines the legal world with the illegal world. Illegal cultivation of marijuana is an example of undermining, which mostly happens as domestic cultivations with quite severe risks like water damage, poor air quality and house fires. But also societal consequences like the presence of more drug addicts and the increase in crime in the neighbourhood are related to domestic marijuana cultivations. The main goal of this study was to assess what psychological drivers influence the decision of citizens whether to report their suspicions of marijuana cultivations to authorities.

A questionnaire based on the Community Engagement Theory was used to measure drivers at individual, community and institutional levels, which were expected to predict willingness to report. Additionally, attitude towards people involved with cultivations, knowledge and experience were considered. The convenience sample was gathered in a municipality in the eastern part of the Netherlands by sharing the questionnaire online via Social Media and local news websites.

Results indicate that risk perception, response efficacy, sense of empowerment and drugs attitude were significant predictors for reporting. This means that if people perceive marijuana cultivations in their neighbourhood as risky, believe that reporting helps against these risks, believe that institutions act in the interest of citizens and hold a negative attitude towards people involved with several facets of marijuana cultivations, they are more willing to report.

To increase reportings, it might help to make people more aware of the danger and consequences marijuana cultivations can cause. If people see for themselves how electrical wiring is rerouted dangerously, and the added danger of water leakage, people will see more possible risks for themselves increasing risk perception. Additionally, people can be made aware that most of the cultivators already are more involved in crime, which can increase the negative attitude people hold about these people. Lastly, some sort of feedback should be given after receiving a reporting. This can help to maintain and even increase sense of empowerment and response efficacy.

Keywords: Community Engagement Theory, undermining, willingness to report, marijuana cultivations

Samenvatting

Steeds meer overheden, bedrijven en burgers krijgen te maken met ondermijning; een vorm van criminaliteit die de samenleving ontwricht en een verbinding legt tussen de legale en illegale wereld. Illegale wietkwekerijen zijn hier een voorbeeld van, en komen met name voor als thuiskwekerij met grote risico's voor waterschade, slechte luchtkwaliteit en branden. Maar ook maatschappelijke gevolgen zoals aanwezigheid van meer drugsverslaafden en verhoging van criminaliteit in de buurt zijn gerelateerd aan thuiskwekerijen. Het doel van dit onderzoek was om de drijfveren te achterhalen die invloed uitoefenen op het besluit om wel of niet vermoedens van een wietkwekerij in de buurt te melden.

Een vragenlijst gebaseerd op de Community Engagement Theory is gebruikt om drijfveren op individueel, lokaal en institutioneel niveau te meten. Daarnaast zijn de houding die mensen hebben ten opzichte van mensen die betrokken zijn bij wietkwekerijen, kennis van kenmerken en ervaring met ondermijning gerelateerde situaties meegenomen. Er werd verwacht dat motieven op de drie niveaus samen een voorspellende waarde zouden hebben ten opzichte van meldingsbereidheid. Participanten uit een gemeente in het oosten van Nederland zijn verzameld door het online delen van de vragenlijst via Sociale Media en lokale nieuws-websites.

Uit de resultaten is gebleken dat risicoperceptie, respons effectiviteit, gevoel van empowerment en de houding ten opzichte van mensen betrokken bij een wietkwekerij significante voorspellers zijn. Dit betekent dat als mensen wietkwekerijen zien als gevaarlijk, geloven dat het maken van een melding helpt om de gevaren te verminderen, geloven dat betrokken autoriteiten handelen in het belang van burgers en ze een negatieve houding hebben ten opzichte van mensen die betrokken zijn bij wietkwekerijen, zij bereid zijn om een melding te maken.

Om het aantal meldingen te verhogen, kan het helpen om mensen meer bewust te maken van de gevaren en consequenties van wietkwekerijen. Als mensen zien en ervaren hoe elektrische bedrading op een slechte manier is omgelegd, met toegevoegd gevaar van mogelijk lekkend water, zullen zij meer gevaren inzien, wat de risicoperceptie verhoogd. Daarnaast kunnen mensen bewust worden gemaakt van het gegeven dat de meeste (thuis-) kwekers meer betrokken zijn bij andere vormen van criminaliteit, wat de negatieve houding ten opzichte van mensen die betrokken zijn bij wietkwekerijen kan versterken. Ten slotte kan door middel van feedback na het maken van een melding de respons effectiviteit worden verhoogd.

Introduction

One of the more recent, social problems that the government, businesses, and citizens must deal with, is undermining. There is not one specific definition of this phenomenon, as it depends heavily on the background and point-of-view. A business owner, for example, sees other aspects of the problem than a law enforcement officer. Noteworthy is that all existing definitions do agree that the essence lies in the disruption of society and the intertwining of the illegal with the legal world (e.g. Politie Amsterdam-Amstelland, 2009; Spapens, 2019; Tops & Schilders, 2016; Van der Steen, Schram, Chin-A-Fat, & Scherpenisse, n.d.).

One type of undermining is the illegal cultivation of marijuana, which mainly occurs as home cultivation, either by independent citizens or via an organization which facilitates multiple (bigger) home cultivations (Bovenkerk, Hogewind, Korf, & Milani, 2003; Spapens, Van de Bunt, Rastovac, & Miralles Sueiro, 2007). Domestic marijuana cultivation is considered to be very adaptive to new laws and regulations, resulting in changing trends in cultivation sites, for example, the move from outside to inside cultivation (Decorte, 2010). This, in turn, increased risks like water damage, house fires, mould and poor air quality (Bieleman, Snippe, Naayer, & Ogier, 2004).

The increased risks stress the need for law enforcement to collaborate with citizens to find home cultivations. Kop (2012) stated that, in general, cooperation with citizens and local businesses is more effective than investigation by law enforcement alone. After all, citizens can signal, accept, and even facilitate marijuana cultivations, and thus are able to report this at an early stage if they feel motivated to do so. However, one of the main problems is the decrease of reportings, leading to fewer cultivation sites to get caught. The main goal of this research was, therefore, to assess what psychological drivers influence the decision of citizens whether to report their suspicions of marijuana cultivations to authorities. A more detailed description of marijuana cultivation is given in the following section, after which the Community Engagement Theory is elaborated on.

Marijuana cultivations

Marijuana is one of the world's most used drugs (Murray, Morrison, Henquet, & Forti, 2007; UNODC, 2019) and the cause of about 21% of all addiction treatment requests in Europe (Belackova, Tomkova, & Zabransky, 2016). Due to the open access to information via the Internet, people start cultivating at home and are more and more professionalized (Spapens et al., 2007). This professionalization is further increased by the influence that

grow-shops have nowadays, offering information, supplies and persons that set up the cultivation (Decorte, 2010).

Literature suggests four motives to start a cultivation, with the first being for personal use, either medically or recreational. Secondly, an important motive is paying off debts, as cultivations often yield more money than a regular job. Van Der Torre, Schaap, Cachet and Dijk (2006) have found that most cultivators are unemployed, and about half of them have debts. Debts can be caused by both legal and illegal activities and may lead to being forced to house a cultivation (Bovenkerk et al., 2003). The third motive is financial gain, which can lead to a higher status in the criminal community (Van Der Torre et al., 2006). In line with financial gain, is the fourth motive; maintaining a luxurious lifestyle (Spapens et al., 2007). To be able to get the newest cars, jewellery and gadgets gives a sense of power and makes it possible to brag about how well the business is going. Though, this motive applies more to already successful cultivators or organizations.

The cultivation process

In terms of the cultivation process, domestic marijuana cultivation generally consists of four phases: building, growing, harvesting and using/distributing (Paoli & Decorte, 2013). In the first phase, building, all the information and materials are gathered to set up the cultivation. Sometimes the cultivator does this individually, sometimes with help from so-called facilitators (Spapens et al., 2007). In this phase, the electrical wiring, irrigation and ventilation are prepared (Tytgat, Cuypers, Van Damme, & Vanhove, 2017). To keep hidden, the windows are tapered, walls are often covered with reflective materials to keep warmth inside and sometimes a water-tank will be installed to prevent water leakage. Lights and air-conditioning are installed, powered by illegally taken electricity from the neighbours (Emmet & Boers, 2008). A possible sign of this phase is that many people gather at an empty building, mostly at night times to keep anonymous. It might seem as if the house is being renovated, but no real changes are visible.

The next phase entails the sowing, planting, growing and flowering of cannabis plants. The plants need to be moved into the cultivation site, which is highly notable during the day. Several ways are found to hide what really happens, for instance, the use of scaffoldings covered with cloths (Emmet & Boers, 2008). Growing takes two to three weeks, the flowering period can take six up to fourteen weeks. This is the phase at which a lot of light and odour nuisance can occur, as the plants need at least twelve hours of light a day (Nelisse, Bektas, & Kuindersma, 2017). But also water damage due to leakage from the automatic watering

systems can occur. The cultivator will have to check on the plants regularly but will probably avoid social interactions to keep anonymous.

In the third phase, the cultivator cuts the buds or hires people to do this. The buds are dried in a dark room and the remains of the plants and used growing equipment are removed. During this phase, again, a lot of people can be present to help. It might stand out that a lot of garden waste is removed. The smell reduces during this phase.

After drying and further processing of the tops, the marijuana is distributed in the fourth phase. Little airtight bags with small amounts are sold to the local coffeeshops, exported to other countries or sold to private customers (Bovenkerk et al., 2003; Spapens et al., 2007), often notable by short contact moments at weird times, with a lot of different people (Mehlbaum, Schoenmakers, & Van Zanten, 2018). However, literature also suggests sells happen indoors, to people already known by the seller (Harrison, Erickson, Korf, Brochu, & Benschop, 2007). Grow-shops fulfil an important role in this phase by facilitating a trade market (Bovenkerk et al., 2003; Emmet & Boers, 2008).

Consequences of cultivations

Many consequences related to cultivations have been investigated over the last years and can be divided by societal consequences and personal consequences for cultivators. The first societal consequence is the increase in addiction nuisance. Literature implies that the persons involved in cultivations often have addictions to drugs and alcohol, especially when directly involved with maintaining the plants (Spapens et al., 2007). Furthermore, it can be that many drug-users will be present in the surroundings of a cultivation to have easy access and be sure of their purchase. In turn, the presence of drug addicts increases the chance that other sorts of crimes often related to addictions, like violence and burglary, occur more often (Centrum voor Criminaliteitspreventie en Veiligheid, 2010).

Another societal implication is that the neighbourhood in which the cultivation is situated might have a lower social cohesion. Cultivations will be set up in more discrete, empty buildings, after which cultivators will only be present whenever maintenance is necessary. Additionally, the buildings that house a cultivation often do not look well-kept with for instance taped windows or constant scaffolds, and do not attract people with higher socio-economic status. However, this also works the other way around. In neighbourhoods with low socio-economic statuses, more empty buildings will be present in which cultivations can settle (Korf, Bookelman, & Haan, 2001), similar to the 'broken windows' theory (Harcourt, 1998). The latter theory is based on the idea that if something, like a window, is

broken and remains unrepaired, other people assume that this is normal and will act on this, leading to more broken things in the area and potentially crime.

As mentioned before, smell and water nuisance are also (potential) important consequences. The increased risks, in general, can be seen as consequences (Bieleman et al., 2004). These risks include electrical short-circuiting and house fires, moisture problems and mould, poor air quality and water leakage. If someone believes there might be a cultivation in their neighbourhood, one might experience increased anxiety due to these risks and dangers.

Overlapping with the societal consequences is the individual consequence for the cultivators themselves; an increase in violence. Since the cultivation of marijuana is increasingly intertwined with organised crime, more violence is occurring around cultivators (Spapens et al., 2007). Moreover, Bennett, Holloway and Farrington (2008) found that the odds for offending is 1.5 times higher for marijuana users than non-users, partially causing the increase in violence.

These consequences demonstrate the high impact marijuana cultivations can have on society. It is a good opportunity for law enforcement to work with people, but are those willing to report their suspicions?

Willingness to report

To analyse the factors of influence in the willingness to report, the Community Engagement Theory is used. This theory is validated for natural disasters (Paton, 2013), crime and man-made disasters (Schreurs, 2019). It describes drivers that influence people's collection of information and preparation for various types of crises. The preparation in case of crime, according to Schreurs (2019), is to get information on what to do with suspicions of a crime, after which reporting is a logical next step. In line with this argumentation, in the case of marijuana cultivation, one could look for information about the signals. The theory presumes three levels of psychological drivers; individual, community and institutional (Paton, 2013; Paton & Johnston, 2001; Schreurs, 2019; Schreurs, Franjkić, Kerstholt, De Vries, & Giebels, 2020). All these drivers consist of several constructs, that will be explained below.

Individual drivers

The individual drivers consider beliefs regarding possible dangers and responses. The theory considers four constructs: risk perception, affect, self efficacy and response efficacy (Schreurs et al., 2020).

Risk perception is the belief one has about the likelihood of a risk and whether it is seen as dangerous (Schreurs, 2019). When the probability and/or the consequences of an event are perceived as high, one is more likely to act. For instance, when people are sure that there is a cultivation in the neighbourhood, they are more likely to report compared to people who are not sure. This indicates that two factors are important in measuring risk perception: the likelihood, thus how likely it is that there is a cultivation in the neighbourhood, and the consequences, thus what will happen if there is a cultivation in the neighbourhood.

Affect is a particular feeling, which acts as a driver for actions (Kerstholt, Duijnhoven, & Paton, 2017). Research shows that (moral) emotions also influence risk perception (Kerstholt et al., 2017; Schreurs, 2019). People may interpret the risk differently due to emotional reactions, which can take over analytical thinking and possibly lead to inaccurate reactions (Loewenstein, Weber, Hsee, & Welch, 2001). They might, unconsciously, get anxious when thinking of a cultivation and its risks, after which they are more likely to report.

Self efficacy is the belief that someone is capable to perform a certain task (Schreurs et al., 2020) and influences the perception of information and behaviour (Paton & Johnston, 2001). For the present context, this would mean that someone needs to feel capable to call law enforcement and describe a certain suspicious situation. Self efficacy affects one's intentions to act and their actual behaviour. When someone does not feel capable, the intention to do a certain action will not occur (Bandura, 1982).

Response efficacy is the belief that a certain response will work as expected (Paton, 2013). This construct is also called outcome expectancy (Schreurs et al., 2020) and has to be high in order to motivate someone to act. When people believe that reporting does nothing against the problem, they will not be likely to report it. Response efficacy also includes the expectation that the actions taken by law enforcement are indeed solving the problem.

We have added three additional drivers related to the willingness to report marijuana cultivations in the neighbourhood: knowledge, drugs attitude and experience.

Knowledge is an important factor related to intention and willingness to report. The Safety Region and municipality regularly shared the most common characteristics and signs in newspapers and flyers to inform citizens. If people do not know the signs of marijuana cultivations, they will not report as they are unaware that it is taking place.

Attitude might also affect the decision to report. In literature, attitude is explained as someone's view or evaluation of an (psychological) object or a person (Isacson & Bingefors, 2002; Stacy, Bentler, & Flay, 1994), and is highly important in the decision-making process. A strong attitude has a high predictive value of the intention of certain behaviour. However,

this relation only applies to specific attitudes and behaviours and does not extend to more general attitudes (Armitage & Christian, 2003).

Experience in the current context relates to other situations related to undermining. When people see other instances of undermining, such as shops without any customers that keep existing, they might be more aware of crimes happening in their neighbourhood. It can also be that they are familiar with reporting their suspicions.

Community drivers

Community drivers relate to the sense of cohesion and belonging in a community. This driver is measured using two constructs, sense of community and collective efficacy (Paton, 2013; Schreurs, 2019).

Sense of community indicates whether someone feels connected to the neighbourhood (McMillan, 1996; Paton & Johnston, 2001). The driver consists of several different aspects, amongst which membership (spirit), trust, place attachment (McMillan, 1996) and the degree to which someone feels embedded in the community (Paton, 2013). When a community exists of isolated families, that are not sharing and caring for each other, sense of community will be low (Schreurs et al., 2020), and willingness to report will be high. With a stronger sense of community, fewer people are willing to report as they will 'betray' their neighbours, or they ignore the nuisance to keep everything as it was. But it can also work the other way around, the stronger the sense of community the more people feel responsible and are willing to keep the neighbourhood safe, and thus reporting will increase (Broekhuizen, Meulenkamp, Stoutjesdijk, & Boutellier, 2018; Chaurand & Brauer, 2008).

Collective efficacy is the belief that the community is capable to act together (Schreurs, 2019). This is not only based on shared skills and knowledge but also the way of interaction and coordination within the community (Bandura, 2000). It is influenced by the amount of perceived disorder (Hipp, 2016). According to Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls (1997), it is the combination of trust in each other and the willingness to act for shared spaces that make up the neighbourhood context of this driver. The higher this value, the more likely someone will report.

Institutional drivers

The last set of drivers concern institutional drivers, related to the perception of governmental institutions like law enforcement and the municipality. The willingness of people to act in order to be safe increases when they believe that the relationship to those

institutions is fair (Schreurs et al., 2020). The related constructs are sense of empowerment and trust.

Sense of empowerment is mainly based on the degree citizens think institutions listen to them and do something with the input citizens provide, and whether citizens feel ad if they are a priority for the institutions. When citizens feel empowered, they are more likely to engage in society (Schreurs, 2019). An element of sense of empowerment is relationship fairness, implying that institutions act in the interest of citizens. When this is perceived as high, people believe that reporting induces institutions to do what is best for them, for example, follow up on suspicious signals. If this is the case, citizens will feel heard and probably report again the next time.

Trust is highly important in any kind of relationship (Paton, 2013) and also influences the relationship fairness. When trust is low, citizens will not be likely to report anything. Closely linked is the sense of authority, which is the perception of the legitimacy of an institution. It indicates whether citizens believe that the power of an institution is used in the right ways and in the best interest of the citizens. When the sense of legitimacy is low, citizens will less likely contact law enforcement for help or report suspicious situations (Peyton, Sierra-arévalo, & Rand, 2019). In the study by Broekhuizen et al. (2018), it was indicated that a fair amount of citizens did not report, as they did not trust the institutions to protect their anonymity, and therefore feared the consequences. Lack of trust can sometimes even lead people to work against the institutions, for instance by helping criminals.

Present study

Together, the studies mentioned in this chapter provide theoretical insights to why someone might be willing to report suspicions of a marijuana cultivation. This study tried to examine which psychological drivers influence the willingness to report suspicions of marijuana cultivation. To this end, the Community Engagement Theory was used, which describes several drivers that were expected to have important explanatory and predicting value. Accordingly, the next hypothesis was investigated:

> *Hypothesis 1*: Drivers at individual, community and institutional level together predict willingness to report.

Moreover, in urban environments, where people live relatively close to each other, relationships often are absent or perceived as negative (Cheshire & Fitzgerald, 2015). As a result, social cohesion is lower. It was expected that, due to the lack of positive relationships with neighbours and lower social cohesion, willingness to report within more urban

environments like villages, will be higher. Additionally, since the larger physical distance to neighbours in rural environments in comparison to more urban environments, less nuisance from the cultivations like smell or sound nuisance will be noticed. With regard to the difference between living area the following prediction was made:

> *Prediction 1:* People within more urban environments - i.e. cities and villages - are more willing to report their suspicions of marijuana cultivations than people in rural environments.

Method

Based on meetings with Safety Region Twente and their annual report about marijuana cultivation, it was decided to set out the research in one specific municipality in the Eastern region of the Netherlands, with a low number of reports on cultivations. The municipality, called Hellendoorn, houses about 36.000 citizens and consists of the villages Nijverdal, Hellendoorn, Daarle, Haarle, Daarleveen and some hamlets (Gemeente Hellendoorn, 2020).

Participants

Participants were recruited via messages on the website and Social Media (i.e. Facebook) of the municipality and were then redirected to the online questionnaire. Neighbourhood associations and local news websites, like "hartvanhellendoorn.nl", were also asked to give attention to the questionnaire. It was noticed that on Social Media, a lot of (negative) reactions were placed, indicating that the subject is very much 'alive'. Moreover, one of the neighbourhood associations asked to share the questionnaire, replied that they would not cooperate as "this problem does not occur in the neighbourhood".

Inclusion criteria included the minimal age of 16, internet connection, sufficient understanding of the Dutch language and participants had to live (be registered) in the municipality. The original sample consisted of 295 participants. After removing all incomplete responses, the final sample size was 187 participants. The age varied between 18 and 79 ($M = 42.3$, $SD = 14.3$) and 36.4% of the participants were male. All respondents had the Dutch nationality. Most people (49.2%) finished secondary school and 41.7% has indicated to live with their partner and children. These demographics are similar to the populations' demographics (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2019), see Table 1 for a complete overview of the demographics of the sample.

Materials and procedure

The study was approved by the BMS Ethics Committee of the University of Twente. Participants were informed that the goal of the study was to gain information about the

willingness to report about marijuana cultivations. All participants participated voluntarily and agreed with the informed consent before starting the questionnaire.

The online survey tool Qualtrics was used, to which participants were redirected after clicking on a message about the research on several websites or Social Media channels. The questionnaire started with the informed consent statement, after which participants were asked about their reporting attitude, whether they would report suspicions of marijuana cultivation in their neighbourhood and where they would like to report it. After this, they answered questions regarding the psychological drivers on the three levels of the Community Engagement Theory. Then questions about drugs and demographics were asked to conclude the questionnaire. Participants did not receive any incentives.

The statistical package IBM SPSS version 25.0.0.0 was used to analyse the data.

Measures

Dependent variables

Willingness to report was measured by asking if participants would report if they had suspicions or knowledge of a marijuana cultivation in their neighbourhood. Answer categories included '*yes*', '*maybe*', '*no*' and '*I don't know what that is*'.

Independent variables

Preference for where to report was measured by asking where participants would prefer to report their suspicions. Several options were given, for instance at the municipality, the law enforcement, or Report Crime Anonymous, an anonymous reporting service from the national law enforcement (Dutch: Meld Misdaad Anoniem). Participants could also choose the option that they would not report at all.

General reporting behaviour is measured using five questions, to be able to compare reporting marijuana cultivations with other, more common (i.e. more reported) offences. This is inspired by Broekhuizen et al. (2018) who asked about reporting behaviour of violence as reference. In the current research, participants were asked if they would report witnessing violence and burglary, if they would report being a victim of violence and burglary and whether they would report if other people are around. Answering options ranged from '*very unlikely*' to '*very likely*' on a 5-point scale.

Then three statements were given[1]; "If I report my suspicions of a marijuana cultivation, that has more consequences than only the clearing of that specific cultivation",

---

[1] These questions were asked at the request of Safety Region Twente.

"By smoking marijuana, the criminal chain of marijuana cultivation will be maintained" and "By not reporting my suspicions of a marijuana cultivation, the criminal chain will be maintained". Answers ranged from '*fully disagree*' to '*fully agree*' on a 5-point scale.

The other variables are based on the Community Engagement Theory (Paton, 2013) and complemented with questions about affect (Schreurs et al., 2020), attitude, knowledge and experience. All questions were adapted to fit the goal of marijuana cultivation instead of natural hazards. See Appendix A for a complete overview of the items. All following variables were measured on a 5-point Likert-scale unless stated otherwise.

Individual level. Risk perception was measured with items about the likelihood and consequences of a marijuana cultivation happening in the neighbourhood, using seven items ($\alpha = .73$). Items included "How likely is it that there is a marijuana cultivation in your neighbourhood", "How likely is it that a marijuana cultivation will pose dangers for you" and "How likely is it that you feel less safe in your neighbourhood".

Affect was measured by asking participants how they felt considering marijuana cultivations. Seven specific emotions were asked ($\alpha = .87$, items: tense, anxious, worried, angry, unsafe, helpless and indifferent).

Self efficacy was measured by asking participants if they felt capable to report their suspicions, using seven items ($\alpha = .79$). Included items were "I know how to report signals with the law enforcement", "I am able to share information about a marijuana cultivation in the neighbourhood", "I am able to be alert to signs of marijuana cultivations in my neighbourhood", and "I am able to detect a marijuana cultivation".

Response efficacy was measured by asking participants if they thought that actions they could take, would be effective, with four items ($\alpha = .88$). It included items such as "By reporting suspicious situations, I increase the safety in the neighbourhood", and "By reporting suspicious situations, the law enforcement can address problems".

Drug attitude was measured by asking participants what they thought of people carrying out seven different phases of a marijuana cultivation, for instance, the preparation and building of the space, taking care of the plants, and selling the marijuana ($\alpha = .96$). Answer options ranged from '*not bad at all*' to '*very bad*'.

Knowledge about the characteristics of a marijuana cultivation is measured by asking how many characteristics made participants think of a marijuana cultivation. Answering options were based on the municipal information that is shared regularly with citizens. Participants were asked to select the items that they considered as an indication of a marijuana cultivation, up to nine items, to retrieve a proportion of chosen items.

Experience was measured by asking participants to assess six possible situations in their neighbourhood, e.g. "People who don't have a job or a low-paid job but a lot of money", "Shops with none to a few customers, that still keep existing" and "A residence where unknown people visit regularly". Participants could answer with '*yes*' and '*no*' and give a certainty assessment ($\alpha = .74$).

Community level. *Sense of community* was measured by asking participants about their connectedness to their neighbourhood, using six items ($\alpha = .86$) like "I know the people that live in my neighbourhood", and "I feel at home in this neighbourhood".

Collective efficacy was measured by asking if participants felt able to solve problems with their neighbours with six items ($\alpha = .86$), with items like "My neighbours and I can make decisions together, even when we have different opinions", and "As a neighbourhood, we are able to increase the safety in the neighbourhood".

Institutional level. *Sense of empowerment* is measured by asking if participants have a feeling that they can influence what happens in their neighbourhood, with five items (after removing one item $\alpha = .73$) e.g. "Participating in neighbourhood activities has positive effects", and "I think that the law enforcement is committed to the neighbourhood".

Trust is measured by asking to what extent participants trusted the law enforcement, with five items ($\alpha = .90$) like "The law enforcement will take the needs of me and my neighbours into account", and "The law enforcement has the knowledge and skills to prevent crime".

Results

Descriptive statistics

When participants were sure that there was a marijuana cultivation in their neighbourhood, 73.3% indicated to report this, and only 8.0% indicated to not report this. When participants doubted if there was a marijuana cultivation, 36.9% of the participants indicated to report this and 20.8% indicated to not report this. Most people (42.2%) indicated that they were hesitant to report. People who indicated to report, in general, were slightly older, have completed secondary education, lived with their partner or partner and children, outside the city centre in a personally owned house and did not use drugs in the last 12 months. Of the people that indicated not to report when they doubt, 38.5% would still not report but 25.6% indicated they would report if they were sure of the cultivation. In appendix B the demographics are given for willingness to report when sure. As for preference where to report, most participants pointed out to prefer to report to the law enforcement (50.3%),

followed by Report Crime Anonymous (27.8%). One participant preferred to report at the

housing association.

Table 1
Demographics of the sample and willingness to report with doubt.

Characteristics	Total (N=187)		No (n = 39) 20.8%		Maybe (n = 79) 42.2%		Yes (n = 69) 36.9%	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Age, Mean (SD)	42.3 (14.3)		33.9 (12.7)		40.7 (13.0)		48.8 (13.6)	
Age range	18 – 79		20 – 69		18 – 70		22 – 79	
Gender								
Male	68	36.4	20	51.3	24	30.4	24	34.8
Female	117	62.6	19	48.7	53	67.1	45	65.2
Do not want to say	2	1.1	0	0.0	2	2.5	0	0.0
Education								
Lower	10	5.3	1	2.6	4	5.1	5	7.2
Secondary	92	49.2	18	46.2	39	49.4	35	50.7
Higher	85	45.5	20	51.3	36	45.6	29	42.0
Living situation								
Alone	27	14.4	8	20.5	14	17.7	5	7.2
With my partner	55	29.4	9	23.1	20	25.3	26	37.7
With my partner and children	78	41.7	12	30.8	36	45.6	30	43.5
With my parents/caregivers	17	9.1	6	15.4	8	10.1	3	4.3
Alone with my children	8	4.3	2	5.1	1	1.3	5	7.2
Student housing	1	0.5	1	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Do not want to say	1	0.5	1	2.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
Type of house								
Personal owned	145	77.5	28	71.8	56	70.9	61	88.4
Rental from housing association	33	17.6	9	23.1	16	20.3	8	11.6
Private rental	9	4.8	2	5.1	7	8.9	0	0.0
Living area								
Within city centre	37	19.8	9	23.1	15	19.0	13	18.8
Outside city centre [a]	132	70.6	27	69.2	56	70.9	49	71.0
Outside city limits	18	9.6	3	7.7	8	10.1	7	10.1
Willingness to report when sure								
Yes	137	73.3	10	25.6	58	73.4	69	100.0
Maybe	35	18.7	14	35.9	21	26.6	0	0.0
No	15	8.0	15	38.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Preference where to report								
The municipality	9	4.8	0	0.0	4	5.1	5	7.2
The law enforcement	94	50.3	14	35.9	41	51.9	39	56.5
Report Crime Anonymous	52	27.8	12	30.8	18	22.8	22	31.9
The community law enforcement officer	19	10.2	1	2.6	15	19.0	3	4.3
Housing association	1	0.5	0	0.0	1	1.3	0	0.0
I would not report	12	6.4	12	30.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
Drug use [b]								
Yes	15	8.0	10	25.6	5	6.3	0	0.0
No	172	92.0	29	74.4	74	93.7	69	100.0

Note. [a] Within city limits but outside the city centre, [b] In the past 12 months.

Table 2

Willingness to report according to living area (N = 187).

Variables	Within city centre (n = 37)		Outside city centre [a] (n = 132)		Outside city limits (n = 18)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Willingness to report with doubt						
Yes	13	35.1	49	37.1	7	38.9
Maybe	15	40.5	56	42.4	8	44.4
No	9	24.3	27	20.5	3	16.7
Willingness to report when sure						
Yes	25	67.6	100	75.8	12	66.7
Maybe	8	21.6	22	16.7	5	27.8
No	4	10.8	10	7.6	1	5.6

Note. [a] *Within city limits but outside the city centre.*

Since it was of interest whether there was a difference in willingness to report based on living area, participants were asked if they live within the city centre, outside the city centre or outside city limits. Because the participants were not evenly divided along the living area, a cross-tabulation is made, see Table 2. It is shown that the willingness to report is about the same in each living area. When participants doubt if there is a marijuana cultivation in their neighbourhood, about 37% indicated to report. When participants are sure, about 67% of the people living within the city centre and outside city limits indicated to report, and 7v5.8% of the participants living outside the city centre indicated to report. These amounts are very similar to the total willingness to report as seen in Table 1. So, for further analyses, these groups were taken together.

To benchmark willingness to report (suspicions of) a marijuana cultivation, participants also had to indicate their willingness to report other, more visible kinds of crime. In Table 3 it is shown that the willingness to report suspicions of marijuana cultivation was the lowest with only 36.9% of the participants willing to report. Willingness to report a marijuana cultivation when sure (73.3%) was more equal to the willingness to report other kinds of crime, though still less than the 87.7% for reporting the witnessing of violence and 98.4% for the witnessing of burglary. When people imagined being a victim of either violence or burglary, willingness to report raised above 93%. What is interesting in this table, is the decrease of willingness to report when multiple other witnesses are present. 19.2% of the participants indicated to probably not report crimes anymore.

Table 3

Willingness to report for different crime types (N=187).

Willingness to report…	Probably		Maybe/ neutral		Probably not	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
… marijuana cultivation with doubt	69	36.9	79	42.2	39	20.9
… marijuana cultivation when sure	137	73.3	35	18.7	15	8.0
… witnessing of violence	164	87.7	14	7.5	9	4.8
… witnessing of burglary	184	98.4	1	0.5	2	1.0
… crime when multiple other witnesses are present	111	59.3	40	21.4	36	19.2
… being a victim of violence	174	93.1	8	4.3	5	2.7
… being a victim of burglary	184	98.4	0	0.0	2	1.1

Correlation analysis

To see what variables are related to each other, a correlation matrix is given in Table 4. Means, standard deviation and correlations for the two dependent variables about willingness to report and independent variables of the Community Engagement Theory and about attitude, knowledge and experience are given. Risk perception and affect have a mean score below the middle point of the Likert-scale, 2.77 and 2.33 respectively. All other drivers scored between 3 and 4 on a 5-point Likert-scale.

Willingness to report with doubt correlates positively with all psychological mechanisms, drugs attitude and knowledge, with a weak to moderate strength. For the demographic variables, it was found that willingness to report correlated positively with age. This means that all variables from the Community Engagement Theory, drugs attitude, knowledge and age are related to willingness to report with doubt, and might predict reporting. Response efficacy, sense of empowerment and drugs attitude show the strongest correlations, respectively $r = .48, p < .01, r = .44, p < .01$ and $r = .48, p < .01$.

Willingness to report when sure also correlates positively with all psychological mechanisms, except collective efficacy. Furthermore, positive correlations were found with drugs attitude, knowledge, age and gender. Especially response efficacy and drugs attitude imply stronger relations ($r = .54, p < .01$ and $r = .64, p < .01$). The fact that collective efficacy is not significant indicates that being able to solve problems with neighbours, does not influence willingness to report when someone is sure that there is a cultivation in their neighbourhood.

Table 4

Means, standard deviations and correlations for willingness to report (N = 187).

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Willingness to report with doubt [a]	3.16	0.74	-															
2. Willingness to report when sure [a]	3.65	0.62	.63**	-														
3. Risk Perception	2.77	0.69	.33**	.42**	-													
4. Affect	2.33	0.80	.18*	.27**	.46**	-												
5. Self efficacy	3.66	0.63	.30**	.15*	.07	.03	-											
6. Response efficacy	3.94	0.75	.48**	.54**	.31**	.14	.32**	-										
7. Sense of Community	3.63	0.79	.27**	.20**	.02	.04	.31**	.30**	-									
8. Collective Efficacy	3.63	0.59	.25**	.14	-.09	-.04	.43**	.24**	.67**	-								
9. Sense of Empowerment	3.29	0.61	.44**	.38**	.13	.14	.43**	.57**	.50**	.54**	-							
10. Trust	3.68	0.77	.33**	.44**	.10	.11	.21**	.55**	.22**	.22**	.66**	-						
11. Drugs attitude	3.76	0.97	.48**	.64**	.39**	.32**	.06	.49**	.18*	.10	.33**	.40**	-					
12. Experience [b]	1.51	0.60	-.09	-.12	.03	.01	.03	-.18*	-.09	-.07	-.12	-.22*	-.14	-				
13. Knowledge [c]	5.37	2.35	.26**	.22**	.15*	.15*	.42**	.29**	.09	.16*	.23**	.20**	.21**	.06	-			
14. Age	42.26	14.26	.40**	.25**	.29**	.21*	.09	.20**	.27**	.13	.14*	.05	.23**	-.16*	.01	-		
15. Gender [d]	1.66	0.54	.08	.22**	.17*	.18*	-.10	.14	-.01	-.03	.03	.15*	.29**	-.04	.00	-.10	-	
16. Education [e]	2.40	0.59	-.09	-.03	-.13	-.15*	.06	-.06	-.15*	.05	.03	.04	-.11	.10	-.02	-.20**	-.06	-

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$ (2-tailed),

[a] 1 = I don't know what that is, 2 = no, 3 = maybe, 4 = yes, [b] 1 and 2 = no experience, 3 and 4 = experience, [c] proportion recognised characteristics, [d] 1 = male, 2 = female, 3 = different, 4 = don't want to say, [e] 1 = lower, 2 = secondary, 3 = higher.

17

Table 5

Stepwise regression analysis predicting willingness to report a marijuana cultivation (N = 186).

Variables	Model 1			Model 2			Model 3			Model 4		
	B	t	Sig.	B	t	Sig.	B	t	Sig.	B	t	Sig.
Risk perception										0.14	2.89	.004
Response efficacy							0.20	3.63	.000	0.18	3.25	.001
Sense of empowerment				0.37	6.51	.000	0.25	4.00	.000	0.26	4.16	.000
Drugs attitude	0.38	10.19	.000	0.30	8.37	.000	0.25	6.76	.000	0.22	5.62	.000
R^2	.38			.50			.54			.56		
Adjusted R^2	.37			.49			.53			.55		
F	103.73*			85.54*			65.49*			53.33*		
F Change (df)	103.73 (1, 172)			42.40 (1, 171)			13.18 (1, 170)			8.36 (1, 169)		

*Note. * p <.01*
Willingness to report is set as the dependent variable.

Regression analysis

To find out which of the variables were predictive for willingness to report, a stepwise regression analysis was done. For this end, willingness to report with doubt and willingness to report when sure were combined to one variable; *willingness to report* and set as the dependent variable. Risk perception, affect, self efficacy, response efficacy, sense of community, collective efficacy, sense of empowerment, trust, drugs attitude, experience and knowledge were taken as the independent variables. After removing one outlier, the assumptions were met. The final regression model is significant with $F(4, 169) = 53.33$, $p <$ .01 and explains 55% of the variance in willingness to report (*adjusted R^2 = .55*), see Table 5 for the complete results. In the table it is shown that the variables risk perception ($B = 0.14$, $t = 2.89$, $p < .01$), response efficacy ($B = .18$, $t = 3.25$, $p < .01$), sense of empowerment ($B = .26$, $t = 4.16$, $p < .01$) and drugs attitude ($B = .22$, $t = 5.62$, $p < .01$) are significant, positive predictors for willingness to report. This means that participants were more willing to report when they perceived marijuana cultivations as risky, believed that reporting helps, believed institutions really listen to them and had a negative attitude towards people involved with drugs. All other drivers did not turn out to be of predictive value.

Knowledge of characteristics

To measure knowledge about characteristics of marijuana cultivations, participants were asked to indicate which of the nine most common characteristics of a cultivation they have recognized as a sign of cultivation. As can be seen in Table 6, taped windows was

Table 6
Multiple response analysis of the characteristics of marijuana cultivations (N = 187).

Characteristics	n	% of sample
Taped windows	159	85.9
High power usage	156	84.3
Smell nuisance	150	81.1
Uninhabited house with common visitors	146	78.9
Condensation on the windows	105	56.8
Warmth coming from walls/floors/ceilings	97	52.4
Constant noise from air extraction systems	86	46.5
Poor air quality	57	30.8
Water damage	48	25.9
Total	1004	542.7

chosen most often (n = 159) and was recognized by 86% of the participants, followed by high power usage (n = 156) and thirdly smell nuisance (n = 150). The least known characteristics were water damage (n = 48) and poor air quality (n = 57), which were recognized by at least 25% of the participants.

Experience with undermining

Participants were asked if they thought the criminal chain behind marijuana cultivation would stay intact when they would not report their suspicions, using three statements. These statements can be seen in Table 7. When asked the opinion on the statement "If I report my suspicions of a cultivation, that has more consequences than clearing only that cultivation", the majority agreed, with a mean score of 3.55. This suggests that most people are aware that there is more behind a cultivation, like the criminal chain. The opinions about the second statement; "By smoking marijuana, the criminal chain behind the cultivation will stay intact" were more divided with a mean of 3.46 (SD = 1.11). This indicates that fewer people believe that smoking marijuana keeps the criminal chain behind marijuana cultivations intact.

Table 7
Means (M) and Standard Deviations (SD) of participants opinion about keeping the criminal chain intact (N=185).

Statements	M	SD
If I report my suspicions of a cultivation, that has more consequences than clearing only that cultivation.	3.55	0.88
By smoking marijuana, the criminal chain behind the cultivation will stay intact.	3.46	1.11
By not sharing suspicions of a marijuana cultivation, the criminal chain behind the cultivation will stay intact.	3.99	0.95

Note. Answering options ranged from 1 (totally disagree) to 5 (totally agree).

Table 8

Occurrence (%) of undermining-related situations according to participants (N = 186).

	Yes	No
Hotel and catering industries with zero to a few customers, that keep existing.	25.1	74.3
A house with a lot of unknown visitors that only stay shortly.	23.0	76.5
Shops with a zero to a few customers, that keep existing.	20.9	78.6
People without a job [a], but with a lot of money.	16.6	83.5
Owners of shops and hotel and catering industries with zero to a few customers, that have a lot of money.	13.4	86.6
Empty business premises where people come and go.	5.9	93.6

Note. [a] People without a job, or a low paid job.

The last statement; "By not sharing suspicions of a marijuana cultivation, the criminal chain behind the cultivation will stay intact" has the highest mean ($M = 3.99$), which indicates that most people agreed with this statement. In general, most people thought reporting suspicions had effects on the criminal chain behind marijuana cultivations.

Furthermore, it was asked what kinds of undermining-related situations participants saw in their neighbourhoods. As shown in Table 8, the most occurring situation is hotel and catering industries with zero to a few customers that keep existing, with 25% of the participants being convinced they have seen it. 23% of the participants thought there is a house in their neighbourhood, with a lot of unknown visitors that stay shortly. This can suggest that there is a selling point of marijuana, as seen in the introduction. The least occurred situation according to participants are empty business premises where people come and go, with only 5.9%.

Discussion

The main goal of this research was to assess what psychological drivers influence the decision of citizens whether to report their suspicions of marijuana cultivations to authorities, with drivers according to the Community Engagement Theory (Paton, 2013) on the individual, community and institutional levels. Most participants indicated that, if they were uncertain that there is a marijuana cultivation, they were hesitant to report it. More participants indicated that they would report if they are certain that there is a cultivation in their neighbourhood. These results are in line with the study by Broekhuizen et al. (2018) and Mehlbaum and Broekhuizen (2020), who found that most respondents did not report as they were unsure/did not have any evidence. This corresponds to the general idea that ambiguity refrains people to act as they would without ambiguity (Chaurand & Brauer, 2008). A

possible explanation is that people like to make decisions that they morally support and stand by, especially in the case of risks (Rheinberger & Treich, 2017). When people are not completely sure their neighbour is doing something illegal, it is harder to justify the decision to report to the authorities. Feelings of fear and guilt might rise, holding back the decision to report. Additionally, the possible consequences of reporting might be unclear. However, when people are sure that their neighbours have a marijuana cultivation, personal risks outweigh the feelings of guilt, which leads to a higher willingness to report. Since the municipality was chosen because of the low amount of reportings, law enforcement may not receive signals because citizens are simply not sure of the fact that there is a marijuana cultivation in their neighbourhood.

In comparison to other, more visible types of crime (i.e. violence), willingness to report (suspicions of) marijuana cultivations is lower. It seems possible that these results are due to the higher uncertainty that people have about signals of marijuana cultivation. With violence or burglary, it is more evident that it is happening. This reasoning is further reinforced by the result that people are less willing to report when they know other people share the knowledge; when other witnesses are present, the willingness to report is about 40% lower compared to witnessing a burglary. It can be that in this context, pluralistic ignorance is happening; people might think that there is a cultivation, but because it would appear nobody else shares their suspicions, the uncertainty rises and nobody reports it (Kassin, Fein, & Markus, 2014).

To assess what drivers influence the decision whether to report, correlation and regression analyses were carried out. Results indicate that, if people perceive marijuana cultivations in their neighbourhood as risky, believe that reporting helps against these risks, hold a negative attitude towards people involved with marijuana cultivations and believe that institutions act in the interest of citizens, they are willing to report.

So, for individual-level drivers, risk perception, response efficacy and attitude are significant predictors. When citizens think there is a probability that marijuana cultivations are situated in their neighbourhood and that this will have consequences for them, thus have a high risk-perception, they are more likely to report. These results are in line with the research by Broekhuizen et al. (2018), who stated that the more aware people seem to be about the consequences of undermining crime, the more willing people are to report. These findings suggest that to increase reporting, it can help to make people more aware of the dangers and consequences marijuana cultivations can cause. But attention should also be given to perceived likelihood, as one of the neighbourhood associations did not cooperate with the

research in the belief that cultivations would not occur in their neighbourhood. Schreurs (2019) also found that both crime consequences and crime likelihood are of influence in willingness to act, which in their case involved the gathering of information. Chaurand and Brauer (2008) have argued that when people see personal consequences, they are more likely to act, similar to the concept of self-interest. In their article, Kerstholt, Duijnhoven, and Paton (2017) discuss that risk perception is a combination of cognitive and affective processes. In the current study, affect was taken as a separate variable and did not turn out to be predictive. This indicates that citizens are more likely to have used cognitive processes in determining risks and thought thoroughly and analytically about marijuana cultivations. In reviewing the literature, these results seem somewhat rare. As Loewenstein et al., (2001) and Slovic, Finucane, Peters, and MacGregor (2004) have argued, similar to Kerstholt et al. (2017), in all cognitive processes there is an influence of affect and emotions. A possible explanation for these results may be that affect turned out to be an underlying factor of influence or a confounding variable. This line of thought is supported by the results of the correlation analysis, where affect correlates positively with risk perception with moderate strength.

Related to the beforementioned cognitive processes is the attitude people hold against people involved with marijuana cultivations. Attitude turned out to be the most important factor in predicting willingness to report. Most people indicated to feel negative towards people involved with marijuana cultivations, leading to a higher willingness to report. Attitude is more influenced by beliefs and knowledge than by affect (Eagly, Mladinic, & Otto, 1994), and can be influenced by intuition which is based on experience and knowledge (Schreurs, 2019). In the results we have seen a moderate-to-high amount of knowledge, indicating a sufficient base for substantiated attitudes. This strengthens the suggestion to make people more aware of how cultivations are set up and what the dangers and consequences are. However, research has also shown that attitudes are immutable, as they are based on personal experience and relevance (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2000). Broekhuizen, Mehlbaum, and Wester (2020) evaluated the use of a so-called 'Marijuana-container', in which citizens could take a look inside a cultivation site and experience for themselves what it looks like and what the dangers are. Results indicated that being exposed to such a scenario would increase a person's knowledge about cultivations and perception of crime consequences for the short and long term. Though it is not proven that the attitude is adjusted based on the container, it gives people personal experiences along with information touching upon all elements that an attitude is based on. This can increase negative feelings towards the cultivators, increasing

negative attitude. Future research on attitude and crime-related matters can be useful to broaden the scope of prevention tools.

As previously stated, response efficacy is also a predictor variable. These results reflect those of Schreurs (2019), who also found that when people believe that reporting is effective in diminishing crime, willingness to act increases. It is therefore important that law enforcement communicates in advance what will happen after reporting and emphasizes that each reporting has value (Schreurs, 2020). The latter is especially important since it seems that people refrain from reporting because they think it has no effects, even though improvements have been made in the last years (Van De Weijer & Bernasco, 2016). These points insinuate that trust in the institutions, especially law enforcement, is indispensable. This idea is strengthened by the correlation analysis from which we have seen that response efficacy correlates moderately strong with sense of empowerment and trust.

For the drivers at the institutional level, sense of empowerment turned out to be a predictive driver. The relationship with authorities is important, as the willingness to take responsibility regarding own safety is increased with a higher sense of empowerment (Paton et al., 2010). If organizations are perceived as legitimate and caring for citizens, people feel more invested in society, increasing the responsibility taken to care for the neighbourhood. As mentioned by Zimmerman (1990), feelings of personal power are increased with a higher sense of empowerment, thereupon increasing the amount of effort put into the neighbourhood, including keeping the neighbourhood safe by reporting suspicions of crime. Schreurs (2019) argued that citizen participation in general can increase law enforcement legitimacy and vice versa.

The beforementioned findings support the hypothesis that a combination of drivers at different levels predicts willingness to report, excluding the drivers at the community level. It seems that reporting is perceived as somewhat an individual task, independent of the community. The involved institutions, however, do play a role in this process and are thus important in deciding to report.

Moreover, it was expected that the willingness to report differed based on the area participants lived in. Based on the sample, no evidence for this prediction is found. Social influence is thus less important for the willingness to report than previously assumed. It can be for instance, that people involved with marijuana cultivations are not taken as part of the community when assessing the sense of community (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2001). Previous studies evaluating social cohesion observed inconsistent results on whether it influences willingness to report (Broekhuizen et al., 2018; Van De Weijer & Bernasco, 2016).

Limitations

Many insights have been found in this research, but due to the properties of the sample, it cannot directly be generalized to other regions or cultures. All participants were collected within one specific municipality by means of convenience sampling, which can influence some - if not all - of the variables measured. The community-level drivers might be very different in a neighbourhood with a different level of cohesion. Similarly, drivers at the institutional level can be different in large cities, as seen in Taiwan where in more urban settings trust in law enforcement was rated lower than in more rural settings (Wang & Sun, 2020). More research in this specific relation can be useful for similar future studies and in community policing research.

By using a digital questionnaire, it might be that intuitive reactions are suppressed. This may have biased the variables, like affect, which did not predict willingness to report. An explanation for this result is that citizens processed the risks analytically, rather than intuitively. This contradicts with the literature, stating that affect influences risk perception and judgements directly, before analytical assessment (Slovic, Finucane, Peters, & MacGregor, 2007; Slovic & Peters, 2006). Using a questionnaire does not necessarily touch upon the quicker, intuitive processes someone has in case of real danger (Slovic & Peters, 2006), especially when it is done online in a familiar and safe location where people can take their time to answer the questions. Internet-anonymity can also facilitate people to give a much stronger reaction which they would not have spoken otherwise, as mentioned previously. It is however ethically questionable if you can put people in such a situation that they perceive real danger and give information on the several variables. Additionally, the response is reasonably low. Since the occurrence of COVID-19, it was not possible to personally invite people to participate. However, the subject of marijuana cultivations very much 'lives' amongst citizens, as some have reacted quite intense on Social Media, mentioning that people that report are traitors. The researcher received personal messages from people that wanted to share their opinions and point-of-views.

Furthermore, this study has focused on the intention to report (the willingness), and not so much on the actual reporting behaviour. Intention is a moderate predictor of behaviour (Paton et al., 2010), even though people do not always turn their intention into behaviour (Sheeran & Webb, 2016). People can have the intention to report, but in the heat of the moment change their mind, for example through fear. To find out what psychological drivers influence actual reporting behaviour, more research is necessary. For example, an annual survey can be used to cross-reference to the reporting numbers. It might be used just in the

neighbourhood where a cultivation is been caught, or in the whole municipality as part of a general evaluation. Another way to investigate actual behavior, without much ethical restrains, is the use of for instance VR- or AR-techniques. It is used before to compare behavior between several groups (Nee, van Gelder, Otte, Vernham, & Meenaghan, 2019).

Knowledge did not turn out to be a predictor of willingness to report. Possibly, people thought deeply about the characteristics mentioned in the questionnaire, but not concerning their neighbourhood. Since no decoy characteristics were added to the answer possibilities, people might have checked more characteristics than they actually knew. For future research, the way of measuring knowledge needs to be adjusted to get a complete image.

Practical implications

As mentioned before, future research is necessary. Nonetheless, some practical implications can be made. As mentioned before, awareness influences most of the predictor variables. This can be done by letting people experience what the risks and consequences of marijuana cultivations are. This could be done by the use of a so-called 'Marijuana-container' (Broekhuizen et al., 2020) or similar ideas. People can create a better understanding of what exactly happens during the several phases of marijuana cultivation and all the related consequences. If people see how electrical wiring is rerouted dangerously, and the added dangers of water leakage, they will see more possible consequences for themselves, increasing risk perception. Additionally, by explaining some background about the phases of cultivations and people that are often involved with marijuana cultivations, knowledge will be obtained which can strengthen the attitude people have. For instance, if people are made aware that most of the cultivators already are more involved in crime, it can increase the negative attitude about these people coming into their neighbourhood. As shown in this research, this will increase the willingness to report. Lastly, an additional effect of the experience will be the general increase in knowledge, which can decrease feelings of doubt if someone thinks there might be a cultivation in their neighbourhood.

Secondly, after receiving a reporting, some sort of feedback should be given when possible. This can help to maintain and even increase sense of empowerment and response efficacy (Mehlbaum & Broekhuizen, 2020). People will get to know that information they gave is used and that their input is taken seriously. It can also show that reporting has some use and is certainly not done for nothing. Though it is probably not possible to provide feedback for each reporting, general feedback might work as well (Broekhuizen et al., 2020). It can, for instance, be mentioned in media messages that a cultivation was discovered due to intelligence gained from reportings.

Lastly, it can lower the threshold for reporting to provide information about the next steps that law enforcement will take. This can increase the willingness to report when someone doubts if there is a cultivation in their neighbourhood. Providing someone with information on forehand can persuade hesitant citizens, since it can take stress-factors away as they have information on what will happen next. As part of this, it can help to assure that suspicions will also be taken seriously and that anonymity will be kept when someone is reporting (Broekhuizen et al., 2018), which can again increase response efficacy and sense of empowerment.

References

Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2000). Attitudes and the Attitude-Behavior Relation: Reasoned and Automatic Processes. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *11*(1), 1–33. https://doi.org/10.1080/14792779943000116

Armitage, C. J., & Christian, J. (2003). From Attitudes to Behaviour: Basic and Applied Research on the Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Current Psychology*, *22*(3), 187–195. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315126449-1

Bandura, A. (1982). Self-efficacy Mechanism in Human Agency. *American Psychologist*, *37*(2), 122–147. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.37.2.122

Bandura, A. (2000). Exercise of Human Agency Through Collective Efficacy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *9*(3), 75–78. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8721.00064

Belackova, V., Tomkova, A., & Zabransky, T. (2016). Qualitative research in Spanish cannabis social clubs: "The moment you enter the door, you are minimising the risks." *International Journal of Drug Policy*, *34*(34), 49–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugpo.2016.04.009

Bennett, T., Holloway, K., & Farrington, D. (2008, March 1). The statistical association between drug misuse and crime: A meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, Vol. 13, pp. 107–118. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2008.02.001

Bieleman, B., Snippe, J., Naayer, H., & Ogier, C. (2004). *Preventieve doorlichting cannabissector c.a.* Groningen.

Bovenkerk, F., Hogewind, W., Korf, D., & Milani, N. (2003). *Hennepteelt in Nederland: het probleem van de criminaliteit en haar bestrijding* (8th ed.). Utrecht.

Broekhuizen, J., Mehlbaum, S., & Wester, A. (2020). *Invloed Interventies Meldingsbereidheid Ondermijnende Criminaliteit op Lange Termijn*. Retrieved from https://www.bureaubroekhuizen.

Broekhuizen, J., Meulenkamp, T., Stoutjesdijk, F., & Boutellier, H. (2018). *Ondermijnende criminaliteit en de meldingsbereidheid van burgers. Een pilotonderzoek in drie buurten in Brabant-Zeeland*. Amersfoort.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek. (2019). *Kerncijfers Wijken en Buurten*.

Centrum voor Criminaliteitspreventie en Veiligheid. (2010). *Handboek Bestuurlijke Aanpak Georganiseerde Criminaliteit* (L. Olsthoorn & O. van Hees, Eds.). Retrieved from https://hetccv.nl/fileadmin//Bestanden/Bestellen/Algemeen/handboek_bestuurlijke_aanp ak.pdf

Chaurand, N., & Brauer, M. (2008). What Determines Social Control? People's Reactions to Counternormative Behaviors in Urban Environments. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *38*(7), 1689–1715. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2008.00365.x

Cheshire, L., & Fitzgerald, R. (2015). From Private Nuisance to Criminal Behaviour: Neighbour Problems and Neighbourhood Context in an Australian City. *Housing Studies*, *30*(1), 100–122. https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2014.933783

Decorte, T. (2010). Small Scale Domestic Cannabis Cultivation: An Anonymous Web Survey among 659 Cannabis Cultivators in Belgium. *Contemporary Drug Problems*, *37*(2),

341–370. https://doi.org/10.1177/009145091003700208

Eagly, A. H., Mladinic, A., & Otto, S. (1994). Cognitive and affective bases of attitudes toward social groups and social policies. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *30*(2), 113–137. https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1994.1006

Emmet, I., & Boers, R. (2008). *Het groene goud: verslag van een onderzoek naar de cannabissector voor het Nationaal dreigingsbeeld criminaliteit met een georganiseerd karakter*. Zoetermeer.

Gemeente Hellendoorn. (2020). *Gemeentegids Hellendoorn 2020*. Hellendoorn: Akse Media bv.

Harcourt, B. E. (1998). Reflecting on the Subject : A Critique of the Social Influence Conception of Deterrence , the Broken Windows Theory , and Order-Maintenance Policing New York Style Author (s): Bernard E . Harcourt Source : Michigan Law Review , Vol . 97 , No . 2 (Nov . *Michigan Law Review*, *97*(2), 291–389. https://doi.org/10.2307/1290289

Harrison, L. D., Erickson, P. G., Korf, D. J., Brochu, S., & Benschop, A. (2007). How much for a dime bag? An exploration of youth drug markets. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, *90*(2007), S27–S39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2006.09.009

Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2001). *INTERGROUP BIAS*. Retrieved from www.annualreviews.org

Hipp, J. R. (2016). Collective efficacy: How is it conceptualized, how is it measured, and does it really matter for understanding perceived neighborhood crime and disorder? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *46*, 32–44. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2016.02.016

Isacson, D., & Bingefors, K. (2002). Attitudes towards drugs - A survey in the general population. *Pharmacy World and Science*, *24*(3), 104–110. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1016127320051

Kassin, S., Fein, S., & Markus, H. R. (2014). *Social Psychology* (9th ed.; J. Hague, Ed.). Wadsworth: Cengage Learning.

Kerstholt, J., Duijnhoven, H., & Paton, D. (2017). Flooding in The Netherlands: How people's interpretation of personal, social and institutional resources influence flooding preparedness. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, *24*(2017), 52–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.05.013

Kop, N. (2012). Van opsporing naar criminaliteitsbeheersing. In *Onderzoeksreeks Politieacademie*. Den Haag.

Korf, D. J., Bookelman, G. W., & Haan, T. (2001). Diversiteit in Criminaliteit. Allochtone arrestanten in de Amsterdamse politiestatistiek. *Tijdschrift Voor de Criminologie*, *3*(43), 230–259.

Loewenstein, G. F., Weber, E. U., Hsee, C. K., & Welch, N. (2001). Risk as Feelings. *Psychological Bulletin*, *127*(2), 267–286.

McMillan, D. W. (1996). Sense of community. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *24*(4), 315–325. https://doi.org/10.1386/dbs.3.1.3_2

Mehlbaum, S., & Broekhuizen, J. (2020). *Vreemde Geuren: Nulmeting Meldingsbereidheid*

Drugsproductielocaties in Zaanstad. Halfweg.

Mehlbaum, S., Schoenmakers, Y., & Van Zanten, J. (2018). *Notoire straten. Over de lokale inbedding van georganiseerde criminaliteit.* Den Haag.

Murray, R. M., Morrison, P. D., Henquet, C., & Forti, M. Di. (2007). Cannabis, the mind and society: The hash realities. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *8*(11), 885–895. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2253

Nee, C., van Gelder, J. L., Otte, M., Vernham, Z., & Meenaghan, A. (2019). Learning on the job: Studying expertise in residential burglars using virtual environments. *Criminology*, *57*(3), 481–511. https://doi.org/10.1111/1745-9125.12210

Nelisse, R. M. L., Bektas, K. E., & Kuindersma, P. (2017). *Fysieke Risico's van Hennepkwekerijen in de Leefomgeving*. Delft.

Paoli, L., & Decorte, T. (2013). Assessing the Harms of Cannabis Cultivation in Belgium. *ISSDP Annual Conference*. Bogotà.

Paton, D. (2013). Disaster Resilient Communities: Developing and testing an all-hazards theory. *Journal of Integrated Disaster Risk Management*, *3*(1), 1–17. https://doi.org/10.5595/idrim.2013.0050

Paton, D., & Johnston, D. (2001). Disasters and communities: Vulnerability, resilience and preparedness. *Disaster Prevention and Management: An International Journal*, *10*(4), 270–277. https://doi.org/10.1108/EUM0000000005930

Paton, D., Sagala, S., Okada, N., Jang, L. J., Bürgelt, P. T., & Gregg, C. E. (2010). Making sense of natural hazard mitigation: Personal, social and cultural influences. *Environmental Hazards*, *9*(2), 183–196. https://doi.org/10.3763/ehaz.2010.0039

Peyton, K., Sierra-arévalo, M., & Rand, D. G. (2019). A field experiment on community policing and police legitimacy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, *116*(40), 19894–19898. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1910157116

Politie Amsterdam-Amstelland. (2009). *Over ondermijning: Een verkenning naar het fenomeen, de aanpak en mogelijke verbeteringen* (2nd ed.). Amsterdam: Elco Extension.

Rheinberger, C. M., & Treich, N. (2017). Attitudes Toward Catastrophe. *Environmental and Resource Economics*, *67*(3), 609–636. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10640-016-0033-3

Sampson, R. J., Raudenbush, S. W., & Earls, F. (1997). Neighborhoods and violent crime: A multilevel study of collective efficacy. *Science*, *277*(5328), 918–924. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.277.5328.918

Schreurs, W. (2019). *Crossing lines together. How and why citizens participate in the police domain* (University of Twente). https://doi.org/10.3990/1.9789036548496

Schreurs, W. (2020). Waarom melden burgers? Individuele, sociale en institutionele drijfveren voor meldgedrag in het verleden en toekomstige meldingsbereidheid. *Tijdschrift Voor de Veiligheid*, *19*(2–3), 8–28. https://doi.org/10.5553/TvV/187279482020019203002

Schreurs, W., Franjkić, N., Kerstholt, J. H., De Vries, P. W., & Giebels, E. (2020). Why do citizens become a member of an online neighbourhood watch ? A case study in The Netherlands watch ? A case study in The Netherlands. *Police Practice and Research*.

https://doi.org/10.1080/15614263.2020.1712202

Sheeran, P., & Webb, T. L. (2016). The Intention-Behavior Gap. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *10*(9), 503–518. https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12265

Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2004). Risk as Analysis and Risk as Feelings: Some Thoughts about Affect, Reason, Risk, and Rationality. *Risk Analysis*, *24*(2), 311–322. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0272-4332.2004.00433.x

Slovic, P., Finucane, M. L., Peters, E., & MacGregor, D. G. (2007). The affect heuristic. *European Journal of Operational Research*, *177*(3), 1333–1352. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2005.04.006

Slovic, P., & Peters, E. (2006). *Risk Perception and Affect*.

Spapens, A. C. M. (2019). Bestuurlijke aanpak van ondermijning : ervaringen in Nederland en het buitenland. *Tijdschrift Voor Bijzonder Strafrecht En Handhaving*, (2), 85–92. https://doi.org/10.5553/TBSenH/229567002019005002002

Spapens, A. C. M., Van de Bunt, H. G., Rastovac, L., & Miralles Sueiro, C. (2007). *De wereld achter de wietteelt*. Den Haag.

Stacy, A. W., Bentler, P. M., & Flay, B. R. (1994). Attitudes and Health Behavior in Diverse Populations: Drunk Driving, Alcohol Use, Binge Eating, Marijuana Use, and Cigarette Use. *Health Psychology*, *13*(1), 73–84. Retrieved from http://pesquisa.bvsalud.org/portal/resource/pt/mdl-8168474%5Cnhttps://www.scopus.com/inward/record.url?eid=2-s2.0-0028189359&partnerID=40&md5=b1f53e131c78c42d757df01297abf511

Tops, P., & Schilders, H. (2016). Naar een meervoudige aanpak van ondermijning. *Tijdschrift Voor de Politie*, *78*(7), 12–15. Retrieved from https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwjp3fn99KLkAhXEZVAKHQPUAAcQFjAAegQIARAC&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.politieacademie.nl%2Fkennisenonderzoek%2Fkennis%2Fmediathee k%2Fpdf%2F92747.pdf&usg=AOvVaw37zVW9gNWEk0SbY

Tytgat, J., Cuypers, E., Van Damme, P., & Vanhove, W. (2017). *Hazards of illicit cannabis cultivation for public and intervention staff*.

UNODC. (2019). *World Drug Report: Cannabis and hallucinogens 2019*. Vienna.

Van De Weijer, S., & Bernasco, W. (2016). *Aangifte- en Meldingsbereidheid: Trends en determinanten*. Retrieved from https://www.wodc.nl/binaries/2674-volledige-tekst_tcm28-124633.pdf

Van der Steen, M., Schram, J., Chin-A-Fat, N., & Scherpenisse, J. (n.d.). *Ondermijning ondermijnd*.

Van Der Torre, E. J., Schaap, L., Cachet, E. D., & Dijk, V. (2006). *Daders in beeld. Daderprofielen van henneptelers, dealers, runners en drugstoeristen in Roosendaal en Bergen op Zoom*. Den Haag.

Wang, S.-Y. K., & Sun, I. Y. (2020). A Comparative Study of Rural and Urban Residents' Trust in Police in Taiwan. *International Criminal Justice Review*, *30*(2), 197–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/1057567718763724

Zimmerman, M. A. (1990). Taking Aim on Empowerment Research: On the Distinction

Between Individual and Psychological Conceptions. In *American Journal of Community Psychology* (Vol. 18).

Appendixes

Appendix A. List of items from the Community Engagement Theory, as used in the questionnaire.

Construct	Items
Risk perception	How likely is it that…?
	… there is a marijuana cultivation in your neighbourhood.
	… a marijuana cultivation will pose dangers for you.
	… you become a victim of marijuana cultivations, for example by water damage or smell nuisance.
	Image there is a marijuana cultivation in your neighbourhood, how likely is it that…
	… you feel less safe in your neighbourhood.
	… your family members and you get involved with marijuana cultivations, for example by the illegal electricity usage.
	… you experience hindrance by the psychological consequences, for example fear complaints.
	… a marijuana cultivation will damage your home and belongings, also think of decreases of value and image.
Affect	Indicate to what extent you feel the following emotions regarding a marijuana cultivation in your neighbourhood.
	Tense
	Anxious
	Worried
	Angry
	Unsafe
	Helpless
	Indifferent [a]
Self efficacy	Indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:
	I know how to report signals of a marijuana cultivation with the law enforcement.
	I am able to share information about a marijuana cultivation in the neighbourhood
	I am able to be alert for signs of a marijuana cultivation in my neighbourhood.
	I am able to discuss suspicions of a marijuana cultivation with my family, friends or neighbours.
	I am able to search for information about signals that I find suspicious.
	I am able to keep an eye at the neighbourhood.
	I am able to detect a marijuana cultivation.
Response efficacy	Indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:
	By reporting suspicious situations, I increase the safety in the neighbourhood.
	By reporting suspicious situations, the law enforcement can address problems.
	By actively monitoring with the law enforcement, many problems can be prevented.
	By being alert for suspicious situations in the neighbourhood, I can keep the neighbourhood safe.
Sense of community	Indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:
	I know the people that live in my neighbourhood.
	I feel connected to the people that live in my neighbourhood.
	My neighbours help me when I need it.
	I feel at home in this neighbourhood.
	I would not want to move out of this neighbourhood.
	Neighbours come visit me regularly.

Collective efficacy	Indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:
	My neighbours and I can make decisions together, even when we have different opinions.
	My neighbours and me can improve the quality of life in the neighbourhood, even with few materials.
	In difficult situations, my neighbours and me are capable to work together towards a solution.
	The people in my neighbourhood can collaborate, also when this takes more effort than usual.
	As neighbourhood, we first try to solve problems ourselves.
	As neighbourhood, we are able to increase the safety in the neighbourhood.
Sense of empowerment	Indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements:
	I feel as if I can influence what happens in my neighbourhood.
	Participating in neighbourhood activities has positive effects.
	I feel that I play an important role in increasing the quality of life in my neighbourhood.
	I have an (outspoken) opinion about the way things get done by the chosen local representatives. [b]
	I think the police takes my opinion seriously.
	I think that the law enforcement is committed to the neighbourhood.
Trust	Indicate to what extent you agree with the following statements. I trust the law enforcement…
	… will take the needs of me and my neighbours into account.
	… has the knowledge and skills to prevent crime.
	… takes fitting measures if there is a dangerous situation.
	… will inform me on time if necessary.
	… gives me the correct advice about how to deal with situations.
Attitude	What do you think if people are busy with the following matters:
	Building marijuana cultivations.
	Delivering marijuana plants and seeds.
	Marijuana cultivation itself.
	Cutting the buds of marijuana plants.
	Selling marijuana.
	Buying marijuana.
	Smoking marijuana.
Experience	Do you see/have you seen the following situations in your neighbourhood?
	People without a job, but with a lot of money.
	Shops with zero to a few customers, that keep existing.
	Hotel and catering industries with zero to a few customers, that keep existing.
	Owners of shops and hotel and catering industries with zero to a few customers, that have a lot of money.
	A house with a lot of unknown visitors that only stay shortly.
	Empty business premises where people come and go.
Knowledge	Which of the following characteristics make you think of a marijuana cultivation?
	Taped windows.
	High power usage.
	Smell nuisance.
	Uninhabited house with common visitors.
	Condensation on the windows.
	Warmth coming from walls/floors/ceilings.
	Constant noise from air extraction systems.
	Poor air quality.
	Water damage.

Note. [a] = recoded, [b] = removed after scale analysis with Cronbach's Alpha.

Appendix B. Demographics divided for willingness to report when sure.

Characteristics	Total (N=187) n	%	No (N = 15) n	%	Maybe (N = 35) n	%	Yes (N = 137) n	%
Age (Mean, SD)	42.3 (14.3)		37.4 (13.5)		34.7 (13.1)		44.7 (13.9)	
Age range	18 – 79		22 – 69		18 – 65		20 – 79	
Gender								
Male	68	36.4	11	73.3	16	45.7	41	29.9
Female	117	62.6	4	26.7	18	51.4	95	69.3
Do not want to say	2	1.1	0	0.0	1	2.9	1	0.7
Education								
Lower	10	5.3	0	0.0	1	2.9	9	6.6
Secondary	92	49.2	9	60.0	17	48.6	66	48.2
Higher	85	45.5	6	40.0	17	48.6	62	45.3
Living situation								
Alone	27	14.4	5	33.3	7	20.0	15	10.9
With my partner	55	29.4	5	33.3	7	20.0	43	31.4
With my partner and children	78	41.7	3	20.0	12	34.3	63	46.0
With my parents/caregivers	17	9.1	0	0.0	7	20.0	10	7.3
Alone with my children	8	4.3	1	6.7	2	5.7	5	3.6
Student housing	1	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
Do not want to say	1	0.5	1	6.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
Type of house								
Personal owned	145	77.5	10	66.7	20	57.1	115	83.9
Rental from housing association	33	17.6	4	26.7	13	37.1	16	11.7
Private rental	9	4.8	1	6.7	2	5.7	6	4.4
Living area								
Within city centre	37	19.8	4	26.7	8	22.9	25	18.2
Outside city centre [a]	132	70.6	10	66.7	22	62.9	100	73.0
Outside city limits	18	9.6	1	6.7	5	14.3	12	8.8
Willingness to report with doubt								
Yes	69	36.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	69	50.4
Maybe	79	42.2	0	0.0	21	60.0	58	42.3
No	39	20.8	15	100.0	14	40.0	10	7.3
Preference where to report								
The municipality	9	4.8	0	0.0	1	2.9	8	5.8
Law enforcement	94	50.3	3	20.0	16	45.7	75	54.7
With Report Crime Anonymous	52	27.8	1	6.7	12	34.3	39	28.5
The community police officer	19	10.2	1	6.7	4	11.4	14	10.2
Housing association	1	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	0.7
I would not report	12	6.4	10	66.7	2	5.7	0	0.0
Drug use [b]								
Yes	15	8.0	6	40.0	6	17.2	3	2.2
No	172	92.0	9	60.0	29	82.9	134	97.8

Note. [a] Withing city limits but outside city centre, [b] In the past 12 months.

Appendix C. Occurrence of undermining-related situations according to participants, including their certainty assessment.

	No		Yes	
	Sure	Not sure	Sure	Not sure
Situations	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)	n (%)
People without a job [a], but with a lot of money.	134 (71.7)	22 (11.8)	14 (7.5)	17 (9.1)
Shops with a zero to a few customers, that keep existing.	128 (68.4)	19 (10.2)	14 (7.5)	25 (13.4)
Hotel and catering industries with zero to a few customers, that keep existing.	119 (63.6)	20 (10.7)	12 (6.4)	35 (18.7)
Owners of shops and hotel and catering industries with zero to a few customers, that have a lot of money.	138 (73.8)	24 (12.8)	11 (5.9)	14 (7.5)
A house with a lot of unknown visitors that only stay shortly.	130 (69.5)	13 (7.0)	18 (9.6)	25 (13.4)
Empty business premises where people come and go.	166 (88.8)	9 (4.8)	3 (1.6)	8 (4.3)