



ISSN: 0038-0253 (Print) 1533-8525 (Online)



Organizational Activities and Property-Crime Victimization

Katie E. Corcoran, Christopher P. Scheitle & Erin B. Hudnall

To cite this article: Katie E. Corcoran, Christopher P. Scheitle & Erin B. Hudnall (2019): Organizational Activities and Property-Crime Victimization, The Sociological Quarterly, DOI: [10.1080/00380253.2019.1583047](https://doi.org/10.1080/00380253.2019.1583047)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00380253.2019.1583047>



Published online: 04 Jun 2019.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 15



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)



Organizational Activities and Property-Crime Victimization

Katie E. Corcoran, Christopher P. Scheitle, and Erin B. Hudnall

Department of Sociology and Anthropology, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia, USA

ABSTRACT

Research utilizing routine activities theory has focused on the victimization of individuals and not organizations. Organizations vary in the activities that they engage in, and these activities produce variation in organizations' exposure to potential offenders. Drawing from routine activities theory and using data on religious congregations, we examine how congregational activities shaped experiences with property crime in the past year. The analysis shows that routine activities are positively associated with theft and external vandalism. These findings contribute to the routine activities literature and highlight a tension between congregations' desire to serve the community and the risks of that service.

KEYWORDS

Crime victimization; organizations; routine activities; congregations

Introduction

An oft-cited theory of crime victimization—routine activities theory—proposes that everyday actions, such as going to work or shopping, can increase an individual's likelihood of victimization by bringing him or her into contact with potential offenders. This is particularly the case if the individual is an attractive target and lacks guardianship or supervision. Most research on routine activities theory has focused on the activities and victimization of *individuals* (e.g., Arnold, Keane, and Baron 2005; Cohen and Felson 1979; Cohen, Klugel, and Land 1981; Kennedy and Silverman 1990; Lynch 1987; Popp and Peguero 2011; Salvolainen et al. 2009; Wilcox Rountree, Land, and Miethe 1994). This focus on individuals has led research to overlook other types of victims and, hence, the opportunity to extend the application of routine activities theory.

Organizations, for example, typically own physical property. This property can be stolen or vandalized. Scholars have noted that the issue of organizations as victims of crime is an understudied area (Felson and Clark 1997; Verhage 2009). The few studies that have examined organizational victims have focused on businesses and tend to be atheoretical—the main goal being to provide crime rates (Hopkins 2002; Taylor 2004; van Dijk and Terlouw 1996; see Exum et al. 2010; Salmi, Kiviuori, and Lehti 2015; and Savolainen 2007 for notable exceptions).

Routine activities theory offers a possible theoretical framework for understanding organizational victimization. Organizations, like individuals, vary in the types of activities in which they engage. In routine activities research, organizations like schools (Fisher et al. 1998; Fisher and Wilkes 2003; Popp and Peguero 2011; Tillyer, Wilcox, and Gialopsos 2010; Wilcox, Jordan, and Pritchard 2007) and workplaces (Lynch 1987; Wooldredge, Cullen, and Latessa 1992) are typically only considered as a way to control for levels of

security surrounding individuals. That is, organizations are not viewed as potential victims but as contexts that might affect the victimization risk of individuals in those organizations.

We argue that routine activities theory can be used to understand the victimization of organizations. Drawing from this theory, we specify hypotheses concerning how the activities engaged in by an organization affect its reported experiences with vandalism and theft. Specifically, organizations that engage in more routine activities, particularly those that bring potential offenders to their property, will be more likely to experience property crime. Additionally, organizations that are more attractive targets and have less guardianship will also be more at risk for property crime. We test these hypotheses using data from a survey of over 1,300 religious congregations in the United States representing a range of religious traditions.

Routine Activities Theory

A central interest of criminology is to identify what individual, situational, and structural factors increase one's likelihood of becoming a victim of crime. Routine activities theory stresses the importance of social factors that facilitate or impede the opportunity to commit crime. At the core of routine activities theory is the proposition that the activities individuals undertake are associated with their risk victimization. Routine activities are "any recurrent or prevalent activities which provide for basic population and individual needs," such as going to work or school (Cohen and Felson 1979:593). Routine activities are thought to increase the likelihood of victimization by bringing motivated offenders into contact with attractive victims in the absence of something that could prevent the victimization.

There are four components of routine activities theory: *exposure*, *proximity*, *target attractiveness*, and *guardianship*. *Exposure* refers to the "visibility of or physical access to victims by potential offenders," whereas *proximity* refers to how proximate a potential target is to "dense pools of offenders," typically conceptualized as the "presence of offenders in an area" (Lynch 1987:287–288). In this way, exposure can be thought of as accessibility to potential offenders based on a target's characteristics, while proximity is accessibility based on physical location (Cohen, Klugel, and Land 1981). *Target attractiveness* refers to "the material or symbolic desirability of persons or property targets to potential offenders as well as the perceived inertia of a target against illegal treatment," that is, how difficult it would be to commit the crime against a particular target (Cohen, Klugel, and Land 1981:508). Examples of attractive or suitable targets include objects that are worth stealing, homes/vehicles easily broken into, or people that are vulnerable to muggings. Target attractiveness thus captures both the perceived value of the target and how easy it is to commit the crime against it. Finally, *guardianship* refers to individuals capable of protecting an attractive target from victimization, such as a security guard, as well as objects that can serve as a deterrent for crime, such as video surveillance, locked doors, and security systems (Miethe and McDowall 1993; Miethe and Meier 1990, 1994; Tilley and Webb 1994; Wilcox Rountree and Land 1996; Wilcox Rountree, Land, and Miethe 1994).

Routine activities alter "the location of personal and property targets at particular times" (Arnold, Keane, and Baron 2005:346). By altering these locations, routine activities can affect one or more of these core components. For example, when someone goes to work or school, their home lacks guardianship, thereby increasing the target attractiveness of the home for

a burglar. Similarly, by engaging in routine activities, individuals may increase their exposure and proximity to motivated offenders. Recreational activities, for example, can “bring together people of different backgrounds at various times of night or day in locations that leave them vulnerable to violent victimization” (Arnold, Keane, and Baron 2005:346). Variations in routine activities are thus thought to account for the likelihood of victimization such that changing one’s routine activities affects one’s risk of being victimized. Routine activities that increase exposure, proximity, and target attractiveness and/or reduce guardianship are particularly likely to increase the risk of victimization.

Organizations as Victims

Routine activities theory has been extensively examined at the individual level and, to some extent, at the macro or neighborhood level. Yet, there is little such research discussing the role of organizations. When organizations are mentioned in routine activities research, they serve as the environments in which individual victimization takes place, for example within schools (Fisher et al. 1998; Fisher and Wilkes 2003; Popp and Peguero 2011; Tillyer, Wilcox, and Gialopsos 2010; Wilcox, Jordan, and Pritchard 2007) and workplaces (Lynch 1987; Wooldredge, Cullen, and Latessa 1992). This research typically focuses on the use of target-hardening strategies (i.e., increased guardianship) by organizations, which may affect the likelihood of individual victimization (Astor, Meyer, and Behre 1999; Popp and Peguero 2011; Wooldredge, Cullen, and Latessa 1992). Organizations are thus viewed as contexts in which victimization can occur and not potential victims themselves.

Organizations, however, can be victims of property crime. Most organizations own some form of physical property and operate out of physical buildings. This makes them possible targets for both theft and vandalism. Studies of organizations as victims of crime are almost completely absent from the routine activities literature (see Salmi, Kiviuri, and Lehti 2015 for an exception) and, more generally, tend to be disconnected from theory.¹ As Hopkins (2002:789) argues, future research on organizations (businesses in particular) as crime victims needs to “examine why some business types appear to experience higher rates of victimization than others.” That is, studies need to draw on and develop theory.

Of the few studies on crimes against organizations, those testing theory generally focus on target-hardening/security strategies and the locations of the organizations—whether they are hot spots, crime generators, and/or crime attractors (Salmi, Kiviuri, and Lehti 2015). Hot spots refer to locations that are at an increased risk of crime (Brantingham and Brantingham 1995; Eck et al. 2005; Sherman, Gartin, and Buerger 1989). Crime generators are organizations that bring large volumes of people into a particular location (McCord et al. 2007; see also Brantingham and Brantingham 1995), such as bus stations or schools (Brantingham and Brantingham 1995; Murray and Swatt 2013; Salmi, Kiviuri, and Lehti 2015; Willits, Broidy, and Denman 2013). Crime attractors refer to locations that “create well-known criminal opportunities,” which attract motivated offenders, such as bar districts (Brantingham and Brantingham 1995:8). Crime attractors can also refer to organizations or places in which motivated offenders “are likely to self-select themselves,” such as “social welfare offices, or shelters for drug or alcohol addicts” (Salmi, Kiviuri, and Lehti 2015:412).

While these factors contribute to understanding the proximity and exposure of organizations to motivated offenders, they fail to capture the routine activities of organizations. This is ironic, as the routine activities of organizations are likely a primary reason that

they are hot spots, attractors, or generators in the first place. We extend prior research by arguing that all four components of routine activities theory – exposure, proximity, target attractiveness, and guardianship—can be applied to organizations to explain variation in their likelihood of experiencing property-crime victimization.

Organizations that engage in routine activities increase their likelihood of exposure to potential offenders, especially if such routine activities involve individuals outside of their organization who are more likely to be offenders. An example might be a nonprofit organization that operates a homeless shelter. This routine activity brings strangers into the organization's building and may thereby increase their exposure to potential offenders. Thus, organizations that participate in routine activities with individuals outside of their organization are at an increased risk of property crime victimization. Of course, some such activities will increase the likelihood of exposure more than others. Organizational activities involving outsiders that make the organization a crime generator or crime attractor will be particularly likely to increase property-crime victimization risk due to increasing the likelihood of exposure to potential offenders (Brantingham and Brantingham 1995). Organizations that are more geographically proximate to “dense pools of offenders” will also have an increased risk of contact with potential offenders (Lynch 1987:287–288). Potential offenders will be more attracted to organizations with more valuable goods that are easily accessible and visible (i.e., target attractiveness). Most research on crime and organizations examines how businesses or schools implement security measures and the effectiveness of those target-hardening strategies (Cheurprakobkit and Bartsch 2005; Exum et al. 2010; Hendricks et al. 1999; Kajalo and Lindblom 2010; Lee, Hollinger, and Dabney 1999). This connects to the guardianship component of routine activities theory, which refers to objects or people that are capable of deterring crime (e.g., security guards and security systems) (Miethe and David 1993; Miethe and Meier 1990, 1994; Tilley and Webb 1994; Wilcox Rountree and Land 1996). Organizations attempt to make it harder for potential perpetrators to target them by increasing guardianship through surveillance measures (Cheurprakobkit and Bartsch 2005; Exum et al. 2010; Hendricks et al. 1999; Kajalo and Lindblom 2010; Lee, Hollinger, and Dabney 1999). We expect that organizations that have higher levels of guardianship, such as through having surveillance systems, will be less likely to experience property victimization. This leads to the following hypotheses:

H1: Organizational routine activities with outsiders will be positively associated with property-crime victimization.

H2: Organizational routine activities that make the organization a crime attractor or a crime generator will be more positively associated with property-crime victimization than those that do not.

H3: Organizational proximity to potential offenders will be positively associated with property-crime victimization.

H4: Organizations that are more attractive targets will be more likely to experience property-crime victimization.

H5: Organizational guardianship will be negatively associated with property-crime victimization.

Case Study: Religious Congregations

Past research on organizations as contexts for crime (Fisher et al. 1998; Fisher and Wilkes 2003; Lynch 1987; Popp and Peguero 2011; Tillyer, Wilcox, and Gialopsos 2010; Wilcox, Jordan, and Pritchard 2007; Wooldredge, Cullen, and Latessa 1992) and organizations as victims of crime (Exum et al. 2010; Hopkins 2002; Salmi, Kiviuri, and Lehti 2015; Savolainen 2007; Taylor 2004; van Dijk and Terlouw 1996) focus almost exclusively on businesses and schools to the neglect of nonprofit organizations. We extend past research by testing our hypotheses on one type of nonprofit organization—religious congregations. It is estimated that there are over 350,000 congregations in the United States, which means that they represent one of the largest organizational populations in the nation (Grammich et al. 2012).

What makes religious congregations a particularly compelling case study for the questions being examined here is that they vary widely in the activities in which they engage. At their core, religious congregations exist to provide religious goods/services to their members, the most central of which are weekly worship services. Chaves (2004:128) argued that “congregations are organizations whose primary output is the regular worship event...[a] congregation that stopped producing regular worship services would no longer be a congregation.” While some congregations may limit their activities to providing a worship service, many others are centers of activity every day of the week, as the building serves as the site of community-service activities. In the U.S., 83% of congregations participate in some form of activity “intended to help people outside of the congregation” (Chaves and Eagle 2016:4). In terms of types of programs, 52% of congregations participate in programs related to food, 18% related to housing/shelter, 17% related to clothing, around 12% related to homelessness, around 14% related to education, and around 5% related to substance abuse among others. Larger congregations and congregations located in poor neighborhoods engage in more social-service activities (Chaves and Tsitsos 2001).

Although little research has considered the victimization experiences of religious congregations, it is clear that such experiences are fairly common. Using survey data, Scheitle (2018) finds that 39% of congregations reported experiencing at least one form of victimization. Scheitle (2016) examined U.S. newspaper records of crimes occurring on the property of congregations for one year. This analysis found over 600 incidents, which based on the sample would project to over 6,000 incidents for the entire year. As the author acknowledged, newspaper records are undoubtedly a severe undercount of the actual total. An earlier study (Bourns and Wright 2004) surveyed a small sample of Protestant congregations ($N = 51$) and found that 78% of the congregations had experienced at least one incident of vandalism in the past year and 73% had experienced at least one case of theft during the same time period.

Religious congregations are exposed to victimization risks that originate from both inside and outside of the organization. From the outside, congregations are exposed to the same street-crime risks as other organizations with a physical presence in a neighborhood. Additionally, a congregation faces additional potential bias-crime risks, as they are often the most obvious embodiment of a religious tradition and/or a racial-ethnic group in a community. Finally, a congregation can be victimized from within, as guests, attendees, employees, or tenants could, for instance, steal the organization’s property. All of these risks, of course, vary across congregations and are influenced by factors such as the

congregation's religious tradition, participant characteristics, and neighborhood characteristics. The primary question of this study, however, is how a congregation's activities with outsiders influence exposure to these external risks controlling for internal risks.

Data

The data used for this study come from a survey fielded by Pennsylvania State University Survey Research Center in the spring of 2015. The survey, which was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation, was designed to broadly assess the crime experiences, fears, and preparations of religious congregations. The sample ($N = 10,615$) for the survey was drawn from the marketing firm InfoUSA's database of religious congregations, which is commonly referred to as the American Church Lists database. Although it does have gaps in coverage, this database is seen as the "standard source" for sampling congregational addresses (McKeever and Pettijohn 2014:16). In addition to gathering the names and addresses of congregations, InfoUSA categorizes congregations based on their religious tradition. These categories were used in the sampling process.

The construction of the sample frame was theoretically driven. Specifically, the sample frame was created with a focus on two key dynamics facing religious congregations: street crime and bias crime. With a focus on the issue of street crime, a core random sample of 5,000 Protestant congregations was taken from the InfoUSA database. Protestant congregations represent just under 90% of all congregations in the United States, according to the National Congregations Study (Chaves, Anderson, and Eagle 2014). With a focus on the issue of bias crime, targeted samples were taken of congregations belonging to historically Black Protestant denominations ($N = 1,500$), as well as Jewish ($N = 1,500$), Muslim ($N = 367$),² Eastern Orthodox ($N = 385$), and liberal and conservative nontraditional religious traditions (e.g., Jehovah's Witnesses, Unitarian Universalist) ($N = 2,248$).

We did not sample Catholic congregations. This is because we did not conceptualize these congregations as adding particularly unique dynamics for the interests of the project. That is, any street crime issues faced by Catholic congregations will be similar to at least some of the congregations sampled in the core Protestant sample (e.g., being urban). Any bias crime issues faced by Catholic congregations, say, due to the ethnic composition of the congregation, will also be faced by some of the congregations in the Protestant sample. Still, we recognize this is a limitation of these data and our analysis and we discuss it further later.

Sampled congregations first received a prenotification letter. A survey instrument was then mailed to the congregations followed by two reminder mailings and a second copy of the survey. A total of 1,380 of the sampled congregations responded, which represents a 13 percent response rate based on the American Association for Public Opinion Research's Response Rate Two formula. Although a higher response rate would have been desirable, this is in line with past surveys of places of worship with a similar design and reflective of the generally lower response rates for organizational surveys (Baruch and Holtom 2008).³ Nonresponse analyses showed that the response rate was somewhat higher (~15 percent) in the Northeast and Midwest, which could be a function of the Survey Research Center's university having more name recognition in these regions. The response rate was lower (~7 percent) among some conservative nontraditional congregations (e.g., Mormon, Jehovah Witness congregations). This could be a function of these groups'

hesitancy to participate in a government-funded, academic survey and/or their tending to have smaller, lay-led congregations.

The survey's cover letter directed the congregation to have "a person who has significant knowledge of the congregation's history and involvement in its operations" complete the survey. On the survey, 63 percent of the respondents stated that they were the congregation's "head religious leader (e.g., pastor, priest, imam, rabbi)," 9 percent stated that they were a "supporting religious leader (assistant pastor, music minister, youth pastor)," 10 percent identified as an "office manager, secretary, or receptionist," 5 percent stated that they were simply members of the congregation, and 13 percent identified as having an "other" role.⁴ Additional details concerning the survey can be found in Scheitle (2018).

Measures

The outcomes of interest for this study come from a series of questions asking the congregations whether they had experienced any property crimes in 2014.⁵ Specifically, congregations were asked to indicate if they had experienced any of the following in that year: (1) vandalism on the outside of your building, (2) vandalism on the inside of your building, (3) a theft of something that was outside of the building, and (4) a theft of something that was inside the building.⁶ We keep these items separate to account for the possibility that some activities might influence extra-building victimization differently than intra-building victimization. Each of these items is measured as (0) did not experience and (1) did experience.

The predictors of primary interest in this study come from two questions on the survey that assessed different types of activities taking place on the grounds of the congregation (H1). One question on the survey asked respondents, "Does your congregation host or rent space for any of the following groups or events on its property that bring *nonmembers* to the congregation? [emphasis added]" The survey offered eight specific activities and asked respondents to select all that applied.⁷ These eight items asked whether the congregation had hosted or rented space for: (1) meetings of addiction/recovery groups, (2) a soup kitchen or food shelf, (3) shelter/temporary housing, (4) a community garden, (5) election voting, (6) local government meetings, (7) community festivals, and (8) other congregations. Each of these is coded as (0) does not do and (1) does. A second question asked respondents whether they had "a middle school or junior high school" or "a high school" on its property. The congregation could indicate having both types of schools on site, but for our analysis, we combine these into a measure representing (0) does not have a junior high or high school on property and (1) does have a junior high or high school on property. Prior research has identified schools as crime generators (Murray and Swatt 2013; Salmi, Kiviuri, and Lehti 2015; Willits, Broidy, and Denman 2013); thus, having a school on their property represents a routine activity that is likely to increase property-crime victimization risk. In the analysis, we examine the independent effect of each of these activities and also examine a measure representing the sum of all the activities. This measure theoretically ranges from 0 to 9, but empirically ranges from 0 to 6. As all the activities are in regard to nonmembers or outsiders, they allow us to test H1. Of course, members may have also participated in these activities, but as per the question wording, they would have been joined by outsiders. Meetings of addiction/recovery groups, soup kitchen or food shelf, and shelter/temporary housing activities represent crime attractors

because they include activities in “which potential offenders are likely to self-select themselves” (Salmi, Kiviuri, and Lehti 2015:412; see also McCord et al. 2007). As schools are often crime generators (Salmi, Kiviuri, and Lehti 2015), due to large numbers of people frequenting them, an organization offering a school on site is considered a crime generator. This allows us to test H2.

We include several measures to capture exposure and proximity to motivated offenders (H3). Several of these measures are taken from the U.S. Census Bureau’s 2006–2010 American Community Survey. The first represents the percentage of families living below the poverty line in the congregation’s census tract. A second measure represents the population density, or people per square mile, within the congregations’ census tract. The final measure represents the total number of property crimes reported in the congregation’s census place according to the 2010 Uniform Crime Report. In addition to these factors, we also control for the percentage of the population in the congregation’s census tract that is non-Hispanic White.

To account for variations in the number and attractiveness of targets across congregations (H4), we include a measure from a question on the survey that asked respondents, “Which of the following could be easily accessible to a visitor at your congregation (that is, not locked in storage or in an office)?” The survey offered 11 specific items and asked the respondent to select all that applied. These items were: (1) valuable artwork, (2) cash or other valuable offerings in unlocked donation boxes, (3) cash or other valuable offerings in locked donation boxes, (4) cash or other valuable offerings in plain sight, (5) television(s), (6) computer(s), (7) other electronics (e.g., projectors, stereos), (8) musical equipment, (9) religious items made of precious metals (e.g., gold, silver), (10) individuals’ purses, wallets, phones (e.g., in a coat area), (11) maintenance equipment (e.g., power tools, lawn mowers). We created a total “easy access valuable targets” measure by summing the total number of items selected by the respondent in this list. This measure theoretically ranges from 0 to 11, but empirically ranges from 0 to 10.

We also include measures meant to assess the level of guardianship in the congregation (H5). A question on the survey asked respondents, “Which of the following security measures has your congregation taken?” Eighteen specific items were offered: (1) alarm system on entry-door(s), (2) motion detectors inside building, (3) security camera(s) outside of building, (4) security camera(s) inside of building, (5) security camera(s) in parking lot, (6) additional lighting around exterior of building, (7) additional lighting in parking lot, (8) limited the number of entry points into parking lot, (9) limited the number of entry points into building, (10) visitors must be buzzed into the building, (11) fence around exterior of property, (12) gate at entry to parking lot, (13) security guard(s)—full time, (14) security guard(s)—part time, (15) security guard(s)—special events, (16) person living on property of congregation, (17) signs banning weapons on property, (18) signs reminding people to lock cars. We collapsed these 18 items into six summed scales representing the different forms of security contained within the 18 items. Specifically, we collapsed the alarm system and motion detectors items (1, 2) into one summed measure, the three security camera items (3, 4, 5) into another measure, the two lighting items (6, 7) into a third measure, the five limited access items (8, 9, 10, 11, 12) into a fourth measure, the four security guard items (13, 14, 15, 16) into a fifth measure, and the two signage items (17, 18) into a sixth measure.

The analysis controls for a number of characteristics representing differences in religious tradition, size, and membership demographics across congregations. All of these controls are meant to represent variation in victimization risks (i.e., exposure, proximity, attractiveness, guardianship) that are not fully captured by the direct measures described above, particularly those that may represent internal risk. Regarding the congregational demographics, we include a measure for the percent of the congregation's attendees who are non-Hispanic White and the percent of attendees who are under 35 years of age. These items come from a question that asked respondents to estimate percentages for different demographic groups in the congregation while "thinking about the regular adult participants." Respondents assigned a specific percentage to these demographics. The survey question asking, "What percentage of your congregation's members would you say live within a five-minute walk of the congregation?" offered six possible responses: (1) none of them, (2) less than 10%, (3) 10–25%, (4) 26–50%, (5) 51–75%, and (6) more than 75%.

Regarding congregational characteristics, we include a measure from a question asking, "In what year did your congregation begin worshipping at its current location?" We subtracted responses to this question from the survey year to create a measure for the number of years in the current location. We also include a measure from a question asking, "In a typical week, how many worship services does your congregation hold?" We recoded responses into the following categories: (1) 1 per week, (2) 2 per week, (3) 3 per week, and (4) 4 or more per week. The analysis also controls for the size of the congregation, using a measure from a question asking, "Not counting special events or holidays, about how many people would you say attend your largest worship service during an average week? Please count both children and adults." We recoded responses to this question into four categories: (1) 50 or fewer, (2) 51–90 people, (3) 91–165 people, (4) over 165 people. In smaller congregations, attendees may be more likely to know each other, which might discourage strangers from accessing the building and result in fewer congregational property crimes. The average for this measure is 1.43—between 50 or fewer and 51–90—which is consistent with the national median of 60 for non-Catholic congregations (Chaves, Anderson, and Eagle 2014).

We include in the analysis indicators of the congregation's religious tradition. Because we knew that InfoUSA's religious classification of congregations likely included some errors, the survey itself asked respondents to identify its broad religious tradition (e.g., Baptist) and any specific denominational affiliation (e.g., Southern Baptist Convention). These items were used to classify the congregation as either (1) Protestant (e.g., evangelical and mainline), (2) Black Protestant, (3), Eastern Orthodox (e.g., Greek Orthodox Church, Orthodox Church in America, Russian Orthodox Church), (3) Jewish, (4) Muslim, (5), Conservative nontraditional, and (6) Liberal nontraditional. In creating the Black Protestant and two nontraditional categories we relied on Steensland et al.'s (2000) classification.⁸ The conservative nontraditional category consists primarily of Latter-Day Saint (Mormon), Jehovah's Witness, and Christian Science congregations. The liberal nontraditional category consists of congregations belonging to groups such as the Unitarian-Universalist Association, the Unity Church, and Religious Science. The Black Protestant category consists of congregations belonging to denominations such as the National Baptists Convention–USA, African Methodist Episcopal Church, and African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church.

Results

We begin by examining some descriptive patterns for our key outcomes and predictors. Table 1 displays descriptive statistics for all of the measures. From Table 1 we see that 18.83% of the congregations in the data experienced vandalism on the outside of their building while 5.53% experienced vandalism on the inside of their building. This inside-outside gap is reversed when looking at thefts, as 11.30% of respondents reported a theft of something that was outside the building and 17.07% reported a theft of something that was inside of the building.

Examining the measures representing different congregational activities, we see that hosting other congregations is the most commonly reported activity with 25.24% of respondents saying they offer or rent their space to other religious groups. Also common were respondents who said they host addiction or recovery groups (23.80%) and community festivals (19.39%). Offering a soup kitchen or food shelf was somewhat less common

Table 1. Descriptive statistics ($N = 1,248$).

	% or Mean	S.D.	Min-Max
Vandalism outside of building in 2014	18.83%	–	0–1
Vandalism inside in of building 2014	5.53%	–	0–1
Theft outside of building in 2014	11.30%	–	0–1
Theft inside of building in 2014	17.07%	–	0–1
Hosting & Engagement			
Junior High/High School	5.29%	–	0–1
Addiction/Recovery groups	23.80%	–	0–1
Soup kitchen or food shelf	14.10%	–	0–1
Shelter/Temporary housing	6.01%	–	0–1
Community garden	4.49%	–	0–1
Election voting	11.94%	–	0–1
Local government meetings	7.93%	–	0–1
Community festivals	19.39%	–	0–1
Other congregations	25.24%	–	0–1
Count of Hosting & Engagement Activities	1.18	1.27	0–6
Security Measures			
Alarm, motion detection	.76	.88	0–2
Cameras	.54	.98	0–3
Extra lighting	1.01	.83	0–2
Limiting access points	.75	1.03	0–5
Guards	.27	.52	0–3
Signage	.07	.25	0–2
Count of easy access targets	3.07	2.07	0–10
Percent of attendees non-Hispanic White	74.75	35.99	0–100
Percent of attendees under 35 years of age	22.29	15.82	0–100
Percent of members within five-minute walk	2.28	.99	1–6
Years worshipping in current location	60.58	48.11	1–373
Number of services per week	2.19	1.09	1–4
Attendance at largest weekly worship service	1.43	1.15	1–4
Religious Tradition of Congregation			
Protestant	53.77%	–	0–1
Black Protestant	12.90%	–	0–1
Eastern Orthodox	4.57%	–	0–1
Jewish	13.14%	–	0–1
Muslim	1.84%	–	0–1
Conservative nontraditional	4.41%	–	0–1
Liberal nontraditional	9.38%	–	0–1
Percent poor in congregation's Census tract	11.61	11.23	0–72
Population density of congregation's Census tract (people per sq mile/10,000)	4.14	10.06	.0006–180
Percent of population in congregation's Census tract that is non-Hispanic White	69.70	27.51	0–100
Number of property crimes in congregation's Census place	7934	22,701	0–139,615

among the respondents (14.10%), as was hosting election voting (11.94%). Even less common activities were hosting government meetings (7.93%), offering a shelter or temporary housing (6.01%), a junior high or high school (5.29%), and a community garden (4.49%). The mean number of activities among the respondents was 1.18 and the maximum was six.

The primary issue of interest in this study is how these activities shape experiences with property crime. We begin by considering the bivariate patterns shown in [Table 2](#). This table shows the percentage of congregations reporting an experience with vandalism or theft in 2014 by whether or not they offer certain activities on their property. The most consistent differences across the four crime experiences are with the soup kitchen/food shelf activity and the community festival activity. Congregations that engage in these activities are significantly more likely to have experienced vandalism and theft both inside and outside of their buildings compared to those that do not offer these services.

More isolated differences are seen across the other activities. Congregations with a junior high or high school on their property, for example, are significantly more likely to have experienced vandalism on the outside of their building in 2014 than those that do not have such a school (37.14% to 17.71%). Addiction/recovery groups and hosting other congregations are not associated with vandalism inside of the building but are associated with the other three crime types. Community gardens are associated with higher rates of thefts from outside of a congregation's building, as is hosting election voting on the congregation's property. Hosting local government meetings is associated with higher rates of theft both inside and outside of the building but is unassociated with vandalism. Hosting a shelter or temporary housing is the only activity that does not show any initial association with any of the property crimes.

Of course, engaging in such activities is undoubtedly associated with other congregational and neighborhood characteristics. Larger congregations, for instance, might be more likely to offer a wider variety of activities. This raises the question of whether it is the activities or the congregational size that is leading to property crime. That is, if we took two congregations that were identical in size and other characteristics, but one congregation engaged in an activity, would that congregation be at higher risk of experiencing property crime? To assess this question, we turn to a series of logistic regression analyses. The results of these analyses are shown in [Tables 3](#) and [4](#). These tables display odds ratios so that effects over 1 represent an increase in the odds of experiencing the specified property crime, while effects under 1 represent a decrease in the odds of experiencing that crime.⁹

Vandalism Models

[Table 3](#) shows the results for the two vandalism outcomes. In Model 1, we find that the total count of activities is associated with an increase in the odds of experiencing vandalism on the outside of a congregation's building, supporting H1. Contrary to our expectations (H5), most of the security measures are not significantly associated with vandalism, and the only security measure that is significant is actually *positively* associated with vandalism. Specifically, congregations that have alarm systems have higher odds of having experienced an exterior vandalism than congregations without an alarm system. This finding could reflect that congregations that have had or are having problems with



Table 2. Cross-tabulations between congregational activities and property crime experiences ($N = 1,248$).

Percent reporting crime experience	Activity Present on Congregational Property?					
	Junior High or High School		Addiction/Recovery groups		Soup Kitchen/Food shelf	
	Not Present	Present	Not Present	Present	Not Present	Present
Vandalism outside of building	17.85%*	36.36%*	17.03%*	24.58%*	16.98%*	30.11%*
Vandalism inside of building	5.50%	6.06%	5.36%	6.06%	4.85%*	9.66%*
Theft outside of building	11.00%	16.67%	9.88%*	15.82%*	9.98%*	19.32%*
Theft inside of building	16.75%	22.73%	15.14%*	23.23%*	14.55%*	32.39%*
	Shelter/Temporary housing		Community garden		Election voting	
	Not Present	Present	Not Present	Present	Not Present	Present
Vandalism outside of building	19.01%	16.00%	18.54%	25.00%	18.20%	23.49%
Vandalism inside of building	5.80%	1.33%	5.29%	10.71%	5.46%	6.04%
Theft outside of building	11.34%	10.67%	10.82%*	21.43%*	10.65%*	16.11%*
Theft inside of building	16.79%	21.33%	16.78%	23.21%	16.65%	20.13%
	Local government meetings		Community festivals		Other congregations	
	Not Present	Present	Not Present	Present	Not Present	Present
Vandalism outside of building	18.28%	25.25%	17.10%*	26.03%*	15.41%*	23.97%*
Vandalism inside of building	5.48%	6.06%	4.87%*	8.26%*	4.93%	7.30%
Theft outside of building	10.53%*	20.20%*	9.94%*	16.94%*	8.90%*	18.41%*
Theft inside of building	16.36%*	25.25%*	15.41%*	23.97%*	14.26%*	25.40%*

*Pearson χ^2 $p < .05$

Table 3. Logistic regression models predicting interior and exterior vandalism, odds ratios displayed.

	Vandalism Outside of Building		Vandalism Inside of Building	
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Hosting & Engagement				
Junior High/High School	–	2.19**	–	.92
Addiction/Recovery groups	–	1.41	–	.97
Soup kitchen or food shelf	–	1.72**	–	1.70
Shelter/Temporary housing	–	.59	–	.15
Community garden	–	.92	–	1.94
Election voting	–	1.12	–	.83
Local government meetings	–	.92	–	.80
Community festivals	–	1.35	–	1.54
Other congregations	–	1.11	–	1.13
Total Count of Hosting & Engagement Activities	1.22**	–	1.11	–
Security Measures				
Alarm, motion detection	1.37**	1.35**	1.38	1.30
Cameras	1.09	1.09	1.54**	1.55**
Extra lighting	1.07	1.08	1.12	1.15
Limiting access points	.97	.95	.70*	.68*
Guards	.98	.98	1.03	1.04
Signage	1.33	1.39	.59	.64
Count of easy access targets	1.04	1.04	1.11	1.11
Percent of attendees non-Hispanic White	.99	.99	.99	.99
Percent of attendees under 35 years of age	.99	.99	1.01	1.01
Percent of members within five-minute walk	.97	.97	1.08	1.08
Years worshipping in current location	.99	.99	.99	.99
Number of services per week	.99	.97	.79	.80
Attendance at largest weekly worship service	1.07	1.09	1.05	1.06
Religious Tradition of congregation				
Protestant (ref.)	–	–	–	–
Black Protestant	.45*	.44*	.60	.50
Eastern Orthodox	.87	.90	.76	.74
Jewish	.95	.98	.54	.55
Muslim	.69	.57	^a	^a
Conservative nontraditional	.95	.94	1.43	1.41
Liberal nontraditional	.82	.85	.54	.58
Percent poor in congregation's census tract	1.02*	1.02*	1.01	1.01
Population density of congregation's Census tract	1.01	1.01	1.04**	1.04**
Percent of population in congregation's census tract that is non-Hispanic White	.99	.99	.99	.99
Number of property crimes in congregation's Census place	1.00	1.00	.98*	.98*
<i>N</i>	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,225 ^a
Pseudo <i>R</i> ²	.06	.07	.09	.11

Note. a. No Muslim congregation reported vandalism inside the building, so this effect cannot be estimated and these cases cannot be included in the model.

p* < .05 *p* < .01

vandalism install alarm systems.¹⁰ Of course, the cross-sectional nature of these data does not allow us to determine causality.

We do not find any significant effects across the measures of congregational demographics, size, age, and worship activity. Compared to Protestant congregations, Black Protestant congregations have lower odds of having experienced exterior vandalism. None of the other religious traditions differ significantly from the Protestant reference group. Finally, looking at the neighborhood measures we see that the percent poor in the congregation's census tract is associated with higher odds of having experienced exterior vandalism. None of the other neighborhood measures have significant associations with having experienced exterior vandalism.

Table 4. Logistic regression models predicting interior and exterior theft, odds ratios displayed.

	Theft Outside of Building		Theft Inside of Building	
	Model 5	Model 6	Model 7	Model 8
Hosting & Engagement				
Junior High/High School	–	1.21	–	1.22
Addiction/Recovery groups	–	1.17	–	1.12
Soup kitchen or food shelf	–	1.48	–	2.22**
Shelter/Temporary housing	–	.68	–	.96
Community garden	–	1.64	–	1.05
Election voting	–	.87	–	.87
Local government meetings	–	1.05	–	.96
Community festivals	–	1.28	–	1.29
Other congregations	–	1.73**	–	1.49*
Total Count of Hosting & Engagement Activities	1.26**	–	1.26**	–
Security Measures				
Alarm, motion detection	1.42**	1.40**	1.16	1.14
Cameras	1.11	1.10	1.30**	1.30**
Extra lighting	1.06	1.07	1.13	1.16
Limited access points	1.04	1.03	.92	.91
Guards	.94	.94	.98	.97
Signage	.82	.87	.62	.65
Count of easy access targets	1.13**	1.12*	1.18**	1.17**
Percent of attendees non-Hispanic White	.99	.99	.99	.99
Percent of attendees under 35 years of age	1.00	1.00	.99	.99
Percent of members within five-minute walk	1.13	1.14	1.25**	1.26**
Years worshipping in current location	.99	.99	.99	.99
Number of services per week	1.03	1.05	1.05	1.06
Attendance at largest weekly worship service	1.22*	1.25*	1.02	1.05
Religious Tradition of Congregation				
Protestant (ref.)	–	–	–	–
Black Protestant	.41*	.39*	.69	.64
Eastern Orthodox	1.67	1.74	.42	.44
Jewish	.43*	.42*	.60	.62
Muslim	.38	.39	.13	.11*
Conservative nontraditional	1.09	1.03	.90	.93
Liberal nontraditional	1.74	1.91	1.84*	1.99*
Percent poor in congregation's census tract	1.01	1.01	1.01	1.01
Population density of congregation's census tract	.98	.98	1.01	1.01
Percent of population in congregation's census tract that is non-Hispanic White	.99	.99	.99	.99
Number of property crimes in congregation's Census place	1.01**	1.01**	1.00	1.00
<i>N</i>	1,248	1,248	1,248	1,248
Pseudo <i>R</i> ²	.12	.13	.10	.11

p* < .05 *p* < .01

Model 2 examines each activity individually. Here we find that having a junior high or high school or a soup kitchen/food shelf on a congregation's property is significantly associated with an increase in the odds of experiencing exterior vandalism. The other significant associations seen in Model 1 remain the same in Model 2. To summarize the exterior vandalism findings, we find that offering more activities on a congregation's property does appear to be related to more incidents of exterior vandalism. In particular, having a school or soup kitchen/food shelf on site appears to underlie much of this relationship.

Models 3 and 4 in Table 3 examine the interior vandalism outcome. Note that no Muslim congregations reported experiencing interior vandalism, so we are unable to include these cases in these models as the Muslim indicator is a perfect predictor of the outcome.¹¹ Neither the overall count of activities measure in Model 3 nor the individual activity measures in Model 4 show a significant association with the odds of experiencing

interior vandalism, failing to support H1. We do find that congregations that have taken steps to limit access points to their building/property have lower odds of experiencing interior vandalism. This is in line with our expectations in H5. However, congregations that have installed security cameras have higher odds of having experienced interior vandalism, which is opposite of our expectation in H5. We also find that population density is associated with higher odds of experiencing interior vandalism. Population density might increase the number of individuals, including motivated offenders, moving on and through the property of the congregation and some of those individuals might find their way into the congregation itself. This provides some support for H3. On the other hand, we find that congregations in areas with more property crimes have reduced odds of interior vandalism. This is counter to what we would expect. For our primary research interest, though, we can say that offering activities does not seem to be associated with interior vandalism in the same way that it does seem to be associated with exterior vandalism. As shown in [Table 1](#), interior vandalism was the rarest of the four crimes examined, so it may be subject to a different and possibly more idiosyncratic set of dynamics.

Theft Models

[Table 4](#) shows the logistic regression analyses for the two theft outcomes. In Model 5, we find that the total count of activities is associated with higher odds of having experienced a theft of something from the outside of the congregation's building, supporting H1. As expected (H4), our measure for the number of easy-access valuable targets on the congregation's property is associated with higher odds of having experienced an outside theft. Contrary to our expectations (H5), though, the security measures are either nonsignificant or, in the case of alarm systems, positively associated with having experienced an exterior theft. As we noted with the similar finding in [Table 3](#), this could be a function of congregations installing alarm systems because of their experiences with theft.

Looking further at Model 5, we do not find any significant associations with congregational demographics, age, or number of services per week. We do find, however, that larger congregations have higher odds of having experienced a theft from outside of the building. Examining the religious tradition indicators, we see that Black Protestant and Jewish congregations have lower odds of having experienced an exterior theft compared to Protestant congregations, net of other factors. These findings primarily appear after controlling for the number of property crimes in the surrounding neighborhood and the racial composition of the congregation and neighborhood. This suggests that, compared to Mainline and Evangelical Protestant congregations, Black Protestant and Jewish congregations are more likely to live in neighborhoods that contribute to higher levels of congregational property crime (e.g., number of property crimes in census place). Once these factors are considered, they actually have significantly lower odds of experiencing theft outside of their buildings. This could be due to leaving less property outside, because of their location, which our neighborhood measures may not fully capture, or due to being more integral to their communities. For example, the Black church is a dominant, important, and esteemed institution in the Black community (DuBois 1899; Lincoln and Mamiya 1990). Lincoln (1984:96) notes that "there is no distinction between the African American church and the Black community. The Church is the spiritual face of Black

subculture, and whether one is a member or not is beside the point.” This may reduce the likelihood that congregants and others in the community would perpetrate property crime against Black churches. Finally, the only neighborhood measure found to have a significant association in this model is the count of property crimes in the surrounding area, which provides some support for H3.

Model 6 examines the independent association of each activity instead of the summed count of activities measure. Here we find that hosting other congregations is the only activity with an independent association with the exterior theft outcome. Specifically, congregations that host or rent space to other congregations have higher odds of having experienced a theft of something from the outside of their building. Hosting or renting space to other congregations may increase the number of motivated offenders that have access to the building. Looking at the rest of the findings in the model shows that the results largely mirror those found in Model 5.

Finally, Model 7 and Model 8 examine the interior theft outcome. Looking first at Model 7, we see that the summed count of activities is associated with higher odds of having experienced a theft of something inside the building in the past year, further supporting H1. As was also seen when looking at the exterior theft outcome, the count of easy-access targets (H4) is associated with higher odds of reporting an interior theft. Contrary to H5, the security measures are largely not significant except for cameras, which show a positive association with having experienced an interior theft. Somewhat surprisingly, the measure for the percent of attendees who live within a five-minute walk of the congregation is positively associated with having experienced an interior theft. We had expected the opposite, thinking that having attendees who lived nearby would serve as a form of guardianship that would reduce thefts. However, if we consider that the attendees could be the source of the thefts, then this finding actually makes sense. Attendees who live nearby and have access to the congregation could easily take various things from the building, either with intent to steal or simply to borrow. Regardless, if the item does not get returned to the congregation, then it will effectively look like a theft.

The only other significant finding in Model 7 is that liberal nontraditional congregations (e.g., Unity, Unitarian-Universalist) have significantly higher odds of having experienced an interior theft compared to Protestant congregations. This effect appears even before controlling for other factors. It is possible that the liberal social and theological cultures in these congregations foster more of a communal attitude about property. This could lead attendees to think that they can “borrow” items from the congregation, but this ultimately is interpreted as theft by the congregation. This is, of course, speculative. We, unfortunately, do not have measures that would allow us to measure such attitudes among attendees. Alternatively, it is possible that these congregations have additional attractive targets that are not being fully captured by our easy-access targets scale. Indeed, congregations in this tradition tend to represent the upper socioeconomic strata (Smith and Faris 2005).

Model 8 breaks out the activities from the overall count measure used in Model 7. Here we see that the soup kitchen or food-shelf activity and the hosting-other-congregations measure are both individually associated with higher odds of having experienced an interior theft in the past year. All of the other measures’ associations are identical to what was seen in Model 7. The one exception is that in Model 8, the Muslim indicator becomes significant. Specifically, Muslim congregations report lower odds of having experienced an interior theft in the past year compared to Protestant congregations.

Muslim congregations are less likely to rent out space compared to Protestant congregations; the two Muslim congregations that do rent out space did not experience internal theft. Thus, net of controlling for “other congregations,” the Muslim coefficient becomes statistically significant. We summarize and discuss all of these findings below.

Discussion

The analyses presented in [Tables 3](#) and [4](#) show that the nature and number of activities an organization engages in are associated with the organization’s experiences with property crime. The overall count of activities was positively associated with having experienced exterior vandalism, exterior theft, and interior theft, which strongly supports H1. We found more nuanced findings when disaggregating the activities. Hosting a junior high or high school is associated with higher odds of exterior vandalism but none of the other property crime types providing only some support for H2. Hosting or renting space to other congregations is positively associated with both interior and exterior theft but not any form of vandalism. Hosting a soup kitchen or food shelf is positively associated with exterior vandalism and interior theft (H2). However, contrary to expectations (H2), temporary shelters and addiction recovery groups are not significantly associated with any property crime type.

Based on these findings, an observer might suggest that a congregation simply stop engaging in these activities as a way to reduce the congregation’s future experiences with crime. This solution, though, is not as easy as it might seem. Some of these activities are crucial to the viability of the congregations as organizations. Many congregations rent space in their building as a way to financially survive. This is particularly the case for congregations that once had larger memberships but have declined over time. For instance, it was recently reported that 100 of the 262 Evangelical Lutheran Church in America (ELCA) congregations in the Minneapolis-Saint Paul area are renting space to other congregations ([Sapong 2016](#)). The ELCA has lost over 20% of its membership in the past 30 years ([Grammich et al. 2012](#)), and renting space to other congregations is a way to financially support its buildings.

Beyond concerns about the financial implications, abandoning certain engagement activities could threaten the central identity and purpose of the congregation. While providing worship services might be the core function of congregations, many congregations see their purpose as going far beyond that one function. Offering soup kitchens, youth education, and engaging in other activities are all part of many congregations’ larger mission and identity ([Ammerman 2005](#)). Additionally, the social-service activities congregations engage in contribute to the social welfare system of the United States ([Chaves 2012](#)). Reducing such activities could have significant implications for communities that depend on them.

This study contributes to the literature in a number of ways. First, it provides a relatively rare consideration of organizations as victims of blue-collar crime. Organizations are not merely contexts in which individuals may experience victimization, but themselves are potential victims of crime whose activities may bring them into contact with motivated offenders. Second, this study also moves the literature away from research solely based on businesses and demonstrates that nonprofit organizations can also be victims of property crime. In fact, such crime may be even more damaging to nonprofit organizations, which tend to have limited resources and

depend heavily on donors for funding. While businesses may transfer some of the costs of property crime to their customers through increased prices (Ramaseshan and Soutar 1991; Wilkes 1978), nonprofit organizations are unable to do so. Still, more research is needed on businesses as victims of crime (Hopkins 2002). Due to the dearth of research on organizations as victims of blue-collar crime, it is not possible to compare the victimization rates of congregations to businesses, schools, or other organizations. Thus, we do not know how prone different types of organizations are to victimization. This is a fruitful avenue for future research. Third, this study provides support for the relevance of routine activities theory in application to organizations. The same factors that affect individual victimization—frequency and type of routine activities, target attractiveness, and proximity to motivated offenders—also affect organizational victimization, though the extent to which varies by crime type.

This study is not without limitations. The data is cross-sectional and thus, we cannot ascertain causality. Collecting longitudinal data is vital for understanding the causal direction of the relationship between security measures and organizational victimization. The survey only included Protestant, Jewish, Muslim, Eastern Orthodox, and nontraditional religious tradition congregations; it did not survey Catholic congregations, which make up 6 percent of the congregational population of the United States. Thus, the results should be generalized with caution to Catholic congregations, and future research should examine whether the findings are applicable to Catholic congregations as well. Additionally, the data do not contain information on perpetrators, so we are not able to distinguish property crimes committed by strangers from those committed by parishioners. We also do not have any additional information on the extent to which the congregations teach moral codes against theft and vandalism. It is possible that some congregations emphasize norms against property crime more than others, which could potentially explain some of the variation in property crimes if attendees are included among the perpetrators.

Future research examining organizations as victims or contexts for individual victimization should also consider how organizational routine activities may affect both organizational and individual-level victimization. Additional research findings in this area would allow for the possibility of identifying whether certain elements of routine activities theory are more important for predicting organizational versus individual victimization risk. The results also suggest that congregations may be crime generators by bringing in large numbers of people for social-service activities, schools, and/or church services. The former may also contribute to congregations being crime attractors as well, by drawing motivated offenders to their establishment.

The findings of this study suggest the need for more research on organizations, and nonprofit organizations in particular, as victims of crime. While this study focused on voluntary organizations, specifically congregations, future research would benefit from testing our hypotheses in the context of government or state agencies. Many state agencies engage in social welfare activities, similar to those of congregations, and thus may also be prone to experience victimization because of their activities. Qualitative data may also help identify the particular circumstances regarding the incidents and how organizations respond to them. Data on the perpetrators of these crimes—whether they are members, outsiders, volunteers, employees, or customers/clients—would also aid in developing strategies for reducing victimization. Given the large contribution nonprofit organizations make to society, further identifying factors that facilitate or impede their victimization is an important area for future research.

Notes

1. Outside of studies on routine activity theory, there is research on organizations as victims of white-collar crime (Braithwaite 1985; Cressey 1953). Our study focuses on the lack of research regarding how organizations can also be victims of blue-collar crime such as property theft and vandalism.
2. These represented all of the Muslim cases in the InfoUSA database, which obviously does not come close to covering the full population of Muslim congregations in the U.S., which is estimated to be over 2,000 (Grammich et al. 2012).
3. For example, the 2008–2009 US Congregational Life Survey received 148 responses from 1,330 invited congregations (11%). See <http://thearda.com/Archive/Files/Descriptions/CLS08PR.asp>.
4. Examining the open-ended responses to this latter category finds that most of these individuals identified as a leader or member of the congregation's board of directors, as an executive director, or as some combination of the other categories.
5. The survey also asked about violent crimes in 2014, but these were quite rare (less than 2% of respondents).
6. The property crime section also asked whether the congregation had experienced "a theft of a car or property in a car" or "an arson/intentional fire." We do not utilize the arson outcome as it was quite rarely chosen (less than 1% of respondents). We do not utilize the car theft item simply for the sake of space and because we do not think it adds much conceptually beyond the other theft items.
7. There was also a ninth "other" option in which congregations could specify other activities or groups. We do not include this in our analysis.
8. In addition to defining Black Protestant category, Steensland et al. (2000) further separate Protestants into Evangelical Protestant and Mainline Protestant categories. We have theoretical reasons to think that Black Protestant congregations might have higher bias-motivated victimization risks, so we created a separate category for this group of congregations in this analysis. However, we did not have clear reasons to expect a difference between Mainline and Evangelical Protestant congregations, so we did not separate these categories.
9. We considered whether our models would be affected by multicollinearity by examining the variance inflation factors (VIFs) of the predictors in the models. This analysis showed that the mean VIF was 1.57 and the maximum VIF was 3.32, which does not indicate a significant concern.
10. ° We examined models that included interaction terms between activities, security, and easy access targets. We did not find evidence of significant interaction effects.
11. We examined models for the other three outcomes that also excluded the Muslims cases to see whether this would affect those findings. The results of these alternative models (N = 1225), however, were substantively identical to those including the Muslim cases (N = 1248).

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Jeff Ulmer and Ezekiel Kaufman for their feedback and assistance with this research.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This research was made possible by support from the National Science Foundation (Awards #1349738 & #1349728).

Notes on contributors

Katie E. Corcoran is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at West Virginia University. She is a theoretical generalist who studies social groups and networks as links between macro-structures and micro-attitudes and behaviors. Her research applies these lenses to several empirical subfields—organizations, culture, crime/deviance, religion, emotion, inequality, and social movements. She is interested in exploring the processes by which individuals join and leave groups, invest time and resources in them, and come to hold their norms and values. She published the book *Religious Hostility: A Global Assessment of Hatred and Terror* with Rodney Stark (ISR Books).

Christopher P. Scheitle is an Assistant Professor of Sociology at West Virginia University. His research examines the social dynamics between religion and science, organizational changes in American religion, and discrimination against and criminal victimization of religious individuals and organizations. His most recent book is *Religion vs. Science: What Religious People Really Think* (with Elaine Howard Ecklund, Oxford, 2017).

Erin B. Hudnall is a doctoral student in sociology at West Virginia University, and her research interests include prosocial behavior, disaster preparedness and volunteerism, community development, and Appalachian studies. She is also interested in community-engaged scholarship and applied sociology. Her current research focuses on the impacts of spontaneous volunteers' motivations and experiences on future volunteerism.

References

- Ammerman, Nancy Tatom. 2005. *Pillars of Faith: American Congregations and Their Partners*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Arnold, Robert, Carl Keane, and Stephen Baron. 2005. "Assessing the Risk of Victimization through Epidemiological Concepts: An Alternative Analytic Strategy Applied to Routine activities theory." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 42 (3):345–64. doi: [10.1111/j.1755-618X.2005.tb00844.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-618X.2005.tb00844.x)
- Astor, Ron Avi, Heather Ann Meyer, and William J. Behre. 1999. "Unowned Places and Times: Maps and Interviews about Violence in High Schools." *American Educational Research Journal* 36 (1):3–42. doi: [10.3102/00028312036001003](https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312036001003)
- Baruch, Yehuda and Brooks C. Holtom. 2008. "Survey Response Rate Levels and Trends in Organizational Research." *Human Relations* 61 (8):1139–60. doi: [10.1177/0018726708094863](https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726708094863)
- Bourns, William and Wesley D. Wright. 2004. "A Study of Church Vulnerability to Violence: Implications for Law Enforcement." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 32 (2):151–57. doi: [10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2003.12.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2003.12.005)
- Braithwaite, John. 1985. "White Collar Crime." *Annual Review of Sociology* 11:1–25. doi: [10.1146/annurev.so.11.080185.000245](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.11.080185.000245)
- Brantingham, Patricia L. and Paul J. Brantingham. 1995. "Criminality of Place: Crime Generators and Crime Attractors." *European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research* 3 (3):5–26. doi: [10.1007/BF02242925](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02242925)
- Chaves, Mark. 2004. *Congregations in America*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Chaves, Mark. 2012. "Religious Congregations." Pp. 362–93. in *The State of Nonprofit America*, 2nd ed., edited by Lester M. Salamon. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Chaves, Mark, Shawna L. Anderson, and Alison Eagle. 2014. *National Congregations Study*. Cumulative data file and codebook. Durham, North Carolina: Duke University, Department of Sociology.
- Chaves, Mark and Alison J. Eagle. 2016. "Congregations and Social Services: An Updated from the Third Wave of the National Congregations Study." *Religions* 7 (55). doi: [10.3390/rel7050055](https://doi.org/10.3390/rel7050055)
- Chaves, Mark and William Tsitsos. 2001. "Congregations and Social Services: What They Do, How They Do It, and with Whom." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 30 (4):660–83. doi: [10.1177/0899764001304003](https://doi.org/10.1177/0899764001304003)

- Cheurprakobkit, Sutham and Robert A. Bartsch. 2005. "Security Measures on School Crime in Texas Middle and High Schools." *Educational Research* 47 (2):235–50. doi: [10.1080/00131880500104366](https://doi.org/10.1080/00131880500104366)
- Cohen, Lawrence E. and Marcus Felson. 1979. "Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach." *American Sociological Review* 44:588–608. doi: [10.2307/2094589](https://doi.org/10.2307/2094589)
- Cohen, Lawrence E., James R. Klugel, and Kenneth C. Land. 1981. "Social Inequality and Predatory Criminal Victimization: An Exposition and Test of a Formal Theory." *American Sociological Review* 46:505–24. doi: [10.2307/2094935](https://doi.org/10.2307/2094935)
- Cressey, Donald. 1953. *Other People's Money: A Study in the Social Psychology of Embezzlement*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- DuBois, W. E. B. 1899. *The Philadelphia Negro: A Social Study*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Eck, John E., Spencer Chainey, James G. Cameron, Michael Leitner, and Ronald E. Wilson. 2005. *Mapping Crime: Understanding Hot Spots*. Washington DC: National Institute of Justice (U.S).
- Exum, M. Lyn, Joseph B. Kuhns, Brad Koch, and Chuck Johnson. 2010. "An Examination of Situational Crime Prevention Strategies across Conveniences Stores and Fast-Food Restaurants." *Criminal Justice Policy Review* 21 (3):269–95. doi: [10.1177/0887403409346110](https://doi.org/10.1177/0887403409346110)
- Felson, Marcus and Ronald V. Clarke. 1997. *Business and Crime Prevention*. Monsey, NY: Criminal Justice Press.
- Fisher, Bonnie S., John J. Sloan, Francis T. Cullen, and Chunmeng Lu. 1998. "Crime in the Ivory Tower: The Level and Sources of Student Victimization." *Criminology* 36 (3):671–709. doi: [10.1111/j.1745-9125.1998.tb01262.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1998.tb01262.x)
- Fisher, Bonnie S. and Andrew R. P. Wilkes. 2003. "A Tale of Two Ivory Towers: A Comparative Analysis of Victimization Rates and Risks between University Students in the United States and England." *The British Journal of Criminology* 43 (3):526–45. doi: [10.1093/bjc/43.3.526](https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/43.3.526)
- Grammich, Clifford, Kirk Hadaway, Richard Houseal, Dale E. Jones, Alexei Krindatch, Richie Stanley, and Richard H. Taylor. 2012. *2010 U.S. Religion Census: Religious Congregations & Membership Study*. Lenexa, KS: Association of Statisticians of American Religious Bodies.
- Hendricks, Scott A., Douglas Landsittel, Harlan E. Amandus, Jay Malcan, and Jennifer Bell. 1999. "A Matched Case-Control Study of Convenience Store Robbery Risk Factors." *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 41:995–1004.
- Hopkins, Matt. 2002. "Crimes against Businesses: The Way Forward for Future Research." *The British Journal of Criminology* 42 (4):782–97. doi: [10.1093/bjc/42.4.782](https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/42.4.782)
- Kajalo, Sami and Arto Lindblom. 2010. "The Perceived Effectiveness of Surveillance in Reducing Crime at Shopping Centers in Finland." *Property Management* 28 (3):47–59. doi: [10.1108/02637471011017172](https://doi.org/10.1108/02637471011017172)
- Kennedy, Leslie W. and Robert A. Silverman. 1990. "The Elderly Victim of Homicide: An Application of the Routine Activities Approach." *The Sociological Quarterly* 31 (2):307–19. doi: [10.1111/j.1533-8525.1990.tb00330.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.1990.tb00330.x)
- Lee, Gang, Richard C. Hollinger, and Dean A. Dabney. 1999. "The Relationship between Crime and Private Security at US Shopping Centers." *American Journal of Criminal Justice* 23 (2):157–77. doi: [10.1007/BF02887270](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02887270)
- Lincoln, C. Eric. 1984. *Race, Religion, and the Continuing American Dilemma*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Lincoln, C. Eric and Lawrence Mamiya. 1990. *The Black Church in the African American Experience*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Lynch, James P. 1987. "Routine Activity and Victimization at Work." *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 3:283–300. doi: [10.1007/BF01066832](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01066832)
- McCord, Eric S., Jerry H. Ratcliffe, R. Marie Garcia, and Ralph B. Taylor. 2007. "Nonresidential Crime Attractors and Generators Elevate Perceived Neighborhood Crime and Incivilities." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 44 (3):295–320. doi: [10.1177/0022427807301676](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427807301676)
- McKeever, Brice S. and Sarah L. Pettijohn. 2014. "The Nonprofit Sector in Brief 2014: Public Charities, Giving, and Volunteering." *Urban Institute*. Retrieved <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/33711/413277-The-Nonprofit-Sector-in-Brief-.PDF>.

- Miethe, Terance D. and McDowall, David. 1993. "Contextual Effects in Models of Criminal Victimization." *Social Forces* 71 (3):741–59. doi: [10.1093/sf/71.3.741](https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/71.3.741)
- Miethe, Terance D. and Robert F. Meier. 1990. "Opportunity, Choice, and Criminal Victimization: A Test of A Theoretical Model." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 27:243–66. doi: [10.1177/0022427890027003003](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022427890027003003)
- Miethe, Terance D. and Robert F. Meier. 1994. *Crime and Its Social Context: Toward an Integrated Theory of Offenders, Victims, and Situations*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Murray, Rebecca K. and Marc L. Swatt. 2013. "Disaggregating the Relationship between Schools and Crime: A Spatial Analysis." *Crime & Delinquency* 59 (2):163–90. doi: [10.1177/0011128709348438](https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128709348438)
- Popp, Ann Marie and Anthony A. Peguero. 2011. "Routine Activities and Victimization at School: The Significance of Gender." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 26 (12):2413–36. doi: [10.1177/0886260510383021](https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510383021)
- Ramaseshan, B. and Geoffrey N. Soutar. 1991. "Retailers' Attitudes Towards Shoplifting and Prevention Devices." *The International Review of Retail, Distribution and Consumer Research* 1 (3):301–13. doi: [10.1080/09593969100000030](https://doi.org/10.1080/09593969100000030)
- Salmi, Venla, Janne Kiviuri, and Martti Lehti. 2015. "Public Disorder and Business Crime Victimization in the Retail Sector." *Security Journal* 28 (4):410–24. doi: [10.1057/sj.2012.56](https://doi.org/10.1057/sj.2012.56)
- Sapong, Emma. 2016. "Many Congregations, One Roof: Aging Churches Rent Space to Growing Ones." *MPRNews*. July 1st. Retrieved www.mprnews.org.
- Savolainen, Jukka. 2007. "Public Disorder and Business Victimization: Findings from a Survey of Female Entrepreneurs." *Crime Prevention and Community Safety* 9:1–20. doi: [10.1057/palgrave.cpcs.8150031](https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.cpcs.8150031)
- Savolainen, Jukka, Petteri Sipila, Pekka Martikainen, and Amy L. Anderson. 2009. "Family, Community, and Lifestyle: Adolescent Victimization in Helsinki." *The Sociological Quarterly* 50:715–38. doi: [10.1111/j.1533-8525.2009.01155.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1533-8525.2009.01155.x)
- Scheitle, Christopher P. 2016. "Crimes Occurring at Places of Worship: An Analysis of 2012 Newspaper Reports." *International Review of Victimology* 22 (1):65–74. doi: [10.1177/0269758015610855](https://doi.org/10.1177/0269758015610855)
- Scheitle, Christopher P. 2018. "Religious Congregations' Experiences With, Fears Of, and Preparations for Crime: Results from a National Survey." *Review of Religious Research* 60 (1):95–113. doi: [10.1007/s13644-017-0316-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13644-017-0316-3)
- Sherman, Lawrence W., Patrick R. Gartin, and Michael E. Buerger. 1989. "Hot Spots of Predatory Crime: Routine Activities and the Criminology of Place." *Criminology* 27 (1):27–55. doi: [10.1111/j.1745-9125.1989.tb00862.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1989.tb00862.x)
- Smith, Christian and Robert Faris. 2005. "Socioeconomic Inequality in the American Religious System: An Update and Assessment." *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion* 44 (1):95–104. doi: [10.1111/jssr.2005.44.issue-1](https://doi.org/10.1111/jssr.2005.44.issue-1)
- Steensland, Brian, Jerry Z. Park, Mark D. Regnerus, Lynn D. Robinson, W. Bradford Wilcox, and Robert D. Woodberry. 2000. "The Measure of American Religion: Toward Improving the State of the Art." *Social Forces* 79 (1):291–318. doi: [10.1093/sf/79.1.291](https://doi.org/10.1093/sf/79.1.291)
- Taylor, Natalie. 2004. "Petrol Service Stations as Victims of Crime: Their Risks and Vulnerabilities." *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: an International Journal* 6 (1):31–41. doi: [10.1057/palgrave.cpcs.8140177](https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.cpcs.8140177)
- Tilley, Nicholas and Janice Webb. 1994. *Burglary Reduction: Findings from Safer Cities Schemes*. Crime Prevention Unit Paper 51. London, U.K.: Home Office.
- Tillyer, Marie Skubak, Pamela Wilcox, and Brooke Miller Gialopsos. 2010. "Adolescent School-Based Sexual Victimization: Exploring the Role of Opportunity in a Gender-Specific Multilevel Analysis." *Journal of Criminal Justice* 38:1071–81. doi: [10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.07.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.07.010)
- van Dijk, Jan J. M. and G. J. Terlouw. 1996. "An International Perspective of the Business Community as Victims of Fraud and Crime." *Security Journal* 7 (3):157–67. doi: [10.1016/0955-1662\(96\)00168-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0955-1662(96)00168-3)
- Verhage, Antoinette. 2009. "Corporations as a Blind Spot in Research: Explanations for a Criminological Tunnel Vision." Pp. 79–108 in *Contemporary Issues in the Empirical Study of Crime*, edited by Marc Cools. Antwerpen, Belgium: Maklu Publishers.

- Wilcox, Pamela, Carol E. Jordan, and Adam J. Pritchard. 2007. "A Multidimensional Examination of Campus Safety: Victimization, Perceptions of Danger, Worry about Crime, and Precautionary Behavior among College Women in the Post-Clery Era." *Crime & Delinquency* 53 (2):219–54. doi: [10.1177/0097700405283664](https://doi.org/10.1177/0097700405283664)
- Wilcox Rountree, Pamela and Kenneth C. Land. 1996. "Burglary Victimization, Perceptions of Crime Risk, and Routine Activities: A Multilevel Analysis across Seattle Neighborhoods and Census Tracts." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 33:146–80.
- Wilcox Rountree, Pamela, Kenneth C. Land, and Terance D. Miethe. 1994. "Macro-Micro Integration in the Study of Victimization: A Hierarchical Logistic Model Analysis across Seattle Neighborhoods." *Criminology* 32:387–414. doi: [10.1111/j.1745-9125.1994.tb01159.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-9125.1994.tb01159.x)
- Wilkes, Robert E. 1978. "Fraudulent Behavior by Consumers." *Journal of Marketing* 42 (4):67–75.
- Willits, Dale, Lisa Broidy, and Kristine Denman. 2013. "Schools, Neighborhood Risk Factors, and Crime." *Crime & Delinquency* 59 (2):292–315. doi: [10.1177/0011128712470991](https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128712470991)
- Wooldredge, John D., Francis T. Cullen, and Edward J. Latessa. 1992. "Research Note: Victimization in the Workplace: A Test of Routine activities theory." *Justice Quarterly* 9 (2):325–35. doi: [10.1080/07418829200091391](https://doi.org/10.1080/07418829200091391)