Kasetsart Journal of Social Sciences

journal homepage: http://kjss.kasetsart.org

Analyzing factors influencing crime victimization among students and staff at Mahidol University: A multidimensional approach

Trynh Phoraksa

Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Mahidol University, Nakhon Pathom 73170, Thailand

Article Info

Article history:
Received 16 January 2025
Received 01 May 2025
Accepted 19 May 2025
Available online 12 November 2026

Keywords:
factors affecting victims of crimes,
victimization,
victims of crimes

Abstract

This study aims to examine the factors contributing to victimization from various forms of crime among students and staff at Mahidol University. The research is quantitative, supplemented by a review of relevant documents and theories. A questionnaire was utilized as the primary data collection tool, designed with a 5-point rating scale to measure perceptions and experiences related to campus crime. The data were collected through quota sampling from two sample groups: students and university staff. The total sample size comprised 1,100 individuals, including 506 students, 66 academic staff, and 528 support staff. The response rate yielded 674 completed questionnaires, representing 61 percent of the total sample. The findings indicate that significant factors associated with the risk of victimization include student status, residence within the university, support staff, and work experience or years of study. Conversely, gender, age, and living alone were not significantly correlated with victimization among students and staff at Mahidol University. To address and mitigate crime on campus, several measures are recommended. These include the installation of additional CCTV cameras, particularly in high-risk areas, increased lighting in vulnerable locations, and the establishment of a network between Mahidol University and local police authorities for the exchange of crime-related information, crime prevention strategies, and cooperation during criminal incidents. These initiatives aim to enhance safety awareness and reduce the likelihood of victimization in the university community.

© 2026 Kasetsart University.

E-mail address: trynh.p@gmail.com **(**Phoraksa, T.**)**.

https://doi.org/10.34044/j.kjss.2026.47.4.19
2452–3151/© 2026 Kasetsart University.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

Introduction

Crime victimization in university settings is a growing concern, affecting both students and staff and raising critical questions about campus security and personal safety. As open and dynamic environments and often characterized by high mobility, large student populations, and extensive public access, universities are vulnerable to various types of crime, including property offenses, physical assault, sexual harassment, and cybercrime. While academic institutions strive to create safe and conducive learning and working environments for students and staff members, insufficient security measures, social dynamics, and economic stressors may increase individuals' risk of victimization.

Mahidol University, one of Thailand's leading higher education institutions, faces similar challenges. A prior study by Kasetsin (2017) has identified security weaknesses at Mahidol University, Salaya Campus, particularly multiple entry and exit points, inadequate lighting, and limited CCTV coverage, which make certain areas more vulnerable to crime. Data from previous studies highlight that crime rates tend to rise during the academic semester when campus activity increases. These trends highlight the importance of proactive security policies that not only respond to crime incidents but also implement preventive measures to reduce crime risks.

As a result, this study aims to analyze the types of crimes affecting students and staff at Mahidol University and examine both individual risk factors, such as student status, residence, and work experience, as well as environmental conditions that contribute to victimization. By doing so, it seeks to identify gaps in existing safety measures and propose practical policies to enhance campus security.

As part of the research on "Analyzing Factors Influencing Crime Victimization among Students and Staff at Mahidol University: A Multidimensional Approach", this research project has received research ethics approval on human subjects from the Committee for Research Ethics (Social Sciences), Mahidol University, No. 2022/194 (B2). Ultimately, the findings are expected to contribute to the development of effective crime prevention strategies, making Mahidol University a safer and more secure environment for students and staff while also serving as a model for improving university security policies in Thailand and beyond.

Literature Review

This literature review gathers, examines, and synthesizes existing knowledge from books, textbooks, academic documents, research studies, and journal articles related to crime victimization.

The review of literature focuses on three core areas; (1) risky behaviors contributing to victimization; and (2) factors influencing crime victimization in university settings. By examining the existing studies, this section provides a foundational understanding of the key elements relevant to the study of crime victimization and highlights potential research gaps for future exploration.

Risky Behaviors Contributing to Victimization

Crime victimization is a complex phenomenon which is influenced by various individual and environmental factors. While some individuals may become victims due to circumstances beyond their control, research suggests that certain behaviors and situational factors can increase the likelihood of victimization (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Hindelang et al., 1978; Schafer, 1977) Understanding these factors through theoretical frameworks provides valuable insights into how daily routines, institutional security, and personal behaviors influence crime risk.

Theories of victimization

Schafer (1977) classified crime victims based on their responsibility for their own victimization and the relationship between crime and crime victims into 7 types as follows (Schafer, 1977 as cited in Thongyai & Tepsumethanon, 2022):

1. Unrelated victims refer to innocent victims of criminals' actions without any relationship to the criminals.

2. Provocative victims refer to victims who cause criminals to become angry or dissatisfied. They provoke the crime to harm themselves.

3. Precipitative victims refer to victims who behave or place themselves in dangerous situations that tempt criminals to commit crimes with their intentions.

4. Biologically weak victims refer to victims who are both physically and mentally weak, which causes criminals to target them.

5. Socially weak victims refer to victims who are insecure in society. They are minorities in the community, have cultural problems and problems of adjustment to society.

6. Self-victimizing victims refer to victims who voluntarily interact with criminals or commit a crime themselves, so they are criminals and victims at the same time.

7. Political victims refer to victims who are political competitors campaigning for a position of power in politics but those in power victimize them by labelling them as offenders.

The lifestyle theory

Hindelang et al. (1978) proposed the lifestyle theory which suggested that the risk that a person will be victimized is affected by his or her lifestyles such as taking a high-risk, frequently drinking alcohol with others, enjoy gambling, etc. In other words, crime victimization can be caused by risky lifestyles that increase the likelihood of victimization. Three elements must converge: a motivated offender, a suitable target or victim who lacks guardians including living in high-crime areas. Thus, it is easier to become a crime victim (Thongyai & Tepsumethanon, 2022).

Routine activity theory

Cohen and Felson (1979) as cited in Khantee, et al. (2015) defined routine activities as recurring actions or behaviors that individuals engage in, either consciously or unconsciously. These habitual routines can create opportunities for criminals to commit offenses. For instance, homeowners who leave for work every day without anyone remaining at home may unknowingly expose their property to burglary, as thieves recognize and exploit predictable absences. Similarly, individuals who wear expensive jewelry in public may attract criminals looking for opportunities to commit robbery. Another common example involves students walking along the roadside while distracted by their mobile phones, increasing their vulnerability to phone snatching.

Cohen and Felson (1979) as cited in Khantee, et al. (2015) assumed that a crime occurs due to a victim's routine activities and three necessary elements. The three elements of a crime are as follows:

1. Suitable Target: The first element of a crime is a suitable victim or target. For example, students leave their bags with valuables inside to reserve a table in the cafeteria; therefore, their bags are at risk of being stolen. Also, students participate in recreational activities and practice cheering until late at night, and then they travel home alone in a dark alley. This situation increases the risk of victimization.

2. Absence of Capable Guardian: The second element is when guardians are absent or present but not capable. In this case, a guardian can be someone or something that can prevent a crime from happening. They can be people or equipment such as security guards, police patrols, neighbors, door keepers, CCTV cameras, etc.

3. Likely and Motivated Offenders: The third element is offenders who consider that a victim or target is suitable, and the guardian is incapable, so they decide to commit a crime. Offenders have many reasons to commit a crime such as poverty, drug addiction, being a child or youth who lacks care and attention. Apart from the environment that is suitable for committing a crime, another important thing is the desire and mental state of the criminal who is willing to commit a crime, causing criminal behavior to occur.

Factors Influencing Crime Victimization in University Setting

Crime victimization in university settings is shaped by a variety of personal, social, economic, and environmental factors, influencing students' and staff members' exposure to crime risks. Research has demonstrated that violence and sexual victimization are significant concerns on university campuses in international contexts, leading to adverse mental health effects and barriers to seeking support services (Björklund et al., 2010; Finkelhor & Asdigian, 1996; Hayes et al, 2021; Pengpid & Peltzer, 2020; Pratt & Turanovic, 2016; Spencer et al., 2024; Stoner & Cramer, 2019)

Björklund et al. (2010) found that violent victimization was highly prevalent among Finnish university students, with male and female students equally experiencing a broad range of violent behavior including being attacked by strangers. The study also presented that violent victimization has significant effects on mental health and alcohol consumption. Similarly, Stoner and Cramer (2019) conducted a systematic review of sexual violence victimization among female college students, reporting that the prevalence rates of sexual violence victimization on college campuses were routinely high. Victims were commonly unaware of available resources as reasons for not seeking help after a sexual assault and frequently encountered barriers to accessing healthcare services, including self-blame, societal stigma, and negative experiences with campus personnel, such as perceived victim-blaming attitudes.

Expanding on these findings, Spencer et al. (2024) conducted a meta-analysis on sexual assault victimization among U.S. college students, reaffirming that female students were greatly affected, and victims of sexual violence feel most at ease sharing their unwanted experiences with friends. This creates a natural opportunity to establish peer education programs aimed at preventing and addressing sexual violence victimization on college campuses. Pengpid and Peltzer (2020) provided a broader global perspective, analyzing violence victimization among university students from 25 different countries and linking victimization to sexual risk behaviors,

such as multiple sexual partners and alcohol use in the context of sex, and mental health concerns, such as depression, loneliness, PTSD, sleeping problem, and short sleep.

Beyond sexual and physical violence, research suggests that victimization risk extends beyond lifestyle and routine activity factors to include psychological, social, and institutional vulnerabilities. Finkelhor and Asdigian (1996) introduced a victim-centered framework that extends beyond Routine Activity Theory, suggesting that victimization risk is shaped by internal vulnerabilities of victims such as self-confidence, coping skills, and situational awareness, target gratifiability which has characteristics like gender, and target antagonism which has characteristics that arouse the anger of perpetrator. Hayes et al. (2021) applied Routine Activity Theory to understand the risks of sexual victimization among college students and found that proximity to deviant peers and exposure to high-risk environments were significant factors in rape and sexual assault, the presence of guardianship factors, such as security personnel or surveillance, did not significantly reduce victimization risks because sexual violence victims are more likely to be assaulted by someone they know, in private spaces where traditional conceptualizations of guardianship are not as relevant compared to other crimes.

Collectively, these studies emphasize the multidimensional nature of crime victimization in university environments within international contexts while identifying critical research gaps that warrant further investigation. Recent research highlights the need to examine the factors influencing crime victimization among students and staff in Thailand, as studies in this area remain limited. To address this gap, this research provides an in-depth analysis of crime victimization within a Thai higher education setting by selecting Mahidol University as a case study as it is one of the universities in Thailand with open spaces and high mobility.

Methodology

This study employs a quantitative research approach to examine factors influencing crime victimization among students and staff at Mahidol University. The research utilizes a structured questionnaire to collect data, and statistical analysis is conducted using both descriptive and inferential statistics to analyze relationships between demographic characteristics and the risk of victimization. The study aims to identify key predictors of victimization and provide empirical evidence to inform campus crime prevention policies.

Sampling Method and Sample Size Justification

The study employs quota sampling to ensure representation across three key subgroups: students, academic staff, and support staff. This method was chosen because it allows for structured recruitment of respondents while ensuring that each subgroup is proportionally represented based on their presence in the overall university population. Given the differences in roles and daily routines between students and staff, quota sampling helps balance the sample composition, enabling a more precise understanding of crime victimization across different groups.

The quotas were determined based on the proportion of each group within the university population. Specifically, the sample included 506 students (46 %), 66 academic staff (6 %), and 528 support staff (48 %), mirroring the distribution within the university community. The sample size of 1,100 respondents was determined using Taro Yamane's formula at a 97 percent confidence level with a margin of error of 3 percent.

Questionnaire Design and Validity

The primary data collection tool was a self-administered questionnaire, which was designed based on relevant literature and theoretical frameworks related to crime victimization. The questionnaire was structured into five sections: (1) demographic information, (2) perceptions of campus security, (3) awareness of crime issues, (4) personal experiences of victimization, and (5) perceived causes of campus crime. Responses were recorded using a five-point Likert scale, allowing for quantification of attitudes and perceptions.

To ensure content validity, the questionnaire was reviewed by a panel of criminology and social science experts. Additionally, a pilot study was conducted with 50 respondents from the target population to assess clarity, reliability, and response consistency. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was used to measure internal consistency, with a threshold of 0.7 or higher indicating acceptable reliability. Any ambiguities identified in the pilot study were revised before the full-scale data collection.

Variables Analyzed

The study examined both independent and dependent variables to determine factors influencing victimization risk. Independent variables included demographic factors such as age, gender, student or staff status, place of residence, and length of time at the university. The dependent variable was

crime victimization, measured by whether respondents had experienced any form of crime within the university environment.

Data Analysis Techniques

Both descriptive and inferential statistics were applied to analyze the data. Descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation, were used to summarize respondents' demographic characteristics and general perceptions of campus crime. For inferential analysis, the study initially employed multiple regression analysis to assess the predictive strength of various factors on victimization risk. However, given the categorical nature of the dependent variable (victim vs. non-victim), logistic regression was deemed more appropriate. Logistic regression was applied to identify significant predictors of victimization while controlling for other variables, ensuring a statistically robust analysis. The model helped determine the odds ratio of different demographic characteristics contributing to crime victimization risk.

Addressing Potential Biases

Several steps were taken to minimize potential biases in data collection and analysis. Non-response bias was addressed by ensuring a high response rate through follow-ups with selected participants. Self-report bias, which is a common concern in crime victimization research, was mitigated by emphasizing participant anonymity and confidentiality. Additionally, questions were randomized to reduce the likelihood of response order effects. Given the sensitive nature of crime victimization, neutral language was used to encourage honest responses.

Ethical Considerations

This study involved collecting personal experiences of crime victimization, necessitating strict ethical oversight. Participants were fully informed of the research objectives, data confidentiality, and voluntary participation before completing the questionnaire. To protect participant privacy, no identifiable information was collected, and responses were stored securely. Ethical clearance for the study was obtained from the Committee for Research Ethics (Social Sciences), Mahidol University (Approval No. 2022/194 (B2)), ensuring adherence to ethical guidelines for research involving human subjects.

Results

This research study employed a questionnaire as an instrument to collect data from two sample groups using quota sampling. The sample size was 1,100, including 506 university students, 66 academic staff and 528 support staff. A total of 674 responses were received, representing 61 percent of the total sample, with 331 students, 25 academic staff, and 318 support staff completing the questionnaire. According to academic standards, a response rate of no less than 20 percent is acceptable, while a response rate exceeding 50 percent is considered good (Rattanamanee & Phasunon, 2019).

Regarding the demographic characteristics of the sample at Mahidol University, the majority were female (443 respondents, 65.7 %). The average age of respondents was 30.25 years, with the youngest being 18 years old and the oldest 60 years old. Among students, most were in their second year, while the majority of staff had work experience of 1 year and 10 years, respectively, with an average of 12.9 years. Additionally, most respondents lived alone off-campus, which may indicate a higher degree of independence but also potential exposure to victimization risks due to reduced social support and security measures compared to those living on campus.

These demographic characteristics are relevant to the study's objectives, as age, gender, experience level, and living arrangements can influence an individual's risk of victimization. For instance, younger students or those living alone off-campus may face increased exposure to crime due to factors such as limited awareness of personal safety, less security surveillance, or increased vulnerability in transit areas. Similarly, differences in work experience among staff could affect their perceptions of crime risk and security measures. Understanding these demographic distributions allows for a more nuanced analysis of victimization risks and contributes to the development of targeted crime prevention strategies within the university environment. Table 1 shows that students and staff at Mahidol University were aware of various types of crimes occurring within the university, with different levels of awareness for each type of crime (Table 1).

Table 1 Crimes occurring in the university that students and staff at Mahidol University were aware of

Types of crime	Aware		Unaware	
	Number of people	Percent	Number of people	Percent
Online bullying	330	49.0	344	51.0
Face-to-face/or online bullying	315	46.7	359	53.3
Cybercrime	276	40.9	398	59.1
Sexual harassment both physical and verbal one (online)	262	38.9	412	61.1
Theft	238	35.3	436	64.7
Sexual harassment both physical and verbal (face-to-face)	208	30.9	466	69.1
Impersonation scam with name/signature	155	23.0	519	77.0
Impersonation scam with national ID card, credit card, debit card, etc.	145	21.5	529	78.5
Physical assault	106	15.7	568	84.3
Threat	103	15.3	571	84.7
Gang-robbery	34	5.0	640	95.0
Robbery	17	2.5	657	97.5
Snatching	8	1.2	666	98.8

The opinions of students and staff at Mahidol University regarding crime risks in different campus areas: outside buildings (surrounding the university) and inside buildings (within the university campus) were analyzed using a Likert scale ranging from 1 (least likely) to 5 (most likely). The findings indicate that the area surrounding the university (outside buildings) was perceived as having the highest likelihood of sexual harassment (both physical and verbal), with an average score of 2.84, followed by cybercrime (2.81) and theft (2.45). In contrast, within the inside of university buildings, cybercrime was perceived as the most likely crime (2.43), followed by sexual harassment (2.16) and theft (1.87).

The difference in perception between outside and inside campus areas may be attributed to the nature of crime and the level of environmental security. Sexual harassment, particularly in isolated outdoor areas, such as parking lots or poorly lit pathways, is often associated with higher risks due to reduced surveillance and lower pedestrian traffic at certain times. Meanwhile, cybercrime is considered the most likely crime inside university buildings, possibly due to the high usage of online platforms for academic and administrative purposes, making students and staff more vulnerable to phishing, hacking, or online harassment within campus Wi-Fi networks or university-based digital systems.

Regarding crime awareness among students and staff at Mahidol University, the most frequently recognized crime was online bullying (49%), followed by face-to-face or online bullying (46.7%), cybercrime (40.9%), and sexual harassment (both physical and verbal, including online harassment) (38.9%). These findings highlight the increasing role of digital platforms in shaping crime experiences on campus, emphasizing the need for preventive measures targeting online safety and responsible digital behavior.

Participants primarily became aware of campus crimes through word of mouth from other people on campus (67.7%), followed by news from various media sources (45.1%), crime incidents involving close acquaintances (39.6%), and personal victimization experiences (17.5%). The predominance of word-of-mouth awareness suggests that informal networks play a significant role in shaping perceptions of crime risk on campus. This insight could be used to enhance crime prevention strategies, such as structured information-sharing campaigns, peer-led safety initiatives, and improved communication channels between the university and its community. For instance, university-wide safety awareness programs and real-time campus security alerts via mobile apps could serve as more reliable sources of crime-related information, helping students and staff proactively manage their safety. Table 2 presents crime victimization occurring in the university.

Regarding crime victimization among students and staff at Mahidol University, the most commonly reported type of victimization was face-to-face and/or online bullying (10.2%), followed by online bullying (8.3%), sexual harassment (both physical and verbal, face-to-face) (7.0%), and sexual harassment (both physical and verbal, online) (6.8%) (Table 2). These findings align with the study's objectives by identifying the types of victimization that occur within the university environment and assessing the factors contributing to students' and staff's vulnerability to crime.

The prevalence of bullying, both online and in person, highlights the increasing role of digital platforms in shaping crime victimization experiences within universities. Online bullying, in particular, is a growing concern as students and staff increasingly rely on digital communication for academic, social, and professional interactions. The anonymity provided by online platforms may encourage more aggressive behavior,

Table 2 Crime victimization in the university

Types of crime	Experienced		Never experienced	
	Number of people	Percent	Number of people	Percent
Face-to-face/or online bullying	69	10.2	605	89.8
Online bullying	56	8.3	618	91.7
Sexual harassment both physical and verbal (face-to-face)	47	7.0	627	93
Sexual harassment both physical and verbal one (online)	46	6.8	628	93.2
Cybercrime	44	6.5	630	93.5
Theft	37	5.5	637	94.5
Impersonation scam with name/signature	22	3.3	652	96.7
Impersonation scam with national ID card, credit card, debit card, etc.	13	1.9	661	98.1
Physical assault	7	1.0	667	99.0
Gang-robbery	5	0.7	669	99.3
Snatching	-	-	674	100.0
Robbery	-	-	674	100.0
Threat	-	-	674	100.0

leading to higher rates of cyber harassment compared to traditional face-to-face bullying.

Sexual harassment, both online and face-to-face, also emerged as a significant issue. The physical form of harassment could be linked to inadequate surveillance, poorly lit areas, and a lack of security personnel in some campus locations, making certain areas more vulnerable to predatory behavior. Meanwhile, online sexual harassment may be facilitated by the increased use of social media, university forums, and instant messaging apps, where inappropriate behavior can go unchecked due to the absence of strict digital monitoring policies.

When examining the causes of crime in the university, students and staff identified economic problems as the primary factor contributing to criminal incidents. This was followed by hanging out at entertainment venues, the lack of CCTV coverage across all areas, insufficient lighting in some parts of the university, and the inadequate presence of security personnel. These factors suggest that crime victimization may be influenced by both socioeconomic pressures and environmental vulnerabilities within the university. For example, financial struggles may drive individuals to commit crimes such as theft or fraud, while poorly monitored campus areas create opportunities for harassment and assault.

The factors influencing crime victimization among students and staff at Mahidol University were analyzed using logistic regression analysis, an appropriate technique for examining categorical independent variables such as student/staff status and on-campus vs. off-campus residence. The results identified four significant factors that contribute to crime victimization within the university.

At the 0.01 significance level, being a student and living in on-campus residences were found to be strongly associated with a higher risk of victimization. At the 0.05 significance level, support staff were significantly more likely to experience victimization than academic staff. Additionally, at the 0.10 significance level, work experience or years of education was negatively associated with crime victimization, indicating that individuals with longer work experience or more years of education faced a lower risk of being victims of crime.

Meanwhile, gender, age, and living alone were not significantly related to crime victimization, suggesting that these factors did not have a meaningful impact on the likelihood of experiencing crime within the university.

These findings suggest that students face higher risks of crime victimization than staff, possibly due to greater exposure to communal areas, less familiarity with safety precautions, and increased participation in campus activities. Similarly, on-campus residents are at higher risk than those living off-campus, which may be due to shared living spaces, open-access areas, and fewer security measures in some dormitory environments. Furthermore, support staff face higher risks than academic staff, possibly due to differences in job roles, work environments, and the necessity of being in specific high-risk areas on campus. On the other hand, increased work experience or years of study reduces the likelihood of victimization, potentially due to greater situational awareness, familiarity with crime prevention strategies, and more established routines that minimize risk exposure.

Regarding the interpretation of significance levels, a 0.01 significance level ($p < .01$) indicates a strong statistical association, meaning that students and on-campus residents are significantly more likely to experience victimization. A 0.05

Table 3 Multiple Regression Analysis

Variables	Coefficients	*t* Statistics	*p*-values
Constant	-0.447	-1.054	.292
Female	-0.105	-1.013	.311
Age	0.014	1.287	.198
Student	0.796	2.779	.006***
Support staff	0.613	2.400	.017**
Exp	-0.018	-1.654	.099*
On-campus acc	0.380	2.602	.009***
Living alone	0.074	.691	.490

$R = 0.191$ $R^2 = 0.036$ Adjusted $R^2 = 0.026$ Std. Error of the Estimate = 1.173

Remark: * $p \leq .10$, ** $p \leq .05$, *** $p \leq .01$

significance level ($p < .05$) suggests moderate confidence that support staff are at increased risk of victimization. A 0.10 significance level ($p < .10$) indicates a weaker but still notable association, suggesting that work experience or years of education may contribute to reducing victimization risk, though further investigation may be needed (Table 3).

Funding Statement

The findings confirm that students and on-campus residents face higher risks of victimization compared to other groups. One possible explanation is that students tend to spend more time in shared public areas, such as libraries, cafeterias, and common spaces, which may increase their exposure to potential offenders. Additionally, students may have less experience in recognizing or avoiding risky situations, making them more vulnerable targets. The significant relationship between on-campus residence and victimization risk could be attributed to reduced guardianship in certain dormitory areas, limited access control, or the presence of high foot traffic, increasing opportunities for crime.

The higher risk for support staff compared to academic staff may be due to differences in work environments and responsibilities. Support staff often work in various operational or maintenance roles, which may require them to be in isolated or less monitored areas of the campus, especially outside regular working hours. On the other hand, the finding that longer work experience or more years of study reduces victimization risk aligns with the concept that familiarity with campus security measures and increased situational awareness can lead to more effective crime avoidance strategies.

The analysis identified students, on-campus residence, support staff, and work experience/years of study as significant predictors of crime victimization risk. However, gender, age, and living alone did not show significant associations with victimization. This contradicts some previous studies that suggest women and younger individuals are more vulnerable to crime. One possible explanation is that security measures and university regulations may provide a level of protection that minimizes gender-based victimization disparities. Additionally, while living alone is often considered a risk factor in general crime studies, the structured and relatively safe environment of a university campus may reduce its influence. Future research should explore whether personal safety behaviors or campus-specific factors play a role in neutralizing these traditionally significant factors.

The findings of this study provide valuable insights for improving crime prevention policies at Mahidol University. Since students and on-campus residents are at higher risk, targeted safety initiatives should be implemented in these areas. This could include increasing security patrols around student dormitories, installing additional CCTV cameras in shared spaces, and enhancing access control measures for residence halls. Additionally, awareness programs focused on educating students about personal safety, reporting mechanisms, and crime prevention strategies could be beneficial.

For support staff, improved workplace safety protocols, such as better lighting in maintenance areas, designated security support for late-shift workers, and emergency response training, could help mitigate risks. Since economic stress was identified as a contributing factor to campus crime, the university could also explore community support programs, financial assistance options, and mental health services to address the root causes of crime.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study examined crime victimization among students and staff at Mahidol University, focusing on crime types and contributing factors. The majority of respondents were female (443 individuals), with an average age of 30.25 years. Most students were in their second year, and staff had an average of 12.9 years of work experience. The majority lived alone off-campus.

The findings of this study provide valuable insights by indicating that crime victimization is a multifaceted issue influenced by individual characteristics, environmental conditions, and institutional security measures. The study identified that student status, on-campus residents, and support staff face a higher risk of victimization, whereas academic staff and individuals with greater work experience or years of education are less likely to experience crime. In contrast, gender, age, and living alone were found to have no significant relationship with crime victimization. These findings align with prior research on crime victimization in university settings, highlighting the role of exposure, routine activities, and institutional vulnerabilities in shaping crime risk.

For the types of crime, physical and verbal sexual harassment was perceived as the most likely crime in outdoor areas, while cybercrime was most common indoors. Online bullying was the most widely recognized crime, primarily learned about through word-of-mouth. The most frequently experienced crime was bullying (face-to-face/online), with economic stress as the top contributing factor, followed by visiting entertainment venues, insufficient CCTV coverage, poor lighting, and limited security personnel

Aligning with Kasetsin's (2017) study on campus security infrastructure at Mahidol University that found weaknesses in the management of the campus environment, this study also aligns with previous research on crime victimization in university settings such as Pengpid and Peltzer (2020) on how cultural and institutional factors shape victimization. Economic stress and inadequate security infrastructure were identified as key contributors to increased crime risk, making students and staff more vulnerable to victimization, including bullying both online and in person.

To improve campus safety, Mahidol University should enhance security patrols, expand CCTV coverage, and tighten access control in dormitories. Raising awareness about personal and online safety is crucial, along with improving workplace safety for support staff. Addressing financial struggles through aid programs and mental health support can also help reduce crime risks.

Future research should incorporate additional quantitative dimensions by collecting data from individuals who have personally experienced crime or have close associates who have been victims, ensuring more accurate and relevant findings for crime prevention planning. Additionally, alternative statistical methods, such as logistic regression, should be explored to offer different perspectives on significant and non-significant factors. The collected data could also contribute to the development of a crime database, aiding in the creation of targeted strategies to prevent future criminal activities effectively.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

References

Björklund, K., Häkkänen-Nyholm, H., Huttunen, T., & Kunttu, K. (2010). Violence victimization among Finnish university students: Prevalence, symptoms and healthcare usage. *Social Science & Medicine*, *70*(9), 1416–1422. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.12.015

Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social change and crime rate trends: A routine activities approach. *American Sociological Review*, *44*(4), 588–609. https://doi.org/10.2307/2094589

Finkelhor, D., & Asdigian, N. L. (1996). Risk factors for youth victimization: Beyond a lifestyles/routine activities theory approach. *Violence and Victims*, *11*(1), 3–19. https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.11.1.3

Hayes, B. E., O'Neal, E. N., & Hernandez, C. N. (2021). The sexual victimization of college students: A test of routine activity theory. *Crime & Delinquency*, *67*(12), 2043–2068. https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128720954347

Hindelang, M. J., Gottfredson, M. R., & Garofalo, J. (1978). *Victims of personal crime: An empirical foundation for a theory of personal victimization*. Ballinger.

Kasetsin, T. (2017). การพัฒนาต้นแบบการจัดสภาพแวดล้อมร่วมกับชุมชนเพื่อลดความเสี่ยงการเกิดอาชญากรรมในพื้นที่สถานที่ศึกษา : กรณีศึกษาในพื้นที่มหาวิทยาลัยมหิดล วิทยาเขตศาลายา [Development of a community-participatory environmental model to reduce the risk of crime in educational institutions: A case study of Mahidol University, Salaya Campus] (Research report). Research and Development Office, King Prajadhipok's Institute. [in Thai]

Khantee, P., Treemek, K., & Putrakul, K. (2015). *อาชญาวิทยา: ทฤษฎี หลักการ วิจัย และการประยุกต์ใช้นโยบาย* [*Criminology theories: Principles, research, and policy application*]. S. Charoen Print. [in Thai]

Pengpid, S., & Peltzer, K. (2020). Associations of physical partner violence and sexual violence victimization on health risk behaviours and mental health among university students from 25 countries. *BMC Public Health*, *20*(1), Article 937. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-020-09064-y

Pratt, T. C., & Turanovic, J. J. (2016). Lifestyle and routine activity theories revisited: The importance of "risk" to the study of victimization. *Victims & Offenders*, *11*(3), 335–354. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2015.1085568

Rattanamanee, N., & Phasunon, P. (2019). อัตราการตอบกลับของแบบสอบถามในงานวิจัยเชิงปริมาณ [Response rate in quantitative research]. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Thonburi University*, *13*(3), 181–188. [in Thai] https://so03.tcithaijo.org/index.php/trujournal/article/view/214077

Schafer, S. (1977). Victimology: The victim and his criminal. Reston Publishing.

Spencer, C. M., Rivas-Koehl, M., Astle, S., Toews, M. L., McAlister, P., & Anders, K. M. (2024). Factors correlated with sexual assault victimization among college students in the United States: A meta-analysis. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *25*(1), 246–259. https://doi.org/10.1177/15248380221146800

Stoner, J. E., & Cramer, R. J. (2019). Sexual violence victimization among college females: A systematic review of rates, barriers, and facilitators of health service utilization on campus. Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, *20*(4), 520–533. https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838017721245

Thongyai, P., & Tepsumethanon, T. (2022). มาตรการคุ้มครองสิทธิผู้เสียหายหรือเหยื่ออาชญากรรมในกระบวนการยุติธรรมทางอาญาของประเทศไทย: การจัดทำคำแถลงเกี่ยวกับผลกระทบของอาชญากรรม [Measures to protect the rights of victims in the criminal justice process in Thailand: Victim impact statements]. *Chulalongkorn Law Journal*, *40*(1), 1–25. [in Thai] https://so01.tci-thaijo.org/index.php/lawchulajournal/article/view/249734/170076