

# D2.2 – State-of-the-art report

## WP2 – State-of-the-art



## Document Description

|                            |   |
|----------------------------|---|
| <b>Dissemination level</b> | Public  |
| <b>Delivery date</b>       | 1 <sup>st</sup> October 2015  |
| <b>Status</b>              | Final   |
| <b>Authors</b>             | Sonia Bellit (INHESJ)<br>Hugo D'Arbois De Jubainville (INHESJ)<br>Riccardo Valente (UB) |



This project is funded by the European Union under the Horizon 2020 Programme  
*Grant agreement no 653004*

## Table of Contents

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>1. Introduction .....</b>  | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>2. Theoretical dimensions: risk, insecurity and fear of crime .....</b>      | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>3. Overview of survey-based measures of crime.....</b>                       | <b>10</b> |
| 3.1 Spain (Catalonia) – <i>Enquesta de Seguretat Pública de Catalunya</i> ..... | 10        |
| 3.2 UK (England and Wales) – <i>Crime Survey for England and Wales</i> .....    | 11        |
| 3.3 France – <i>Cadre de Vie et Sécurité</i> .....                              | 12        |
| 3.4 Hungary – <i>Victims and Opinions</i> .....                                 | 13        |
| 3.5 Italy – <i>Sicurezza dei cittadini</i> .....                                | 14        |
| <b>4. Overview of police crime-recording systems .....</b>                      | <b>14</b> |
| 4.1 Spain (Catalonia) – <i>Mossos d’Esquadra</i> .....                          | 15        |
| 4.2 UK (England and Wales) – <i>Local police and the Home Office</i> .....      | 15        |
| 4.3 France – <i>National police and Gendarmerie</i> .....                       | 16        |
| 4.4 Hungary – <i>ENYÜBS</i> .....   | 17        |
| 4.5 Italy – <i>Polizia di Stato and Carabinieri</i> .....                       | 18        |
| <b>5. Addressing factors affecting insecurity .....</b>                         | <b>18</b> |
| 5.1 Victimization and crime as predictors of perceived insecurity .....         | 19        |
| 5.2 Demographic factors .....   | 20        |
| 5.3 Socio-economic factors .....  | 20        |
| 5.4 Socio-geographic factors .....  | 22        |
| 5.5 The situational perspective .....   | 24        |
| <b>6. Best practices in reducing insecurity .....</b>                           | <b>25</b> |
| 6.1 Police-centred crime prevention .....                                       | 25        |
| 6.2 Knowledge-based initiatives .....   | 30        |
| 6.3 Using CVSs as a tool for policy-making .....                                | 31        |
| <b>7. Conclusions .....</b>   | <b>34</b> |
| <b>References .....</b>   | <b>35</b> |

## 1. Introduction

The following state-of-the-art report has three objectives:

- Provide stakeholders and the general public with relevant information concerning crime and victimization surveys (CVSs) and police crime-recording systems (PRC) at the European level, with a focus on the five countries involved in the MARGIN project (Spain, France, Italy, Hungary and the UK);
- Address socio-economic and socio-geographic factors affecting perceptions of insecurity;
- Explore the best practices that have proven to be effective in reducing insecurity in urban contexts, both at the EU level and worldwide.

The state-of-the-art report is the second deliverable (D2.2) produced in the framework of WP2. The previous one (D2.1, cf. *MARGIN database for smart aggregation*) provides an archive of secondary data collected through two types of sources: the five CVSs available within the consortium<sup>1</sup>, and the different police crime-recording systems used in the same countries. Raw primary data was requested both at the national and the local level (Barcelona, Budapest, Firenze, London, Milano and Paris) and it was agreed to include in the database information for the last 5 years (2010-2014). The focus on the urban dimension was deemed crucial for two reasons: firstly, it appears that (in)security will be an increasingly urban phenomenon (ICPC, 2014) since, according to the demographic forecasts of the United Nations Human Settlements Program, by 2050 seven out of ten people will live in cities and towns. Secondly, in the case of the MARGIN project that addresses vulnerable subjects, an additional concern stands out: if the world is becoming increasingly urban, there will be also an increase in the number of urban poor. As argued during a workshop organized by the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (ICPC) in collaboration with UN-HABITAT and the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), an analysis of the impact of rapid current and future urban growth on perceived insecurity is urgently needed (Shaw and Travers, 2007). Ultimately, (in)security is definitely becoming “a central responsibility of cities” (ICPC, 2014, p. 27).

Accordingly, the MARGIN project is oriented toward the creation of a link between the spatial and the social dimension of insecurity, with the results arising from the statistical analysis of the database informing the overall empirical study to be carried

---

<sup>1</sup> *Crime Survey for England and Wales* (UK); *Sicurezza dei cittadini* (Italy); *Cadre de vie et sécurité* (France); *Encuesta de Seguridad Pública de Cataluña* (Spain); *Victims and Opinions* (Hungary).

out throughout the lifetime of the project (specifically, data collection on demographic and socio-economic determinants of insecurity and the anthropological fieldwork). Furthermore, the creation of the MARGIN database represented a key milestone as it facilitated the development of the state-of-the-art report by allowing for a comparison of common schemes and variances among the different data collection traditions of the five countries addressed. Namely, the information exchange that led to the creation of the MARGIN database revealed that data is highly heterogeneous from one country to another, as some sources are general whereas other are extremely detailed. The main issue concerned CVSs' data and the different understandings of the perception of insecurity. Both fear of crime and social concern about crime are conceptualised and operationalized differently from one country to another (e.g., feelings of security, feelings of insecurity, or fear of walking alone at night in the area). Moreover, when questions were similar, modalities may still be different. Therefore, these questions do not *practically* measure the same things. This is a major methodological problem, since these differences hinder potential cross-national comparison.

## 2. Theoretical dimensions: risk, insecurity and fear of crime

As stated by the authors of the International Centre for the Prevention of Crime report, “when the economic recession began in 2008, there was much expectation among policy makers and academics that rates of crime, especially property crime, would increase. This has clearly not happened” (ICPC, 2014, p. 4; Clarke, 2013). Nevertheless, findings from EU-funded research projects showed that perceived insecurity is increasing, which is confirmed by the fact that 4 out of 5 European citizens asked for more action against organized crime and terrorism (De Wever, 2011), and more recent analysis also confirms this trend (Maffei and Markopoulou, 2013). The correspondence between perceptions and reality is frequently imperfect given that insecurity may be affected by factors such as communities' physical and social disorders, individual factors, mass media, personal experiences with crime and other individual and/or contextual factors. This heterogeneity may explain why, despite victimization being a relatively infrequent event, so many people are concerned about crime-related issues (Echazarra, 2014).

Some authors explain the rise in insecurity perception as a consequence of what Beck (1998) has defined “risk society”, which supposedly inaugurates an era of uncertainty due to structural changes (labour precarity and delocalization of production, threats related to terrorism, increase of natural disasters, etc.).

According to Beck, in such a context the 'unequal' society is definitively overtaken by the value system of the 'unsafe' society, or in other words, the ideal of equality is abandoned in favour of safety and security. The concept of risk has been widely used in social sciences since its original formulation. Nevertheless, it is a controversial argument since this concept seems to underestimate the problem of what public authorities identify as risks to citizens' security and, more importantly, the social causes of "risky" behaviours (Sanders, 2012). According to the French sociologist Wacquant (2000), social conditions do not become at risk until authorities define them as such in view of the implementation of measures to eradicate them. Pushed to its extreme consequences, his theory cautions that this is a misunderstanding since "what we live in is not a risk society, which does not mean too much if we cannot identify who is in danger and why a situation is at risk, but a society of advanced insecurity" (Wacquant, 2000, p. 9), characterized by high levels of labour and social uncertainty.

Despite the criticisms, the need to define and identify "risky groups" (marginalised, criminals, etc.) has nowadays become the institutional prerequisite for reducing insecurity. Put concretely, this led to the deployment of a quantitative effort by police forces and criminal law practitioners based on the calculation of probability and statistical distribution of potential risks. At the same time, public authorities are currently facing a radical re-contextualization of their priorities and, accordingly, this implies a new focus on the phenomenon of (in)security. In fact, while up until the late 1970s researchers and public authorities assumed that analysis of the official police statistics was the best strategy to understand insecurity, today there is a general consensus on the heterogeneous nature of the phenomenon of insecurity and this concept has evolved to a broader and more complex idea including different fields. In wider terms, a review of the literature makes clear that a comprehensive analysis on insecurity should include at least two traditional dimensions: the objective dimension, that refers to actual crime statistics, and the subjective dimension, with reference to cognitive aspects such as fear of crime or perceived risks by the citizenship.

With regard to the fear of crime, Maffei and Markopoulou (2013) have shown that in criminology literature researchers identify five main causes: on the one hand, it has been demonstrated that (a) crime, (b) victimization and (c) perceived risk of victimization are clearly predictors of perceived fear but, on the other hand, one has to include a consideration of the impact of (d) social disorganization and (e) socialization on the perception of insecurity.

Furstenberg (1971) divided the concept of perception of insecurity into three areas: fear of crime, which is about being afraid of victimization; social concerns about

crime, considering crime as a social problem that must be addressed by authorities; and the objective risk of being victimized. This distinction proposed by Furstenberg has often been embraced and expanded on by American and European researchers. For instance, LaGrange and Ferraro (1987) developed this typology further, and added that perceived insecurity could be personal (i.e., for oneself) or altruistic (i.e., for the others). Today, most researchers agree that perceptions of insecurity are composed of distinct yet related elements (Abizanda et al., 2012; Dittmann, 2005; Doran and Burgess, 2012; Gray, Jackson and Farrall, 2011), which are:

- The emotional element, restricted to fear of crime *stricto sensu*, which means a negative mental state in reaction to crime and victimization;
- The cognitive element, related to the evaluation of one's personal risk or probability of being victimized. Jackson (2011) suggests that this element is mitigated by the evaluation of crime likelihood and consequences, as well as one's perceived control over such situations;
- The behavioural element, related to the modifications of one's behaviours (e.g., protection, mobility) in response to personal insecurity;
- The social concern or worry element, related to the belief that crime and delinquency are social problems that must be addressed by public policies.

For their part, Valera and Guàrdia (2012) argue in favour of a clear distinction between fear of crime and perceived insecurity since the former is basically emotional while the latter is more related to cognitive perceived risk theories. Assuming that fear of crime and perception of insecurity are clearly different topics, the authors opt for a more inclusive concept of "victimization threats" (Rader, 2004), which include three aspects: affective (fear of crime), cognitive (perceived risk) and behavioural (restricted behaviour). Such a definition has the added value of including a focus on the personal competences needed for handling risky circumstances or, as Valera and Guàrdia state in a more recent paper (2014), both real and perceived skills to cope with potentially threatening situations (e.g., antisocial behaviours, incivility, presence of potential assailants in the public space, etc.).

Beyond differences in theoretical approaches, the perception of insecurity arises as a complex issue not merely limited to actual crime trends. Soomeren et al. (2008) argue, for instance, that there are three factors affecting an individual's feeling of insecurity: (a) the socio-cultural context, that is to say the characteristics of the social environment that might influence feelings of insecurity; (b) individuals factors, including a wide range of aspects such as gender, age, ethnic background, vulnerability, victimization, lifestyle or media; (c) the situational context, which mainly depends on environmental features (urban layout, visibility and clarity of space, lighting, etc.).

The radical change in the conceptualization of (in)security that occurred in the last few decades pushed scholars to approach the study of insecurity by considering two different sources (crime statistics and victimization surveys), enabling a comparison between the objective (crime-related) and the subjective (perceived) dimensions of this phenomenon. With this objective in mind, CVSs arise as a privileged tool for policymaking. According to Killias (2010), for instance, they allow for a comparison with traditional measures of crime and, in principle, unveiling the “dark figure” of crime, a concept referring to all crimes that take place but, for different reasons, are not reported to or recorded by the police (Boivin and Cordeau, 2011; Hale, 1996; Jansson, 2007; Messner, 1984; Skogan, 1974). More than four decades after the first victimization survey in the United States (i.e., the National Crime Victimization Survey, NCVS), the comparison between objective and subjective measures of crime is a well-established practice for broadening the understanding of the roots causes of crime in contemporary societies. Even so, it is crucial to point out that these sources cannot be combined in order to obtain a single measure of data on the level of criminality within a society. In other words, crime statistics and victimization surveys must be considered as unique sources of information and, accordingly, should be used to integrate and supplement information about insecurity rather than combining it (Murrià, 2010).

In the end, several methodological issues related to the measurement of the different dimensions affecting the perception of insecurity have been identified:

- **Epistemology:** generally, the perception of insecurity is an on-going social process that cannot be perfectly measured by the use of CVSs or police statistics;
- **Conceptualisation and operationalization:** as stated before, the perception of insecurity is a complex phenomenon that deserves to be conceptualised by taking into account several elements (fear of victimization, perceived risk of victimization, social concern for crime). Consequently, the instruments used to measure these concepts produce data on different phenomenon, which may be difficult to compare. For instance, CVS questions on the fear of being assaulted, or the feeling of safety when walking alone at night in the neighbourhood, *actually* measure different perceptions of insecurity;
- **Technique:** the reliability of data on the perceptions of insecurity is likely to change depending on the technique that is used (qualitative/quantitative methods, open/closed questions, questions on the frequency or context of the perceptions).



The MARGIN project's approach to insecurity takes this previous research into account and proposes a broad definition addressing four key dimensions:

1. The *objective dimension* with a main focus on two typologies of crimes, namely: contact and violent crimes (e.g. sexual offences, murder, injury, robbery, etc.) and property crimes (e.g. burglary, theft, larceny, vandalism, etc.). This approach is based on the assumption that these indicators encompass criminal offenses that suppose a direct attack on people and, accordingly, a greater feeling of insecurity;
2. The *subjective dimension* referring to a continuum including emotional and cognitive factors affecting perceived insecurity;
3. The *spatial dimension* by taking into account physical characteristics of spaces or areas that could have an impact on residents as well as the interaction between people and the space in which they live through an analysis of individual lifestyles and their consequences on risk perception;
4. The *social dimension* or social insecurity, referring to the social consequences of poverty and deprived living conditions on ontological security.

The following report has been organized in order to reflect the underlying theoretical structure of the project. Firstly, it provides an overview of CVSs and PRC available within the consortium (sections 3 and 4). As mentioned in the introduction, a database has been generated including both sources of information, which will allow for a comparative analysis between objective and subjective measures of crime in five EU countries during WP3 (cf. *Data analysis of factors assessing public and personal insecurity*). Secondly, spatial and social determinants of insecurity have been examined in section 5 in order to go further with the analysis of factors that may explain changes in terms of perceived insecurity as well as to establish a solid theoretical basis with a view toward the implementation of the activities foreseen in WP4 (cf. *Survey design and data collection*) and WP5 (cf. *Anthropological dimension of insecurity*). In addition, a set of evidence-based best practices on reducing fear and insecurity has been examined in section 6. The review of best practices will inform the production of one of the main deliverables (i.e. *Agenda of best practices: enhance the socio-political impact of CVSs*) included in WP6 (cf. *Dissemination and exploitation*).

### 3. Overview of survey-based measures of crime

Since the 1980s, the use of crime and victimization surveys (CVSs) has spread throughout Europe. Survey-based data constitute an alternative source to police statistics and are often considered more reliable because they can allow for identifying crimes that are usually not reported to or noticed by police services. In other words, CVS data can assess the so-called “dark figure” of crime and delinquency. Moreover, unlike police statistics, CVS data can directly address the various dimensions defining the perception of insecurity. Although CVS data do have limits (e.g., homicides, victimless crimes), the analysis of these statistics is crucial for the MARGIN project in order to conduct a comparative analysis and assess perceptions of insecurity. An overview of CVSs is presented below with regard to the methodology used (i.e., frequency, sample, data collection) as well as questions related to victimization and insecurity.

#### 3.1 Spain (Catalonia) – *Enquesta de Seguretat Pública de Catalunya*

Although Spanish national CVSs are often seen as limited and out-dated, Catalonia has a long-lasting history of such surveys with the first one having been conducted in Barcelona in 1984 (EVB). The current survey, titled *Enquesta de Seguretat Pública de Catalunya* (ESPC), was conducted annually from 1999 and since 2013 has been carried out every two years.

The ESPC has an average sample of 14.000 respondents aged 16 and over. Respondents are randomly selected on the basis of population distribution and the age and sex quota in each area of the survey. Data is collected via computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI). The average length of the interviews is 16 minutes.

All respondents are asked questions on victimization and general perceptions of insecurity. Then, half the sample is asked questions concerning the relationship between police and their perceptions of insecurity, whereas the other half of the sample is asked questions concerning the relationship between social coexistence in the neighbourhood and these perceptions.

With regard to victimization, a specific feature of the ESPC is that respondents are first asked to recall spontaneous memories of victimization. According to Gondra (2010), such question identifies the “vivid recollection” of one’s personal experience, thus measuring the impact of victimization on individuals. Respondents are also asked questions on different types of victimization (i.e., vehicles, households, shops, farms, and personal victimization) and on the details of the victimization experience

(i.e., time, place, cost, consequences, author/s, and report to the authorities). It should be noted that these questions are related to events that happened during the *previous year*.

Concerning the perception of insecurity, the ESPC covers a wide range of indicators: assessment of general and local social problems; level of personal safety and its evolution over time; perception of social disorder (anti-social behaviours) and its evolution over time; assessment of the police in general and local police action specifically.

### 3.2 UK (England and Wales) – *Crime Survey for England and Wales*

The United Kingdom has a long-standing history of CVSs, since the first British Crime Survey (BCS) was conducted in 1982. More recent surveys have also been conducted, such as the Scottish Crime and Justice Survey (SCJS) since 1993 and the Northern Ireland Crime Survey (NICS) since 1994.

The current survey, named Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW, formerly BCS) has been conducted since 1982. The frequency of the CSEW became annual in 2001. The research organisation TNS-BMRB was in charge of carrying out the survey on behalf of the Home Office (HO) until 2012, and it has been administered by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) since that time. The CSEW has an average sample of 35.000 respondents aged 16 and over, although around 50.000 households are invited to participate in the survey. Since 2009, a module of the CSEW includes approximately 3.000 children between 10 and 15.

Data is collected through a computer-assisted personal interviewing system (CAPI) and a computer-assisted self-interviewing system (CASI) for sensitive questions. Respondents are asked questions on their victimization experience, as well as their perceptions of insecurity. For methodological and pragmatic reasons, self-completion modules are only completed by respondents aged between 16 and 59.

Concerning victimization, respondents are asked questions on their experience (i.e., household, vehicles, personal). Questions are also related to the details of the event (i.e., time, place, cost, consequences, author(s), modus operandi, report to the authorities, issues). It should be noted that these questions concern events that happened during the *previous year*.

With reference to the perception of insecurity, this survey covers a large range of indicators: personal feeling of safety or unsafety; assessment of criminality and its

evolution over time; personal feeling of security in the neighbourhood; perception of neighbourhood social problems; perceived impact of crime on quality of life; perceived victimization risk; protective and avoiding behaviours; assessment of police action in general.

### 3.3 France – *Cadre de Vie et Sécurité*

France has had several CVSs since the 1980s, when the first surveys were conducted by the *Centre d'études sociologiques sur le droit et les institutions pénales* (CESDIP). Different CVSs have been conducted both at the national and local level, as well as on specific topics such as violence against women. The current survey, named *Cadre de Vie et Sécurité* has been conducted every year since 2007, under the leadership of the French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies (INSEE) and the French Supervisory Body on Crime and Punishment (ONDRP).

The French CVS has an average sample of around 15.000 respondents aged 14 and over for certain parts of the survey, and of around 12.000 respondents aged between 18 and 75 for other parts. Households are randomly selected from a master sample that is derived from the population census.

Data is collected through computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI), and computer-assisted self-interviewing (CASI) for sensitive questions. All respondents are asked questions on victimization and perceptions of insecurity. A specific feature of the *Cadre de Vie et Sécurité* is that the survey is divided into three questionnaires:

- A questionnaire on household victimization and the perception of insecurity, answered by the head of household (aged 14 and over);
- A questionnaire on personal victimization and the perception of insecurity, answered by a randomly selected member of the household (aged 14 and over);
- A question on personally-sensitive victimization (sexual violence, violence within the household), answered by the previous respondent (aged between 18 and 75).

With regard to victimization, respondents are asked a wide range of questions on victimization experience (i.e., household, vehicles, personal, and victimization within the household). Detailed questions are also asked with regard to the specific circumstances of the victimization event(s) (i.e., time, place, cost, consequences, author/s, modus operandi, report to the authorities, issues). It should be noted that these questions are related to events that happened during the *last two* years.

In relation to the perception of insecurity, the *Cadre de Vie et Sécurité* survey covers a large range of indicators: perception of general and local social problems; personal feelings of insecurity, both at home and in the neighbourhood; specific crime and anti-social behaviours; protection and avoiding behaviours; assessment of general and local police action as well as the justice system.

### 3.4 Hungary – *Victims and Opinions*

The history of CVSs in Hungary is more sporadic, since fewer surveys were conducted there. The first survey, known as “Victims and Opinions”, was in 2002-2003 by the National Institute of Criminology (OKRI). It is considered the first Hungarian CVS that is representative at a national level.

The sample for this survey is composed of roughly 10.000 individuals aged 18 and over. Data is collected through computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI), and computer-assisted self-interviewing (CASI) for sensitive questions. Respondents are asked questions about their experience of victimization, as well as their perception of (in)security.

With respect to victimization, respondents are asked a wide range of questions on 19 types of victimization (i.e., household, vehicles, personal). Questions related to the details of the victimization experience are also asked (i.e., time, place, cost, consequences, author/s, report to the authorities). It should be noted that these questions concern victimization that happened during the *last six months*.

On the perception of insecurity, this survey covers a large range of indicators: assessment of criminality at the national and local level, and its evolution over time; personal feeling of security in the neighbourhood; perception of neighbourhood social problems; protective and avoiding behaviours; assessment of police action in general.

Another survey was conducted within the European project “Crime Prevention Carousel”. This survey was conducted in 2005. Its sample is rather small (1.500 respondents), as it was only conducted at the local level. Indeed, the survey concerns three neighbourhoods in Budapest. This survey is not specifically focused on victimization, but rather on the perceptions of insecurity at the individual and local level. In this sense, questions from the survey are more diverse and detailed than in the previous survey. The questions cover a large range of indicators: perceptions of insecurity, notably fear of crime and the evaluation of victimization

risk; assessment of police and local authorities action at the local level, including trust in the authorities; assessment of neighbourhood's wellbeing, social problems and associated policies.

### 3.5 Italy – *Sicurezza dei cittadini*

As in France and Catalonia, Italy has had several CVSs, which were conducted both at the national and local levels. The current survey, named *Sicurezza dei cittadini*, was first conducted in 1997-1998 under the leadership of the *Istituto Nazionale di Statistica* (ISTAT). Subsequently, the survey was conducted in 2002, 2006, and 2008-2009. The frequency has now been changed to every five years.

The *Sicurezza dei cittadini* has had heterogeneous samples, ranging from roughly 2.000 respondents for the first survey to almost 16.000 in the most recent one. Respondents are individuals aged 14 and over, randomly selected within households. The households themselves are randomly selected from the list of landline phone subscribers. Data is collected through computer-assisted telephone interviewing (CATI). Respondents are asked questions on victimization and their perceptions of (in)security.

Concerning victimization, respondents are asked questions on their personal experience of crime (i.e., household, vehicles, personal), and on the details of the victimization experience (i.e., time, place, cost, consequences, author/s, modus operandi, report to the authorities, issues). It should be noted that, because of the frequency of the survey, questions concern victimization during the *last 3 years* as well as the *last 12 months*.

With reference to the perception of insecurity, the survey covers a large range of indicators: perception of personal security, notably the fear of crime in general and for specific offences; assessment of criminality and social problems at the local level; protective and avoiding behaviours; assessment of police action at the local level.

## 4. Overview of police crime-recording systems

For some time, police recorded crime (PRC) data have been an important indicator of criminality as well as police action. On the one hand, these data allow for measuring specific crimes that CVSs cannot (e.g., homicides, victimless crimes such as drug offences). On the other hand, these statistics are limited to those offences that are

reported to or noticed by the police. For this reason, it is commonly argued that PRC data better reflect the activity of police services than it does actual crime levels, resulting in the so-called “dark figure” of crime and delinquency. Nevertheless, the use of PRC statistics is crucial for the MARGIN project in terms of comparative analysis. An overview of PRC data sources are presented below with reference to their methodology, changes in recording practices, data availability, information on victims and offenders, and specific counting rules.

#### 4.1 Spain (Catalonia) – *Mossos d’Esquadra*

In Spain, police statistics are quite heterogeneous since they are produced by various institutions at different levels both nationally (i.e., Ministry of Interior) and locally (i.e., Basque country, Catalonia, Navarra). In Catalonia, the *Police of the Generalitat de Catalunya – Mossos d’Esquadra* (PG-ME) is the responsible for gathering police statistics based on crimes reported to and registered by its services. Although these statistics are considered the most reliable at the local level, “statistical conflict” might happen between different police services (for instance with the local police, *Guàrdia Urbana*).

The criteria for recording crime had remained the same since 2006, but the reform of the Criminal Code in July 2015 is likely to cause variations concerning the data collected by the police services. Consequently, it might be difficult to compare the two time periods (before and after 2015). However, this difficulty will not affect the MARGIN project because the selected time period is different.

PRC data is available monthly and yearly at the Catalan level, as well as at the local level (i.e., municipalities, districts, and neighbourhoods).

The statistics produced by the PG-ME include details on victims’ and offenders’ individual characteristics, such as age, sex and nationality. Concerning specific counting rules, if an incident comprises more than one offence, only the most serious offence is recorded.

#### 4.2 UK (England and Wales) – *Local police and the Home Office*

In the United Kingdom, police statistics are produced by various institutions, such as the Home Office (HO) for England and Wales, the Scottish Government, or the Police Service of Northern Ireland. In England and Wales specifically, police statistics are supplied by the HO to the Office for National Statistics (ONS). These statistics concern the 43 territorial police services in England and Wales, as well as the British

Transport Police. It should be noted that data only concerns the incidents that have been reported to services and that have been recorded as crimes.

These statistics have undergone important methodological changes. In 1998, the Home Office Counting Rules (HOCR) was revised in order to include additional offences and change the unity of count (victims instead of offences). Moreover, the National Crime Recording Standard (NCRS) was introduced in 2002, requiring police services to record events as crimes unless there was credible evidence to the contrary. For these reasons, it is extremely difficult to compare the different time periods (before and after 2002-2003). However, this difficulty will not affect the MARGIN project.

PRC data is available monthly and yearly at the national and local level. Basically, the coordinates provided for each crime allows aggregating data to any geographical unit, such as census areas or police districts.

These statistics include information on victims' and offenders' individual characteristics, such as age, gender, ethnicity and occupation. Moreover, the relationship between victims and offenders is also provided.

Concerning specific counting rules, if a procedure concerning only one victim is composed of more than one crime, only the most serious is recorded. Moreover, if the same crime affects two or more victims, this crime is recorded for each victim.

### 4.3 France – *National police and Gendarmerie*

In France, official crime statistics known as *État 4001* have been produced since 1972 by the two main police services (i.e., national police and national *gendarmerie*). These statistics concern attempted and committed offences that are reported to the police services for the first time, or that are recorded in any procedure transmitted to the judiciary authority. Several offences are excluded from these statistics: notably, contraventions, offences described in the Highway Code (including homicides resulting from them), offences recorded by other administrations, or procedures recorded in a *main-courante* (other official register).

PRC data is available monthly and yearly, at the national and local levels (i.e., region, department, city).

The *État 4001* is composed of 107 indexes corresponding to different types of offences, and of 12 columns containing data on clearance, custodies, and the *mis en*



*cause* (suspects). A physical or legal person is considered *mis en cause* as soon as there is circumstantial evidence that he or she has committed or attempted an offence recorded in police statistics.

These statistics include details on the *mis en cause's* individual characteristics, such as sex, age (minor / major), and nationality (French / other). It should be noted that the *État 4001* does not provide information on the victims.

Concerning specific counting rules, if an incident comprises more than one offence, only the most serious offence is recorded.

#### 4.4 Hungary – ENYÜBS

In Hungary, police statistics called *Egységes Nyomozóhatósági és Ügyészségi Bűnügyi Statisztika* (Unified System of Criminal Statistics of the Investigative Authorities and of Public Prosecution, ENYÜBS) have been produced since 1964. Since 2013, these statistics have been split into two databases (offences and offenders) based on:

- Act no. IV of 1978 of the “old” Criminal Code;
- Act C of 2012 of the “new” Criminal Code.

In other words, only the offences described in the Hungarian Criminal Code, and considered as crimes by investigative authorities and prosecution services, are actually recorded in the ENYÜBS. Similarly, individuals must be considered as offenders by these services before they are recorded in the databases. It should be noted that the investigation and prosecution phases are handled separately. During the second phase, data are processed by the *Vádemelési Információs Rendszer* (Prosecution Information System, VIR).

Data is available yearly, at the national and local level.

The ENYÜBS includes extremely detailed information on victims' and offenders' characteristics, such as sex, age, profession and citizenship. Additional characteristics are also provided for offenders, including education, marital status and recidivism. Finally, contextual factors are also included (i.e., influence of alcohol or drugs, relationship between victims and offenders).

Concerning specific counting rules, if an incident comprises more than one offence, only the most serious offence is recorded.

#### 4.5 Italy – *Polizia di Stato and Carabinieri*

In Italy, police statistics called *statistiche della delittuosità* have been produced since 1955 by the Ministry of Interior, and disseminated by the National Institute of Statistics (ISTAT). These statistics concern the offences that are reported to (or recorded by) the police services, and then transmitted to the judiciary authorities. In other words, they do not include offences that are not transmitted, or for which complaints are directly addressed to the prosecutors.

Until 2004, these statistics were produced by the main police services (i.e., national police, financial police, and the *Carabinieri*) at the provincial level, and then aggregated in a document named Model 165. In 2004, the introduction of a new data collection system, called *Sistema di Indagine* (System of Investigations, SDI), profoundly affected the Italian police statistics. On the one hand, the SDI allows more detailed statistics in terms of offence type, context, and individual characteristics. On the other hand, discontinuities and the fact that SDI data come from all police services have made the comparison of the two time periods (before and after 2004) difficult. However, this difficulty will not affect the MARGIN project.

PRC data is available monthly and yearly, at the national and local level (i.e., regional, provincial, city). At the city level, only county towns and municipalities of more than 250 000 inhabitants are provided with crime statistics.

The *statistiche della delittuosità* provide information on victims' and offenders' individual characteristics, such as sex, age, nationality and country of origin.

## 5. Addressing factors affecting insecurity

The need to take into consideration contextual factors when comparing statistics about crime, victimization and the perception of insecurity has been underlined by several authors both from the academic and the institutional point of view. Killias (2010), for instance, calls for collecting more *independent* variables (individual factors, lifestyle, routine activities, nightlife, etc.) to better understand why crime increases or decreases. According to this author, without explanatory variables that may help to understand differences, trends and changes, policymakers will have little interest in CVs. This approach to insecurity is the key to allowing policymakers to better cope with crime-related issues as well as to predict and influence future trends. With this in mind, a review of the factors that have been found to have an impact on the perception of insecurity is presented below.

## 5.1 Victimization and crime as predictors of perceived insecurity

Despite the traditional approach, which considers that there is “a baseline connection between the amount of crime and the level of fear of crime” (Cordner, 2010, p. 16), the perception of insecurity arises as a far more complex phenomenon. For instance, most researchers showed that the personal experience of crime and previous victimization could be a significant predictor of the perception of insecurity (Barabás, 2014; Condon, Lieber and Maillachon, 2005; Garoscio, 2006; Russo and Roccato, 2010; Sabbadini and Muratore, 2009; Zauberman et al., 2013), but similarly individuals and groups may show high levels of fear even if they have not experienced victimization. In an extensive meta-analysis, Doran and Burgess (2012) conclude for instance that victimization does not necessarily affect the perception of insecurity.

The relation between victimization and the perception of insecurity is not that simple, and recorded victimization incidents alone are not able to explain one’s feeling of insecurity. Roché (1993) argues for instance that the effect of victimization is mitigated by social networks. When individuals have open *uniplex* networks, their perceptions of insecurity tend to be influenced by their own victimization; on the contrary, when individuals have closed *multiplex* networks, their perceptions are more likely to be influenced by the victimization experiences of others. Similarly, Russo and Roccato (2010) note that direct and indirect victimization have different effects on the perception of insecurity.

What is more, the effect of victimization on the perception of insecurity changes depending on the type and frequency of victimization. Notably, Garoscio (2006) notes that the perception of insecurity dramatically increases with repeated victimization. Similarly, extreme forms of violence such as rape are more likely to increase women’s fear (Agüero, 2013; Condon et al., 2005; Hanley and Ruppner, 2015; Sabbadini and Muratore, 2009).

Another crucial finding is that the experience of “soft crimes” (also known as low intensity violence, anti-social behaviours, or incivility) has a strong effect on the perception of insecurity (Battistelli, 2011; Condon et al., 2005; De Maillard and Roché, 2004; Echazarra, 2014; Gavín, 2010; Lefèvre, 2014; Muratore and Tagliacozzo, 2008; Sabbadini and Muratore, 2009; Sette, 2014). Individuals perceive incivilities as threats, thus increasing their perceptions of insecurity. Roché (1993) also argues that incivilities are even more relevant to understanding the perception of insecurity, since individuals can experience incivility on a daily basis. The effect of incivility can also explain why higher levels of perceived insecurity do not necessarily correlate with the areas most affected by crime.

## 5.2 Demographic factors

Sex and age are both strong predictors of the perception of insecurity. Women are likely to express higher levels of fear, while the elderly are more likely to express higher levels of fear and social concern (Condon, Lieber and Maillochon, 2005; Dittmann, 2005; Hanley and Ruppner, 2015; LaGrange and Ferraro, 1987; Le Goff, 2011; Sutton and Farrall, 2005). These trends can appear paradoxical, because these two demographic groups are both less likely to be victimized and to personally experience crime.

The concept cited most often to explain this discrepancy is vulnerability, which can be described as both “natural” and “perceived”. According to the “natural” vulnerability hypothesis, women and the elderly are more vulnerable to crime because of their weaker physical condition and inability to protect themselves against offenders. Moreover, these two demographic groups may be more vulnerable to specific crimes (e.g., harassment and sexual violence for women, burglaries and frauds for the elderly). However, the “natural” vulnerability hypothesis has been challenged for being deterministic and over-simplifying (Condon, Lieber and Maillochon, 2005; Lieber, 2008). On the contrary, the “perceived” vulnerability hypothesis seems more adequate to explain the stronger perception of insecurity of specific demographic groups. From this perspective, vulnerability is socially constructed and then integrated by those groups who *perceive* themselves as more vulnerable. In this regard, Maffei and Markopoulou (2013) report that socialization is crucial when it comes to explaining, for instance, the differences in the way that men and women experience fear. In their opinion, “the socialization model shows that women are socialized into fear and to behave in a more reserved way while men are taught to be brave and to take risks” (p. 123). Notably, men are socially pressured to appear less vulnerable and conform to masculinity, and consequently tend to express lower feelings of insecurity (Sutton and Farrall, 2005).

## 5.3 Socio-economic factors

**Health:** physical and mental health, as a general indicator of well-being, tend to have an impact on the perception of insecurity. Individuals with precarious health conditions or disabilities are more likely to express stronger insecurity, notably concerning fear of crime (Gargiulo, Iannucci and Tinto, 2012; Graham and Chaparro, 2011; Jackson and Stafford, 2009; Lorenc et al. 2012; Pearson and Breetzke, 2014). This is probably due to physical vulnerability, the withdrawal from social life, or generalized fear caused by a degraded state.

**Ethnicity:** even if this variable has not been largely investigated, ethnicity is likely to influence the perception of insecurity (Andreescu, 2013; Sette, 2014). Non-nationals (whether they are immigrants or not) and individuals belonging to “visible minorities” tend to express higher levels of perceived insecurity. However, it is difficult to assess whether such negative perceptions of their safety depend on ethnicity itself and being a victim of racism, or because foreigners tend to suffer from a concentration of social disadvantages and live in deprived areas (Pan Ké Shon, 2007, 2012).

**Marital status, family and parenthood:** familial relationships are likely to have an impact on the perception of insecurity. It has been shown, for instance, that the perception of insecurity tends to increase when individuals are living alone (Le Goff, 2011) and to decrease for those who are married or have a partner (Condon, Lieber and Maillochon, 2005; Sabbadini and Muratore, 2009). However, it should be noted that marriage functions differently for women and men: married women are more reassured, whereas married men are less reassured – one may infer that there is an increase of fear *for the partner* (Pinkster, 2014). Also, being pregnant or having children is likely to have a positive effect on the perception of insecurity *for the children* (Zauberman et al., 2013). Similarly, it is possible that there is a transfer of fear for oneself to fear for others.

**Employment and income:** employment and income are strong predictors for the perception of insecurity. Usually, the unemployed and people with lower incomes are more likely to express stronger feelings of insecurity, both with respect to fear of crime and social concern (Hummelsheim, Hirtenlehner, Jackson and Oberwittler, 2011; Vieno, Roccato and Russo, 2013). On the contrary, individuals with stable jobs and with higher incomes are less insecure. They are also more able to cope with the perception of insecurity (e.g., buying residential or personal protection, moving out, etc.). Similarly, employment and income are considered as measures of well-being, which can decrease the perception of insecurity.

**Education:** an individual’s level of education is significantly associated with the perception of insecurity. In particular, individuals with no education or lower levels of education tend to have higher levels of perceived insecurity (Barabás, Irk and Kovács, 2004; Sette, 2014; Zauberman et al., 2013). On the contrary, higher education, as an element of social capital, is likely to soothe these feelings and help one to cope with fear.

**Media consumption:** perceptions of insecurity and media consumption are often associated, but the literature studying this relation has proven inconsistent. Indeed, Garcia-Espana and colleagues (2010) argue that individuals exposed to daily news on

criminality tend to have stronger perceptions of insecurity. Similarly, De Maillard and Roché (2004) noted that mass media have dedicated increasing time to the coverage of crime since the 1970s-1980s, which may have influenced the way individuals perceive insecurity. On the other hand, Roché (1993) and Dittmann (2005) find no strong support for the media's impact on feelings of insecurity. In other words, the potential effect of media consumption is likely to be mitigated by other factors (e.g., media type, frequency, individual characteristics such as education). Currently, the interest in studying the relationship between fear of crime and media consumption is growing (Callanan and Rosenberger, 2011; Cashmore, 2014; Greer, 2011; Greer and McLaughlin, 2011; Jewkes, 2011; Surette, 2011).

#### 5.4 Socio-geographic factors

**Urban and rural areas:** the perception of insecurity varies depending on the geographic location and the distinction between urban and rural settings. Notably, the perception of insecurity tend to be stronger in large urban settings, which may be due to social mixing (González and Murria, 2011), fear of victimization (Roché, 1993), the prevalence of predatory crime (Sabbadini and Muratore, 2009; Sacchini, 2009), or the presence of immigrants who are often associated with insecurity (Bell and Machin, 2012; Ceobanu, 2011; Müller and Fisher, 2015). Researchers have also demonstrated that people living in cities are more likely to be victims of crime than those in rural areas (Apraxine et al., 2012; Dixon et al., 2006).

It is important to note that the analysis of the perception of insecurity in rural contexts has not received as much attention as in urban contexts. Yet this does not mean that fear and social concern are absent from the countryside (Kaylen and Pridemore, 2013). On the contrary, these perceptions are likely to function differently. Roché (1993) suggests that insecurity in rural settings is less related to fear of victimization but more to the preservation of a traditional moral order, which is perceived as threatened. This hypothesis has been also confirmed by more recent analysis (Chichignoud, 2004; Lefèvre, 2014).

**Collective efficacy/disorder in the neighbourhood:** In order to understand the impact of neighbourhood characteristics on crime or the fear of crime, the social disorganisation theory (Brunton-Smith and Sturgis, 2011; Permentier, Bolt, and van Ham, 2011; Sampson and Raudenbush, 2004) provides a useful framework. The theory states that communities with a greater collective efficacy – which broadly reflects a community's cohesion, its ability to exert informal social control, and its likelihood of intervening to stop a crime – will experience fewer violent crime events. From this point of view, a large body of empirical work has attempted to link

structural characteristics of neighbourhoods to violent crime. Brunton-Smith and colleagues (2014) note that if a number of studies have given evidence for the theory with respect to US communities and neighbourhoods, support for this theory in Europe has been less convincing. They have thus considered whether collective efficacy and signs of neighborhood disorder influences not the rate of crime but rather the fear of crime and public beliefs. Both collective efficacy and neighborhood disorder are found to strongly influence worries and beliefs about violent crime.

**Deprived areas:** understanding the relationship between deprived areas and the perception of insecurity is crucial for the MARGIN project. The vast majority of studies find that deprived, marginalized areas also exhibit higher levels of perceived insecurity, both individual fear and social concern. Residents of these areas are more likely to be insecure and dissatisfied. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the high levels of fear and social concern in deprived areas is not necessarily associated with high levels of crime. Indeed, many researchers argue that the areas where insecurity is strong are not always the areas deeply affected by crime and delinquency (Battistelli, 2011; Lefèvre, 2014; Murria, González and Cónsola, 2014; Sacchini, 2009). For instance, Zauberman and colleagues (2013) note that the perception of insecurity is high in deprived areas where residents are often victimized, but also in other deprived areas where residents are barely victimized at all.

Marginalized areas are places of social disorganisation, they demonstrate a decline of community efficacy and urban decay, which are significantly related to higher levels of perceived insecurity. Pan Ké Shon (2012) argues that residents of deprived neighbourhoods are more likely to feel insecure, even after controlling for individual characteristics, and to associate insecurity with serious forms of violence as well as social disorder (e.g., incivilities, threats, insults, graffiti, street drinking, drug use). Similarly, in marginalized areas residents are more inclined to associate the perception of insecurity with the presence of “troublemakers”, usually the youth and the foreigners (Echazarra, 2014; Garoscio, 2006; Lefèvre, 2014). Such associations may reflect xenophobic and racist attitudes, but it is also due to the fact that young people and foreigners are overrepresented in deprived areas.

Finally, marginalized neighbourhoods concentrate social disadvantages: degraded buildings and environment, social housing, high unemployment rates, low incomes, low education levels, family dissolution, and so on (EUCPN, 2004; Pan Ké Shon, 2007). According to Winton (2004), “in situations of widespread and severe inequality, the urban poor are undervalued and marginalized, and their daily living conditions heighten the potential for the emergence of conflict, crime or violence” (p. 166). From this perspective, these areas usually combine the factors that are likely to increase one’s perceptions of insecurity. This also explains why, in

marginalized areas, feeling of insecurity may be dramatically higher than one might expect when compared to the actual crime rate.

**Mobility (moving out):** mobility, defined as the desire to move away from one's neighbourhood or area, is also significantly related to the perception of insecurity (Pan Ké Shon, 2007; Roché, 1993). Insecure individuals as well as residents of poor neighbourhoods are more likely to express such a desire. Crime and insecurity are often mentioned as a reason for moving out (Small and Feldman, 2012). Yet, it should be noted that not all individuals express this desire to actually move out. This may be due to old age, financial reasons, or even attachment to the neighbourhood that overcomes insecurity (Le Goff, 2011; Pan Ké Shon, 2012).

### 5.5 The situational perspective

**Dynamic approach to the perceptions of insecurity:** according to previous studies, the fear of crime is associated with crime itself on the one hand, and to the socio-economic, socio-geographic and demographic environment in which the crime occurs on the other hand. Solymosi and colleagues (2015) propose a new approach, which consists of treating the fear of crime as a situational phenomenon. From this point of view, the fear of crime can vary in space and time with the routine activities of individuals. The authors highlight some of the problems with existing measurements of fear of crime that can be obtained from surveys and instead emphasize the importance of assessing fear of crime using small "microspatial" units of analysis. The results support the hypothesis that fear of crime varies over time and by microspatial units across individuals. This suggests that future attempts at measuring fear of crime should account for this variation, otherwise biases may affect data collection.

**Avoiding behaviours:** from this perspective, taking into account the behavioural element of insecurity, individuals tend to adapt their behaviours and routines according to their perceptions of insecurity (San-Juan, Vozmediano and Vergara, 2012; van Eijk, 2012). Notably, individuals avoid places considered to be dangerous, or going out at night. Yet, this restriction of mobility does not affect demographic groups equally: women are more likely to exhibit avoiding behaviours (Condon, Lieber and Maillochon, 2005), while this is not the case for the elderly (Le Goff, 2011).



## 6. Best practices in reducing insecurity

From the perspective of Guillén (2011), a review of the strategies for preventing public feelings of insecurity reveals two different models. Firstly, the idea of crime exists as a rational choice. Since citizens are free to choose whether to comply with the rules or not, public authorities should punish those who break the rules. In such a context, measures such as video-surveillance or police patrolling arise as reasonable measures to tackle insecurity. Secondly, public authorities may opt for an approach targeting social inequalities that have been proven to influence the perception of insecurity. This model is based on the assumption that crime, offences and insecurity occur in the framework of specific spatial, social and political contexts. From this view, crime prevention strategies should have the objective of modifying the setting and the circumstances that generate insecurity.

Each one of these models generates specific interventions to deal with fear reduction and, according to an extensive review of the literature, it is possible to distinguish at least two main approaches: on the one hand, police-centred crime prevention and, on the other, knowledge-based initiatives oriented toward social prevention.

### 6.1 Police-centred crime prevention

As argued by Cordner (2010), this approach to fear reduction has been evolving over the previous decades and it is now possible to outline some best practices that have been identified as successful. Cordner's study, commissioned by the Office of Community Oriented Policing Services of the US Department of Justice, reveals that there is moderate to strong evidence supporting the following approaches:

1. Reducing crime may (sometimes) reduce fear even if, as stated above, this approach *per se* is not sufficient;
2. Key studies have shown that professional policing, which includes a wide range of strategies (motorized patrols, rapid response, follow-up investigation of crimes, etc.), is not very productive. For instance, the preventive patrol experiment, which includes a variation of the levels of motorized patrols in Kansas City between zero patrol units per beat to 2-3 patrol units per beat for a year, shows no relevant changes in the public's fear of crime;
3. Despite their potential collateral effects (analysed, among others, by Wunsch, 2006; Barthe, 2006), crime prevention strategies seem to reduce fear of crime. Nevertheless, the effectiveness of these measures varies from

- low (i.e., self-restricted behaviours, use of alarms, locks, dogs, CCTV, etc.) to high (i.e., street lighting). In particular, Atkins, Husain and Storey (1991) showed that street lighting improves women's perception of safety;
4. Community crime prevention and public confidence in police reduce fear. According to the US Department of Justice, "there is plenty of evidence that communities that enjoy more neighbourliness, social cohesion, social capital, and collective efficacy also experience less fear of crime" (Cordner, 2010, p. 18). Community crime prevention is even more effective when linked with community policing, a strategy encompassing a wide range of measures including police officers on foot patrol, increased police-citizen contact, and information exchange between police and the public. The establishment of such a police-community partnership shows positive effects on fear of crime and may also lead to increased public confidence in police work, which in turn, has been proved to increase feelings of safety (as showed, for instance, by the research project FIDUCIA, funded under FP7: Maffei and Markopoulou, 2013);
  5. While a reduction of social disorder and antisocial behaviour may also reduce fear (especially among specific social groups), the effectiveness of this approach has not been verified through in-depth empirical studies.

Once these five clusters of good practices for reducing fear have been established, Cordner (2010) concludes that the most effective approach in reducing fear is **problem-oriented policing**. Compared with the above-mentioned measures, a problem-oriented approach leads to a more targeted intervention focused on specific issues, places, behaviours and people. In particular, Cordner argues in favour of the SARA process that could be summarized as follows:

- **S**canning to determine whether fear of crime is a problem;
- **A**nalysis of the causes of fear and differences between neighbourhoods;
- **R**esponses specifically addressed to the identified problem(s);
- **A**ssessment of the implemented responses.

To sum up, this study commissioned by the US Department of Justice, while mainly focused on North America, seems to fit with the purpose of this section since it reveals the internationally recognized prominence of including "fear reduction among the explicit components of the modern police mission" (Cordner, 2010, p. ix). With this in mind, reducing crime (which may lead to making people safer) is only part of a problem that needs to be complemented with measures that can make people *feel* safer.

On the other side of the Atlantic, Zagrodzki (2012) also argues that contemporary policing has been continually balancing two different models: a “professional” model, based on police core activities and law enforcement, which is often associated with zero tolerance, and a “community-based” model, also known as community policing. In the opinion of its supporters, the added value of the latter is the establishment of a secure climate in a given area or neighbourhood, as well as a trustworthy relationship between police officers and citizens. In other words, community policing may lead to an effective reduction of both objective and subjective insecurity.

In Europe, local and national experiences of **community policing** have been extremely interesting in terms of reducing the perception of insecurity (Jeandesboz and Ragazzi, 2010; Selmini, 2009). For instance, in France, *ilôtiers* (community police officers) and municipal police officers, patrolling on foot or bike, managed to create a close relationship with residents, and to actually reduce the perception of insecurity (EUCPN, 2004; Malochet, 2010; Mouhanna, 2010; Zagrodzki, 2012). In Catalonia, Gavin (2010) describes a similar trend when arguing for the implementation of the *politica de civismo* (civic policy) in Barcelona, enforced by the local police (Guardia Urbana), with the objective of regulating and managing behaviour in public spaces, notably incivility and anti-social behaviours. In Italy, municipal police are also engaged in night patrolling and territory surveillance (e.g., specific neighbourhoods, schools, or public goods).

All in all, community policing appears to be an effective policy for tackling insecurity, both real and perceived, by creating a secure and trustworthy relationship between police officers and the residents of a given area. Yet, it should be noted that European experiences of community policing have been affected by restrictions. For instance, in France, budget reductions, institutional resistance and the *politique du chiffre* (statistics-oriented policy), have led to the decline of community policing (Malochet, 2010; Mouhanna, 2010; Zagrodzki, 2012). Furthermore, from the perspective of Wacquant (2011), it can also be argued that policies such as the Civic Ordinance of Barcelona or the Antisocial Behaviour Order in the UK have led to the stigmatization of marginalized social groups.

An alternative solution to community policing is represented by **situational prevention measures**, a model that has recently received considerable development. The objective of situational prevention is not to tackle the sources of crime and insecurity, but rather to reduce criminal opportunities and make crime more difficult to commit. Situational prevention measures are extremely diverse and include (while not limited to):

- Increased police patrols and increased presence of security guards (Guillén, 2011; Selmini, 2009);
- Street lighting (Atkins, Husain and Storey, 1991; EUCPN, 2004);
- Urbanism and the creation of physical barriers (Benbouzid, 2010; Soomeren et al., 2008);
- Administrative control and regulation of social life, such as the presence of individuals associated with insecurity, opening hours of public places, clearance of occupied buildings (Doran and Burgess, 2012; Gavín, 2010; Wacquant, 2000).

However, the most iconic measure of situational prevention is certainly represented by the increased use of **video-surveillance**, also referred as CCTV (closed-circuit television). Indeed, most developed countries have been developing this approach to reduce crime as well as the perception of insecurity (EUCPN, 2004; De Maillard and Roché, 2004; Galdon, 2011; Le Goff, 2010; Lieber, 2008). This development is also due to financial help and a relaxed legal framework (Le Goff, 2010). On the one hand, video-surveillance is believed to have a deterring effect on potential criminals. On the other hand, this effect is thought to reduce the perception of insecurity, notably the fear of crime, among citizens. Lefèvre (2014) and Le Goff (2010) argue that such an approach had a deterring and reassuring effect, but only in closed spaces (e.g., car parks, shops, transports, or hospitals) and for property crimes. On the contrary, the use of video-surveillance in public spaces, where harassment or incivility is more likely to occur, has not proven to be effective enough. Moreover, cameras – and technology in general – are more likely to reassure only certain demographic groups. For instance, Lieber (2008) noted that women are less reassured by cameras rather than by security guards. Another drawback of video-surveillance, pointed by Doran and Burgess (2012), is that the dramatic increase in the use of cameras actually can deteriorate community life, or even makes certain individuals more insecure.

To sum up, situational prevention appears to be effective policy for reducing the perception of insecurity. Yet, it has been proved that such an approach does not directly tackle the sources of insecurity but only their manifestations. Put concretely, situational prevention measures appear to be effective only as short-term policies.

While not exhaustive, the review of police-centred approaches on fear reduction allows for some general conclusions. As stated by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC, 2015b; 2010), while government should take the lead in implementing crime prevention strategies, it is nowadays clear that partnerships between law enforcement agencies and civil society are deemed crucial in order to

increase safety. During the Thirteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (UNODC, 2015a), an argument was made in favour of the concept of subsidiarity, that is to say that, “when a problem is identified as being specific to a locality, it should be dealt with locally by the responsible local authorities” (p. 5) in collaboration with public-private partnerships. After all, the United Nations’ approach is based on reaffirming the cross-cutting nature of crime prevention through the development of grass-roots initiatives to promote public contribution to crime prevention efforts (i.e., alternative justice processes, paralegal services programmes, neighbourhood and community policing, etc.).

Cooperation and **partnerships between local actors** are common in most European countries: audits in the United Kingdom, *contrats locaux de sécurité* in France, and *protocolli* or *contratti di sicurezza* in Italy. Although such policies were already used in the 1990s, they have mostly been developed during the 2000s, under the influence of local officials (notably, mayors) and the need for security “co-production” (Barabás, Irk and Kovács, 2004; De Maillard and Roché, 2004; Lefèvre, 2014). These partnerships are usually placed under the authority of the mayor, or of the State representative at the local level. Their members are local stakeholders from diverse backgrounds, such as the police, prosecutors, urbanists, social workers, school representatives, and associations. Usually, local partnerships have two main goals: to implement national policies at the local level, by taking into account specific local characteristics; and, to identify local issues and develop policies to address them, which are most often related to social action and education.

In this perspective, local partnerships enable formal dialogue between national and local institutions. Such flexibility is a chance to understand environmental and social settings of a given area or neighbourhood (Doran and Burgess, 2012). Consequently, local partnerships appear as the best way to develop situational and social prevention policies, and to take community-policing measures. However, Dunavölgyi (2005) argues that citizens are not always aware that public security is produced by such partnerships. However, most authors point out difficulties inherent to the involvement of different groups in such partnerships, depending on the heterogeneity of professional cultures that may lead to competition instead of collaboration (De Maillard and Roché, 2004; Lefèvre, 2014; Selmini, 2011). Such difficulties must be overcome in order to ensure that local partnerships are effective.

## 6.2 Knowledge-based initiatives

As stated by the ICPC report (2014), knowledge-based crime prevention initiatives “encompass a number of concepts, but principally entail the application of good research principles and theory, and well-constructed evaluation methods” (p. 28). Based on the contribution of Blomberg and colleagues (2013), the authors of this report outline four examples of the use of research by policymakers and practitioners:

- Tactical use, referring to the use of evidence to endorse existing policies;
- Imposed use, where findings support only evidence-based practices;
- Instrumental use, linked to the exploitation of evidence for specific policies;
- Conceptual use, allowing for the definition of a problem and its causes.

Apart from the different uses of evidence-based research, a review of the literature shows that it is definitely assumed by policymakers and practitioners that the implementation of policies to reduce fear should be based on knowledge-based approaches aimed at *targeting fear* (Cordner, 2010, p. x) through an **in-depth measurement and analysis of the determinants of insecurity**. With this in mind, the Handbook on the Crime Prevention Guidelines (UNODC, 2010, pp. 55-62) enumerates the following knowledge-based initiatives that have been tested and shown to be effective:

- Knowledge of the incidence and prevalence of crime-related problems;
- Knowledge of the causes of crime and victimization;
- Knowledge of existing policies and good practices;
- Knowledge of the process of implementing programmes and measuring their outcomes and impacts.

The conclusions gathered by the Handbook of the UNODC (2010) clearly endorse the MARGIN project’s approach since they consider the exploitation of data sources on crime (PRC) and related problems (CVSs) as essential in order to implement a knowledge-based approach to the reduction of insecurity. Furthermore, it is deemed crucial to **collect alternative information sources** (which is the aim of WP3) such as population censuses, household surveys, public health information, statistics from housing and environmental departments, justice and prison services as well as information from civil society organizations and the private sector.

The exploitation of a wide range of data sources that allow for **the definition of the social causes of insecurity** lead to the broadest possible approach to crime

prevention and fear reduction, which is supported by the United Nations Economic and Social Council in the framework of resolution 2014/21 on Strengthening social policies as a tool for crime prevention (ECOSOC, 2014). The resolution encourages “Member States to develop and implement, as appropriate, comprehensive policies and programmes that, by fostering social development, are aimed at the prevention of crime and violence and that address the multiple factors that contribute to crime and victimization, in close cooperation with relevant stakeholders, including civil society, and based on available evidence and good practices”.

In line with the above, the **social prevention approach** is particularly prominent when it comes to addressing the social roots of insecurity. Selmini (2009) notes that such an approach encompasses various domains, such as urbanism, public health, family, education, work, as well as integration measures. More generally, the author differentiates between two broad categories of social prevention, which are often implemented in a “mixed” model: object-oriented prevention, which is mainly associated with the urban environment (i.e., re-qualification, street furniture, activity in public spaces, etc.), and subject-oriented prevention. The aim of the former is to overcome urban decay, but also to improve collective efficacy and quality of life. The latter targets individuals with high levels of perceived insecurity by implementing measures such as social assistance to the residents of marginalized areas, integration for individuals at risk of exclusion, support to victims, physical or psychological assistance, etc. Social prevention and its diverse measures were shown to be among the most effective long-term strategies for dealing with feelings of insecurity, especially in deprived areas. Yet, it should be noted that such an approach is sometimes difficult to implement, because the various domains of action (e.g., public health) do not always fall under the competence of local authorities.

### 6.3 Using CVSs as a tool for policy-making

In the framework of knowledge-based initiatives, crime and victimization surveys are considered an important resource for collecting information about the social determinants of the perceived insecurity experienced by citizens. Nevertheless, according to Killias (2010), CVSs would only interest policymakers if they helped to understand differences and trends in terms of crime, victimization and the perception of insecurity. In order to do so, CVSs need to go further with a process of standardization allowing for the conceptualization of analytical definitions of the perception of insecurity and to prioritize issues in a specific area.

Nowadays, victimization surveys are used extensively used at the international level. Among other examples, the initiative of the UNODC and UN-Habitat under the Safer

Cities Programme stands out, which enabled the implementation of CVSs in several cities in Africa and in Papua New Guinea. In these contexts, CVSs represent a powerful tool in order to explore crime-related issues especially because police statistics are not easily available. UNODC together with the Economic Commission for Europe have also developed a *Manual on Victimization Surveys* (UNODC, 2009), which has been piloted in several countries including the United Republic of Tanzania, Rwanda and Uganda. This manual provides a set of guidelines enabling national governments to establish standards and common definitions as well as to overcome methodological problems.

In summary, based on the different national experiences in implementing CVSs it is now possible to identify several ways in which survey-based data can be used in order to guide public intervention:

1. **Examining the relationship between victimization and perceived insecurity:** even if the relationship between victimization, perception of insecurity, fear and social concern is complex, policymakers should be able to identify this relationship and target specific groups by taking into account refined CVS questions on victimization and individual characteristics (UNODC, 2011; Zauberman, 2008);
2. **Creating a typology of marginalized territories:** a review of the literature shows that the perception of insecurity tends to be stronger in deprived areas but not necessarily in areas where crime is prevalent. As showed by recent research (Kershaw and Tseloni, 2005; Murrià et al., 2014), combining objective and subjective measures of crime may allow for identifying those territories most likely to record high levels of insecurity so as to develop targeted interventions;
3. **Developing diversified interventions addressing specific social groups:** this initiative can be seen as the natural continuation of the previous step. Researchers analysing CVS data managed to create typologies of insecure individuals, whether they were afraid or socially concerned or both (Pan Ké Shon, 2012; Zauberman et al., 2013). By taking into account CVS data on victimization, perceptions of insecurity and individual characteristics, policymakers should be able to target those individuals or social groups most vulnerable to feelings of insecurity (Muggah, 2012). The International Violence Against Women Survey is an example of an instrument used to analyse specific crime problems, such as violence against women, one of the main categories of under-reported crime. These kinds of surveys may provide valuable information on the extent of such violence and the characteristics of the victims in order to implement personalized interventions;



4. **Improving quality of life:** higher feelings of insecurity are significantly associated with urban decay and the decline of community. Currently, CVS questions address more or less deeply these trends (e.g., neighbourhood's problems and needs, neighbourhood's social life and cohesion, avoiding behaviours, desire to move out and its reasons). By taking into account this kind of data, policymakers should be able to identify local issues that must be addressed urgently, whether they are related to urban re-qualification or social re-vitalization (United Nations Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, 2014; UN-HABITAT, 2015);
5. **Assessing police action:** CVSs allow for the collection of information on how citizens assess the work of the police and public authorities dealing with insecurity in three ways: at the global level, at the local level and with regards to a specific event. In this perspective, CVSs appear to be an ideal tool for independently assessing police action as well as citizens' expectations concerning police forces (Bradford, Stanko and Jackson, 2009). By taking into account survey-based data on police assessment, policymakers should be able to allocate police resources where they are the most needed. In the end, CVSs appear to be a good basis for the implementation of community policing measures;
6. **Implementing and monitoring local policies:** CVSs contain indicators that can be used for the local assessment of problems (e.g., victimization, perceptions of insecurity, police assessment, socio-economic individual indicators, socio-geographic indicators). By taking this content into account and establishing local priorities, local stakeholders can develop partnerships, in terms of social prevention for instance. In this sense, the frequency of CVSs is a valuable asset: because of the regularity of these surveys, policymakers should be able to monitor the implementation of these policies, as well as their results over time.

Nevertheless, despite the undeniable added value of CVSs, in order to realize their full potential as a tool for developing evidence-based public policies, the following challenges remain:

1. Consolidating victimization surveys as a method allowing for the integration and supplementation of police recorded crime;
2. Progressing in terms of territorial analysis and comparability by collecting information about territories and clusters of local areas;
3. Progressing in terms of knowledge on the perception of insecurity by broadening the focus on those indicators and enabling an analysis of the quality of life and social cohesion;

4. Regaining the potential of surveys for conveying citizens' opinions and gathering information about the assessment of police work and citizens' expectations in relation to public security policies;
5. Making up for knowledge limitations by designing and carrying out surveys targeted to specific social groups and, particularly, those most at risk of social exclusion.

## 7. Conclusions

Perceived insecurity is considered a critical social problem encompassing several dimensions that are difficult to analyse. The state-of-the-art review shows that a wide range of factors can influence feelings of insecurity: previous experience(s) of victimization, demographic factors, socio-economic characteristics, the environmental setting and situational perspective. Consequently, perceived insecurity can be addressed from different perspectives and by diverse public policies: community policing, situational and social prevention, local partnerships, etc. Within the knowledge-based approach to reducing insecurity, CVSs appear as privileged tools to guide policymakers in their understanding of this social phenomenon and that could help them to reduce feelings of insecurity among citizens, notably in marginalized areas. To sum up, according to González and Murrià (2010), it is imperative dealing with (in)security issues in the broadest way possible and in a way that is not just limited to controlling crime, but instead includes a variety of measures (e.g., economic, social, educational, cultural, urban) aimed at tackling insecurity in all its heterogeneity.

## References

- Abizanda, B., Serra Hoffman, J., Marmolejo, L. and Duryea, S. (2012). *Citizen Security: Conceptual Framework and Empirical Evidence*. Discussion Paper IDB-DP-232. Washington: IDB.
- Agüero, J. M. (2013). *Causal estimates of the intangible costs of violence against women in Latin America and the Caribbean*. IDB Working Paper Series No. IDB-WP-414. Washington: Inter-American Development Bank.
- Andreescu, V. (2013). Fear of Violent Victimization among the Foreign-Born. *Journal of Identity and Migration Studies*, 7, 69–131.
- Apraxine, P., et al. (2012). *Urban violence and humanitarian challenges*. Joint European Institute for Security Studies (EUISS) – International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) Colloquium: Brussels.  
[http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/Urban\\_violence\\_and\\_humanitarian\\_challenges.pdf](http://www.iss.europa.eu/uploads/media/Urban_violence_and_humanitarian_challenges.pdf)
- Atkins, S., Husain, S. and Storey, A. (1991). *The Influence of Street Lighting on Crime and Fear of Crime*. London: Home Office.  
[www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/prgpdfs/fcpu28.pdf](http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/prgpdfs/fcpu28.pdf)
- Barabás, T. (2014). Victimization and fear of crime. *European Police Science and Research Bulletin*, 10, 20-23.
- Barabás, T., Irk, F. and Kovács, R. (2004). The Hungarian Case. In: EU Research on Social Sciences and Humanities, *Insecurities in European Cities: Crime-Related Fears within the Context of New Anxieties and Community-Based Crime Prevention* (pp. 62-77). Brussels.
- Barthe, E. (2006). *Crime Prevention Publicity Campaigns: Response Guide No. 5*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.
- Battistelli, F. (2011). Sicurezza Urbana: Il paradosso dell'insicurezza e il dilemma della prevenzione. *Rassegna italiana di sociologia*, 52(2), 201-228.
- Beck, U. (1998). *La sociedad del riesgo. Hacia una nueva modernidad*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Bell, B. and Machin, S. (2012). *The Crime – Immigration Nexus: Evidence from recent research*. CESifo DICE Report No. 1.
- Benbouzid, B. (2010). Comment rendre la sécurité acceptable dans l'urbanisme? *Les cahiers de l'Institut d'Aménagement et d'Urbanisme d'Ile-de-France*, 155, 30-32.

- Blomberg, T.G., Metre, J. and Mann, K. (2013). Seeking causality in a world of contingency. *Criminology, Causality and Public Policy. Criminology & Public Policy*, 12(4), 571-584.
- Boivin, R. and Cordeau, G. (2011). Measuring the Impact of Police Discretion on Official Crime Statistics: A Research Note. *Police Quarterly*, 14(2), 186-203.
- Bradford, B., Stanko, E. and Jackson, J. (2009). Using Research to Inform Policy: The Role of Public Attitude Surveys in Understanding Public Confidence and Police Contact. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*.
- Brunton-Smith, I., Jackson, J. and Sutherland, A. (2014). Bridging structure and perception: On the neighbourhood ecology of beliefs and worries about violent crime. *British Journal of Criminology*, 54, 503–526.
- Brunton-Smith, I. and Sturgis, P. (2011). Do neighborhoods generate fear of crime? An empirical test using the British Crime Survey. *Criminology*, 49(2), 331-369.
- Callanan, V. and Rosenberger, J. (2011). Media and public perceptions of the police: the impact of race and personal experience. *Policing & Society*, 21(2), 167-189.
- Cashmore, J. (2014). The 'Fear of Crime-Media Feedback' Cycle. *Internet Journal of Criminology*.  
[http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com/Cashmore\\_The\\_Fear\\_of\\_Crime-Media\\_Feedback\\_Cycle\\_IJC\\_Jan\\_2014.pdf](http://www.internetjournalofcriminology.com/Cashmore_The_Fear_of_Crime-Media_Feedback_Cycle_IJC_Jan_2014.pdf)
- Ceobanu, A. (2011). Usual suspects? Public views about immigrants' impact on crime in European countries. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, February 2011, 52(1-2), 14-131.
- Chichignoud, C. (2004). Insécurité, réalité et représentations: Le cas du Nord-Isère. *Hérodote*, 113, 94-112.
- Clarke, S. (2013). Trends in crime and criminal justice. *Eurostat Statistics in focus 18/2013*. [http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY\\_OFFPUB/KS-SF-13-018/EN/KS-SF-13-018-EN.PDF](http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/KS-SF-13-018/EN/KS-SF-13-018-EN.PDF)
- Condon, S., Lieber, M. and Maillochon, F. (2005). Insécurité dans les espaces publics: Comprendre les peurs féminines. *Revue française de sociologie*, 46(2), 265-294.
- Cordner, G. (2010). *Reducing Fear of Crime. Strategies for Police*. U.S. Department of Justice - Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.  
<http://www.popcenter.org/library/reading/pdfs/ReducingFearGuide.pdf>
- De Maillard, J. and Roché, S. (2004). Crime and Justice in France: Time Trends, Policies and Political Debate. *European Journal of Criminology*, 1(1), 111-151.

De Wever, W. (2011). *Crime and deviance in the EU. Key findings from EU funded social sciences and humanities research projects*, European Commission, Directorate-General for Research and Innovation, Socioeconomic Sciences and Humanities, Brussels.

Dittmann, J. (2005). Les causes de la peur: La mesure des sentiments d'insécurité et de la peur du crime en Allemagne et en France. *Déviance et société*, 29(3), 109-121.

Dixon, M., et al. (2006). *CrimeShare – The unequal impact of crime*. Institute for Public Policy Research: London.

Doran, B.J. and Burgess, M.B. (2012). *Putting Fear of Crime on the Map: Investigating Perceptions of Crime Using Geographic Information Systems*. New York: Springer.

Dunavölgyi, S. (2005). A közbiztonságról és a rendőrségről alkotott vélemények területi jellemzői. *Kriminológiai tanulmányok*, 42, 92-111.

Echazarra, A. (2014). Neighbourhood Crime: Perceptions and Reactions. *Social Studies Collection*, 37. Barcelona: "La Caixa" Welfare Projects.

EUCPN, European Crime Prevention Network (2004). *Review of Scientifically Evaluated Good Practices for Reducing Feelings of Insecurity or Fear of Crime in EU Member States*. European Communities.

Furstenberg, F. (1971). Public Reaction to Crime in the Streets. *The American Scholar*, 40(4), 601-610.

Galdon, G. (2011). Local surveillance in a global world: zooming in on the proliferation of CCTV in Catalonia. *Information Polity*, 16(4), 319-338.

García-España, E., Díez Ripollés, J. L., Pérez Jiménez, F., Bénitez Jiménez, M. J. and Cerezo Domínguez, A. I. (2010). Evolución de la delincuencia en España: Análisis longitudinal con encuestas de victimización. *Revista Española de Investigación Criminológica*, 8, 1-27.

Gargiulo L., Iannucci L. and Tinto A. (2012), The Use of Health-Related Quality of Life Measures in Official Statistics: The Italian Experience. In Maggino F., Iuvolati G. (eds). *Quality of Life in Italy – Research and Reflections, Social Indicators Research Series no. 48* (pp. 291–304). Dordrecht: Springer.

Garoscio, A. (2006). Représentations sociales de l'insécurité en milieu urbain. *Les cahiers internationaux de psychologie sociale*, 69(1), 33-46.

Gavín, J. P. (2010). La política de civismo en los ayuntamientos españoles: entre policía, acción social y educación cívica. *Revista Aragonesa de Administración Pública*, 36, 11-52.

Gondra, J. (2010). La Encuesta de seguridad pública de Cataluña (ESPC). En Departamento de Interior de la Generalitat de Catalunya, *10 años de Encuesta de seguridad pública de Cataluña: experiencias europeas: balance y retos de futuro* (pp. 37-63). Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya.

González, C. and Murrià, M. (2011). La seguretat des d'una perspectiva metropolitana. El cas de Barcelona. In Institut d'Estudis Regionals i Metropolitans, *La seguretat ciutadana a les metròpolis del segle XXI* (pp. 74-80). Papers 53. Regió Metropolitana de Barcelona.

Graham, C. and Chaparro, J.C. (2011). *Insecurity, Health and Well-Being. An initial exploration based on happiness surveys*. IDB Monograph 107. Washington: IDB.

Gray, E., Jackson, J. and Farrall, S. (2011). Feelings and functions in the fear of crime: Applying a new approach to victimisation insecurity. *British Journal of Criminology*, 51, 75–94.

Greer, C. (2011). *Sex Crime and the Media: Sex Offending and the Press in a Divided Society*. London, New York: Routledge.

Greer, C. and McLaughlin, E. (2011). 'Trial by media': Policing, the 24-7 news media sphere and the 'politics of outrage'. *Theoretical Criminology*, 15(1), 23-46.

Guillén, F. (2011). Les polítiques de seguretat ciutadana. In Institut d'Estudis Regionals i Metropolitans, *La seguretat ciutadana a les metròpolis del segle XXI* (pp. 21-32). Papers 53. Barcelona: IERMB.

Hale, C. (1996). Fear of Crime: a Review of the Literature. In *International Review of Victimology*, 4, 79-150.

Hanley, N. and Ruppner, L. (2015). Understanding the Effects of Crime on Women: Fear and Well-Being in the Context of Diverse Relationships. *Social Science*, 4, 276-293.

Hummelsheim, D., Hirtenlehner, H., Jackson, J. and Oberwittler, D. (2011). Social Insecurities and Fear of Crime: A Cross-National Study on the Impact of Welfare State Policies on Crime-related Anxieties. *European Sociological Review*, 27(3), 327-345.

ICPC, International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (2014). *The 4th International Report Crime Prevention and Community Safety: Trends and Perspectives*. Montréal, Canada: ICPC. [http://www.crime-prevention-intl.org/uploads/media/ICPC\\_report\\_4.pdf](http://www.crime-prevention-intl.org/uploads/media/ICPC_report_4.pdf)

Jackson, J. (2011). Revisiting risk sensitivity in the fear of crime. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 48(4), 513–537.

- Jackson, J. and Stafford, M. (2009). Public Health and Fear of Crime: A Prospective Cohort Study. *British Journal of Criminology*, 49(6), 832-847.
- Jansson, K. (2007). *British Crime Survey: Measuring Crime for 25 years*. London: Home Office.
- Jeandesboz, J. and Ragazzi, F. (2010). *Review of security measures in the Research Framework Programme*, Study for the Directorate-General for Internal Policies of the European Parliament, Brussels.
- Jewkes, Y. (2011). *Media and Crime: Key Approaches to Criminology*. 2nd edition. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Singapore: Sage Publications.
- Kaylen, M. T. and Pridemore, W. A. (2013). Social Disorganisation and Crime in Rural Communities: The First Direct Test of the Systemic Model. *British Journal of Criminology*, 53, 905–923
- Kershaw, C. and Tseloni, A. (2005). Predicting crime rates, fear and disorder based on area information: Evidence from the 2000 British Crime Survey. *International Review of Victimology*, 12, 293–311.
- Killias, M. (2010). Crime Surveys as Tools of Policy-making. In Government of Catalonia, Ministry of Home Affairs. *10 Years of the Crime Victimization Survey in Catalonia. European Experiences. Assessment and Future Challenges* (pp. 9-18). Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya.
- LaGrange, R. and Ferraro, K. (1987). The Elderly's Fear of Crime: A Critical Examination of the Research. *Research on Aging*, 9(3), 372-391.
- Lefèvre, I. (2014). Espaces de l'insécurité: Réalités territoriales et réponses locales à la délinquance: Le cas de la région Midi-Pyrénées. *EchoGéo*, 28.
- Le Goff, T. (2010). La vidéosurveillance: Un outil de prévention efficace? *Les cahiers de l'Institut d'Aménagement et d'Urbanisme d'Ile-de-France*, 155, 38-40.
- Le Goff, T. (2011). Peurs et victimation des personnes âgées: Au-delà des discours, quelle réalité chiffrée? *Gérontologie et société*, 136(1), 175-188.
- Lieber, M. (2008). *Genre, violences et espaces publics : La vulnérabilité des femmes en question*. Paris : Sciences Po, les Presses.
- Lorenc, T., et al. (2012). Crime, Fear of Crime, Environment and Mental Health and Well-Being: Mapping Review of Theories and Causal Pathways. *Health Place*, 18, 757–65.

Maffei, S. and Markopoulou, L. (eds) (2013). FIDUCIA. New European crimes and trust-based policies. *FP7 Research Project Report, Volume 1*.

<http://crimen.eu/images/stories/web/documentacion/2013/Volume1.pdf>

Malochet, V. (2010). Les polices municipales, «vraies» polices de proximité? *Les cahiers de l'Institut d'Aménagement et d'Urbanisme d'Ile-de-France*, 155, 45-47.

Messner, S. (1984). The “dark figure” and composite indexes of crime: Some empirical explorations of alternative data sources. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 12(5), 435-444.

Mouhanna, C. (2010). La police de proximité: Quel bilan? *Les cahiers de l'Institut d'Aménagement et d'Urbanisme d'Ile-de-France*, 155, 41-44.

Muggah, R. (2012). *Researching the Urban Dilemma: Urbanization, Poverty and Violence*. International Development Research Centre, IDRC.

<http://www.idrc.ca/EN/PublishingImages/Researching-the-Urban-Dilemma-Baseline-study.pdf>

Müller, T. and Fisher, T. (2015). Feeling unsafe in a multicultural neighbourhood: indigenous inhabitants' perspectives. *British Journal of Criminology*, 55, 790-810.

Muratore, M. and Tagliacozzo, G. (2008). The Italian National Victimization Survey. In Aromaa, K. and Heiskanen, M. *Victimization Survey in Comparative Perspective: Papers from the Stockholm Criminology Symposium* (pp. 100-121). Helsinki: HEUNI.

Murrià, M. (2010). Crime Surveys in Catalonia. In Government of Catalonia, Ministry of Home Affairs, *10 Years of the Crime Victimization Survey in Catalonia. European Experiences. Assessment and Future Challenges* (pp. 63-71). Barcelona: Generalitat de Catalunya.

Murrià, M., González, C. and Cónsola, A. (2014). Metodología para el análisis, diseño y evaluación de políticas de seguridad: el Plan de Seguridad Ciudadana de Barcelona. In *Actas del XI Congreso Español de Sociología: Crisis y cambio: propuestas desde la Sociología* (pp. 479-491).

Pan Ké Shon, J.-L. (2007). Portrait statistique des zones urbaines sensibles: Population, mobilité, habitat, chômage, scolarité. *Informations sociales*, 141(5), 24-32.

Pan Ké Shon, J.-L. (2012). Perceptions on insecurity in French poor neighbourhoods: Racial proxy or pure discrimination hypotheses? *Urban Studies*, 49(3), 505-525.

Pearson, A. and Breetzke, G. (2014). The association between fear of crime, and mental and physical wellbeing in New Zealand. *Social Indicators Research*, 119, 281-94.



Permentier, M., Bolt, G. and van Ham, M. (2011). Determinants of Neighbourhood Satisfaction and Perception of Neighbourhood Reputation. *Urban Studies*, 48(5), 977-996.

Pinkster, F. M. (2014). 'I Just Live Here': Everyday Practices of Disaffiliation of Middle-class Households in Disadvantaged Neighbourhoods. *Urban Studies*, 51(4), 810-826.

Rader, N.E. (2004). The Threat of Victimization: A Theoretical Reconceptualization of Fear of Crime. *Sociological Spectrum*, 24(6), 399-425.

Roché, S. (1993). *Le sentiment d'insécurité*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Russo, S. and Roccato, M. (2010). How long does victimisation foster fear of crime? A longitudinal study. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38(8), 960-974.

Sabbadini, L. and Muratore, M. (2009). Fear of Crime in Italy. In Sabbadini, L. L., Muratore, M., and Tagliacozzo, G. *Towards a Safer Society: The Knowledge Contribution of Statistical Information* (pp. 207-236). Rome: ISTAT.

Sacchini, G. (2009). Comparing police data and victimisation survey in Italy. In Robert, P. *Comparing Crime Data in Europe: Official Crime Statistics and Survey Based Data* (pp. 89-94). Brussels: VUBPRESS.

Sampson, R., & Raudenbush, S. (2004). Seeing Disorder: Neighborhood Stigma and the Social Construction of "Broken Windows". *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 67(4), 319-342.

San-Juan, C., Vozmediano, L., and Vergara, A. (2012). Self-protective behaviours against crime in urban settings: An empirical approach to vulnerability and victimization models. *European Journal of Criminology*, 9(6), 652-667.

Sanders, C. (2012). Policing the "risky". Technology and Surveillance in Everyday Patrol Work. *Canadian Review of Sociology*, 49(4), 389-410.

Selmini, R. (2009). The Prevention Strategies in the Italian Cities. In Sabbadini, L., Muratore, G. and Tagliacozzo, G. *Towards a Safer Society: The Knowledge Contribution of Statistical Information* (pp. 389-410). Rome: ISTAT.

Sette, R. (2014). Società sicure e mutamento sociale: Possibili sfide per il futuro. *Rivista di Criminologia, Vittimologia e Sicurezza*, 8(1), 107-120.

Shaw, M. and Travers, K. (eds) (2007). Strategies and Best Practices in Crime Prevention in particular in relation to Urban Areas and Youth at Risk. *Proceedings of the Workshop held at the 11th UN Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice*. Montréal, Canada: International Centre for the Prevention of Crime. <http://www.crime-prevention->

[intl.org/fileadmin/user\\_upload/Publications/Strategies and Best Practices in Crime Prevention urban Areas and Youth at Risk ANG.pdf](http://intl.org/fileadmin/user_upload/Publications/Strategies_and_Best_Practices_in_Crime_Prevention_urban_Areas_and_Youth_at_Risk_ANG.pdf)

Skogan, W. (1974). The Validity of Official Crime Statistics: An Empirical Investigation. *Social Science Quarterly*, 55(1), 25-39.

Small, M. and Feldman, J. (2012). Ethnographic Evidence, Heterogeneity, and Neighbourhood Effects After Moving to Opportunity. In van Ham, M., Manley, D., Bailey, N., Simpson, L. and Maclennan, D. (eds). *Neighbourhood Effects Research: New Perspectives* (pp. 57-78). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands.

Solymosi, R., Bowers, K. and Fujiyama, T. (2015). Mapping fear of crime as a context-dependent everyday experience that varies in space and time. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 20, 193-211.

Soomeren, P., Schillings, M., Smits, N., Woldendorp, T., Jongejan, A., Davey, C., ...Marselle, M. (2008). *Reducing the fear factor. Guidance for addressing fear of crime and insecurity within urban development*. Design Against Crime Solution Centre: University of Salford.  
<http://www.securefit.org/downloads/files/Reducing%20the%20Fear%20Factor.pdf>

Surette, R. (2011). *Media, Crime and Criminal Justice: Images, Realities and Policies*. 4th edition. United States: Wadsworth, Cengage Learning.

Sutton, R. and Farrall, S. (2005). Gender, socially desirable responding and the fear of crime: Are women really more anxious about crime? *British Journal of Criminology*, 45, 212-224.

United Nations Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (2014). *Contribution of the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice to the ECOSOC Integration Segment on issues related to sustainable urbanization*.  
<http://www.un.org/en/ecosoc/integration/pdf/commissiononcrimepreventionandcriminaljustice.pdf>

ECOSOC, United Nations Economic and Social Council (2014). Resolution adopted by the Economic and Social Council on Strengthening social policies as a tool for crime prevention, 16 July 2014.  
[https://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/CCPCJ/Crime\\_Resolutions/2010-2019/2014/ECOSOC/E\\_Res\\_2014\\_21.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/CCPCJ/Crime_Resolutions/2010-2019/2014/ECOSOC/E_Res_2014_21.pdf)

UN-HABITAT, United Nations Human Settlements Programme (2015). *Issue Paper on Safer Cities*. New York: UN-Habitat. [http://unhabitat.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Habitat-III-Issue-Paper-3\\_Safer-Cities-2.0.pdf](http://unhabitat.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/Habitat-III-Issue-Paper-3_Safer-Cities-2.0.pdf)

UNODC, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2009). *Manual on Victimization Surveys*. [http://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/Crime-statistics/Manual on Victimization surveys 2009 web.pdf](http://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/Crime-statistics/Manual_on_Victimization_surveys_2009_web.pdf)

UNODC, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2010). *Handbook on the crime prevention guidelines. Making them work*. New York: UNODC.

[https://www.unodc.org/pdf/criminal\\_justice/Handbook on Crime Prevention Guidelines - Making them work.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/pdf/criminal_justice/Handbook_on_Crime_Prevention_Guidelines_-_Making_them_work.pdf)

UNODC, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2011). *Introductory Handbook on Policing Urban Space. Criminal Justice Handbook Series*. New York: UN Publication.

[https://www.unodc.org/pdf/criminal\\_justice/Introductory Handbook on Policing Urban Space.pdf](https://www.unodc.org/pdf/criminal_justice/Introductory_Handbook_on_Policing_Urban_Space.pdf)

UNODC, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2015a). *Workshop 4: Public contribution to crime prevention and raising awareness of criminal justice — experiences and lessons learned. Thirteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice*. Doha, 12-19 April 2015.

[http://www.unodc.org/documents/congress//Documentation/IN\\_SESSION/ACONF22\\_L4Add1\\_e\\_V1502578.pdf](http://www.unodc.org/documents/congress//Documentation/IN_SESSION/ACONF22_L4Add1_e_V1502578.pdf)

UNODC, United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (2015b). *Doha Declaration on Integrating Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice into the Wider United Nations Agenda to Address Social and Economic Challenges and to Promote the Rule of Law at the National and International Levels, and Public Participation. Thirteenth United Nations Congress on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice*. Doha, 12-19 April 2015.

[http://www.unodc.org/documents/congress/Documentation/ACONF222\\_L6\\_e\\_V1502120.pdf](http://www.unodc.org/documents/congress/Documentation/ACONF222_L6_e_V1502120.pdf)

Valera, S. and Guàrdia, J. (2012). *Confirmatory factor analysis of an inventory of perception of insecurity and fear of crime. Anuario de Psicologia, 42(3), 327-342.*

Valera, S., & Guàrdia, J. (2014). *Perceived insecurity and fear of crime in a city with low-crime rates. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 38, 195-205.*

van Eijk, G. (2012). *Good Neighbours in Bad Neighbourhoods: Narratives of Dissociation and Practices of Neighbouring in a 'Problem' Place. Urban Studies, 49(14), 3009-3026.*

Vieno, A., Roccato, M. and Russo, S. (2013). *Is Fear of Crime Mainly Social and Economic Insecurity in Disguise? A Multilevel Multinational Analysis. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 23, 519-535.*

Wacquant, L. (2000). *Parola d'ordine: tolleranza zero: la trasformazione dello stato penale nella società neoliberale*. Milano: Feltrinelli.

Wacquant, L. (2011). *Poner orden a la inseguridad. Polarización social y recrudescimiento punitivo. Revista catalana de seguretat pública, 24, 141-155.*

Winton, A. (2004). Urban violence: a guide to the literature. *Environment and Urbanization*, 16(2).

Wunsch, D. (2006). *Fear of Crime – Literature Review*. London: Metropolitan Police Service, Strategy, Modernisation and Performance Directorate, Mimeo.

Zagrodzki, M. (2012). *Que fait la police? Le rôle du policier dans la société*. Paris: Éditions de l'Aube.

Zauberman, R. (2008). *Victimisation and Insecurity in Europe: A Review of Surveys and Their Use* (pp. 127-148). Brussels: VUBPRESS.

Zauberman, R. et al. (2013). Victimation et insécurité en Ile-de-France: Une analyse géosociale. *Revue française de sociologie*, 54(1), 111-153.