THE GOVERNANCE OF PUBLIC SAFETY AND JUSTICE IN A DIVERSE SOCIETY

MIGUEL ÁNGEL GANDARILLAS AND ÁNGEL CUEVA (COORDINATORS)

SSG SUSTAINABLE SAFETY GOVERNANCE
SEGURIDAD, SOSTENIBILIDAD Y GOBERNANZA

The Governance of Public Safety and Justice in a Diverse Society

Miguel Ángel Gandarillas and Ángel Cueva (coordinators)

INDICE

CONTENTS   Page

CONTENS Page

CHAPTER 4
Governance and safety assessment

Miguel Ángel Gandarillas[1], Juan Pedregosa[2], Nuria Morral[3], Delphine Boghos[4], Menno Vos[5], Lorenzo Segato[6], Valentina Scioneri[7], Ismael Vargas[8], Gilberto Tardochi[9], Adam Crawford[10], Kiran Vagarwal[11], Julius Lang[12], Alex Calabrese[13], Leonardo Lafuente[14], José Luis Carque[15], Manuel Rodríguez[16], Daniel Salafranca[17], Carolina Ricardo[18], Valentina Tanese[19], Paloma Siqueira[20], Raúl Alonso[21], Bernardus Jozef Maria Beuvink[22], Mohamed Aatil[23], Brian Biery[24], Pilar Mairal[25], Gema María Pastor[26], María José García[27], Tomás Gil2[28,], y Manuel Palacio[29], María Jesús Martín[30], José Manuel Martínez[31], Joan Lluis Pérez[32] and Susana Durao[33]

Assessment is essential in any public policy or service in order to move forward, to improve on and to find out which practices and methodologies are the most adequate for our objectives. There are many methods and tools to assess public safety and local governance. However each method is based on different concepts, and many show limitations when used in the wide and integrated framework of community governance and public safety. It is also important to know the objectives of the practices and of the working

[1]InNODS, Madrid, España
[2]CEPS Projectes Socials, Barcelona, España
[3]CEPS Projectes Socials, Barcelona, España
[4]CEPS Projectes Socials, Barcelona, España
[5]Windesheim University of Applied Sciences
[6]RISSC, Italia
[7]RISSC, Italia
[8]Ayuntamiento de Cicero, Illinois, EEUU.
[9]Policía Militar de Sao Paulo, Brasil
[10]University of Leeds, UK
[11] Borough of Barnet, London, UK
[12]Center for Court Innovation, EEUU
[13] Red Hook Community Court, Brooklyn, EEUU
[14]Policía de Aranjuez, España
[15]Policía de Castellón, España
[16]Policía de Castellón, España
[17]Policía de Castellón, España
[18]Sou da Paz, Sao Paulo, Brasil
[19]Interurbano, España
[20]Interurbano, Brasil
[21]Interurbano, España
[22]Enschede Police, Netherlands
[23]Enschede Poilce, Netherlands
[24]Flintridge Center, Pasadena, EEUU
[25]Universidad Complutense de Madrid, España
[26]Universidad Complutense de Madrid, España
[27]Universidad Complutense de Madrid, España
[28]Departamento de Policía de Sant Adriá de Besós, España
[29]INHESJ, Francia.
[30]Facultad de Psicología, UAM, España
[31]Facultad de Psicología, UAM, España
[32]Facultad de Derecho, UAB, España
[33]Universidad de Lisboa, Portugal

methods to evaluate. Since we want to know the causes of insecurity problems and the sources of safety values in a community, the evaluation method must be interdisciplinary and be focused on individual, social and institutional factors. And finally, we want a scientific method that provides the maximum degree of reliability, validity and accuracy. We wonder if current evaluation methods meet these objectives so in the following pages we will briefly review them.

1. Limitations of the classical methods for public safety evaluation

There is a wide variety of methods to evaluate public safety, not only the level of security in a neighbourhood or city but also the services aimed to this purpose. All methods are based on a particular idea of safety. For that reason, classical evaluation methods, which are still the most common, usually focus on the impact of crime intervention with a positivistic approach, that is to say, observable and quantifiable. They often include quantitative indicators of variations in the criminality rate and crime clearance rate. The most common crime impact indicator is the number of crimes reported to the police.

However these evaluation tools do not offer accurate information when we use integrated and wider public safety concepts, such as those considering the causes and consequences of crime. Reported crime rates measure intervention but not the reality of the phenomena. They include neither the many factors and elements that affect and explain the development of crime nor the work carried out in relation to crime.

Alvazzi (2010) highlights how important is to improve the mechanisms to collect and process data and to obtain more reliable statistical indicators that can be used in cross-national comparisons. She considers that most of the countries should improve the following areas: data collection methods, adapting them to the local territory; training specialists; engaging the departments involved; overcoming fears about the use of the information; a better inter-agency participation and coordination; a better use of information technologies; a higher number of surveys; a better dissemination of the results; and a greater effort to use indicators that permit cross-national comparisons. Aebi, Aubusson, Barclay et al. (2010) pointed out a series of limitations that should be taken into account when using police reports to make comparative studies of crime rate:

- Police comparative statistics do not show how varied or exhaustive the measures against crime are.
- Victims can decide not to report the crime to the police for different reasons: fear of the offender (even of the police in some countries); lack of confidence on the usefulness of reporting; or just because they are not aware of having been the victim of a crime.

- Reporting a crime can be humiliating or self-incriminatory (if the victim has also committed a crime).
- Police may not include some complaints in the statistics.
- Minor crimes are more likely not registered.

Apart from that, we should add that the complaints used in statistics do not always reflect a crime. When comparing crime among countries using police reports, we should also consider that complaints are filed in different ways depending on the country, which affects the information the citizen provides. For example, in the United Kingdom a citizen can confidentially file a claim with almost no legal consequences for him, whereas in Spain a formal complaint is needed, with legal proceedings and a notification to the defendant, which refrains victims from reporting the crime.

Crime clearance may provide more valid information than claims. However, we are not completely sure a crime has been 'cleared' until a final sentence, and even then figures can be biased due to the guaranteeing practices of justice that can produce false negatives or false positives. Justice and public safety scopes are different so justice indicators cannot be direct criteria to measure public safety. In addition, countries have different penal laws and classifications of crimes.

Another bias in assessment is related to police methods which are different in every country. In many countries figures about crime impact are difficult to separate from those about the impact of public safety practices, so in the case of an increase of the crime rate it is difficult to know if it is caused by a crime increase or by the capacity of the system to detect it. Learning about procedure changes is not enough information because crime detection depends on a lot of factors with effects in the medium and long term. The main common bias in most countries comes from the fact that police procedures are mainly based on reactive actions. Thus the assessment of public safety practices usually focuses on the fight against crime, and areas such as prevention are forgotten. Therefore, police hardly gathers contextual information regarding causes and consequences of crime behaviour, so it will only register the commission of a crime.

Sagant and Shaw (2010) carried out an international research on the assessment of public safety prevention practices. They found that 21.5% (11 countries out of 51) did not evaluate crime prevention, while 45% (23 out of 52) did. These authors also pointed out that there are many countries where only partial aspects of public safety are assessed (for example, operational actions to respond to crime), or only specific projects are evaluated, or there are poor transparency and dissemination of the results. Most complex programmes, which count on citizens and community participation, are the least assessed. Besi-

des, evaluation results have such a limited impact that many programmes continue even though they have been proved to be ineffective, whereas positively assessed programmes are ended. They noticed that in general there is a lack of objectivity and impartiality both in the interpretation of results and their dissemination and use. Systematic, methodical and exhaustive assessment tools have little presence in many countries.

These authors reviewed eleven evaluation guides on prevention practices. They found positive elements in most of them: cost-benefits analysis was frequently cited; and interesting methods such as proactive evaluation, which actively seeks for the root of the problems identified in the evaluation, were sometimes mentioned. However the guides gave little information about assessment methods, being mainly focused on impact indicators, which echoed a classic positivist vision of evaluation and public safety models. Few handbooks openly referred to evaluation strategies and resources. In most of the cases there were insufficient indicators included, but too many references to crime or victimisation rates.

In their conclusions, Sagant and Shaw (2010) recommended to make a greater effort to use multilevel assessment with multiple indicators from different actors. Citizens, social agents and the community participating together in collaborative and action research programs is a basic strategy which has proved to be more efficient, precise and useful, not only for the design of the programme and the definition of the indicators, but also to collect the information about the processes and their impact on public safety. According to these authors, it is important for the improvement of the evaluation processes to empower the communities so that they can participate in the evaluation with an action-oriented approach.

Apart from the limitations mentioned above, Gandarillas and Gómez (2014), in the framework of an integrated model of public safety, found that many classic methods of evaluation focusing on crime indicators also have the following limitations:

- They do not take account of the information about the citizens, either of their needs and problems or of their resources.
- They do no not include many basic factors from different areas (urban planning, economy, family, education, culture, psycho-sociological areas, etc.) which would help to identify the causes, consequences, triggers and other questions that affect the crime.
- They only mention the crime and do not include positive factors related to full safety (versus insecurity).
- They do not differentiate between public safety in a territory and public safety services.

- They do not include significant information from different sources (citizens, practitioners from different areas, experts…).

All this provides a narrow and limited diagnosis of a very complex and multidimensional phenomenon, which hinders the design of actions, strategies and measures to improve security. It also entails self-satisfied conclusions because they use the same concepts of public safety that the services they want to assess.

2. Current evaluation methods

In the last decades, other methods have appeared to collect more accurate and scientific information, without having needed to change the classic concept of public safety. Victimisation surveys, which ask people if they, or somebody they know, have experienced any kind of crime and how they feel about their security, are increasingly used (García et al., 2010; Van Durmen, González and Durán, 2011; Vuanello, 2006). Thanks to victimisation surveys it was known that about half of the crimes committed in the USA are not reported to the police (Plant and Scott, 2009). Crime Victims Surveys (ICVS), carried out by the UN Interregional Crime and Justice Research Institute, are an example of the effort made to compare levels of victimisation across countries (EFUS, 2007; García et al., 2010). Victimisation surveys usually ask about crimes. We can also add items asking about public safety in a positive way, including questions about informal elements and resources related to safety and protection in the community or about the social environment of the victims.

Although victimisation surveys let us know the degree of validity of the crime information provided by the police force, their main limitation is the difficulty to do comparative analysis due to the different types of existing questionnaires and procedures. Apart from that, the subject is so delicate that it is difficult to make a questionnaire which can avoid a validity bias because citizens have different ideas of safety in their environment. In any case, victimisation surveys are still an essential tool which should be used by every public safety service (García et al., 2010; Van Durmen, González and Durán, 2011).

Tilley (2009) enumerates a long list of problems related to the internal and external validity of the most common evaluation methods used to assess public safety intervention. These problems are mainly caused by a scientifically poor design of the research: little methodical accuracy in the formulation of the hypotheses; lack of systematisation which would guarantee the inclusion of all the significant factors; absence of control groups; insufficient information collected before the intervention; bias in the samples due to lack of a random sampling; and research bias in the action research projects. Tilley concludes

that all these limitations can be solved with solid and ethical designs. Crawford (1999) states that surveys should be taken very cautiously for different reasons: their limitations to reflect the complexity of public safety and its causes; the difficulties to identify certain crimes (like corporate crime); the ideological bias of the questionnaire; and the shallowness of the methods used to collect citizen's perceptions.

The United Nations, worried about the limitations existing in the assessment of public safety and the impact of the fight against crime, in 2003 created the United nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) which made a list of eight basic criteria for a good evaluation:

1. Transparency of the evaluation processes
2. Specialised knowledge and experience
3. Independence
4. Impartiality of the evaluators
5. Intentionality (planning, objectives, real utility of the results)
6. Commitment and capacity to be evaluated
7. Quality of the evaluation
8. Take note of the recommendations arising from the evaluation

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNDOC) drew up a handbook on the crime prevention guidelines (UNODC and UN-Habitat, 2009). The handbook includes a number of factors and criteria that should be taken into account when defining evaluation indicators, so that the assessment can address prevention with a multi-causal and integrated approach. Criteria should be related to a thorough research and include: the needs, risk factors and vulnerability of the population and the territory; the training of the agents on preventive strategies; the planning at a national, regional and local level; management and operational systems; and inter-agency coordination and wide partnership.

Current trends entail new challenges for the evaluation of public safety because many prevention objectives can hardly be measured (Crawford, 2009). For this reason, new indicators of safety are added to the existing ones (Barchechat and Sansfaçon, 2003; Pérez, Antolinez, Cabrera and Peligero, 2010) and the new methods to collect data are more qualitative, participative and multilevel (Eck, 2005). These methods should also study the qualitative information obtained in the meetings with the community (Reanauer, Duffee and Scott, 2003). Eck (2005) pointed out that generalisation is a basic element if we want to reach valid conclusions. Situational prevention, for example, cannot be easily generalised because it focuses on the characteristics of a particular place. A good theoretical formulation is very important for the validity of the evaluation (Eck, 2005).

Recent models are focused on obtaining precise results and products. Their approach to security is based on evidence, performance and accountability. These positivist trends are reflected in the reports about 'what works' and 'what does not work', forgetting questions such as 'what has to work', 'why something works and why not' or 'what can function better'. According to P. Ekblom, a good method to assess public safety must include the 5 Is: intelligence, intervention, implementation, involvement and impact. The diversification and contextuality of the information are essential for a preventive evaluation (Sagant and Shaw, 2010). Contextuality of the information, comparison of the results and transferability to other territories should go hand in hand and be included in the planning of the evaluation.

There has been a proliferation of Safety Observatories, which is a proof of the difficulty of evaluation. Sagan and Shaw (2010) found out that more than half of all the observatories were in Latin America. They derive from police departments, so impartiality is affected, and do not include data mapping. The report of the European Forum for Urban Security gave good examples of evaluation and social audits (EFUS, 2007).

An integrated evaluation model: Based on an integrated and interdisciplinary approach to public safety (understood here as a systemic relationship among factors that enable the protection of citizens' rights), and trying to overcome the limitations of other methods mentioned above, we define an integrated framework for the evaluation making a distinction between the situation or level of public safety in a territory and the public safety services that address safety in its full complexity.

The framework to study the situation of public safety should include indicators such as risk and vulnerability which will help us detect and prevent the multifaceted factors influencing insecurity. It should also consider positive factors which naturally encourage safety and peaceful coexistence. That way, a wide range of indicators should be taken into account to make a general diagnosis of public safety in a particular community.

The following groups of factors should be taken into account to obtain indicators about public safety using modern participative methods:

- Urban, architectural, environmental and social factors can give us information about the risks for developing insecurity (Canter and Shalev, 2008; Canter and Youngs, 2008; Clarke, 2005; Shaftoe, 2008, 2011; Tilley, 2005).
- Factors related to the quality of the relations between people, groups, associations and the community in general can provide information about the level of conflict, cohesion and social peaceful coexistence (Montero, 1998; Mooney and Neal, 2009)

- Factors related to education, socialisation, childcare, intrafamilial relationships will be a key element in the models of developmental criminality (Kury and Woessner, 2002; Redondo and Pueyo, 2007).
- Factors related to the psychological and behavioural understanding and development of safety in the social context of citizens, groups, associations and community (Canter and Hodge, 2008; Gómez and Navas, 2008; Lott, 2010; Moya and Rodríguez, 2005).

Besides, indicators of planning, management, implementation and outcomes in relation to the factors previously mentioned will give us extensive information about the satisfaction of citizens and workers and about the efficiency and effectiveness of the different strategies and practices carried out by the public safety services in their fight against crime and also in crime prevention and public safety promotion. Our planning will be then more comprehensive and multilevel. If we address public safety with an interdisciplinary approach, including causes and consequences, and with services based on interagency collaboration, public-private partnership and community participation, means we are also including the evaluation of the local and community governance in our methodology.

R. Jaffe (2013) underlines the importance of also including criteria of transparency, accountability and specialists and citizens' support. He thinks it is essential to focus on the strengths of the local community, that is to say, to analyse the potentialities of a community instead of its needs and problems. In his opinion it is also important to measure the collective effectiveness for planning problem-solving strategies and the mechanisms and resources used for that. There are other elements that should be included when analysing the level of community governance: community manager's skills and competences, community spirit, community involvement, and an appropriate training programme. The system this author recommends to evaluate community resources includes 10 elements:

1. Community ownership
2. Community development
3. Access and equity
4. Advocacy and social action
5. Leadership, collaboration and sector linkage
6. Compliance, reporting and acquittal
7. Staff and volunteers
8. Strategic planning
9. Risk management
10. Financial management

It would be interesting to include here the concept of corporate governance, that is to say, the capacity of an organisation to collaborate and involve other organisations and citizens in the management and implementation of services. Governance International has included the following criteria in their assessment system:

1. Degree of orientation of the organisation towards outcomes
2. Collaborative work with partners
3. User's commitment
4. Effective political, organisational and community leadership
5. Learning and innovation

Within the framework of public safety, Diamond and Weiss (2009) include the following elements to assess:

1. Partnerships among municipal agencies: Operationalising partnerships; the role of leadership; the quality of the relations between agencies; the history of previous relationships between agencies; and the interest of departments in developing relationships.
2. Partnerships with the community: Operationalising partnerships; the role of leadership; actions to engage citizens; interest among the community; attention to community concerns.
3. Collaborative problem-solving efforts: Operationalising collaborative actions to solve problems; the role of leadership; community's interest; proper use of technologies.
4. Organisational change: operationalising organisational change; the quality of the organisational management; transparency; accountability; the change of organisational structures; personal skills of the community agent; training; communication and information technology; the role of leadership, allocation of resources; and political support.

The European project 'Security in Diversity' included a scientific deliberative process to define new frameworks for public safety in the diverse society. This process used a model of governance designed by experts, practitioners and citizens from different countries. It concluded with a set of international guidelines, including those related to community governance in the diverse society (Gandarillas, 2011). The guidelines highlight some elements that should be taken into account in the process of governance for public safety and justice, and its assessment:

1. Mechanisms for services and quality management, using criteria such as the capacity to reach every citizen; the ability to draw together all the resources and services for citizens and their contexts; and the role of community managers as generalist agents.
2. Interagency collaboration according to criteria such as an adequate definition of the role of every agent in inter-agency teams, the role of community managers in the framework of the collaborative leadership, the role of departmental officers as specialists, the empowerment levels of the governance system, and the processes of simplification, deconcentration and horizontalisation of the organisations.
3. Information, transparency, auditing and accountability according to criteria related to confidentiality levels and public information about public safety and accountability results.
4. Citizens' participation under criteria related to a clear definition of participative roles (versus professional roles); level of independence in the decision-making spaces; transparency and accountability of actions and results; inclusiveness and quality of network structures; advice; and community, cohesive and extensiveness leadership.

In order to overcome the limitations of the assessment procedures of public safety, and to use the opportunities provided by governance approaches, we carried out a study to design and test an evaluation system of public safety in the framework of governance for public safety.

3. Methodology and procedures

Geographical area: the main study area was Juan de la Cierva neighbourhood (Arganda del Rey, Spain. See map in the Appendix). Similar projects of the Safety Governance City Network were also included for the comparative analysis, including those implemented in El Vendrell, Barcelona, Lisbon, Berlin, Pasadena, Brooklyn, Madrid and Enschede.

Study population: Neighbours of Juan de la Cierva neighbourhood (350 households); and members of public and private entities who develop some of their activities in this neighbourhood (200 entities in total).

Design of the research project: the scientific design of the project combines participative and hypothetico-deductive methods, in an epistemological frame both integrative and constructivist. Information is being built through the integration of the wideness of the quantitative information and the deepness of the qualitative information, along with the creation of new more proactive information towards participative strategies. The project was constantly under evaluation according to a participative action-research methodology. Researchers collected qualitative and participative information in the meetings and

group interviews held during the implementation of the project (there were more than forty meetings and interviews). The information gathered in the field visits to Berlin, Barcelona, El Vendrell and Lisbon was also included, alongside the information collected in the home interviews and from the entities.

Apart from all that, a summative evaluation was done at the end using the information collected through the questionnaires that neighbours, traders and social agents answered. A wide range of evaluation criteria were chosen after having done an international bibliographic research on evaluation methods (Gandarillas and Gómez, 2014). The multidisciplinary criteria included were related not only to the commission of crime and offences but also to other issues such as environment, architecture, urban planning, health, education, finance and public management.

In the list of assessment criteria of public safety, 71 negative criteria (related to insecurity) and 118 positive (related to safety) were included. The list was studied by a group of 32 experts in different fields (public safety, justice, urban planning, economy, public management, psychology and sociology) from Spain, USA, United Kingdom, France, Portugal, Italy, Germany and Brazil. They made up the external assessment commission of the project (they are included as authors of this chapter). It was also provided to the community agents in the Interagency Team of the Project Sustainable Safety Governance in Arganda del Rey, made up by police officers, social services, education, health, citizens, youth, employment and public management. All of them were asked to select 20 negative criteria and 20 positive that, in their opinion, should be included in an evaluation questionnaire on public safety, understood as the conditions that support a peaceful coexistence based on the respect for every citizen's rights. Among the criteria most commonly cited, the researcher team chose those better representing all the areas. They then made a questionnaire with items reflecting those criteria. The questionnaire was again sent to the experts and to the community agents for a final adjustment. The final questionnaire is included in the appendix of this book. Eventually 65 people answered it: neighbours, traders, business people, workers and public agents of the study area.

Quantitative, qualitative and participative studies were combined in a constructivist process in which the qualitative and participative results provided a deeper meaning to the study.

4. Results and discussion

We would like to highlight the capacity of the method to detect a group of public safety elements that usually remain hidden in the traditional methods. This method provides wider, deeper and more extensive information about safety and insecurity in a given te-

rritory, which helps us to design a planning more focused on prevention and promotion. At the same time, it provides information about the impact of the work on prevention, something that is hidden with traditional methods. Including factors related to environment, architecture, housing, economy, education and society make it easier for us to agree with neighbours and workers on objectives focused on the improvement of the quality of life and social welfare as a strategy to promote safety based on the strengths, the resources and the social capital of the territory. That way these evaluation methods become tools for the participative and collaborative analysis and accountability. They improve the transparency and the validity of the results because they compare their evaluation according to a 360º evaluation approach (which includes users, officers from different departments and managers).

In conclusion, the preliminary results of this study suggest that an assessment method based on an interdisciplinary concept in the framework of governance work and with the involvement of the diverse society can allow us to address public safety and justice as positive values in the territory, and not just as the absence of crime.

Main results of the evaluation process of the SSG project in its community implementation

Although the final evaluation of the project is not available on the date of this publication, we can establish several main conclusions on the preliminary results the assessment process.

- According to neighbours and traders, there had been an improvement of safety and peaceful coexistence indicators in the study area in the two years of implementation of the project.
- The project facilitated awareness raising, sharing of knowledge and consensus of the public agents, entities and neighbours on the direction to improve public services.
- The proposed governance model was widely acclaimed by neighbours, entities and public agents.
- As the main limitation we can mention the difficulties of and resistance from most of the public departments and institutions to change their usual departmental way of working in their offices, towards an inter-agency team work carried out on-site where the problems can be found. This was an important factor that prevented us to reach more citizens and get greater citizens' involvement and participation. This seems to be related to the fact that it is difficult to move from a culture based on users´ demands to a more proactive one. A related limitation derives from the characteristics of officers' jobs, based on office work waiting for the user to appear, and the formal structure of services, specialised and focused on particular citizen's demands.

References

Aebi, M.F., Aubusson, B., Barclay, G., et al. (2010). European Sourcebook of Crime and Criminal Justice Statistics – 2010. Den Haag: WODC.

Alvazzi, A. (2010). Chapter 8 – Crime and criminal justice statistics challenges. In S. Harrendorf, M. Heiskanen, S. Malby (Eds.): International Statistics on Crime and Justice, pp. 167-175. Helsinki: European Institute for United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC).

Barchechat, O., and Sansfaçon, D. (2003). Evaluating Prevention: Elements for an Alternative Approach. Canada: International Centre for the Prevention of Crime.

Canter, D., and Shalev, K. (2008).Putting Crime in its Place: Psychological Process in Crime Site Selection. In D. Canter., and D. Youngs (Eds.). Principles of Geographical Offender Profiling, pp. 259-269. USA: Ashgate.

Canter, D., and Youngs, D. (2008). Geographical Offender Profiling: Origins and Principles. In D. Canter., and D. Youngs (Eds.). Principles of Geographical Offender Profiling, pp. 1-18. USA: Ashgate.

Clarke, R. (2005). Seven misconceptions of situational crime prevention. In N. Tilley (Ed). Handbook of Crime Prevention and Community Safety, pp. 39-70 Canada: Willan Publishing.

Crawford, A. (1999). The Local Governance of Crime. Appeals to Community and Partnerships. New York : Oxford Univ. Press.

Crawford, A. (2009). Situating Crime Prevention Policies in Comparative Perspective: Policy Travels, Transfer and Translation. In A. Crawford (Ed.): Crime Prevention Policies in Comparative Perspective, pp. 1-37. England: Willan.

Diamond, D. and Weiss, D.M. (2009). Advancing Community Policing Through Community Governance: A Framework Document. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Community Oriented Policing Services.

Eck, J.E. (2005). Evaluation for lesson learning. In N. Tilley (Ed). Handbook of Crime Prevention and Community Safety, pp. 699-733. Canada: Willan Publishing.

EFUS (European Forum for Urban Safety) (2007). Guidance on Local Safety Audits. A

Compendium of International Practice. Paris: European Forum for Urban Safety.

Gandarillas, M.A. (2011). Proceedings of the International Congress of Public Safety in a Diverse Society. Madrid: CultivaLibros.

Gandarillas, M.A., and Gómez, L. (2014). Manual de Seguridad Ciudadana para el Profesional de la Sociedad Diversa. Madrid: IE University and CultivaLibros.

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

Gómez, C., and Navas, M. (2008). Las relaciones entre grupos. In V. Zarco, A. Rodríguez (Dirs.), A. Martín-Quirós and F. Díaz (Coord.): Psicología de los Grupos and las Organizaciones, pp. 193-221. Madrid: Pirámide.

Jaffe, R. (2013). Network West Communithy Governance Project. Retrieved from http://www.networkwest.net/images/Network_West_Governance_Report_Final.pdf in 12 September 2014.

Kury, H. and Woessner, G. (2002). Comparative analysis of crime: The background of deviant behavior. Psicothema, 14(1), pp. 78-89.

Lott, B. (2010). Multiculturalism and Diversity. A Social Psychological Perspective. United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.

Montero, M. (1998). La comunidad como objeto and sujeto de la acción social. In A.M. González (Ed.): Psicología Comunitaria: Fundamentos y Aplicaciones. España: Síntesis.

Mooney, G., and Neal, S. (2009). Community: Themes and debates. In G. Mooney and S. Neal (Eds.): Community. Welfare, Crime and Society, pp. 2-32.United Kingdom: Open University Press.

Moya, M., and Rodríguez, R.B. (2005). Cognición social aplicada. In F. Expósito and M. Moya (Coord.): Aplicando la Psicología Social, pp. 149-170. Madrid: Pirámide.

Pérez, F., Antolinez, P., Cabrera, C.E., and Peligero, A.M. (2010). Evolución de la seguridad en España. Aproximación a la creación de un índice de medición. Madrid: Universidad Camilo José Cela.

Plant, J.B, and Scott, M.S. (2009). Effective Policing and Crime Prevention. A Problem-Oriented Guide for Mayors, City Managers, and County Executives. Washington: U.S. Department of Justice.

Redondo, R. and Pueyo, A.A. (2007). La Psicología de la Delincuencia. Papeles del Psicólogo, 28(3), pp. 147-156.

Renauer, B.C., Duffee, D.E., Scott, J.D. (2003). Measuring police-community co-production. Trade-offs in two observational approaches. Policing An International Journal of Police Strategies & Management, 26 (1), pp. 9-28.

Sagant, V, and Shaw, M. (2010). International Report 2010. Crime prevention and Community Safety: Trends and Prespectives. Canada: International Centre for the Prevention of Crime (ICPC).

Shaftoe, H. (2008). Convivial Urban Spaces. Creating Effective Public Places. UK: Earthscan.

Shaftoe, H. (2011). Public safety and public space. In M.Gandarillas (Coor.): Proceedings of the International Congress on Public Safety in a Diverse Society, pp. 314-327. Madrid: IE University and Cultivalibros.

Tilley, N. (2005). Introduction: thinking realistically about crime prevention. In N. Tilley (Ed). Handbook of Crime Prevention and Community Safety, pp. 3-13. Canada: Willan Publishing.

Tilley, N. (2009). Crime Prevention. Canada: Willan Publishing.

UNODC and UN-Habitat (2009). Crime Prevention Assessment Tool. Criminal Justice Assessment Toolkit. New York: United Nations. In Urra, J. (2010). Adolescentes en conflicto. 53 casos reales. Madrid: Ediciones Pirámide.

Van Durmen, J., González, A., and Durán, E. (2011). Herramienta para la evaluación de la sensación de inseguridad, proyecto Victimad. In M.Gandarillas (Coord.): Proceedings of the International Congress on Public Safety in a Diverse Society, pp. 327-335. Madrid: IE University and CultivaLibros.

Vuanello, R. (2006). Un nuevo instrumento de evaluación psicológica: el cuestionario de la inseguridad ciudadana. Interdisciplinaria, 23 (1), pp. 17-45.