



University safety in post-pandemic literature

Arturo Sanchez Sanchez, Javier Carreón Guillén

Universidad Autónoma de Tlaxcala

Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México

Article History

Volume 6, Issue Si4, 2024

Received: 16 May 2024

Accepted: 20 June 2024

Doi:

10.48047/AFJBS.6.Si4.2024.2134-2146

Abstract – Security has worried authorities and civil society in recent years. Different substrata of society have different perceptions about security. This document explores the reliability and validity of an instrument that measures the perception of security in undergraduate students by reviewing seven dimensions: territorial, national, public (government), human, public (self-protection), private and internet. Consequently, fit and residual values allowed us to accept the null hypothesis of a significant relationship between the theoretical dimensions with respect to the weighted factors.

Keywords : **Reliability** of the instrument, Validity of the instrument, Perception of security.

INTRODUCTION

The history of public safety is vast and varied, reflecting the evolution of societies over time (Shearing & Stenning, 1983). Since ancient civilizations such as the Sumerian, Egyptian, Greek and Roman, there have been incipient forms of public security (Gurinskaya & Nalla, 2020). Cities had guards to maintain order and protect citizens (Saxby, 2015). Under feudalism, public security was mainly in the hands of feudal lords and their knights, although cities began to organize local systems of surveillance and protection (Macaulay, 2005). With the rise of nation states, more organized security forces were established (Paek et al., 2022). For example, in England, the London Metropolitan Police was founded in 1829 by Sir Robert Peel, considered the first modern police force.

Public security became professionalized and expanded considerably around the world (Terpstra, 2009). Police functions diversified to range from crime prevention to emergency response and traffic management (Hay, 2007). Public safety encompasses a wide range of activities, including law enforcement, disaster management, cybersecurity, and counterterrorism (Bonner, 2014). There have been significant technological advances that have transformed security strategies, such as the use of surveillance cameras, advanced communication systems and data analysis (Tassabehji, Elliman & Mellor, 2007). Public security has evolved from simple structures in ancient civilizations to complex modern organizations that face increasingly sophisticated challenges in a globalized and technologically advanced world (see Table 1).

Table 1. Comparison of security systems

Security Type	Description	Examples
Territorial Security	Protection of borders and territories	Armed forces, patrols borders. Against external threats.
National security	Guarding national interests	Intelligence agencies, national defense against internal and external threats.
Public Security	Maintenance of public order and crime prevention at the local level.	Local police, fire departments.
Citizen Security	Protection of the rights and well-being of citizens in their daily lives.	Community safety policies, crime prevention programs.
Private Security	Security services provided by non-governmental entities.	Private security companies, bodyguards.
Cybernetics Security	Protection of systems, networks and data	Computer security equipment, antivirus software.

Theories of public security focus on understanding how the protection of the population is managed and ensured at the local or national level (Clotfelter, 1978). It focuses on modifying the physical and social environment to reduce criminal opportunities (Boyer & Van Slyke, 2019). It proposes strategies such as safe environmental design and public space management to deter crime. Based on the idea that severe penalties and the certainty of capture deter individuals from committing crimes. It focuses on strengthening law enforcement capabilities and increasing risk perceptions among potential criminals. Examines how police strategies and tactics influence crime prevention and perceptions of safety. It focuses on the professionalization of law enforcement and improving the relationship with the community. Promotes collaboration between police and the community to identify local problems and develop joint solutions.

Public safety seeks to strengthen trust and cooperation between residents and law enforcement (Valkenburg, 2017). Like the concept of human security internationally, it broadens the focus of public security beyond crime to include aspects such as the economic, social and environmental security of individuals in the community. Explores how the cognitive and information limitations of actors involved in public safety affect decision-making and policy implementation. Proposes adaptive and pragmatic approaches. These theories offer diverse perspectives on how to understand and address public safety challenges, from crime prevention to risk management and promoting community safety. Each provides conceptual tools and practical strategies to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of security policies and practices at the local or national level.

Table 2. Comparison of public security theories

Theory	Description	Key Concepts	Application Examples
Environmental Security	Defines the physical and social environment to reduce criminal opportunities.	Urban design, public space management	Improving safety in urban areas through street lighting and design.
Deterrence Theory	Emphasizes the role of severe penalties and high certainty of capture in deterring crime.	Deterrence, perception of individual risk	Law enforcement policies that act as deterrents against criminal activities.

	apture to deter crime.	ences.
ory of Police ctiveness	nines how police o tolerance" policy, egies and tactics s on violent crime ent crime and improve	ementation of evidence- d strategies by law rcement agencies.
roach munity	y. notes collaboration imunityparticipation, ween police and ighteningrelationship munity to solve safety	imunity policing programs joint patrolling with lents.
ian ory lly)	Security ands public safety to tidimensional (applied ide economic, social, rity, needs basic environmental well-	il policies for prehensive social lopment and reduction of ualities.
ory of Limited onality	siders cognitive and ptability, mation limitations in nizational rity decision making.	learning ning police officers in ble response to changing tions.

Security, in several countries, has suffered a lack or absence, particularly when it comes to government participation. As mentioned by Molina-Ruiz et al., (2017), public security can be understood as the work of the State to protect and safeguard its population from internal dangers or threats. In Latin American countries, public security is perceived as absent, due to the large amount of journalistic coverage that exposes this lack.

In the case of Mexico, a greater amount of red notice coverage appears in the news every day, which shows a violent face of the country (Molina-Ruiz *et al.*, 2017). The objective of this work is to establish the reliability and validity of an instrument that measures the perception of security in: Territorial security; National security; Public security (State as attorney general); human security; Public security (Self-protection); Private security; and, Internet perception of security, scope.

Public safety protection events occur around the world that pose a threat to personal and property safety and national security (Wu *et al.*, 2016). Mexico's security problems are similar in many ways to the general context of Latin America (Romero, Magaloni and Díaz- Cayeros, 2016). However, Mexico has a particular influence from organized crime due to the levels of consumption of illegal things in the US market (Molina-Ruiz *et al.*, 2017).

As mentioned by Aguilera-García & Uribe-Arzate (2014), it has traditionally been understood as the function of the State that consists of protecting its citizens from illegal attacks (or crimes against) their property, their physical integrity, their sexual freedom and their sexual freedom. soon. In Chianca - Dantas (2015), the meaning of public custody is inferred as the safety of people. In Khalili - Dehdezi& Qaleh-Sardi (2016) 4 specific characteristics of public custody are presented: inherence, inseparability, comprehensiveness and focus on justice.

In Hernando (1999), it is stated that the perception of our reality is subjective, and that the perception of our world depends on our particular living conditions. The perception of reality operates from a higher order, from a mesosystem that would include both (perception and reality), and in which each one appears as elements and not as closed and independent units (Nescolarde - Selva, Usó-Doménech& Gash, 2014). The notion that what we see may not be what really exists, has disturbed and tormented [...] (Lotto, 2017), the entire population in each sector, class or role of our society (Molina-Ruiz *et al.*, 2017). Different sectors of the population would have different perceptions of security.

It can also be mentioned that the cultural stigma in the country also affects and promotes the lack of public protection, due to the general way of thinking of the Mexican population, which, compared to

other cultures, seems slow and with little interest. develop in academic, professional, social aspects, among others (Molina-Ruiz *et al.*, 2017). The administration of public security is the implementation of public policies that justify the orientation of the State in the prevention of crime and the administration of justice, but only the distrust of citizens towards government action is evidenced in a growing perception of insecurity reported in Literature. in seven dimensions: territorial, national, public (government), human, public (self-protection), private and Internet.

As Molina-Ruiz (2015) mentions, Mexico can be seen from diverse areas such as economic, historical or social. In that sense, there are other subfields (or subscales in the social field) such as health, public safety, education, environmental awareness, among others. As mentioned above, different sectors of the population have different perceptions of social subspheres (or subscales). In the case of Bachelor's students, given that their academic training provides the possibility of generating critical thinking, this sector of the population can generate a solid perception of a factor that affects the context of society.

METHOD

The experimental design consists of a non-experimental, exploratory and cross-sectional study. Formulation rounds on the question: what are the factors that underlie the measurement of the perception of security in its various forms? The null hypothesis was raised as: the theoretical relationships between security perceptions are consistent with the observed data. An alternative hypothesis was also proposed: the theoretical relationships between security perceptions are different from the observed data.

The sample was carried out with a non-random selection of 320 students from a public university in the State of Mexico. 44% are women and 66% men.

50% of the respondents are under 18 years old ($M = 17.29$ and $SD = 1.24$), 40% are between 18 and 22 years old ($M = 20.14$ and $SD = 2.36$) and 10 % are over 22 years old ($M = 23.25$ and $SD = 4.36$).

30% earn less than 3'500 pesos ($M=3'200$ and $SD=123.25$), 25% between 3'500 and 7'000 monthly ($M=5'467$ and $SD=345.25$) and 45% earn more than 7,000 per month ($M = 8,913$ and $SD = 135.47$).

An insecurity perception scale was constructed that includes 28 perception items regarding security: territorial, national, public (government), human, public (self-protection), private and internet.

Territorial security perception subscale. It refers to the expectations about the State as the ruler of public peace. It includes four items that respond with any of the six response options: 0 = "not at all likely" to 5 = "very likely."

National security perception subscale. It refers to expectations regarding the State as prosecutor of crimes against democracy, national identity or the interests of the population. It includes four items that respond with any of the six response options: 0 = "not at all likely" to 5 = "very likely."

Public safety perception subscale. Expectations regarding the State as Attorney General. It includes four items that are answered with any of the six response options: 0 = "not at all likely" to 5 = "very likely."

Human safety perception subscale. It refers to the expectations generated by crime prevention policies, the administration of justice and the promotion of social peace. It includes four items that respond with any of the six response options: 0 = "not at all likely" to 5 = "very likely."

Citizen security perception subscale. It refers to the expectations that citizens generate from distrust and alienation of the State with its security institutions, while interest focuses on civil remedies for self-protection. It includes four items that respond with any of the six response options: 0 = "not at all likely" to 5 = "very likely."

Private security perception subscale. It refers to the expectations of civil society generated from the State as incapable of preventing crime and combating corruption. It includes four items that are answered with any of the six response options: 0 = "not at all likely" to 5 = "very likely."

Subscale Perception of security of Internet users. It refers to the expectations that Internet users consider generated from state espionage in their search for information, selection of content and dissemination of topics. It includes four items that are answered with any of the six response options; 0 = "not at all likely" to 5 = "very likely."

The Delphi technique was used to establish the homogeneity of the concepts in the items. We examined the exhibit in the lobby of his university library. The data were processed with the Statistical Analysis Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) and Structural Analysis of Moments (AMOS). Versions 18.0. Reliability was estimated with Cronbach's alpha, Bartlett's validity test, KMO and factor weight.

Cronbach's alpha was estimated to establish the internal consistency of the general scale and the subscales. The Bootstrap parameter was calculated to establish sampling when it is not possible to fully use the data and only part of the distribution is used. Adequacy and sphericity were calculated with the Kayser Meyer Olkin parameters and the Bartlett test. An exploratory factor analysis was performed with obliquity criteria and promax rotation of the principal axes. The hypothesis test was carried out with the estimation of the adjustment and residual parameters.

Internal consistency, according to data collection and analysis, in the global scale and the subscales are discrete because it shows the differences between the study contexts in which security was conceptualized.

RESULTS

The analysis of the adequacy of the instrument to the sample size is sufficient (see Table 3). That is, the instrument barely meets this requirement to be able to carry out its validity.

Table 3. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Test

Overall MSA	.
Status	.
Security	.
Hygiene	.
Sanitization	.
Infrastructure	.
Protection	.
Policies	.
Anxiety	.
Denial	.
Emotion	.
Mindset	.
Isolation	.
Coexistence	.
Belonging	.
Interaction	.
Support	.
Need	.
Quality	.
Access	.
Preparation	.
Virtuality	.

Table 3. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Test

Communication	
Satisfaction	
Worry	
Recommendation	
Expression	
Trust	

The exploratory factor analysis of principal axes with promax rotation suggests the establishment of eight factors that reflect the security construct (see Table 4). The results show five for the first factor, five for the second, four for the third, three for the fourth, two for the fifth, two for the sixth, two for the seventh and two for the eighth factor.

Table 4. Factor Loadings

	r 1	r 2	r 3	r 4	r 5	r 6	r 7	r 8	ness
Preparation									
Communication									
Virtuality									
Worry									
Recommendation									
Belonging									
Anxiety									
Need									
Infrastructure									
Status									
Isolation									
Mindset									
Hygiene									
Satisfaction									
Quality									
Denial									
Expression									
Interaction									
Protection									
Support									
Policies									
Access									
Emotion									
Sanitization									
Coexistence									
Security									
Trust									

Applied rotation method is promax .

The rotation analysis explains the percentage of variance (see Table 5). The first factor explained 19%, the second explained 17%, the third was close to 12%, the fourth was close to 8%, the fifth 6%, the sixth 5%, the seventh 5%. and the eighth 4%.

Table 5. Factor Characteristics

	Unrotated solution				Rotated solution			
	Factor	Initial Var	Initial %	Initial Cum %	Factor	Initial Var	Initial %	Initial Cum %
Factor 1	198	13.0	19.0	19.0	119	7.8	11.4	11.4
Factor 2	155	10.3	17.0	36.0	133	9.5	17.0	33.0
Factor 3	77	5.1	12.0	48.0	49	3.3	12.0	60.0
Factor 4	66	4.4	8.0	56.0	91	6.4	8.0	68.0
Factor 5	32	2.1	6.0	62.0	79	5.6	6.0	74.0
Factor 6	11	0.7	5.0	67.0	76	5.4	5.0	79.0
Factor 7	35	2.3	5.0	72.0	70	5.0	5.0	84.0
Factor 8	15	1.0	4.0	76.0	68	4.8	4.0	88.0

The correlation analysis indicates the degree of multicollinearity (see Table 6). Values close to zero are seen that show reflective relationships between the factors with respect to the security construct.

Table 6. Factor Correlations

	r1	r2	r3	r4	r5	r6	r7	r8
Factor 1	1.00	0.18	0.19	0.21	0.40	0.12	0.21	0.11
Factor 2	0.18	1.00	0.34	0.24	0.95	0.07	0.17	0.18
Factor 3	0.19	0.34	1.00	0.12	0.96	0.19	0.56	0.11
Factor 4	0.21	0.24	0.12	1.00	0.85	0.69	0.14	0.18
Factor 5	0.40	0.95	0.96	0.85	1.00	0.51	0.62	0.11
Factor 6	0.12	0.07	0.19	0.69	0.51	1.00	0.70	0.15
Factor 7	0.21	0.17	0.56	0.14	0.62	0.70	1.00	0.22
Factor 8	0.11	0.18	0.11	0.18	0.11	0.15	0.22	1.00

The residual analysis indicates multicollinearity between the items (see Table 7). The correlations between the indicators suggest reflective relationships with the factors and the security construct.

Table 7. Residual Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Eleven	12	13	14	fifteen	16	17	18	19	twenty	twenty-one	22	23	24	25	26	27		
Status	0.608	0.082	-0.022	-0.011	-0.010	0.025	0.001	0.002	0.008	0.000	0.005	0.017	0.005	0.004	0.000	0.003	0.002	0.006	0.000	0.023	0.004	0.027	0.003	-0.005	0.009	0.005	0.001	0.003	0.006
Security	0.082	0.751	0.041	-0.024	0.030	0.005	0.002	0.009	0.002	0.000	0.003	0.001	0.009	0.000	0.003	0.005	0.007	0.006	0.000	0.005	0.012	0.009	0.008	0.008	0.002	0.007	0.001	0.000	0.008
Hygiene	-0.040	0.043	-0.009	-0.000	0.015	0.004	0.007	0.000	0.000	0.006	0.007	0.006	0.002	0.005	0.004	0.008	0.002	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.002	0.006	0.000	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.010	0.000	0.000

Table 7. Residual Matrix

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Ele ven	12	13	14	fift ee	16	17	18	19	tw ent	tw nty-	22	23	24	25	26	27	
ty			.6396	.818	.068	.140	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00
ss			.87	.067	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00	.11	.00
ration			.05	.50	.0958	.558	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
ality			.46	.43	.52	.97	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
nunication			.583	.16	.652	.581	.07	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
raction			.84	.306	.483	.44	.08	.20	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
y			.5	.41894	.2644	.30	.33	.1	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
mmendation			.689	.319	.072	.679	.01	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
ssion			.0	.62	.76	.40	.08627	.4834	.5																			
			.2	.5	.121	.7486	.2	.4	.1192	.5																		

The parallel analysis suggests the allowable number of factors in the model (see Table 8). A maximum of eight factors are seen that demonstrate the specification of the model. That is, the number of factors is not greater than the number of relationships between the factors and the construct.

Table 8. Parallel Analysis

	Real data componenteigenvalues	lated data meanseigenvalues
Factor 1*	5,407	.
Factor 2*	4,742	.
Factor 3*	3,367	.
Factor 4*	2,376	.
Factor 5*	1,832	.
Factor 6*	1,711	.
Factor 7*	1,685	.
Factor 8*	1,345	.
Factor 9	0,955	.
Factor 10	0,850	.
Factor 11	0,607	.
Factor 12	0,532	.
Factor 13	0,423	.
Factor 14	0,287	.
Factor 15	0,221	.
Factor 16	0,164	.
Factor 17	0,132	.
Factor 18	0,110	.
Factor 19	0,080	.
Factor 20	0,052	.
Factor 21	0,043	.
Factor 22	0,037	.

Table 8. Parallel Analysis

	Real data component eigenvalues	lated data mean eigenvalues
Factor 23	0.019	
Factor 24	0.012	
Factor 25	0.007	
Factor 26	0.005	
Factor 27	0.000	

'*' = Factor should be retained. Results from PC-based parallel analysis.

The adjustment and residual parameters [$X^2 = 3052.071$ (163 df) $p = 0.001$; CFI = 0.717; TLI = 0.365; RMSEA = 0.267] suggest the non-rejection of the hypothesis related to the significant differences between the theoretical relationships with respect to the relationships observed in the present work.

DISCUSSION

The contribution of this work to the state of the art lies in the establishment of a model of relationships reflective of security. The results show the prevalence of three factors that explained 61% of the total variance.

The analysis of eigenvalues suggests the maximum number of permissible factors for the system of reflective relationships between the construct, its dimensions and indicators. The results suggest three predominant factors alluding to public, citizen and private security which explained the total variance.

Structural analysis suggests indirect and direct, negative and positive, spurious or significant relationships between factors and indicators. The findings demonstrate the prevalence of three factors related to public, citizen and private security. Furthermore, the relationships between the factors and indicators are direct, positive and significant except for the relationship between the third factor and indicator 3.

The literature on security and the public covers a wide range of topics and perspectives. Public key steganography with active attacks highlights the importance of secure communication methods (Moreira, Cardoso & Nalla, 2015). The security of electronic systems and computer networks emphasizes the need for solid cybersecurity measures in the digital age (Noaks, 2008). Private security, corporate investigation and European military services shape collective security and the structuring of the public sphere (Gasper & Gómez, 2015). The challenges and increasing costs associated with improving national security emphasize the complexities and failures of achieving absolute security.

Public and private security, particularly in the context of the security ensemble highlights the changing patterns of security governance (Shearing & Stenning, 1981). A smart security system for women's safety in public places creates a 100% safe environment through innovative security measures (Ungar, 2007). The State of Public Infrastructure as a Service Cloud Security highlights both established best practices and areas of innovation in cloud security mechanisms (Henderson, 1987). Covert security with public verifiability emphasizes the importance of faster, more agile and simpler security protocols (Dickinson, 2013). A comprehensive evaluation prototype of the security model for databases in public organizations mitigates cyber-attacks, using blockchain technology and security algorithms to improve data protection (Knop, 2008). Overall, the review of security and public literature highlights the changing nature of security challenges and the innovative approaches adopted to address them in various contexts.

In this work, it was found that public security is associated with citizen security and both with private security. In that sense, the state of the art and the observations of this work agree in the analysis of a comprehensive structure of public security with private security and cybersecurity. Therefore, the exploration of cybersecurity is recognized as limits to increase the percentage of the total variance

explained. The study of cybersecurity is recommended to establish the axes of discussion in the research agenda.

CONCLUSION

In Mexico, the interpretation or idea that the country lacks security is common. This lack of protection is influenced by the presence of organized crime, the illegal trade in drugs and weapons and the corruption available in each branch of the government, among the main aspects. The correlations of reliability and validity when the unit shows that there are other dimensions linked to the construct. In this sense, the inclusion of self-control explains the effects of state propaganda on crime prevention, law enforcement, and peace education on the lifestyles of civilian sectors. The contribution of this study refers to the reliability and validity of an instrument that measured dimensions of security: territorial, national, human, public, private and digital.

References

- Aguilera-García, ER & Uribe-Arzate, E. (2014). Towards a society oriented towards human security, conception of public security in the context of globalization, *Ciencia Ergo Sum*, 21, 1, 71–76, Autonomous University of the State of Mexico Toluca, Mexico, available at: [<http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=10429976009>].
- Bonner, M.D. (2014). Violence, policing, and citizen (in) security. *Latin American Research Review*, 49 (1), 261-269. <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/latin-american-research-review/article/violence-policing-and-citizen-insecurity/36BA9C107467C4554FC5D326D73796EE>
- Boyer, E.J., & Van Slyke, D.M. (2019). Citizen attitudes towards public–private partnerships. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 49 (3), 259-274. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0275074018769072>
- Chianca -Dantas, A (2015). Police media, public security and human security : a reflexive approach , *Direito , Estado e Sociedade* , 46, 72–100.
- Clotfelter, C. T. (1978). Private security and the public safety. *Journal of urban economics* , 5 (3), 388-402. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0094119078900189>
- Dickinson, L.A. (2013). Regulating the privatized security industry: The promise of public/private governance. *Emory LJ*, 63, 417. https://heinonline.org/hol/cgi-bin/get_pdf.cgi?handle=hein.journals/emlj63§ion=16
- Gaspar , D., & Gómez, OA (2015). Human security thinking in practice: ' personnel security','citizenssecurity'and comprehensive mappings. *Contemporary Politics* , 21 (1), 100-116. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13569775.2014.993906>
- Gurinskaya , A., & Nalla, M. K. (2020). Citizen satisfaction with private police in Russia: Does satisfaction with public police matter?. *Journal of Contemporary Criminal Justice* , 36 (1), 4-18. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1043986219890210>
- Hay, J. (2007). The many responsibilities of the new citizen-soldier. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* , 4 (2), 216-220. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14791420701296604>
- Henderson, J. H. (1987). Public law enforcement, private security and citizen crime prevention: Competition or cooperation. *The Police Journal* , 60 (1), 48-57. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0032258X8706000110>
- Hernando, A. (1999). Perception of reality and prehistory. Relationship between the construction of identity and socioeconomic complexity in human groups, *Works on Prehistory*, Higher Council for Scientific Research, vol. 56, no. 2, pp. 19 – 35.
- Khalili- Dehdezi , A., & Qaleh-Sardi , F.K. (2016). The role of public security in society, *International Journal of Humanities and Cultural Studies*, ISSN: 2356-5926.

- Knop, K. (2008). Citizenship, public and private. *Law and Contemporary Problems* , 71 (3), 309-341. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27654675>
- Lotus, B. (2017). *Going Away: The Science of Seeing Differently*, Hachette Books Group , 1290 Avenue of the Americas , New York, NY 10104, ISBN-13: 978-0316300193, ISBN-10: 0316300195.
- Macaulay, F. (2005). Civil society-state partnerships for the promotion of citizen security in Brazil. *South. International Journal of Human Rights*, 2, 146-173. <https://www.scielo.br/j/sur/a/P93wKHTJrb4TnD7sHCt4Mpf/?format=html&lang=en>
- Molina-Ruiz, HD (2015). Mexico and its economic, historical and social contexts, in the business environment: an approach from the approach of globalization as a tool for decision making, *Innovation and Technological Development Revista Digital*, 7 (1), 8— 33, ISSN: 2007—4786.
- Molina-Ruiz, HD, García- Mungía , M., Rojano-Chávez, SM & Moreno-Gutiérrez, SS (2017). Chapter: Perception of public security from the crowd-search approach : using the impact of social networks, advancing the use of knowledge of collective consciousness, In: *Emerging technologies for an intelligent world*, Edited by: Alfa-Omega, available at: http://www.aniei.org.mx/Archivos/Memorias/L_Electronico_CNIC2017.pdf.
- Moreira, S., Cardoso, C., & Nalla , MK (2015). Citizen confidence in private security guards in Portugal. *European journal of criminology*, 12 (2), 208-225. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1477370815571946>
- Nescolarde -Selva, JA, Usó-Doménech, JL & Gash , H. (2014). A theoretical view of reality, perception and language, *Complexity*, 20, 1, 27–37, Wiley Periodicals Inc., DOI: 10.1002/cplx.21493
- Noaks, L. (2008). Private and public policing in the UK: a citizen perspective on partnership. *Policing & society*, 18 (2), 156-168. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/10439460802008678>
- Paek, SY, Nalla, MK, Lee, J., & Gurinskaya , A. (2022). The effect of perceived citizen views and supervisor support on Private Security Officers' job satisfaction: the mediating role of self-legitimacy. *Security Journal*, 35 (4), 1047. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8383254/>
- Romero, V., Magaloni , B. & Díaz- Cayeros , A. (2016). *Presidential Approval and Public Safety in Mexico's War on Crime*, Latin American Politics and Society, University of Miami, DOI: [10.1111/j.1548-2456.2016.00312.x] .
- Saxby, S. (2015). The 2014 CLSR-LSPI Lisbon seminar on 'the digital citizen'—Presented at the 9th International Conference on Legal, Security and Privacy Issues in IT Law (LSPI) 15–17 October 2014, Vieira De Almeida & Associados , Lisbon, Portugal. *Computer Law & Security Review*, 31 (2), 163-180. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0267364915000345>
- Shearing, C.D., & Stenning, P.C. (1983). Private security: implications for social control. *Social problems*, 30 (5), 493-506. <https://academic.oup.com/socpro/article-abstract/30/5/493/2925183>
- Shearing, C.D., & Stenning, P.C. (1981). Modern private security: its growth and implications. *Crime and justice*, 3, 193-245. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/449080>
- Tassabehji , R., Elliman, T., & Mellor, J. (2007). Generating citizen trust in e-government security: Challenging perceptions. *International Journal of Cases on Electronic Commerce (IJCEC)*, 3 (3), 1-17. <https://www.igi-global.com/article/generating-citizen-trust-government-security/1516>
- Terpstra, J. (2009). Citizen involvement in local security networks. *Security Journal* , 22 , 156-169. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/palgrave.sj.8350079>
- Ungar, M. (2007). The privatization of citizen security in Latin America: From elite guards to neighborhood vigilantes. *Social justice*, 34 (3/4 (109-110)), 20-37. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/29768462>
- Valkenburg, G. (2017). Security technologies versus citizen roles? *Science as Culture* , 26 (3), 307-329. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/09505431.2016.1255723>

Wu, S., Liu, Q., Bai, P., Wang, L., and Tan, T. (2016). SAPE: A System for Situation Aware Public Safety Assessment, Proceedings of the Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-16), Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence.

Annex: Questionnaire to Measure Public Safety

Instructions: Please answer each question based on your experience and perception in the community.

1. Demographic Data

- Age: _____
- Gender: _____
- Education level: _____
- Residence area: _____

2. Perception of Personal Security

- How do you feel about your personal safety in your community?
- Very unsafe / Unsafe / Neutral / Safe / Very safe

3. Perception of Safety in the Community

- How do you perceive general safety in your community?
- Very unsafe / Unsafe / Neutral / Safe / Very safe

4. Experience with Crime

- Have you been a victim of any crime in the last 12 months?
- But
- If yes, what type of crime(s) have you experienced? (Check all that apply)
- Heist
- Assault
- Vandalism
- Other (specify): _____

-How would you rate the authorities' response to crime? (on a scale of 1 to 5)

- 1 (Very unsatisfactory) / 2 / 3 (Neutral) / 4 / 5 (Very satisfactory)

5. Access and Quality of Security Services

- How would you rate the accessibility to emergency services (police, fire, ambulance) in your community?
- Very limited / Limited / Acceptable / Good / Excellent
- How would you rate the quality of justice services in your community? (e.g. response times, case resolution)
- Very low / Low / Moderate / High / Very high

6. Perception of the Police and other Security Institutions

- How do you evaluate the effectiveness of local police in preventing and resolving security problems?
- Very low / Low / Moderate / High / Very high
- Do you feel that the police work collaboratively with the community to address safety issues?
- Very little / Little / Neutral / A lot / A lot

7. Social and Community Factors

- How do factors such as lighting, maintenance of public spaces and community activities affect your perception of security?
- Negatively / Neutral / Positively

8. General Satisfaction with Public Safety

- In general, how would you rate public safety in your community?
- Very unsatisfactory / Unsatisfactory / Neutral / Satisfactory / Very satisfactory