

Summary of WP 2.2: Morphological analysis of Actual and Perceived Security

The purpose of WP 2.2, Morphological Analysis (MA), was to bring together a group of subject specialists, representing different relevant areas of competence concerning safety and security, in order to develop an initial structure, a common problem space and modelling framework for the CPSI project. This modelling framework is to serve as a first approximation and hypothesis concerning the essential parameters to be investigated. This was done with the non-quantified modelling method *Morphological Analysis*. (For a summary of Morphological Analysis go to: <http://www.swemorph.com/pdf/gma.pdf>)

The primary questions addressed during the workshops were:

1. What are the main factors which determine, and by which we can measure, “Actual Security” (AS) in a community, and how do these factors relate to each other?
2. What are the main factors which determine, and by which we can measure, “Perceived Security” (PS) for the population of a community, and how do these factors relate to each other?

These two questions represent the two main pillars of social/cultural research, the so-called *etic* and *emic* approaches. (Pike, K. 1954. *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behaviour*. Summer Institute of Linguistics, Glendale, CA.)

The **etic** perspective relies upon *extrinsic concepts* and categories that have meaning for scientific observers (e.g., per capita energy consumption, crime statistics). Subject specialists studying these phenomena are the primary judges of the validity of an etic account. The assessment of Actual Security (AS) is primarily an etic matter.

The **emic** perspective focuses on *intrinsic cultural distinctions, perceptions and motivations* that are meaningful to the members of a given society or group. The group members (of a culture) are the judges of the validity of an emic account. The assessment of Perceived Security (PS) is primarily an emic matter.

The work was carried out in 3 two-day workshops between 9 April and 11 July, 2008. Five to eight subject specialists per workshop, representing different organisations representing different aspects of the problems area, participated.

The working groups created two morphological fields, one representing important parameters relating to a community’s Actual Security (AS), and one relating to Perceived Security (PS) (see Figure 1, below for an example).

During the final (third) workshop, the working group also began to identify possible intervention typologies (i.e. different types of interventions at different levels of abstraction). It is important to assess how different types of interventions are appropriate/effective for different types of security risks/threats, and how these, in turn, might influence actual and perceived security.

The deliverable for WP 2.2 included a process report, the prototype morphological models developed for Actual and Perceived Security (including software to run the models) and a prototype intervention typology. The process report also included a description of the

Stockholm Security Survey, carried out by Stockholm municipality in 2007. The survey concerned perceived security in 14 districts in Stockholm and was mainly concerned with local area crime. A morphological field containing parameters which were extracted from the survey questionnaire was presented and compared with the parameters of the Actual and Perceived Security models created by the working groups.

Type of threat/risk/insecurity	Context of perceived threat/insecurity	Demographic characteristics which can determine whether and to what extent people perceive threat?	Hypothesis about how people primarily appraise and cope with perceived threat	Type of responses (effect of coping style)
Natural disasters	Home and family	Age	Denial (of threat)	Seek social support
Man made disasters (tech. accidents)	Neighbourhood	Gender	Downplay the seriousness of consequences	Seek professional support (psychological)
Violence	Workplace	Type of "household"	Attribute cause to higher power (God, fate)	Defensive avoidance (limiting oneself)
Property crime	Social group	Ethnic background	Attribute cause to society	Deal with symptoms of threat
Vandalism and other crimes against public order	Public spaces	Sexual orientation	Problem focussed coping	Seek / buy protection (legal/ physical/public authority)
"Terrorism"	Transport systems	Level of Education	Stereotyping	Confront source of threat
Drugs abuse and other addiction	Institutions	Occupation	"It's all my fault"	Do nothing
Discrimination/ marginalisation/ social exclusion	Society in general	Religion	Fear and insecurity (Not coping)	
Economic downturn/ social upheaval		Income		
War		Type of Housing		
		Membership in political parties/groups		
		Degree of social exclusion		
		Social cohesiveness		
		Previous victim of crime or threat		

Figure 1: The prototype Perceived Security (parameter) field with one configuration selected.