Abstract

Security have concern authorities and civil society during last years. Different society’s substrates have different perceptions on security. Present document explores reliability and validity of an instrument which measures security perception in bachelor’s students by reviewing seven dimensions: territorial, national, public (government), human, public (self-protection), private and internaut. Accordingly, setting values and residual permitted to accept the null hypothesis significant relationship between the theoretical dimensions with respect to the weighted factors.
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Introduction

Security, in several countries, have been suffered a lack, or absence, particularly when it is talked about governmental participation. Public security can be understood it as the state labor to protect and safe its population from internal dangers or threats. In Latin-American countries, public safe keeping is perceived as absent, due to big amount of press coverages which exposes mentioned lack [1].

In case of Mexico, day by day, they appear in the news, a bigger quantity of red notes’ coverages, which shows a violent face of the country. Objective of present work is to establish the reliability and validity of an instrument that measures the perception of security in: Territorial security; National security; Public safety (State as general attorney); Human security; Public safety (Self-protection); Private security; and, internaut perception of safety, scopes [2].

Public safety events occur throughout the world, posing a threat to personal safety, property and national defense. Mexico’s security problems are similar to the general context in Latin America in many ways. However, Mexico has an influence of organized crime due to the levels of consumption of illegal products in the US market [3].

Public security has traditionally been understood as the function of the State that consists in protecting its citizens from illegal attacks on (or crimes against) their property, physical integrity, sexual freedom, etc. The meaning of public safety is inferred as security of persons: inherence, inseparability, breadth and focus on justice [4].

It is stated that our reality’s perception is subjective and that our world’s perception depends of our life conditions. Perception of reality operates from a superior order, from a mesosystem that would include both (perception and reality), and in which each appear like elements and not like closed and independent units. The notion that: what we see, might not be what is truly there, has troubled and tantalized, all the population in every sector, class, or roll of our society. Different population’s sector would have different perception of security [5].

It can also be mentioned that cultural stigma in the country, also affects and promotes a lack of public safe keeping, due to the general manner of Mexican population’s thinking, which in comparison with other cultures, appear to be like sluggish and with a short interest to develop in academic, professional, social, among other aspects. The administration of public security is the implementation of public policies that justify the guidance of the State in the prevention of crime and the administration of justice, but only the citizens’ distrust of government action is evidenced by a growing perception of insecurity reported in the literature in seven dimensions: territorial, national, public (government), human, public (self-protection), private and internaut [6].

Mexico can be seen from diverse scopes like economic, historic, or social. In that sense, there exist other sub-scopes (or sub-scales in the social scope) like health, public security, education, environmental consciousness, among others. As mentioned before, different population’s sectors have different perception of social
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A second study was conducted with 89 merchants from a locality with a high index of public insecurity, considering their participation in the prevention of crime and the employment of private security. The same scale was used, and the information was processed with the same software and parameters.

Results

Internal consistency, according to data collection and analysis, in overall scale (0.793) and the subscales F1 = Perception of territorial security (alpha of 0.792 and 22% of the total variance explained); F2 = Perception on national security (alpha of 0.709 and 19% of the explained variance); F3 = Perception of public safety (alpha of 0.785 and 17% of the variance explained); F4 = Perception of human security (alpha of 0.785 and 12% of the explained variance); F5 = Perception of public security (alpha of 0.792 and 12% of the explained variance); F6 = Perception private security (alpha of 0.794 and 9% of the explained variance); and F7 = Perception internaut safety (alpha of 0.731 and 7% of the explained variance) is discrete because evidence the differences between the contexts of study in which security was conceptualized.

Adequation (KMO = .764), Sphericity \( \chi^2 = 334.1 (25g) \) p < .01 Method: Principals Ways, Rotation: Promax. F1 = Perception of territorial security (alpha of 0.792 and 22% of the total variance explained); F2 = Perception on national security (alpha of 0.709 and 19% of the explained variance); F3 = Perception of public safety (alpha of 0.785 and 17% of the variance explained); F4 = Perception of human security (alpha of 0.785 and 12% of the explained variance); F5 = Perception of public security (alpha of 0.792 and 12% of the explained variance); F6 = Perception private security (alpha of 0.794 and 9% of the explained variance); and F7 = Perception internaut safety (alpha of 0.731 and 7% of the explained variance).

A second study, once the factors were established, possible and associative linear relationships were estimated to investigate the emergency of a second order factor common to the seven first-order factors found.
The values of the adjustment and residual parameters $\chi^2 = 135.34$ (32gl) $p = 0.054$; GFI = 0.995; CFI = 0.990; RMSEA = 0.003 suggest the non-rejection of the null hypothesis relative to the significant differences between the theoretical relationships established in the literature with respect to the empirical relationships found in the study.

Discussion

In Mexico, a common interpretation or idea of which country is lacking security prevails. The absence of custody is influenced by the presence of organized crime, the illegal sale of drugs and weapons and the corruption available in each branch of government, among the main aspects.

The correlations of reliability and validity when the unit far show that there are other dimensions linked to construct. In this sense, the inclusion of self-control explains the effects of state propaganda regarding crime prevention, law enforcement and peace education on lifestyles of civilian sectors.

The contribution of this study is concerned about the reliability and validity of an instrument which measured seven dimensions of security: territorial, national, human, public, public, private and digital.

The studies on public safety identify in the government’s expectations the predominant factor that explains the phenomenon as an efficient, effective and effective institution, but in the present work the emergence of this phenomenon has been demonstrated from a structure of perceptions around the personal, citizen, public, human, national and territorial agenda.

Conclusion

The objective of this work was to corroborate the factorial structure of perceived safety, although the research design limits the finding of the research scenario, suggests the construction of an agenda and the incidence in security policies based on opinions and expectations of the governed with respect to the performance of their rulers.
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