Document Title: Local Safety Councils in Slovenia – A Story on Attempts to make Local Communities Responsible for Solving Crime and Safety Problems

Author(s): Gorazd Mesko

Document No.: 208036

Date Received: December 2004

GORAZD MEŠKO

LOCAL SAFETY COUNCILS IN SLOVENIA - A STORY ON ATTEMPTS TO MAKE LOCAL COMMUNITIES RESPONSIBLE FOR SOLVING CRIME AND SAFETY PROBLEMS

Recent trends in crime prevention and community safety in Slovenia have been characterised by the influence of ideas of crime prevention in Western societies, especially with the idea of community responsibilisation and involvement of local administration in setting priorities in safety/security efforts and prevention of everyday criminal offences.

Since 1998 eighty local safety/security councils have been established. The police initiated the establishment of all councils. The councils have been situated within the local town/city/municipality administration as a consultative body in crime and safety/security matters. A legal basis for such councils are the Police Act (paragraph 21) and the Local Self-administration act (paragraph 30). It is necessary to stress that both paragraphs are more or less »recommendations«. Therefore, a consultative body (a safety/security council) can be established by a municipality council. None piece of national legislation determines the obligations of such councils.

The results of research based on 178 members of local safety/security councils imply problems related to definition of local crime prevention, community policing, disparities between proclaimed ideas and practice of crime prevention. The role of such councils is still debatable. It is also necessary to stress the necessity of criminological analysis of local crime and safety/security problems. So far, the majority of such councils have drawn conclusions mainly upon the police presentation of crime problems in their communities and »public opinion« about the root causes of criminality in their environments. Expectations of the police are related to more responsibile local citizens but there exist a paradoxical weak bond of the police with local communities.

INTRODUCTION

Recent trends in crime prevention and community safety in Slovenia have been characterised by the influence of ideas of crime prevention in Western societies, especially with the idea of community responsibilisation and involvement of local administration in setting priorities in safety/security efforts and prevention of everyday criminal offences.

Before 1991, when Slovenia was a republic of the Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia, safety councils were situated in every local community. With the independence of Slovenia in 1991 all such councils were cancelled. Between 1991 and 1997 not such councils existed in Slovenia. Since 1997 more than 100 local safety councils have been established. The police initiated the establishment of all councils. In this sense we can discuss "new old" strategies of crime prevention and public safety which were "once upon time" directed by a communist party (Social Self-protection, orig. družbena samozaščita) and now by "responsible" individuals and groups of local communities and sometimes populists. These efforts can be described also as a story about help

and support vs. power. I assume, from my personal experience as a member of such a council in the capital of Slovenia, that these activities are sometimes characterized by the ideas of informal for the purpose of formal, thinking globally and reacting locally without a substantial financial support.

The councils have been situated within the local town/city/municipality administration as a consultative body in crime and safety matters. The legal basis for such councils are the Police Act, paragraph 21 (Internet, *www.policija.si*) and the Local Self-administration act, paragraph 20 (Internet, *www.mnz.si*). It is necessary to stress that both paragraphs are more or less »recommendations«. Therefore, a consultative body (a safety council) can be established by a municipality council. No piece of national legislation determines the obligations of such councils (Stategy of community policing in Slovenia, 2002).

This paper presents research research findings on some aspects of the definition of local crime prevention, community policing, disparities between proclaimed goals and reality, eevryday practice of crime prevention, the role of safety councils in everyday life, conducting a criminological analysis of local crime and safety problems, the influence of the police presentation of crime problems and »public opinion« about the root causes of criminality in their environments etc.. Research findings show also whether the respondents are more inclined to the ideas of authoritarian communitarianism and avoidance in »common efforts in solving crime and safety problems« or of moral minimalism (Hope, 1995: 67-68).

THE STUDY OF LOCAL SAFETY COUNCILS IN SLOVENIA

This study was an attempt to gain information on the extent to which the European Urban Charter (1992) and 'Prevention of violence – a guide for local authorities' (2002) might be applicable to local communities in Slovenian cities. In addition, the study aimed to explore the ways in which the local safety councils were started and established, and how they performed. Our study concentrated on seventeen Slovenian local administrations: Celje, Žalec, Polzela, Prebold, Velenje, Trebnje, Nova Gorica (participants of this meeting were not only from this town but also from several all Slovenian towns), Bovec, Vipava, Tolmin, Most na Soči, Kobarid, Ajdovščina, Ljubljana, Šentjernej, Škocjan and Novo mesto.

For this purpose we organised presentations in each of these cities for representatives of local authorities, the police force, local community representatives and non-governmental organisations. These sessions were held in the winter, spring and autumn of 2003, and in spring 2004. Documents were presented to the participants, including the European Urban Charter and Urban Crime Prevention Guide mentioned above. The participants discussed safety problems of local communities, especially with regard to the role of local safety councils in these towns. We also tried to identify the main local safety and crime prevention problems, and the ideas for and ways of solving such problems. Furthermore, we closely studied the practice of local safety councils, the legal framework for such activities and strategies used by of the Slovene police force regarding community policing, and the role of police officers in local safety councils. After the presentation, the participants discussed the applicability of the Guide in the management of crime and safety problems in their municipalities. Each session lasted about three hours.

At the end of each meeting we offered a questionnaire to the participants. In total, 178 persons participated in the study. Among them were police officers (53), city adminis-

tration representatives (35), city councillors (21), business sector representatives (11), school representatives (8), mayors (7), directors of social services (8), media representatives (4) and others (31). Although the selected sample should not be seen as representative, it still contains important information. Geographically, the study covers Central, West and a part of South Slovenia. Both small and large cities are included, with a great diversity from the rural area to the capital of Slovenia. 125 "non-police" persons and 53 police officers participated in the study. Regarding gender, men prevail (130) in comparison to women (47).

The questionnaire used in the study contained questions based on the European Urban Charter (1992) and 'Urban Crime Prevention – A Guide for Local Authorities' (2002). The questionnaire covered the following issues, among others: perceptions of local crime and safety problems, responsibility for solving local crime and safety problems, partnership, fear of crime and insecurity, local social policy, youth problems, violence at school, drug problems, priorities in solving local problems, the role of the police in the prevention and control of local safety problems, co-operation (police, local administrations, non-governmental organisations and citizens), measures of crime prevention, financial resources for crime prevention and safety efforts, city safety council and its role in setting crime prevention and safety priorities, the willingness to participate, co-operate and invest time in crime prevention, knowledge about community policing.

RESULTS

This chapter is divided into six parts. Part one presents a general perception of solving local safety/security and crime problems in the studied towns. Part two deals with the assessment of the most appropriate preventative approach for the problems of crime and disorder. Part three presents the analysis of open-ended answers on prevailing safety problems and responsibility for solving crime and safety problems. Part four consists of correlational analysis community policing variable with other variables, oneway analysis of variance between the police and other responsdents regarding their opinion about the most appropriate preventative approaches and factor analysis of the studied preventative measures. Part six consists of the assessment of the feasibility of the COE Urban crime prevention – A Guide for Local Authorities (2002) in Slovenian local crime prevention and safety efforts.

GENERAL PERCEPTION OF SOLVING LOCAL SAFETY PROBLEMS

Part one of this study shows that the respondents perceive safety/security problems in their communities as far the biggest problem as is typical for an average Slovenian community. Local safety/security problems in their communities are are solved on the basis of a temporary partnership and use *ad hoc* approaches without a profound analysis of the problems. A common sense approach prevails. More than a half of the respondents mean that the police are the most active, while other institutions are more or less seen as apathetic. Sense of security and reassurance is good where police officers appear to be on the streets and among local citizens. Social policy is not balanced with the needs of crime prevention, especially dealing with a social underclass and other economically deprivileged citizens.

More than 80% of respondents (53 police officers and 125 other "non-police persons) report that the police perform well. The majority of respondents state that the police and local administration should cooperate more closely in solving of local safety problems and crime prevention. More efforts should be paid to informing citizens about possibilities for crime prevention and organisation of citizens in local communi-

ties. The general idea is that financial aspects of safety/security efforts and crime prevention are neglected – it is expected that people of good will would solve complex social problems.

Respondents also mean that there is not a substantial number of NGOs dealing with crime prevention in their local communities. More than a half of "non-police" respondents are not familiar with the idea of community policing.

In the respondents' opinion, the police force is seen as having the greatest responsibility for the control of local crime and safety problems. However, this responsibility is no longer seen as the sole monopoly of the police. Other agencies are also seen as responsible in this field. The first to be mentioned is the local city administration, followed by individuals, schools, social services and family. Most respondents think that the police and local administration should co-operate more closely in solving local safety and crime problems. Priorities in the prevention and control of local problems should be set in co-operation and this is seen as a shared responsibility.

About 15 percent of the respondents report that local crime problems are solved on the basis of partnership. About three-quarters of them say that, in cases where local safety problems should be handled by more than one agency, including citizens, the partnerships are only temporary. This may be seen as an indication of the flexible and pragmatic nature of these partnership structures.

Analysis of local safety problems and crime is not an everyday practice in the towns studied. Only about forty percent of the respondents say that they make an analysis of problems before taking action. It is significant that police officers in particular say that they conduct analyses of the local problems of crime, disorder and safety. These are then presented to local citizen safety councils. The dominant position of the police is also reflected in the fact that these analyses are mainly based on police statistics. As a rule the police undertake these analyses of crime and local safety problems either monthly or quarterly. In towns where local safety councils have been established, the police deliver an annual safety and crime report. If necessary, this report is produced to cover a shorter period.

APPROPRIATE PREVENTATIVE ACTIVITIES

In this part of the study the respondents were asked to mention what are in their view the most appropriate preventive activities for solving crime and disorder problems in the community. The results of the ranking of these preventive activities are shown in Table 1. We used Lab's (2000) list of preventative measures studied in his work.

Table 1: What are the most appropriate preventive activities for solving crime and disorder problems in a community?

Prevention	Rank (mean)
Organised work with the youth	1 (9.17)
Leisure activities available for the young	2 (8.76)
Professional (accountable) policing	3 (8.57)
More work available – anti unemployment measures	4 (8.55)
Training of/work with for parents	5 (8.47)
School teachers competent for work with problem children	6 (8.41)
Solving social problems	7 (8.38)
Student/pupil-friendly school climate	8 (8.26)

4

Vocational training	9 (8.24)
Police control of problem areas	10 (8.01)
Development of the sense of community belonging	11 (7.98)
Self-protective measures	12 (7.94)
Information on crime prevention	13 (7.78)
Community policing	14 (7.77)
Economic growth – wealthy community	15 (7.71)
Responsibility of pub/bar owners in case problems re-occur in their premises	16 (7.70)
Punishment of criminals	17 (7.56)
Traffic regime	18 (7.43)
Social skills training (conflict resolution)	19 (7.21)
Shelters for abused women	20 (7.20)
Employment opportunities for ex-offenders	21 (6.95)
Property and life insurance	22 (6.48)
Situational crime prevention	23 (6.22)
Private security	24 (5.95)
"Designing out" crime	25 (5.33)
Reactive (repressive) policing	26 (5.15)
Private security officers at schools	27 (5.10)
Citizens' patrols	28 (3.40)

It is more than obvious that social crime prevention measures are recognised as necessary priorities in local crime prevention. Besides the professional (accountable) policing we can see that respondents see crime and disorder problems as activities of the young and neglected citizens in the social sence and od those alienated from their communities and "problem" pupils/students at schools. The least appropriate preventative measures seem to be citizen's patrols (holding a notion of vigilante-ism), private security at schools (despite the fact that school area is being more and more controlled by private security), police repression – strict law enforcement, designing out crime (almost impossible due to suburban neighbourhoods characterised by high blocks of flats with a high density of population), private security (affordable only for the well off), situational crime preveniton (seems to be too impersonal and costly) and personal and property insurance.

Planned, systematic and co-ordinated communal/common crime prevention and efforts for local safety/security are at an early stage due to the problems of centralised institutions and consequently of the financing of activities on the local level. A role of local municipalities in the field of crime prevention and local safety has not been clearly defined. Despite all these obstacles, numerous activities take place on the local level, especially those of the local governmental (state) institutuions, NGOs and civil society initiatives. A national crime prevention programme which should stress the organisation of crime prevention and local safety/security efforts has not yet been adopted. Due to its complexity a consensus on its contents has not been agreed upon totally. It is also necessary to learn from others' experiences which witness that crime prevention and local safety/security activities can become a subtle "people friendly control" which is only about net widening but has nothing to do with the "real crime prevention" and reassurance. Authoritarian and non-democratic organisation of such activities can only lead to police-isation of local communities where the primary goal is serving the police with information for criminal investigation and order maintenance. Other functions of common safety endeavours are neglected in this scenario.

Such scenarios can be prevented if institutions, agencies, and respresentatives from all parts of society are included into local decision making bodies – safety councils.

OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS ON LOCAL SAFETY

We also studied respondents' perception of prevailing safety problems (open ended questions). It seems that in the studied towns the following problems deserve greatest attention. Violence (including domestic violence, violence in public, at school or committed by youth, in combination with bullying and vandalism) is the most urgent and serious safety problem, followed by drugs (alcohol included), traffic (un-) safety, property crimes, public disorder, economic crime, corruption and criminal gangs.

Responsibility for solving these safety and security problems is attributed to the police which should cooperate with other institutions, civil society and local administration. Analysis of local safety problems is still the activity performed mainly by the police. It is also the police who are supposed to reassure citizens and reduce fear of crime with their presence in local communities. In this sense we have a paradioxical situation – the majority of the most appropriate crime prevention activities are of so called "social crime prevention" but attribution as to who is supposed to perform these activities implies that the police is responsible for everything in the field of safety/security and crime prevention. Ranking of responsibility for solving local safety/security and crime problems is as follows: the police, social care institutions, prosecutors office, courts, other law enforcement agencies, NGOs, educational institutions. In solving problems of the young, at least one representative of the young shoul be present while reaching a decision about any actions. The results of the study show that low level of responsibility, seriousness, co-ordination, slow response, training, knowledge etc. are the main obstacles in common efforts in local community safety and crime prevention efforts.

Suggestions for better policing of their communities are related to more police officers on the beat in local communities, greater visibility and approachability of police officers, better co-operation and communication between the police and local citizens, adequate police training in communication skills, social diversity and multicultural society. To promote 'community policing', in the view of the respondents, it is necessary to pay more attention to professional policing, learning skills for solving problems, the development of a sense of belonging to the community, and solving social problems.

The respondents familiar with the idea of community policing emphasize citizens-police co-operation, support of local citizens in organising of "crime control networks" with educating them on what can anyone to for his/her safety and other kinds of problem solving.

STATISTICAL ANALYSES

In this part of the study a correlational analysis, oneway analysis of variance and a factor analysis were conducted. A significant correlation (Pearson's r) between a variable "community policing and the following variables has been detected: "self-protective behaviour of individuals", "informing citizens about crime prevention", "work with the young", "professional policing", "learning of problem solving skills", "development of the sense of community belongingness (social bonds)" and "solving of local social problems".

Analysis of variance shows that police officers emphasize a greater importance of situational crime prevention, private security services, self-protective measures, social

6

skill training (conflict resolution skills), responsibility of pub/bar owners in case problems re-occur in their premises, and community policing, than the other respondents. Other respondents allocate more importance to a student/pupil-friendly school climate and organised work with the youth and appropriate social policy.

Factor analysis of the most appropriate preventive activities for solving problems in the studied communities extracts four factors which explain 45.45 % of variance. Factor 1 (*Social crime prevention*) consists of variables: training/work with parents, organised work with the youth, solving social problems, student/pupil friendly school climate and development of the sense of belonging to the community (24.25% of variance explained). Factor 2 (*Self-protective measures*) consists of the following variables: information about crime prevention and self-protective measures (8.83 of variance explained). Factor 3 (*Formal social control measures*) consists of the variables: responsibility of pub owners, reactive (repressive) policing, punishment of criminals, more opportunities for employment of ex-convicts (6.46% of variance explained). Factor 4 (*Informal and private social control measures*) consists of the following variables: citizens patrols, security guards at schools, private security (5.93% of variance explained). Detailed results are availble in the Table 2.

Table 2: Factor analysis – crime prevention mesures

Scale* (1-10)	Factor Loading	Means
Social crime prevention (Mean= 8.49)		
Training of/workwith for parents	.785	8.47
Organised work with the youth	.733	9.17
Solving social problems	.685	8.38
Student/pupil-friendly school climate	.614	8.26
Development of the sense of community belonging	.613	7.98
School teachers competent for work with "problem children"	.569	8.41
Leisure activities available for the young	.519	8.76
Crombachs Alpha = .808		
Self-protective measures (Mean= 7.86)		
Information on crime prevention	.695	7.79
Self-protective measures	.615	7.93
Cronbach's Alpha = .592		
Formal social control measures (Mean= 7.24)		
Responsibility of pub/bar owners in case problems re-occur in their premises	.662	7.69
Reactive (repressive) policing	.659	5.17
Punishment of criminals	.656	7.55
More work available – anti unemployment measures	.542	8.55
Crombachs Alpha = .636		
Informal and private social control measures (Mean= 6.24)		
Citizens' patrols	.684	7.77
Private security officers at schools	.683	5.01
Private security	.644	5.94
Cronbach's Alpha=.615		

* 1-totally disagree, 10-totally agree.

IMPLEMENTATION OF LOCAL SAFETY EFFORTS

This part of the study was about the ongoing activities and the obstacles related to the implementation of local crime prevention. The ongoing local preventive programmes and actions are directed to solving the following problems: drug addiction, traffic safety, prevention of violence, prevention of victimisation of the elderly, and prevention of vandalism. There is a remarkable discrepancy here. Activities of social crime prevention, although highly ranked by the respondents as an appropriate preventive activity, are not seen as a priority. Situational crime prevention and fire brigade interventions are still preferred in solving everyday local crime and safety problems.

The majority of respondents are convinced that a shortage of financial resources causes several problems in the field of crime prevention, such as: discontinuity, volunteers who participate only for a short time, and poor implementation of well prepared programmes and actions. In addition, human resources are also a vital part of team building for the implementation of such programmes – project work in the field of crime prevention is not attractive to professionals who seek steady and secure long-term work. Safety activities are more or less attributed to the police. Some fields of crime prevention and safety efforts lack co-operation due to the nature of the problems and the confidentiality of police operations. This means that local communities and the local administration can be included only in efforts to reduce everyday crime (e.g. petty crimes), public order problems and minor safety problems that do not endanger individuals who are willing to be involved in crime prevention activities.

About two-thirds of the respondents think that the local safety councils are a good step towards democratisation of endeavours in reducing local problems. In the view of the other one-third, however, these councils have no influence on everyday policing, crime prevention and the implementation of set priorities in crime prevention and community safety. Comparison between police officers and other respondents shows that about half of the police officers do not believe in the effectiveness of such councils, whereas the majority of the other respondents think that these councils serve the community and contribute to a greater social cohesion and safety in the area. This is a remarkable finding because the local safety councils were the initiative of the police and in the majority of Slovenian cities they are facilitated by the police. Presumably many police officers have too high an expectation of the safety councils. Their view of the councils as an expanded 'police arm' is probably too ambitious. Instead of this, the meetings of the councils are rather a place for democratic debate and the exchange of different views on local problems. Sometimes the views on solving local safety problems of other partners involved differ significantly from those of the police.

FEASIBILITY OF THE COE GUIDE FOR LOCAL AUTHORITIES

In the last part of the study we dealt with a feasibility study of the COE guide for urban crime prevention. Every chapter of the guide was assessed on a 5 point scale on how ideas presented in each chapter are applicable, useful and realisable. Ranking of chapters is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Feasibility of ideas presented in chapters of Urban Crime Prevention –
A Guide for Local Authorities (2002) Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Chapters/computed variables	Mean/s.d.
Schools and violence	4.01/.58
Police and local authorities	4.00/.75
Young people and crime	3.98/.63
1727 Violence against women and elderly	3.75/.71
Local social policy	3.69/.71
Partnership	3.68/.66
Fear of crime	3.66/.70
Public involvement	3.65/.70
Key role of local authorities in crime prevention	3.62/.70
New professions	3.60/.97
Right to a safe city	3.59/.59
Public transport and traffic safety	3.53/.88
Surveys of crime and fear of crime	3.49/.75
Administrative and political integrity	3.48/.91
The built environment	3.42/.79
Manufacture, commerce and the private sector	3.41/.85
Transfrontier crime	3.41/.89
European co-operation, international partnerships	3.41/.81
Adapting judicial and penal systems and victim support	3.39/.94
Minorities	3.04/1.04
Total:	**3.52/.52**

The results of this preliminary feasibility test should be understood as a complement to the Table 1. The results can be understood as the need for putting more attention to school and violence, a facilitated co-operation between the police ans local authorities, paying attention on the young people and violence, violence against the most vulneralbe people in our societies, the need for an appropriate local social policy and the development of partnership.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The research results imply thet the most significant obstacles in local safety endeavours are as follows:
- unclear roles of institutions and representatives of civil society in such activities,
- diverse understanding/conceptualisation of safety problems,
- diverse understanding of partnership,
- too vertical relations among partners,
- "just a discussion on diverse problems and the lack of executive powers,
- lack of political will and departmentalism",
- questionable willingness to listen to others who do not share the same view of the problem,
- feeling that such councils are an extended police arm (in all acses the police initiated the establishment of such councils),
- ignorance and apathy of local citizens (too busy people, crime prevention is not an attractive and "profitable" activity),
- centralised arrangements and local problem solving (no firm legal background),

- "informal for the purpose of formal" – cooperation based only on a good will of representatives on state/local institutions, local administration and civil society without any responsibility or legal framework.

Advantages of such councils could be as follows:
- democratisation of formal social control and control over the police,
- cooperation of (responsible) citizens and knowing each other,
- development of more active cooperation between all local key persons,
- facilitating of "safety consciousness" and discussions on local problems and
- "communities that care" mentality.

Since 1997 more than 100 such councils have been established. Some of the councils have overcome "child diseases" and are dealing with setting goals and use modern knowledge and information based approaches in solving local safety problems (i.e. Ljubljana). Recently established councils are still in the phase of defining their mission.

It is hoped that local safety councils will not be just "chatting rooms" where people of good will would come and talk about local safety problems without any influence on setting priorities in this field on the contrary to have a huge influence on everyday crime control practice without taking into consideration the rule of law, human rights and respect oh human dignity. It is necessary to emphasize that decisions should not be reached only on the basis of public opinion (e.g. angry and outraged victims of crime) but have to be based on profound studies of problems which are to be solved.

An effective safety policy depends upon close co-operation between the police and the local community. This is also the main principle underlying the concept of community policing. With regard to the role of local safety councils and community policing, the police have contributed substantially – perhaps even too eagerly. A crucial question is the extent to which the police can achieve consent with local citizens in solving crime and safety problems. There are still substantial obstacles, both in the current formal rules (which do not allow police discretion in the field of achieving 'police-community consensus') and in the restrictive policing mentality which relies upon the idea of law enforcement and control. Co-operation of the police with local communities and local administrations is still limited to informal communication without any obligation and real consequences for everyday practices of the involved institutions. It seems that these activities have more influence on the reduction of fear of crime or feelings of insecurity than on the reduction and elimination of crime in the community. It will take quite a time for the police and communities to learn how to co-operate and solve problems together more effectively.

Policy implications of this research will be discussed on a national seminar for all parties involved in local crime prevention and safety efforts in Slovenia. It is needed to incorporate these findings into a national crime prevention programme which is being in its final draft phase and facilitate the development contemporary crime prevention and safety efforts.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Gorazd Meško, Ph.D. is Associate Professor of Criminology at the Faculty of Criminal Justice, University of Maribor, Slovenia. He is also a president of the Slovenian Association of Criminal Law and Criminology. He is the author of a book on criminal lifestyle of Slovene prisoners (1997), a text book on criminology (1998) and crime pre-

vention (2002). He edited publications on corruption in Central and Eastern Europe (with Dobovšek and Dimc, 2000), a book on Slovenian criminology (2002), crime prevention in Slovenia (2004) and youth violence in Slovenia (with Anžič and Plazar, 2004).

REFERENCES

European Urban Charter (1992). Council of Europe, Strasbourg.

Hope, T. (1995). Community Crime Prevention, In Tonry, M., Farrinfton, D.P. (eds.) Building A Safer Society, Strategic Approaches to Crime Prevention. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.

Lab, S. (2000). Crime prevention – Approaches, Practices and Evalustions. Cincinnati, Anderson Publishing.

Meško, G. (2002). Osnove preprečevanja kriminalitete. Ljubljana, Visoka policijsko-varnostna šola.

Strategija v skupnost usmerjenega policijskega dela (2002). Ministrstvo za notranje zadeve R Slovenije, (Stategy of community policing in Slovenia, 2002).

The Police Act, Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, 1998 (www.policija.si, March 10, 2003)

The Local Self-government Act, Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia. (www.mnz.si, March 10, 2003).

Urban Crime Prevention – A Guide for Local Authorities (2002). Council of Europe, Strasbourg.