



**“Eyes & apps on the streets:  
From natural surveillance to crime sousveillance”**  
**An international seminar on social control in the digital era**

**Date: 8<sup>th</sup> September 2017**

**Time: 9:00-17:00**

**Venue: Valhallavägen 79, OpenLab, Multihallen, Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan, Stockholm, Sweden**

Since Jane Jacobs’s 1961 seminal work **The Death and Life of Great American Cities** (Jacobs, 1961), we have countless times heard the key concept of “eyes on the street”. Jacobs wrote that, in order for a street to be a safe place, it has to promote natural **surveillance**: “there must be eyes upon the street, eyes belonging to those we might call the natural proprietors of the street.” In the era of smartphones, ‘eyes’ are complemented by ‘apps’, giving expression to new ways of depicting what happens in public space and perhaps redefining the role of guardians. Compared with the old “eyes on the street”, the new exercise of social control invites a number of other senses than sight, such as touch and sound using personal smartphones and other devices (**sousveillance**). An incident that happens on the street is still local (attached to a physical place and a pair of coordinates), but can now be seen by far-away eyes, as soon it is shared over the internet. We suggest that Jacobs’ sense of “natural proprietors of the street” acquires an entirely different meaning as those who set a record on the (m)app are not only residents but also temporary visitors or transients, perhaps with no attachment to the area. What does this development mean for the understanding of situational conditions of crime and crime prevention?



In this seminar we bring together international scholars from different disciplines and countries to discuss the nature of social control in the digital era and the potential effects of new technologies to crime and crime prevention. To what extent the use of these technologies and the new practices they impose, ‘blur’ the accepted roles of crime controllers, offenders and victims? How have these technologies impacted on the way protesters take their message to the streets and also how they interact with law enforcement in events of police brutality? These are examples of the questions we are going to discuss in this seminar. Don’t miss it!

Vania Ceccato, chairman of the seminar

**Registration**

This event is **free-of-charge**, [registration](#) is mandatory by **4th September**.



- **Opening: Social control in the digital era**
  - Vania Ceccato, KTH, Sweden
- **Extending guardianship using surveillance technology**
  - Danielle M. Reynald, Griffith University, Australia
- **Guardianship – Not too broad, not too narrow**
  - Marcus Felson, Texas State University, USA
- **Disrupting crime place networks: The role of surveillance**
  - Tamara Madensen, University of Nevada, USA
- **Beliefs about CCTV**
  - Johannes Knutsson, Norway police academy, Norway/Sweden
- **Body worn cameras as surveillance tool**
  - Elizabeth Groff, Temple university, USA
- **Real time sousveillance: citizens' live broadcasting of conflicts in public space**
  - Lucas Melgaço, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium
- **Mapping the movement of active guardians in time and place**
  - Reka Solymosi, University of Manchester, UK
- **The use of ICT to create a “beehive” for data collection and information sharing in policing**
  - Stefan Holgersson, Linköping university, Sweden
- **Take away messages**
  - Vania Ceccato, KTH, Sweden



## SPEAKERS (in alphabetical order)

### Danielle M. Reynald, Griffith University, Australia



Danielle is a criminologist at the Griffith Criminology Institute and Senior Lecturer at the School of Criminology & Criminal Justice at Griffith University in Australia. Her main line of research focuses on guardianship, or how citizens function (or fail to function) as effective crime controllers across different contexts (eg. residential, work, cyberspace), and against various types of crime (including property crime, sexual violence and abuse, cyberabuse and workplace). Her research utilizes multiple methods—such as observations, interviews, surveys, experiments—to develop a better understanding about how and under what circumstances citizens function most/least effectively as agents of crime disruption and prevention. Her other related research areas include crime prevention through environmental design and offender decision making.

### Elizabeth Groff, Temple university, USA



Elizabeth is an Associate Professor in the Department of Criminal Justice at Temple University. Dr. Groff's research interests are in the areas of geographic criminology, agent-based modeling, police practices and the use of technology in policing. One area of focus over the last ten years has been on developing evidence to improve police practice. For example, she has examined how agencies can communicate crime statistics without increasing fear of crime (Redlands, CA), the impact of using AVL to provide feedback on patrol levels achieved (Dallas, TX) and which policing tactics are effective (Philadelphia, PA). She is a Fellow of the Academy of Experimental Criminology and serves on the editorial boards of the *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, the *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* and the *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*.

### Johannes Knutsson, Norwegian Police University College, Norway/Sweden



Johannes is Professor Emeritus of Police Research at the Norwegian Police University College. He has been employed at the Swedish National Police Academy and the Swedish National Police Board. He has conducted studies with and for the police for 40 years. Among other publications he has co-edited several books on different aspects of policing – the latest [\*Applied Police Research. Challenges and Opportunities\*](#) (with Ella Cockbain, from 2014) and [\*Advances in Evidence Based Policing\*](#) (with Lisa Tompson, from 2017).

### Lucas Melgaço, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium



Lucas is a Professor at the Department of Criminology and is a former post-doctoral researcher at the same department. He was also a former post-doc at the Surveillance Studies Centre at Queen's University, Canada and at the Department of Geography at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro. He has a doctorate degree in Social Geography from a partnership between the University of São Paulo and the University of Paris 1 – Panthéon Sorbonne. His main scientific interests are in the domains of surveillance, public order, social movements and protests, policing, urban criminology, social geography, and in the relationships between information and communication technologies, space and security. He has also worked on translating and introducing the theories of the Brazilian scholar Milton Santos to the English-speaking community. Lucas is editor-in-chief of the journal *Criminological Encounters*.

**Marcus Felson, Texas State University, USA**



Marcus is a professor at Texas State University, USA. He has been a leader not only in crime theory ("the routine activity approach") but also in applying that theory to reducing crime. His central argument is that everyday legal activities set the stage for the illegal activities that feed on them. Before Texas State University, he was professor at the Rutgers University School of Criminal Justice and the University of Illinois and has been Visiting Scholar at the University of Stockholm. He is a foreign honorary member of the Netherlands Academy of Sciences. He received his B.A. from the University of Chicago and his Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. Professor Felson has been guest lecturer in Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, El Salvador, England, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Scotland, Spain, South Africa, Sweden and Switzerland. He is coauthor of "Opportunity Makes the Thief" and author of Crime and Nature, as well as Crime and Everyday Life, in its fourth edition.

**Reka Solymosi, The university of Manchester, UK**



Reka is a lecturer in quantitative criminology at the Centre for Criminology and Criminal Justice/School of Law, The University of Manchester. Her PhD thesis entitled "Mapping everyday experiences with crime and fear using crowd-sourcing and a purpose-build mobile application to capture the dynamic nature of fear of crime" is from UCL in Crime Science and Civil Engineering.

**Stefan Holgersson, Linköping university, Sweden**



Stefan is an Associate Professor at Department of Management and Engineering/Information Systems, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden. Holgersson has conducted research over 20 years about the Swedish police and has been a police officer for 25 years. He works at the field in a patrol car in the south part of Stockholm. His research is in different areas within the police and just now he is studying the 'dialogue police'-model, the police work with traffic safety and the centralization of the police organization. Most of the time he is doing action research and cooperate at different hierarchy levels within the police.

**Tamara Madensen, University of Nevada, USA**



Tamara is an associate professor of criminal justice and graduate director at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Madensen is the director of the Crowd Management Research Council and serves as associate director of the Center for Crime and Justice Policy. She uses the Crime Science perspective to study the criminological impact of the design and management of places, and studies crowd dynamics that lead to violence. Her research and teaching projects involve working directly with police, private security, and stadium/venue operators. She serves as an Editorial Advisory Board member for the Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, Journal of Crime Science, and Justice Policy Journal.

## Chairman

**Vania Ceccato, Royal Institute of Technology,  
Sweden**



Vania is an Associate Professor at Department of Urban Planning and Environment, Royal Institute of Technology (KTH). She coordinates the national network [SafePlaces](#) sponsored by BRÅ – The National Crime Prevention Council in Sweden. Her research is on the situational conditions of crime and crime prevention. She is interested in the space-time dynamics of crime and people's routine activity. She has published in international journals, mostly in Criminology, Geography and Urban Planning and is the author of [Rural crime and community safety](#) (2016, Routledge), [Moving Safely, Crime and perceived safety in Stockholm's subway stations](#) (2013) and the editor of [The urban fabric of crime and fear](#) (2012) and co-editor of [Safety and Security in Transit Environments: An Interdisciplinary Approach](#) (2015, Palgrave) with Andrew Newton. Since 2016, Ceccato serves as an [International Ambassador of British Society of Criminology \(BSC\)](#).

**WELCOME!**

**Extending Guardianship using Surveillance Technology**

Danielle M. Reynald, Griffith University, Australia

This presentation will focus on the concept of guardianship for the purposes of crime prevention and control. It will chart the evolution of the concept with emphasis on key contemporary conceptualizations that are currently being applied within criminology. With supervision and surveillance as central to guardianship functioning, this presentation will highlight how recent technological advancements have led to changes in opportunities for surveillance and supervision. Particular attention will be focused on assessing the ways and extent to which guardianship can be effectively extended across time and space through the use of new surveillance technologies.

**Guardianship – Not Too Broad, Not Too Narrow**

Marcus Felson, Texas State University, USA

Specific guardianship of crime targets is part of a larger guardianship process, including place managers and parental presence. However, the guardianship idea does not include absent people or abstract influences. It is a tangible process. Electronic monitoring can only be included if there is specific information about technical ability, whether people watch screens, whether watchers can discern what is happening or do anything to control a situation remotely. Electronic monitoring is much more complicated than meets the eye. Guardianship needs to explore whether people look out the window, why, and when. Mutual interest may allow mutual guardianship with neighbors sharing electronic monitoring.

**Disrupting Crime Place Networks: The Role of Surveillance**

Tamara D. Madensen, University of Nevada, USA

Research shows that ineffective place managers create unsafe spaces, void of guardianship and other crime prevention mechanisms. Traditionally, researchers and practitioners have focused on the influence of place managers by treating high-crime places as independent entities. However, recent crime-place theory and research suggest that crime places are networked. Crime place networks include locations generate crime, but they also include places that are designed to escape the attention of authorities. This lecture will describe how networked places create enduring criminogenic infrastructures and the critical role that surveillance techniques play in uncovering these networks.

**Beliefs about CCTV**

Johannes Knutsson, Norway police academy, Norway/Sweden

CCTV has come to be a common means of surveillance in modern society. There are many forces behind this development. First of all is technology that has evolved from clumsy and expensive systems to easily available and refined ones. However, there is no common accepted view on the merits of CCTV. Producers and providers obviously want to promote CCTV as an effective means to increase safety. Police often looks upon it as an effective tool to prevent and detect crime, thereby increase feelings of safety. However, politicians and legislators often have a divided opinion where efficiency has to be weighed against integrity threats. A core issue for researchers is its proclaimed effects. In spite of rather clear-cut results indicating that CCTV seemingly does not work in some physical settings (e.g. town centres), the police insist on its effectiveness. What should be done to get further?

## **Police body worn cameras as surveillance tool**

Elizabeth Groff, Temple University, USA

A series of highly-publicized incidents have sparked controversy over police use of force. Police accountability activists, judges, and some police departments have championed body worn cameras (BWCs) as the solution. Their perception is that BWCs will increase police accountability and transparency as well as change police actions in ways that improve citizens' perceptions of police legitimacy. But we know relatively little about how police view the role of cameras or how wearing BWCs is changing officer's approach to policing. What do officers do differently now that they have BWCs? What remains unchanged? This talk describes findings from the initial implementation of body worn cameras in a major United States police department.

## **Real time sousveillance: citizens' live broadcasting of conflicts in public space**

Lucas Melgaço, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, Belgium

While surveillance is more commonly seen as a top-down activity, sousveillance calls attention to the counter-surveillance potential of those who are normally expected to be only the watched, but never the watcher. With the increasingly ubiquitous presence of image and video recording technologies on the streets (smartphones being the most iconic example) citizens can now more easily watch their peers and also their watchers. A recent novelty, however, is the fact that some technologies existent today allow citizens to not only practice sousveillance, but also to do so in real time. Live-streaming applications such as Periscope, Meerkat, Facebook Live among others create the possibility for recording and broadcasting videos in real time. This has, for example, impacted the way protesters take to the streets and also how they interact with law enforcement agents in events of police brutality. In this presentation I will analyze the use of live-streaming apps in demonstrations in Brazil and recent protests in Brussels, Belgium.

## **Mapping the movement of active guardians in time and place**

Reka Solymosi, University of Manchester, UK

Crowdsourced data are increasingly used in crime research, mostly to provide accurate denominators for estimating crime risk. In this study data collected using web scraping from an online problem reporting platform is considered as a possible measure of active guardianship. We use spatially weighted regression models to determine how this measure reflects willingness to intervene, population change, and their relationship to crime levels. Results show a positive association between the new measure and willingness to intervene, supporting the claim that this data reflects active guardians. Within-day fluctuation in active guardianship shows a negative relationship with burglary, a distinct effect from baseline willingness to intervene and population change measures. These findings support active guardianship theory through showing distinct effect from population change, and the potential for such data to highlight areas of temporarily increased crime risk due to fluctuation in guardianship, which can inform targeted prevention efforts.

## **The use of ICT to create a "beehive" for data collection and information sharing in policing**

Stefan Holgersson, Linköping university, Sweden

In connection to demonstrations the police in Stockholm have been using a simple ICT-solution on mobile phones (sms based) to be able to share information to an extensive numbers of volunteers. Within a research action framework, the shared information has been assessed by external actors at the same time that the police have received information back. Findings indicate that this technical platform has been valuable in different aspects for ongoing police operations and examples are provided in this presentation. This described arrangement has not only created a technique but also a "beehive" system with representatives of different groups of actors for data collection, information sharing, that helps with directed information collection and assessment of information in everyday policing.

## Venue/Directions

The venue of the seminar (OpenLab, Multihallen) is located at entrance of the campus of KTH Royal Institute of Technology, at Valhallavägen 79.

**Venue:** [Valhallavägen 79, OpenLab, Multihallen](#),  
Kungliga Tekniska Högskolan, Stockholm,  
Sweden



## Registration

This event is **free-of-charge** but registration is mandatory by 4th September.

Please register [here](#).

**WELCOME!**



Valhallavägen 79, OpenLab, Multi



From Stockholm's central station, take the Red underground line towards Mörby centrum, get off at "Tekniska Högskolan" station. Take exit "Tekniska Högskolan", you will see the venue on your right, a red-brick house, Valhallavägen 79, OpenLab, Multihallen.

## Organisers

