



Juan Díez Nicolás
Royal Academy of Moral and Political Sciences
Camilo José Cela University

SECURITY AND THE GUARDIA CIVIL

SECURITY AND THE GUARDIA CIVIL

Juan Díez Nicolás
Royal Academy of Moral and Political Sciences
Camilo José Cela University

SUMMARY: 1. THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY; 2. THE VALUES OF FREEDOM, EQUALITY AND SECURITY; 3. THE PERCEPTION OF SECURITY; 4. SECURITY AND THE GUARDIA CIVIL; BIBLIOGRAPHY CITED.

ABSTRACT: Security has become the most important value in today's societies. Recent data from over a hundred countries around the world show that most of the world's population considers security more important than freedom, although there are important exceptions. When differentiating between three levels of security – personal, community and national – in general, most people perceive more security in the place where they live, less in their personal security, and even less in the security of their country. The Guardia Civil as one of the Security Forces in Spain, has usually received a rating of more than 6 points on a scale of 0 to 10 points, along with the Crown Prosecution Service, the National Police Service and the Armed Forces. This article describes how the Guardia Civil has been assessed over the past few decades by different sectors of Spanish society, and attempts to explain the main variables behind this assessment.

KEYWORDS: Guardia Civil, security, international, indexes, surveys.

1. THE CONCEPT OF SECURITY

All human communities, from the most primitive (even nomadic) to the most developed, have been endowed with two forms of social organisation that are absolutely necessary for survival: an economic organisation, which is responsible for determining what resources are needed, how they are obtained, and how they are distributed to all members of the community, and a political organisation, which is responsible for establishing rules, rewards and sanctions for those who meet or fail to meet the objectives set by the economic organisation. The forms of economic and political organisation have varied greatly throughout human history, both in time and space, depending mainly on the size of the population of each human community, the resources available, and the technology available. Population, environment, technology and social organisation are the four elements of the social ecosystem that have been interacting and changing since the origins of Humanity, and that, at each time and place, produce an equilibrium, always unstable, which from time to time breaks down to give way to a new, equally unstable equilibrium (Hawley 1950, 1966; Díez-Nicolás 2018).

But political organisation has always generated another organisation equally present in any human community to implement its rules, its rewards and sanctions: an organisation that provides security for their enforcement, and which generally also takes care of protecting

the community from internal and external threats. Traditional societies have generally had a social group that has dealt simultaneously with internal and external security. As societies have become more complex, from the late Middle Ages onwards (14th and 15th centuries), most developed societies established separate organisations dealing with internal security (police or equivalent), and external security (armies, armed forces, by that or any other name) (Alkire 2003; Carro 1989). Interestingly, very recently it has been observed that the distinction between internal security and external security is very difficult to establish, as most threats to internal security have implications for external security, and vice versa (Bigo 2000; Brimmer 2008; Fuentes 2011; Haerpfer and Wallace 1977^a; Ilie 2012; Medina 2003, Díez Nicolás 2011b). Almost all states today, however, continue to differentiate between the two types of security, as public policy inertia continues to differentiate between the two, but is aware of their interaction, centres involving members of the security forces together with members of armies and even intelligence services are proliferating.

It can be argued that, for many centuries, the majority of the population in all countries, even in countries that have developed earlier, have been living in situations of insecurity, both personal and economic. Economic insecurity, because only a small part of the population had income, even discontinuous income, only a part had land to cultivate (and even then those who had land were always at risk when it came to harvesting crops because of the climate), so most of the population was aware that their main problem was to eat every day and have shelter every night. Personal insecurity both on the roads (due to bandits) and in towns or cities (due to general economic insecurity), as well as other sources of insecurity, such as disease, hunger and war (Inglehart, 1977, 1990, 1997; Díez-Nicolás 2011a).

Even in our most developed Western societies, we had to wait until the end of the Second World War to see how, little by little, the majority of the population in these societies achieved previously unattained levels of economic and personal security. The period from 1945 to 1989, even up to the end of the 20th century, was the period in history when, at least in the West, there was a previously unknown growth of the middle classes and generalisation of the welfare state, which guaranteed economic and personal security to an extent never known before. The transition from traditional societies to industrial and post-industrial societies has taken place in these 50 years, although it seems that, since the end of the bipolar world, not only is the Welfare State shrinking and the middle classes are losing weight, but also insecurity is increasing, both economic (rising unemployment, increasing economic and social inequalities, reduced upward social mobility, etc.) and personal (increasing delinquency, organised crime, terrorism, conflicts within each country and between countries, etc.). Societies are becoming more aware of increasing insecurity, so a sense of security has been an achievement that seems to have only lasted around 50 years in human history (Newman 2010; Posen 2006; Rowley and Weldes 2011; Tang 2009).

As the UN Human Development Report pointed out as early as 1994 that the concept of security has referred more to nation states than to citizens, whereas for most people, the concept of human security means freedom from the threat of hunger, disease, unemployment, crime, social conflict, political repression and environmental catastrophes (United Nations 1994). The concept of security has thus shifted from a focus on threats to territories to a focus on threats to people. The concept of security has therefore been

extended to include economic, food, health, environmental, personal, community, political, and even emotional security, according to some.

2. THE VALUES OF FREEDOM, EQUALITY AND SECURITY

These three concepts have been the basis for many political doctrines, ideologies and social movements throughout human history. In the latest wave of values surveys (European Values Survey-EVS, and World Values Survey-WVS¹⁸⁴) conducted between 2017 and 2022 in almost a hundred countries, respondents were asked which is more important to them, freedom or equality, and then which is more important, freedom or security. Although data is not available for many countries, including Spain, data is available for most countries, especially the major countries in the world, and is sufficient for providing a global view of the opinion in most of the world's cultures and regions.¹⁸⁵

Table 1. Preferences between Freedom and Equality, and between Freedom and Security. World and countries grouped into geo-cultural regions. EVS-WVS 2017-2022

	Preferences			Preferences		
	Freedom	Equality	N =	Freedom	Security	N =
TOTAL WORLD	55.4%	44.6	(79,585).	29.3%	70.7	(79,901).
Anglo-Saxons	70.7%	29.3	(9,355).	56.1%	43.9	(9,270).
European Union	71.1%	28.9	(5,850).	39.1%	60.9	(5,882).
Eastern Europe and the Balkans	62.0%	38.0	(5,039).	30.9%	69.1	(5,185).
Middle East and North Africa	40.9%	59.1	(9,736).	21.2%	78.8	(9,789).
Non-MENA Islamic	52.3%	47.7	(8,718).	25.3%	74.7	(8,748).
Indian Ocean	74.0%	26.0	(1,193).	27.5%	72.5	(1,194).
Asia Pacific	49.3%	50.7	(19,784).	22.1%	77.9	(19,891).
Latin America	50.2%	49.8	(14,990).	25.6%	74.4	(15,027).
Sub-Saharan Africa	70.9%	29.1	(4,920).	29.8%	70.2	(4,915).

Source: EVS_WVS_TimeSeries_InternalUse_spss_v3_0

Just over half of respondents in several dozen countries around the world seem to prefer freedom to equality, although a slightly lower proportion prefer equality to freedom. When

¹⁸⁴ The European Values Study (EVS) is the international comparative project that initiated the study of social and cultural values in European countries in 1981. However, some non-European countries also conducted the survey, such as Argentina, the United States and others. From the 1990 wave onwards, the EVS and the WVS (World Values Survey) have conducted different surveys but have cooperated with each other, sharing much of the questionnaire and facilitating the comparison of their data, even collaborating to produce an aggregated data file and a common codebook. The WVS Data Archive, under the direction of Jaime Díez Medrano and his JDSurvey institute in Madrid, has been responsible for aggregating and distributing the joint data from the EVS and WVS projects. Until mid-2022, seven waves have been conducted between 1981 and 2022, with 117 participating countries, and a total of over 650,000 personal interviews in the respondent's home (www.worldvaluessurvey.org).

¹⁸⁵ Not all countries have asked these questions in the case of the EVS, because the EVS management decided not to include these questions in these countries, and in the case of the WVS, because some countries were unable to participate in this wave, either due to lack of funding, the pandemic, or both. This explains why, although Spain participates, with different teams, in both projects, data on these questions are not available for different reasons in each case. However, data is available for part of Spain, specifically Andalusia, as part of research conducted at the end of 2021. These data indicate that 53% of Andalusians prefer freedom versus 43% who prefer equality; 55% prefer security versus 42% who prefer freedom; and 55% prefer security versus 41% who prefer equality (Peña Ramos, Díez-Nicolás and Llera Ramo, 2022).

the countries are grouped into geo-cultural regions, it can be seen that the Anglo-Saxon countries, the countries of the European Union, the Indian Ocean and sub-Saharan Africa are in the majority in favour of freedom, and those in Eastern Europe and the Balkans are somewhat less so. Citizens of Islamic countries outside the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) and those in Latin America are very divided in their preferences, but slightly in favour of freedom, while those in Asia Pacific are also very slightly in favour of equality. Only respondents in the Middle East and North Africa expressed a somewhat clearer, but not a strong preference for equality.

As for preferences for freedom or security, the preference for security is very clear in the world as a whole, even though Anglo-Saxon countries, although divided in their preferences, seem to prefer freedom, perhaps because they feel that their security is fairly guaranteed. It should be emphasised that respondents express somewhat stronger preferences in the case of the comparison between freedom and security than between freedom and equality, suggesting that they are clearer about their choice in the former case than in the latter.

These data show that there is still no common value system for the whole of Humanity and that, on the contrary, cultural diversity, as manifested in value systems, is still the rule rather than the exception (Díez-Nicolas 2020).

Table 2. Preferences between Freedom and Equality, and between Freedom and Security. World and selected countries. EVS-WVS 2017-2022

	Freedom	Equality	N =	Freedom	Security	N =
TOTAL COUNTRIES	55.4%	44.6%	(21,219).	29.4%	70.6%	(21,317).
Argentina	61.9%	38.1%	(1,000).	33.8%	66.2%	(998).
Australia	73.3%	26.7%	(1,799).	52.4%	47.6%	(1,770).
Canada	63.9%	36.1%	(4,018).	49.1%	50.9%	(4,018).
China	34.2%	65.8%	(3,019).	7.1%	92.9%	(3,028).
Taiwan	62.7%	37.3%	(1,212).	13.7%	86.3%	(1,216).
Germany	67.4%	32.6%	(1,450).	44.7%	55.3%	(1,476).
New Zealand	73.5%	26.5%	(965).	53.0%	47.0%	(944).
Russia	55.1%	44.9%	(1,653).	24.6%	75.4%	(1,729).
Turkey	42.3%	57.7%	(2,352).	39.9%	60.1%	(2,371).
Ukraine	69.8%	30.2%	(1,178).	30.9%	69.1%	(1,229).
United States	78.5%	21.5%	(2,573).	71.1%	28.9%	(2,538).

Source: EVS_WVS_TimeSeries_InternalUse_spss_v3_0

Eleven countries have been selected, which to a certain extent represent the world as a whole, since, as can be seen, the preferences for the selected countries as a whole are practically identical to those of the world as a whole. But the differences between countries are much more important than between regions. Indeed, in the comparison between freedom and equality, the preference for freedom also predominates, much more strongly in Australia, New Zealand and the United States (Anglo-Saxon countries), and somewhat less so in Ukraine, Germany, Canada, Taiwan and Argentina, and very slightly in Russia, which seems to show a very balanced preference between the two values. But China and somewhat less so Turkey are clearly in favour of equality in their preferences.

In relation to the choice between freedom and security, there is also a very clear preference for security in these countries as a whole, but the majority is overwhelming in the case of China and Taiwan, suggesting that these societies fear potential conflict, though not necessarily with each other in the two countries. Interestingly, given the date of the interviews, Russia also shows a very high preference for security, followed by Ukraine, Argentina, Turkey, Germany and Canada. The latter country, mostly Anglo-Saxon, shows an almost totally divided opinion in its preferences for security and freedom, possibly because of its dual Anglo-Saxon and European identity.

The rest of the Anglo-Saxon countries, led by the United States, and followed by New Zealand and Australia, very clearly prefer freedom to security, possibly, as suggested above, because they are confident that they are fairly secure. It is also evident that respondents are more likely to answer when asked to choose between freedom and security, possibly because they are clearer about their own opinion than when asked to choose between freedom and equality.

3. THE PERCEPTION OF SECURITY

Perceptions are always subjective, each individual perceives reality based on their own experiences, their own assessments and their own values. Research in Spain and in value studies has shown, through principal components analysis with several dozen items, that individuals anywhere in the world seem to perceive three levels of security: personal security, which affects them directly or their families, community security, which affects them in the place where they live (a neighbourhood of a big city, a village), and national security, which affects them as a country, as a nation, as a state.

These three indices have been included in the aforementioned value studies in the last two waves, 2010-2015 and 2017-22 (Díez Nicolás 2011b, 2015, 2016).

Table 3. Perception of security at three levels and overall (scales from 0 = no security 12 = maximum security) EVS-WVS, Waves 2010-2015, and 2017-2022

WAVE		PERSONAL SAFETY INDEX	COMMUNITY SAFETY INDEX	NATIONAL SECURITY INDEX	OVERALL SAFETY INDEX
2010-2014	Average	7.50	9.44	6.44	7.80
	N =	85,477	76,078	82,118	67,068
	Stand. dev.	3.65	2.41	3.15	2.03
2017-2020	Average	7.16	9.19	6.37	7.54
	N =	70,582	73,701	75,420	65,258
	Stand. dev.	3.63	2.40	3.04	2.08
OVERALL	Average	7.35	9.32	6.41	7.67
	N =	156,059	149,779	157,538	132,326
	Stand. dev.	3.65	2.40	3.09	2.06

Source: EVS_WVS_TimeSeries_InternalUse_spss_v3_0

Given the small difference in the results of the two waves, and the fact that there are countries that have participated in one or the other or both waves (the majority), it was preferable to use the aggregated data from the two waves, which makes it possible to obtain average perceptions for each wave. A slight decrease in the perception of security in

the latest wave compared to 2010 is observed in all four indices. This can be attributed to the consequences of the financial crisis in 2008, the effects of which have reached the beginning of the Covid-19 epidemic, and above all, to the increased tension in international relations due to the emergence of China as a world power.

And in the two waves, it can be seen that security is perceived to be somewhat higher in the community of residence, somewhat lower on the personal level, and even lower on the national level, but in all cases above 6 points, which would be the mid-point for the 0 to 12 point scales. All the data are very similar in the two waves, both in terms of arithmetic means, standard deviations and even the number of people interviewed in each wave and those who answered the questions used in the construction of the indexes. It should be noted that the number of cases is different for each of the measurements, because each index is constructed from the answers to several questions in the questionnaire, and not all respondents answered all questions, as usual.

Table 4. Perception of security at three levels and overall (arithmetic average on scales of 0 = no security 12 = maximum security), by geo-cultural regions EVS-WVS 2010-2015, and 2017-2022

GEO-CULTURAL REGIONS	PERSONAL SAFETY INDEX	COMMUNITY SAFETY INDEX	NATIONAL SECURITY INDEX	OVERALL SAFETY INDEX
TOTAL WORLD	7.35	9.32	6.41	7.67
Anglo-Saxons	7.59	9.40	8.32	8.43
European Union	8.45	10.34	8.18	9.06
Eastern Europe and the Balkans	7.47	9.77	5.45	7.64
Middle East and North Africa	8.64	9.58	5.68	7.92
Non-MENA Islamic	6.80	10.17	5.42	7.48
Indian Ocean	6.29	8.82	6.62	7.20
Asia Pacific	6.81	9.89	6.71	7.78
Latin America	6.51	7.92	5.93	6.74
Sub-Saharan Africa	7.16	8.28	5.35	6.90

Source: EVS_WVS_TimeSeries_InternalUse_spss_v3_0

When the data is analysed by geo-cultural region, it is found that, in most regions, it is confirmed that the greatest security is perceived in the community of residence, and secondly in terms of personal security, with two exceptions, the Anglo-Saxon countries and the Indian Ocean countries (India and Bangladesh), where national security is perceived to be greater than personal security. In the case of Anglo-Saxon countries, the explanation seems to be the aforementioned; their citizens are confident that their national security is highly guaranteed, but not to the same extent, according to these data, their personal security. In the case of the Indian Ocean countries, it seems more plausible to interpret that, due to their economic level and high social and economic inequalities, the explanation is due more to low personal security than to high national security. Comparing the highest and lowest ratings on each of the three indexes confirms these interpretations, as Anglo-Saxon countries indeed have the highest rating of perceived national security, while Indian Ocean countries have the lowest perception of their personal security.

It is somewhat surprising that citizens in the Middle East and North Africa region perceive personal security to be the highest, considering the conflicts in those countries over the last

decade. Countries in the European Union are second in this perception of personal security, second in the perception of national security, and first in the perception of community security.

The other Islamic countries are second in perceived community security, but they are also the second lowest in national security. Latin American countries have the lowest perception of personal security (after the Indian Ocean countries), and the lowest perception of community security. And Sub-Saharan African countries have the second lowest community security and the lowest national security. According to the Overall Perceived Safety Index, the "ranking" from highest to lowest safety is as follows: European Union, Anglo-Saxon, Middle East and North Africa, Asia Pacific, Eastern Europe and Balkans, other Islamic countries, Indian Ocean, Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America.

Table 5. Perception of security at three levels and overall (arithmetic average on scales of 0 = no security 12 = maximum security), by selected countries EVS-WVS 2010-2015, and 2017-2022

SELECTED COUNTRIES	PERSONAL SAFETY INDEX	COMMUNITY SAFETY INDEX	NATIONAL SECURITY INDEX	OVERALL SAFETY INDEX
TOTAL COUNTRIES	7.52	9.68	7.37	8.29
Argentina	7.23	7.93	8.52	7.92
Australia	8.31	9.41	8.42	8.72
Canada	7.26	9.18	9.03	8.49
China	5.91	11.11	7.42	8.14
Taiwan	6.89	10.74	6.31	7.98
Germany	8.56	10.63	8.73	9.33
New Zealand	8.47	9.62	9.37	9.25
Russia	6.92	8.92	5.91	7.33
Spain	10.07	10.00	7.29	9.18
Turkey	8.90	9.93	5.70	8.36
Ukraine	6.13	9.34	5.47	6.93
United States	7.07	9.52	7.26	7.96

Source: EVS_WVS_TimeSeries_InternalUse_spss_v3_0

The analysis by country is much more interesting¹⁸⁶, although it is clear that the analysis by geo-cultural regions provides very valuable and hypothesis-suggestive information that we will not be able to address here. The first thing to note is that, in these countries as a whole, the highest perception of security is that of the community, and the lowest is that on the national level, as in the set of countries examined above. But there is much more diversity when comparing these twelve countries than when comparing the nine regions. In ten out of the twelve countries, the highest rating corresponds to community security, but in Spain, the perception of the highest security is on a personal level, and in Argentina, it is national security. On the other hand, of the ten countries whose highest perceived security is community security, in six the second highest is national security (Australia, Canada, China, Germany, New Zealand and the United States), confirming the high perceived

¹⁸⁶ In this case, there is data for Spain, because the WVS team participated in the 2010-2015 wave, and the EVS team participated in the 2017-22 wave and included this battery of questions, although it did not include the questions on freedom, equality and security, as indicated above.

national security in Anglo-Saxon countries plus China and Germany. The remaining four countries that report greater personal than national security are Taiwan, Russia, Turkey and Ukraine (two of them directly involved in the current war in Ukraine and the other two in worrying scenarios, one threatened by possible invasion and the other in a conflict scenario, such as the Middle East). And the two countries that do not perceive greater community security, Spain and Argentina, agree, however, that their second highest perception of security is on the community level.

But when looking for the countries that perceive the most and least security at each of the three levels, there are a few surprising findings, although most could be considered to be expected. Spain and Turkey are the two countries with the highest perceived personal security, which is not surprising given that Spain is recognised as one of the countries with the lowest crime and the highest security. Other countries with high personal security ratings include Germany, Australia and New Zealand. But those with the lowest perceived personal security are China and Ukraine, and to a lesser extent Taiwan and Russia.

China and Taiwan are the two countries with the highest perceptions of community security, which contrasts with their low perceptions of personal security (including economic, family, etc.), while Argentina and Russia have the lowest perceptions of community security. However, the perception of community security is generally high in all countries, with this receiving above 7 points in all of them. And in relation to national security, New Zealand and Canada show the highest perceptions, while Ukraine, Turkey and Russia are the three countries with the lowest perceptions of national security. It is significant that two of these three countries, Ukraine and Russia, are the main direct protagonists of the current war on European soil, and that Turkey is one of the main mediators in the conflict, due to its good relations with both sides and its strategic geopolitical position. It should be clarified that all interviews were conducted before the outbreak of the war in Ukraine.

The ranking of countries according to their overall perception of security is as follows: Germany, New Zealand, Spain, Australia, Canada, Turkey, China, Taiwan, the United States, Argentina, Russia and Ukraine. The explanation for this classification is to be found in two factors that are difficult to analyse here. Firstly, the real contrast in some countries between these three levels of security, which should be measured by objective security indicators. And, secondly, the different sensitivity of citizens in different countries to subjectively assess whether their security at each of the three levels is high, medium or low. Some people have a tendency to assign higher or lower ratings. These are issues that merit further analysis in other publications.

4. SECURITY AND THE GUARDIA CIVIL

Analysis of the above data provides two key insights into Spain. Firstly, the preference for security over equality and freedom, albeit with nuances, as explained above, according to different sectors and social groups. Secondly, Spaniards have been found to feel particularly secure in their personal (and family) lives, significantly more so than citizens of eleven other countries in different geographical areas, and also quite secure in the community in which they live, but less so (in seventh place out of twelve countries) in terms of their national security. Overall, Spaniards rank third in overall security, behind only New Zealand and Canada, and ahead of Germany, Australia, the United States and five other countries.

Spain has two national security forces, the Guardia Civil and the National Police, as well as regional police forces in some Autonomous Communities, and municipal police forces in many large cities. It seems likely to assume that the functioning of these security forces (on the one hand their effectiveness in protecting citizens, and on the other hand their treatment of these same citizens) must have something to do with these two findings discussed above, their high assessment of security (over equality and even freedom), and their perception of very high personal and community safety. We have focused in particular on the Guardia Civil, because it is both part of the National Security Forces, and also part of the Armed Forces, and therefore reports to two different ministries, the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Defence, which is not the case with the National Police, which only reports to the Ministry of the Interior. However, comparisons between the Guardia Civil, the National Police, the Armed Forces and various other Spanish political institutions will be examined. For this purpose, it has been possible to use another great source of survey data, the 248 national surveys conducted monthly in Spain by ASEP between 1986 and 2011, over 25 years, using a questionnaire with a large number of questions repeated month by month, which provide a database with many time series difficult to match by other national or foreign data archives (<http://www.jdsurvey.net/jds/jdsurvey.jsp>), and a total of almost 300,000 personal household interviews with representative samples of the Spanish population over 18 years of age.

Table 6. Assessment (arithmetic average) of the Guardia Civil, 1987-2009, Spain.

Year month	Average	N	Stand. dev.	Year month	Average	N	Stand. dev.
1987-Mar	5.68	1,038	3.156	1998-Oct	6.38	1,164	2.638
1987-Jun	6.04	1,014	2.983	1999-May	5.68	1,158	2.665
1988-Feb	6.59	1,120	2.986	1999-Oct	6.43	1,143	2.551
1989-Mar	6.83	1,107	2.791	2000-May	6.55	1,155	2.463
1990-Apr	6.51	1,036	2.840	2000-Oct	6.51	1,180	2.461
1991-Apr	6.40	1,110	2.899	2001-May	6.37	1,159	2.576
1992-May	6.57	1,148	2.584	2001-Oct	6.56	1,171	2.351
1992-Dec	6.24	1,127	2.560	2002-May	6.21	1,177	2.350
1993-Jan	6.25	1,128	2.640	2002-Oct	6.09	1,187	2.472
1993-Feb	5.94	1,118	2.485	2003-Oct	5.97	1,161	2.547
1993-Oct	6.15	1,143	2.690	2004-Sep	6.17	1,120	2.331
1994-Feb	6.05	1,134	2.562	2004-Oct	6.10	1,177	2.347
1994-May	5.96	1,154	2.878	2005-Sep	6.04	1,181	2.597
1994-Oct	6.18	1,129	2.721	2005-Oct	5.79	1,172	2.544
1995-May	6.60	1,119	2.788	2006-Oct	6.30	1,164	2.434
1995-Oct	6.17	1,075	2.670	2007-Oct	6.13	1,155	2.325
1996-May	6.14	1,152	2.675	2009-Mar	6.38	1,077	2.557
1997-May	6.51	1,155	2.615	2009-Jul	6.38	1,077	2.557
1997-Oct	6.66	1,131	2.464				
1998-May	5.97	1,111	2.637				

Source: ASEP, Spaniards' Public Opinion, ASEP/JDS Data Base,
<http://www.jdsurvey.net/jds/jdsurvey.jsp>

In this monthly national survey, the image of the Guardia Civil was asked about 38 times. As can be seen, its rating, on a scale of 0 to 10 points, has not changed significantly between 1987 and 2009, in over 20 years, and no subsequent data are known to be stored in any public data archive. The average rating of these 38 samples is 6.25 points, with a standard deviation of 2.26 points, indicating little disparity between respondents assigning

high or low ratings, and therefore that there is some consensus on a good assessment. This persistence in the assessment suggests that the image of the Guardia Civil is well established in the Spanish population, so that one-off events may hardly affect it, except at specific moments that do not change over long periods of time. Values change very slowly, attitudes somewhat more quickly, and opinions much more frequently.

Table 7. Assessment (arithmetic average) of various political and social institutions, 1987-2009, Spain

	248 investigations			38 investigations		
	N =	Average	Stand. dev.	N =	Average	Stand. dev.
The Guardia Civil	43,027	6.25	2.63	43,027	6.25	2.63
The Crown Prosecution Service	276,724	6.88	2.84	41,642	7.03	2.83
The National Government	276,205	4.85	2.73	41,609	4.92	2.73
The Armed Forces	262,241	5.59	2.71	40,367	6.00	2.67
The Constitutional Court	41,975	5.35	2.25	1,541	5.36	2.41
The Spanish Confederation of Business Organisations (CEOE)	10,998	4.81	2.29	780	5.10	2.39
Trade Unions	37,234	4.93	2.59	3,979	5.08	2.69
The Supreme Court	21,895	5.25	2.25	0		
The Lower House of Parliament	32,183	4.99	2.34	8,940	4.89	2.56
The Upper House of Parliament	23,985	4.84	2.28	0		
The National Police Service	33,628	6.31	2.48	22,518	6.36	2.37
The Catholic Church	34,578	4.91	2.98	0		
Political parties	36,468	4.00	2.42	888	3.92	2.98

Source: ASEP, Spaniards' Public Opinion, ASEP/JDS Data Base, <http://www.jdsurvey.net/jds/jdsurvey.jsp>

In all the monthly surveys, the image of Spain's main political and social institutions was asked about, most of them every month, and others, such as the Guardia Civil, only from time to time. Therefore, data has been selected for the same 13 institutions in the 248 monthly investigations carried out, and only for the 38 investigations in which the Guardia Civil was asked about. Logically, the data for the Guardia Civil are the same in both cases, but differ for the rest of the institutions, because, as with the Supreme Court, the Upper House of Parliament and the Catholic Church, they were not discussed in the 38 investigations in which the Guardia Civil was asked about. In any case, it seems clear that the data from both series, for the 10 institutions that are included in both, do not differ significantly. It can thus be seen that the Crown Prosecution Service has always been the most highly rated, although its rating was somewhat lower than that of the Armed Forces from 2009 until 2011, when this monthly survey was discontinued. It is evident that, in addition to the Crown Prosecution Service, the National Police, the Guardia Civil and the Armed Forces are valued more highly than the other political and social institutions, regardless of the political forces that had the majority in the powers of the State at any given time. Political parties have always been the worst rated by Spaniards, something that is also common in over a hundred countries around the world, according to international surveys on values¹⁸⁷.

¹⁸⁷ Data on the image of the Armed Forces, compared to that of other institutions, in 117 countries participating in the EVS-WVS values surveys have been analysed in great detail in Díez-Nicolas 2022, in press.

Detailed data for each of these ten institutions is provided in Annex I. Specifically, for each of the 38 surveys, the arithmetic average, the standard deviation and the number of cases are presented for each of the ten institutions mentioned.

Table 8. Matrix of correlations between each institution's rating and others, 1987-2009, Spain

	The Guardia Civil	The Crown Prosecution Service	The National Government	The Armed Forces	The Constitutional Court	The Spanish Confederation of Business Organisations (CEOE)	Trade Unions	The Lower House of Parliament	The National Police	Political parties
The Guardia Civil	1	.445**	.318**	.686**	.171**	.312**	.191**	.284**	.749**	.184**
The Crown Prosecution Service	.445**	1	.344**	.483**	.203**	.272**	.170**	.286**	.443**	.219**
The National Government	.318**	.344**	1	.328**	.333**	.278**	.280**	.580**	.368**	.472**
The Armed Forces	.686**	.483**	.328**	1	.169**	.359**	.181**	.311**	.646**	.136**
The Constitutional Court	.171**	.203**	.333**	.169**	1	. ^b	. ^b	. ^b	.211**	. ^b
The Spanish Confederation of Business Organisations (CEOE)	.312**	.272**	.278**	.359**	. ^b	1	. ^b	. ^b	. ^b	. ^b
Trade Unions	.191**	.170**	.280**	.181**	. ^b	. ^b	1	.495**	. ^b	.484**
The Lower House of Parliament	.284**	.286**	.580**	.311**	. ^b	. ^b	.495**	1	. ^b	. ^b
The National Police Service	.749**	.443**	.368**	.646**	.211**	. ^b	. ^b	. ^b	1	. ^b
Political parties	.184**	.219**	.472**	.136**	. ^b	. ^b	.484**	. ^b	. ^b	1

Source: ASEP, Spaniards' Public Opinion, ASEP/JDS Data Base, <http://www.jdsurvey.net/jds/jdsurvey.jsp>

In the correlation matrix between the assessment of each institution and that of all the others, it can be seen that all the correlation coefficients (Pearson's = r) are positive and statistically significant, but with different degrees of intensity. The Guardia Civil's highest correlations are with the National Police and the Armed Forces, and the lowest are with the Constitutional Court, Political Parties and Trade Unions.

Table 9. Principal component analysis, 1987-2009, Spain

	Component	
	1	2
The Guardia Civil	.885	.075
The Crown Prosecution Service	.653	.334
The National Government	.205	.781
The Armed Forces	.859	.065
The Constitutional Court	.064	.813
The National Police Service	.862	.189

Source: ASEP, Spaniards' Public Opinion, ASEP/JDS Data Base, <http://www.jdsurvey.net/jds/jdsurvey.jsp>

Method of extraction: Principal component analysis.

Method of rotation: Varimax normalisation with Kaiser.

a. The rotation has converged in 3 iterations.

A principal components analysis produces a first factor that encompasses the three institutions representing security, Guardia Civil, National Police and Armed Forces, and also The Crown Prosecution Service, albeit with a somewhat lower but nonetheless high level of saturation. Spaniards obviously consider these four institutions to be part of the same construct, the same “latent structure”, in the words of Lazarsfeld (1968). The second component includes the Constitutional Court and the National Government, as a “political” construct or component. The other three institutions were rejected by the model, because they did not coincide with each other enough times on the same dates. It seems to be clear that, for Spaniards, the Security Forces (Guardia Civil and National Police), the Armed Forces and the Crown Prosecution Service constitute a unit, providing them with security, as distinct from politics, which apparently does not provide them with the same sense of security.

Table 10. Assessment of the Guardia Civil by different social groups 1987-2009, Spain

Sex	Average	Habitat of residence	Average	Educational level	Average
Male	6.15	Less than 2,000	6.43	Low	6.58
Female	6.34	From 2,001 to 5,000	6.36	Medium	6.01
Cohort	Average	From 5,001 to 10,000	6.33	High	5.84
Born between 1907-21	7.18	From 10,001 to 50,000	6.19	Family SSE	Average
1922-1936	6.96	50,001 to 100,000	6.23	High, Medium high	6.05
1937-1951	6.59	100,001 to 250,000	6.19	Medium	6.21
1952-1966	5.96	Over 250,000	6.31	Medium Low	6.54
1967-1981	5.67	Madrid and Barcelona	6.14	Low	6.80
1982-1996	5.36	Occupational status	Average	Subjective Social Class	Average
Autonomous Community	Average	High	6.09	High	6.14
Andalusia	6.67	Medium	6.03	Average	6.24
Aragon	6.76	Low	6.06	Low	6.28
Asturias	6.30	Unemployed	5.98	Household income level	Average
Balearic Islands	6.52	Housewife	6.35	Low	6.70
Catalonia	5.81	Retired	6.71	Average	6.34
Canary Islands	6.47	Student	5.88	High	6.08
Cantabria	6.24	Other	7.39	Social Position	Average
Castile and León	6.46	Economic sector	Average	0. Very low	6.94
Castile-La Mancha	7.01	Not active	6.70	1.	6.75
Extremadura	6.71	Unemployed	5.97	2.	6.44
Galicia	5.79	Public Sector	6.38	3.	6.27
La Rioja	6.17	Priv. Sec. employed	5.96	4.	5.96
Madrid	6.49	Priv. Sec. self-employed	6.13	5.	6.07
Murcia	6.91	Nationalist sentiment	Average	6.	6.30
Navarre	5.05	Nationalist	5.42	7.	6.47
Basque Country	3.88	Nationalist/Spanish	6.40	8. Very high	6.24
Valencian Community	6.51	Spanish	6.66	Post-materialism	Average
Exposure to information	Average	Ideology	Average	Materialists	6.56
0	6.28	Far left	3.87	Postmaterialists	5.68
High	6.30	Left	5.52	Religious practice	Average
Average	6.13	Centre left	6.04	Low	5.92
Low	6.29	Centre	6.53	Average	6.68
None	6.27	Centre right	6.95	High	7.00
		Right	7.21		
		Far right	7.48		

Source: ASEP, Spaniards' Public Opinion, ASEP/JDS Data Base,
<http://www.jdsurvey.net/jds/jdsurvey.jsp>

The data show that the rating of the Guardia Civil is higher among women, the elderly, the retired and the non-active, those with a “materialistic” (traditional, scarcity) value orientation. In addition, the higher their exposure to information, their feeling of Spanishness, their right-wing ideological orientation, their religious practice, and the lower the size of the habitat where they live, their educational level, their family socio-economic status, their subjective social class, their household income level, and their social position, the higher their assessment of the Guardia Civil (Galtung 1964, 1976; Díez Nicolás 2009).

In terms of their assessment by region in Spain, their highest assessment is found in Castile-La Mancha, and also in Murcia, Aragon and Extremadura, and the lowest in the Basque Country, and also in Navarre, Galicia and Catalonia, all regions with a higher nationalist identification than with Spain. In any case, it should be stressed that the rating of the Guardia Civil is higher than 6 points in 76 social groups, and is only lower than 6 points but equal to or higher than 5 points among those born after 1967, those living in Catalonia, Galicia and Navarre, students, those who consider themselves more nationalist than Spanish, those with a high level of education, those oriented towards post-materialist values, and those with low religious practice. And it is only less than 5 points in the Basque Country and among those who position themselves ideologically on the extreme left.

The data seem to show that the Guardia Civil has a better image among older people, of low socio-economic status and residing in rural areas and small towns, which confirms the objectives of this institution, which is oriented to always acting in defence of the weakest and neediest, and above all, to provide security outside the cities, which already have their own local police or the National Police.

Finally, a regression model has been constructed to try to understand which variables contribute most to explaining the variance in the assessment of the Guardia Civil. For this purpose, we have used as explanatory variables those which, according to the previous data, seem to have greater explanatory-predictive power, i.e. Age, habitat of residence size, household economic situation, household income, social position index, post-materialism index, information exposure index, ideological self-positioning, Spanish-nationalist sentiment, satisfaction with the government and religious practice.

Table 11. Regression model to explain the assessment of the Guardia Civil, 1987-2009, Spain

Corrected R ² = 0.177	Unstandardised coefficients		Typified coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Typical error	Beta		
(Constant)	.102	.588		.173	.863
Age	.031	.004	.221	8.302	.000
Habitat of residence	.119	.034	.094	3.508	.000
Household Economic Situation	.103	.083	.029	1.243	.214
Household income level	.262	.129	.058	2.025	.043
Social Position Index	-.068	.045	-.052	-1.516	.130
Post-materialism index	-.583	.133	-.104	-4.397	.000
Exposure to information	-.011	.081	-.003	-.137	.891
Ideological self-positioning	.349	.050	.190	6.939	.000
Spanish-nationalist sentiment	.616	.094	.156	6.580	.000
Satisfaction with democracy	.415	.064	.159	6.445	.000
Satisfaction with the government	.092	.054	.046	1.701	.089
Religious practice	.063	.087	.019	.727	.468

Source: ASEP, Spaniards' Public Opinion, ASEP/JDS Data Base,
<http://www.jdsurvey.net/jds/jdsurvey.jsp>

The model explains 18% of the variance in Spaniards' assessment of the Guardia Civil, and only five of the twelve variables included in the model do not seem to contribute anything additional to what the other seven variables explain.¹⁸⁸ And of the seven variables that do have a statistically significant relationship, as measured by the beta coefficient, age seems to be the variable that contributes most to this explanation, in the sense that the higher the age of the respondent, the higher their assessment of the Guardia Civil. Three other variables also contribute significantly to the explanation of the variance, namely ideological self-positioning, Spanish-nationalist sentiment and satisfaction with democracy, in the sense that the more to the right the respondent's ideological self-positioning, the more Spanish they feel and the more satisfied they are with the functioning of democracy, the higher the rating of the Guardia Civil. The latter is very important, and implies that those who value the Guardia Civil are those who are satisfied with democracy, and therefore do not favour non-democratic systems.

¹⁸⁸ It does not seem necessary to explain that this does not mean that these five variables do not have a statistically significant relationship with the assessment of the Guardia Civil. It just means that they do not add anything to the explanation already contributed by the other variables in the model, because they have a strong relationship with these.

ANNEX I

Assessment (arithmetic average on a scale of 0 to 10 points), number of respondents who answered the question (N) and standard deviation of the ratings, of ten security and political or social institutions in the 38 investigations in which the Guardia Civil was asked about. Spain 1987-2009

		Crown Prosecution Service	National Government	FAS	Constitutional Court	Lower House of Parliament	CEOE	Guardia Civil	National Police	Trade unions	Political parties
Total	Average	7.03	4.92	6.00	5.36	4.89	5.10	6.25	6.36	5.08	3.92
	N	41,642	41,609	40,367	1,541	8,940	780	43,027	22,518	3,979	888
	Stand. dev.	2.826	2.727	2.672	2.406	2.563	2.387	2.631	2.374	2.687	2.967
1987-Mar	Average	7.29	5.39	4.89				5.68		5.23	3.92
	N	996	993	950				1,038		891	888
	Stand. dev.	2.903	2.972	3.346				3.156		3.002	2.967
1987-Jun	Average	7.49	5.61	5.98	5.76			6.04	6.44		
	N	972	965	901	654			1,014	984		
	Stand. dev.	2.867	2.929	2.973	2.683			2.983	2.921		
1988-Feb	Average	7.60	5.62	6.22				6.59			
	N	1,071	1,081	1,061				1,120			
	Stand. dev.	2.816	2.768	3.152				2.986			
1989-Mar	Average	7.64	4.90	6.31				6.83		5.86	
	N	1,058	1,055	1,046				1,107		964	
	Stand. dev.	2.695	2.640	2.899				2.791		2.660	
1990-Apr	Average	7.18	5.56	6.01		5.47		6.51			
	N	988	991	983		892		1,036			
	Stand. dev.	2.946	2.767	2.954		2.565		2.840			
1991-Apr	Average	7.31	5.54	6.19		5.63		6.40			
	N	1,053	1,063	1,076		934		1,110			
	Stand. dev.	2.883	2.729	3.034		2.612		2.899			
1992-May	Average	7.33	5.07	6.30		4.97		6.57			
	N	1,082	1,098	1,113		975		1,148			
	Stand. dev.	2.729	2.555	2.708		2.648		2.584			
1992-Dec	Average	7.09	4.39	6.17			5.10	6.24			
	N	1,063	1,082	1,096			780	1,127			
	Stand. dev.	2.821	2.639	2.654			2.387	2.560			
1993-Jan	Average	7.31	4.71	6.10				6.25			
	N	1,071	1,069	1,094				1,128			
	Stand. dev.	2.740	2.690	2.683				2.640			
1993-Feb	Average	7.39	4.31	5.66				5.94			
	N	1,075	1,084	1,053				1,118			
	Stand. dev.	2.602	2.657	2.471				2.485			
1993-Oct	Average	7.51	4.30	6.23				6.15	6.35		
	N	1,102	1,107	1,088				1,143	1,124		
	Stand. dev.	2.733	2.825	2.627				2.690	2.541		
1994-Feb	Average	7.20	3.98	6.15				6.05			
	N	1,080	1,092	1,087				1,134			
	Stand. dev.	2.784	2.742	2.576				2.562			
1994-May	Average	7.35	3.81	5.81		4.05		5.96			
	N	1,108	1,129	1,120		1,029		1,154			
	Stand. dev.	2.853	2.965	2.902		2.667		2.878			
1994-Oct	Average	7.41	4.22	5.85				6.18	6.28		
	N	1,070	1,084	1,077				1,129	1,104		
	Stand. dev.	2.775	2.932	2.716				2.721	2.560		
1995-May	Average	7.52	4.07	6.22		4.30		6.60			

	N	1,078	1,086	1,064		979		1,119			
	Stand. dev.	2.714	2.918	2.738		2.646		2.788			
1995-Oct	Average	7.38	3.81	5.92				6.17	6.15		
	N	1,021	1,032	1,012				1,075	1,047		
	Stand. dev.	2.757	2.873	2.799				2.670	2.525		
1996-May	Average	7.59	5.26	6.04		5.33		6.14			
	N	1,130	981	1,111		990		1,152			
	Stand. dev.	2.717	2.664	2.797		2.429		2.675			
1997-May	Average	7.52	4.84	6.10		4.52		6.51			
	N	1,117	1,095	1,115		1,032		1,155			
	Stand. dev.	2.617	2.604	2.684		2.447		2.615			
1997-Oct	Average	7.33	5.20	6.16				6.66	6.71		
	N	1,088	1,087	1,071				1,131	1,115		
	Stand. dev.	2.713	2.665	2.667				2.464	2.285		
1998-May	Average	7.20	5.22	5.60		5.12		5.97		4.95	
	N	1,087	1,080	1,078		1,038		1,111		1,048	
	Stand. dev.	2.789	2.656	2.705		2.291		2.637		2.412	
1998-Oct	Average	7.24	5.22	6.13				6.38	6.52		
	N	1,143	1,132	1,123				1,164	1,151		
	Stand. dev.	2.768	2.628	2.635				2.638	2.419		
1999-May	Average	7.17	4.96	5.29		4.78		5.68		4.38	
	N	1,139	1,137	1,139		1,071		1,158		1,076	
	Stand. dev.	2.717	2.657	2.708		2.321		2.665		2.486	
1999-Oct	Average	7.18	5.28	6.13				6.43	6.41		
	N	1,104	1,103	1,106				1,143	1,128		
	Stand. dev.	2.802	2.510	2.605				2.551	2.379		
2000-May	Average	7.29	5.77	6.11				6.55	6.42		
	N	1,130	1,134	1,128				1,155	1,145		
	Stand. dev.	2.698	2.588	2.494				2.463	2.269		
2000-Oct	Average	7.20	5.38	6.18				6.51	6.61		
	N	1,156	1,154	1,156				1,180	1,172		
	Stand. dev.	2.727	2.640	2.543				2.461	2.306		
2001-May	Average	6.86	5.27	6.03				6.37	6.45		
	N	1,119	1,129	1,109				1,159	1,152		
	Stand. dev.	2.854	2.584	2.558				2.576	2.375		
2001-Oct	Average	6.79	5.18	6.21				6.56	6.55		
	N	1,151	1,153	1,143				1,171	1,164		
	Stand. dev.	2.638	2.509	2.459				2.351	2.181		
2002-May	Average	6.99	5.03	5.88				6.21	6.27		
	N	1,150	1,158	1,139				1,177	1,168		
	Stand. dev.	2.732	2.592	2.378				2.350	2.253		
2002-Oct	Average	6.52	4.76	5.83				6.09	6.15		
	N	1,155	1,155	1,166				1,187	1,184		
	Stand. dev.	2.644	2.630	2.388				2.472	2.333		
2003-Oct	Average	6.36	4.55	5.68				5.97	6.02		
	N	1,141	1,151	1,141				1,161	1,153		
	Stand. dev.	2.756	2.829	2.494				2.547	2.360		
2004-Sep	Average	6.29	5.40					6.17			
	N	1,096	1,090					1,120			
	Stand. dev.	2.813	2.500					2.331			
2004-Oct	Average	6.40	5.70	5.63				6.10	6.31		
	N	1,159	1,144	1,160				1,177	1,170		
	Stand. dev.	2.954	2.406	2.385				2.347	2.162		
2005-Sep	Average	6.48	5.23	5.93				6.04			
	N	1,153	1,162	1,168				1,181			
	Stand. dev.	2.865	2.444	2.572				2.597			
2005-Oct	Average	6.62	5.10	5.86				5.79	6.01		
	N	1,151	1,146	1,147				1,172	1,164		

	Stand. dev.	2.796	2.319	2.364			2.544	2.305		
2006-Oct	Average	6.13	4.86	6.07			6.30	6.47		
	N	1,134	1,141	1,127			1,164	1,150		
	Stand. dev.	2.897	2.650	2.386			2.434	2.139		
2007-Oct	Average	6.44	5.01	6.01			6.13	6.33		
	N	1,137	1,142	1,123			1,155	1,129		
	Stand. dev.	2.807	2.582	2.341			2.325	2.292		
2009-Mar	Average	5.85	4.42	6.44			6.38	6.46		
	N	1,057	1,062	1,048			1,077	1,057		
	Stand. dev.	2.930	2.681	2.433			2.557	2.352		
2009-Jul	Average	5.90	4.05	6.48	5.07		6.38	6.33		
	N	1,057	1,062	1,048	887		1,077	1,057		
	Stand. dev.	2.934	2.608	2.420	2.133		2.557	2.402		

Source: ASEP, Spaniards' Public Opinion, ASEP/JDS Data Base,
<http://www.jdsurvey.net/jds/jdsurvey.jsp>

ANNEX II

Countries that make up geo-cultural regions

The countries included in each region are: **1: Anglo-Saxons** (Australia, Canada, Great Britain, New Zealand, United States); **2: European Union** (Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus (G), Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Northern Ireland, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland); **3: Eastern Europe & Balkans** (Albania, Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Georgia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Moldova, Montenegro, Russia, Serbia, Ukraine); **4: MENA** (Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libya, Morocco, Palestine, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Turkey, Yemen); **5: Non-MENA Islamic** (Azerbaijan, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Pakistan, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan); **6: Indian Ocean** (Bangladesh, India); **7: Asia Pacific** (China, Hong Kong, Japan, Macao, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, Thailand, Vietnam); **8: Latin America** (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Dominican R., Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Mexico, Nicaragua, Peru, Puerto Rico, Trinidad & Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela); **9: Sub-Saharan Africa** (Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Ghana, Kenya, Mali, Nigeria, Rwanda, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe).

BIBLIOGRAPHY CITED

Alkire, S. (2003): A conceptual framework for human security, working paper 2, Centre for Research on Inequality, Human Security and Ethnicity, CRISE, Queen Elizabeth House, University of Oxford.

Bigo, D. (2000): "When two become one: Internal and external securitisations in Europe", in M. Kelstrup and M. Williams, *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration. Power, Security and Community*. London: Routledge.

Brimmer, E. (ed.) (2008): *Five Dimensions of Homeland and International Security*, Center for Transatlantic Relations, The John Hopkins University.

Carro, J. L. (1989): "Los conceptos de orden público, seguridad ciudadana y seguridad pública" (The concepts of public order, public safety and public security). I Seminar on institutional collaboration between the Menéndez Pelayo International University and the Directorate General of the Police. Santander. *Policía y Sociedad (Police and Society)*. Madrid: Directorate General of Police.

Díez-Nicolás, J. (2009): "Some theoretical and methodological applications of centre-periphery theory and the social position index", in K. van der Veer, A. Hartmann, H. van den Berg (eds.) and J. Díez-Nicolás, J. Galtung and H. Wiberg, *Multidimensional Social Science*, Rozenberg, Amsterdam.

_____ (2011a): "¿Regreso a los valores materialistas? (A return to materialistic values?) El dilema entre seguridad y libertad en los países desarrollados" (The dilemma between security and freedom in developed countries). *Revista Española de Sociología (RES)*, 15.

_____ (2011b): *La Seguridad Subjetiva en España (Subjective Security in Spain): Construcción de un Índice Sintético de Seguridad Subjetiva (ISSS) (Construction of a Synthetic Index of Subjective Security (SISS))*. Madrid: Ministry of Defence.

_____ (2018): *La Globalización (Globalisation): El proceso de expansión de los Sistemas Sociales (The process of expansion of Social Systems)*. Madrid: Royal Academy of Moral and Political Sciences.

_____ (2015): "Perception of security in an international comparative perspective". Real Instituto Elcano, Working Paper 16/2015. www.realinstitutoelcano.org

_____ (2016): "The perception of security in the international comparative perspective", *Bulletin of Peoples' Friendship University in Russia*. Moscow: Sociology Series, no. 2, Publishing House, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia.

_____ (2020): *Los Valores Sociales y Culturales (Social and Cultural Values)*. Madrid: Centre for Sociological Research.

_____ (2022): "La imagen de las Fuerzas Armadas" (The Image of the Armed Forces). First Civil-Military Congress of Sociology. Toledo. (in press).

Galtung, J. (1964): "Foreign policy opinion as a function of social position". *Journal of Peace Research*, 34.

_____ (1976): "Social position and the image of the future", in H. Ornauer et al. (eds.), *Images of the world in the year 2000*. Paris: Mouton.

Haerpfer-99k, Ch. & C. Wallace (1997a): *Internal and external security in post-communist Eastern Europe. Results of a 10-nation study*. Institute for Advanced Studies, Wien, Sociological Series, No.20.

Hawley, A.H. (1950). *Human Ecology*. New York: The Ronald Press Company.

_____ (1966): *La Estructura de los Sistemas Sociales (The Structure of Social Systems)*. Madrid: Tecnos.

Ilie, F.A. (2012). "National and international security objectives: some correlations", *Journal of Defense Resources Management*, vol.3, Issue 1 (4).

Inglehart, R. (1977): *The Silent Revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

_____ (1990): *Culture Shift in Advanced Industrial Society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

_____ (1997): *Modernization and Post-Modernization*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lazarsfeld, P. (1968): *Latent Structural Analysis*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Medina, J. (2003): "Inseguridad ciudadana, miedo al delito y policía en España" (Citizen insecurity, fear of crime and policing in Spain), *Revista Electrónica de Ciencia Penal y Criminología*.

Newman, E. (2010): "Critical human security studies", *Review of International Studies*, 36, 77-94.

Peña Ramos, J.A., J. Díez-Nicolás and J.F. Llera Ramo (2022): *La Década del Cambio en Andalucía (The Decade of Change in Andalusia). Actores, comportamientos, actitudes, identidades, valores, opiniones y expectativas (Actors, behaviours, attitudes, identities, values, opinions and expectations)*. Colección Enfoques. Seville: Andalusian Public Foundation.

Posen, B.R. (2006). "European Union security and defence policy: response to unipolarity?" *Security Studies*, Vol. 15, 2.

Rowley, Ch. and J. Weldes (2011): *The evolution of international security studies and the everyday: suggestions from the buffyverse*. School of Sociology, Politics and International Studies, Working Paper 11-12, University of Bristol.

Tang, S. (2009): "The security dilemma: a conceptual analysis", *Security Studies*, vol. 18.3.

United Nations (1994): "New dimensions of human security", Chapter 2, *Human Development Report 1994*, New York; UN.