Dear Author,

Here are the proofs of your article.

- You can submit your corrections **online**, via **e-mail** or by **fax**.

- For **online** submission please insert your corrections in the online correction form. Always indicate the line number to which the correction refers.

- You can also insert your corrections in the proof PDF and **email** the annotated PDF.

- For fax submission, please ensure that your corrections are clearly legible. Use a fine black pen and write the correction in the margin, not too close to the edge of the page.

- Remember to note the **journal title**, **article number**, and **your name** when sending your response via e-mail or fax.

- **Check** the metadata sheet to make sure that the header information, especially author names and the corresponding affiliations are correctly shown.

- **Check** the questions that may have arisen during copy editing and insert your answers/ corrections.

- **Check** that the text is complete and that all figures, tables and their legends are included. Also check the accuracy of special characters, equations, and electronic supplementary material if applicable. If necessary refer to the *Edited manuscript*.

- The publication of inaccurate data such as dosages and units can have serious consequences. Please take particular care that all such details are correct.

- Please **do not** make changes that involve only matters of style. We have generally introduced forms that follow the journal's style.
  Substantial changes in content, e.g., new results, corrected values, title and authorship are not allowed without the approval of the responsible editor. In such a case, please contact the Editorial Office and return his/her consent together with the proof.

- If we do not receive your corrections **within 48 hours**, we will send you a reminder.

- Your article will be published **Online First** approximately one week after receipt of your corrected proofs. This is the **official first publication** citable with the DOI. **Further changes are, therefore, not possible.**

- The **printed version** will follow in a forthcoming issue.

Please note

After online publication, subscribers (personal/institutional) to this journal will have access to the complete article via the DOI using the URL: http://dx.doi.org/[DOI].
If you would like to know when your article has been published online, take advantage of our free alert service. For registration and further information go to: http://www.link.springer.com.

Due to the electronic nature of the procedure, the manuscript and the original figures will only be returned to you on special request. When you return your corrections, please inform us if you would like to have these documents returned.

Metadata of the article that will be visualized in OnlineFirst

ArticleTitle	Reflections on community safety: the ongoing precarity of women's lives
Article Sub-Title	
Article CopyRight	Springer Nature Limited (This will be the copyright line in the final PDF)
Journal Name	Crime Prevention and Community Safety

Corresponding Author	Family Name	**Walklate**
	Particle	
	Given Name	**Sandra**
	Suffix	
	Division	Eleanor Rathbone Chair of Sociology
	Organization	University of Liverpool
	Address	Liverpool, UK
	Division	Chair of Criminology
	Organization	Monash University
	Address	Melbourne, Australia
	Phone	
	Fax	
	Email	S.L.Walklate@liverpool.ac.uk; Sandra.walklate@monash.edu
	URL	
	ORCID	

Abstract	In 2007 Jayne Mooney observed that violence against women was a public anathema and a private commonplace all at the same time. In the decade since this observation was made it would not be hard to conclude that the situation remains the same despite the increasing public policy profile afforded to such violence(s). The purpose of this paper is to consider how and why such forceful observations can still be made and it will do so by reflecting on five inter-connected ongoing tensions for the community safety agenda in addressing violence against women. These tensions are: epistemic (who can know what); methodological (how things, like violence against women, can be known); conceptual (how to make sense of what we think we know); saliency (what variables count and when); policy (what can be done in the light of the foregoing issues); and global (the Northern bias endemic in such policies). The paper will suggest that only when debates on community safety fully embrace the implications of these issues will effective in-roads be made into understanding and improving the ongoing precarity of women's lives.

CrossMark

1 ORIGINAL ARTICLE

2 # Reflections on community safety: the ongoing precarity
3 of women's lives

4 **Sandra Walklate[1,2]**

5

7 **Abstract** In 2007 Jayne Mooney observed that violence against women was a
8 public anathema and a private commonplace all at the same time. In the decade
9 since this observation was made it would not be hard to conclude that the situa-
10 tion remains the same despite the increasing public policy profile afforded to such
11 violence(s). The purpose of this paper is to consider how and why such forceful
12 observations can still be made and it will do so by reflecting on five inter-connected
13 ongoing tensions for the community safety agenda in addressing violence against
14 women. These tensions are: epistemic (who can know what); methodological (how
15 things, like violence against women, can be known); conceptual (how to make sense
16 of what we think we know); saliency (what variables count and when); policy (what
17 can be done in the light of the foregoing issues); and global (the Northern bias
18 endemic in such policies). The paper will suggest that only when debates on com-
19 munity safety fully embrace the implications of these issues will effective in-roads
20 be made into understanding and improving the ongoing precarity of women's lives.

AQ1

22 ## Introduction

23 In 1998 (the year of the launch of this journal), the UK government passed what
24 was then considered to be the flagship legislation of the newly elected Labour Party:
25 the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act. One key feature of this legislation was to embed

A1 ✉ Sandra Walklate
A2   S.L.Walklate@liverpool.ac.uk; Sandra.walklate@monash.edu

A3 [1] Eleanor Rathbone Chair of Sociology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

A4 [2] Chair of Criminology, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

| Journal : **SmallExtended 41300** | Article No : **50** | Pages : **12** | MS Code : **50** | Dispatch : **19-9-2018** |

S. Walklate

26　responsibility for crime and disorder within local, multi-agency community safety
27　'crime and disorder partnerships'. These newly constituted partnerships were (in
28　theory) to be led by local authorities (though in practice often were led jointly with
29　the police) and were required to produce community safety/crime and disorder plans
30　establishing local priorities for crime prevention against which local 'success' was to
31　be measured. At the time many partnerships took the lead from the Home Office in
32　setting their priorities and put in place plans to deal with crime and disorder accord-
33　ingly. Such priorities included violence against women, which, as Welch (2008) has
34　pointed out, was by this time a well-established concern of government policy found
35　on agendas from crime prevention to health. However, as Welch (2008) also points
36　out, the way in which such policies and practices were implemented at the local
37　level remained subject to contestation well illustrated by Davies (2008). She sug-
38　gests, 'A crime prevention and community safety paradigm that relies on a non- or
39　only partially gendered set of knowledges is likely to be non-inclusive of some indi-
40　viduals and groups who experience criminal victimization or something akin to it.'
41　(Davies (2008: 2014). Indeed it is the capacity or otherwise of community safety
42　agendas to 'see' gender, especially in relation to violence against women, which is
43　the focal concern of the discussion here.

Setting the scene

45　Violence against women has certainly moved up both national and international
46　policy agendas over the last 20 years (see, for example Goodmark 2015; Fitz-Gib-
47　bon et al. 2018). During this time the tension raised by gender for crime prevention
48　and community safety has been subjected to critical scrutiny (see inter alia Walk-
49　late 1998; Davies 2008), as has the project of community safety as a whole (see for
50　example the edited collection by Squires 2006). Policies in both arenas have contin-
51　ued to invoke the importance and spirit of multi-agency working. In the context of
52　community safety this spirit has been invoked without examining whose sense of
53　community and whose sense of safety are being considered (see inter alia Tombs
54　and Whyte 2006; Walklate 2006). At the same time policies in relation to violence
55　against women have for the most part reflected the recourse to legislative interven-
56　tion paying particular attention on the role of the police. Arguably this focus simi-
57　larly misses the mark in relation to the questions of whose community and whose
58　safety are of central concern. Interestingly despite these kinds of difficulties policies
59　in both arenas but criminal justice in particular continue to travel the globe amount-
60　ing to what Goodmark (2015) has called 'exporting without a licence'.

61　　The priority given to criminal justice responses to violence against women does
62　vary. Elizabeth Wilson, for example, as long ago as 1983 made the case for a whole
63　systems approach to violence against women. However, fuelled by some initial
64　empirical work conducted by Sherman and Berk (1984) who reported some posi-
65　tive effects on arresting perpetrators of domestic violence, the focus on the policing
66　response, the wider legislative framework and women's experiences of the criminal
67　justice process, have been given centre stage. Attention to these issues has contin-
68　ued unabated despite their efficacy being subjected to ongoing review and critique.

69　As just one example of such critique, recent work by Sherman and Harris (2015)
70　indicates that the stress experienced by those women whose partners are arrested for
71　such violence renders them much more likely to suffer an early death with Sherman
72　(2014) adding 'if the current policy is to be continued in the UK, the moral burden
73　of proof now lies with those who wish to continue with this mass arrest policy'.
74　Similarly, the focus on rendering violence against women criminal has also contin-
75　ued unabated. Notable in this respect, in England and Wales, the Domestic Violence,
76　Crime and Victims Act (2004) made common assault an arrestable offence for the
77　first time, and in December 2015, under Section 76 of the Serious Crime Act, engag-
78　ing in controlling and/or coercive behaviour in intimate or familial relationships also
79　became a new criminal offence. This ongoing concern with the (symbolic) role of
80　the law and positive policing in relation to violence against women can be found in
81　the UK government consultation on Transforming the Response to Domestic Abuse
82　(2018) and can be traced throughout the Anglo-speaking world (Goodmark 2015).
83　All of which reflects a tendency to override the complexities of communities and
84　concepts of community safety documented by Welch (2008).

85　　In sum, since and prior to 1998, there has been a good deal of policy energy
86　and resource directed towards violence against women yet, as Mooney (2007) com-
87　mented, such violence remains commonplace. Indeed in 2018 this remains the case.
88　From the point of view developed here, this is a result of the tensions posed for
89　the ability of policies and practices in relation to community safety to appreciate
90　both the complexities of what is meant by community and safety through a gendered
91　lens and the resort to the role of the criminal justice system on the other. Taken
92　together these tensions direct attention to six inter-related issues: the epistemic (who
93　can know things) and the methodological (how things, like violence against women,
94　can be known) discussed below together; the conceptual (how to make sense of what
95　we think we know); saliency (which variables count and when); policy (what can
96　be done in the light of the foregoing issues: these three are also discussed together
97　below); and the global (the Northern bias endemic in such policies).

Who can know things and how can things be known

99　Feminist thought focuses attention on how we can know things about the world, who
100　can have that knowledge, and then what that knowledge might look like. It is useful
101　to develop an understanding of these questions by illustration. The work of Genn
102　(1988: 92–3) offers one such illustration. This emanates from her involvement in the
103　development of the criminal victimisation survey in England and Wales in the late
104　1970s. As a result of this work she states:

105　　Becoming interested in what appeared to be examples of "victim-proneness"
106　　in one geographical area, I visited one particular block on a council estate
107　　over a number of months, tape-recorded interviews with several families, their
108　　neighbours and friends, and eventually moved in for a short period with the
109　　woman who had suffered the greatest number of victimisations in our survey.
110　　The views which I formed after this period of intensive observation have a

111 substantial bearing not simply on the experiences of multiple victims but on
112 the limitations of victim surveys as they are currently designed… What also
113 became apparent was the fact that events reported to us in the survey were not
114 regarded as particularly remarkable. They were just part of life.

115 This quote relates to one woman's experience of criminal victimisation, some of
116 which she probably identified as criminal victimisation and some she did not. How-
117 ever for the purpose of this discussion the key phrase is, 'They were just part of life'.
118 This emphasises her life not as a series of discreet, measurable incidents or events,
119 but as a process. Recognising process demands a different way of thinking about and
120 exploring what 'just part of life' means for people. In the arena of violence against
121 women taking account of process has led to work situated within a knowledge-based
122 framework emphasising people's experiences as they understand them. Thus not
123 necessarily as separate and separable discrete incidents but as part of a continuum of
124 their routine daily lives (see inter alia Kelly 1988; Cockburn 2013).

125 Post-1998 many local crime and disorder partnerships in putting in place their
126 plans for community safety did so, not informed by a vision of life proposed by
127 Genn (1988) but informed by information derived from either national victimisa-
128 tion survey data or by commissioning their own criminal victimisation surveys. This
129 not only enhanced the power and influence of those surveys which were gaining
130 an ever increasing presence on the international stage in informing cross-national
131 crime agendas (see for example Van Dijk and Groenhuijsen 2018), but it also solidi-
132 fied the presence of the positivistic, cause–effect approach to thinking about policy
133 responses on this issue. Put simply it added weight to the view that positive polic-
134 ing and enhancing the law could improve the safety of women living with violence.
135 In some respects this process of solidification reflected an implicit denial of femi-
136 nist approaches (often poorly characterised as work done 'by women, with women,
137 for women' which was frequently qualitative in orientation) and by implication also
138 denied violence as just part of life. Ignoring the dangers of this 'fetishism with num-
139 ber' Young (2011; see also Walklate 2014) rests on the assumption that numbers
140 can capture social reality. However the construction of such numbers glosses social
141 reality in all its complexity and has the capacity to hide the (gendered) assumptions
142 on which such numbers are built: the questions of who can know things and what it
143 is that can be known. Both of these questions ultimately inform how we make sense
144 of what we think we know. Thus the question is raised: How to make sense of what
145 we think we know?

How to make sense of what we think we know

146

147 There are a number of concepts which have informed community safety and crime
148 prevention policy since 1998. In chronological order of their primacy these are fear,
149 risk, security, and latterly vulnerability. As shall be argued all of these concepts
150 are neither unitary nor uniform, and in their operationalisation, all reflect struc-
151 tural assumptions about who can be fearful of what, who is and is not risky, whose

| Journal : **SmallExtended 41300** | Article No : **50** | Pages : **12** | MS Code : **50** | Dispatch : **19-9-2018** |

Reflections on community safety: the ongoing precarity of…

152   security counts, and who is and is not considered vulnerable. It will be of value to
153   say a little about each of these in turn.

154   Since the policy embrace of the criminal victimisation survey in the early 1980s,
155   understandings of the fear of crime have been informed to a great extent by that
156   database and its increasingly sophisticated development (Lee 2017). Over time, as
157   intimated above, the fearful have variously included the elderly and women (con-
158   structed as both rational and irrational in their fears); men as afraid to express fear
159   as being contraindicated by their masculinity; and ethnic minority groups as being
160   both the subjects of fear, the objects of fears, and both subjects and objects of fear
161   simultaneously (Mythen et al. 2009). The salience of gender in each of these con-
162   structions of the fearful is complicated. As intimated above feminist-informed work
163   focuses on the nature of women's everyday lives and conceptualises fear in terms of
164   how it translates for women and men into what Stanko (1993) has called an 'ordi-
165   nary fear'. Morgan (1989: 23) expressed this in the following way:

166   Suddenly there are footsteps behind her. Heavy, rapid. A man's footsteps. She
167   knows this immediately, just as she knows she must not look round. She quick-
168   ens her pace in time to the quickening of her pulse. She is afraid. He could
169   be a rapist. He could be a soldier, an harasser, a robber, a killer. He could be
170   none of these. He could be a man in a hurry. He could be a man walking at his
171   normal pace. But she fears him. She fears him because he is a man. She has
172   reason to fear.

173   In this sense, the 'fear of crime' constitutes one end of a continuum of experiences
174   (Kelly 1988) in which women routinely learn to manage their daily lives structured
175   and informed by their relationships with the men in their lives: fathers, sons, part-
176   ners, lovers, colleagues, co-workers. In these relationships women learn to deal with
177   harassment, incest, violence, and rape over the course of their lives. These learning
178   experiences are not easily separable into a public and private domain. For example,
179   the routine fears experienced by young mothers in Palestine, the associated surveil-
180   lance of their bodies, and their resistance to such oppression reported by Shalhoub-
181   Kevorkian (2015), stand in stark contrast to the blinkered vision of how and when
182   fear is experienced as articulated in criminal victimisation survey data. Thus the
183   feminist path offers an appreciation of women's lives as differently and differentially
184   informed by the everydayness of ordinary fears. Importantly for community safety
185   agendas this demands acknowledging that women are just as likely to fear men that
186   they know and with whom they live and/or are close to as they are strangers. This is
187   telling advice for all those crime prevention and community safety initiatives want-
188   ing to spend money on improved street lighting, or better lit car parks, comforting as
189   such initiatives might be. Importantly notions of who we might be afraid of are also
190   tied to who might be thought of as risky. So implicit to the myriad of work focusing
191   on the fear of crime is also the concept of risk.

192   O'Malley (2006: 49) has pointed out, 'crime prevention has succeeded in marry-
193   ing risk with a more traditional social and behavioural form of criminology by trans-
194   lating the old causes of crime into risk factors'. This pre-occupation with risk factors
195   is evident from the local to the global illustrated by the adoption of the World Health
196   Organisation's 'ecological model' of violence into national violence prevention

197 programmes. This model assumes that violence can be prevented by reducing the
198 violent characteristics of individuals. However it also begs the questions; what does
199 violence mean and who does what to whom? (Hester 2013). Indeed a further ques-
200 tion might be: How is it possible to understand the risk factors of violent behaviour
201 when arguably violence and the recourse to violence exist in the folds of everyday
202 life (to borrow a phrase from Das 2007). The problematic nature of these issues is
203 particularly well demonstrated by Shalhoub-Kevorkian (2003: 603), who, in dis-
204 cussing femicide, asks;

205 What is the alternative if her male adult 'protector' abuses her (sexually, emo-
206 tionally, physically), and how can she speak about her abuse if she has never
207 learned that it is possible to voice personal matters? How can she speak out
208 when she knows that customs and cultural codes may be used to cause her
209 death? How can she ask for help when her protectors might also be her ene-
210 mies? …..What happens if the legal system supports her femicide?

211 Under these kinds of conditions what counts as risk and who counts as risky are
212 arguably quite differently informed than any identification of risk *factors* might lead
213 us to believe. It is a view which also carries with it huge implications for under-
214 standings of what counts as community and community safety when seen through
215 such a differently informed gendered and ethnicised lens (see also the work of Gill
216 and Harrison 2016). Nevertheless the identification of risk factors has been a signifi-
217 cant driver of policy interventions in the crime prevention field in relation to vio-
218 lence against women and some of these risk factors have been derived from criminal
219 victimisation survey data.

220 The 'discovery' of the repeated nature of criminal victimisation from criminal
221 victimisation survey data, especially in relation to intimate partner violence, had
222 an important effect on informing policy responses, especially policing responses to
223 such violence. For example, initial responses in the UK 'flagged' such victims on
224 police computer systems so that they could be dealt with appropriately. However,
225 as Pease suggests in this issue, responding to the phenomenon of repeat victimisa-
226 tion was quickly left behind. This happened as the risk assessment tools used in the
227 context of multi-agency responses to violence against women became increasingly
228 accepted as the preferred community-based response to such violence. Contem-
229 porarily there is a wide range of risk assessment tools available, from the Spousal
230 Risk Assessment Guide (SARA), the Propensity for Abusiveness Scale (PAS); to the
231 Partner Abuse Prognostic Scale (PAPS) (all quoted in Hoyle 2008: 327). The DASH
232 model is favoured by most police forces in the UK (Domestic Abuse, Stalking and
233 Harassment, and Honour Based Violence). McCulloch et al. (2016) review a further
234 nine tools (including DASH) designed to inform responses to intimate partner vio-
235 lence and used to assess the levels of risk judged to be present in individual cases.
236 Some risk assessment practices endeavour to pay greater attention to the victim's
237 voice in the assessment process, and as Hoyle (2008: 332) observes, these typically
238 include getting the victim to agree to 'safety plans' for which 'victims are made indi-
239 vidually accountable—in part, at least—for minimising the risk of further violence'.
240 Simultaneously such plans fail to 'take into consideration women's own assessments
241 of the danger they are in, independent of other risk factors, even though most studies

242 suggest it is highly predictive of serious domestic assault' (ibid. 330; see also Camp-
243 bell 2004; Heckert and Gondolf 2004).

244 These observations reveal the tensions referred to above in relation to who can
245 know what and who is listened to as a consequence. Indeed there are multiple exam-
246 ples of cases in which the failure to listen to women's own voices appropriately
247 resulted in their subsequent death and/or serious injury. The fact remains that the
248 number of women murdered by their partners or ex-partners has remained unremit-
249 tingly consistent over the last 20 years in England and Wales as well as elsewhere.
250 From the Thurman Case in the USA in the early 1980s that led to the introduction of
251 mandatory arrest policies in cases of domestic violence, to the case of Kelly Thomp-
252 son in Melbourne, Australia, in 2015 who was killed by her partner after 38 calls to
253 police over a 3-week period for breaches of intervention orders, little has changed
254 in the capacity for policy responses to prevent these kinds of fatal outcomes. The
255 multi-agency community-based activities of MARAC's (multi-agency risk assess-
256 ment conferences) and the presence of IDVA's (independent domestic violence advi-
257 sors: in 2018 there were 815 such advisors in England and Wales) have made little
258 impact on such fatal outcomes either. Of course, since 2008 much of the work in
259 relation to policing in general and responses to violence against women has been
260 subjected to the effects of the wider cuts in policing budgets as a result of austerity
261 measures. Nevertheless, as Walklate (2018) has argued, the difficulties in engaging **AQ3**
262 in meaningful risk assessment practices for at-risk victims in this arena amount to
263 conceptual failure (Lewis and Greene 1978). Indeed the faulty theoretical founda-
264 tions of risk on which these practices are actually built are now well established
265 (Mythen 2014). Moreover, McCulloch et al. (2016: 58) state 'there is a paucity of
266 empirical research evaluating the outcomes of [international] risk assessments…',
267 with Westmarland (2011:300–301) observing that the relationship between such risk
268 assessment exercises and subsequent incidents of femicide is somewhat arbitrary.
269 Taken together these problems comprise an inability to think about security through
270 a gendered lens.

271 Since the events of 11 September 2001 and like events since, it is possible to
272 argue that the framing of community safety has become increasingly informed
273 by questions of security. The UK Government's PREVENT agenda has become a
274 central feature of these concerns in which the question of the relationship between
275 community, crime, and crime prevention has become increasingly informed by the
276 potential or otherwise for radicalisation. Put specifically the concern with the pre-
277 vention of violent extremism is one in which the security of the state has taken prec-
278 edence over security as a local and/or individual sense of well-being (see amongst
279 others Walklate et al. 2017). This pre-occupation has had a number of telling effects
280 one of which is the extent to which the continuities between violence against women
281 and violent extremism, particularly 'lone' terrorist attacks (see Hamm and Spaij
282 2017), have taken a back seat in the rush to target communities presumed to be a
283 risk to national security. Lack of space dictates an inability to unwrap all of the
284 issues that the question of security raises for community safety, but the failure to
285 envision communities as structured spaces in which some voices are heard and oth-
286 ers not is an important one. Contemporarily policy agendas outside of community
287 control can frame what safety might look like and for whom within communities.

288 This means that those who are not heard remain locked into very informal networks
289 of support and control: some of which can work well, some of which do not. Honour
290 killings and forced marriage are perhaps two of the more contentious and contested
291 issues which serve to illustrate the bigger problem of the failure to think through
292 the consequences of such policies for those who remain invisible in them. For the
293 purposes of the discussion here, this means taking account of gender. This leads
294 into the more recent focus on the question of vulnerability in informing responses to
295 community safety.

296 The concept of vulnerability has rarely been explored in its own right (Green
297 2007), and a good deal of policy takes what might be called inherent vulnerabil-
298 ity (that characterised by age, mental capacity, or physical ability) as the grounds
299 for special treatment. For Sparks (1982) vulnerability is not physical but rather is
300 informed by who is considered to be at risk and who is considered to be harmed by
301 such risk. This is a view embraced by criminal victimisation surveys in which the
302 data gathered measure vulnerability by measuring who is at most risk from crime
303 and then linking those data with other information about who crime has the most
304 impact on. The relationship between these two variables determines who is the most
305 vulnerable. However the most vulnerable are not always those positively targeted by
306 policy particularly at the community level. The hierarchy of victimisation identified
307 by Carrabine et al. (2004) illustrates this. At the bottom of this hierarchy would be
308 the homeless, the drug addict, the street prostitute: all those for whom their lifestyle
309 renders them prone to victimisation (vulnerable but denied victim status), and nearer
310 the top would be the elderly female victim of violent crime (the least prone to such
311 crime, but assumed to be vulnerable and readily assigned victim status). Contem-
312 porarily the concept of vulnerability has increasingly informed policy and practice,
313 explicitly in terms of who policy is directed towards (for example communities vul-
314 nerable to the risk of radicalisation) and implicitly in terms of resource allocation
315 (for example the assumed progression from low, medium to high risk in cases of
316 intimate partner violence when there is little evidence that such progression exists,
317 see Johnson et al. 2017). Taken together, these issues point to the importance of the
318 relationship between policy and saliency.

Saliency, policy, and the global

320 Recently Kruttschnidt (2016) has reiterated the point that as yet still not enough
321 is known about when gender is the salient variable. Social lives are complicated
322 and it would be naïve to assume that any particular course of action, including
323 being a victim or a perpetrator of violence against women, was not equally com-
324 plex. However under some circumstances it is known that gender does matter.
325 The statistical evidence is for the most part irrefutable: it is predominantly men
326 who are violent towards women, and it is also the case that some women are
327 violent towards some men. How these data are read informs how such violence
328 is responded to. The intervention by Welch (2008) referenced above focused
329 detailed attention on how understandings of who the perpetrators are and who the
330 victims are in community-based responses to domestic violence and illustrates

331 the importance of this issue. Thus the question of saliency and the extent to
332 which gender is considered the salient variable is deeply entrenched in the kind of
333 policy response which flows from the data.
334   Contemporarily, in comparison with 1998, there has been a shift towards the term
335 gender which is now commonly used by policy makers and practitioners (and indeed
336 some academics) as a substitute for sex. This shift assumes that this deals with the
337 contested nature of the relationship between sex and gender and in so doing erases
338 the questions that a serious embrace of gender can pose. For example, it remains the
339 case that male-dominated criminal justice systems (which most still are) can and do
340 have an important impact on responding to gendered crimes like domestic violence
341 and rape (for both men and women as victims of these crimes). Similarly under-
342 standing communities as gendered communities in policy terms still has some way
343 to travel in appreciating that the lived reality of communities looks different for men,
344 women, and other groups who occupy different structural positions within a com-
345 munity. Referring back to Genn's (1988) profound observation of violence as 'just
346 part of life' aptly captures this policy dilemma. Recognising this dilemma requires
347 more than simply substituting the term gender for sex. An appreciation of structural
348 location serves also to remind us that in this arena, like many others, criminal justice
349 policies travel, not just from one locality to another but also globally and the direc-
350 tion of that travel is more often than not from the global north to the global south.
351   This paper has referred to this phenomenon in relation to violence against women
352 using Goodmark's (2015) label of 'exporting without a licence'. This conveys much
353 that is contentious in the policy transfer process. On the one hand exportation might
354 serve to problematise behaviour previously considered unproblematic. For example,
355 campaign groups in some European countries have used the Istanbul Convention
356 (which became effective in 2014) to assert pressure on their governments to take
357 violence against women seriously. On the other hand those same processes can also
358 erase and silence the issues of location, specificity, and cultural difference. Fitz-Gib-
359 bon and Walklate (2017) have subjected Clare's law (the Domestic Violence Dis-
360 closure Scheme introduced in England and Wales in 2014) and the pro-arrest stance
361 towards domestic violence as illustrative of both of this. Cunneen and Rowe (2015:
362 15) point the finger at the epistemic violence done by the beliefs in the superior-
363 ity of, what they call, Eurocentric thinking. This, they observe, has crucial conse-
364 quences insofar as

365   … Eurocentric domestic violence, law and policy imposed in Indigenous con-
366   texts is often predicated on an incongruent ontological and epistemological
367   reality – a reality based on the potential for autonomous and individualised
368   decision making

369 Assuming a potential for 'autonomous and individualised decision making', whether
370 that be for a woman living with coercive control in England and Wales, or for a
371 member of an Indigenous community already labelled as risky in Australia, runs
372 through the tensions discussed in this paper. All of which when taken together act
373 as barriers to effective policy responses to crime prevention and community safety.
374 Such barriers can assume a uniform and unified subject and object of intervention
375 the dangers of which are reflected in the conceptual failure discussed above.

| Journal : **SmallExtended 41300** | Article No : **50** | Pages : **12** | MS Code : **50** | Dispatch : **19-9-2018** |

S. Walklate

Conclusion: The ongoing precarity of women's lives

Loader and Walker (2001) observed that our sense of security is deeply embedded in our relationships with others. For women living with violence this involves a precarious existence between keeping themselves and their children safe in ways that might demand they stay with the person who threatens them most. The policy activity documented above represents a plethora of initiatives few of which have impacted upon this fundamental 'truth'. The failure to commit to the kind of whole systems approach advocated by Wilson in 1983will continue to embed women's lives in a precariousness which is often compounded by the policies intended to support and help them. Perhaps the time is ripe for a Royal Commission on Violence Against Women which could take a long hard look at what has and has not worked over the last 20 years. Such a commission would need to take to heart that for some (women) violence is 'just part of life' before any in-roads could be made to render community safety an inclusive experience. So much remains to be done both in how community safety is understood, the evidence based on which such understandings are constructed, and the extent to which gendered thinking informs both of these issues. Some in-roads have already been made on these questions (see for example the measurement work reported by Walby et al. 2016). There is more to do.

References

Campbell, J. 2004. Helping women understand their risk in situations of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 19(12): 1464–1477.

Carrabine, E., P. Inganski, M. Lee, K. Plummer, and N. South. 2004. *Criminology: A Sociological Introduction*. London: Routledge.

Cockburn, C. 2013. Towards a different common sense. www.cynthiacockburn.org.

Cunneen, C., and S. Rowe. 2015. Decolonising indigenous victimisation. In *Crime, Victims and Policy: International Contexts, Local Experiences*, ed. D. Wilson and S. Ross, 10–32. London: Palgrave-MacMillan.

Das, V. 2007. *Life and Words; Violence and the Descent into the Ordinary*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Davies, P. 2008. Looking out of a broken old window: Community safety, gendered crimes and victimizations. *Crime Prevention and Community Safety* 10: 207–225. https://doi.org/10.1057/cpcs.2008.8.

Fitz-Gibbon, K., and S. Walklate. 2017. The efficacy of Clare's Law in domestic violence law reform in England and Wales. *Criminology and Criminal Justice* 17(3): 284–300.

Fitz-Gibbon, K., S. Walklate, J. McCulloch, and J.M. Maher (eds.). 2018. *Intimate Partner Violence, Risk and Security: Securing Women's Lives*. London: Routledge.

Genn, H. 1988. Multiple victimisation. In *Victims of Crime: A New Deal?*, ed. M. Maguire and J. Ponting, 88–98. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gill, A.K., and K. Harrison. 2016. Police responses to intimate partner sexual violence in South Asian communities. *Policing* 10(4): 446–455. https://doi.org/10.1093/police/paw027.

Goodmark, L. 2015. Exporting without license: The American attempt to end intimate partner abuse worldwide. In *Comparative Perspectives on Gender Violence: Lessons from Efforts Worldwide*, ed. R. Goel and L. Goodmark, 3–14. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

| Journal : **SmallExtended 41300** | Article No : **50** | Pages : **12** | MS Code : **50** | Dispatch : **19-9-2018** |

Reflections on community safety: the ongoing precarity of…

Green, S. 2007. Crime, victimisation and vulnerability. In *Handbook of Victims and Victimology 1/e*, ed. S. Walklate, 91–118. Cullompton, Devon: Willan.

Hamm, M., and R. Spaaji. 2017. *The Age of Lone Wolf Terrorism*. Columbia: Columbia University Press.

Henckert, D.A., and W. Gondolf. 2004. Battered women's perceptions of risk versus risk factors and instruments in predicting repeat reassault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 19(7): 778–800.

Hester, M. 2013. Who does what to whom? Gender and domestic violence perpetrators in English police records. *European Journal of Criminology* 10(5): 623–637.

Hoyle, C. 2008. Will she be safe? A critical analysis of risk assessment in domestic violence cases. *Children and Youth Services Review* 30(3): 323–337.

Johnson, H., Eriksson, L., Mazarolle, P. and Wortley, R. 2017. Intimate femicide: The role of coercive control. Feminist Criminology. Epub ahead of print 7 April 2017. https://doi.org/10.1177/1557085117701574.

Kelly, L. 1988. *Surviving Sexual Violence*. Oxford: Polity.

Kruttschnitt, C. 2016. The politics, and place, of gender in research on crime. *Criminology* 4(1): 8–29.

Lee, M. 2017. Fear, vulnerability and victimisation. In *Victims, Crime and Society: An Introduction 2/e*, ed. P. Davies, P. Francis, and C. Greer, 127–145. London: Sage.

Lewis, R., and J.R. Greene. 1978. Implementation evaluation: A future direction in project evaluation. *Journal of Criminal Justice* 6: 167–1765.

Loader, I., and N. Walker. 2001. Policing as a public good: Reconstituting connections between policing and the state. *Theoretical Criminology* 5(1): 9–35.

McCulloch, J. Maher, JM, Fitz-Gibbon, K., Segrave, M., and Roffee, J. 2016 Review of the family violence risk assessment and management framework (CRAF) Final report. www.monash.edu Melbourne.

Mooney, J. 2007. Shadow values, shadow figures: Real violence. *Critical Criminology* 15(2): 144–164.

Morgan, R. 1989. *The Demon Lover: On the Sexuality of Terrorism*. New York: Norton Books.

Mythen, G. 2014. *Understanding the Risk Society*. London: Palgrave.

Mythen, G., S. Walklate, and F. Khan. 2009. I'm a Muslim, but I'm not a Terrorist': Victimization, risky identities and the performance of safety. *British Journal of Criminology* 49(6): 736–754.

O'Malley, P. 2006. Criminology and risk. In *Beyond the Risk Society*, ed. G. Mythen and S. Walklate, 43–58. London: McGraw-Hill.

Shalhoub-Kevorkian, N. 2003. Reexamining femicide: Breaking the silence and crossing "scientific" borders. *Signs* 28(2): 581–608.

Shalhoub-Kevorkian, N. 2015. The politics of birth and the intimacies of violence against Palestinian women in occupied East Jerusalem. *British Journal of Criminology* 55(6): 1187–1206.

Sherman, L. 2014. Mandatory arrest in domestic violence call-outs causes early death in victims. http://www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/mandatory-arrest-in-domestic-violencecall-outs-causes-early-death-in-victims (Accessed 3 March 2014).

Sherman, L., and R. Berk. 1984. The Specific Deterrent Effect of Arrest for Domestic Assault. *American Sociological Review* 49(2): 261–276.

Sherman, L., and H.M. Harris. 2015. Increased Death rates of domestic violence victims from arresting vs. warning suspects in the Milwaukee domestic violence experiment (MilDVE). *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 11(1): 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-014-9203-x.

Sparks, R.F. 1982. *Research on Victims of Crime: Accomplishments, Issues, and New Directions*. Rockville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services.

Squires, P. (ed.). 2006. *Community Safety: Critical Perspectives on Policy and Practice*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Stanko, E. 1993. Ordinary fear: Women, violence and personal safety. In *Violence Against Women: The Bloody Footprints*, ed. P. Bart and E. Moran, 155–164. London: Sage.

Tombs, S., and D. Whyte. 2006. Community safety and corporate crime. In *Community Safety: Critical Perspectives on Policy and Practice*, ed. P. Squires, 155–168. Bristol: Policy Press.

Van Dijk, J., and M. Groenhuijsen. 2018. A glass half full or half empty? On the implementation of the EU's Victim Directive regarding police reception and specialised support. In *Handbook of Victims and Victimology (2/e)*, ed. S. Walklate, 275–292. London: Routledge.

Walby, S., J. Towers, and B. Francis. 2016. Is violence increasing or decreasing?: A new methodology to measure repeat attacks making visible the significance of gender and domestic relations. *British Journal of Criminology* 56(6): 1203–1234. https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azv131.

| Journal : **SmallExtended 41300** | Article No : **50** | Pages : **12** | MS Code : **50** | Dispatch : **19-9-2018** |

S. Walklate

479 Walklate, S. 2006. Community safety and victims: Who is the victim of community safety? In *Commu-*
480   *nity Safety: Critical Perspectives on Policy and Practice*, ed. P. Squires, 169–180. Bristol: Policy
481   Press.
482 Walklate, S. 2014. Sexual violence against women? Still a controversial issue for victimology? *Interna-*
483   *tional Review of Victimology* 20(1): 71–84.
484 Walklate, S. 2018. Criminology, gender and risk: The dilemmas of Northern theorising for Southern
485   responses to intimate partner violence. *International Journal for Crime, Justice and Social Democ-*
486   *racy* 7(1): 1–14. https://doi.org/10.5204/ijcjsd.v7i1.444.
487 Walklate, S., and K. Fitz-Gibbon. 2018. The violence of 'northern' theorising for policy responses to AQ4
488   intimate partner violence. In *Palgrave Handbook on Criminology and the Global South*, ed. K. Car-
489   rington, M. Sozzo, R. Hogg, and J. Scott, 847–866. London: Palgrave.
490 Walklate, S., J. McCulloch, K. Fitz-Gibbon, and J.M. Maher. 2017. Criminology, gender and security
491   in the Australian context: Making women's lives matter. *Theoretical Criminology*. https://doi.
492   org/10.1177/1362480617719449.
493 Welch, K. 2008. Current policy on domestic violence: A move in the right direction or a step too far?
494   *Crime Prevention and Community Safety* 10: 226–248. https://doi.org/10.1057/cpcs.2008.7.
495 Westmarland, N. 2011. Co-ordinating responses to domestic violence. In *Handbook of Sexual Violence*,
496   ed. J. Brown and S. Walklate, 287–307. London: Routledge-Willan.
497 Wilson, E. 1983. *What Is To Be Done About Violence Against Women?*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
498 Young, J. 2011. *The Criminological Imagination*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

🦄 **Springer**
the language of science

Author Query Form

Please ensure you fill out your response to the queries raised below and return this form along with your corrections

Dear Author

During the process of typesetting your article, the following queries have arisen. Please check your typeset proof carefully against the queries listed below and mark the necessary changes either directly on the proof/online grid or in the 'Author's response' area provided below

Query	Details Required	Author's Response
AQ1	Please confirm the inserted city name is correctly identified in affiliation 1 and amend if necessary.	
AQ2	Reference "Walklate (1998)" was mentioned in the manuscript; however, this was not included in the reference list. As a rule, all mentioned references should be present in the reference list. Please provide the reference details to be inserted in the reference list.	
AQ3	Lewis and Greene (1979), Johnson et al. (2015) and Gibbon and Walklate (2018) have been changed to Lewis and Greene (1978), Johnson (2017) and Gibbon and Walklate (2017) so that these citations matches the list.	
AQ4	Reference "Walklate and Fitz-Gibbon (2018)" was provided in the reference list; however, this was not mentioned or cited in the manuscript. As a rule, if a citation is present in the text, then it should be present in the list. Please provide the location of where to insert the reference citation in the main body text.	