

A COMMUNITIES PERCEPTIONS AND ATTITUDES TOWARDS NEIGHBOURHOOD POLICING

By Anthea Tainton¹

Abstract

This dissertation evaluates the impact of Neighbourhood Policing in a local community, focusing in particular on the perceptions of key stakeholders and members of the community. Neighbourhood policing is the most recent model of community policing in the UK, whilst community policing has been a popular model in the USA it has not been as influential in the UK. However, during the early 2000s there was growing anxiety and an increase in the public's fear of crime, despite crime rates decreasing since the mid 1990s. This led to the development of the National Reassurance Policing Programme. This programme developed a set of practical policing strategies that were targeted, primarily, at reducing fear of crime amongst the public. The Neighbourhood Policing model developed directly out of the reassurance programme, and is attempting, with the extension of the policing family, to provide each community with a local policing team that is both visible and accessible.

Due to the contemporary nature of Neighbourhood Policing there is limited literature available examining a range of important issues. Not least, the majority of evaluations of this model have focused on implementation issues at a national level, thus ignoring the localised nature of policing. In response to this gap in the literature this dissertation explores perceptions and attitudes towards neighbourhood policing at the level of a local community, examining: public awareness of neighbourhood policing and its aims; multi-agency partnerships and their fit with this model; public understanding of the effectiveness or impact that Neighbourhood Policing is having on crime and anti-social behaviour. Although this is only an exploratory study it argues that in order to understand the impact and effectiveness of Neighbourhood Policing it is essential that future research concentrates on the perceptions of those involved in the delivery and on the receiving end of this approach.

¹ Student at Nottingham Trent University, Division of Criminology, Public Health and Policy Studies, BA (Hons) Criminology

Key Abbreviations

ASB = Anti-Social Behaviour

BCS = British Crime Survey

BCU = Basic Command Unit

CAPS = Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy

CDA = Crime and Disorder Act

CP = Community Policing

CPO = Community Protection Officer

MEH – Middletown Eastshire Housing

NAT = Neighbourhood Action Officer

NIM = National Intelligence Model

NPP = Neighbourhood Policing Programme

NP = Neighbourhood Policing

NPT = Neighbourhood Policing Team

NRPP = National Reassurance Policing Programme

PC = Police Constable

PCSO = Police Community Support Officer

PFA = Police Force Area

POP = Problem Oriented Policing

SCP = Signals Crime Perspective

Chapter One

Introduction

Aims and Objectives

Contemporary policing in the UK recently returned to a more traditional style more commonly associated with a CP model. Crime levels in the UK have been falling consistently since 1995 but the public have failed to acknowledge this decrease and instead their fear of crime has increased. NP evolved from the NRPP and has aimed to reduce the gap between the increase in the public's fear of crime and the actual decrease of crime. Over the last decade policing has experienced significant changes, including the expansion of the policing family. The NRPP utilised the extension of the policing family and began to improve the public's confidence in the police and the NPP aimed to continue this improvement. The NPP is still in its infancy and initial evaluations have begun to explore if fear of crime is continuing to decrease. Due to this infancy many of the evaluations are mainly concerned with implementation issues. This research is aiming to explore the NPP impact in more detail by examining the attitudes and perceptions towards this latest style of community policing within a single, local community.

The main research aims and objectives are realised by using primary research. The primary research method, a semi-structured interview, was designed to gather the attitudes and perception of the community.. The interviewees highlight a range of perspectives from the community including residents, the NPT and local authority employees who regularly work in the area. This variety of perspectives and attitudes provided the research with a rounded view of how NP operates in a community.

Justification for Research

The current literature on NP consists mainly of Home Office funded evaluations and arguably such research is biased to support political agendas. This research therefore will be more independent than the Home Office evaluations.

None of the previous evaluations have addressed the issue of multi agency partnerships working with NPT and how they co-operate and if this has had any impact upon public perceptions about NP. Thus an important aim of this research is to assess the impact of multi agency partnerships on NP.

The whole issue of examining NP on a smaller scale is important. A national evaluation does not have the time and resources to look at every individual NPT in depth. NP operates at a local level and policing priorities in communities are decided by the public. It is the local communities that have the daily contact with the police so it is essential that any evaluations that are undertaken focus on getting rich and valid data from all perspectives. Perceptions and attitudes can be difficult to gather by quantitative research methods. This research therefore would begin to bridge the

gap in the literature by providing some qualitative data on what the communities perceptions are on the latest model of policing.

Dissertation structure

The dissertation is divided into four main chapters followed by a conclusion, references and appendices.

The Literature Review is the first main chapter, which begins with a brief history of CP and how it developed and evolved, especially in the US where it has been a dominant model of policing. The majority of the research on CP has been conducted in the US. The literature goes on to discuss the importance of multi-agency partnerships. Key legislation in the late 1990s placed statutory requirements upon the police to work with other agencies. The development of the NRPP and SCP is then discussed in relation to why it was introduced and how it then impacted and evolved into the current NPP. All of these themes are re-discussed later in the evaluation chapter when they are compared to the findings of the primary research.

The methodology is the next chapter. This section states the methodological practices that the researcher undertook during the research. The research methods used are discussed in relation to their advantages and disadvantages. The research justifications are explored as well as how the research could have been improved with the use of different research methods.

The findings chapter, explores the findings of the primary research. The interviews that were conducted are discussed at length with regard to reoccurring themes that emerged from the interviewees. Some of these themes are similar to those that emerged from the literature review.

Finally, the evaluation chapter discusses the findings in comparison to the previous literature. The primary research found some emerging trends across all the responses of the interviewees. This was then explored in relation to previous research. The evaluation chapter provides the dissertation with an analytical perspective.

The final part of the dissertation is summed up in the concluding chapter. This section highlights the key findings of the primary research and makes recommendations on how NP could be improved in the future. Further research is also discussed in this section. If the researcher was to have more time research could be improved and extended by exploring more NPT's across the country and conducting further interviews with more members of the public.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

Introduction

This section reviews the existing literature on a contemporary model of policing in England and Wales called Neighbourhood Policing (NP). The first part focuses on the origins of NP in the context of Community Policing (CP), first developed in the 1970s: the former having many similarities and shared aims with the latter. The review then explores how the 'Signal Crimes Perspective' developed by Innes (2004a) led to the development of the National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP), which aimed to address public perceptions that crime rates were increasing throughout the 1990s despite crime statistics revealing a reduction (Innes 2004b; Crawford 2007). It was via the NRPP that the Neighbourhood Policing Programme (NPP) directly developed and the differences and similarities between these two programmes are discussed. Then the early evaluations of the NPP will be explored to see if there is any evidence of NP having a positive impact in communities that initially implemented it.

Community Policing

Alderson (1979) and Skogan (2006) are key contributors to the CP literature and their work, in a sense, anticipates the emergence of NP. CP in the UK emerged in the late 1970s. A former Chief Constable of Devon and Cornwall Police, John Alderson, argued that society was changing and that policing styles had to reflect this. Society was becoming 'free, permissive and participatory' and authoritarian policing styles were no longer appropriate (Alderson, 1979: 199). His vision for the future of policing consisted of key aims that are still relevant in contemporary CP styles such as NP. Some of these early aims were to create trust in communities, to uphold and protect human rights, to dispel criminogenic social conditions through cooperative action, to strengthen security and feelings of security and to involve other agencies in policing where needed. This last point was an important early recognition that the police, in order to solve, prevent and detect crimes, needed to work together with other key agencies. Alderson's suggestions placed emphasis on a more pro-active style of policing that works with the public in their communities.

Community policing received less support in the UK compared with the USA where it has been more popular and widely used. Writers have argued that it is an ambiguous term and has been used in such a general way it has become meaningless (Bayley 1994, Tilley 2008). Some of the ambiguity comes from the problematic definition of what CP actually is. There are various definitions in the literature, including Alderson's, but one of the key pieces of work, although published in the USA, which has been extremely influential for CP is Skogan's (2006) research into CAPS. The CAPS project influenced the development of the NRPP in the early 2000s.

Although Skogan does not define CP specifically, he argues:

Community policing is not a set of specific projects; rather, it involves changing decision-making processes and creating new cultures within police departments. It is an organisational strategy that leaves setting priorities and the means of achieving them largely to residents and the police who serve in their neighbourhoods. Community policing is a process rather than a product (Skogan, 2006: 5).

Skogan, like Alderson, also clearly emphasises the importance of partnership working in CP. He suggests that community engagement is an important part of police work, by developing partnerships with community groups; this enables the police to build relationships with the community. From these relationships the police are able to gather information that allows them to use a problem solving approach when tackling issues in the community. This is another area that Skogan believes relies upon the police being able to work with other agencies in order to be successful. Many of the problematic issues are associated with the way an area looks, for example graffiti and vandalism, so the police would have to work with other partners for these issues to be tackled. These disorders are the 'signal crimes' that Innes (2006a) identified as having an impact on public perceptions about criminogenic risk and will be further explored later in the chapter.

The literature on CP discusses many advantages that it can bring to communities and policing if it is implemented properly but the whole organisation change that is required for that is rare and difficult to achieve (Mackenzie and Henry, 2009). The main successes of CP are the public's increased satisfaction with the police, and where implemented CP has improved police-public relations. The CAPS data also shows an increase in public confidence across all ethnic groups (Skogan, 2006), an important issue for police to recognise when they are policing ethnically diverse communities. The fear of crime is another important aspect of policing that CP should have an impact on but the evidence suggests otherwise. Tuffin et al (2006) found that there was only a slight decrease in fear of crime but the CAPS evaluation found that fear of crime fell from 41% in 1993 to 26% in 2003 (Skogan, 2006). Further research does suggest that where the public perceive high levels of police-community cooperation they perceive lower levels of crime and disorder and feel safer than other citizens that do not perceive a good relationship (Reisig and Parks, 2004).

The similarities between NPP and CP would lead some writers to suggest that NRPP and NPP are just CP repackaged (Millie and Herrington, 2004). The reviews below of NRPP and NPP assess if the programmes have offered something different mainly because of the importance and the introduction of partnership working in the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 which made partnership working with the police and other agencies a statutory requirement.

Multi-agency partnerships

Although not formally introduced until the 1998 Crime and Disorder Act the emphasis on the police working with other agencies was suggested by some key people many years before. Alderson (1979), as discussed earlier, was one of the first to suggest that communities needed the input of other agencies. After the Brixton

Riots of 1981 Lord Scarman headed a public review. The Scarman Report (1981) was released later in the year, which criticised police for their heavy handed approach to the 'Operation Swamp 81' in the community of Brixton. Scarman continued that the police's core duties should be 'the prevention of crime, the protection of life and property and the preservation of tranquillity' and in the event of any conflict in communities the police should prioritise ensuring the maintenance of public peace above crime fighting (*ibid*: 4.55). Scarman concluded that the police's lack of consultation with the community was an 'error of judgement' (*ibid*). This was an early recognition that the relationship between the police and the community they serve is an important one and should not be underestimated otherwise it may have serious implications.

The Morgan Report (Standing Conference on Crime Prevention, 1991) that considered who should take lead responsibility for crime prevention was a key document with important recommendations for the future of multi-agency approaches to policing communities. The report concluded that: 'at present crime prevention is a peripheral concern for all of the agencies involved and a truly core activity for none of them' (*ibid*: 3.15). The report contained 19 major recommendations including: that multi-agency crime prevention should be developed and coordinated by the local authority and that the police and other agencies information systems should be compatible in order to make exchanging data simpler. The report concluded that there were six core elements that are crucial to multi-agency crime reduction work; structure, leadership, information, identity, durability and resources. The report also suggested the term 'community safety' was preferred over 'crime prevention' as this suggested that the police were not the sole agency to be responsible for crime prevention and it could encourage other sections of the community to become involved in fighting crime.

Prior to the 1997 General Election the Labour party was committed to implementing the key recommendations of the Morgan Report if elected and after forming a new government in May 1997 New Labour released details of their plans via the document, *Getting to Grips with Crime* (Home Office, 1997). The document recognised the importance of the Morgan report and claimed that most of the key findings had been taken on board by partnerships across the country it then suggested that it should not be up to local authorities to take the lead role but joint responsibility should be taken alongside other partnership agencies.

In the following year the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) was introduced. This act was important for future partnership workings as it placed a statutory duty on chief police officers and local authorities, in cooperation with probation committees and health authorities to formulate and implement a strategy for the reduction of crime and disorder in local areas. Since the act was introduced early evaluations by the Home Office (Phillips, 2002) suggested that some difficulties were being experienced regarding leadership and accountability but there was also evidence of promising practice among partnerships. A later Home Office (2006a) review of the CDA exposed several ongoing problems within partnerships, including the relative lack of strategic direction, accountability, information sharing and public consultation. The Police and Justice Act (2006) incorporated some changes that would aim to address these issues. The major changes included more power to share information amongst statutory agencies, and clearer guidelines for community

consultation. All of these Acts and reviews are important for NP, which relies heavily on partners to work efficiently within communities. It continuously builds and strengthens the relationships between agencies and assists them in tackling crime and anti social behaviour together. The input of the public into this process is also important to NP. The CDA placed specific emphasis on community consultation requiring the police and local authorities to cooperate with the public as well as encouraging them to access hard to reach groups such as ethnic minorities. This type of consultation means the public are at the heart of policing and policing priorities which is a key aim of NP.

Signal Crimes Perspective and Reassurance Policing

The Signal Crimes Perspective (SCP) was developed by Martin Innes, in the early 2000s, to suggest that specific crimes and disorders have a greater impact on public feelings of safety than others. This perspective was developed alongside but separately to the NRPP. The SCP provided a new way of seeing how the public interpret crime and disorder and how this affects their feelings of risk and security.

Innes (2004a) developed the SCP from the literature on fear of crime and the limitations that arose from the 'Broken Windows' theory as well as Sloviks' (1992, cited in Millie and Herrington 2004) work on risk perception which identifies different risks as having different 'signal' values. Innes explored the relationship between experiences of crime and disorder and perceptions of criminogenic risk, how the public interpret and define these threats to their security. SCP suggests that some crime and disorders act as warning signals to people about their exposure to risk, the signals then cause people to change the way they feel, think and behave. The perspective covers a range of crimes and disorders but not everyone recognises the same signals or interprets them in the same way. A succession of weak signals in a community can lead to a strong signal and therefore a greater perception of risk by the public. Innes (*ibid*) also claims that the perspective allows for the police to develop 'control signals' that allow them to neutralise signal crimes and disorders.

Reassurance Policing was born out of a lack of confidence in the police by the public despite the decrease in crime rates and the SCP was an important development in regard to this problem. SCs have a disproportionate negative impact on public perceptions of crime so it is therefore crucial for the police to listen to the public and then tackle the SCs that they believe to be important. This was to be a key part of RP. One of the main aims of the programme was to increase high visibility patrols by police officers because whilst police patrols may have little impact on crime rates they can increase public confidence in the police and reduce fear of crime (Kelling *et al* 1974, cited in Innes, 2004a: 7). Bahn (1974, cited in Innes, 2004a: 8) suggests that a police presence is important in terms of reassuring people about their safety. This increase in visibility could assist the police in engaging with the public so SCs could be identified. This would therefore see the public determine police priorities and therefore resources could be targeted at these SCs, which would have an impact in making communities and neighbourhoods more secure by the police and local partners developing solutions together to tackle them. This identification of SC that are identified by the public and therefore fed into local policing priorities can be seen in the NRPP and current NPP.

RP was first introduced in 2003. It was piloted in 16 ward level sites in eight police forces in England. As mentioned previously the main focus of the programme was to improve public confidence in the police, reduce fear of crime amongst the public, to reassure them that crime was actually decreasing and to further reduce the crime and anti-social behaviour levels. The British Crime Survey (BCS) had been consistently showing falls in crime since 1995 however in 2002/03 (Nicholas and Walker, 2003 cited in Tuffin et al 2006: 2) two-thirds of respondents still believed that, compared to two years before, crime rates had risen. This new vision of policing contained three key elements: the presence of visible, accessible and locally known authority figures in neighbourhoods including police officers and PCSOs; community involvement in the process of identifying priorities and tackling them; and targeted police activity and problem solving to tackle crime and disorders that matter the most in neighbourhoods.

The evaluation of the NRPP, alongside the aims and objectives, was designed to measure crime reduction although that was not the primary aim of the programme. The results (Tuffin et al, 2006) achieved over a 12 month period were consistent positive changes in the key outcomes such as crime reduction, perceptions of anti-social behaviour, and feelings of safety after dark and public confidence in the police. The research suggested that where public priorities are targeted by the police this can have a positive impact on crime and public perceptions.

Millie and Herrington (2004) also conducted research into the impact of the NRPP using focus groups and interviews to speak to key stakeholders involved in the programme. Their work also tried to explore what was different about this NRPP compared to other forms of previous CP. Millie and Herrington (*ibid*) suggest that NRPP has evolved from previous CP models because of the introduction of new initiatives such as the extension of the policing family which includes the use of PCSOs in communities. Millie and Herrington's research (*ibid*) discovered that the police officers welcomed visible policing and getting out into the community although they recognised there was more to it than just 'showing their faces'. The consultation of the community, like the SCP suggested, was also welcomed but officers claimed that in some areas this may be 'easier said than done' because some communities did not have positive relationships with the police after previous failures by the police to listen. Whilst police officers were enthusiastic, the research also identified problems. Firstly, due to scarce resources officers were often pulled out of the community to do other work, such as response. A further criticism was the quick turn over of staff for RP to work it needs a consistent police presence so the public could build up trusting relationships with them. This issue was addressed when the NRPP evolved into NP. The conclusion of the research discovered that the NRPP had the potential to meet many of its aims with the SCP running through the heart of it, this allows the public to have direct input into and a key role in defining policing priorities, which can lead to many of the programme objectives being met. Millie and Herrington (*ibid*) argue that for the programme to be taken seriously it needs the commitment of all police and not just those directly involved in the programme.

Neighbourhood Policing

During the NRPP development the Government set out plans for NP in the Home Office Strategic Plan 2004-2008 closely followed by the publication of the Police Reform White Paper, *Building Communities, Beating Crime*. The White Paper set out how NP was going to be different from previous versions of CP. The aim of the NPP was to not only reassure the public but to reduce crime levels through a problem solving approach. The National Intelligence Model (NIM) is an intelligence led business style of policing used to gather and manage information. The models aim is to use intelligence effectively to identify priorities and the allocation of resources. The NIM would therefore provide a structure for the police service, which assisted forces with targeting and analysis alongside the NPP. The NIM works effectively with Problem Oriented Policing (POP) styles as both complement each other and although a business model it allows police forces to work together with a common understanding and greatly assists a problem-solving approach. The NIM was designed with law enforcement in mind but actually provides a platform for partnerships to share information, identify problems, process information and to analyse intelligence. The NIM therefore has the potential to allow problem solving policing approaches to operate and evolve. This is important to NP that is based around problem solving.

The White Paper's vision for NP was similar to the NRPP but it also made a note of other research and evaluations regarding implementation failures. The main aims of NP are to provide people who live or work in a neighbourhood with:

- Access to local policing services via a named point of contact.
- Influence over policing priorities in their neighbourhood.
- Interventions including joint action with public and partners.
- Answers sustainable solutions and feedback.

The NP pilot schemes were rolled out across England and Wales with the aim of each neighbourhood having their own dedicated NPT by April 2008. Each team would be made up of uniformed police officers, PCSOs and CPOs, who are employed by the local authority or housing association. The shape and size of a neighbourhood varies across rural and inner city areas so local forces and local authorities would decide what constitutes a neighbourhood but usually they are one or two wards of an area.

One of the early evaluations of NP was released in 2006 (Neighbourhood Policing: Progress Report 2006) showing it has the capacity to achieve dramatic improvements, the early statistics from the pilot areas revealed an improvement in public confidence with the police. Another evaluation by Quinton and Morris (2008) also showed promising success. The evaluation consisted of 4 previous studies including the NRPP evaluation and a follow up study, a Basic Command level evaluation and a national evaluation. With all the data available from all the above evaluations the results showed a significant positive impact on a wide range of outcome measures including public confidence, but perceptions are key to the success of NP. Quinton and Morris (2006) argue that it is easy for public confidence

to slide so NP should be aiming to maintain current confidence levels as well as attempting to improve them. The studies also reaffirmed the importance of the three delivery mechanisms; visibility, community engagement and problem-solving in delivering improvements in public perceptions and confidence.

The Government reiterated their commitment to NP by continuing with their reform of the way the police service will work in communities. The Home Office Green Paper (Home Office, 2008) introduced the Policing Pledge, a set of commitments that the public can expect from the police, that aims to increase levels of public confidence in the police as well as to give the public more responsibility in setting local police priorities. The Policing Pledge, it was hoped, would ensure each resident knew their local NPT and be able to contact them. The Green Paper signalled the beginning of the reduction of 'red tape' for the police so they could spend more time in the communities they serve.

Findings from the second year of the NPP (Home Office: 2009) focused on the impact of key outcomes at BCU level and PFA level. The findings identified some positive impact on outcomes at BCU level but no positive changes at PFA level which is an important difference as it is at PFA that changes are expected to have had an impact. The reasoning behind this no change at PFA level was that it was still early in the implementation stage being only the second year. It is also suggested that because NP is responsive to individual communities it is difficult to measure the impact by a national evaluation, maybe a more locally focussed qualitative approach would be better suited to measuring the impact of NP. This appears to show a gap in the literature, that there is limited qualitative research on NP most likely due to the time and resources required to do such research. By using another methodology different findings may emerge about the impact NP has had in communities. This will be explored in more detail in the analysis chapter that will discuss the various differences in data that has emerged from using a different research method.

Chapter 3

Methodology

Introduction

This dissertation is aiming to explore community perceptions and attitudes towards NP so in order to fulfil the research objective a primary research method was utilised. The primary research used was semi-structured interviews with various members of a local NP team as well as other members of the community including residents, local councillors and local authority employees. This methodology will outline all the advantages to using primary research and how it assisted in ensuring the research objective was meant. It will also explore some of the disadvantages, how another research method could have been used and what the implications for the research would have been. Ethical considerations and sampling issues will be discussed in this chapter too.

Primary Research

It was decided that primary research would be used for this dissertation as it allowed the researcher to explore perceptions and attitudes of a community as stated in the research aims and objectives and this can not be done by using secondary research or by a quantitative research method. A qualitative research method allows the researcher to gather data and attach social meaning to it (Jupp et al, 2007) this is particularly important when exploring perceptions and attitudes. Quantitative research methods do not allow for behaviours and meanings to be understood outside of the specific environments in which they operate (Bryman, 2004). This research therefore has used a qualitative research method, semi-structured interviews, to gather community perceptions and attitudes towards NP.

A major advantage of using primary research is the accuracy of the data produced. Whilst the quality of secondary data is checked it is not as accurate as using primary data where the researcher has control over what is collected therefore producing high quality data (Bryman, 2004). Another problem for the researcher if a secondary research method was used would be the difficulty with the data available as it may not answer the research question posed (Riedel, 2000). This would be problematic for this dissertation as NP is a recent model of policing and there is little qualitative data and literature available so using secondary research alone would not be able to answer the research question.

However, primary research does have some limitations despite all of its advantages. Henn et al (2006) argue that one of the major disadvantages is reliability. Qualitative research methods are often criticised for lacking structure and therefore no generalisations are able to be made from it especially if small samples are used. One of the major advantages of secondary research is the financial aspect and the time it

saves a researcher if it is used. David and Sutton (2004) suggest this method is an attractive method for researchers as there is no data collection, coding or data entry to be undertaken.

Semi-structured Interviews

As the research question would be exploring a variety of different people's perceptions from a community it was decided the use of interviews would be the most appropriate research method. Interviews were preferred to questionnaires as they do not allow the interviewer any flexibility (Noaks and Wincup, 2004). Interviews have the flexibility for the research to change, for ideas to develop and for particular issues that arise to be explored further by the interviewer (Henn et al, 2006).

A semi-structured interview was preferred as this method still allowed for a general framework to be present in the interview but also allowed the interviewer the flexibility to change the way questions were asked or the order they were asked in. This allowed probing from the researcher and allows the interviewee to respond in their own terms or ways which is significant and relevant (Jupp et al, 2007). The value of the semi-structured interview is that they allow the researcher to explore in depth some aspect of the respondent's feelings, motives meanings and attitudes (*ibid*). This is particularly important for this dissertations aims. An unstructured interview was not considered as this is often as Bryman (2004: 321) describes as 'very similar in character to a conversation'.

The semi-structured interview questions were designed with three different groups of interviewees in mind. The structure changed slightly depending which group the interviewee belonged to from either the NP team, residents who live in the community or local authority employees including local councillors (See Appendix 1). The structures of the interviews were designed to allow the interviewees the opportunity to give the researcher as wide a range of appropriate information as possible (Bryman, 2004). It was also important that the researcher did not design the interview structure with any pre-conceptions in mind (*ibid*). The relationship between the researcher and interviewee is an important aspect of conducting interviews. A good rapport is crucial for the interviewee to engage and answer questions thoroughly (Henn, 2006). This also allows the research to query the interviewee's response to ensure they have interpreted it correctly.

Interviews, however carefully planned and designed, do have limitations. Critics of the semi-structured interview suggest that the method is a subjective one that gives too much scope for the researcher to influence interviewee's response via their questioning style or body language (*ibid*). This is often referred to as an 'interviewer factor' (Sarantakos, 2006: 186) where issues such as gender, class and ethnicity have an impact upon the researchers influence on the interviewee therefore affecting any answers given during the interview (Bryman, 2004). Another issue that may affect an interview is that they are not anonymous. Other research methods may allow the respondent to answer in private and therefore they may be more willing and open when responding to sensitive issues (Sarantakos, 2005).

A way to address some of these issues would have been to use a different research method such as self-completion questionnaires. This would have eradicated any

interviewer bias and would have ensured anonymity. This method however may have been too structured for the research aim. Questionnaires are not the best way to gather meanings and feelings, they are impersonal and do not allow the researcher any flexibility. This is why for this research despite the limitations with interviews it was decided they were the most appropriate method of gathering the data to meet the research question.

Sampling

The sampling used for the interviews in this dissertation, due to the research objective, was both purposive and convenience sampling. Although Bryman (2004: 184) suggests that these types of sampling are held in 'low esteem' because the results from any research can not be generalised to the wider public. Qualitative researchers would argue that the interviewee's perceptions were not meant to be representative of the population but of only the community of which they reside.

In this instance convenience and purposive sampling for recruiting interviewees was the best method. The residents recruited to be interviewed were a convenience sample as they were easily accessible through personal contacts made by the researcher within the local community. The interviewees recruited from the local authority and the local policing team were purposively selected for a variation of perceptions and attitudes about how NP works especially from a multi-agency view point.

Communication was initiated by email and the interviews were arranged this way. Access to one member of the NP team was difficult to negotiate as they were unsure on the types of questions to be asked. As Punch (1993, cited in Henn 2006) states any research involving the police is difficult as it is a secretive and secluded part of the criminal justice system. This barrier was overcome after the interview schedule was emailed to the interviewee who was then reassured and happy to take part.

Ethical considerations

It is extremely important when conducting primary research that the researcher takes whatever steps are necessary to ensure ethics codes are not broken (Henn, 2006). In this research all interviewees were fully informed of the research aims by giving them a participant information sheet and consent form (See Appendix 2). The participant information sheet informed all interviewees of who the researcher was, what the research was aiming to explore and details of all their rights as a participant in the research. It was made clear that their participation was entirely voluntary and they had the right to withdraw at any point before the final submission date for dissertation and that no reason was needed. All participants were assured of their anonymity in the research and they would not be personally identifiable. They were also informed that if any audio recordings were recorded they would be kept in a safe and secure place with only the researcher having access and they would be safely destroyed after the research was complete.

All of these safe guards were undertaken so that no harm would come to the researcher, or any of the interviewees because of the research. The participant information sheet and consent form were approved by Nottingham Trent University's School of Social Science Research and Ethics Committee. This meant that the research conducted complied with the British Society of Criminology's ethical guidelines.

The following chapters will go on to explore the data that was collected from the primary research.

Chapter 4

Results

Introduction

This chapter explores the findings of the primary research that explored attitudes and perceptions on NP. The interviews aimed to address some of the issues arising from the literature. The chapter considers the findings that emerged from the interviews with the NP team, followed by local authority employees as well as the two local Councillors from the same area. Next the findings from the interviews with local residents are discussed. The main themes explored by all three interviews are concerned with; public awareness of NP and its aims, appreciation of the differences roles and powers of each member of the NP team, how multi-agency work works together with the NPP and finally the interviewee's perceptions of the impact that NP is having within the community.

Neighbourhood Policing Team

The interviews conducted with a NPT consisted of three interviewees; a PC; a PCSO; and a CPO. The specific area that the NPT work has not been identified to ensure anonymity as previously mentioned in the methodology chapter.

Awareness

Public awareness of NP is vital in order for the programme to succeed. This theme was discussed with the interviewees to explore how they themselves, as a team, aimed to raise public awareness of the NPP and if they thought the public were aware of the team and its aims. Both the PC and CPO thought that at least half of the public from their policing beat area know the team but many do not recognise it as NP. All of the team suggest there is a lack of understanding of NP amongst the public but this could be for a variety of reasons such as not enough publicity or that the programme is still in its infancy in many areas.

The publicity surrounding NP, since the launch of the Policing Pledge in January 2009, has been on the increase especially with the televised advertisements that details what the public can expect from the Policing Pledge and their NPT. All of the team recognise that there is a wide variety of sources being utilised to raise awareness of NP within communities. Some of the barriers that the team believe are hindering the awareness campaign are information technology such as the internet. Many of the elderly residents do not have internet access and may be missing out on vital information that is now publicised online instead of the traditional newsletter. This point is emphasised from a resident's perspective who suggested that not enough information comes through the letterbox any more and they feel they rarely hear from the police. Many of the resident interviewees also suggested that there is not enough information accessible to residents and they know very little about policing in the area. Each member of the NPT suggested that it is usually the same

type of person that knows about NP, for example they are usually the older white middle class residents who attend the majority of local meetings and are the most likely type of person to have the teams contact details and to actually contact them. They find some sections of the community difficult to engage with, especially young people who have quite negative attitudes towards the police but more specifically towards the PCSO because of their lack of powers. They all agree the best method of raising awareness is to be out on patrol engaging with the public as much as possible. All of team stated that they get out on patrol for the majority of their shifts and are only not out when they are doing the paperwork side of the job.

Policing Powers and Roles

This section of the interviews elicited similar responses from all the interviewees. The policing team acknowledged a lack of understanding from the public about each member's powers and roles. The NP awareness campaigns do not include any of the details about each team member's expertise, so the public, unless they have had a reason to have had contact with a member of the team, are unaware of their roles, powers and responsibilities. Both the PCSO and CPO believed the similarity in the uniform was problematic as there were no clear distinctions between them therefore making it difficult for the public to recognise any differences. This was elaborated further by the PCSO who believed the uniform for the PCSO in particular was not very public friendly and the role had a lot of stigma attached because of the lack of powers held by a PCSO. The CPO felt their role as part of the team was perceived differently by the public, for example the public are much more positive towards them because the work by a CPO has a more visible impact in communities and therefore has an impact on the way the public perceive the two different roles.

Multi-Agency Partnerships

The interviewees all believe that working alongside multi-agency partnerships works well most of the time. The biggest issue facing the police working with other agencies is an ongoing problem with information sharing and data protection (See Bellamy *et al* 2006). It was suggested by one member of the team that there is too much 'red tape' that restricts them doing their job properly. Although they do find that working with other agencies and having regular team meetings means all the agencies now can be held more accountable therefore leading to more cooperation and a more responsive approach to tackling issues.

Impact

All of the policing team believe that NP is slowly beginning to have an impact within communities but each member of the team explores this impact from differing angles. The PC suggested that some areas of NP still need to have more of an impact, such as being more accessible to the public, and there needs to be clearer procedures in place to ensure that the team remains in the community to ensure the impact is sustainable. The most positive difference is that the crime rate is going down each year but sometimes this can have an adverse effect because it means the beat managers then get abstracted to other beats that have more problems and higher crime rates. This then starts to have a knock on effect in their own beat as residents then do not have that visible public presence that they want namely an actual police officer out on patrol.

The PCSO suggests also that the most important indicator of the impact of NP is the decrease in crime and anti-social behaviour in the beat area. It is believed that this in itself will lead to increased public confidence in the police. The problems NP is facing the PCSO suggests, is not from the public but from within the force itself. The amount of paperwork is still problematic as well as the lack of communication between the top ranks and street level police. This they believe is leading to a division of views within the force on NP which then has an impact on resources allocated to NP.

The CPO believes that NP is having a positive impact but not an excellent one. They suggest there is room for improvement with the way multi-agencies work together as when they do they have more of an impact in communities. They also suggest that because of a low crime level the beat then gets neglected and loses resources that it should have allocated to it. Targeting resources at low level crime and ASB, such as litter and graffiti issues would lead to a greater impact within communities. The CPO suggests that the Policing Pledge means that the team is going to have to become more responsive to the public in a systematic way. This means expectations from the public will be raised and will need to be adhered to.

Councillors and Local Authority

Two local councillors (CO1 and CO2) were interviewed as well as a Neighbourhood Action Officer (NAO) for the Local Authority; these interviewees all represented the same area that the policing team were responsible for. They provided a multi-agency viewpoint on how they worked with the NPT's.

Awareness

The local authority has a joint responsibility alongside the police to raise awareness of NP. In the early implementation stages the NAO's in NP areas were told to prioritise raising awareness. All three interviewees stressed the importance of how each community is different in the way NP works with other agencies. In their area of responsibility, when it comes to the NPT and the local authority working together the main responsibility falls on the local authority for much of the joint work, for example organising public meetings and raising of awareness of NP. This led the NAO to suggest that the police 'get lazy' and rely on the local authority's resources for work that they should be doing themselves. However, both Councillors felt that the majority of the issues raised at public meetings were non-police matters so police presence was not needed.

Multi-Agency Working Relationships

The previous point, regarding public concerns that are non-policing matters, highlights the need for all agencies to work together on all issues that affect communities. All three of the interviewees felt this was an important part of NP and that it did actually work well. They all felt despite the issue of who took responsibility that all the meetings between agencies were productive which is

proven to the public at meetings where all the agencies are accountable for their actions.

Impact

All three interviewees agree that NP is beginning to have an impact within the community but they all suggest, for different reasons, that it has a long way to go and a lot of room for improvement. The NAO explained that the NPT are recognised by some residents as being visible in the communities but they need to work harder to get other parts of the community to meetings. One of the biggest challenges they face is gaining the trust of young people, which at the moment they don't do successfully. They also suggest that there appears to be a lack of commitment from Eastshire Police, at city level, in regard to NP and this is hampering the programme and any potential impact.

The councillors also highlighted the difficulty accessing some parts of the community, as they both believe this is having an impact on the attempts of NP to reduce the fear of crime, which they suggest NP is primarily about. The lack of visibility of the beat manager is also a concern; CO1 suggests that more training and resources are needed within the police to ensure NP has a positive impact in the communities they work in.

Residents

Seven residents of the same area were interviewed to explore their views on NP and multi-agency work.

Awareness

All residents were asked what they knew about NP in the area, if they knew their NPT and if they knew how to contact them if needed. The majority of interviewees spoken to did not fully understand what NP's aims and objectives were but all residents knew both the PCSO and CPO, at least by face. Only one resident knew and had previously seen the beat manager before. Residents that worked during the day expressed the concern that they rarely saw the team which led them to believe they only worked a day shift so they therefore would not always see them out on patrol at times when they were home.

Whilst not many of the residents had had any reason to contact w the NPT just over half knew the contact details if they needed future contact. They all felt that they would have no qualms approaching them if necessary. All residents felt the public meetings were well publicised but felt other than the meetings they were not consulted enough and more could be done to inform residents of the positive action undertaken.

Police Powers and Roles

This issue, as the other interviewees highlighted, is an area that is problematic. Only one of the residents knew the differences in powers and roles of the NPT. This has

an impact on which member of the NPT the residents need to get in contact with. It could lead to a resident having to contact two or three people before getting the right person to deal with the problem. The councillors are quite well known to residents but they all had little knowledge of what multi-agency partnership working meant and how the NPT worked alongside these.

Impact

Most of the residents believed that NP was having an impact in their community, many saying they could visibly see the changes. For example, many of the residents suggested that young people are less likely to be hanging around the area and engaging in anti-social behaviour because of the presence of the NPT. They believe this presence to be important and they preferred to have the team around. None of the residents had any immediate concerns about crime in the area and many believed ASB was the issue affecting them the most. Only one resident believed they were living in a high crime area but when they were asked to discuss why they explained it was due to the way the neighbourhood looked rather than being based upon any evidence of crime itself; this is a good example of Wilson and Kellings Broken Windows Theory (1982).

The next chapter will discuss and evaluate these findings in more detail in regard to the literature and the future of NP.

Chapter 5

Evaluation

Introduction

The interview data highlighted a variety of perspectives on NP held within one community. This chapter evaluates this material, focusing on lack of public awareness and knowledge of NP and its aims. The success of NP is dependent on the latter. The impact of NP is discussed with varying opinions from interviewees. The findings of the primary research will also be discussed in relation to the previous literature on CP and NP referred to in chapter two.

Awareness

There still appears to be some implementation issues regarding public awareness about the aims and objectives of NP. Whilst many residents are aware of the increased police presence in their area they are not as aware of the programme behind it. This could be explained by the infancy of the programme, three years is a short amount of time for long term changes within the police to filter through to the public. This issue could potentially be problematic for NP if the public is not aware of the aims of the programme but recognise a police presence, because it could lead them to conclude an alternative reason such as an increase in crime. This research did not find any evidence to support this, and the majority of residents did not believe this was the reason for a more visible police presence.

More contemporary methods of raising awareness, such as online services and information, have created problems for residents who still prefer a more traditional approach to receiving policing information. This could lead to many sections of the community not being engaged with fully by the police. Police engagement with some sections of the community is still a problematic issue even though it was identified back in the 1980s in the Scarman Report (1981). The review of the CDA (Home Office, 2006a) also suggested that the police still do not consult the public enough about issues that need prioritising.

Young people especially do not appear to have a positive relationship with the police and it is suggested that the NP teams could do more to improve this relationship. Thames Valley Police (2009) have recently become involved with a project called 'Take over Day'. As part of a wider strategy to improve engagement and consultation with young people, they are given the opportunity to be involved in local policing for the day. This was an area that Skogan (2006) also identified as key to the success of community policing programmes in order to build positive relationships with all sections of the community. The Government recently unveiled the Safer Schools Partnership (2006) that will attempt to bridge the gap between local NPT's and young people via schools.

The announcement in early March 2010 of the introduction, across Midtown of the newspaper 'Policing for You' appears to be a traditional way of the police directly informing local people about a wide range of police issues. The pilot scheme saw

15,000 homes receiving a copy of the paper and a survey of 1,000 residents. The survey found that 90 per cent of residents thought the paper was an effective way of providing residents with information about the local police and 71 per cent felt well informed of local policing as a result of receiving the newspaper (Eastshire Police, 2010). The launch of the newspaper is a positive indicator that the police are listening to the concerns and feedback of local people. The introduction of this paper to every home in Eastshire may begin to bridge the gap between the police and parts of the community they previously have not been able to engage with leading to more public confidence in local policing.

According to the NP team, enhanced awareness will improve further the more time the team spend out in the community on patrol because this allows the NPT to actively engage with the public. The recent introduction of street meetings in some areas are good examples of the police raising their own awareness via patrols and engaging with residents that would not usually come to public meetings. The problem of lack of time spent on patrol (Home Office 2008) appears to have made some progress. All of the NP team stated that they get out on patrol for most of their shifts unless doing paperwork. This may be an indicator that the Government managed to 'cut the red tape' as they suggested they would do as part of the Green Paper reform. The report by Berry (2009) still seems to suggest the police have along way to go before the 'red tape' has been cut fully as NP beat managers still spend an hour at the end of every shift doing paperwork justifying their visibility in the neighbourhood.

Police roles and powers

This research confirms that the differing roles and powers of the NP team is a problematic issue for residents, even those whom are aware of the aims of NP find this confusing. This is a problem that has previously been identified in previous research on PCSOs (Cooke 2005). A Home Office evaluation (2006b) into PCSOs also discovered that residents felt they were ill informed about their powers.

Lack of knowledge of powers has led the public to believe that PCSOs are just 'policing on the cheap' (Paskell, 2007, 352), a term widely used in the media. The public perhaps fails to see that the lack of powers is what makes the PCSO a valuable member of the policing team - more powers would reduce the ability to engage with the community in an unthreatening manner. Research (Rowe, 2008) has previously suggested that police officers prefer not to do community policing tasks such as foot patrols, but the role of the PCSO means that they provide the community with a dedicated patrol that they would otherwise not have. Thus they are invaluable as a familiar visible police presence and their non-confrontational role provides reassurance to communities. But the lack of powers has led to the role of the PCSO to be perceived as a negative one especially among young people (Paskell, 2007).

The interviews show that the CPO's role is perceived more positively because they are personally more familiar with the CPO and due to the work they do such as tackling environmental issues. The SCP (as discussed in the literature review) demonstrated that certain crimes and disorders have a greater impact on public

feelings of safety. The CPO has the powers to tackle visible crimes and ASB such as the removal of vandalism and graffiti, which if tackled can reassure the public and lead to a more positive public view of CPOs. CPO's spend 85 per cent of their shift on patrol, subsequently they are able to identify and tackle visible SCs promptly before they have a chance to negatively impact upon the community.

Much of the work of a PCSO, other than being a visible presence, goes unnoticed by the public as it is mainly community engagement oriented towards the gathering of intelligence that is referred to their superiors. A positive relationship with the community and public confidence allows the PCSO to gather intelligence that other officers would not have access to; this has significant benefits for the police. This part of the PCSO role reinforces the perception that they are 'policing on the cheap' as intelligence gathering is primarily a police officers job. However, this intelligence can make the police aware of key issues that they were previously unaware such as changes in community tensions, thus enabling the police to target resources where needed.

Multi-agency work and Partnerships

NP is built on the foundations of multi-agency work and this research found that the raising of awareness of NP is a joint responsibility between the police and the local authority. The efficiency and outcomes of public meetings are a good example of multi-agency work. Whilst an interviewee thought that the police could take more responsibility for this area, as they usually allow the local authority to organise and promote meetings, for the most part the content of the meetings works well. This was proven at a later meeting where all agencies are accountable to the public about the previous actions they have taken. The report *Getting to Grips with Crime* (Home Office, 1997) suggested that joint responsibility was the way forward and it appears that this recommendation has been implemented successfully.

The main problem that limits the effectiveness of multi-agency work is information and data sharing. This was highlighted in the Morgan Report (Standing conference on Crime Prevention, 1991) back in the early 1990s, who recommended that information sharing systems between agencies should be compatible to ensure data sharing is made simpler; this was a problematic suggestion as the design of many IT systems made them incompatible. A review of the 1998 CDA, which made it a statutory duty for agencies to work together with the police, also found problems with information sharing. The findings of this research suggest that this is an area that is still problematic and hindering the effectiveness of multi-agency work. In interview the CPO highlighted MEH as a problematic agency that finds information sharing with the NP team difficult because of data protection reasons. Problems with information sharing do have an impact upon NP as it can negatively affect the relationship between the agencies that need to work together in the community. This may result in communication problems between agencies and the police that can then have a negative impact upon an issue that needs action. Other problems with partnership working that Byrne and Pease (2003) found were a high ratio of talk to action and lengthy delays between decision to act and action. The interview data did not identify any of these things to be problematic.

Impact

The main reason for the introduction and expansion of the policing family was to provide communities with a visible policing presence to reassure the public who were not recognising that crime levels were actually falling. Whilst residents do not recognise the specific roles of the NP team they do recognise the increase in police presence. This has led residents to acknowledge a clear impact, at least over the last year, that NP is having a positive, visible impact, especially on ASB. The fact that all residents felt safe and safer because of the presence of the NP team is a positive indicator that NP is meeting some of the aims and objectives of the programme. The feelings of safety however may be attributed to the lack of identified SCs that was referred to earlier in the chapter.

The findings from the policing team interviews show that whilst the reduction in crime rates for the area is an obvious sign of a positive impact there are still some implementation issues at police force level that could be improve NP. The main problems identified in the findings are issues surrounding staffing and resources. For example, NP beat areas that are statistically low crime areas lose resources in terms of staffing and the beat manager is often abstracted to areas that are experiencing higher crime levels. The concern is that eventually this has an impact in the original beat as residents notice the gradual lack of actual police presence. All the residents interviewed did not know or realise that there was a beat manager for the area. So this abstraction may already be having a negative impact in this community. The issues regarding resources may continue for some time due to the economic downturn. The implication from the countries recent recession means that policing, according to Lambert (2008) is going to have to prioritise resources and encourage smarter working.

Concluding thoughts

This chapter has explored some key findings raised by the primary research. The section on awareness found that the lack of public awareness of the aims of NP is problematic but there is also evidence of good practice beginning to emerge as the NPP continues to expand, such as the recent announcement of the local policing newspaper. This research reiterates the finding of previous research that there is a lack of public knowledge about roles and powers of the NPT. This has contributed to some negative stereotypes, especially about the PCSO role. The final section on impact reveals some promising information about NP suggesting that NP is meeting the aims and objectives of the programme. The concluding chapter will further discuss the findings and the implications of NP for future practice.

Chapter six

Conclusion

The aims of this research were to explore community perceptions and attitudes towards NP. Over the last 30 years policing has attempted to become community orientated. Alderson (1979) and Scarman (1981) were among the first to highlight the need for the police to understand the community and to engage with multi-agencies in order to solve and prevent crimes. It was not until the late 1990's that these recommendations were fully realised. The 1998 CDA placed a statutory requirement on the police to work with other agencies. The Government then went on to introduce the NRPP that aimed to bridge the gap between the falling crime statistics and the public's perception that crime was actually increasing. This programme evolved into the current NPP that this research has attempted to gather community perceptions of.

The main foci of the primary research attempted to explore some of the issues that the literature review raised. The interviews focused upon four main themes; awareness of NP, NPT roles and powers, multi-agency partnerships and the impact that NP is having in communities. The findings discovered that there are some important issues for the future practice of NP.

Recommendations

- NPT need to work harder or find more innovative ways to engage with the wider public. The research discovered that only a narrow section of the community know who their NPT is and how to contact them. This is further reiterated at public meetings with the NPT where certain sections of the community such as young people and ethnic minorities are under represented.
- More awareness is needed on the differing roles and powers of the NPT. The public are confused and unsure about the responsibilities each member has, specifically CPO's and PCSO's. More awareness could lead to greater confidence in the police. The public would be able to directly contact a member of the team that they know can assist them. More knowledge of roles and power may also help to remove negative perceptions that some sections of the public hold about PCSO's. If they were aware of the key aims to their role they may see them in a more positive way.
- Multi-agency work with the NPT would be further improved if the problems surrounding data protection and information sharing were resolved. This would lead to a more joined up way of working between all agencies within the community.
- NP would benefit from the beat manager consistently staying in their own beat. Evidence from the research suggests they get abstracted quite often to other jobs and areas. This has a consequence for the community who notice a lack of police presence from an actual police officer

The findings of the research suggests that NP is beginning to have a positive impact within communities but from the recommendations it is clear that improvements are still needed in some areas of the programme. If acknowledged and implemented they could positively raise the public's opinion of NP leading to more public confidence

in policing. Lea and Young (1993, cited in Rowe, 2008) argue that CP such as NP can only be fully realised when the community itself decide on its priorities and then enlist the police service in order to tackle them. The NPP has attempted to address this by allowing the public to decide their priorities but as previously mentioned the lack of representativeness of the community is problematic.

Further Research

The research on NP could have been expanded with more time. Further research could have explored more NPT's across the country and the way they police their communities. As previously identified communities are diverse and differ from place to place. This means initiatives and policing priorities are different and vary across the country. Further research could compare these differing policing practices. A larger piece of research would lead to more of the public being consulted. The foci of the research could explore some of the key issues arising from this research such as why the police find it difficult to engage with certain sections of the community. This would be important to the future practice of NP and could help it develop further in the future.

Appendix 1

Interview Questions for residents

Awareness

- Are you aware of the neighbourhood policing scheme that has been launched in your area? Do you know any of the policing team?
- On average how often do you see the neighbourhood policing team on patrol?

Contactability

- Do you know how to contact or have contact details for your neighbourhood policing team? If you have had contact with the team, how easy was it to contact them? Are they approachable?
- How aware are you, as residents, of public meetings/events with the policing team in order for public problems and issues to be listened to? Do you feel residents are consulted enough?

Roles of the Policing team and other agencies

- Are you aware of the different roles and powers of each member of the neighbourhood policing team?
- Do you know who your local councillors are? Are you aware of the work that other agencies do alongside the neighbourhood policing team?

Perceived impact

- Do you believe the policing team and other agencies are having any impact on crime and anti social behaviour in your local area? Are residents being listened to and are issues that affect the community being understood? Are these issues being tackled? How safe/unsafe do residents feel? Are the problems crime or anti social behaviour?

Interview questions for the neighbourhood policing team

Awareness

- Do you think the residents know who the team are? Do you think they know what neighbourhood policing is about and the aims of it?
- What have been the reactions of the public to the team? Positive responses and negatives?
- Are you approached regularly? How often do you manage to get on patrol?

Publicity

- How do you raise awareness of your team and your responsibilities? How do you make your contact details known to residents? How do you make the public aware of each member of the teams differing roles and powers?

Working with other agencies

- How do the team work together? How do you work with other partners and agencies? Do you encounter problems and how are they resolved?

Impact

- How do you feel the team are impacting in the community? Have there been any changes (positive/negative) since the policing teams were first introduced?
Questions for Councillors and other partnership agencies

Awareness

- How do local councillors, local authority and other agencies help to raise awareness of the neighbourhood policing teams?

Working relationships

- How does everyone work together? Difficulties and positives?

Impact

- How do councillors and other agencies feel the neighbourhood policing teams are impacting in communities?
- What has been the feedback from residents?
- Do they feel residents and their issues are listened to and taken seriously and then tackled?

Appendix 2

Consent Form

Email – N0183813@ntu.ac.uk

My name is Anthea Tainton and I am a final year Criminology student at Nottingham Trent University. I am conducting research for my final year dissertation which explores Community Perceptions and Attitudes towards Neighbourhood Policing.

The research uses focus groups and interviews. The interviews will allow me to ask questions and encourage discussion on the topic of Neighbourhood Policing in order to gather some perceptions from various members of a local community.

The interviews and focus group may be audio recorded. This is to ensure I can gather accurate data and not have to rely on note taking.

Information gathered from either of these interviews or focus groups may be used in my final dissertation. I will ensure that any sources of this information will be fully anonymous.

Participation in this research is entirely voluntary and greatly appreciated. You do not have to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable with and have the right to withdraw your participation at any time without any reason but it must be before the 12th of March 2010 as this will be the last opportunity before the research is finalised for completion.

Any audio recordings that are made will be stored securely and will only be listened to by myself or my supervisor and will be destroyed after the research is complete.

If you have any questions before, during or after the research then please contact me on the details above or my supervisor whose details are below.

Agreement to consent

I understand I have the right to withdraw from the research at any point before the 12th March 2010 and any data would be destroyed. I do not need to give a reason and there will be no repercussions as a result.

I understand that the sources used in the final dissertation will be anonymous, and I will not be personally identifiable.

I understand my participation in this research is entirely voluntary.

I understand that any tape recordings would be kept safely and securely and destroyed after the completion of the dissertation.

Signed.....

Date.....

Supervisor – Chris Crowther-Dowey email – christopher.crowtherdowey@ntu.ac.uk

References

- Alderson, J. (1979) *Policing Freedom*. Plymouth: Macdonald and Evans.
- Bayley, D. (1994) *Police for the Future*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bellamy, C., 6, P., Raub, C., Warren, A. and Heeney, C. (2006) 'Information-sharing and confidentiality in social policy: Regulating multi-agency work', *Public Administration*, 86 (3): 737-59.
- Berry, J. (2009) *Reducing Bureaucracy* London: Home Office.
- Bryman, A. (2004) *Social Research Methods* (3rd Edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Byrne, S. And Pease, K. (2003) 'Crime Reduction and Community Safety', in Newburn, T. (eds) *Handbook of Policing*. Cullompton: Willan: 286-310
- Cooke, C. A. (2005) 'Issues Concerning Visibility and Reassurance Provided by 'The New Policing Family'', *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 15: 229-40
- Crawford, A. (2007) 'Reassurance Policing: Feeling is Believing', in A. Henry and D.J. Smith (eds.) *Transformations of Policing*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- David, M. and Sutton, C. (2004) *Social Research: The Basics*. London: Sage
- Eastshire Police (2010) '*Police Launch Newspaper for Residents*' Available at: http://www.nottinghamshire.police.uk/newsandevents/news/2010/march/11/police_launch_newspaper_for_residents/ Accessed 18/3/10
- Henn, M., Weinstein, M. and Foard, N. (2006) *A Critical Introduction to Social Research*. (2nd Edition) London: Sage.
- Home Office (1997) *Getting to Grips with Crime: A new Framework for Local Action*. London: Home Office. Available at: <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ERORecords/HO/421/2/crimprev/ggwc.htm> Accessed 20/1/10
- Home Office (2006a) *Review of the Partnership Provisions of the Crime and Disorder Act*. London: Home Office. Available at: <http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/partnerships60.htm> Accessed 20/1/10
- Home Office (2006b) *A National Evaluation of Community Support Officers*. London: Home Office
- Home Office (2009) *Findings from the 2nd Year of the Neighbourhood Policing Programme*. Available at: <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs09/horr14b.pdf> Accessed 21/10/09

Innes, M. (2004a) 'Signal Crimes and Signal Disorders: Notes on Deviance as Communicative Action', *British Journal of Sociology* 55: 335-55.

Innes, M. (2004b) 'Reinventing Tradition? Reassurance, Neighbourhood Security and Policing', *Criminal Justice* 4(2): 151-71.

Lambert, R. (2008) The Implications of the economic downturn for policing. Available at: http://publicservices.cbi.org.uk/uploaded/Richard_Lambert_speech_police_efficiency_June2009.pdf Accessed 15/3/10

Mackenzie, S. and Henry, A. (2009) *Community Policing: A Review of the Evidence*. Available at: <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/292465/0090209.pdf> Accessed 18/1/10

Millie, A. and Herrington, V. (2004) 'Reassurance Policing in Practice: Views from the Shop Floor', *British Society of Criminology*, 7.

Paskell, C. (2007) 'Plastic Police' or 'Community Support'? The Role of Police Community Support Officers Within Low Income Neighbourhoods', *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 14, 349

Phillips, C. (2002) 'From Voluntary to Statutory Status', in Hughes, G., McLaughlin, E and Muncie, J. (eds) *Crime Prevention and Community Safety: New Directions*. London: Sage: 163-81 .

Newburn, T. (ed) (2008) *Handbook of Policing*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Noaks, L. and Wincup, E. (2004) *Criminological Research: Understanding Qualitative Methods*. London: Sage.

Quinton, P. and Morris, J. (2008) *Neighbourhood Policing: The Impact of Piloting and National Implementation*. Available at: <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs08/rdsolr0108.pdf> Accessed: 21/10/09.

Reidel, M. (2000) *Research Strategies for Secondary Data*. London: Sage.

Reisig, M.D. and Parks, R.B. (2004) 'Can Community Policing Help the Truly Disadvantaged?' *Crime & Delinquency* 50(2): 139-67.

Rowe, M. (2008) *Introduction to Policing*. Sage: London

Safer Schools Partnership (2006) Available at: <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/doc/13566/8250-DCSF-Safer%20School-3.pdf> Accessed 25/2/10

Sarantakos, S. (2005) *Social Research* (3rd Edition). Basingstoke: Palgrave

Scarman, Lord. (1981) *The Scarman Report*. London: HMSO.

Skogan, W.G. (2006) *Police and Community in Chicago: A Tale of Three Cities*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Standing Conference on Crime Prevention (1991) *Safer Communities: The Local Delivery of Crime Prevention Through the Partnership Approach* (The Morgan Report). London, Home Office

Thames Valley Police (2009) 'Police bring in young people for the day to take over' Available at: <http://www.thamesvalley.police.uk/yournh/yournh-tvp-pol-area/yournh-tvp-pol-area-nh-newslist/yournh-tvp-pol-area-nh-newsitem.htm?id=105941&nhcode=N104> Accessed 15/3/10

Tilley, N. (2008) 'Modern Approaches to Policing: Community, Problem-orientated and Intelligence-led', in T. Newburn (ed.) *Handbook of Policing*. Cullompton: Willan.

Tuffin, R., Morris, J. and Poole, A. (2006) *An Evaluation of the Impact of the National Reassurance Policing Programme*. Home Office Research Study 296. London: Home Office.

Wilson, J.Q. and Kelling, G. (1982) 'Broken Windows' in T. Newburn (ed.) *Criminology* Cullompton: Willan.