Ankara Avrupa Çalışmaları Dergisi Cilt:15, No:1 (Yıl: 2016), s. 173-199

COMMUNITY POLICING IN ENGLAND, WALES, AND EUROPEAN UNION: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

Erkan PALA[*]
Ercan BALCIOĞLU[**]

Abstract

Community policing philosophy has become an attractive field within the policing literature, exercised enthusiastically by police forces across England and Wales as a response to police and crime related issues ranging from poor police-public relations to minor crime and disorder. This paper provides a critical appraisal of community participation and problem solving elements of community policing before moving onto explaining how they have been implemented in England, Wales, and European Union. Finally, this study also highlights that there are stubborn and very serious financial, organisational and cultural challenges regarding the successful application of community policing schemes in England, Wales, and European Union.

Keywords: *Community Oriented Policing, Peace-keeping, 'Real' Policing, Community Partnership, Problem Solving.*

İngiltere, Galler ve Avrupa Birliği'nde Toplum Destekli Polisliğin Dünü, Bugünü ve Geleceği

Özet

Toplum destekli polislik felsefesi, polislik ve suç ile ilgili konulara bir cevap olarak İngiltere ve Galler polis teşkilatları tarafından uzun yıllardır uygulanmaktadır. Burada düzensizlik ve küçük suç gibi sorunlardan başlayarak kötü polis-halk ilişkileri konularına kadar pek çok konuda sosyal bilimler literatürde cazip bir alan haline gelmiştir. Bu çalışma İngiltere, Galler ve Avrupa Birliği'nde toplumsal katılım ve problem çözme gibi toplum destekli polisliğin temel unsurlarını açıklamaktadır. Aynı zamanda toplum destekli polisliğin bu ülkelerde nasıl

[*] Ph.D., Loughborough University, Department of Social Sciences, Loughborough, UK.
[**] Assistant Professor, Gazi University Department of Sociology.
[***] *Makalenin Gönderilme Tarihi: 17 Aralık 2015, Kabul Edilme Tarihi: 1 Haziran 2016*

uygulandığını eleştirel bir perspektifle değerlendirmektedir. Son olarak İngiltere, Galler ve Avrupa Birliği'nde toplum destekli polislik modelinin başarılı bir şekilde uygulanmasını zorlaştıran yaygın ve çok ciddi finansal, kurumsal ve kültürel sorunların var olduğu vurgulanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Toplum Destekli Polislik, Barış koruma, 'Gerçek' Polislik, Toplum Ortaklığı, Problem Çözme.*

Introduction

It was Sir Robert Peel who introduced the policing system that we know today under the Police Bill of 1829. In contrast to the rest of the world where policing had started highly reactive, proactive policing with a view of maintaining positive relations with the community prevailed in the early days of policing in England and Wales. However, the idea of 'real' police work (which involved pursuing criminals with fast police cars, being tough on crime, using force against offenders and so forth) started to gain momentum during the 1960s, serving to make 'Peelers' or 'Bobbies' an anarchism.[1] Police forces increasingly looked to police specialisation and professionalism following the Police Act of 1964 to enhance effectiveness which in return removed the police from the community.[2]

The increased mobility of criminals, changing crime patterns and stubbornly high rates of crime and violence partly provides support for the government's greater reliance on the law enforcement style of policing. The characteristics which are closely associated with the law-enforcement philosophy are argued to be the assumption of guilt, efficiency and processing of suspects through the police bureaucracy. The police's exercise of 'rough' policing strategies in the community along with the discriminatory and disproportionate conduct by some police officers alienated citizens and the police from one another, leading to the police's loss of ability to recognise and respond to communities' concerns.[3]

Subsequent investigations into 'what works' in policing led to the consensus that the police's success in fighting crime was based on a wide range of partners, the public being the most important one.[4] Some police

---

[1] Weinberger, B., **The Best Police in the World: an Oral History of British Policing.** Aldershot, Scolar, 1995.

[2] Stephens, Mike, **Policing: The Critical Issues**, Harvester, Wheatsheaf, 1988; Weinberger, B., **The Best Police in the World: An Oral History of British Policing.** Aldershot, Scolar, 1995.

[3] **İbid.**

[4] Home Office, **Policing in the 21st Century: Reconnecting Police and the People**. London: Home Office, 2010.

forces have created new posts and introduced police/community consultation meetings in response to their poor relationships, whilst others focused on foot-patrols to engage with the community, all valuable for the effectiveness and efficiency in policing. However, it became apparent that although there are many reasons to implement community policing, making community policing schemes work is another matter in the face of resistance, both within and outside of the police. Community policing schemes frequently get labelled as 'social work', the job of not 'real' police officers; and poor police-public relations serves to complicate it further. Not limited to that, times are tough and the police forces across England and Wales are subject to severe budget cut reforms, inevitably affecting the delivery of policing in England and Wales.

Justifications Made for Community Policing

Community policing has been exercised enthusiastically by police forces across the developed countries, most notably the United States of America (USA), United Kingdom (UK), Singapore, Canada and Australia as a response to minor crime and disorder in the city with a view of re-establishing the relationship between the police and the community.[5] Despite its widespread deployment, however, community policing proves to be a concept which is difficult to define: there does not exist a single definition and nor does exist any mandatory set of community policing schemes. This has led to the arguments that the term 'community policing' should be abandoned and another well-clarified and globally accepted term be introduced. The sense that community policing is a meaningless or an arbitrary concept may well emerge but it would be a mistake to give the impression that it is all rhetoric and that there exists no consensus as to what constitutes the core elements of this model of policing. It holds a number of affinities with the peace keeping style of policing: the main impetus for both models derives from the sense that police-public relations are vital for police effectiveness; they both require the police and citizens to join together as partners; they both seek to be responsive to community demands through consultation; and foot patrol is an important feature of both.

Community policing schemes have taken different forms, ranging from simply delegating a few extra police officers walking the beat to a system where the police work in partnership with local/national agencies to tackle

[5] Cosgrove, F., & Ramshaw, P., It Is What You Do As Well As The Way That You Do It: The Value and Deployment of PCSOS in Achieving Public Engagement. **Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy,** 2013, Vol. 1, pp. 1-20.

problems whether crime related or not. These schemes can be conveniently categorised under two key community policing components: community partnership and problem solving.

Community Partnership

Community partnership is the cornerstone of community policing. In the police literature it is frequently encountered that the public are referred to as the extension of the 'ears and eyes' of the police. Congruent with the central tenets of normative sponsorship theory (a theory which postulates that most people are of goodwill and are positive about cooperating with the police for the benefit of the community[6], the community is no longer viewed as a passive audience but rather as an agent and partner in the quest for promoting peace and security. What lies behind this notion is the belief that the police's success in providing safety and security is dependent on a wide range of partners. This is often known as 'partnership policing' in the policing literature. The partnership element of community policing philosophy takes the view that it would be an unrealistic quest for the police service to prevent crime and bring offenders to justice on their own. Black[7] along with Smith and Visher[8] were the early scholars to validate the importance of the police's engagement with the community when both studies reported that disproportionate number of police arrests occur due to the intelligence gained by the public. Other than aiding the flow of intelligence to the police, partnering up with the community can not only reduce citizens' fear of crime[9] but they can also enhance the image of the police[10]; increase offenders' sense of risk[11] and enhance citizens' ability to protect themselves.[12]

Partnering with the community became an important aspect of policing in England and Wales after the reports by the Audit Commission in 1993 and

---

[6] Tiedke K., Freeman W., Sower C., & Holland, J., **Community Involvement.** Glencoe, IL: The Free Press. 1957.

[7] Black 1970 cited in Shotland, R. L. & Goodstein, L. I. The Role of Bystanders in Crime Control. **Journal of Social Issues,** 1984, 1, p. 9.

[8] Smith, D., & Visher, C. Street Level Justice: Situational Determinants of Police Arrest Decisions. **Social Problems,** 1981, 29, pp.167-78.

[9] Trojanowicz, R. C. An Evaluation of a Neighbourhood Foot Patrol Program, **Journal of Police Science and Administration**, 1983, Vol. 11, pp. 410–419.

[10] Pate 1986 cited in Bureau of Justice Assistance, **Understanding Community Policing A Framework for Action.** Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice, 1994, p. 11.

[11] Trojanowicz, 1983, **Ibid.**

[12] Sherman, L.W, Gottfredson. D.C, MacKenzie, D.L, Eck J, Reuter P, & Bushway S.D. **Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising,** Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice, 1998.

Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary in 1997 which recognised that the police forces were doing too much reactive work.[13] Relatively recent support for community partnership has led to the introduction of Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs) under the Police Reform Act 2002, following then the Labour government's White Paper Policing a New Century: A Blueprint for Reform.[14] The Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) described PCSOs' duty as 'to contribute to the policing of neighbourhoods, primarily through high visibility patrol with the purpose of reassuring the public, increasing orderliness in public places and being accessible to communities and partner agencies working at local level'.[15] ACPO's guidance on how to achieve high visibility mentioned the best use of foot patrols.[16] Although foot patrols' effect on crime is absent or relatively weak, marked changes in public perception of crime were demonstrated: ' ...persons living in areas where foot patrol was created perceived a notable decrease in the severity of crime-related problems'[17]; 'the residents in Flint/Michigan felt especially safe when the foot patrol officer was well known and highly visible'.[18] Furthermore, a more conspicuous police presence can develop public confidence in local policing and provide greater citizen reassurance.[19] Reassurance, 'the feelings of safety and security that a citizen experiences when he sees a police officer or patrol car nearby'[20], can be particularly useful in closing the gap between public perception of inevitable rising crime rates and the statistical reality in England and Wales, as highlighted earlier. Public fear, which has been found to be '... more closely correlated with disorder than with crime'[21] can limit community members' participation in policing and can contribute to social inactivity[22]

---

[13] Ratcliffe, J. H. **Intelligence-Led Policing.** Willan Publishing: Cullompton, Devon, 2008.

[14] Home Office, **Neighbourhood Watch: Findings from the 2000 British Crime Survey**. London: Office for National Statistics, 2001.

[15] ACPO, **Guidance on Police Community Support Officers,** London: National Policing Improvement Agency, 2007, p. 6.

[16] ACPO. **Guidance on Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs),** London: Association of Chief Police Officers, 2005.

[17] Police Foundation, **The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment.** Police Foundation: Washington, D.C.,1981, p.72.

[18] Trojanowicz, R.C. **Evaluation of the Neighbourhood Foot Patrol Program in Flint, Michigan**. East Lansing: Michigan State University, 1982, p. 86.

[19] Wakefield, A., **The Value of Foot Patrol: a Review Of Research**. London: The Police Foundation, 2006.

[20] Bahn 1974, p. 340 cited in Wakefield, **Ibid,** p. 47.

[21] Kelling, G. L., & Moore, M. H., The Evolving Strategy of Policing. **Perspectives on Policing,** 4, 1-15, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, 1988, p. 8.

[22] Bureau of Justice Assistance, 1994, p. 4; Budd, T. & Sims, L. **Antisocial Behaviour and Disorder: Findings from the 2000 British Crime Survey,** London: Home Office, 2001.

Several empirical studies have been published following Bahn's [23], statement, producing fundamental evidence to support Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary's (HMIC) [24] consensus that the sense of reassurance can be obtained through 'the provision of a police service that is visible and accessible and where officers and support staff delivering the service that are familiar to the local communities'. Other forms of close interactions such as community consultation meetings and door-to-door visits, have not only shown to reduce citizens' fear of crime in the neighbourhood but also improved community conditions and enhanced the image of the police with more public accountability.[25]

Problem Solving

As briefly highlighted earlier, police forces have become too professional and too specialised, and as a result they have naturally lost interest in 'less popular' issues that affect many communities because they now lie outside of their populist crime priorities.[26] This critique emerged from a series of studies that suggested that preventive car patrols[27] had little impact on crime. Goldstein therefore advocated for a shift in policing style: from reactive to proactive[28]. This new policing paradigm, which he titled as 'problem oriented policing', would require the police to focus the attention on underlying problems so that crime and disorder can be reduced or even eliminated: 'the heart of problem-oriented policing is that this concept calls on police to analyze problems, which can include learning more about victims as well as offenders, and to consider carefully why they came together where they did'.[29]

Indeed, problems around crime and disorder are unlikely to clear by themselves without some form of intervention. Community policing

[23] Bahn 1974 cited in Wakefield, **op cit.**

[24] HMIC, **Open All Hours: A Thematic Inspection Report on the Role of Police Visibility and Accessibility in Public Reassurance,** London: Home Office, 2001, p. 16.

[25] Pate, 1986 cited in Bureau of Justice Assistance, **op cit.**, p. 11.

[26] Goldstein, H., Improving Policing: A Problem-Oriented Approach. **Crime and Delinquency,** 1979, 24, pp. 236-258; Skogan, G. W. **Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighbourhood**, (2nd editions), Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1992.

[27] Kelling, G.L., Pate, T., Dieckman, D., & Brown, C.E., **The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: Technical report**. Washington D.C: Police Foundation, 1974.

[28] Goldstein, **op cit.**

[29] National Research Council, Effectiveness of Police Activity in Reducing Crime, disorder and fear. in Wesley Skogan and Kathleen Frydl (eds.), **Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence** (pp. 217-251). Committee to Review Research on Police Policy and Practices. Committee on Law and Justice, Division of Behavioural and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2004, p. 91.

postulates that through citizen involvement in policing, the police will become more aware of and more responsive to the varying needs and expectations of communities. Encouraging citizens to play an active part in policing by offering them the chance to influence local policing priorities can have many fold benefits. For example, 'less popular' issues are rarely on the agenda of the police: police forces often classify serious crimes of murder, rape and robbery as the biggest problem in the community, while residents may have a greater concern about rowdy youths. These 'less popular' issues can range from domestic violence to drink driving, and from rowdy youths to cars parking on illegal spot. It is not to say that serious crimes are not important but rather the message here is that the people in the community may find that their or their children's chances of falling a victim to young offenders' low-level crime is high compared to serious crimes, and thus simply by directing the police's attention on these less popular concerns police forces can easily improve the quality of life in the community. For example, one police officer in Sparrow's et al. study reported[30]:

> What we found was that maybe some things that we thought were important to them really weren't that important, and other things we didn't think were important at all, were very important. Like abandoned cars: in one of our areas, that was a very important thing. They were really bugged about all these abandoned cars, and they thought it was a bad police department that wouldn't take care of them. When we started removing the cars their opinion of us went up, even though because we'd changed priorities we were putting fewer drug addicts in jail.

In line with the above assertion, a number of studies have demonstrated that problem solving can reduce fear of crime, violent and property crime, fire-arm related youth homicide and various forms of disorder, including prostitution and drug dealing.[31] For example, the police department in San Diego worked together with the community and identified that a trolley

---

[30] Sparrow, Malcolm K., Moore, M. H. & Kennedy, D. M., **Beyond 911: A New Era in Policing.** New York: Basic Books. 1990, p. 175.

[31] Cordner, G. W. (1997). Community policing: Elements and effects. In G. P Alpert and A. Piquero (Eds.), **Community policing: Contemporary readings** (pp. 451-468). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.; Eck, John E. & William Spelman. (1987). **Problem Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News.** Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.; Kennedy, David M., Anthony A. Braga, Anne M. Piehl, and Elin J. Waring. (2001). **Reducing Gun Violence: The Boston Gun Project's Operation Ceasefire.** Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.; Hope, 1994 all cited in Weisburd., D., Telep., C.W., Hinkle. J.C. & Eck, J.E. (2008). **The Effects of Problem Oriented Policing on Crime and Disorder.** A Campbell Collaboration Systematic Review, 14, DOI: 10.4073/csr.2008.14.

station was the location of gang fights, violent crimes and narcotic activity. Based on the careful analysis and assessment of the problem, police officers agreed that the design of the station was contributing to crime. This information was passed onto the relevant body so that the station could be redesigned. In another example, the same police department was made aware of drug dealing at an 80-unit apartment complex.[32] By working with residents, the on-site manager, the Housing Commission and other police units, San Diego Police managed to evict problem residents and stop the drug dealing in that residential complex.[33]

Community Partnership in Practice

Community partnership was an important feature in the Home Office funded National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP), a project piloted in 2003 to test whether local policing schemes could address anti-social behaviour, crime, public confidence, public fear of crime and social capacity through police visibility, accessibility and familiarity. The project which covered eight police forces and 16 trial sites between 2003 and 2005 highlighted the benefits of community partnership when it reported that the number of people who felt 'very' or 'fairly' safe when walking alone in dark increased by one percentage point while it fell three percentage points for those living in the controlled sites; the percentage of people who had confidence in the police increased by 15 percentage points; and the number of people who trusted the residents in their own neighbourhood increased by three percentage points in trial sites whilst it fell by two percentage points in the control sites.[34] Charles Clarke, then the Home Secretary pledged that 'there will be a Neighbourhood Policing Team (NPT) in every area, covering, typically, one or two council wards, in which every resident will know the name of their local police officer, see them on the street and have their phone number and email address'. Indeed, what the British society expects from their local police is visibility, responsiveness and reassurance.[35] With the national roll out of NPTs in April 2005, police forces across England and Wales sought to increase contact with the local community, reference to community partnership element of community policing

[32] San Diego Police, **Problem Oriented Policing,** 2014, Available at: http://www.sandiego.gov/police/about/problem.shtm.

[33] **Ibid.**

[34] Tuffin, R., Morris, J., & Poole, A., **An Evaluation of the Impact of the National Reassurance Policing Programme,** Home Office: London, 2006, p.14.

[35] Lloyd and Foster, 2009 cited in Foster, J., & Jones C., `Nice to Do' and Essential: Improving Neighbourhood Policing in an English Police Force. **Policing,** 2010, 4, 395.

philosophy. Public perception of local policing improved significantly in parallel with this innovation. According to the Crime Survey for England and Wales (CSEW), formerly known as British Crime Survey, over 62% of the whole population think the police are doing a 'good' or 'excellent' job (an increase of 15% when compared to 2003/04 figures)[36] Nevertheless, public fear of crime, which sits within the remit of NPTs, still appears to be a major concern in England and Wales when considering that the proportion of adults who think crime has gone up remained high at 60%.[37] The perceived perception of being a victim of crime is considerably high: 13% for burglary, 17% for car crime, 13% for violent crime and 13.7% for anti-social behaviour, down from 15%, 21%, 15% and 14.4% respectively when compared to the 2009/10 figures.[38] When these figures are compared with the actual crime rates, the true extent of the public's sense of insecurity and fear of crime becomes evident. For example, 13% of the public perceived that they would be the victim of violent crime in the next 12 months but only 3% had reported being a victim of violent crime in the previous 12 months.[39]

Other than the NPTs, the attempt to encourage greater public co-operation in the fight against crime has also led to the introduction of Neighbourhood Watch (NW) schemes in England and Wales. In 2012/13 almost one in seven (14%) of households belonged to a Neighbourhood Watch scheme (down by 17% in 2004/05).[40] Under the NW scheme, residents are asked to report suspicious people or suspicious behaviour in their neighbourhood to the police; acting as the 'eyes and ears' of the police in other words. As can be seen with the subscription to NW schemes, many police forces experience difficulty in getting citizens involved, partly because individuals' enthusiasm for community policing schemes can easily decrease and also because the efforts to establish a solid working relationship between the police and the community may flounder due to the residents' distrust, hostility and fear of the police.[41]

---

[36] CSEW, **Focus on Public Perceptions of Policing, Findings from the 2012/12 Crime Survey for England and Wales,** London: Office for National Statistics, 2012.

[37] Home Office, **Crime in England and Wales 2010/11: Findings from the BCS and Police Recorded Crime.** (2nd editions), Home Office: London, 2011, p. 23.; British Crime Survey, **Crime in England and Wales 2010/11 Findings from the British Crime Survey and police recorded crime.** (2nd Edition), Rupert Chaplin, John Flatley and Kevin Smith (eds.), London: Office for National Statistics, 2011.

[38] **Ibid,** p. 84.

[39] **Ibid,** p. 84.

[40] CSEW, **op cit.,** p. 29.

[41] Long J, Wells, W., & Leon-Granados W. D., Implementation Issues in A Community and Police Partnership in Law Enforcement Space: Lessons from A Case-Study of A

Many police forces in England and Wales experience a great deal of difficulty in getting citizens involved.[42] This view may well not be supported when one considers the CSEW's (2012:29) finding that 60% of adults had engaged with the police in one way or another through at least one of the four schemes affiliated with community policing: non-emergency police contact, neighbourhood policing teams, use of crime maps and attending consultation meetings.[43] It is important to remind ourselves that the CSEW's method in measuring 'engagement' is widely open to criticism: reporting a crime or disorder (such as graffiti or burglary) by calling a non-emergency police number has also been affirmed as a community policing initiative, and it is predicted that this 'initiative' constitutes the large proportion of those 'engaged'. There were, furthermore, variations in 'engagement': unemployed adults were more likely than employed adults not to engage (45% vs. 37%); and importantly ethnic minorities were significantly more likely than white people not to have engaged with the police (48% vs. 38%).[44] Moreover, ethnic minorities in general, young black people in particular have been shown to be reluctant in engaging with the police. Ethnic populations' reluctance to engage with the police has always been the case, and unfortunately they may have a valid reason not to engage. Procedural injustice has been a re-occurring concept: in 2000, Blacks were twice as likely as Whites to be 'really annoyed' by the actions of a police officer in the last five years (19% compared to 38%; for Asians the figure was at 23%) due to the unfriendly, rude and unreasonable behaviour of officers.[45] The Ministry of Justice's[46] report highlighted that Blacks were 7 times more likely than their White counterparts to be stopped and searched in England and Wales.[47] Given that police-initiated encounters (stop and searches) can

Community Policing Approach to Domestic Violence. *Police Practice and Research*, 2002, 3, 231-46; Schneider, S. R. Overcoming Barriers to Communication between Police and Socially Disadvantaged Neighbourhoods: A Critical Theory of Community Policing. *Crime Law and Social Change*, 1998, 4, 347-377; Bullock, K., & Leeney, D. Participation, 'Responsivity' and Accountability in Neighbourhood Policing. **Criminology and Criminal Justice***,* 2013, 2, 199-214.

[42] Long et.al., **Ibid;** Schneider, **Ibid.**

[43] CSEW, **op cit.,** p. 29.

[44] **Ibid,** p. 29.

[45] BCS, 2000 cited in Sims, **Ibid.**

[46] Ministry of Justice, **Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System (2011),** London: Office for National Statistics, 2011, p. 34; British Crime Survey, **op cit.**

[47] **Ibid.,** p. 34.

have up to 14 times more negative impact than positive encounters[48], ethnic populations' reluctance to engage with the police becomes unsurprising.

Problem Solving in Practice

Problem solving has been identified as a key to the effective delivery of NPTs[49] but there has been a minute interest on it over the recent years. The conventional attempts at problem solving schemes were through consultation meetings, where citizens are asked for their opinions and experiences typically around the insecurities in the neighbourhood. Indeed, such meetings can help police forces be more responsive to the demands of the community; help improve the police force's image, creating positive image; and help generate new and innovative ideas. Foster and Jones[50] gave a good example of problem solving in their study when 29 excluded young people were put into education, training or a job after listening to young people's and community's views at a consultation meeting. Nevertheless, consultation meetings are largely unrepresentative. England and Wales is a diverse society, and inherently social problems differ between and within social categories. In the face of this complexity, the literature has persistently shown that Whites, the rich, senior citizens and house owners are the dominant representatives. [51] In one study, a sergeant reported that a consultation meeting was 'farcical...it's just not representative' while a constable said 'They're a waste of time and certain people dominate them'.[52] In these scenarios, the problem is not just the lack of representation but also the impact of tiny minorities or single individuals clogging up these meetings: the priorities that emerge from these meetings are bound to reflect the views of a tiny minority or even single individuals. Taking more examples from Foster and Jones's[53] study, a sergeant explained that 'they're [the public] quite apathetic...unless it's on their doorstop people aren't bothered'. Skogan[54], too, noted that '[community policing] programmes which rely on citizen initiative and self-help can be regressive rather than

[48] Skogan, W., Asymmetry in the Impact of Encounters with the Police, **Policing and Society**, 2006, 2, pp. 99-126.
[49] Tuffin et al., **op cit.**
[50] Foster and Jones, **op cit.,** pp. 400.
[51] Jones, T. & Newburn, T., **Policy Transfer and Criminal Justice,** Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press, 2006.
[52] Foster, & Jones, **op cit.,** p.398.
[53] **Ibid,** p.399.
[54] Skogan, W., **Community Participation and Community Policing, Institute for Police Research,** A Paper Presented at the Workshop on Evaluating Police Service Delivery, University of Montreal: Canada, 1995, pp. 2-3.

progressive in their impact'. However, not participating in these meetings does not necessarily translate to not wanting to be consulted: time and venue of meetings, transportation and language problems are some of the barriers that the public can face.

In addition to these barriers, Foster and Jones (2010), on the other hand, posit that police forces lack initiative and originality in getting communities involved.[55] The difficulties in getting the community involved are well recognised by neighbourhood teams but they are accepted in a lazy fashion rather than being challenged. Perhaps this is unsurprising when one considers the lack of organisational commitment to community policing: community policing schemes have often been used as something 'extra' or 'nice to do' by police forces across England and Wales.[56] They have been unpopular among police officers: many fail to see community policing as 'real' police work.[57] Community policing's unpopularity is not just limited to police officers: community-orientated work is also undesirable by Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs), which are a core component of NPTs. Blair[58] described the PCSO initiative as a 'revolution in British policing', as their introduction hinted a trend towards Peel's police who prioritised community-focused work over crime-fighting. Not so revolutionary it turned out, however. The motivations behind joining the force as a PCSO differ from individual to individual ranging from monetary to moral motivations. The Home Office's first national evaluation of PCSOs have reported that over 40% of PCSOs said that they saw the position as a 'stepping stone' in their quest to become a fully sworn police officer.[59] This thinking was confirmed by Cunningham and Wagstaff when they reported that more than 50% of applications to the PCSO role in the Metropolitan Police had intended to become a police officer[60]. When one considers these statistics, serious questions should erupt. First and foremost, the success of community policing philosophy is dependent on the degree of commitment and enthusiasm held by PCSOs.[61] It would not be unethical to comment that

[55] Foster, & Jones, **op cit.**
[56] **Ibid.**
[57] Fielding, N. G., **Community policing,** Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
[58] Blair, I., The Policing Revolution: Back to the Beat. **New Statesman,** 2002, 725, p. 23.
[59] Home Office, **A National Evaluation of Community Support Officers**. Research Study 297, London: Office for National Statistics, 2006, p. 1.
[60] Cunningham, S., & Wagstaff, M., **Diversity of PCSO Recruits Compared to Police Officer recruits in the Metropolitan Police Service.** London: Metropolitan Police Authority, 2006, p. 7.
[61] Innes, M., The Reassurance Function, **Policing,** 2007, 2, 132-141; Innes, M., & Roberts, C. Reassurance Policing, Community Intelligence and the Co-Production of Neighbourhood

a significant proportion of PCSOs in England and Wales have no or limited genuine interest in the role and function of PCSOs. The complete achievement of community partnership and problem solving will be unlikely if PCSOs' interest, commitment and enthusiasm are directed towards the police officer role which is not only better paid (PCSOs get paid approximately £17,000 per annum where on the other hand police officers start on £22,700 after training with a salary structure rising every year) but also deemed 'exciting' as it may involve tough crime control work. Indeed, there are PCSOs with genuine interest in the job but they are discontent about the lack of career structure. The current career progression framework wrongly assumes that the next level for PCSOs is the police officer post, and thus many scholars along with UNISON, the second biggest trade union in the United Kingdom, advocated the creation of a hierarchal framework.

The Challenges and Opportunities of Community Policing

Budget Cuts

When considering the above justifications made for community policing, it would be plausible to agree that 'the close alliance forged with the community should not be limited to an isolated incident or series of incidents, nor confined to a specific time frame'.[62] Nevertheless, times are tough and the police forces across England and Wales are facing severe budget cuts. The coalition government embarked on a budget reduction plan in May 2010, slashing 20% off police funding by 2014/15. The 20% (£2.1bn) reduction equates to the redundancy of 16,200 police officers, 1,800 PCSOs and 16,100 police staff- a total of 34,100 employees from March 2010 till March 2015 [63], taking the size of the police forces across England and Wales back to its 2003/04 levels. The reduction in the number of PCSOs has not been that dramatic when compared against police officers, this is partly because PCSOs are cheaper to maintain. Nevertheless, it is significant enough to make dramatic changes on service delivery: at their peak in 2009, there were almost 17,000 PCSOs but this figure declined to 14,205 in March 2013, a reduction of 2,795 officers.[64] As at March 2013,

Order, In T. Williamson (ed.), **The Handbook of Knowledge-Based Policing: Current Conceptions and Future Directions**, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK, 2008.

[62] Bureau of Justice Assistance, **op cit.,** p.17.

[63] HMIC, **Adapting to Austerity: A Review of Police Force and Authority Preparedness for the 2011/12- 14/15 CST period,** London: HMIC, 2011a, p.14.

[64] Home Office, **Police Workforce, England and Wales**, 31 March 2013, London: Office for National Statistics, 2013.

police officers represented 60.7% of the total police workforce (129.586 police officers, a decrease of 3.4% when compared against March 2012), with the rest of the workforce comprised by police staff (30.7%), PCSOs (6.6%) and traffic wardens and designated officers (2%).[65]

It is unlikely that a reduction in the number of patrolling police officers will lead to fewer apprehension of criminals, as confirmed in Kelling et al., (1974) study which showed that a double or three-fold increase in the level of patrol did not affect crime levels.[66] Nevertheless, it does not mean that there will not be any repercussions of budget cuts on the 'service' function of the police. Over the recent years, the PCSOs have been found to take responsibility for roles envisioned for regular police officers because of shortage of officers: they were placed inside police stations rather than on the streets, often filling in forms. The bureaucracy aspect of policing which is intensified as a result of shortage of police personnel not only contradicts the motive behind the introduction of PCSOs but it can also lead to poor police-public confidence.[67] Low public confidence is linked to poor police-community relationships; increased public frustration towards the police; and the loss of police legitimacy.[68] When the attention is diverted to the HMIC's[69] report, it is seen that a broad variation exists between forces in the number of officers and PCSOs allocated to visible roles: from 51% to 75%. A different study carried out by the Police Federation to examine the national deployment of PCSOs revealed that 75% of PCSO time was spent on the beat.[70] The initial reaction to these statistics may well appear positive but further scrutiny reveals that only 12% of officers and PCSOs are visible and available.[71] There are also variations between forces in this aspect. For example, only 9% of officers are visible and available in Devon and Cornwall area whereas it is 16% in Merseyside. Kent Police's research into the deployment of PCSOs revealed that two-thirds of PCSO time is spent on filling forms. [72] The low visibility and availability figures above sit

[65] **Ibid.**

[66] Kelling et. al., **op cit.,** 1974; Myhill, A. & Beak, K., **Cooperation, and Crime Reduction**. London: National Policing Improvement Agency, 2008.

[67] Dangleish D. & Myhill A., **Implementation of the National Reassurance Policing Programme**. Home Office: RDS, 2006.

[68] Lister, S., Fowler, D.P. & Staniforth, A., **Community Engagement: Evidence Review**. N8 Policing Research Partnership: Leeds. 2014.

[69] HMIC, **op cit.,** 2001, p. 28.

[70] Cited in Strickland, P., & Beard, J., **Police Community Support Officers**. London: House of Commons Library, 2012, p. 8.

[71] HMIC, **Demanding Times: The Front Line and Police Visibility.** London: HMIC, 2011b, p. 29.

[72] Cited in Strickland, P., & Beard, **op cit.,** p. 8.

uncomfortably against the original reason behind the introduction of PCSOs which was to contribute to the policing of local communities through strong police presence and public accessibility. Another way of demonstrating the extent of PCSOs' isolation is by focusing the attention on the public: in 2013 only 17% of adults have seen a patrolling officer (could be a PCSO or a police officer) in their local area about once a month; 26% saw about once a week; 9% saw about once a day; and 3% saw more than once a day.[73] Evidence suggests that adults who report high visibility are 68% more likely to rate the police positively than negatively when compared with adults who report low visibility.[74]

Opportunity: Social Media and the Police

Following the examination of the NRPP, Tuffin et al, made a number of recommendations for positive changes in the community[75]. One of these recommendations was that the police should be seeking for other methods of engagement with the community, going beyond the traditional techniques- public meetings, street briefings and door-knocking events- which pose difficulties for the police to engage in a two-way communication.[76] Over the recent years, the police forces across England and Wales have started to embrace the internet, or social media in particular, to turns things around. Indeed, social media provides the police an important platform with which to engage with the community: there are over 1.1 billion Facebook users (half of these users have daily access); over 500 million users of Twitter (grown by around 800% in the past year); and on average over 1 billion regular users visit YouTube every month. A research carried out by ComScore reported that one of every six minutes spent online is spent within social networks.[77] The easy access to advanced technology along with the growing use of mobile phones by all social groups is partly responsible for this global movement. People are now 'engaging with services at their own convenience and in the manner, medium and at a time which suits them'.[78] Taking these impressive finding into consideration, PCSOs can and should, thus, increase their 'visibility' through social media without being seen in person. Social media sites can be particularly effective in communicating with youths, a

---

[73] CSEW, **op cit.,** p. 14.
[74] HMIC, **Policing Austerity.** London: HMIC, 2012, p. 18.
[75] Tuffin et al, **op cit.**
[76] **Ibid,** p. 94.
[77] ComScore, **U.S. Digital Future in Focus: Key Insights from 2012 and What They Mean for the Coming Year**. Reston, USA: ComScore. 2013, p. 13.
[78] ACPO, **Engage: Digital and Social Media Engagement for the Police Service,** London: National Policing Improvement Agency, 2013, p. 3.

demographic group which rarely subscribes to print media. Although physical interaction is an important element of community policing, PCSOs can resort to social media sites to dispel rumours; to keep public informed about events and activities; to solicit crime prevention tips; and to announce their commitment to communities.[79] The significance of publicising good police work through the media was theoretically proven by Bradford[80] when they reported that the public feeling informed about police activities generates positive perceptions of police effectiveness and community engagement. Leaflets and public posters were conventional approaches in England and Wales, but now through 'tweets' and Facebook 'updates' PCSOs can reach a large proportion of their local community, informing hundreds or perhaps thousands of people in communities they are meant to serve and protect. At the moment of writing this article, for example, randomly choosing the Surrey Police's Facebook page, there is a 'wall post' at the top of the page, shared 9 hours ago titled 'protect your garage with added security', aiming to reduce the number of break-ins into garages by raising awareness about crime prevention. Also on this page is a YouTube video 'left your possessions?', again aiming to enlighten individuals about auto-crime. As of today, the video received over 1,200 views, 20 'likes' and it has been 'shared' by 6 other Facebook users. Contents that are 'liked' and 'shared' by Facebook users will be displayed as stories on that person's timeline and his/her friends' 'news feed', and thereby there is the high possibility of that content being viewed by those who are not even subscribed to Surrey Police's Facebook page. The intention here is not to recommend that foot-patrols are no longer necessary, but rather the message is that the social media is fast, free and simple to use, and therefore it is something the PCSOs can, and should, take advantage of.

Community Policing in the EU

Community policing is defined as a specific direction of policing based on a close co-operation between police and community and also aimed at effective solution of community problems. Even though the concept of community policing is not new, its philosophy, principles and operational practices have been present in various degrees within policing for centuries.[81] Historically, police have attempted at various levels to engage with citizens to prevent or reduce crime and maintain social order.

---

[79] Procter R,, Crump , J., Karstedt , S., Voss, A., & Cantijoch, M., What Were The Police **Doing on Twitter?, Policing & Society,** 2013, 4, 413-436.

[80] Bradford et al. 2009 cited in Foster and Jones, **op cit.,** p. 399.

[81] Cordner, G., 'Community Policing – Elements and Effects', in Alpert, G. And Piquero, A. (eds.) **Community policing – contemporary readings.** Prospect Heights, Illinois:

There is no one common or best approach for implementation of community policing in the EU. To that end it is necessary to take into consideration each country's policing practices, the level of societal development, legal awareness, as well as other social and legal aspects, historical experience and select a specific working style. In many European countries the term 'community policing' means slightly different things, and appears in different styles and approaches; the level of interaction and the amount of administrative functions given to those community police to complete in addition to the 'community role' varies considerably.[82]

Community policing, or community-oriented policing, is a strategy of policing that focuses on police building ties and working closely with members of the communities. Community policing is a policy that requires police to inherit a proactive approach to address public safety concerns. Instead of old fashioned reactive policing, the community-oriented policing is a new policing approach including the modelling of proactive and coactive policing.

Community policing delivers police services to the local community. This orientation is usually associated with community-oriented policing. Key terms associated with this second orientation are the local community, responding to local needs and demands, citizen involvement, legitimacy, tailor-made solutions, fragmentation, soft policing, and prevention.[83]

The community-oriented policing is based on proactive and coactive policing strategies rather than an old fashioned policing known as reactive policing. In the EU acquis, there is no compulsory necessity for full compliance with legislation, policies and regulations about Community Policing for the member and candidate countries. As far as Community Policing concerned, it can be said that there is no a supranational or European level structure in EU. Each member country tries to make and implement its own community policing strategies both national and local level. In building trust and confidence between citizens and the police,

Waveland Press, 2000**;** Greene, J. R. & Mastrofski, S. D., **Community policing: Rhetoric or reality**. New York: Prager Publishers, 1988; Colvin, C. A., & Goh, A. Elements underlying community policing: Validation of the construct. **Police Practice and Research,** 2006, 7 (1), pp. 19–33; Cheurprakobkit, S., Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications. **Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management**, 2002, 25(4), 709–725.

[82] Donnelly, D., **Municipal Policing in the European Union: Comparative Perspectives,** New York: Palgrave-Macmillian, 2013, pp. 61-80.

[83] Verma, A.; Das, D. K. and, Abraham, M., (Eds.) **Global Community Policing: Problems and Challenges**, New York: CRC Press, 2013, pp. 230.

sustaining public satisfaction, and establishing a relationship every full member country in European Union, according to its historical development and internal security system each country follow in an appropriate way on the issue of application community policing. Community Policing is applied in EU countries to implement victim-oriented Policing and to provide community-oriented internal security strategies. Because of that there are different community Policing strategies and models in the EU countries. For instant, Netherlands applying neighbourhood policing and the suspect and victim-oriented Policing. It can be said that the best practice of the community policing is in the UK.[84] There is no community policing policy in Germany and Austria. Community policing is not within the scope of the fight against crime. Community policing is being implemented as part of crime prevention strategies. For example, Community policing in the context of monitoring the children who forced into crime. There is EU Commission recommendation for member states about community policing in the field of interior but it is not legally obliged to comply with these recommendations. Community policing is a strategy used to provide community-oriented an internal security service in the EU countries.[85]

The European Police Office (Europol) has traditional, old fashioned, reactive, incident based approach to problems, with a focus upon enforcement policing department in EU level. This department provides policing service in struggling with crime rather than preventing the crime. But the Community–oriented policing has services on prevention of crime rather than struggling with crime.

The European Police Office, commonly abbreviated Europol, is the law enforcement agency of the European Union. Europol headquarters in The Hague, the Netherlands, works closely with law enforcement agencies in the 28 EU Member States and in other non-EU partner states such as Australia, Canada, USA and Norway.

Europol handles criminal intelligence and combating serious international organized crimes by means of co-operation between the

---

[84] DCAF and Coginta, **Police Governance:European Union Best Practices**, avaliable at, file:///C:/Users/hp/Downloads/proconeu_best_practices_policegovernance.pdf

[85] Communication from The Commission to The Council and The European Parliament, **The prevention of crime in the European Union Reflection on common guidelines and proposals for Community financial support… and contractual policies, "community policing" practices and local justice and,** 2000, available at, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52000DC0786&from=EN

relevant authorities of the member states. The agency has no executive powers, to conduct investigations in the member states or to arrest suspects. Europol do this by assisting the European Union's Member States in their fight against serious international crimes and terrorism such as international drug trafficking and money laundering, organized fraud, counterfeiting of the euro currency, people smuggling, cybercrime, illicit immigration networks, trafficking in human beings, illicit vehicle trafficking and other modern-day threats.

EU has no direct powers of arrest but support EU Member States' law enforcement colleagues by gathering, analysing and disseminating information and coordinating operations. As EU has a power for coordination and cooperation operations they are not effectively active in prevention with crime. Thus, there is also no effective cooperation within the member of states of the EU, especially on the issue of Community Policing. Community policing is a further development from problem orientated policing but very similar in nature.

The difference being whilst problem orientated policing deals with specific problems that have been identified and would benefit from a multi-agency, the citizen engagement approach community policing uses this approach in all their activities in reducing crime in local and national level. For example, when the community officers/citizens, identify a problem or a potential crime in the community, when all partners cooperate they either prevent the event happening or stop it totally and the community automatically benefits from this.

Community policing is underpinned through a systematic problem solving approach; be that crime, disorder or social issues. It is delivered through partnerships and collaboration with the community. It is everyone's problem within the community and working together enhances the opportunities for success. Through these positive approaches community policing increases citizen's trust and confidence towards police as well as their feeling in safe. At the same time such approaches are likely to reduce crime and other forms of criminal behaviours.[86]

Conclusion

It is apparent that maintaining the same level of service and at the same time prioritising cost-savings over public safety is a tough challenge for

[86] Anderson, J., Community Policing-Working Together to Prevent Crime. **Australian Institute of Criminology,** Canberra, ACT, Australia, 2005.

police forces across England and Wales. It is certainly a tough challenge for urban police forces. This is because of existing funding arrangements: police forces are funded by central government grants and money raised from council tax payers, urban forces are more likely than other forces to be affected by the Coalition's cuts as they rely more on government grants. Some police forces have responded to this economic challenge by lessening their commitments to specialist teams that investigate serious crimes like murder, rape, child abduction and so on whereas others have drifted towards a 'civilianised' police (a replacement of regular police officers with non-police officers such as support staff, PCSOs and volunteering 'special constables'). Special constables who can come from any occupational background, for example, undergo a very short training programme to support the work of local police with the same powers available to regular police officers. The intention behind a civilianised police is twofold: first, reduce police staff expenses; and second, to withdraw police officers from backroom tasks that do not require their level of skills, powers and training. Along with this shift, however, there were some serious corollaries: increased sense of insecurity and fear of crime due to the prospects of being policed by unprofessional and unequipped individuals. Between 1960 and 1986 the number of civilians in the police increased from just less than 9,000 to 43,675 and totalled 53,011 in 1997[87] A further 46.5% increase was recorded over the next 11-year period: the use of civilians increased from 52.975 in March 1998 to 77,609 civilians in March 2009.[88] Some forces such as Surrey and Northamptonshire have been 'praised' for their achievements in employing more civilians than officers. Although 'civilianisation' saved Surrey Police more than £400,000 in their front-line policing function and more than £1.5 million in the CID, it failed to improve the detection rate which remains to be the lowest in England and Wales.[89]

The success of community schemes is dependent upon the police's ability to engage with the community but it became clear that this engagement is in need of development. This is only possible if police forces are more innovative than the traditional consultation meetings. Social media sites can be part of the solution. Social media users can send online

[87] HMIC, **What Price Policing? A study of Efficiency and Value for Money in the Police Service.** London: HMIC, 1998, p. 48.

[88] Mills, H., Silvestri, A., & Grimshaw, R., **Police expenditure 1999-2009, Centre for crime and justice studies,** London: Hadley Trust, 2010, p. 52.

[89] Telegraph, **Lives at Risk from Civilianised Police Service, Rank and File Warn,** 2010, (available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/law-and-order/7725462/Lives-at-risk-from-civilianised-police-service-rank-and-file-warn.html) [accessed 28/10/2014]

messages, pictures or even videos to their local neighbourhood teams to highlight those issues that concern them. Examples may include youth drinking and drug taking in a public space or pictures of recently painted graffiti which the police are not aware of yet. A prompt feedback from the police on the outcome of requests would reassure the community that action is being taken. Feeding back to communities will make people feel flattered and humbled as their opinions are heard and taken on board by the police. Police forces, thus, should make better use of the social media opportunity by strengthening teams that do social media work. Currently, it is a common scene that online questions from the public to the police are left unanswered, and very rarely is there a two-way communication with the public online. Strengthening social media teams is a necessity not just because of social media's potential in creating create a climate of trust and enhanced engagement with the community, but also because they can help police forces gather evidence that can be used in courts, help identify suspects and locations, and help discover unreported crimes. For example, the Centre Against Sexual Assaults have found that social media sites are the preferred medium in reporting cases of sexual assault amongst young people because this demographic group felt uncomfortable disclosing their unpleasant experiences over the telephone or in person; Leicestershire Constabulary posts images of wanted people, whether reported missing or sought for crime, and appeals to its followers to identify them; and the Metropolitan Police (MET) was particularly successful with their social media initiative in 2011 in apprehending rioters and looters during the riots in London. Although some blamed social media sites for the scale of the riots and thus urged for the closure of such networks, it is widely known and accepted that the social media sites have had the biggest influence in the arrest of over 2000 suspects (two-thirds of all arrests in England and Wales). The first Transparency Report issued by Facebook reported that over the first six months of 2013, United Kingdom officials made 1,975 data requests which concerned 2,337 individuals. Over two-thirds (69%) of these requests were returned by Facebook, which included data like name, date of birth, employment details and IP address logs.[90]

The European Police Office provides policing service in struggling with crime rather than preventing the crime. But the Community–oriented policing has services on prevention of crime rather than struggling with crime. However, as mentioned above, in the European Union *acquis*, there is

[90] Facebook, **Transparency Report Global Government Requests Report,** 2013. Available at: https://www.facebook.com/about/government_requests.

no compulsory necessity for full compliance with legislation, policies and regulations about Community Policing for the member and candidate countries.

Surely the community partnership and problem solving elements of community policing are a worthwhile activity but they will not mean anything if there is insufficient organisational commitment. Almost three decades ago, Alexander[91] reported that community policing schemes were in most cases 'cosmetic' for the reason being that they gave very little, if any, real power to the members of the community. Despite the elapsed time the term continues to be accurate for many police forces in England and Wales, not merely because of the public's reluctance in co-operating but also because community policing schemes require long-term political commitment and ongoing support from levels within the police.[92] Today, there is the strong tendency amongst chief constables to dismiss community policing schemes that do not have immediate impact on crime trends as worthless; and politicians fearing the 'soft on crime label' are not a fan of this philosophy in the face of high crime rates. Looking at this resistance from the chief officers' point of view, they do have an understandable but not an acceptable reason, however. Although some of the intangible benefits of community policing (e.g., citizen reassurance, quality of interaction, flow of information) will become apparent in comments from community members, they are difficult to measure and it takes a considerably lengthy time for the anticipated results to come through.

References

ACPO. (2007). *Guidance on Police Community Support Officers,* London: National Policing Improvement Agency.

ACPO. (2013). *Engage: Digital and Social Media Engagement for the Police Service*, London: National Policing Improvement Agency.

Alexander, N. (1995). *Community-based Policing Does Not Prevent Crime. In: P.A. Winters (Ed.), Crime and Criminals: Opposing Viewpoints*, San Diego: Greenhaven Press.

[91] Alexander, N., Community-based Policing Does Not Prevent Crime. in: P.A. Winters (Ed.),**Crime and Criminals: Opposing Viewpoints,** San Diego: Greenhaven Press, 1995, p. 93.

[92] Skogan, W., & Hartnett K., **Community Policing Chicago Style**, New York: Oxford University Press, 1997.

Anderson, J. (2005). Community Policing-Working Together To Prevent Crime. *Australian Institute of Criminology*, Canberra, ACT, Australia.

ACPO. (2005). *Guidance on Police Community Support Officers (PCSOs)*, London: Association of Chief Police Officers.

Blair, I. (2002). The Policing Revolution: Back to the Beat. *New Statesman*, 725, 21-23.

Bradford, B., Stanko, Elizabeth& Jackson J. (2009). Using Research to Inform Policy: The Role of Public Attitude Surveys in Understanding Public Confidence and Police Contact. *Policing: A Journal of Policy and Practice*, 2, 139-148.

British Crime Survey. (2011). *Crime in England and Wales 2010/11 Findings from the British Crime Survey and police recorded crime*. (2nd Edition), Rupert Chaplin, John Flatley and Kevin Smith (eds.), London: Office for National Statistics.

Budd, T. & Sims, L. (2001). *Antisocial Behaviour and Disorder: Findings from the 2000 British Crime Survey*, London: Home Office.

Bullock, K., & Leeney, D. (2013). Participation, 'Responsivity' and Accountability in Neighbourhood Policing. *Criminology and Criminal Justice,* 2, 199-214.

Bureau of Justice Assistance. (1994). *Understanding Community Policing A Framework for Action*. Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Cheurprakobkit, S. (2002). Community policing: Training, definitions and policy implications. *Policing: An International Journal of Police Strategies and Managemen*t, 25(4), 709–725.

Colvin, C. A., & Goh, A. (2006). Elements underlying community policing: Validation of the construct. *Police Practice and Research.* 7 (1), 19–33.

ComScore (2013). *U.S. Digital Future in Focus: Key Insights from 2012 and What They Mean for the Coming Year*. Reston, USA: ComScore.

Cordner, G. W. (1997). Community policing: Elements and effects. In G. P Alpert and A. Piquero (Eds.), *Community policing: Contemporary readings* (pp. 451-468). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Cordner, G. (2000). *'Community Policing – Elements and Effects', in Alpert, G. And Piquero, A. (eds.) Community policing – contemporary readings*. Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.

Cosgrove, F., & Ramshaw, P. (2013). It Is What You Do As Well As The Way That You Do It: The Value and Deployment of PCSOS in Achieving Public Engagement. *Policing and Society: An International Journal of Research and Policy,* 1, 1-20.

CSEW. (2012). *Focus on Public Perceptions of Policing, Findings from the 2012/12 Crime Survey for England and Wales*, London: Office for National Statistics.

Cunningham, S., & Wagstaff, M. (2006). *Diversity of PCSO Recruits Compared to Police Officer recruits in the Metropolitan Police Service*. London: Metropolitan Police Authority.

Dangleish D. & Myhill A. (2006), *Implementation of the National Reassurance Policing Programme*. Home Office: RDS.

Donnelly, D. (2013). *Municipal Policing in the European Union: Comparative Perspectives*, New York: Palgrave-Macmillian.

Eck, John E. & William Spelman. (1987). *Problem Solving: Problem-Oriented Policing in Newport News*. Washington, DC: Police Executive Research Forum.

Facebook Transparency Report (2013). Global Government Requests Report. Available at https://www.facebook.com/about/government_requests

Foster, J., & Jones C. (2010). `Nice to Do' and Essential: Improving Neighbourhood Policing in an English Police Force. *Policing,* 4, 395-402.

Goldstein, H. (1979). Improving Policing: A Problem-Oriented Approach. *Crime and Delinquency,* 24, 236-258.

Greene, J. R. & Mastrofski, S. D. (1988). *Community policing: Rhetoric or reality*. New York: Prager Publishers.

HMIC. (1998). *What Price Policing? A study of Efficiency and Value for Money in the Police Service.* London: HMIC.

HMIC. (2001). *Open All Hours: A Thematic Inspection Report on the Role of Police Visibility and* Accessibility *in Public Reassurance*, London: Home Office.

HMIC. (2011a). *Adapting to Austerity: A Review of Police Force and Authority Preparedness for the 2011/12- 14/15 CST period*, London: HMIC.

HMIC. (2011b). *Demanding Times: The Front Line and Police Visibility*. London: HMIC.

HMIC. (2012). *Policing Austerity*. London: HMIC.

Home Office. (2001). *Neighbourhood Watch: Findings from the 2000 British Crime Survey.* London: Office for National Statistics.

Home Office. (2006). *A National Evaluation of Community Support Officers.* Research Study 297, London: Office for National Statistics.

Home Office. (2010). *Policing in the 21st Century: Reconnecting Police and the People.* London: Home Office.

Home Office. (2011). *Crime in England and Wales 2010/11: Findings from the BCS and Police Recorded Crime*. (2nd editions), Home Office: London.

Home Office. (2013). *Police Workforce, England and Wales,* 31 March 2013, London: Office for National Statistics.

Innes, M. (2007). The Reassurance Function, *Policing,* 2, 132-141.

Innes, M., & Roberts, C. (2008). Reassurance Policing, Community Intelligence and the Co-Production of Neighbourhood Order, In T. Williamson (ed.), *The Handbook of Knowledge-Based Policing: Current Conceptions and Future Directions,* John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, Chichester, UK.

Jones, T. & Newburn, T. (2006). *Policy Transfer and Criminal Justice.* Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Kelling, G. L., & Moore, M. H. (1988). The Evolving Strategy of Policing. *Perspectives on Policing*, 4, 1-15, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Justice and John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

Kelling, G.L.,Pate, T., Dieckman, D., & Brown, C.E. (1974). *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: Technical report.* Washington D.C: Police Foundation.

Kennedy, David M., Anthony A. Braga, Anne M. Piehl, and Elin J. Waring. (2001). *Reducing Gun Violence: The Boston Gun Project's Operation Ceasefire*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice.

Lister, S., Fowler, D.P. & Staniforth, A (2014). Community Engagement: Evidence Review. N8 Policing Research Partnership: Leeds.

Long J, Wells, W., & Leon-Granados W. D. (2002). Implementation Issues in A Community and Police Partnership in Law Enforcement Space: Lessons from A Case-Study of A Community Policing Approach to Domestic Violence. *Police Practice and Research*, 3, 231-46.

Mills, H., Silvestri, A., & Grimshaw, R. (2010). *Police expenditure 1999-2009*, Centre for crime and justice studies, London: Hadley Trust.

Ministry of Justice. (2011). *Statistics on Race and the Criminal Justice System (2011).* London: Office for National Statistics.

Myhill, A. & Beak, K. (2008). *Cooperation, and Crime Reduction.* London: National Policing Improvement Agency.

National Research Council. (2004). Effectiveness of Police Activity in Reducing Crime, disorder and fear. In Wesley Skogan and Kathleen Frydl (eds.), *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The evidence* (pp. 217-251). Committee to Review Research on Police Policy and Practices. Committee on Law and Justice, Division of Behavioural and Social Sciences and Education. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press.

Fielding, N. G., (1995). Community Policing, Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Police Foundation (1981). *The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment.* Police Foundation: Washington, D.C.

Procter R,, Crump , J., Karstedt , S., Voss, A., & Cantijoch, M. (2013). What Were The Police Doing on Twitter?, *Policing & Society,* 4, 413-436.

Ratcliffe, J. H. (2008). *Intelligence-Led Policing*. Willan Publishing: Cullompton, Devon.

San Diego Police (2014) Problem Oriented Policing. Available at: http://www.sandiego.gov/police/about/problem.shtm

Schneider, S. R. (1998). Overcoming Barriers to Communication between Police and Socially Disadvantaged Neighbourhoods: A Critical Theory of Community Policing. *Crime Law and Social Change*, 4, 347-377.

Sherman, L.W, Gottfredson. D.C, MacKenzie,D.L, Eck J, Reuter P, & Bushway S.D. (1998). *Preventing Crime: What Works, What Doesn't, What's Promising*, Washington D.C.: National Institute of Justice.

Shotland, R. L. & Goodstein, L. I. (1984). The Role of Bystanders in Crime Control. *Journal of Social Issues*, 1, 9–26.

Sims, L. (2001). *Neighbourhood Watch: Findings from the 2000 British Crime Survey*. Home Office: London.

Skogan, G. W. (1992). *Disorder and Decline: Crime and the Spiral of Decay in American Neighbourhood*, (2nd editions), Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Skogan, W., & Hartnett K. (1997). *Community Policing Chicago Style*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Skogan, W. (1995). Community Participation and Community Policing, Institute for Police Research, A Paper Presented at the Workshop on *Evaluating Police Service Delivery*, University of Montreal: Canada.

Skogan, W. (2006). Asymmetry in the Impact of Encounters with the Police. *Policing and Society*, 2, 99-126.

Smith, D., & Visher, C. (1981). Street Level Justice: Situational Determinants of Police Arrest Decisions. *Social Problems*, 29, 167-78.

Sparrow, Malcolm K., Moore, M. H. & Kennedy, D. M. (1990). *Beyond 911: A New Era in Policing*. New York: Basic Books.

Stephens, M. (1988). *Policing: The Critical Issues*, Harvester: Wheatsheaf.

Strickland, P., & Beard, J. (2012). *Police Community Support Officers*. London: House of Commons Library.

Telegraph (2010). Lives at Risk from Civilianised Police Service, Rank and File Warn (available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/law-and-order/7725462/Lives-at-risk-from-civilianised-police-service-rank-and-file-warn.html) [accessed 28/10/2014]

Tiedke K., Freeman W., Sower C., & Holland, J. (1957). *Community Involvement.* Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

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

Trojanowicz, R. C. (1983). An Evaluation of a Neighbourhood Foot Patrol Program, *Journal of Police Science and Administration*, 11: 410–419.

Trojanowicz, R.C. (1982). *Evaluation of the Neighbourhood Foot Patrol Program in Flint, Michigan.* East Lansing: Michigan State University.

Wakefield, A., (2006). *The Value Of Foot Patrol: a Review Of Research.* London: The Police Foundation.

Weinberger, B. (1995). *The Best Police in the World: an Oral History of British Policing*. Aldershot: Scolar.

Weisburd., D., Telep., C.W., Hinkle. J.C. & Eck, J.E. (2008). *The Effects of Problem Oriented Policing on Crime and Disorder*. A Campbell Collaboration Systematic Review, 14, DOI: 10.4073/csr.2008.14.

Verma, A.; Das, D. K. and, Abraham, M. (Eds.) (2013). *Global Community Policing: Problems and Challenges*, New York: CRC Press.