The Value of Foot Patrol:
A Review of Research

Alison Wakefield
Department of Sociology
City University

The Value of Foot Patrol:

A Review of Research

Dr Alison Wakefield

CONTENTS

PREFACE

The debate over the value of police foot patrol has raged, virtually unabated, since the 1960s, not only in Britain but throughout much of the developed world. Over that period a considerable literature has amassed and Dr Wakefield's review of that literature is both thorough and penetrating in analysis and assessment. However, the reader should not expect an 'easy ride', for Dr Wakefield raises many issues that demand further research and analysis. Allow me to highlight just some of them.

As she makes clear, survey evidence about public satisfaction with the police is highly questionable: for instance, as she observes, when asked what outcomes they anticipate from patrol, survey respondents are explicitly invited to speculate on a basis of very little knowledge. Dr Wakefield's appraisal should give us all pause for thought before jumping to glib prescriptions and incessant demands for 'more bobbies on the beat'.

Instead of us uncritically taking such public expressions of opinion as a benchmark of effectiveness, perhaps researchers should pay more critical attention to why and how the public formulate their opinions of policing. In other contexts (such as research on the fear of crime, or appraisal of judicial severity) researchers have been eager to repudiate public ignorance as a guide to public policy, but in relation to police patrol researchers have been complicit with the desire to give the public what they want. Yet there is something decidedly irrational about elevating a tactic (patrolling) into a strategy.

Whilst systematic evidence is lacking, I believe that Dr Wakefield is correct to emphasise how public opinion reflects a desire for a *style* of policing. What, in my view, the public finds attractive in foot patrol is that it is *non*–threatening. Dr Wakefield makes several sound observations in this connection. First, there is the hope and expectation on the part of survey respondents that foot patrol officers will not engage the public exclusively in confrontational situations. Secondly, there is the hope that foot patrol officers will be more responsive to the local community, enforcing their values and standards, rather than imposing alien norms. Finally, as Dr Wakefield notes, citing Skogan and Hartnett (1997), it is an 'apple pie' vision of policing.

Why are the police and government so anxious to be *seen* to respond to ill–informed public sentiments? I think the answer is transparent: the public image of the police is an essential component of its legitimacy. Dixon of Dock Green is an icon of police legitimacy, but he's not alone: he stands alongside Wilson and Kelling's (1982) eponymous 'Officer Kelly', or Skogan and Hartnett's '"Officer O'Leary" strolling down the avenue, holding an apple in one hand and twirling a nightstick in the other, shooing away the pesky street urchins as he warmly greets passers-by' (1997:12). Americans sometimes describe these images as 'Officer Friendly'. Dixon was simply too old to represent a threat and in his first screen appearance in *The Blue Lamp* he was shot dead by Dirk Bogarde's youthful thug!

This goes, in my view, to the heart of policing: non-threatening, vulnerable police were deliberately contrived as part of the Peelite vision precisely in order to evoke respect and legitimacy. But legitimacy must be perpetually renewed, especially in challenging policing environments. Hence, the perpetual rhetorical effort to invoke the 'apple pie' concept of policing's Golden Age. Foot patrol rhetorically is intimately associated, as Dr Wakefield notes, with 'community policing' and its current incarnation as 'reassurance policing'. What 'community policing' represents is the reciprocal assumption of 'Officer Friendly', namely that it is possible to please all the people all of the time, because all the people share common values. As noted in the 1970s (Brown and Howes, 1975) this is a very Durkheimian vision of society.

It is, however, a vision that collides very heavily with the reality that Dr Wakefield describes. She rightly points out that whilst foot patrol is generally popular, it is not *universally* welcome: amongst some groups in some circumstances foot patrol is seen as threatening and evidence of being 'over–policed'. She also notes: 'There is evidence of lower satisfaction rates among ethnic minority groups and the least affluent and healthy segments of society.' She is correct, not only about Britain, but about almost every country in which public satisfaction with the police has been surveyed. Why is this so common? Because, as I have argued elsewhere (Waddington, 1999), the politically unacknowledged and unacknowledgeable role of the police is to keep marginal sections of the population 'in their place'. Behind the Durkheimian façade of 'community policing' is the expectation that in defending

local values and standards the police will protect 'us' against 'them', whoever 'them' happen to be. Even 'Officer Kelly' tells the drunks and derelicts that they can only drink their booze in side alleys and not on the main street.

As Dr Wakefield notes, foot patrol is associated with 'responsiveness'. But to whom should the police be responsive? The *Policing for London* report (FitzGerald *et al.*, 2002) points out that multicultural London is composed of a plethora of ethnically–defined neighbourhoods mutually suspicious of each other. They each demand of the police that they should receive sympathetic policing whilst those in other neighbourhoods should be treated more harshly.

Here, I think, Dr Wakefield's penetrating observation that private security patrols have much to tell us is absolutely correct, for the parallels are striking: as she notes here and expands in her own excellent monograph (Wakefield, 2003), private security personnel do exactly what the police do – they exclude marginal populations. They eject disreputable youth, vagrants and anyone who threatens the ambience of the premises for which they are responsible. The parallels are even more striking in Rigakos' study of Intelligarde (Rigakos, 2002), for here these security officers routinely discriminate against precisely the same sections of the population who show the least satisfaction with the public police. Similarly, Noaks' (2000) research documented how residential private security patrols *divided* the community – those who paid versus those who did not or could not.

However, private security has one massive advantage that the public police lack: they know who their customer is. When a security guard in a shopping mall brusquely ejects a bunch of youths wearing 'hoodies', the guard has no need to justify herself to the youths. They are not her 'master'; the owner of the mall is her master. The public police, by contrast, find themselves repeatedly caught betwixt competing pressures: 'crackdown on youth' but not on 'my kids'.

In other words, the issue of foot patrol is not about a deployment tactic, it is about style, public perceptions, conflict, authority and legitimacy. Dr Wakefield is quite right: further research is desperately needed that does not accept at face value that public satisfaction is unproblematic. On the contrary, what is required is to drill down

into the concept of 'public satisfaction' using more sensitive techniques than those of the opinion survey. There remains much more to be done, but researchers and policymakers should be grateful to Dr Wakefield for bringing into such vivid relief what is known, and what remains yet to be discovered.

P.A.J. Waddington

The University of Reading

18 January 2006

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

In the new millennium, foot patrol has been elevated to the fore of British policing policy, driven by governmental and police concerns about the 'reassurance gap' associated with public demand for 'more visible, accessible and responsive policing'. Five thousand civilian 'police community support officers' (PCSOs) have been employed across the police forces of England and Wales, carrying out their foot patrol duties alongside a growing number of police officers and civilian support staff. The Home Office has announced plans to provide every area of the country with multi-agency 'neighbourhood policing teams' by 2008, designed to be 'citizen-focused' and promote local 'reassurance'. And the demands of the public and corporations for preventative patrols have driven a proliferation of non-police foot patrol schemes in publicly accessible areas, sponsored by local authorities, commercial organisations and neighbourhood collectives, demonstrating that this tactic of policing cannot be seen as the exclusive domain of the police service.

The research

The question remains as to whether foot patrol – delivered by police personnel or other agents of policing – can meet the high expectations of citizens and policy makers. In this study, this is addressed through a literature review that attempts to answer the following questions:

- What does the public expect from foot patrol?
- What models of foot patrol can be identified from the research literature?
- What should be the main objectives of foot patrol, based on public expectations?
- Are these objectives being achieved?

The review draws on social surveys of public expectations of policing, empirical studies of a range of foot patrol initiatives, assorted policy documents and a selection of supplementary sources from the general policing literature.

The limitations of social survey findings

Social surveys concerned with policing have consistently generated findings that reflect the popularity of foot patrol among the public, the priority they attach to the activity and their assumptions about its objectives. The body of survey evidence is, however, flawed for a number of reasons. The politicisation of debates about the need for more 'bobbies on the beat' as a response to rising crime has undoubtedly influenced collective opinion, with iconic images of the friendly and familiar bobby, such as the fictional PC George Dixon,

unabashedly promoted in police marketing material. The public's knowledge about policing is variable and inconsistent, and social survey respondents are frequently asked hypothetical questions about which they have little experience. There is evidence that members of the public have unrealistic expectations of the police service in comparison with their expectations of other criminal justice agencies. Survey questioning techniques are sometimes leading, and only a small number of studies have required participants to make real and difficult choices when thinking about policing priorities. Finally, many social surveys fail to reflect adequately the disparate views of participants in different areas, and from varying backgrounds, age groups and ethnic groups.

If policy makers are to assess public opinion on policing priorities and objectives accurately, more targeted studies which gauge the views of different social groups and establish the knowledge/experience levels of participants should be commissioned. They should employ more sophisticated questioning techniques, and generate qualitative detail to offer more insight into participants' thinking.

Public expectations of foot patrol

The public's expectations of foot patrol, as discerned from this literature, suggest that it is commonly associated with a range of expected *outcomes* (most frequently, crime prevention and reassurance), and a set of specific policing *interventions* or activities that the police 'should do more of' (such as gathering local intelligence, dealing with disturbances, providing advice on crime prevention or more proactive targeting of criminals). The evidence indicates that different social groups have different expectations of foot patrol, which suggests a need to implement different *approaches* to foot patrol that reflect varying community needs.

In short, the survey evidence suggests that the public are not simply asking for more foot patrol, but for a *style* of policing associated with a certain popular image of policing: many are asking for PC George Dixon, the archetypal community bobby, whose approach is friendly, familiar and trustworthy. There is broad public support for a philosophy of policing that reflects some of the principles and practices of community policing, and the objectives underlying the current Home Office strategies of 'reassurance' and 'citizen-focused' policing. Perhaps most importantly, these philosophies espouse the centrality of community engagement and active consultation.

Evaluating foot patrol

Thirteen foot patrol initiatives in the UK, US and Australia were identified from the research literature as a basis for exploring a variety of strategic approaches that have been (and in

some cases continue to be) employed by police and non-police agencies. The initiatives were assessed in relation to four criteria:

1. The expected *outcomes* of patrol: to render policing more visible, accessible, familiar and knowledgeable about local people and local problems ('reassurance').
2. The expected *interventions* associated with patrol: the need to 'tack on' to foot patrol various other activities and deliver it in a structured way, engaging the local community ('enhancement').
3. The expected *approach* to patrol: responsiveness to the contrasting needs of different social groups ('responsiveness').
4. The likelihood that the initiative will remain in place more or less in its present form to secure continuing positive results ('sustainability').

These criteria are identified as the core objectives of foot patrol in accordance with public expectations. The evaluation findings indicate the extent to which these objectives were being achieved according to the accounts of the thirteen initiatives.

The analysis revealed marked differences between the foot patrol initiatives in nature, complexity and scope, leading to the identification of six distinct models, as follows:

- *Community engagement* model, which emphasises community responsiveness both during and prior to the intervention.
- *Citizen contact* model, whereby walking the beat is supplemented by recorded visits to residences and businesses.
- *Deterrent* model, based simply on showing a presence and enforcing the law.
- *Familiarity* model, involving foot patrol and other duties by patrol officers dedicated permanently to the beat area.
- *Strategic* model, in which patrol interventions are closely integrated with broader policing arrangements and the work of external agencies.
- *Client-directed* model, whereby the patrollers' functions and tasks are primarily dictated by those who contract their services.

The reports of the initiatives suggested that many led to improvements with respect to the first criterion of 'reassurance', particularly the visibility element. The other three reassurance factors (accessibility, familiarity and knowledge about local people and local problems) seemed to be met most readily when the officers regularly undertook additional interventions in the course of patrol work. The second criterion of

'enhancement' appeared to be a positive factor in 'reassurance': those initiatives involving functions and tasks additional to foot patrol offered the most scope for promoting visibility, accessibility, familiarity and improved local knowledge. A list of such tasks is provided in chapter three of the report.

Nearly all of the foot patrol initiatives involved elements of community consultation, meeting to varying degrees the third criterion of 'responsiveness'. Engagement with communities took a range of forms, such as community meetings, committees and 'proactive contacts' such as door-to-door visits. Once again, a variety of approaches to community consultation was evident across the range of initiatives, although the findings did not directly address the challenge of engaging hard-to-reach groups.

The fourth criterion of 'sustainability' enabled consideration of the management issues related to foot patrol, which could help to ensure the longevity of initiatives, or conversely undermine a well-intentioned strategy. 'Sustainable' approaches often fostered innovation on the part of the patrollers themselves, emphasising the need for strategies to engage patrollers' continuing interest in, and ownership of, the work in order to minimise staff turnover and maintain familiarity with communities.

The three interventions that appeared to meet the four criteria most comprehensively were delivered, respectively, by police officers (initiative 1: *community engagement* model), PCSOs (initiative 11: *strategic* model) and neighbourhood wardens (initiative 12: *strategic* model). The fact that these interventions were employed by three different types of service provider demonstrates that the type of agency fulfilling the role may not be the most important consideration in addressing public expectations: non-police operatives may fulfil certain local policing demands just as well as police officers.

In recognition of the challenges in evaluating foot patrol by means of a literature review, as well as the need to reflect recent developments in British policing policy, new research into the work of neighbourhood policing teams is advocated, specifically in-depth studies of neighbourhood policing teams and the communities in which they are based. Through observations of policing interventions and interviews with police representatives and residents, an insight into the emerging strategies for reassurance policing and communities' responses to these approaches could be provided, offering qualitative detail on developing relationships between the police service and the community.

In addition, policing strategies should recognise that public expectations of policing can and should be addressed in a number of different ways. Foot patrol is not the only means of meeting the four criteria of 'reassurance', 'enhancement', 'responsiveness' and 'sustainability'. For instance, the example of the Japanese *koban* (mini-police station) suggests that there are alternative means of delivering accessible policing with a similar ethos and style. There are other, equally important strategies for improving police-public relations, including improvements in the selection and training of police officers, and reassessing marketing strategies to remind the public about what the police are doing. Policing organisations need to follow a holistic approach to maintaining public confidence, rather than placing undue faith in one strategy, although there is clearly further scope to get the best out of foot patrol.

INTRODUCTION

Introducing foot patrol

Patrol is a policing tactic or technique that involves movement around an area for the purpose of observation, inspection or security. Since it is based on the allocation of officers between spatial areas, it is also a method of organising policing resources and managing policing personnel. Patrol by police officers or other agents of policing may be undertaken on foot, on a bicycle, on horseback or in a vehicle; and in uniform or in plain clothes. Officers may patrol alone or in pairs.

Foot patrol has historically been a central feature of policing in England and Wales, with the 'bobby on the beat' forming the 'essential bedrock of the force' (Reiner, 2000: 75) in Sir Robert Peel's strategic vision of the Metropolitan Police. This preventative, high visibility approach was to become an entrenched feature of British policing. Through the latter half of the twentieth century, the image of the friendly beat bobby remained powerful even as officers were increasingly being diverted into new strategic areas. The fictional constable *Dixon of Dock Green* emerged as an important television figure, and 'both cemented and celebrated' the bobby's status in post-war English life (Loader and Mulcahy, 2003: 3).

Such icons of policing's so-called 'golden age' have been used to perpetuate the nostalgia associated with policing during the immediate post-war period. McLaughlin and Murji (1998) describe how George Dixon's dated image has been promoted by the Police Federation, whose campaigns have depicted this English bobby as the archetypal police officer, and indeed Dixon featured in their prominent advertisement in *The Guardian* on 6 October 1993 opposing the police reforms recommended by the Sheehy Inquiry. As McLaughlin notes, numerous publications continue to present him as 'the finest police officer in the world' (2005:12). It was explicitly recommended in the HMIC (2001) report *Open All Hours* that the police could capitalise on such imagery. Drawing on survey evidence that public perceptions of safety and confidence in the police have failed to increase as crime rates have fallen, constituting a 'reassurance gap', the report stated: 'public awareness of policing objectives and successes could be marketed more effectively by exploiting the branding potential of images such as the uniformed officer and the blue lamp' (p.*x*).

According to Reiner (2000), a 'tacit contract' between the police and the public that developed over a century begun to fray from 1959 onwards and, 'Evidence mounted of an increasing haemorrhage of public confidence in the police' (p.59). Reiner attributes this to a host of factors, including police corruption scandals, rapidly rising crime, the growth of the counter-culture at the end of the 1960s, as well as the distance between police and public created through a new, motorised 'unit beat' system of patrol. By this time, Reiner suggests, British policing may have come to be better embodied by the 'abrasive' Inspector Barlow of *Z Cars* than by George Dixon. Such developments were, however, not limited to the British context. Weatheritt (1988) notes the parallels between British and US analyses of policing during that period, with police-public contact in the United States seen also to have been eroded by a shift towards 'reactive', 'fire-brigade' policing.

With the Dixonian style of policing seemingly consigned to history, and yet such imagery still being resurrected within the politics of policing, it is unsurprising that British public opinion surveys about the police service have consistently reflected a high degree of public support for police foot patrol, and a general dissatisfaction with the level of resources that the police service has typically been able to devote to the activity (Smith and Gray, 1985; Joint Consultative Committee, 1990; Consumers' Association, 1996; Bland, 1997; Metropolitan Police, 2001; FitzGerald *et al*., 2002; Nicholas and Walker, 2004; MORI, 2005). This apparent public pressure, set against the service's own, rather different strategic priorities of recent years, has for some time presented a challenging dilemma: how to respond to 'the almost insatiable demand from the public that it be provided with a visible uniformed police' (Morgan and Newburn, 1997: 160) in light of resource constraints and doubts within the police service about its effectiveness.

This predicament has been a continuing focus of political debate, but in the new millennium it has been elevated to the fore of policing policy in Britain. The demands of the public and corporations for preventative patrols have driven a proliferation of non-police foot patrol schemes in publicly accessible areas, sponsored by local authorities, commercial organisations and even neighbourhood collectives. Recognising the need to accept and manage this growing phenomenon, while seeking

to stem declining public confidence in the police and reduce fear of crime and disorder, the government advanced the concept and strategy of the 'extended police family' in the White Paper *Policing a New Century: A Blueprint For Reform* (Home Office, 2001). The proposals to implement a new, lower tier of policing operatives tasked with patrolling communities, and to enable police forces to accredit trained and vetted non-police operatives engaged in patrol schemes, were implemented in the Police Reform Act 2002. As a result, 5,000 police community support officers are now employed across the police forces of England and Wales, carrying out their foot patrol duties alongside a growing number of police officers and civilian support staff (Home Office, 2005b).

The investment in additional patrol officers in the new millennium has also been driven by governmental and police concerns about the 'reassurance gap'. Most recently, therefore, the government has announced plans to provide every area of the country with multi-agency 'neighbourhood policing teams' by 2008, presented as a response to public demand for 'more visible, accessible and responsive policing', and forming part of the government's drive to enhance citizens' sense of 'reassurance' (Home Office, 2005b). 'Reassurance policing' is the label being employed to describe this current strategy, associated with three key objectives of 'visibility' ('the level, profile and impact of police resources deployed within local communities'), 'accessibility' (the ease with which the public can obtain appropriate police information, access services or make contact with staff) and 'familiarity' (the extent to which police personnel both know and are known by the local community) (HMIC, 2001:23-4). Such an approach has, most recently, been situated by the Home Office in relation to a broader aim to enhance 'citizen-focused policing' (Home Office, 2005a).

While considerable governmental resources are now being invested in foot patrol, the 'pluralisation' of policing and the foot patrol function has signalled that this policing tactic cannot be seen as the exclusive domain of the police. The objectives underlying foot patrol initiatives will, therefore, vary in emphasis according to the aims of the service provider. Evidence from social surveys, along with the growing market for non-police patrol schemes, proves the popularity of foot patrol with the public to which policymakers are responding. With investment in foot patrol now at the heart

of British policing policy, it is appropriate to revisit the question as to whether such a tactic really can meet the high expectations of citizens and policy makers.

The research

The author was commissioned by the Police Foundation to undertake a literature review 'to assess whether or not the public is getting the return that is expected, or might be expected, from foot patrol' by policing agencies.

On the basis of this brief the following research questions were generated:

- What does the public expect from foot patrol?
- What models of foot patrol can be identified from the research literature?
- What should be the main objectives of foot patrol, based on public expectations?
- Are these objectives being achieved?

Outline of chapters

The aim of the first chapter is to make sense of public expectations of policing, particularly with respect to the delivery of foot patrol, by reviewing the methods and findings of a variety of British-based social surveys. Looking first at British citizens' general perceptions about crime rates and policing as reflected in survey evidence, the chapter offers an analysis of survey evidence concerning their expectations of foot patrol – mainly by the police – regarding the priority attached to it in relation to other areas of police work, and perceptions of its key objectives. The strengths and limitations of such surveys are then discussed in order to gauge their validity as a basis for constructing public policy. In the concluding discussion, those expectations that are clearly discernible within the survey data, but also seen as being reasonable, are identified as criteria for an evaluation of foot patrol initiatives described in a selection of published studies.

Chapters Two and Three review many of the numerous applications of foot patrol, with the purpose of identifying a number of foot patrol models and their objectives. The objectives for foot patrol are seen to have both *organisational* and *tactical* dimensions – the former relating to the agency providing the service and its expectations for foot patrol, and the latter concerned with the management and style

of patrol and specific patrol activities being undertaken. The second chapter is concerned with the organisational dimension, and opens with a discussion about the purpose of foot patrol in relation to the philosophies of community policing and reassurance policing with which it is often associated. The position of the British government and police service regarding police foot patrol is then set out, and followed by an overview of several alternative organisational positions in international public and private policing. The focus of the third chapter is the tactical dimension of foot patrol. It begins with an introduction to issues associated with the successful management and tactics of foot patrol, and then presents an evaluation of a number of foot patrol initiatives according to the criteria set out in chapter one.

The key points and recommendations emerging from this research are set out in the conclusion. This final chapter summarises the key points of the research, identifies the limitations of existing knowledge and outlines how these gaps should be addressed.

CHAPTER 1

Public expectations of foot patrol

Introduction

The promotion of foot patrol is currently at the heart of policing policy in Britain, presented as a response to the problem of declining public satisfaction with the police service and the popularity of foot patrol with the public. The purpose of this chapter is to assess whether public expectations of foot patrol as suggested from social survey findings are discernible, reasonable and therefore valid as a basis for constructing public policy. The chapter provides a review of research on public opinion and expectations of policing agencies, both in general and with respect to the activity of foot patrol.

The first section is concerned with British citizens' perceptions about crime rates and general attitudes to the police. Public expectations of foot patrol – mainly that undertaken by police officers – are the focus of the second section, which reviews research findings on public priorities for policing and the objectives of foot patrol. The third section sets out a number of methodological issues associated with social surveys, to assess their validity as a barometer of public opinion, and their relevance as guidance tools for constructing policies for policing. In the concluding discussion those expectations that may be seen as discernible and reasonable are set out.

General perceptions of crime and the police

Since crime levels in Britain peaked in 1995, the number of incidents recorded by the British Crime Survey (BCS) 2003/4 has fallen by 39%, with vehicle crime and burglary declining by about half and violent crime by over a third during this period (Dodd *et al.*¸ 2004:1). According to the most recent survey, the risk of becoming a victim of crime has fallen from 40% in 1995 to 26%, the lowest level recorded since the BCS began in 1981 (p.1). Yet the survey findings also indicate that two-thirds (65%) of the public believe crime in the country as a whole increased in the previous two years, with about one-third (31%) of these people perceiving that crime had risen 'a lot' (p.16).

An analysis of levels of public satisfaction with criminal justice agencies based on the previous year's BCS reveals that aggregate levels of satisfaction with the police have broadly fallen since 1996. Forty-eight percent of participants in the British Crime Survey (BCS) for 2002/03 (compared with 64% in 1996) stated that the police service does a 'good' or 'excellent' job (Nicholas and Walker, 2004). Satisfaction rates for Londoners are lower: just 40% of participants in the *Annual London Survey 2004* said that they were 'very' or 'fairly' satisfied with the policing in their area (MORI, 2005:10). A report on the BCS findings for 2000 identified as a key area for improvement the way in which members of the public who contact the police are treated, noting complaints of 'poor response times, lack of police interest, failure to keep them informed and poor demeanour' (Clancy *et al*., 2001:103).

There is evidence of lower satisfaction rates among ethnic minority groups and the least affluent and healthy segments of society. According to the BCS for 2002/3, black people and people from a mixed ethnic background were less likely than others to state that the police (at the national level) were doing a good or excellent job (45% and 39% respectively, compared with 48% and 51% of white and Asian people). Ratings of the local police were more positive for all ethnic groups and particularly for black people, yet these first two groups were also more likely to have been 'really annoyed' with police behaviour in the previous five years (25% and 34% respectively). Overall, people rating their local police least positively tended to be those in unskilled occupations, with annual household incomes of below £10,000, living in social housing, based in inner city areas and/or with very poor health or serious disability (Nicholas and Walker, 2004).

A study undertaken by Bradley (1998) on behalf of the Home Office used focus groups to identify four 'key social groups for policing', as well as four ethnic minority sub-groups with 'significant common approaches to policing' (p.*v*). Most critical of the police were the young people (aged 14 to 25), whose concerns were interpreted as reflecting 'a social distance and insufficient communication, mutual understanding and respect'; and 'mid-life' adults (aged 25 to 45) who were found to 'perceive an inadequate/disinterested response to their problems' (p.7). In addition, a number of specific concerns among the four ethnic minority sub-groups were identified, including perceptions by young Pakistani males of negative stereotyping and a lack of

cultural awareness among police officers, and beliefs among young Afro-Caribbean women that police racism is rife and that young Afro-Caribbean men are particularly targeted by the police. Setting these ethnic differences in perceptions within a broader context, Reiner (2000) describes the 'catastrophic' deterioration of relations between the black community and the police, connected with police discrimination evidenced in a host of studies and reports from the mid-1970s, and he observes that the 'disastrous ebbing away of black confidence in the police' was cemented in the Stephen Lawrence case (p.79).

Loader and Mulcahy (2003) discern from their research evidence, 'a certain fracturing of middle-class support for the police' or 'withering of the silent majority' who have 'lost some of their unequivocal identification with the police' (p.158), as well as identifying growing 'respectable' concern about police racism. Such changes in public perceptions about the police service may also be attributed to growing publicity over the years surrounding corruption scandals, miscarriages of justice, abuses of power and allegations of incompetence (as emerged in both the Lawrence and Soham cases – the latter associated with mistakes in the gathering and disclosure of intelligence concerning the young girls' killer, Ian Huntley, which would have precluded him from taking a job at their school). As Reiner (2000) argues, 'the police have experienced a repeated cycle of scandal and reform' (p.62) as the service has attempted to restore public confidence.

Loader and Mulcahy (2003) assert that, as a result of such factors, together with the public's growing willingness to consider market solutions (through private security) to problems that were previously regarded as the exclusive domain of the state, 'the English police have lost their symbolic aura, their capacity to command widespread implicit trust, [and] their ability to signify a common moral and political community' (2003:310). It is therefore unsurprising that the current emphasis of the British government and police service on achieving greater public 'reassurance' is deeply grounded in concerns about falling public satisfaction with the police.

Demand for foot patrol
The British Crime Survey, Annual London Survey and other social surveys also provide data on public expectations of the police, concerning such matters as the tasks

and crime problems that members of the public believe should be prioritised. Two common themes in such surveys are the level of priority that members of the public attach to foot patrol, and public perceptions of its objectives and benefits. These are now discussed in turn.

Priority attached to foot patrol

According to the BCS 2002/3 report on public attitudes to criminal justice agencies, when asked to prioritise different aspects of police work, 17% of the survey participants thought that patrolling on foot should be the main priority, 15% felt it should be the second priority and 20% ranked it as a third priority. The only areas of work to be rated higher were 'responding to emergency calls' and 'detecting and arresting offenders' (Nicholas and Walker, 2004).

Participants in the *Annual London Survey 2004* were asked to indicate, from a list of 28 measures to improve community safety, which two or three measures they felt would be most beneficial in their local area. 'More police around on foot' was ranked highest by a considerable margin, selected by 65% of participants, while 8% selected an alternative form of foot patrol, by 'neighbourhood wardens/caretakers (i.e. people patrolling the area to help prevent crime)' (MORI, 2005:7).

In the survey *Policing for London*, Londoners were asked by FitzGerald *et al.* (2002) to select three activities that the police 'should do more of'. 'Foot patrolling' was ranked highest, supported by 59% of the sample (p.43). This support was spread evenly across affluent and poor boroughs, but found to be lower among those groups reported to be most at risk of being stopped by the police. Thus, 44% of the under 30s advocated more foot patrol, compared with 59% of those aged 30 to 59, and 76% of the over 60s; as did 45% of black Londoners, 49% of Pakistani/Bangladeshi participants and 51% of Indians, compared with 64% of whites (p.43; see also pp.59 to 60 for statistics on people stopped by the police).

According to the 2001 Public Attitude Survey for the Metropolitan Police, just 15% were satisfied with the number patrolling the streets. More than one in three (35%) stated that there should be more police on the beat and more foot patrols, and one

third of participants felt that the police should be more visible (Metropolitan Police, 2001).

In a pilot study by Bland (1997) of the 'gap analysis' public consultation methodology, 37 'key aspects' of service by the police, identified by focus group participants, were assigned levels of priority from one to twelve by 629 survey participants from rural and urban Shropshire. 'Visible' patrolling did not feature in the top four bands, which instead prioritised 'emergency response' and the targeting of the following crimes: the 'sale of hard drugs', the 'use of hard drugs', 'domestic burglary', 'thefts of motor vehicles', 'vandalism', 'street robbery', 'youths racing in cars' and 'drink drivers'. Foot patrol remained, however, a relatively high priority when compared with other aspects of service, with 'high visible presence in towns on weekend nights' and 'high visible patrolling in trouble areas' being included in the fifth band, and 'patrolling town centres on foot' falling in the sixth (p.24). Bland's study also examined the extent of the gap between public expectations and police performance in these 37 categories, and 'high visible presence in towns on weekend nights' was one of four aspects of service that shared the second highest gap (after the tackling of vandalism).

In a *Which?* study on police-public relations (Consumers' Association, 1996), members of the public were asked to rank different crime prevention measures, identifying 'increase foot patrol by full-time officers' as being most effective. Similarly, 60% of participants in the Operational Policing Review (Joint Consultative Committee, 1990), ranked 'foot patrol' in the top five out of a much broader range of policing activities, with just three other tasks receiving a higher percentage (responding immediately to emergencies, detecting and arresting offenders and investigating crime). Police officers were seen to undertake foot patrol a 'great deal/fair amount' by just 20% of participants, however, suggesting demand for increases in the activity. The Review also examined public perceptions of the balance between reactive and preventative policing by asking participants to consider the ideal split between officers on foot and in cars, and finding that 72% wanted to see an equal balance of resources or more officers on foot.

A similar line of questioning was used by Smith and Gray (1985), who asked their sample of Londoners whether they perceived too many or too few police officers to be 'on wheels' rather than on foot, or whether the split was 'about right'. Seven out of ten believed that too many were in vehicles, although there was much greater support for this view among white participants than among non-whites (72% as opposed to 50%-52% of West Indians, Asians or other non-whites), and particularly those non-whites living in more densely populated areas of high ethnic concentration who tended to see police officers on foot much more often (p.191). It was also found that support for increased foot patrol increased steadily through the age groups, with those perceiving that too many officers were 'on wheels' ranging from 55% of 15 to 19 year olds to 75% of over 60s (p.193).

Evidence of public support for foot patrol does not only relate to foot patrol by the police: in a recent evaluation of neighbourhood and street wardens in Leeds, 'patrol activities' were found to be the primary requirement of residents who were asked to identify their main priorities for neighbourhood and street wardens in their areas. Other highly rated activities included 'respond to crime/disorder incidents', 'respond to alarms', 'exclude undesirable visitors' and 'conduct surveillance' – policing interventions that were generally prioritised over more community-oriented work (Crawford *et al*. 2005).

In general, survey evidence suggests that members of the public rank foot patrol highly in relation to many other aspects of policing. There is a need to explore how well such surveys demonstrate *why* members of the public value foot patrol so highly, and this is covered next.

Objectives of foot patrol
A small number of studies have examined public perceptions as to how the task of foot patrol should be approached, and what its specific objectives should be, offering an insight into the reasons behind its popular appeal. Through highlighting these specific expectations there is scope to explore whether the same objectives could be pursued by alternative means. Such questioning has been employed in two types of study – general public opinion surveys, and consumer surveys associated with specific

local patrol initiatives. Research findings based on these two approaches will now be explored.

Public surveys

In the *Annual London Survey 2004*, participants were asked if the number of patrolling police personnel (including community support officers) that they had seen in the past year in London was 'more, less or about the same'. The 35% of participants who perceived increases in visible foot patrol were asked if they believed that the increased police presence had helped to make people feel safer, to reduce crime and to reduce anti-social behaviour. Those who felt that it had helped 'a little' or 'a lot' totalled 74% for 'feeling safer', and 63% and 58% respectively for 'reducing crime' and 'reducing anti-social behaviour' (MORI, 2005:10).

The earlier study of Londoners undertaken by FitzGerald *et al.* (2002) provided more detailed findings about the specific expectations of those participants advocating that the police should devote more time to foot patrol. They were asked for their views on the types of activity in which the patrols should engage, and the most common responses were summarised under the following headings: 'to deter or prevent crime' (65%), 'providing reassurance' (49%), 'work with schools' (25%), 'gathering local intelligence' (24%), 'dealing with disturbances' (20%) and 'providing advice on crime prevention' (15%) (p.43). Older participants were more likely to place an emphasis on reassurance, whereas younger people were found to make a more explicit connection between crime prevention (and their own need for protection) and reassurance. One schoolboy, for example, wanted to see 'police officers at the schools making sure everyone was going home safely and there's no-one out there looking for trouble' (p.43).

The authors reported that a number of participants in their focus groups – particularly the young people – did not see the increase in patrol as an end in itself but explicitly linked patrol with the other main activities that 'the police should do more of'. These were 'community policing', selected by 36% of the participants, 'preventing crimes' (32%) and 'work with teenagers/children' (28%) (p.41) – in other words, 'more community involvement (especially with young people) in the context of an increased

crime *prevention* role for the police' (p.44). Thus, foot patrol was associated with preventing crime as it was seen to facilitate ongoing communication with the community. The research revealed a view that, on the one hand, the police needed to get to know people in contexts different from the usual frame of encounters which tended to be potentially confrontational, particularly with the young people, to surmount officers' stereotypes of young people and ethnic minorities. On the other hand, it was reported, this was seen as a way of building up trust that might overcome young people's reluctance to help the police – young people often faced the tensions of knowing about criminality in their areas but feeling vulnerable in the face of social norms prohibiting 'grassing'.

Bradley's (1998) study used focus groups to explore the nature of public demand for visible patrolling, by asking them to allocate a nominal ten police officers between four competing approaches: 'visible patrolling: deterrence', 'proactive targeting of criminals', 'prevention/advice' and 'responding to incidents/situations'. Young people and members of the lowest two social classes were found to favour 'proactive/targeted policing approaches'. Those who were 'open to persuasion to prioritise proactive/targeted policing approaches as ultimately the most beneficial' were the 'mid-life' adults, members of the higher three social classes, men in the 45 to 60 age group and the ethnic minority groups. Women in the 45 to 60 age group and people over 60 were found to 'consider "visible patrolling" as a vital means of reassurance of personal safety' (p.11).

Bradley concluded that the different groups' policing requirements were related most strongly to life stage, but also significantly to socio-economic environment due particularly to levels of exposure to risk or threat, and gender in reflection of the level of protection sought. Thus, those who experienced most exposure to crime risks and threats were more likely to favour 'proactive/targeted' approaches to policing, and people who were least exposed to crime problems were more inclined to seek reassurance through visible patrolling. He argued that, while this latter group were very aware of crime problems via the media, they lacked the expertise that derives from direct experience in 'assessing where to attack problems directly' (p.11). The activity of visible patrolling could, therefore, be seen as the policing activity of choice for the citizen least troubled by crime.

The Audit Commission (1996a) study *Streetwise* explored through focus groups the public's preference for police foot patrol over deployment in cars. It was found that, for the participants, mobile patrol symbolised 'high speed, reactive policing' – as one participant argued, 'they tend to be going to a crime rather than preventing one'. Furthermore, officers in cars were seen as being less approachable and unable to get to know the community well, whereas those on foot patrol, 'have got time to stop and say "hello" and get to know you', as well as being more effective: 'They can feel the atmosphere, spot trouble at 20 paces, look down side streets … they can provide more complete coverage' (p.19).

In a study by Shapland and Vagg (1987) of the perceptions of residents and business people in two rural areas, participants' demands for increased foot patrols were seen to indicate expectations not for 'concrete results', but rather for the police to be seen around the areas, to 'show those youths they're around' and provide opportunities for problems and information to be passed on to them (p.61). The authors concluded that the most important role being ascribed to the foot patrols by the research participants was a symbolic one, of proclaiming a state of order by their very presence.

Consumer surveys

'Consumer surveys' associated with specific local policing interventions offer a different slant on public expectations of foot patrol, since the research participants in these studies are more directly involved with the issues being raised. Crawford *et al*. (2003) carried out an evaluation of an initiative in the village of New Earswick, North Yorkshire, whereby the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust purchased an additional level of 'community policing cover' for the village. Its purpose was 'to contribute to a visible presence in the streets within the community of New Earswick as a means of providing reassurance and a source of security to the public' (p.*vii*). The project launch was found to stimulate a variety of expectations among residents, among which they were asked to indicate the most important. Crime prevention was overwhelmingly seen as being the most important benefit, by 58% of participants, and those others ranked as important were 'reduce fear of crime (10%), 'encourage greater respect for authority' (8%)', 'encourage better public-police relations' (8%), 'quicker

response to emergencies' (8%), 'detect crime' (5%) and 'encourage greater sense of community' (3%) (pp.10-11). In addition, qualitative interviews with residents were conducted which, the authors report, 'resonated with the belief that the project would result in significant increases in resident reassurance through greater levels of visibility, accessibility and familiarity' (p.10): the three components of reassurance advanced by HMIC (2001).

In an evaluation of the deployment of police community support officers (PCSOs) in Leeds and Bradford city centres, 64% of the members of the public who were interviewed felt that the visible presence of a police officer or PCSO reassured them 'a lot' or 'quite a lot' as to their personal safety (Crawford *et al.*, 2004:65). The participants were also asked to rate out of ten the objectives of visibility (averaging 8.67), accessibility (6.87), familiarity (8.38) and 'knowledge of local people/problems' (7.72), to assess their respective importance in order for reassurance to be delivered.

Noaks (2000), who carried out an ethnographic study of a commercial security company providing patrols of a residential area in the south of Britain, asked residents subscribing to the scheme about their expectations of the patrols. She found that 74% saw crime prevention as the primary function, by means of the enhanced physical presence on the streets provided by security officers. Other priorities were their role in community activities (11%), the on-call service and quick response rates (10%) and catching offenders (2%) (p.148). Subscribers reported their reasons for joining the scheme as being associated with increased peace of mind/enhanced feelings of safety (45%), improved surveillance (23%), reductions in crime levels (20%), availability of officers when compared with the police (11%), recent victimisation (7%) and good response times (1%) (pp.148-9). The predominant concerns to prevent crime and gain peace of mind therefore echoed the results from the other consumer surveys.

McManus (1995) explored the reasons why residents in three neighbourhoods in England (Moston, Bridton and Becton) had supported private security patrols in their areas, the first two of which comprised foot patrol and were funded by resident subscribers. In Moston, the residents had experienced increases in crime and disorder and perceived a lack of police action, turning to the private sector because of

perceptions of police impotency. Bridton residents were also concerned about rising crime and chose to employ a single security officer who was already well regarded in the area, having previously guarded local building work. For 73% of Moston residents and 66% of Bridton residents, the primary motivating factor for the patrols was a fear of victimisation due to increased crime and disorder, with most of the remainder citing inadequate police protection (p.66).

Summary

Taken together, the various surveys and studies measuring public expectations of patrol highlight a range of approaches and activities favoured by members of the public, and a variety of expectations. Their key findings will be drawn out in this chapter's concluding discussion, following an assessment of the approaches to measurement of social attitudes commonly being employed in such studies.

A methodological assessment of public surveys

It is important to consider the validity of the survey methods associated with studies of public attitudes to foot patrol because of the level of faith that is seemingly being placed in their findings by policy makers. The main challenges in using such methods relate to the accuracy with which public expectations of policing are measured, and whether the participants are sufficiently well informed to make reasonable assessments of policing priorities. A number of methodological issues associated with the design and execution of social surveys on policing are discussed in turn.

The construction of public opinion

The high public demand for increased foot patrol is interesting when one considers the historically unsettled relationship between the citizenry of England and Wales and its police. After the New Police were established in 1829 amid massive public opposition, the police began gradually to secure legitimacy with the public, yet as Reiner (2000) argues from about 1959 onwards, 'The tacit contract between the police and the public, so delicately drawn between the 1850s and 1950s, began to fray glaringly' (p.59), and the 'police image … changed from the cosy 1950s Dixon of Dock Green' (p.61) which in fact reflected a very short period in police history. The

powerful and enduring symbolism of such 'icons' as the uniformed officer, George Dixon himself and the blue lamp were noted at the beginning of the report.

When appraising social survey results on crime and policing, it is important to consider the many factors interacting with each other to shape public perceptions. One factor that will influence public demand for foot patrol is the repeated message being played to citizens through politics and the media that 'more bobbies on the beat' are the solution to rising crime. This is sometimes associated with debates about whether police officers are being effectively deployed (reflected in the focus of the Policing Bureaucracy Taskforce, established by the government to 'cut red tape' and increase the visible presence of police officers on the streets – see Home Office, 2002), and in other cases in discussions about the adequacy of overall police numbers (exemplified in the recruitment of 5,000 police community support officers). Smith and Gray (1985) hypothesised that the general preference of Londoners in their survey for foot patrols may be more 'romantic' than 'practical', in response to the message of 'advocates of "community policing"' who 'seem to have succeeded in establishing an association in people's minds between "more bobbies on the beat" and a golden age of social harmony' (1985:288). As one of the primary policing themes in political and media rhetoric, as well as imagery (McLaughlin and Murji, 1998), it is unsurprising that such a message is constantly being played back in the findings from social surveys.

Numerous studies and surveys have drawn attention to the many factors influencing popular opinion. The British Crime Survey, for example, demonstrates the different perceptions of national crime rates typically held by readers of specific newspapers. In the BCS 2002/3, readers of the *Daily Mail* and *The Sun* were most likely, and readers of *The Guardian* and *The Independent* were least likely, to perceive that national crime levels had increased (Nicholas and Walker, 2004:25). The current government and police service line, favouring 'reassurance policing', is itself intrinsically linked with Innes' (2004) concept of 'signal crime' and the disproportionate impact that certain crimes are seen to have on public perceptions of risk, due particularly to the way in which the media employ certain representational and rhetorical techniques to report particular types of crime.

The adequacy of public knowledge

Skogan (1996) emphasises the limitations of social surveys as guides to policy, particularly when participants are being asked hypothetical questions about which they have little experience. He observes that surveys are a most appropriate guiding tool when they focus on matters with which most people have direct experience, but notes that for many members of the public this experience excludes important aspects of policing. It is argued by Morgan and Newburn (1997) that, in view of the high proportion of survey participants who have reported having had no contact with the police in the course of the previous year, many participants' views are based less on first-hand experience than on second-hand accounts or media images. Their impressions, as the authors observe, may differ markedly from the realities of policing. There is certainly no evidence that especially knowledgeable participants were sought in the sampling methods for any of the surveys described in this chapter.

The level of survey participants' ignorance about aspects of police service was assessed in Bland's (1997) pilot of the gap analysis method to measure public priorities for policing. The questionnaire offered participants a 'don't know' option if they felt ill-informed to judge police performance for any of the 37 service aspects that were identified, and the results indicated high levels of self-reported ignorance of most of the aspects. Thirty percent of the participants felt ill-informed about 'patrolling town centres on foot', 39% about the provision of a 'high visible presence in towns on weekend nights' and 57% about 'high visible patrolling in trouble areas'. This lack of awareness is seen to highlight the need for 'marketing' as well as 'operational' 'gap closure' strategies, suggesting that the police service can improve public satisfaction rates in the way they market themselves and publicise their activities and achievements, as well as through changes in their operational strategy. Thus, the pilot study findings not only raise questions about the value of social surveys in assessing public expectations of foot patrols, but also emphasise how strategies for marketing the police service may be as important to its public image as the nature of its operations.

The reasonableness of public expectations

A recent survey by MORI for the Home Office measured the familiarity with, and perceived effectiveness of, different criminal justice agencies by members of the public. The police were found to be the most well-known agency by far, and were rated as having the greatest impact on crime in the local area (Page *et al.*, 2004). When asked what would convince them that crime was being dealt with more effectively, the most frequent answer (by 27% of participants) was 'an increased police presence' (p.4). This finding suggests a common perception that not only do the activities of the police have a direct effect on crime levels, but that the number and/or visibility of police officers is likely to be *more* effective that any other intervention – including tackling the root causes of crime.

Pate (1986) noted how research on the direct effects of foot patrol has been contradictory, citing two studies demonstrating the inconsistencies with respect to whether foot patrol can prevent crime. Bright (1970) found that rates of reported crime over a three month period were significantly reduced when one foot patrol officer was deployed in an area where none had patrolled before, while subsequent increases to two, three and four officers produced no change. By contrast, in a study by Schnelle *et al.* (1975), there was a significant increase in recorded crime as a result of citizens reporting directly to foot patrol officers. Reiner provides a helpful discussion of the factors that have promoted rising post-war crime, and the challenges to the police in directly influencing crime rates (2000:77-8), and such contradictory evidence should be considered in light of his points.

It can be argued, therefore, that many members of the public have unrealistic expectations of the police with respect to the service's ability to influence crime levels. This an important consideration when assessing levels of public satisfaction and perceptions of how police resources should be prioritised – and balancing investment in policing against spending in other areas of criminal policy.

The appropriateness of survey questions

Few of the published studies described in this chapter included copies of surveys and interview schedules, making difficult the appraisal of their approach to questioning. It must be noted, however, that some studies have employed questioning techniques that

appear to have led the participant in their answer, elucidated responses that might have been predicted, or at the very least omitted to demonstrate clearly that leading questions were avoided.

The phrasing of a question in the *Annual London Survey 2004* was likely to lead to a pro-police response in asking participants to indicate whether the increased number of police officers on the beat had helped reduce crime, reduce anti-social behaviour and make people feel safer 'a little' or 'a lot'. The alternative options were 'no' or 'don't know' (MORI, 2005:10). In the *Policing for London* study, by contrast, FitzGerald *et al.* (2002) adopted a more open-ended line of questioning when asking participants about their expectations of increased police foot patrol, which enabled the participants to construct their own responses rather than selecting a preferred response from a list. The researchers then identified a number of common themes from their numerous responses by grouping similar types of answer together.

With respect to the second point, in an evaluation of PCSOs in Leeds (Crawford *et al,*. 2004), for example, the instruction that participants rank out of 10 the four components of reassurance was surely likely to lead to a positive rating of these objectives. In other words, it is doubtful that public would wish for anything other than 'visible', 'accessible', 'familiar' police officers with good local knowledge – the converse being officers who are 'invisible', 'inaccessible', 'unfamiliar' and ignorant of the area! The third issue is raised in the results of another evaluation study, in which it was reported that a high proportion of the resident sample anticipated 'significant increases in resident reassurance through greater levels of visibility, accessibility and familiarity' (Crawford *et al.*, 2003:10), when an explanation of the ways in which these perceptions were conveyed to the researchers in the interviews would have been useful. The key point here is that it is unlikely that many participants' own vocabularies incorporated the buzzwords of 'visibility', 'accessibility' and 'familiarity' first advanced in the HMIC (2001) report, nor indeed the concept of 'reassurance'. This highlights the need for clarity of research method on the part of researchers seeking to evaluate such expectations, and further discussion as to how these current policy objectives can best be translated into measurable criteria.

Finally, Morgan and Newburn (1997) draw attention to the crudeness of many public opinion surveys, noting in particular how participants are usually expected to answer discrete questions that seldom allow the dynamics of choice to be explored. They assert, 'It is one thing to want a particular service. It is quite another to express a preference if there is some appreciation of the trade-off between services' (p.92). Few studies have encouraged participants to consider such a trade-off, although two exceptions are the studies by Bland (1997) and Bradley (1998) which compelled participants to make active choices in thinking about police priorities. On this basis, in Bland's survey forms of visible patrol were ranked far less highly than in other studies. There is potential for such methods to be developed further by simulating the sorts of pressures and difficult choices that police forces face on a day-to-day basis.

The representativeness of the community being surveyed

The use of appropriate sampling methods to gauge public opinion about policing is essential if policy decisions are to be based on, or justified by, survey results. The British Crime Survey, for example, has attracted repeated criticism for providing only an aggregate picture of crime victimisation and attitudes to criminal justice at the national level, masking the very marked variations in people's experiences of crime in different regions, cities and areas of cities, as well as experiences more specific to women, ethnic minorities and the very poor (see, for example, Matthews and Young, 1986; Stanko, 1988; Genn, 1988). The same criticism can be applied to most social surveys, since efforts seem rarely to be made to tease out the variations in experiences and perceptions between different social groups.

One exception was Smith and Gray's (1985) study, which found lower support for increased foot patrol among non-whites living in areas of high ethnic concentration – places where police officers on foot were frequently seen. This raises the question as to whether their lower levels of support were due to a generally lower esteem for the police, or to perceptions of 'over-policing' in their communities. The study also indicated lower levels of support for increased patrols among younger participants.

Bradley (1998) adopted an innovative approach in his examination of public expectations and perceptions of policing, whereby the sample groups reflected marked socio-economic and demographic variations. The purpose of this sampling

method was to identify possible differences in policing needs and priorities across social groupings, enabling him to identify the alternative approaches to visible patrolling favoured by those who experienced crime the most, compared with those people with little exposure to crime threats.

The need to reflect the needs of specific groups, particularly 'minority', 'hard-to-reach' and 'marginalised' communities, has been recognised in policy frameworks for public consultation (see Elliot and Nicholls, 1996; Williams, 2001), and such objectives should be applied to social survey design – particularly in view of the fact that police-public relations have consistently been found to be poorest among such groups. In practice, however, such consultation has proven difficult to implement (Elliot and Nicholls, 1996; Jones and Newburn, 2001), although reports by Jones and Newburn (2001) and the Association of Police Authorities (2001) offer some positive recommendations which are as relevant to social survey research as to public consultation arrangements.

Discussion

Social survey findings on public expectations of police have consistently been interpreted as presenting strong evidence of the popularity of foot patrol, as well as demonstrating the priority attached to foot patrol and perceptions about its objectives. The body of survey evidence is, however, flawed for a number of reasons. The politicisation of debates about the need for more 'bobbies' on the beat as a response to rising crime will have influenced collective opinion. The level of knowledge about policing among the public is variable, and yet in general social surveys on policing, participants are frequently being asked hypothetical questions about which they have little experience (Skogan, 1996). The findings of Page *et al.* (2004) suggest that members of the public have unrealistic expectations of the police service in relation to the work of other social agencies, viewing the service as having the greatest influence on crime levels. Survey questioning techniques can be leading, and rarely force participants to make active and difficult choices when thinking about policing priorities. And in generating aggregate data, many social surveys do not enable differences of view between participants in different areas, and from different backgrounds, age groups and ethnic groups, to be discerned. If policymakers want to take stock of public opinion on policing priorities and objectives, there is a need for

more targeted studies which gauge the views of different social groups and discern the knowledge/experience levels of participants, using more sophisticated questioning techniques and generating qualitative detail to offer insight into their thinking.

The purpose of this chapter is to ascertain whether the public expectations of foot patrol as set out in survey findings are discernible and reasonable, as well as assessing their validity. Despite the flaws in the evidence, in the absence of alternative information this body of literature is the necessary basis for identifying common trends within the parameters of 'reasonableness'. These suggest that foot patrol is commonly associated with a range of expected *outcomes*, and a set of specific policing *interventions* or activities that the police 'should do more of' (FitzGerald *et al.*, 2002). Furthermore, the limited evidence suggesting that different social groups have different expectations of foot patrol suggests that there is a need for different *approaches* to foot patrol that respond to varying community needs – relating, for example, to levels of foot patrol (Smith and Gray, 1985) and the balance of techniques being employed (e.g. 'proactive targeting of criminals' versus 'visible patrolling' as reported by Bradley (1998).

Those expected outcomes most commonly cited were the prevention of crime and reassurance/reduction of fear of crime (McManus, 1995; Noaks, 2000; FitzGerald *et al.*, 2002; Crawford *et al.*, 2003). Others included improvements in police performance such as faster response times and better detection rates (Noaks, 2000; Crawford *et al.*, 2003), and enhancements to general social harmony and local relationships (Crawford *et al.*, 2003). Preventative effects are difficult to measure, and as already argued it is questionable that the police hold the key to crime prevention. It is also hard to measure levels of fear of crime, although the concept of 'reassurance' with its components of 'visibility', 'accessibility' and 'familiarity' has been adopted by the government as a basis for evaluating the 'reassurance factor' associated with certain approaches to policing.

The types of policing intervention associated with foot patrol by survey participants included community involvement ('community policing', working with schools and working with teenagers/children) (FitzGerald *et al.*, 2002); gathering local intelligence (Shapland and Vagg, 1987; FitzGerald *et al.*, 2002); dealing with

disturbances (FitzGerald *et al.*, 2002); providing advice on crime prevention (Bradley, 1998; FitzGerald *et al.*, 2002); proactive targeting of criminals (Bradley, 1998); and responding to incidents (Bradley, 1998; Crawford *et al.*, 2003). This association of foot patrol with other interventions is important because it shows that survey participants commonly see the activity as constituting far more than the simple act of walking around an area for the purpose of observation, inspection or security. It is actively assumed that foot patrollers will perform other tasks in the course of patrol.

Three 'reasonable expectations' of foot patrol might therefore be identified as a basis for evaluating whether the activity meets public expectations. Firstly, the survey findings – however flawed – broadly reflect the popularity of visible foot patrol (e.g. MORI, 2005; Crawford *et al.*, 2004; Crawford *et al.*, 2003; FitzGerald, 2002; Bradley, 1998; Audit Commission, 1996a; Shapland and Vagg, 1987) and the value attached to the symbolic role of the patrol officer (Shapland and Vagg, 1987), and this is supported by the growing demand among citizens and corporations for non-police patrols. The concept of the 'reassurance gap', and specifically the three components of reassurance, offer a potential set of criteria for evaluating policing agencies' capacity to respond to fear of crime.

The first expectation, associated with the *outcomes* of foot patrol, is therefore held to be that foot patrol should be delivered in a way that renders the policing agency more visible, accessible, familiar and knowledgeable about local people and problems. The second 'reasonable expectation', concerned with the *interventions* associated with foot patrol, is that certain key activities should be 'tacked on' to foot patrol so that it is delivered in a structured way with many component tasks in the interests of community engagement. The third, relating to the *approach* to foot patrol, is that such initiatives should be responsive to the contrasting needs of different social groups so that demands for 'proactive targeting of criminals' can be met alongside those for 'visible policing' as well as other potential approaches, and differing perceptions as to optimum levels of patrol can be taken account into account. This would require active engagement with the community and its many component groups, and innovation in the development of an accountable framework for consultation and feedback. The surveys suggest that the public are not simply asking for more foot patrol, but asking for a *style* of policing associated with the imagery

identified at the beginning of the report. Many are asking for George Dixon, the archetypal community bobby, whose approach is friendly, familiar and consensual.

The matter of declining public confidence in the police and poor relations between the police and many sectors of the community, which has provoked such official concern (HMIC, 2001), is an important area for intervention. While the government has chosen to address this by responding to calls for increased visible patrol, other forms of intervention must not be forgotten. For example, Clancy *et al*. noted common public complaints of 'poor response times, lack of police interest, failure to keep them informed and poor demeanour' (2001:103), suggesting the need for improvements in police training and organisation, and the reports by HMIC (2001) and Bland (1997) place an emphasis on the marketing of policing successes.

CHAPTER 2

The objectives of foot patrol

Introduction

This is the first of two chapters concerned with the objectives of foot patrol. While Chapter Three explores the tactical delivery of foot patrol, this chapter offers an analysis of the types of organisation providing the service, and their broad aims in doing so. In the first section of the chapter, public expectations of foot patrol are situated in relation to community policing and reassurance policing: two policing philosophies that have been influential in British public policy. The second section focuses on a selection of other approaches to foot patrol, in other jurisdictions and by non-police agencies, showing that current policing policy in Britain reflects just one interpretation of the aims of foot patrol – these have varied over time, and between service providers both nationally and internationally.

Situating foot patrol: community policing and reassurance policing

It has been argued that foot patrol is a tactic of policing involving movement around an area for the purpose of observation, inspection or security; and that it represents an approach to managing police personnel by organising them spatially. It is evident from the findings presented in the last chapter, however, that foot patrol represents much more to the social survey participant, and three 'reasonable expectations' have been identified, associated respectively with the outcomes of foot patrol, the interventions associated with it, and the approaches used.

It was stated in the last chapter that the public are asking for a style of policing akin to the image presented by George Dixon – the local bobby who is a familiar face in his community. The findings suggest that, in reality, the public are showing support for various forms of 'community policing' or 'reassurance policing' that are firmly centred round foot patrol, as opposed to supporting foot patrol per se. To help situate these expectations, the focus of this section is these two policing philosophies and their development in British policing policy.

Community policing

Community policing was first advocated and implemented by the then chief constable of Devon and Cornwall, John Alderson, in the 1970s. At that time, Alderson described it as: 'a style of day-to-day policing in residential areas in which the police and other social agencies take part by helping to prevent crime, and particularly juvenile delinquency, through social as opposed to legal action' (1979:239). Reiner (2000) argues that it came to be 'the orthodox analysis of the police role for all chief constables' (p.75) after the Scarman Report's endorsement of 'a kind of community policing philosophy' following the inquiry into the Brixton riots. Its rising status was not limited to Britain: community policing came to be 'an influential movement among progressive police chiefs in the USA and elsewhere' (Reiner, 2000:74). The fact that community policing is recognised as a 'philosophy' and a 'movement' differentiates it markedly from foot patrol as a simple tactic or technique.

Community policing is seen by Weatheritt (1983) to be a 'protean' concept, its strengths lying in its capacity to seem many things to many people, yet she argues of its many manifestations, 'If they have any unifying theme, it is that they are all based on the importance of winning and sustaining public confidence in the police as a condition for effective policing' (p.129). This statement has resonance with current policing policy in Britain. Weatheritt (1988) also argues that debates about community policing have occurred on pragmatic, organisational, idealistic and ideological levels, and that its advocates have not always distinguished between these. In exploring the 'reality' as opposed to the 'rhetoric', she reports that on a 'pragmatic level community policing is about developing a set of programmes or activities for the police' (p.153) – foot patrol, community crime prevention and community consultation – and that 'foot patrol is widely regarded as a key … feature of community policing' (p.161). Yet Weatheritt cautions that policy goals have been more concerned with identifying ways of deploying more police officers to foot patrol than with the more important questions of how foot patrol can be made more effective, what patrolling officers should do, and how to evaluate its effectiveness.

Offering a US perspective, Skogan and Hartnett (1997) also acknowledge that the concept of community policing is difficult to characterise, and view it as a process rather than a product, based around four general principles for the police service.

These are: a reliance on organisational decentralisation and a reorientation of patrol to enable communication with the public; a commitment to problem-oriented policing; a responsiveness to the public when setting priorities and developing tactics; and a commitment to community crime prevention. Their interpretation does not present community policing as being synonymous with foot patrol, but they note its 'American as apple pie' (p.12) image not dissimilar to our *Dixon of Dock Green*, stating:

> Community policing is characterized by "Officer O'Leary" strolling down the avenue, holding an apple in one hand and twirling a nightstick in the other, shooing away the pesky street urchins as he warmly greets passersby. It's the quintessential village constable or the night watchman, who lives in the same community as he serves. (*ibid*.)

The analyses of Weatheritt (1983, 1988) and Skogan and Harnett (1997) reveal some of the key aims and mechanisms underlying community policing. According to these British and American interpretations, foot patrol is − or can be − a community policing activity. Technically its status is limited to being part of a 'toolkit' of tactics on which advocates of community policing might draw (Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux, 1990). Yet the image associated with foot patrol is much more powerful than this, with the beat bobby seeming to represent the essence or embodiment of community policing. Trojanowicz and Bucqueroux (1990) argue that confusion as to the nature of community policing stems in part from a period when the terms 'community policing' and 'foot patrol' were (mis)used interchangeably. Indeed, as the popularity of the *koban* (mini-police station), situated in most localities in Japan, suggests, community policing can also be delivered by static methods. Waddington (1999) contrasts the Japanese perception of the *koban* as the place to access a wide range of police services, with the western view of the police station as a base from which to patrol the streets.

Community policing initiatives were first introduced in Britain as a remedy to the problems associated with unit beat policing, a strategy introduced in the mid-1960s with the intention of improving both efficiency and police-public relations. Unit beat policing separated the roles of the area constable with the function of preserving close

relations with the local community, and the area car which offered a 24 hour emergency service. The criticisms of the strategy which arose, however, remain pertinent today – that when police resources were stretched, the activity that always came to be reduced was preventative foot patrol.

Community policing moved to the fore of the political agenda following the report of Lord Scarman's inquiry into the Brixton disorders of April 1981. Early community policing initiatives, most notably the force-wide strategy of the Devon and Cornwall Chief Constable, John Alderson, were acknowledged in Scarman's report in which he described the approach as 'policing with the active consent of the community' (Scarman, 1981: para. 5.46). One of Scarman's recommendations in support of the extension of community-based activities was that chief police officers should re-examine the pattern of patrolling, especially the mix of foot and mobile patrols.

The eighties and nineties saw an expansion in police community liaison departments and the number of officers allocated to such duties, and a steady growth in police initiatives and tactics based on community policing principles (Weatheritt, 1986). Examples of various experiments of the early 1980s are provided by Weatheritt (1986); late 1980s initiatives include the Metropolitan Police 'Plus Programme' and the total geographic policing system of Surrey Police; and among the key strategies of the 1990s is the problem-oriented policing approach imported from the US. Yet Reiner (2000) describes police service efforts in the 1980s and early 1990s to define its role in service terms as having been largely overturned by the Conservative government's reform package of 1993, which 'explicitly sought to prioritize "catching criminals" … as the primary if not sole job of policing' (p.75) – an approach which was sustained in New Labour's Crime Reduction Programme. Thus, as Reiner argues, while chief constables had come to embrace a rhetoric that emphasised the role of the bobby on the beat as the essential bedrock of the force, 'specialist departments have proliferated, and foot patrol has been relatively downgraded … It has been treated as a reserve from which high-flying potential specialists can be drawn, and a Siberia to which failed specialists can be banished' (*ibid.*).

Reassurance policing

The situation changed in the new millennium, with 'reassurance policing' becoming a central feature of British policing policy. The concept of 'reassurance' with reference to patrol work was first introduced by Bahn (1974), who argues that police patrol can help to deliver 'citizen reassurance': 'the feeling of safety and security that a citizen experiences when he sees a police officer or patrol car nearby' (p.340). In his view the need for reassurance underpins citizens' calls for more police, and when they ask for more police they are 'really asking for the police to be on hand more frequently and more conspicuously' (p.341) to help assuage their fears and insecurities about crime.

'Reassurance policing' has only recently come to be anything close to a broad philosophy of policing on the basis of a developing set of principles emerging within the British police service and academic partners including Martin Innes and colleagues at Surrey University (see Innes and Fielding, 2002). The principal policy document introducing the reassurance agenda is the HMIC (2001) report *Open All Hours*, in which reassurance is defined as: 'the extent to which individuals perceive that order and security exist within their local environment' (HMIC, 2001:20) It is argued that the primary cause of the 'reassurance gap' ('the difficulty in reconciling falling crime levels with rising public anxiety about safety') is the level of incivilities within the local environment that counteract the positive message of falling crime figures (p.182). A key solution to the need to promote public confidence in the police, and citizens' sense of reassurance, is seen to be, 'the provision of a police service that is visible and accessible and where officers and support staff delivering the service are familiar to their local communities' (p.16). An 'integrated approach' involving more than simply uniformed foot patrol is advocated.

The National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP) was launched by the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) in March 2004, with funding from the Police Standards Unit, as a means of piloting a number of strategies for delivering reassurance. According to the website for the Programme, reassurance policing is 'targeted' (targeting 'signal' crimes and disorder that 'have a disproportionate impact upon people's experiences and perceptions of security') and 'community-focused' (by listening to and responding to neighbourhood priorities), and promotes 'secure

neighbourhoods' through the presence of 'visible', 'accessible' and familiar police officers (NRPP, 2005). The role of foot patrol within the NRPP is not explicitly defined. 'High visibility patrols' may be a strategy that is adopted as part of a reassurance strategy, yet it is stated on the NRPP website that policing activities are prioritised on the basis of consultation with local communities in response to the issues that make them feel unsafe (*ibid.*).

The Metropolitan Police Safer Neighbourhoods Scheme is one of the NRPP projects. According to the website of the Mayor of London, by spring 2005 256 Safer Neighbourhood teams should have been established across London, consisting of eight teams of six officers per borough (one sergeant, two constables and three community support officers) (LONDON, 2005). The approach that they are adopting is described in Metropolitan Police weekly newspaper *The Job* (19 March 2004):

> Officers will consult with their communities to establish local priorities around crime and disorder, which are having a disproportionate effect on people's quality of life at a local level. The teams will work with partnership agencies to problem-solve in order to deliver long-term solutions, that can have a real impact on the issues that currently raise the fear of crime and feeling of insecurity within communities across London.

It is in relation to this broader set of 'consultation' and 'partnership' objectives, directed at local crime and disorder, that foot patrol sits within the Safer Neighbourhood Scheme.

Connecting the concepts

Foot patrol, as it appears to be conceived by the public, reflects the kind of policing style that is advocated by supporters of community or reassurance policing. Social survey findings suggest that there is public support for a philosophy of policing that reflects elements of both community and reassurance policing, delivered by means of foot patrol. The main difference between these two philosophies, and public expectations of patrol, relates to the centrality of patrol – neither philosophy explicitly situates foot patrol at its centre although foot patrol tactics may be incorporated in

each. Both philosophies espouse community engagement, which may involve active consultation with communities.

Alternative approaches to foot patrol

The remainder of this chapter provides a review of several contexts alternative to British police work in which foot patrol has been a central feature. These encompass the use of patrol auxiliaries in police jurisdictions overseas, the deployment by local authorities of non-police patrollers and the employment or contracting of private security personnel by private clients or corporations.

Two-tier policing in continental Europe

Prior to the British government's conceptualisation and promotion of the 'extended police family', second-tier public policing agents had been employed in other European countries for some years, seemingly with success. Their implementation in Britain – in the form of the PCSO or neighbourhood warden – brings Britain closer into line with policing strategies in the Netherlands and France, both of which have a much higher ratio of police officers to private security officers than the UK (see de Waard, 1999), and which have for many years made use of lower level policing operatives to enhance their patrol and community policing functions.

Experiments with community policing (known as *îlotage*) in the French National Police developed from the 1970s, with 4,360 *îlotiers* reported by the Minister of the Interior to be in operation in 1991. According to Horton (1995), they mainly patrol during the daytime and evening, usually on foot, and are dedicated to specific beats from which they are not supposed to be withdrawn. Much of their work is non-criminal in nature – they deal with complaints of noise and nuisance, disputes between neighbours and parking offences, for example. Auxiliary police officers are often used in this role.

In the Netherlands, two forms of second-tier policing agents are employed to patrol in city centres: the *stadtswachten* (city wardens) and the *politiesurveillanten* (police patrollers). The city wardens are employed by local authorities and hold only the ordinary powers of a Dutch citizen. According to Hofstra and Shapland (1997), they act as 'ambassadors of the city' by providing information on request to members of

the public, as well as enforcing public order through patrol and direct communication with the police, and reporting incidents of crime. The police patrollers form a rank in the Dutch police service below that of the ordinary constable, and are perceived to hold a higher status than the city warden (*ibid.*). The authors report that they are less widespread than the wardens, but hold the same legal powers as a constable, and their main task is to patrol on foot so that in practice they fulfil a similar role to that of the city warden. The Dutch *stadtswachten* have been a particular influence on British public policy – the Social Exclusion Unit (2000) credits the Netherlands with the first-ever warden schemes, first introduced about fifteen years ago and now present in over 150 Dutch municipalities.

Neighbourhood wardens in Britain

A significant aspect of British policing policy that is divorced from the work of the police service, as well as from political rhetoric about policing, has been the active promotion of 'neighbourhood wardens'. Following evaluations of a range of warden schemes under the control of many different agencies (Jacobson and Saville, 1999; Social Exclusion Unit, 2000), the Neighbourhood and Street Wardens Programme (NSWP) was launched in 2000 to allocate funding to pump prime 84 new and existing schemes for neighbourhood and street wardens up to March 2004. Neighbourhood wardens are seen to provide 'a uniformed, semi-official presence in a residential area with the aim of improving quality of life', while street wardens 'provide highly visible uniformed patrols in town and village centres, public areas and neighbourhoods' with 'more of an emphasis on caring for the physical appearance of the area' (Neighbourhood and Street Wardens' Programme, 2004). The two types of warden have now been subsumed under the general title of 'neighbourhood wardens'. They typically fall under direct local authority control – in fact, 83% of the schemes are council-led, 13% are run by housing associations and 4% are controlled by other agencies such as community-based organisations and the police (NRU, 2004).

The government's objectives for neighbourhood wardens are more focused and ambitious than those currently being publicly articulated for neighbourhood policing. The wardens' remit is viewed as being an integral part of broader strategies set out within a National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal, to promote the renewal and revitalisation of poor neighbourhoods, through a combination of efforts to stimulate

the economy, empower the community, improve key public services and promote leadership and joint working (Social Exclusion Unit, 2000). The role for neighbourhood wardens in this strategy is set out in the findings of the Neighbourhood Wardens Evaluation (NRU, 2004): 'Wardens have a unique role to play in neighbourhood renewal. They are a new generation of officials who know the problems, face the people and take the action. Wardens' success lies in their accessibility and ability to link people and agencies together' (p.6). Their foot patrol responsibilities are emphasised – it is explained that, 'Neighbourhood wardens are a neighbourhood level uniformed, semi-official patrolling presence' (p.7) and, in common with objectives for the police, their deployment is described as a strategy to promote 'reassurance' within the community (p.57).

It is argued that patrolling is an easy way of ensuring that the wardens are seen by residents. It is also seen to enable the wardens to carry out a number of other activities, described in the next chapter, and generally 'keep tabs' on housing and the environment (p.39), calling on the support of other agencies where necessary. Their ability to mobilise other agencies is an important aspect of their work, because of the breadth of agencies on which they might call – extending beyond the police to encompass those bodies better positioned to instigate environmental improvements. Clearly integral to the strategy, the terms 'patrol' and patrolling' are mentioned 46 times in the evaluation report, which offers a detailed description of many of the tactical aspects of patrol, summarised in Chapter Three.

Other local authority policing bodies
Neighbourhood wardens are not, however, the only policing bodies working under the remit of local authorities. The corporate membership of the Community and Open Spaces Policing Association (COSPA), established in London in 2003, serves to emphasise the diversity of local authority policing bodies now in operation. The Association employs the term 'extended police family' to encompass the assorted schemes under its umbrella as 'an association for organisations and individuals whose work involves community safety'. These are, specifically, those 'who either carry out a patrolling function or who manage/have responsibility for/employ those with a patrolling function' (COSPA, 2005), and they include a host of bodies with responsibilities for parks or other open spaces as well as those patrolling

neighbourhoods or municipal centres. The Association's aim to give a 'voice' to the diverse range of bodies within this sector emphasises the diversity of objectives reflected in the membership, and reflects how 'pluralising' trends are challenging our assumptions about how policing services should be, and are now being, delivered.

Private security

Four ethnographic studies by researchers in the UK and Canada, detailed in this section, offer an insight into the objectives of foot patrol by private security personnel. Scholarly interest in private security has been stimulated by its advancement into semi-public spaces shared with members of the public, a process that contributed to the emergence of concepts such as the 'pluralisation' of policing and the 'extended police family'.

McManus (1995) carried out case studies of patrol schemes in three residential areas, two of which included foot patrol. He found a common concern about apparent increases in local crime and disorder among the resident subscribers to both schemes, as well as a shared perception that enhanced patrols were needed in response to these problems. Collectives of residents had turned to private security providers – in one case a small company with five mobile dog patrol officers, and in the other a 'one man and his dog' operation. A similar study was carried out by Noaks (2000), based on a single case study of a patrol scheme operating on a housing estate and again funded by the residents. Crime prevention was once again found to be the over-riding motivation of the residents, with 74% seeing the presence on the streets provided by the security officers as the most important aspect of their role. She concluded that other aspects of their work that were valued by respondents included their role in community activities, such as checking on strangers or youths in public places, their on-call service and quick response rates, and their ability to catch offenders.

In the study by Rigakos (2002) of 'Intelligarde', he described the clientele of this contract security company as being made up of large areas of low income housing controlled by various property companies, along with Toronto's harbour and beach areas and ninety car parks. In total their operating territory comprised around two square kilometres of high-rise buildings, walkways and roads, and housed over 30,000 people. The broad objectives of the company were atypical of a private security firm:

as Rigakos reported, the company promoted itself as 'an alternative to complete reliance on the police' (p.71), engaging fully in law enforcement including arrest. Their work included foot and car patrol but as a means towards law enforcement rather than active prevention efforts.

In a previous publication I report the findings from a study of private security personnel in three forms of semi-public space: a shopping mall, a retail and leisure complex and a cultural centre (Wakefield, 2003). In this study I describe security personnel in such settings as being fundamentally linked with the overall design and management, as well as policing, of those settings, supporting the broad commercial objectives of maximising custom and profit. Thus, in two of the settings, an emphasis on 'customer care' extended to the training and uniform style ('blazers and slacks') of the security personnel, whereas the third, more disorderly, site was patrolled by officers in more authoritarian, 'police-style' uniforms who often surveyed the premises from a balcony to emphasise their supervisory presence.

The close association of the security officers with the management of the buildings was also ensured by their continuous presence and ability to communicate readily with other employees to mobilise action: cleaners, maintenance staff and managers, as well as other security personnel or police officers, could be summoned according to the nature of the 'emergency'. This facilitated a very reactive and responsive approach to the management of the commercial environments which rendered these extremely customer-focused and, as the managers would hope, *reassuring* settings in which consumption would be encouraged. Yet this customer focus was not always forthcoming to *all* types of visitor, since in the different research settings there was evidence of marginal groups such as so-called 'known offenders', vagrants or groups of young people being subject to additional controls and often exclusion from the settings, to ensure that the distasteful, annoying or criminal did not disrupt the 'reassuring' environments.

The 'semi-public' and 'public' settings being policed by private security personnel, described in these four studies, are of particular interest because of the scope for exploring the relationship between security patrols and the needs and expectations of those members of the public who inhabit such settings. In contrast with the police,

policing auxiliaries and patrollers employed by local authorities, the priority of private security officers is to serve the client as opposed to the public interest. This has implications for the tactical delivery of foot patrol, discussed in the next chapter.

Discussion

In this chapter it has been argued that public expectations of foot patrol share many similarities with the philosophies espoused by advocates of community policing and reassurance policing. There are commonalities in the broad objectives, interventions being employed and approaches being followed, re-emphasising the point that the public are asking for a certain *style* of policing in their calls for more foot patrol by the police.

The analysis has, however, also highlighted the very different objectives of a number of policing strategies involving foot patrol. The main objective underlying the governmental initiative of 'reassurance policing', involving increased levels of 'visible patrol', is to stem declining public confidence in the police. Yet among the wide-ranging applications of foot patrol explored in this chapter, the investment in neighbourhood wardens as part of the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal stands out as being particularly far-reaching in its objectives, designed to promote the revitalisation of poor neighbourhoods. The purposes of foot patrol by wardens are much more explicitly stated than those for the police service – they are tasked not only with promoting 'reassurance' through a visible presence, but also seen as a means of co-ordinating people and agencies, positioned to mobilise other agencies when they have identified problems themselves, or residents have reported problems to them. Importantly many of these problems are seen as being environmental or housing issues, not just issues of crime and disorder, so that wardens are positioned to initiate action by a much wider range of bodies than simply the police. This approach, if delivered well, places the warden in a similar relationship with the community to that of the shopping mall security officer and his or her client: co-ordinating a whole range of complementary interventions to contribute to the overall management of an area.

CHAPTER 3

Evaluating Foot Patrol

Introduction

The focus of this chapter is the successful delivery of foot patrol in relation to the criteria set out in chapter one. It begins with a discussion of the management and tactics associated with successful initiatives, making reference to the one British policy document (published by the Audit Commission in 1996) that sets out a number of tactical requirements for the activity. An evaluation of 13 initiatives described in a selection of published studies then forms the main body of the chapter, with the findings summarised at the end.

The delivery of foot patrol

A number of studies and reports have identified management and tactical elements of foot patrol seen as being essential to ensure its successful delivery. These two dimensions of foot patrol are discussed in turn.

Important management elements of foot patrol identified by policing scholars include the supervision and integration of foot patrollers, officer selection and training, cultural aspects of the police service, and role identification. With respect to supervision and integration, Rosenbaum and Lurigio (1994) observe that foot patrol initiatives may face organisational problems associated with concerns among senior officers about the perceived risks of devolved decision making, a situation that emphasises the need for backing from command officers (Trojanowicz, 1984). Related to this, Trojanowicz (1984) sees the placement of foot patrollers within the organisation as being a critical success factor in such initiatives, arguing that they need to be supervised and co-ordinated alongside motorised patrollers, and that both should be in close communication.

Selection and training of officers are also identified as important factors by Trojanowicz – he emphasises the need for the 'right' officers, with at least a few years of police experience, to be selected for such roles. In an experiment in Flint, Michigan, Trojanowicz (1986) noted initial training deficiencies with respect to

officers' making of referrals to other social agencies and the development of communication and interpersonal skills, and these had to be addressed to ensure the success of the initiative.

Many scholars have acknowledged the challenges associated with certain common cultural characteristics of the police, and Mastrofski *et al.* (2002) have considered how these might present challenges for the successful implementation of community policing strategies. They draw on five stereotypical officers previously identified by Worden, described as: 'professionals', 'tough cops', 'clean-beat crime fighters', 'problem-solvers' and 'avoiders'. The authors argued that those officers fitting Worden's category of 'professionals' exhibited behaviour most consistent with the leadership ideal of how the police should deal with the public. Since only a proportion of police officers reflected this working style, it was noted that rapid, wholesale changes in all officers' behaviour are not likely to follow a move to community policing models, and that such an obstacle will limit the quality of implementation.

Finally, the need for clear role identification for foot patrollers – an issue that should also be seen as a tactical matter – is emphasised by Trojanowicz (1984), who argues that roles should be articulated in writing and reinforced through such mechanisms as roll call, training and command meetings. They should, he asserts, be sufficiently structured so that officers can be consistent in responding to community needs, yet flexible to the extent that they can respond to the uniqueness of different neighbourhoods. As part of this role specification, Trojanowicz advises that the role should not be based solely on 'soft' or 'service' functions, since officers need to continue in their law enforcement roles to ensure that they are capable of backing up colleagues in emergencies, and avoid misconceptions within their forces that they are not 'real police officers'.

Some of these 'success factors' for community policing in general and foot patrol initiatives in particular are largely specific to police organisations, such as the need to ensure that foot patrollers are well-integrated and co-ordinated with the rest of the police organisation, and to manage the negative effects of the occupational culture. Others, however, have relevance to all service providers, including the need for clear

role identification, effective partnership working, and engagement with the community for the purpose of identifying and resolving community problems (as opposed simply to bolstering public satisfaction rates).

Turning to the tactics of foot patrol, associated with the operating style and required skills for patrol activities, there is a lack of official guidance within the public domain on those tactics that might support governmental and police objectives for achieving 'reassurance policing'. One official report published in 1996 did, however, set out a number of recommended management and tactical elements for patrol work. This Audit Commission management handbook, *Tackling Patrol Effectively* (1996b), sets out five key elements of patrol which are interconnected and determine the nature, style and effectiveness of patrol work. The elements are as follows (those elements seen as reflecting tactical aspects of patrol have been emphasised in bold):

Responding to the public
- Deployment based on consistent application of graded response;
- Non-emergency response planned through help desk;
- **Officers aware of need to shape expectations in dealing with public.**

Planning patrol deployment
- Staffing levels based on assessment of need and agreed standards for patrol;
- **Patrol objectives include proactive work**;
- Flexible shift system based on analysis of demand;
- Monitoring of sickness and other abstractions to achieve target staffing levels;
- Role of supervisors clearly defined;
- Planned deployment of Special Constables to supplement patrol effort.

Solving local problems
- **Officers aware of problem-solving techniques**;
- **Deployment based on analysis of information, including hot spots**;
- **Recognition of role of briefing and debriefing in directing activity**;
- **Regular feedback and evaluation of problem-solving activity**.

Valuing patrol

- Beat manager role used to enhance responsibility and status;
- **Officers trained in beatcraft skills;**
- Accreditation for patrol skills and experience;
- **Patrol officers work closely with CID and other specialists; no rigid demarcation**.

Working with the community

- **Officers given responsibility for geographic beats;**
- **Officers deployed on foot patrol to foster contacts with the community;**
- **Community consulted on standards and targets for patrol;**
- **Officers work with other agencies in effective partnerships**.

The 'tactical' elements in bold associate patrol with *problem-solving*, supported through analysis, co-ordination with other police specialists, skills training, targeted activity and evaluation; and facilitation of *community engagement* through deployment to geographic beats, skills training, developing contacts, community consultation and partnership working. There is an absence of guidance on how to engage with different, including the hard-to-reach, social groups.

The 'tacking on' to patrol of such tasks is quite common in foot patrol initiatives. Rosenbaum and Lurigio (1994) note how, while some are limited to the 'walk and talk' approach and traditional surveillance and arrest functions, in others foot patrollers are asked to assume non-traditional police functions such as attending community meetings, identifying community problems and needs, organising citizen initiatives, resolving neighbourhood disputes and making referrals to appropriate social service agencies. They often have a specific purpose of increasing citizen-police contacts (e.g. through community meetings or door-to-door visits) to improve satisfaction with the police and perceptions of safety, which the authors argue should be seen as a means to solve community problems rather than focusing on community contact for the sake of it. This latter point has salience for 'reassurance policing' initiatives and their emphasis on police visibility, accessibility and familiarity for the purpose of bolstering public satisfaction with the police, as opposed to the identification and resolution of specific problems identified by the community.

On the matters of accessibility and familiarity, the findings from a study by Mackenzie and Whitehouse (1995) are also relevant to reassurance policing objectives. They reported that officers patrolling alone were approached significantly more often than those working in pairs, an observation of which police managers seeking to bolster public perceptions of police accessibility should take notice.

The evaluation

In this section, a number of example foot patrol initiatives are identified and described as a basis for exploring a variety of tactical approaches that have been, and continue to be, employed by policing agencies. It is not claimed that this evaluation of the tactics of patrol is scientific or comprehensive – the aim was to use the available published information simply to describe as far as possible how a selection of strategies appear to correspond with a set of criteria for foot patrol relating to public expectations of the activity. Such an approach offers the scope to situate current 'neighbourhood policing' efforts within a broader tactical context, expand the list of foot patrol tactics provided from the Audit Commission (1996b) report, and identify a number of foot patrol models for the purpose of comparison and evaluation.

The evaluation criteria

It was argued in Chapter One that three discernible and 'reasonable' expectations of foot patrol can be drawn out of the analysis of research findings generated from a range of social surveys. These are:

- Concerning the expected *outcomes* of patrol: to render the policing agency more visible, accessible, familiar and knowledgeable about local people and problems ('reassurance').

- Concerning the expected *interventions* associated with patrol: the need for the 'tacking on' of various activities that can be supplementary to foot patrol, so that it is delivered in a structured way with a range of component tasks in the interests of community engagement. This will be described as 'enhancement' of foot patrol.

- Concerning the expected *approach* to patrol: responsiveness to the contrasting needs of different social groups ('responsiveness').

A further criterion will be added, concerned with:

- The likelihood that the initiative will remain in place in its present form, to enable continuing positive results ('sustainability').

These four criteria are employed as the basis for the evaluation.

The selection criteria

The initiatives selected for the evaluation represent some of the 'classic' policing experiments (such as those by Trojanowicz, 1984, 1986; Pate *et al*, 1986; and Skogan and Hartnett, 1997), as well as most of the relatively few (and largely British) non-police foot patrol initiatives that are detailed in recent criminological literature. Literature on foot patrol by private security personnel is limited and published evaluation studies are therefore scarce, although studies by McManus (1995), Noaks (2000) and Wakefield (2003) offer a level of descriptive detail that is sufficient for their inclusion in the evaluation. Finally, a series of evaluations with which Adam Crawford has been associated (Crawford *et al.*, 2003; Crawford *et al.*, 2004; Crawford *et al.*, 2005), and a national evaluation of neighbourhood warden schemes (NRU, 2004), offer a basis for exploring more recent police and local authority foot patrol initiatives.

The initiatives

The initiatives in the evaluation are set out in Table 3.1, which outlines their delivery mechanisms, describes how they appear to relate to the evaluation criteria, and summarises their general approach.

Table 3.1: The foot patrol initiatives

	Study	Model	Mechanism	Reassurance (visibility, accessibility, familiarity and improved local knowledge)	Enhancement (activities 'tacked on' to patrol)	Responsiveness (to a diverse community)	Sustainability (longevity of the initiative)
1.	Trojanowicz, R. *et al.* (1986) *Evaluating a Neighbourhood Foot Patrol Program: The Flint, Michigan Project*, and Trojanowicz (1990) *The Flint Experience*, USA (police)	**'Community engagement' model**, with a high emphasis placed on community responsiveness both during and prior to the intervention.	Foot patrol officers were deployed to 14 neighbourhoods of Flint (a racially mixed industrial city with high unemployment) following over a year of city wide public meetings to inform the initiative, keep citizens informed and take account of their views. Officers were expected to be familiar with their neighbourhoods, recognise potential problems and make referrals to appropriate social agencies, and act as catalysts for neighbourhood associations, citizen watch groups and other forms of community organisation.	90% of the residents surveyed were aware of the programme, almost half knew the role of the foot patrol officer, 72% had either seen or had personal contact with a police officer, 30% knew of programmes an officer was involved in, and 62% said that foot patrol officers encouraged them to report crime and become involved in crime prevention.	Problem-solving, referrals to other agencies and mobilisation of community organisation were all connected with the patrols. Police officers initiated projects such as recruiting children to paint people's scuffed front doors to improve the environment and encourage further community participation, a curfew incentive programme for children based on setting curfews with parents, and various programmes to provide children with peer support, role modelling or counselling.	The early community meetings and focus on promoting community organisation suggested that the initiative was responsive to the community, although it is not known whether special efforts were made to target minority or hard-to-reach groups.	The authors report year-on-year improvements in public satisfaction with the programme and feelings of safety, and the initiative was expanded to cover the entire City.
2.	Pate *et al.* (1986) *Reducing Fear of Crime in Newark and Houston*, USA (police)	**'Citizen contact' model**, whereby walking the beat is supplemented by recorded visits to residences and businesses en route.	'Citizen contact patrol' was one of several strategies employed in Houston to enable patrol officers to get to know local residents and employees, learn about their perceptions of problems and respond to these. Officers would spend an entire shift in one area, responding to neighbourhood calls for service and making proactive contacts at residences and businesses.	The making of 'proactive contacts' provided opportunities to improve reassurance for those individuals contacted. For participants who reported that an officer had come to their door, evaluations of police service were rated more highly, along with satisfaction with the area and perceptions of crime. The recording and reporting of problems provided a basis for developing local knowledge.	On making the 'proactive contacts', the officers introduced themselves, explained the purpose of the contact, asked if there were any problems to report, and left a business card. Any problems mentioned were recorded and filed at the police station, and officers worked individually to try to solve them. Between Sept. 1983 and June 1984, officers made approx. 500 contacts, representing about 14% of the population in 37% of the occupied housing units.	In the evaluation, black residents and those renting their homes were significantly less likely than whites and home owners to report awareness of the programme – thus the programme was less successful in contacting such persons.	The initiatives were set up specifically for the research. It is not known whether they continued after the conclusion of the research period.
3.	Kenney (1987) *Crime, Fear and the NYC Subways: The Role of Citizen Action*, USA (Guardian Angels)	**'Deterrent' model**, based simply on showing a presence and enforcing the law.	Volunteer patrols of the New York City subway by the Guardian Angels during peak crime hours, for the purpose of deterring crime and making citizens' arrests where serious crimes were observed.	46% of the subway users reported that they usually or sometimes saw the Angels when riding the subways.	The patrols appeared to have the simple function of deterrent patrol and law enforcement when crimes were observed, although the Angels reported numerous cases of engagement in other activities such as finding missing children, helping the elderly and assisting the injured, for example.	There was no in-built community engagement element to the initiative, yet the survey of subway passengers found higher rates of approval among female over male participants (80% and 71% respectively), and black over Hispanic and white participants (77%, 69% and 66% respectively).	The initiative had been in place for over four years prior to Kenney's data collection, and has now developed into a worldwide alliance.

Table 3.1: continued

	Study	Model	Mechanism	Reassurance (visibility, accessibility, familiarity and improved local knowledge)	Enhancement (activities 'tacked on' to patrol)	Responsiveness (to a diverse community)	Sustainability (longevity of the initiative)
4.	Bennett (1991) *The Effectiveness of a Police-Initiated Fear-Reducing Strategy*, UK (police)	**'Citizen contact' model**, whereby walking the beat is supplemented by recorded visits to residences and businesses en route.	Replication of the citizen contact patrols experiment conducted by Pate *et al.* (1986), based in two police force areas with high levels of fear of crime. Each police team consisted of four constables and one sergeant, and to achieve a continuous police presence at least one officer was maintained in each area for two daytime shifts per day.	There was at least one officer in the beat area for an average of 10.6 hours per day in Birmingham and 10.4 hours per day in London. The percentage of residents who 'noticed increased patrol in the last year' rose by 24% in Birmingham and 8% in London. In Birmingham the percentage of participants who knew an officer by name rose from 15% to 50%. In London this grew from 20% to 32%.	In the course of the police-initiated contacts, residents were asked about problems in the area, and the officers completed contact cards.	Officers were instructed to contact one adult representative of each household during the course of the one year experiment period. Contact rates of 88% in Birmingham and 87% in London were achieved.	The initiative was a short-term experiment and it is not known whether it was continued at the end of the research period.
5.	Criminal Justice Commission (1995) *Beat Policing: A Case Study*, Australia (police)	**'Familiarity' model**, with the patrol officer living within the beat area.	Senior constables were assigned to two permanent beats for two years, having been specially selected and trained for the project. Both were housed in their beat, and each house contained a mini police station. They were expected to patrol on foot, and answer calls for service, perform follow-up visits, solve problems and investigate crimes. They determined their own working hours, and other officers covered for them when not working.	Residents' awareness of the project was high (86%) but knowledge of project features (e.g. parameters of beat and location and identity of beat officer) were lower. The residents in the beat areas (as opposed to the comparison areas) were more likely to rate the police positively on working with residents to solve local problems, dealing with problems, preventing crime and maintaining order.	Problem-solving efforts, e.g. targeted patrols in cases where residents reported continuing problems.	As stated, residents in the beat areas were more likely to rate the police positively on working with residents to solve local problems. Residents in the evaluation survey who had contacted the police and been dealt with by a beat officer (as opposed to a general duties officer) were more likely to have been informed about the officer's arrival time, intended action and the outcome of the action.	Although the project involved just two dedicated officers and was therefore dependent on their continuing involvement, the police officers' job satisfaction was found to have improved. It is not known whether the project continued, but the findings suggested that if the right officers were selected for the job, the risks of low sustainability associated with staff turnover might be mitigated.
6.	Skogan and Hartnett (1997) *Community Policing, Chicago Style*, USA (police)	**'Strategic' model (top down**, whereby patrol interventions were directly responsive to formal community consultations, other public agencies and criminal information systems to facilitate a problem solving approach.	In the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS), the assignment of officers to permanent beats, and parallel working of beat teams and rapid response units, was one of several strategies employed in the initiative. Beat teams were dispatched to incidents less frequently and where possible on their own beats, with the aim of keeping them within their beat for 70% of the time. It is not known how far officers were encouraged to patrol on foot as opposed in cars.	The visibility of foot patrols (police officers 'walking or standing on patrol', 'walking on patrol in the nearest shopping area', 'patrolling in the alley …' or '… chatting …') was found to have increased in all of the programme districts. People who observed more police activity were found to be more satisfied with the quality of police service and felt safer. The effect of police visibility was found to be greater for African-Americans and Hispanics.	The typical routine of a police officer is not obvious from the research because the programme has many other facets, and the approach to patrol is not set out in detail. The community policing was seen as being enhanced by a city-wide involvement, permanent beat assignments, investment in training, community involvement, integration with other city services and an emphasis on crime analysis supported by technical systems, so as to facilitate a problem-solving approach.	The programme involved monthly beat meetings in every beat, open to all and attended by the officers covering the beats. District advisory committees were also in place, made up of local 'pillars of the community' who met with local commanders. The evaluation comprised random sampling of residents and re-interviewing at later stages. Men, Hispanics, younger participants, those with less education and renters were less likely to be successfully re-contacted.	The programme remains in place, with annual evaluations being published by the Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority.

Table 3.1: continued

	Study	Model	Mechanism	Reassurance (visibility, accessibility, familiarity and improved local knowledge)	Enhancement (activities 'tacked on' to patrol)	Responsiveness (to a diverse community)	Sustainability (longevity of the initiative)
7.	McManus, M. (1995) *From Fate to Choice: Private Bobbies, Public Beats*, UK (private security)	**'Client-directed' model**, whereby the patrollers' functions were dictated by those who hired them.	Private security patrols of residential areas Moston and Bridton, funded by resident subscribers. McManus's third case study of Becton (mobile) patrol was excluded from the analysis. Moston was policed by Moston Security Services, consisting of five mobile dog patrol officers (carrying out foot and vehicle patrol). Bridton was patrolled by Brian, a sole security officer, between 6pm and 6am daily, either on foot with a dog or in his car.	54% of Moston residents and 40% of Bridton residents had been concerned by the lack of police patrol. 52% of Moston and Bridton residents saw the private patrols as being effective. McManus concluded that 'high profile foot patrols … added to the quality of life of the residents' (p.85). Components of reassurance were not explicitly measured, but residents buying into the scheme were readily able to contact and communicate with the patrol officers.	Particular focus on unoccupied premises – residents informed the patrollers when they were going on holiday and particular attention was paid to security checks on premises. Patrollers also responded to reports of suspicious incidents or people, reports of minor crime and reports of nuisance, so that the patrols had a reactive but also problem-solving approach.	The patrollers' mandate was defined by the clients – those members of the community subscribing to the scheme.	Residents of Moston and Bridton were not only found to be satisfied with the perceived results of the patrol, but also to see it as a status symbol. Some new residents had been attracted to the area by the patrols and talked about its 'snob value'. Patrols were likely to continue due to residents' willingness to finance the initiative.
8.	Noaks, L. (2000) 'Private cops on the block: a review of the role of private security in residential communities' UK (private security)	**'Client-directed' model**, whereby the patrollers' functions were dictated by those who hired them.	Private security patrols of a residential area, funded by resident subscribers. Foot and mobile patrols were carried out between 11pm and 6am, and an on-call service was provided at other times.	92% of subscribers were 'satisfied' or 'very satisfied' with the patrols, with the lack of trouble in the area found to be the most common reason, cited by four-fifths of subscribers. Components of reassurance were not explicitly measured, but residents buying into the scheme were readily able to contact the patrol officers.	It was difficult to assess the typical routine of a security officer since Noaks' focus is on subscriber perceptions of the patrols, yet as noted this included checking on unoccupied premises and following up on reported problems. 11% of survey participants rated highly their role in community activities (e.g. checking on strangers or youths in public places).	The patrollers' mandate was defined by the clients – those members of the community subscribing to the scheme. Noaks reported that the company was run in a 'participatory' style whereby regular newsletters were provided, and officers visited the subscribers weekly to collect payments, when residents were encouraged to report problems and inform the company when they were going away from home.	Residents were found to be very satisfied with the patrols. Patrols were likely to continue due to residents' willingness to finance the initiative, which had been in place for eight years prior to the start of the research.
9.	Wakefield (2003) *Selling Security: The Private Policing of Public Space*, UK (private security)	**'Client-directed' model**, whereby the patrollers' functions were dictated by those who hired them. In this case they were an integral part of the management of the patrol sites.	Security officers were contracted or employed within three semi-public settings: a cultural centre, a shopping mall and a retail and leisure complex. Their broad functions were described by Wakefield as 'housekeeping', 'customer care', 'preventing crime and anti-social behaviour', 'rule enforcement and the use of sanctions', 'responding to emergencies and offences in progress' and 'gathering and sharing information'.	Public perceptions were not measured, although security personnel could be seen as part of broader holistic strategies to maintain pleasant, customer-friendly environments to encourage visitors.	Numerous ancillary tasks were carried out in the course of patrols, based on 'housekeeping' (caretaker function, helping to look after building), 'customer care', crime prevention (e.g. maintaining a visible presence to deter crime, checking premises are locked) and information gathering and sharing (e.g. with the police and other security personnel).	The security personnel fulfilled 'customer care' functions in responding to visitor requests for information and assistance, including giving directions, hearing complaints and supplying wheelchairs. Intended as the first point of contact for visitors, they responded to a range of queries that extended well beyond security matters. They were less responsive, however, to traditional 'police property' groups who were more likely to be perceived as a nuisance.	Sustainable so long as clients funded them – however, the officers were likely to be considered essential to the day-to-day running of the buildings.

Table 3.1: continued

	Study	Model	Mechanism	Reassurance (visibility, accessibility, familiarity and improved local knowledge)	Enhancement (activities 'tacked on' to patrol)	Responsiveness (to a diverse community)	Sustainability (longevity of the initiative)
10.	Crawford, A., Lister, S. and Wall, D. (2003) *Great Expectations: Contracted Community Policing in New Earswick*, UK (police)	**'Familiarity' model**, whereby a dedicated officer who became known to the community was meant to be provided.	Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust (JRHT) purchased an additional level of policing cover (one officer for 24 hours per week) for the village of New Earswick, with the purpose of contributing to a 'visible presence on the streets' to provide 'reassurance and a source of security to the public' (p.vii).	Three different officers filled the designated post and four different police managers oversaw the project, undermining the familiarity of the contracted officer. 40% of the residents questioned had seen the officer in the previous year, 21% had spoken to him in that time, and 6% found the officer to be more accessible, whereas 17% found him to be less so. A similar proportion as prior to the initiative (three-fifths) had had no contact with him.	There was a marked absence of specified aims and objectives and strategies for achieving them – JRHT deferred to the professional expertise of the police, which increased the emphasis on the personality and style of each officer. According to Crawford *et al.*, this led to inconsistencies, as well as giving free rein to the expectations of the residents.	The initiative was a response by JRHT, as the main social landlord of the village, to tenants' expressed concerns about crime, disorder and a perceived reduction in police presence. A Police Consultative Group chaired by a member of the residents' forum was established to inform the project and provide feedback to the community.	The initiative failed to meet its stated aims and was terminated early. Separately, the residents' forum turned to a local security company to provide patrols of the village.
11.	Crawford, A., Blackburn, S., Lister, S. and Shepherd, P. (2004) *Patrolling with a Purpose: An Evaluation of Police Community Support Officers in Leeds and Bradford City Centres*, UK (PCSOs)	**'Strategic' model (bottom up)**, whereby patrol interventions were intended to engage with groups within the community, generate intelligence and report traces of low level disorder to facilitate follow-up action.	Sixty police community support officers (PSCOs) were deployed to Leeds and Bradford city centres, to target street crime in these areas. Their main purpose was to undertake visible patrol, during which they were expected to respond promptly to public requests for assistance and report problems to the police, as well as respond to police requests and help them with inquiries. Officers patrolled in pairs in Leeds but often singly in Bradford during the day-time.	On occasions so many officers had been on patrol that they reported 'falling over each other', and a pub licensee had 'thought there must have been a terrorist alert' (p.14), reflecting the need for balance between high visibility and flooding of an area with police personnel. 61% of members of the public surveyed said that they saw a PCSO at least once a week.	PCSOS were encouraged to talk to shopkeepers and others in their areas, gather community intelligence including monitoring and reporting the 'traces of crime and disorder' such as graffiti, broken glass and abandoned vehicles (p.15), issue fixed penalty notices, give crime prevention advice and distribute leaflets, undertake directed patrols (e.g. in conjunction with truancy officers), help refer people to other council services (e.g. drug rehabilitation).	In a survey of the PCSOs, they identified five different communities in their (city centre) beats, each requiring different relationships: shop workers, office workers, street workers, visitors/shoppers/tourists and street people (homeless people and *Big Issue* sellers). It was not specified how they specifically responded to/engaged with these groups, however. Additional initiatives were described which included working with student populations to give crime prevention advice, and working with truancy officers to help reduce school absenteeism.	The authors recommend that the PCSO role should remain integrated yet distinct within the police organisation, avoiding 'mission creep', and with continuing focus on maintaining visibility levels, clear objectives, and appropriate training in order for the strategy to continue operating successfully.

	Study	Model	Mechanism	Reassurance (visibility, accessibility, familiarity and improved local knowledge)	Enhancement (activities 'tacked on' to patrol)	Responsiveness (to a diverse community)	Sustainability (longevity of the initiative)
12.	Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) (2004) *Research Report 8: Neighbourhood Wardens Scheme Evaluation*, UK (neighbourhood wardens)	**'Strategic' model (bottom up)**, whereby patrol interventions were intended to engage with target groups within the community, sometimes through community projects, and take a problem-solving approach, as part of a neighbourhood renewal agenda.	According to this national evaluation based on an overall assessment of the 84 schemes in England and Wales, meso level evaluation of 15 schemes and case studies of 8 schemes, the purpose of wardens (in general) is the provide a 'neighbourhood level uniformed, semi-official patrolling presence' (p.7) predominantly in deprived urban areas which are subject to other neighbourhood renewal initiatives (allowing for collaborative and complementary efforts). Schemes are seen to vary in their focus, objectives and organisation, yet most are concerned with the reduction of crime, fear of crime and anti-social behaviour and environmental improvements as core objectives. The majority of schemes are located in areas that are subject to other neighbourhood renewal initiatives.	The case studies revealed different approaches to promoting reassurance factors, many of which generated good levels of visibility amongst the residents, while others failed to do so. The evaluation advocated basing visibility objectives around patrolling, the employment of complementary, targeted strategies to enhance patrol, and targeted and flexible approaches enabling a focus on the more fearful such as young people and the elderly. It also noted the success of schemes with neighbourhood bases and/or allocation of wardens to specific areas.	In the schemes that were seen as being more successful in promoting visibility, wardens worked on a range of activities and initiatives within the area in the course of their patrols. These included targeting particular groups within the community, and carrying out high profile projects that involved a breadth of residents (such as the walking bus initiative in Knowsley to escort children to school).	The case study evidence was seen to show that those schemes with active resident representation and involvement met the needs of the community most effectively. Approaches included resident representation on steering groups, involvement in recruitment and evaluation, and informal contact with residents during patrols or meetings.	This was likely to vary in relation to the success of the scheme. Key factors included quality of management, staff turnover and/or sickness rates (likely to be associated with management and reward factors), and the quality of partnership working.
13.	Crawford, A., Blackburn, S. and Shepherd, P. (2005) *Filling the Void, Connecting the Pieces: An Evaluation of Neighbourhood and Street Wardens in Leeds*, UK (wardens)	**'Strategic' model (bottom up)**, whereby patrol interventions were intended to engage with target groups within the community, sometimes through community projects, and take a problem-solving approach, as part of a neighbourhood renewal agenda.	Across five research sites (one city centre with street wardens and four residential districts with neighbourhood wardens), the range of activities consisted of visible patrols to promote reassurance and promote quality-of-life in their beat areas, closely connected with the government's neighbourhood renewal agenda.	Residents' awareness of wardens varied across the five areas, ranging from 22% to 86% in the residential areas, and 84% in the city centre. Those who had seen a warden at least once a fortnight ranged from 5% to 53%. In one area, 37% knew a warden by name. The wardens also scored well on perceptions of their local knowledge and approachability.	Other activities carried out in the course of wardens' daily routines across the five areas were reported to include crime prevention/problem-solving efforts (e.g. truancy patrols, door-to-door property marking, noting and reporting environmental problems (e.g. fly-tipping and discarded needles) for resolution, befriending and assisting vulnerable people, involvement in local youth projects, communicating with different sections of the community and encouraging cohesion, gathering community intelligence to refer to other agencies, and directing people to other council services.	Neighbourhood wardens in particular were in contact with vulnerable people (e.g. the disabled, mentally ill, rough sleepers and drug users) to give support and informal counselling; became involved in youth projects; and helped to bridge gaps between different community groups through familiarity with those various groups.	Warden schemes are closely associated with the government's neighbourhood renewal agenda and have been supported through start-up government funding since 2000, suggesting commitment to the role.

The analysis

A variety of approaches to foot patrol were evident across the thirteen initiatives, and the four evaluation categories of 'responsiveness', 'enhancement', 'reassurance' and 'sustainability' provided a framework for drawing out their key differences and similarities. The first column of Table 3.1 sets out their different contexts and broad approaches, while the second identifies a number of foot patrol models based on the main characteristics of the patrol interventions suggested by the thirteen research studies. These are as follows:

- *Community engagement* model (initiative 1), involving a high emphasis on community responsiveness both during and prior to the intervention.
- *Citizen contact* model (initiatives 2 and 4), whereby walking the beat is supplemented by recorded visits to residences and businesses en route.
- *Deterrent* model (initiative 3), based simply on showing a presence and enforcing the law.
- *Familiarity* model (initiatives 5 and 10), involving foot patrol and other duties by patrol officers dedicated permanently to the beat area.
- *Strategic* model (initiatives 6, 11, 12 and 13), in which patrol interventions were closely integrated with broader policing arrangements and external agencies, either through a highly directed 'top down' approach, or a 'bottom up' method in which patrollers engaged in problem-solving and instigated follow-up interventions.
- *Client-directed* model (initiatives 7, 8 and 9), whereby the patrollers' functions were dictated by those who hired them.

The models reflect the primary characteristics of the patrol initiatives in relation to the descriptions provided in the selected studies, and it is recognised that in many cases there is overlap between them in the tactics and objectives. The following analysis does not identify certain models as being more or less successful than others, but considers the four evaluation criteria in turn, identifying those initiatives that appeared to meet these most successfully.

One of the defining characteristics of the various initiatives was the extent to which the police officers, PCSOs, wardens or security officers were assigned to dedicated geographical areas. The *deterrent* approach of the Guardian Angels (initiative 3) did not appear to be based on

dedicated beats for the volunteers who patrolled the New York subway system during peak crime hours. By contrast, the Houston police *citizen contact* patrols (initiative 2) involved officers being assigned to a specific area for their entire shift; the *familiarity* patrols in Australia (initiative 5) were performed by officers who were not only assigned permanently to their beat areas but were also allocated housing in those areas; and more typically (in all of the remaining initiatives) foot patrollers received permanent beat assignments without being required to live in the areas. It appeared that in all cases the foot patrollers were also involved in responding to calls for service, but typically this was mainly in their beat areas. Officers' diversion from foot patrol in attending to calls for service should not necessarily be seen as problematic, as Trojanowicz (1984) advises, due to the need for officers to maintain their law enforcement skills in order to support colleagues and avoid the development of barriers between those in 'reactive' and those in 'service' functions. Yet an emphasis on aiming to keep officers in their beat areas for most of the time, as in the *strategic* approach of the CAPS (initiative 6) could help to avoid an over-reliance on using 'community' officers for emergency response functions which would undermine their broader objectives.

The ability of the thirteen initiatives to meet the public's 'reassurance' expectations was typically measured through surveys of residents, most frequently focusing on the visibility factor. All of the strategies appeared to be successful in increasing the visibility of the policing agents, although the initiatives involving the more 'enhanced' forms of patrol (identified below) seemed to offer the most scope for success in promoting visibility, accessibility, familiarity and improved local knowledge. The variety of initiatives demonstrated the many ways in which patrols might be 'enhanced', by 'tacking on' any of a number of activities to foot patrol, and making the most of officers' ready presence within neighbourhoods. Many of these supported the broad tactical objectives of community engagement and problem-solving, reflected within the Audit Commission (1996b) guidance. They included the following activities:

- Initiation of community projects, including recruiting children to paint scuffed front doors (initiative 1), a curfew initiative for children supported by parents (1), youth projects to enhance social capital (1, 13), and escorting of children to school (12);
- Door-to-door visits (the 'proactive contacts described above – 2, 4 and 8);
- Assisting the vulnerable, including missing children, the elderly or infirm (3, 13);

- Referrals to other social agencies (e.g. of drug addicts) (11, 13);

- Targeted patrols in response to reported problems (5, 13);

- Security checks of unoccupied premises (7, 8, 9);

- Integration with broader policy frameworks to facilitate a community-oriented, problem-solving approach (6);

- Environmental monitoring and reporting of problems (9, 11, 12, 13);

- Delivery of crime prevention advice in person or via leafleting (11, 13);

- Reporting of problems/sharing of intelligence within the policing organisation or in partnership with other agencies (all initiatives);

- Responding to calls for service (all initiatives).

This range of activities demonstrates the many ways that visible foot patrols can be enhanced to facilitate proactive community engagement and problem solving. Those strategies which appeared to focus most on providing visibility (the *familiarity* model of initiative 10), deterrence (the *deterrence* model of initiative 3) or security (the *client-directed* model of initiatives 7 and 8), with very few additional activities 'tacked on', were potentially missing out on important opportunities to address these broader tactical objectives. By contrast, those involving the highest degrees of 'enhancement' through the 'tacking on' of numerous activities additional to patrol were the *community engagement* interventions undertaken by the police in Flint, Michigan (1), and the 'bottom up' *strategic* patrols by the PCSOs (11) and neighbourhood wardens (initiatives 12 and 13). These schemes involved the patrollers in a constructive range of activities to engage them with the community and promote problem-solving, so that visible patrol became a means of delivering a host of services to provide a sense of structure to the officers' work, yet also afforded them considerable flexibility and scope to use their initiative. Where such schemes were successful – and it is acknowledged in the Neighbourhood Warden Scheme Evaluation (NRU, 2004) that not all the schemes in the national programme were so – they seemed to offer numerous benefits to the residential communities as well as varied and interesting roles for the officers. It is worthy of note that three different forms of service provider were involved in such similar initiatives, seemingly with success, raising the question as to whether it really matters which agency provides the service.

The purpose of permanent beat assignments was to enable officers to get to know their beat neighbourhoods well, responding to the expectations of 'responsiveness' to the diverse communities within the beat areas. The range of methods to facilitate this included:

- community meetings prior to the project launch in order to gauge expectations in advance (1);
- efforts to mobilise community organisation in various ways (1 and 13);
- proactive contacts of residents and/or business employees (2, 4 and 8);
- regular beat meetings as in the CAPS initiative (6);
- the establishment of resident/community advisory committees (6, 10 and 12);
- ongoing resident evaluation to inform the initiative (6 and 12);
- resident involvement in the recruitment of wardens (12), and
- contact with residents in the course of patrols (all initiatives).

The extent of community consultation in the thirteen initiatives varied considerably: there was no evidence that consultation played a part in the *deterrent* approach of the Guardian Angels (initiative 3) or the *client-directed* approach of the private security personnel in the three semi-public settings (initiative 9). At the other end of the scale, the *community engagement* approach used in Flint, Michigan (initiative 1) appeared to have been steered by the outcomes of the extensive consultation efforts associated with the programme. The remaining ten initiatives fell between these two extremes in terms of the level of community consultation that was involved.

Across the range of initiatives, engagement with communities took a wide variety of forms, through such methods as community meetings, committees and 'proactive contacts' such as door-to-door visits. As already argued, however, any or all of these measures cannot be seen as the solution to successful community engagement – patrollers should continually be seeking new ways of engaging members of communities including hard-to-reach groups such as the young. As reported in Chapter One, FitzGerald *et al.*'s (2002) survey participants felt that the police should get to know people in contexts different from the usual frame of (often confrontational) encounters, and that in doing so they could learn about, and respond to, such

concerns as the schoolboy's desire to see police officers patrolling close to the schools at the end of the school day. It should be added that consultation will be largely meaningless if public suggestions are not explored and feedback is not provided, and the extent to which patrollers actively responded to public comments and provided feedback in the thirteen initiatives cannot adequately be discerned.

Although it was not possible to provide a true assessment of the sustainability of the various projects, some sustainability factors were evident. It was clear that some of the initiatives were already well-established at the time of the research, whereas others were designed as short-term experiments, and this was certain to affect their longevity. The larger scale projects (the *community engagement* approach of initiative 1, the Flint, Michigan project, and the 'top down' *strategic* approach of initiative 6, the CAPS project) were substantial and well-resourced programmes which were able to demonstrate success and gain political support. In the case of the *client-directed* private security patrols of residential areas (initiatives 7 and 8), the patrols appeared to be meeting the fairly modest customer expectations and thus were likely to continue to receive funding. Yet the importance of some of the management factors highlighted in the first section of the chapter was also evident in the initiative descriptions – particularly measures to promote the job satisfaction of the patrollers being assigned to specific beats, through careful selection and ongoing support (e.g. training), and thus minimising the staff turnover problems that undermined the *familiarity* approach of initiative 10 and some of the schemes included among the 'bottom up' *strategic* interventions by neighbourhood wardens (initiative 12).

Discussion

The analysis revealed marked differences in the approaches to foot patrol, which ranged from the limited emphases on deterrence, security or visibility of initiatives 3, 7, 8 and 10, to strategies involving high levels of proactive engagement with communities and problem-solving efforts oriented towards general environmental improvement as much as crime prevention (employed by police officers, PCSOs and neighbourhood wardens in initiatives 1, 11, 12 and 13).

The evaluation criteria related respectively to the expected outcomes, interventions and approaches associated with foot patrol. With respect to the outcome of reassurance (measured in relation to the visibility, accessibility, familiarity and local knowledge of the patrollers), many strategies appeared to be successful in increasing policing operatives' visibility, and the other reassurance factors seemed to be met most readily when the officers regularly undertook additional interventions in the course of patrol work. The recommendation by Mackenzie and Whitehouse (1995) that officers patrolling singly are regarded by the public as more approachable than those in pairs should also be observed, particularly by patrol managers seeking to enhance patrollers' accessibility and familiarity.

The thirteen initiatives revealed a long list of interventions associated with foot patrol: additional activities that were undertaken in the course of patrols. These 'enhancements' of foot patrol demonstrate that the approach can provide a basis for highly interventionist community work and therefore be ambitious in its objectives – as demonstrated, for example, in the neighbourhood warden initiatives associated with neighbourhood renewal. The list could be seen as a helpful checklist for patrol managers and patrollers themselves to assist in the setting of patrol objectives.

The approaches to foot patrol were, in general, highly consultative. Again, the list of approaches could be helpful to patrol managers in suggesting a range of consultation options, although it is suggested that the development of innovative new ways of engaging hard-to-reach groups should still be encouraged. Taking note of the recommendation by Rosenbaum and Lurigio (1994) that community engagement should be seen as a means to solve community problems rather than focusing on community contact for the sake of it (a criticism that might be levelled at the 'reassurance agenda'), it is important that opinions and information generated through consultation should lead to follow-up action and feedback.

The focus on sustainability enabled some consideration of the management factors underlying foot patrol, which could help to ensure the longevity of initiatives or conversely undermine a well-intentioned strategy. It enabled the patrollers' own innovations to be put into practice, emphasising the need for strategies to engage their continuing interest in, and ownership of, the work in order to minimise staff turnover and maintain familiarity with

communities. None of the initiatives explored in this chapter fell under the National Reassurance Policing Programme, but such conclusions could be transferable to the new 'neighbourhood policing teams', offering the scope to bestow strategic management responsibilities on police constables in relation to their neighbourhood beats and the deployment of PCSOs, to add interest and substance to their role.

It appeared that the *community engagement* approach to foot patrol by police in Flint, Michigan (initiative one), and the 'bottom up' *strategic* approach of the PCSOs (initiative 11) and the neighbourhood wardens (initiatives 12 and 13) were most successful in responding to the four criteria, because they involved the patrollers in a constructive range of activities to engage them with the community and promote problem-solving. The fact that this broad approach was followed by three types of service provider demonstrates its flexibility as a patrol model, and suggests that the type of agency fulfilling the role may not be the most important consideration in addressing public demand for the style of policing that foot patrol is widely seen to embody – non-police operatives may fulfil certain local policing demands just as well as police officers..

The main limitation of these conclusions is the fact that this evaluation was carried out retrospectively in relation to initiatives that were not designed directly to meet the evaluation criteria. To take account of this, as well as developments in British policing policy, there is a case for empirical research into the work of neighbourhood policing teams using case study methods. An ethnographic study of neighbourhood policing teams and the communities in which they are based could offer an insight into the developing strategies for reassurance policing and communities' responses to these approaches, providing qualitative detail on developing relationships between the police service and the community.

DISCUSSION

This final chapter provides a review of the main findings and arguments emerging from the report. These relate to the measurement of public expectations, approaches to foot patrol which respond to these expectations, and alternative ways of addressing public expectations.

Measuring public expectations

Social survey findings provide a flawed basis for evaluating public expectations of foot patrol for a number of reasons. These relate to the political and media influences on the social attitudes being measured, the level of knowledge about policing by survey participants who are asked important and complex policy questions, the typically unrealistic expectations of the police held by the public (Page *et al.*, 2004), poor approaches to survey questioning, and the failure to discern differences of view between participants in different areas, and from different backgrounds, age groups and ethnic groups.

It is recommended that future social surveys concerned with foot patrol should employ more sophisticated questioning techniques that compel participants to make active choices between different police interventions, and make use of more open-ended questions to generate qualitative detail about their thinking processes and justifications. The differing perceptions between social groups should also be teased out, and Bradley's (1998) use of focus groups each with a different democratic profile offers one approach to discerning such differences of view.

Approaching foot patrol

In spite of their limitations, the social surveys reviewed in this study remain a primary source of information about the expectations of foot patrol by the British public. It was argued that three 'reasonable' types of public expectation can be discerned from this body of literature. The first expectation, associated with foot patrol *outcomes*, is that foot patrol should be delivered in a way that renders the policing agency more visible, accessible, familiar and knowledgeable about local people and problems. The second, concerned with foot patrol *interventions*, is that supplementary tasks that can be undertaken in the course of foot patrol should be 'tacked on' to the activity to provide structure and purpose, and allow more far-

reaching objectives than reassurance – such as neighbourhood regeneration, as in the case of the Neighbourhood and Street Wardens Programme (NRU, 2004) – to be pursued. The third expectation, relating to foot patrol *approaches*, is that such initiatives should be responsive to the contrasting needs of different social groups regarding the level and style of policing, requiring active engagement with the community and its many component groups. In sum, the public are not simply asking for more foot patrol, but asking for a *style* of policing associated with the imagery identified at the beginning of the report, reflecting elements of community policing and reassurance policing philosophies, and friendly, familiar and consensual in character.

The three types of expectation were translated into the evaluation concepts of 'reassurance' (as an outcome), 'enhancement' of foot patrol (relating to additional interventions) and 'responsiveness' as an approach. A fourth criterion was also incorporated, concerned with the initiatives' 'sustainability'.

The outcome of 'reassurance' was measured with respect to the visibility, accessibility, familiarity and local knowledge of the patrollers. Many strategies appeared to be successful in increasing policing operatives' visibility, and the other reassurance factors seemed to be met most readily when the officers undertook additional interventions ('enhancement') in the course of patrol work. The thirteen initiatives enabled the generation of a long list of activities that could be undertaken in the course of patrols. This demonstrates that foot patrol can provide a basis for proactive community work, and potentially offers a helpful checklist for patrol managers and patrollers themselves to assist in the setting of patrol objectives.

The approaches to foot patrol were, in general, 'responsive' to the community in a variety of ways, and again a list was generated that could be beneficial to patrol managers in suggesting a range of consultation options that could actively address community problems rather than focusing on community contact for the sake of it. This, however, should not preclude the development of innovative new strategies, particularly with respect to the engagement of hard-to-reach groups.

The focus on sustainability enabled some consideration of the management factors associated with successful foot patrol initiatives set out at the beginning of Chapter Three, such as the need for strategies to engage officers' continuing interest in, and ownership of, the work in order to minimise staff turnover and maintain familiarity with communities. Such conclusions could be transferable to the new 'neighbourhood policing teams', offering the scope to bestow strategic management responsibilities on police constables in relation to their neighbourhood beats and the deployment of PCSOs, to add interest and substance to their role.

Six foot patrol models were identified in the analysis of the thirteen initiatives. The *community engagement* approach to foot patrol used in Flint, Michigan (initiative 1), and the 'bottom up' *strategic* approach of the PCSOs (initiative 11) and the neighbourhood wardens (initiatives 12 and 13) appeared to meet the four criteria most successfully, because they involved the patrollers in a constructive range of activities to engage them with the community and promote problem solving. The fact that these interventions were employed by three types of service provider demonstrates that the type of agency fulfilling the role may not be the most important consideration in addressing public demand for foot patrol.

The evaluation methodology has important limitations, however, particularly the fact that the evaluation was carried out retrospectively in relation to initiatives that were not designed directly to meet the evaluation criteria. To respond to these limitations, as well as to new developments in British policing policy, there is a case for new empirical research to be carried out into the work of neighbourhood policing teams using case study methods. One approach would be an ethnographic study of neighbourhood policing teams and the communities in which they are based, providing an insight into the developing strategies for reassurance policing and communities' responses to these approaches.

Alternatives to foot patrol

A final question that remains unanswered is whether the key public expectations identified in this report, and the government's aim to increase public confidence in the police, could be responded to by alternative means. It is the government's view that foot patrol can provide the answer to public needs for reassurance, but there are undoubtedly alternative

interventions that could be employed. Many of the community consultation and engagement activities advocated in this report do not have to be carried out as part of foot patrol strategies – alternative approaches by policing and other agencies should be explored. The advantage of the association of these consultation efforts with foot patrol is that officers are potentially on hand to discuss and respond to local problems as they are identified although, as the example of the Japanese *koban* system suggests, such accessibility can equally be approached through means to widen the provision of static policing services.

Potential deficiencies in the training of policing agents were identified in Bradley's (1998) survey, which revealed alarmingly negative perceptions of the police among Afro-Caribbean and Pakistani participants in particular. The selection and training of policing agents for reactive as well as community roles should be seen as being important areas for attention, since by improving the quality of contact between policing agents and members of the public there is scope for public perceptions to be positively challenged.

Policing agencies may also find benefits in reassessing their marketing strategies as a way of reminding the public what they are doing. HMIC (2001) recognised the symbolic value of such icons of policing's 'golden age' as the blue lamp and PC George Dixon as a basis for marketing activities, yet there is considerable scope for creative approaches to marketing that respond to the public's 'reassurance' needs – which might include community feedback mechanisms such as local newsletters.

In short, public expectations of policing can – and should – be addressed in a number of ways, and foot patrol offers just one of several means of doing this.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Association of Police Authorities (2001) *Consulting Communities: A Review of Recent Police Authority Good Practice*, London: Association of Police Authorities.

Audit Commission (1996a) *Streetwise: Effective Police Patrol*, London: Audit Commission for Local Authorities and the National Health Service in England and Wales.

Audit Commission (1996b) *Tackling Patrol Effectively: Management Handbook*, London: Audit Commission for Local Authorities and the National Health Service in England and Wales.

Bahn, C. (1974) 'The reassurance factor in police patrol', *Criminology*, 12:3.

Bland, N. (1997) *Measuring Public Expectations of Policing: An Evaluation of Gap Analysis,* Police Research Series Paper 24, London: Home Office.

Bradley, R. (1998) *Public Expectations and Perceptions of Policing*, Home Office Research Paper 96, London: Home Office.

Bright, J.A. (1970) *Beat Patrol Experiment*, London: Home Office, Police Research and Development Branch.

Brown, J. and G. Howes (eds.) (1975) *The Police and the Community*, Farnborough: Saxon House.

Clancy, A., Hough, M., Aust, R. and Kershaw, C. (2001) *Crime, Policing and Justice: The Experience of Ethnic Minorities – Findings from the 2000 British Crime Survey*, Home Office Research Study 223, London: Home Office.

Consumers' Association (1996) *Policy Report: Police and the Public*, London: Consumers' Association.

COSPA (2005) Community and Open Spaces Policing Association (COSPA), London: COSPA, http://www.cospa.co.uk/index.html (accessed 16 March 2005).

Crawford, A., Blackburn, S. and Shepherd, P. (2005) *Filling the Void, Connecting the Pieces: An Evaluation of Neighbourhood and Street Wardens in Leeds*, Leeds: Centre for Criminal Justice Studies, University of Leeds.

Crawford, A., Blackburn, S., Lister, S. and Shepherd, P. (2004) *Patrolling with a Purpose: An Evaluation of Police Community Support Officers in Leeds and Bradford City Centres*, Leeds: Centre for Criminal Justice Studies, University of Leeds.

Crawford, A., Lister, S. and Wall, D. (2003) *Great Expectations: Contracted Community Policing in New Earswick*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Crawford, A., Lister, S., Blackburn, S. and Burnett, J. (2005) *Plural Policing: The Mixed Economy of Visible Patrols in England and Wales*, Bristol: Policy Press.

Criminal Justice Commission (1995) *Beat Policing: A Case Study*, CJC Criminal Justice Research Paper Series 2:1, Brisbane: Criminal Justice Commission of Queensland.

de Waard, J. (1999) 'The private security industry in international perspective', *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, 7:2.

Dodd, T., Nicholas, S., Povey, D. and Walker, A. (2004) *Crime in England and Wales 2003/2004*, Home Office Statistical Bulletin 10/04, London: Home Office.

Elliot. R. and Nicholls, J. (1996) *It's Good to Talk: Lessons in Public Consultation and Feedback*, Police Research Series Paper 22, London: Home Office.

FitzGerald, M., Hough, M., Joseph, I. and Qureshi, T. (2002) *Policing for London*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing.

Genn, H. (1988) 'Multiple victimization' in M. Maguire and J. Pointing (eds.) *Victims of Crime: A New Deal?* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

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

Hofstra, B. and Shapland, J. (1997) 'Who is in control?' *Policing and Society*, 6: 4.

Home Office (2001) *Policing a New Century: A Blueprint for Reform*, London: HMSO.

Home Office (2002) *Policing Bureaucracy Taskforce: Change Proposals to Increase the Presence of Police in Communities*, London: Home Office.

Home Office (2005a) *Citizen-Focused Policing*, London: Home Office,

Home Office (2005b) *Neighbourhood Policing: Your Police; Your Community; Our Commitment*, London: Home Office.

Horton, C. (1995) *Policing Policy in France*, London: Policy Studies Institute.

Innes, M. (2004) 'Crime as a signal, crime as a memory', *Journal for Crime, Conflict and the Media*, 1:2.

Innes, M. and N. Fielding (2002) 'From community to communicative policing: "signal crimes" and the problem of public reassurance', *Sociological Research Online*, 7:2.

Jacobson, J. and Saville, E. (1999) *Neighbourhood Warden Schemes: An Overview*, Crime Reduction Research Series Paper 2, London: Policing and Reducing Crime Unit, Home Office.

Joint Consultative Committee (1990) *Operational Policing Review*, Surbiton: Surrey.

Jones, T. and Newburn, T. (2001) *Widening Access: Improving Police Relations with Hard to Reach Groups*, Police Research Series Paper 138, London: Home Office.

Kenney, D. (1987) *Crime, Fear, and the New York City Subway*. New York: Praeger.

Loader, I. and Mulcahy, A. (2003) *Policing and the Condition of England: Memory, Politics and Culture*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LONDON (2005) 'Safer neighbourhoods', LONDON (website of the Mayor of London), London: Greater London Authority, http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/crime/safer_neighbourhoods.jsp (accessed 23 March).

Mackenzie, I. and Whitehouse, R. (1995) 'The approachability of police officers patrolling on foot: a pilot study', *Policing and Society*, 5:4.

Mastrofski. S.D., Willis, J.J. and Snipes, J.B. (2002) 'Styles of patrol in a community policing context' in M. Morash and J.K. Ford (eds.) *The Move to Community Policing: Making Change Happen*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Matthews, R. and Young, J. (eds.) (1986) *Confronting Crime*, London: Sage.

McLaughlin, E. (2005) 'From reel to ideal: 'The Blue Lamp' and the popular cultural construction of the English 'bobby', *Crime, Media, Culture*, 1:1.

McLaughlin, E. and Murji, K. (1998) 'Resistance through representation: "storylines", advertising and the Police Federation campaign against Sheehy' *Policing and Society* 8:4.

McManus, M. (1995) *From Fate to Choice: Private Bobbies, Public Beats*, Aldershot: Avebury.

Metropolitan Police (2001) 'The Met get thumbs up from 32 London boroughs', London: Metropolitan Police, http://www.met.police.uk/public_attitudes/survey2001/index.htm (accessed 16 March 2005).

Morgan, R. and Newburn, T. (1997) *The Future of Policing*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MORI (2005) *Annual London Survey 2004: Final Topline 11th January 2005*, London: London.gov.uk,

   http://www.london.gov.uk/mayor/annual_survey/docs/als05_topline.pdf   (accessed 23 March).

National Reassurance Policing Programme (NRPP) (2005) *The National Reassurance Policing Programme*, London: Home Office, http://www.reassurancepolicing.co.uk (accessed 16 March 2005).

Neighbourhood and Street Wardens' Programme (2004) *Neighbourhood and Street Wardens' Programme General Information Leaflet*, London: Home Office, http://www.crimereduction.gov.uk/wardens2.htm (accessed 16 March 2005).

Neighbourhood Renewal Unit (NRU) (2004) *Research Report 8: Neighbourhood Wardens Scheme Evaluation*, London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Nicholas, S. and Walker, A. (eds.) (2004) *Crime in England and Wales 2002/2003: Supplementary Volume 2. Crime, Disorder and the Criminal Justice 02/04 System – Public Attitudes and Perceptions*, London: Home Office.

Noaks, L. (2000) 'Private cops on the block: a review of the role of private security in residential communities', *Policing and Society*, 10: 2.

Page, B., Wake, R and Ames, A. (2004) *Public Confidence in the Criminal Justice System*, Findings 221, London: Home Office.

Pate, A. M., Wycoff, M. A., Skogan, W. G. and Sherman, L. W. (1986) *Reducing Fear of Crime in Houston and Newark: A Summary Report*, Washington D.C: Police Foundation.

Pate, A.M. (1986) 'Experimenting with foot patrol: the Newark experience' in D. Rosenbaum (ed.) *Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work?* London: Sage.

Reiner, R. (2000) *The Politics of the Police* (3rd edn.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rigakos, G. (2002) *The New Parapolice: Risk Markets and Commodified Social Control,* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Rosenbaum, D.P and Lurigio, A.J. (1994) 'An inside look at community policing reform: definitions, organizational changes, and evaluation findings', *Crime and Delinquency*, 40:3.

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

Schnelle, J.F., Kirchner, R.E., McNees, M.P. and Lawlor, J.M. (1975) 'Social evaluation research: the evaluations of two police patrolling strategies', *Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis*, 8:4.

Shapland, J. and Vagg, J. (1987) 'Using the police', *British Journal of Criminology*, 27:1.

Skogan, W. G. and Hartnett, S. M. (1997) *Community Policing, Chicago Style*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Skogan, W.G. (1996) 'Public opinion and the police' in W. Saulsbury, J. Mott and T. Newburn (eds.) *Themes in Contemporary Policing*, London: Police Foundation.

Smith, D.J. and Gray, J. (1985) *Police and People in London: The PSI Report*, Aldershot: Gower.

Social Exclusion Unit (2000) *National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal: A Framework for Consultation*, London: Cabinet Office.

Stanko, E. (1988) 'Hidden violence against women' in M. Maguire and J. Pointing (eds.) *Victims of Crime: A New Deal?* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Trojanowicz, R. (1984) 'Foot patrol: some problem areas' *Police Chief*, 51:6.

Trojanowicz, R. (1986) 'Evaluating a neighbourhood foot patrol programme', in D. Rosenbaum (ed.) *Community Crime Prevention: Does it Work?* London: Sage.

Trojanowicz, R. and Bucqueroux, B. (1990) *Community Policing: A Contemporary Perspective*, Cincinnati: Anderson Publishing Company.

Waddington, P. A. J. (1999) *Policing Citizens*, London: UCL.

Wakefield, A. (2003) Selling Security: *The Private Policing of Public Space*, Cullompton, Devon: Willan Publishing.

Weatheritt, M. (1983) 'Community policing: does it work and how do we know? A review of research' in T. Bennett (ed.) *The Future of Policing*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge Institute of Criminology.

Weatheritt, M. (1986) *Innovations in Policing*, London: Croom Helm.

Weatheritt, M. (1988) 'Community policing: rhetoric or reality?' in J.R. Greene and S. Mastrofski (eds.) *Community Policing: Rhetoric or Reality?* New York: Praeger.

Williams, L. (2001) *Consulting Communities: A Review of Recent Police Authority Good Practice*, London: Association of Police Authorities.

Wilson, J. Q. and G. Kelling (1982) 'Broken windows', *The Atlantic Monthly*, March.