Policing and Crime Reduction

The evidence and its implications for practice

Police Effectiveness in a Changing World Project

Dr Jacqui Karn

Policing and Crime Reduction

The evidence and its implications for practice

Dr Jacqui Karn, Senior Research and Development Officer,
The Police Foundation

June 2013

About the Police Foundation

The Police Foundation is an independent think tank focused on developing knowledge and understanding of policing and challenging the police service and the government to improve policing for the benefit of the public. The Police Foundation acts as a bridge between the public, the police and the government, while being owned by none of them.

Contents

Executive summary

Introduction

The 'Police Effectiveness in a Changing World' project was initiated at a time of rapid, fundamental changes both within the police service and beyond. New forms of police accountability, a renewed emphasis on fighting crime alongside substantial cuts in budgets present considerable challenges at a time when globalisation, rapid developments in technology and major changes in the way individuals, families and communities live their lives are substantially changing patterns of crime and victimisation.

The role and function of the police is changing accordingly. The police mission has become broader and more complex, embracing functions more commonly associated with other agencies. Yet politicians and the public still expect and demand a police service that focuses on fighting crime. The 'Police Effectiveness in a Changing World' project addresses these different challenges by identifying and delivering better police-led approaches to reducing crime. This paper provides the evidence base on which the project will draw.

Policing and crime reduction

Much police work is reactive and incident-focused rather than proactive and strategic. Efforts to shift policing towards a more effective and sustainable approach to crime reduction have been few and far between. Although the police do much more than fight crime – responding to civil emergencies, maintaining order and even undertaking 'social work' – they still constitute the front line in tackling crime. And there is now a considerable body of evidence on how effective they are at doing so, which this paper summarises.

Traditionally, the police have favoured a law enforcement approach to crime control based on the theory of deterrence. This is largely manifested through random patrols, emergency response, stop and search, investigation and detection and intensive enforcement, all of which still dominate contemporary policing activity. Evidence from research, however, suggests these strategies are relatively ineffectual in reducing crime and detecting offenders. Increasingly however, police forces are moving towards identifying and managing risk, which shifts resource allocation towards specific individuals (prolific offenders and repeat victims) and places (high crime areas) rather than relying on arrest, conviction and punishment.

The targeting of resources on the most risky people and places is characterised by approaches to policing that identify hotspots of criminal activity, vulnerable individuals at risk of being repeatedly victimised and serious and prolific offenders. Where resources are more concentrated in these ways, crime is more likely to be reduced. However simply concentrating patrols in crime hotspots, for example, is insufficient. It is important to adopt the right tactics. Combining sensitive law enforcement with situational and social measures, efforts to prevent repeat victimisation and the active involvement of the community helps to increase effectiveness.

Intelligence-led policing and problem-oriented policing are two of the most developed approaches to maximising the effective allocation of police resources to reduce crime. The former constitutes the basis of the National Intelligence Model, which has been adopted by all police forces in England and Wales. Based on strategic assessments of targets and problems, it aims to

develop solutions to crime beyond recourse to the criminal justice system. Intelligence-led policing has not however been evaluated in terms of its impact on crime.

Not dissimilar to intelligence-led policing, problem-oriented policing emerged in response to criticisms of traditional approaches to reducing crime and approaches which simply focus enforcement resources on hotspots. It aims to reduce crime proactively and sustainably by focusing on the most important problems identified by local communities, using careful analysis to define problems and inform multi-agency solutions. There is strong evidence that problem-oriented policing reduces crime, but it is difficult to implement successfully.

The notion that communities have an important part to play in crime reduction initiatives is embedded in what is commonly referred to as community (or neighbourhood) policing. Although not as distinctively defined as intelligence-led or problem-oriented policing, it has been widely embraced both in North America and the UK. Community policing helps to reassure the public and increase their confidence in the police, but the evidence that it delivers sustained reductions in crime is equivocal.

Effective community engagement seems to be central to any locally-based approach to reducing crime. It ensures the right problems are addressed and that the police and their partner agencies are held to account for their actions. There are fewer calls to the police when local communities feel safer and have trust and confidence in the police, and effective engagement may even help to reduce crime. In practice, however, community engagement too

often fails to embrace all sections of a local community and/or take its views seriously.

The legitimacy of the police is important in determining whether people are willing to co-operate with the police (reporting incidents, providing intelligence, acting as witnesses) and comply with the law. By being fair, respectful and just, the police are more likely to secure that legitimacy and be more effective in reducing crime.

Meeting the demands of a more globalised, culturally diverse and technologically connected society with fewer resources represents a significant challenge. Reliance on enforcing the law to deter offenders and protect local communities is limited in its capacity to respond to these challenges and to prevent and reduce crime. The evidence summarised here suggests that these limited resources should instead:

● Be targeted on high crime micro-locations where the risks of potential harm are greatest.

● Focus on connected problems rather than on individual incidents and involve local communities in identifying and prioritising them and harnessing their own resources to address them.

● Be used to effectively engage with the local community and harness the resources of other agencies to deliver an integrated approach to reducing crime.

● Be aware of the central importance of securing police legitimacy in delivering a new and more effective approach.

Challenges for local policing in a changing world

Notwithstanding the internal reforms and budget cuts affecting the police service, there are major

socio-economic, demographic and technological changes affecting contemporary patterns of crime which demand new responses. The globalisation of goods and services, the rapid spread of new forms of communication, the increase in personal mobility and migration, growing income inequality and the fragmentation of families and communities have created new threats and risks and new criminal opportunities. It no longer makes sense to tackle crime without acknowledging the extent to which it crosses local, regional and national boundaries.

These changes present considerable challenges for the police, such as:

● Working effectively across local, regional and national borders.

● Staying ahead of increasingly fluid criminal networks.

● Responding to new kinds of offences and new ways of committing them.

● Engaging with increasingly transient and diverse communities and with citizens connected more through social media than through the places where they live.

● Meeting increasing public expectations for security and the demand for a visible presence at a time when resources are declining.

Faced with these and other challenges and asked to do more with less, the risk is that the service will retreat to familiar ground: reactive, response-oriented policing, with resources being deployed to respond to immediate demands rather than more strategic, long term demands. Community engagement, neighbourhood policing, partnership working and problem-solving may all

be at risk as other agencies withdraw towards their core activities.

Targeting resources to deliver the most impact is now more important than ever. In the new 21st century world of policing, the role of robust evidence of effectiveness will become increasingly important at a time when it may become increasingly difficult to generate. The introduction of Police and Crime Commissioners will have important implications for resource allocation in a new commissioning environment that embraces a wider range of providers.

Meeting the challenges

The police service faces a period of profound change. Neighbourhood policing, particularly in transient, culturally diverse communities, will need to develop new approaches to community engagement and build collective efficacy around shared norms and values. Public expectations of what the police can and cannot deliver will need to be carefully managed. And better sources of community intelligence on, for example, new types of criminal activity, hidden crime and inter-connected offences that cross borders will need to be fostered.

Many of these changes will need a different style of policing, one which fosters the trust and confidence of local communities and meets their concerns and expectations. It will require a step change in information management, with more effective methods for gathering, sharing and analysing intelligence to better inform tasking and strategic decision-making. Developing these skills will be crucial to effective problem-solving in highly diverse and mobile communities such as Luton and Slough.

Transforming information into intelligence to provide a detailed, accurate picture of the changing world and how the police should respond to it will be key to improving the effectiveness of policing in reducing crime. In addition to the sheer volume of information, there are real issues concerning data quality and how it is used to inform tasking. The focus of crime analysis needs to shift – from tracking the movements of known offenders to identifying persistent problems and anticipating (rather than reacting to) incidents or events. Crime analysts need more sophisticated skills, better training and more resources if they are to achieve the status and influence the new world of policing urgently requires.

Introduction

The Police Foundation is currently undertaking a four-year independently funded project entitled 'Police Effectiveness in a Changing World'. The project is based in Luton and Slough, two average-sized, ethnically diverse towns without especially high rates of crime or deprivation overall but with pockets of deprivation and high population turnover. It is being delivered at a time of considerable policy and organisational change for the police service. In addition to the reduction in the central government grant to the police service by 20 per cent over four years, the coalition government has introduced wide-ranging reforms to police accountability, in particular the introduction of elected Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs), and re-emphasised the police role as being first and foremost to fight crime. This stands in contrast to the previous government, with its broader focus on community safety and, in its later years, the measurement of police effectiveness in terms of public confidence. The introduction of PCCs may, at least in some force areas, serve to reinforce this shift, as do police forces' own targets, which continue to prioritise the reduction of crime.

At the same time, wider contextual changes – globalisation of markets for goods and services, the rapid expansion of information technology and social media, the growth of personal mobility and migration, the fragmentation of families and communities and the ever-widening gap between the rich and the poor – are changing patterns of crime. New threats create new forms of harm, particularly for the most vulnerable groups: children, new migrants, the elderly and the poor. Identity theft, people trafficking, investment scams, internet fraud and other 'emerging' crimes pose new challenges for the police, who must

also now work across local, regional and national boundaries to keep abreast of increasingly fluid criminal networks and their changing *modus operandi*. Meanwhile, personal relationships constructed primarily in neighbourhoods composed of people sharing the same ethnic, social and economic circumstances are becoming increasingly rare.

The role of the police

In the UK, preventing and detecting crime and preserving the public peace have been the central mandate of the public police since its inception. In practice, the police spend a large proportion of their time performing other roles – responding to emergencies, protecting vulnerable people, preventing terrorism – and are often called upon to deal with situations characterised as 'something-that-ought-not-to-be-happening-and-about-which-someone-had-better-do-something-now!' (Bittner, 1974). As graphically illustrated by the 24 hour twitter experiment conducted by Greater Manchester Police in 2010, the Police Service are very much the agency of first resort, with more than a third of all the incidents they respond to on a daily basis being social work rather than crime-related.

Ronnie Flanagan's Review of Policing (2008) suggested that over the last decade or so, this public demand has resulted in "the police service mission… becoming both broader and more complex", requiring a response to issues that might otherwise be addressed by other agencies. This has also been accompanied by an unprecedented increase in police powers and resources. Yet the image of the police service as largely engaged in crime control continues to shape public and policy expectations of police

work[1] as well as rank and file understandings of their role (Reiner, 2010). So despite this wider mandate and an expansion in its mission, the police service has been judged over the past 30 years or so primarily on the basis of its effectiveness in tackling crime and continues to be so. The Police Effectiveness in a Changing World project continues this trend by focusing primarily on police effectiveness in reducing crime, which is the project's main aim.

The purpose of this report

This report provides some background to the project by summarising the evidence base on policing and crime reduction. It summarises the key lessons from research on which the project will draw in developing locally-tailored approaches to improving police effectiveness and reducing crime, addressing some of the organisational and operational challenges arising out of the changing socio-economic context in which the police service[2] currently operates. It does not explore the approach to practice development that will be used during the project itself, but rather highlights the way in which existing knowledge about current challenges and effective practice might shape and inform the project.

The report is divided into three sections. The first section reviews the research literature on the role of the police in reducing crime, drawing out some of the key lessons. The second focuses on the challenges facing the police service in a changing world, while the third section focuses on the implications of the conclusions from the first two sections for the Police Effectiveness in a Changing World project.

---

[1] See, for example, the Home Secretary's speech to the National Policing Conference 29 June 2010 when she stated: "I couldn't be any clearer about your mission ... it is to cut crime. No more. No less.".

[2] The project is primarily concerned with the role of the public police service in reducing crime, not policing more broadly.

1. The role of the police in reducing crime

Introduction

Following a brief description of what is known about what the police do and the extent to which their activity is (or is not) based on robust evidence, this section summarises the large body of research on the effectiveness of policing in reducing crime. Most of this evidence-base comes from the US, but some also comes from the UK. The review focuses primarily on those aspects of policing commonly associated with uniform rather than plain-clothes or civilian officers – street patrol, crime prevention and routine detection rather than less visible forms of policing such as covert surveillance and forensics. It relies primarily but not exclusively on the findings of systematic reviews rather than individual studies. The main aim is to distil from this review the key lessons for the Police Effectiveness in a Changing World project.

There are a number of ways in which the presentation of this complex and considerable body of work could be organised. There is no 'right' way of doing this, particularly given the degree to which specific models and approaches to policing are defined differently by different scholars and sometimes overlap. The approach adopted here organises the evidence primarily in terms of how different approaches utilise and allocate resources and, where possible, attempts to differentiate strategic as opposed to tactical measures. It concludes with a section on police legitimacy, which is more about the 'how' of policing rather than the 'what', but which, it was felt, is crucial to improving effectiveness.

What the police do

Popular perceptions of what the police do tend to focus on their role in responding to a constant stream of emergency calls, mostly from the public. As an emergency service, the police respond to calls 24/7 on a case-by-case basis, dealing with each one individually. Commonly termed 'response policing', it focuses on the here and now, providing immediate help to victims and (potentially) arresting suspects. It constitutes what police officers often refer to as 'real' policing. Although response policing constitutes the 'bread and butter' of everyday policing, there is in fact virtually no evidence on its effects on crime (Committee on Law and Justice, 2004).

Considerable research has been undertaken in the past to establish the degree to which the police spend their time directly responding to or preventing crime (see, for example, Bittner, 1990). This research, mainly undertaken in the 1970s and then 1980s, highlighted the large proportion of police time devoted to duties other than crime control, including incidents not classified as crime or leading to criminal proceedings, and time spent in processing cases and administration (Brodeur, 2010). According to the British Crime Survey, only a minority of contacts between the police and the public involve actual criminal incidents (Skogan, 1990), although research also suggests that just over half of police work is in some way crime-related (i.e. incidents that might involve or lead to a crime) (Shapland and Vagg, 1990). The Greater Manchester twitter experiment referred to earlier suggests little has changed.

Research on the role of the police has consistently highlighted their wider mandate and service function in order maintenance more generally (for example crowd control, responding to emergencies etc.) and the amount of time they spend on front line, public-facing activities.[3] A

---

[3] This has recently re-emerged in public discourse in response to the current climate of financial constraint and concerns about maintaining a visible police presence on the streets.

recent National Police Improvement Agency (NPIA) study of neighbourhood and response teams in the UK found that public-facing work in the community accounted for about 44 per cent of officers' time. This included responding to incidents, taking statements, foot patrol and community engagement. Administrative work accounted for nearly a third of officer time and a further quarter of their time was spent in the custody suite or at court, in training, briefings or meetings, travelling or on breaks (Mclean and Hillier, 2010).

A key issue raised by research exploring 'what the police do' has been the disjointed, incident -focused nature of police work, with incidents being treated in large part as unconnected. This incident focus stems not just from the way in which the public report incidents but also from the way in which such incidents are dealt with (as issues which do or do not merit criminal prosecution). However this limits the capacity to develop a more strategic picture, over time, of the inter-connectedness, persistence or escalation of problems and can be a key impediment to developing more long-term, sustainable approaches to reducing crime. An approach more able to develop that picture would require the development of new skills in front line officers (see Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary, 2012), but with the exception of various kinds of problem-oriented Policing (see below), this aspect of police work has been relatively neglected.

Does more police mean less crime?

Before looking in detail at how effective the police are in reducing crime, it is worth looking briefly at the evidence on the impact that increases or

decreases in total police officer numbers have on crime rates. On the whole, the evidence that additional numbers of police reduce crime rates is inconclusive (Bradford, 2011), although the absence of any police presence (e.g. as a result of strike action) has been shown to increase crime (Sherman and Eck, 2002). Some studies have suggested that increased police numbers may be associated with lower property and other acquisitive crime, with one study suggesting that an estimated 10 per cent increase in officers leads to a reduction of around three per cent in crime (Levitt, 1997), but the evidence of an association between police numbers and violent crime seems to be more ambiguous (Bradford, 2011). Efforts to increase the speed of response to urgent incidents have also been shown to have little impact on detection rates as the delay in calling the police tends to outweigh any increase in the chances of catching the perpetrator that reduced response times might achieve (Skogan and Frydl, 2004). In practice, it is difficult to separate out the effect of increased numbers from what these additional officers actually do.

What works in policing to reduce crime?

On the whole, the police service and its partners do not routinely use research evidence to inform their practice in tackling crime. In a review of 150 entries to the UK Tilley Award, which recognise innovative crime fighting projects, fewer than a third explicitly drew on evidence in developing their projects (Bullock and Tilley, 2009). Nonetheless there is now a significant, and growing, body of research on what works in policing. Much of this research has been undertaken in North America, where policing and

the context in which the police perform their functions differ from the UK, but there are important lessons to be learnt from this now extensive body of research. This section draws on the findings of a number of reviews of this evidence and is divided into the following four sub-sections:

- Traditional approaches to policing.
- Targeted policing.
- Maximising effective resource allocation.
- Building relationships with the community.

Traditional approaches to policing

The traditional approach to policing tends to allocate resources across a jurisdiction and cover all crime types, is reactive rather than proactive and favours deterrence through law enforcement rather than taking account of different patterns of crime across time and space. In terms of how traditional policing impacts on crime, there are essentially four different strategies that have been the subject of research:

- Random patrol and response.
- Stop and search.
- Investigation and detection.
- Intensive enforcement.

Random patrol and response

A considerable body of early research on police effectiveness in reducing crime was devoted to exploring the effectiveness of random patrol in preventing and detecting crime, either as a general deterrent or by answering calls in the shortest possible time (Skogan and Frydl, 2004). This research demonstrated the very small chance that

random patrols will come across an incident in progress. It was famously estimated that, on the basis of burglary rates (in the 1980s) and evenly distributed patrol, an officer in London could expect to pass within a hundred yards of a burglary in progress once in every eight years (Clarke and Hough, 1984). In practice, random patrol is less about deterring or catching offenders and more about providing a symbolic presence that proclaims a state of order and reassures the public.

The research evidence on foot patrols does not seem to coincide with public perceptions, which see patrols as principally synonymous with preventing crime and securing community safety (see for example Noaks, 2000). According to the British Crime Survey (2002/03), when prioritising different aspects of police work, the public place foot patrols third after responding to emergency calls (placed first) and detecting and arresting offenders (placed second). When asked to rank which measures would most improve community safety, the public tend to place 'more police patrolling on foot' well above any other measure (Wakefield, 2006). This helps to explain why politicians from all parties are keen to maintain or better still increase the number of 'bobbies on the beat'.

Research also shows that the public expect police patrols to do more than just prevent crime. A community survey undertaken as part of the Policing in London study carried out in 2002 found that two thirds of respondents (67 per cent) thought patrols should focus on detecting and preventing crime, but half (49 per cent) wanted them to focus on reassurance, a quarter (25 per cent) on work in schools and a further quarter (24 per cent) on gathering local intelligence (FitzGerald

et al, 2002). A fifth (20 per cent) cited dealing with disturbances and 15 per cent mentioned providing advice on crime prevention. Furthermore, the public believe that the number and/or visibility of officers are more effective in tackling crime than any other intervention, including addressing the root causes of crime (Wakefield, 2006).

In reality, the evidence on the deterrent effect of the visible presence of officers on foot is mixed. Early research showed that on the whole neither car patrols (Kelling et al,1974) nor foot patrols (Kelling, 1981) reduced crime rates, although the latter was found to improve community relations and reduce (to a small extent) fear of crime (Pate, 1986). Despite notable exceptions in relation to specific crimes – in the US, directed patrols have helped to reduce the carrying of illegal weapons (Koper and Mayo-Wilson, 2006) and in the UK, additional foot patrols have reduced personal robberies (Jones and Tilley, 2004) – the general view is that foot patrols do little to reduce crime overall. However, where directed patrols are deployed as one of a number of tactics to reduce crime in hotspots (or better still micro-locations) or as part of a problem-oriented policing initiative, the impact tends to be more positive (Ratcliffe, 2011). The most encouraging evidence comes from the Philadelphia foot patrol experiment, where targeted foot patrols were found to significantly reduce violent crime (Ratcliffe et al, 2011). The key ingredients seem to be dosage – the more focussed or concentrated patrols are, the more likely they will have a suppressive effect – what officers actually do on patrol to increase the risk (or perceived risk) of apprehension and how patrols are combined with other tactics to address wider problems.

Stop and search

Stop and search powers enable the police to allay or confirm suspicions about individuals and detect, for example, those suspected of carrying weapons, stolen goods or going equipped for stealing. In practice, the law requires the execution of such powers to be based on fact, information and/or intelligence and not on the subjective whim of individual officers. Research shows that only a small minority of searches result in an arrest (see The Police Foundation, 2012), with variations according to the reason for the stop. Arrest rates for those suspected of possessing stolen property tend to be higher than those for carrying drugs (primarily cannabis).

A low detection rate alone does not necessarily undermine the use of stop and search powers for crime prevention if their use disrupts and deters criminal activity rather than simply detecting it (House of Commons Home Affairs Committee, 2005). However research shows that searches reduce the number of 'disruptable' crimes by just 0.2% and its use in disrupting drug markets is largely ineffectual as officers primarily target users rather than dealers (Miller et al, 2000). Blanket enforcement crackdowns on neighbourhood drug markets may even be counter-productive, with violence actually increasing following market disruption as new organised crime groups compete for territory (Weisburd and Eck, 1999). Research does however suggest that searches may be more effective in deterring crime when used intensively in a particular location over a short period of time (Miller et al, 2000).

Investigation and detection

Analysing drug or stolen goods markets is a relatively recent development in crime control

generally and in criminal investigation more specifically. Traditionally, the deployment of investigative resources amounted primarily to responding to crimes reported to the police (largely by the public) and identifying the perpetrators of an offence. The main aim was to gather evidence, such as witness statements, fingerprints or CCTV images, which could be used in court to secure a conviction. This approach is based on a deterrence model whereby offending is discouraged by increasing the chance that an offender will be caught.

Catching offenders is a core function of detective work, but research suggests that detectives fail to clear up most cases. The vast majority of property crimes and a significant proportion of violent crime are unsolved (Telep and Weisburd, 2012). On the whole, if a suspect is not caught at the scene of the crime, then he/she is rarely identified. Detectives are however a potentially useful source of intelligence, particularly in relation to repeat offending, and it has been suggested that they could be used more proactively, such as helping to identify the future plans of known criminal networks. This would amount to a shift from producing evidence to secure a conviction towards a role that is more about producing knowledge or 'intelligence' about suspects and their associates and information about the circumstances of their current and future offending behaviour (Maguire, 2008).

In today's rapidly changing world, where communities are more diverse and fragmented, governments are increasingly concerned with identifying and managing risk. This requires more lasting solutions that prevent behaviour being repeated by or against specific individuals (i.e.

offenders or victims) or in certain places (i.e. areas of high crime) rather than relying on arrest, conviction and punishment (Maguire, 2008). This more strategic approach to targeting law enforcement resources requires relatively sophisticated forms of data sharing across a number of agencies and is discussed in more detail in the section below on targeted policing.

Intensive enforcement

Commonly referred to as either a 'zero tolerance' (see Weatheritt, 1998) or 'broken windows' (Wilson and Kelling, 1982) approach to law enforcement, intensive forms of law enforcement are often associated with tough crime-fighting rhetoric.[4] In practice, however, these approaches are based on the idea that responding immediately and consequentially to incivilities such as vandalism, street drinking and prostitution, will avert a downward spiral of disorder, which occurs when communities, in fear of more serious offending, start to withdraw their willingness to intervene (Wilson and Kelling, 1982). While the link between incivilities and more serious crime has been challenged (Taylor, 2001), focusing police resources on incivilities (more commonly referred to as antisocial behaviour in the UK) has become a popular government response to a legitimate public concern.

In general, intensive enforcement activity (and any deterrent effect it may have) is not only unsustainable in the longer term but in its simplest form does not, on the whole, reduce crime or incivilities (Skogan, 1992). However, its effectiveness depends largely on what tactics are adopted and how they are deployed (Skogan, 1990). The best known example of intensive enforcement was introduced in New

---

[4] Although zero tolerance policing was greeted with scepticism by British police professionals sensitive to the impact of such an approach on police-community relationships, the influence of the related 'broken windows' rationale has been evident in the development of policy and practice to tackle antisocial behaviour in the UK. To date, there is no evidence to show that this approach has led to a reduction in related crime.

York, where its impact has been a source of considerable contention.

The New York experience

During the 1990s and beyond, the crime rate in New York fell sharply. A series of commentators have attempted to explain this fall, including a succession of City Mayors and Police Commissioners. The main difficulty lies in separating out the effect of intensive/aggressive enforcement activity from a number of other changes introduced at the same time. One of these was the introduction of CompStat, which focuses on increasing the accountability of individual officers for their performance in achieving crime reduction targets (Bratton, 1998). In practice, CompStat scrutinises real-time crime data and focuses police activity in specific hotspots and therefore goes beyond the intensification of enforcement activity.

Although the evidence suggests that the targeted work created by CompStat may indeed have contributed to reductions in crime in New York, the evidence of its impact in other American cities is mixed. CompStat's use can also lead to an over-emphasis on holding officers to account for performance targets (and the manipulation of data that this can incentivise) rather than solving problems.

Explanations for the reduction in overall crime in New York remain strongly contested. In addition to policing, it has been attributed variously to drug market changes, high rates of imprisonment and increased supervision of persistent offenders. The claims for the success of the specific style of policing in the city have also been undermined by simultaneous falls in crime in other North American and European cities, where different approaches have prevailed. Importantly, the use of focused enforcement activity to tackle crime and disorder in New York was also criticised for resulting in increased complaints about police misconduct and a loss of public trust.

Targeted policing

The limited impact of random patrol, reactive and intensive enforcement on crime rates led to attempts to improve the effectiveness of the police in reducing crime by concentrating resources on specific crimes, criminals, victims and places. This led to the development of much more focused resource allocation through, in particular, hotspots policing, tackling repeat victimisation and focused deterrence. These are discussed in turn.

Hotspots policing

Initiatives that take account of the uneven distribution of crime between and within neighbourhoods and target resources on micro-locations (a small number of streets, a block of flats or even two or three addresses) are commonly referred to as 'hotspots' policing (Weisburd and Braga, 2006). The influential Minneapolis Hot Spots Experiment, for example, found that 50 per cent of calls for service came from only 3.3 per cent of locations and advocated focusing interventions (in this case increased patrol) on such micro-locations rather than whole neighbourhoods. It delivered clear, if modest, general deterrent effects as measured by

reductions in crime calls and observations of disorder (Sherman et al, 1989), as have other similar initiatives (Sherman and Weisburd, 1995).

While there is evidence that focusing resources in hotspots reduces crime, initiatives that simply rely on using patrol and law enforcement in these hotspots tend to be less effective (Taylor et al, 2011), the impact tending to be small and short-lived (Koper, 1995). The effectiveness of hotspots policing clearly varies according to the approaches and tactics that are used; it is rarely sufficient simply to concentrate police patrol resources in specific locations (Rosenbaum, 2006).

A frequent component of hotspots policing initiatives is the introduction of measures that reduce the opportunities for committing crime. Commonly known as 'situational crime prevention', such measures include installing better locks on doors and windows (target hardening), increasing surveillance through for example installing CCTV cameras and looking after or altering the environment by for example cleaning up graffiti, removing abandoned cars or improving street lighting. There is now considerable evidence to support the effectiveness of situational crime prevention (which cannot be reviewed here), which where included partially helps to explain the convincing body of evidence that broadly supports the strategic targeting of micro-locations (see also Bottoms, 2012).

Reducing the opportunities for crime is sometimes contrasted with approaches that attempt to change the socio-economic context of high crime neighbourhoods. This school of thought acknowledges the importance of developing lasting solutions (Rosenbaum, 2006) based on a detailed understanding of the multiple and

persistent problems commonly found in such communities. [5] Such problems include:

- High concentrations of poverty and ill-health.
- A poor physical environment.
- Low-income families.
- Poor performing schools.
- Limited neighbourhood resources and informal control.
- Active drug markets.
- Barriers to offender resettlement.

Although often characterised as polarised approaches, researchers have begun to highlight the potential for a more integrated approach that takes greater account of the social context of hotspots, in particular the need for greater recognition that it is the social characteristics of hotspots that account for their longevity (Weisburd, 2012). This suggests that there may be some potential for more targeted socio-economic interventions in micro-locations.

As yet little is known about why hotspots are attractive targets to offenders and what role, if any, residents' 'collective efficacy' plays in this. The term 'collective efficacy' is used to describe the degree to which neighbours know and trust one another and are willing to intervene (together or individually) to protect their neighbourhood from crime and related problems. It acts as a protective factor in neighbourhoods that might otherwise experience high levels of crime (Sampson and Raudenbusch, 1999). Recent research, which has begun to explore whether collective efficacy is also protective in micro-locations (Bottoms, 2012; Weisburd, 2012), suggests that offenders are aware of the willingness of local residents to intervene or watch out for each other. Thus a street, for example, with

---

[5] In the British context, this tends to be particularly influenced by social housing provision and housing allocation practice (Bottoms, 2012).

greater collective efficacy may be a less attractive location for committing offences than another, even within a high crime neighbourhood. This suggests there may be potential benefits in strengthening collective efficacy in micro-location hotspots (Bottoms, 2012), particularly in areas of high population turnover, where length of residence, social organisation and mutual trust, may be considerably less.

Although the evidence on hotspots policing is encouraging, there are a number of issues that need addressing. For example, little is known about the degree to which sustained targeting results in offenders engaging in other forms of crime. Also, analyses of hotspots based on reported crime data are limited in terms of identifying patterns that are not location-specific (for example e-crime and fraud) or are under-reported (for example, domestic abuse and hate crime) (Rosenbaum, 2006). There are also limits to the degree to which managing localised crime hotspots can address criminality that transcends local, regional or even national boundaries. However, research has shown that feared displacement effects – whereby the problem moves to other neighbourhoods – are rarely a problem and indeed in some instances can have the opposite effect of reducing crime in neighbouring areas (Braga et al, 2012; Bowers et al, 2011). This absence of displacement has been explained by the fact that crime hotspots also tend to be hotspots of offender residence and that offenders are reluctant to commit offences in unfamiliar areas (Weisburd et al, 2006).

Focusing resources on places for which there is evidence of concentrated demand has an operational logic that is appealing to many police managers, but most studies have tended to neglect the reaction of the community to

concentrated crime control efforts. While community members may generally support the concentration of resources to address crime, care needs to be taken to ensure that hotspots policing does not become overly enforcement-focused (Rosenbaum 2006). Although arrests will always be a central element in policing, the aggressive use of enforcement approaches to address problems that are not considered the most damaging in a community, or in ways that appear heavy-handed or unjust, can have lasting consequences for police-community relations (Karn, 2007) and ultimately police legitimacy. Such approaches can also disproportionately increase the entry of predominantly low-income, often minority ethnic men into the criminal justice system. Political pressure for short-term gains therefore needs to be carefully considered alongside the potential risk that particular types of hotspots policing can undermine the long-term stability of neighbourhoods (Weisburd, 2012).

A thorough understanding of the dynamics of the social context in which resources are being deployed may help to mitigate some of these limitations. Some of the most promising approaches to hotspots policing integrate socio-economic interventions and social and situational crime prevention measures to reduce crime with measures that increase the resilience of local residents. They also incorporate the strong body of evidence that shows that what matters is not just whether more *police* resources are assigned to hotspots, but *what* resources are best deployed (from what agencies/ professions/ sectors) to address a well-understood problem and *how* (Rosenbaum, 2006). This more integrated approach, more akin to problem-oriented policing, is discussed further below.

Tackling repeat victimisation

A further approach that aims to focus resources more effectively is based on research that highlights the increased risk of being re-victimised. Repeat incidents account for a high proportion of the total number of most categories of offences: one per cent of people experience 59 per cent of personal crimes and two per cent experience 41 per cent of non-vehicle-related property crime (Pease, 1998). The risk of re-victimisation also tends to increase with each experience of crime. Targeting repeat victims is therefore seen as an effective way to reduce crime, and has been shown to be particularly effective in reducing the rate of repeat victimisation for burglary (Grove et al, 2012).

Research also shows that in the short term, crime risks increase for near-neighbours as well as the victim and that, at least for burglary, the offences are often committed by the same perpetrator (Burnasco, 2008). As a result, in the mid-1990s all police forces in England and Wales were obliged to develop strategies to reduce repeat victimisation (Nicholas and Farrell, 2008) and more recently a number of forces in the UK, including Greater Manchester Police and the Metropolitan Police Service, introducing so-called 'Super Cocooning' projects, which focus activity on preventing repeat *and* near-repeat victimisation. This is intended to allocate resources according to risk while giving victims (and potential victims) practical help and support (Nicholas and Farrell, 2008). In line with the available evidence (Grove et al, 2012), it has been claimed that they have had a significant impact (Chainey, 2012).

Work to prevent repeat and near-repeat victimisation is a form of predictive policing, which uses data from a range of sources to predict where and when crime is likely to take place in the future. This approach is most commonly associated with work by the police in Los Angeles (LA) in the US, where patrols are deployed on the basis of a victimisation risk assessment. It builds on a hotspots approach by offering more specificity in time and place and thus enabling police officers to use problem-solving approaches in the right place at the right time. In LA, the model focuses on burglary and theft of, and from, a motor vehicle, but in Memphis, for example, a predictive approach has also been used to tackle violent crime.

The crime reduction effect of predictive policing is yet to be rigorously tested (Telep and Weisburd, 2012), although in the US the National Institute of Justice has funded a programme of work to measure its impact that will contribute to the evidence base in due course (US Department of Justice, 2009). Within the UK, in addition to existing initiatives to tackle repeat victimisation, a pilot project based on the LA model was launched by Kent Police in December 2012 and subsequently rolled out across the force (Whitehead, 2013).

Focused deterrence

An alternative to targeting repeat victims is to focus resources on repeat offenders. In the US, some initiatives have adopted a focused deterrence or 'pulling levers' approach, which has demonstrated significant reductions in crime through targeting multi-agency resources on a small number of high risk/prolific offenders (Braga and Weisburd, 2012). The approach is based on increasing the certainty, swiftness and severity of punishment by directly engaging offenders and

potential offenders and offering incentives to comply with the law as well as clear consequences for not doing so (Kennedy, 2009). The findings from these studies add to the evidence in support of the deterrent effect of police enforcement activity that heightens offenders' perceived *risk of apprehension* (Durlauf and Nagin, 2011), but also stress that complementary crime reduction mechanisms also play a key role in contributing to the large effects on crime rates observed (Braga and Weisburd, 2012). These include:

- Reducing the situational opportunities for violence.

- Deflecting offenders from crime.

- Increasing access to social services, employment opportunities, housing and drug treatment.

- Increasing collective efficacy and natural surveillance within communities.

- Treating offenders with respect and dignity to encourage greater compliance.

The evidential success of 'pulling levers' approaches has led to a new model of crime reduction in the US termed the New Criminal Justice.

Maximising effective resource allocation

Economic and political pressures to increase efficiency, improve performance and reduce costs has led to more strategic approaches or 'models' of policing, in particular intelligence-led policing and problem-oriented policing. Drawing on some of the more targeted approaches discussed above, they constitute a more strategic approach to crime reduction.

Intelligence-led policing

Intelligence-led policing aims to reduce crime by:

- Collecting relevant and reliable information from a variety of sources to provide a clear and accurate picture of the most pressing current and future crime problems.

- Prioritising them and planning targeted responses to them.

- Implementing the plans and evaluating the process and the outcomes.

- Feeding back the knowledge and experience gained (Ratcliffe, 2011).

Four intelligence products are created: strategic assessments, tactical assessments, target profiles and problem profiles. Regular meetings of Tasking and Control Groups (TCGs) are held to decide how to best target resources to priority people (e.g. prolific offenders), places (e.g. crime hotspots) and activities (e.g. night time economy).

Intelligence-led policing was first pioneered in the UK by Kent Police Service in the early 1990s. In practice however, cultural resistance and the significant reorganisation of officer roles and functions meant that Kent's embracing of intelligence-led policing remained an exception to the rule until the introduction of the National Intelligence Model (NIM) a decade later (Maguire, 2008). NIM is the major vehicle for delivering intelligence-led policing, variations of which are now being used in all forces. Introduced in part as a response to the increasingly sophisticated, transnational and mobile nature of criminality, the NIM has institutionalised intelligence-led policing. Based on strategic assessments of current and predicted crime threats and tactical assessments of targets and problems, its aim is to develop

solutions to crime problems outside the criminal justice system, such as disrupting criminal markets and the criminal networks that control them.

With less than a quarter of all recorded crime leading to detection and a sanction, finding alternative ways to fight crime outside the criminal justice system should be a key priority. But although the NIM is seen by most officers as successful in tackling the main problems in an area (Maguire and John, 1995), it has, like intelligence-led policing, not been independently evaluated in terms of its impact on crime (Maguire, 2008) let alone how relevant it might be in tackling new, emerging crime patterns. Embracing partners who focus on risks and problems identified through the analysis of multiple sources of data relating to patterns of crime, as piloted in Greater Manchester (known as Greater Manchester Against Crime), would help to shift the NIM towards a more problem-oriented approach, which is discussed below.

Problem-oriented policing

A recent review of hotspots policing initiatives by the Campbell Collaboration provides convincing evidence that while, overall, hotspots policing strategies can be effective in reducing crime, they are more likely to do so where interventions alter the characteristics and dynamics of hotspots through problem-oriented policing interventions. Problem-oriented policing emerged as a more proactive alternative to traditional response policing and more effective than simply focusing enforcement approaches on hotspots. While still identifying problem hotspots, problem-oriented policing places more emphasis on understanding the connections between problems and *wh*y they are occurring, tackling problems identified by local

communities that have been resistant to other, more conventional responses (Goldstein, 1990). To an extent a problem-solving approach is embedded in the National Intelligence Model (and potentially in some investigation practice), and is evident, in particular, in the way analysis is intended to inform multi-agency tasking meetings (Maguire and John, 2003), so problem-solving has become part of policing practice.

Problem-oriented policing requires a thorough understanding of the problems and the effectiveness of strategies to address them. This involves an analysis of their causes, identifying strategies for intervention (beyond law enforcement) and involving other agencies and the community in delivering them. It also requires checking whether the intended benefits have accrued (Tilley, 2010). The main intention is to reduce crime and disorder proactively and sustainably by dealing with recurrent or connected problems, rather than responding incident by incident, and improving community confidence in the effectiveness of agencies by responding to their immediate and most pressing concerns. The capacity for problem-solving approaches to reduce local crime rates in hotspots is now widely accepted, especially when driven by community concerns (Tuffin, 2006), although their effectiveness has in the past suffered from implementation failure (Quinton and Morris, 2008) and a tendency for the police to 'rush to solution' before securing a full understanding of the problem and how best to resolve it (Myhill, 2006).

A recent systematic review concluded that problem-oriented policing initiatives built on sound data analysis and research have had 'an

overwhelmingly positive impact on crime rates' (Weisburd et al, 2010), although the evidence is less clear about how and why they have worked in some circumstances but not in others (Tilley, 2006). Unfortunately, in practice the police and their partners often fail to conduct systematic, in-depth problem analysis (Telep and Weisburd, 2012), revisit problems and learn lessons highlighted during implementation, or effectively implement evidence-based interventions (Tilley, 2010). The effective integration of multi-agency information and interventions also remains a significant challenge and analytical capacity remains one of the potentially weakest elements in the implementation of a problem-solving approach.

Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment

Scanning, Analysis, Response and Assessment (SARA) is the model most often used to guide the design and implementation of multi-agency, problem-solving crime reduction initiatives. The model comprises an iterative process of:

- Identifying community and organisational concerns (scanning).

- Investigating priority problems, such as exploring in depth what, where, when, who, how and why the problem is happening (analysis).

- Developing tailored, evidence-based interventions to address the problems identified and their causes (response).

- Evaluating the implementation and outcomes achieved (assessment) and then redefining and refining those

problems and strategies in response to attempts to address them.

SARA has been criticised for being over-simplistic (Bullock and Tilley, 2009), but it nevertheless provides a logical stepwise approach to embedding evidence in problem-oriented policing.

The growth in the analysis infrastructure within UK police forces, using software for the collection, mapping and analysis of crime and disorder data and other local information to inform an understanding of local problems, has been assisted in part by the recognition of the need to understand better the connections between incidents. There have been successful initiatives that share data between police and partner agencies, bringing together different kinds of information to supplement recorded crime data. An initiative in Cardiff Accident and Emergency Departments in hospitals, for example, actively collected data from victims of violence to develop better responses to tackling violence (including unreported incidents) (Florence et al, 2011). However, attempts to replicate this elsewhere have struggled to create the conditions for the successful provision and use of similar quality data (Davison et al, 2010).

Partnership working

A crucial component of problem-oriented policing is the role of partners in delivering problem-solving interventions. The police do not possess all the information needed to assess all the problems and their causes, nor all the means to coordinate and deliver sustainable solutions. This realisation has been a key driver in the

development of multi-agency partnership approaches to crime reduction. Such arrangements recognise the complexity of crime and disorder problems and the greater capacity that a number of agencies working together can bring to bear on them. In England and Wales this approach has been embedded in legislation since 1998 when the Crime and Disorder Act introduced Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships (now referred to as Community Safety Partnerships) and other partnerships such as the Drug Interventions Programme and Integrated Offender Management initiatives.

Although it is difficult to identify the particular contribution of partnership mechanisms to effective crime reduction, a recent assessment of partnerships largely set up to reduce violence in the US concluded that partnership working is effective (Berry et al, 2011). On the basis of this body of evidence, the most effective initiatives seem to be those that focus collaborative work around well-defined problems, develop common values between agencies, embed researchers in partnerships and provide robust data analysis to guide decision-making (McGarrell, 2010). In the US, there are concerns about whether partnership working is sustainable without any statutory underpinning; partnerships have crumbled without follow-up funding (Klofas et al, 2010). In contrast in the UK, where there is a statutory basis for partnership working, such arrangements are sustained over the longer term (Home Office, 2011), although recent reforms in probation, education and health along with cuts in government expenditure may well begin to undermine this.

Building relationships with the community

The fourth and final part of this section exploring the role of the police in reducing crime focuses on the role communities can play.

Community policing

The concept of community policing first emerged in the 1970s, and has subsequently built up widespread support. Problem-oriented policing (see above) and community engagement (see below) are both central to effective community policing, which is built around the idea of enhanced local accountability. Community policing tends to mean different things to different people and lacks a clear definition, while the term community is itself 'notoriously slippery' (Tilley, 2008). And as with other models of policing, there is considerable overlap.

As Fielding (2009) argues, to some community policing is simply an alternative to an enforcement-based approach whereas to others it is an approach that actively involves the public in crime control and improves communication between the public and the police. Despite this, the principles underpinning community policing have been widely adopted and community policing has become, in the US at least, 'a new orthodoxy for cops' (Eck and Rosenbaum, 1994).

The Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy

A well-known example of community policing in the US is the Chicago Alternative Policing Strategy (CAPS), where the community and its concerns are at the heart of the approach and where priority setting and problem-solving is devolved to local residents and neighbourhood level officers (Skogan, 2006). CAPS was set up in 1993 in five police districts in Chicago with diverse populations in terms of race, ethnicity and socio-economic status. Based on the premise that to reduce local concerns about crime the police need to work together with partner agencies to address issues identified by community members, CAPS aimed to bridge the gap between police understandings of problems – or their organisational tendency to redefine them as non-crime-related – and the understandings of local citizens. It comprised several key components:

- The integration of crime control and prevention, incorporating authoritative and impartial law enforcement and rapid response with proactive problem-solving.

- Teams of response and beat officers engaging in proactive problem-solving.

- Police officers working the same beat on the same watch each day to ensure continuity.

- Involvement of the community at all levels to identify local issues and problems and help set priorities.

- Formalisation of problem-solving, with officers creating a beat profile of the district's characteristics and chronic problems and identifying resources to address them. Together with other agencies and the community, the police prioritise problems, identify strategies and measure success.

- All officers, together with their supervisors, receive training in problem-solving, interpersonal communication, partnership working and leadership skills.

- Neighbourhood level data is analysed to map crime hotspots and track other neighbourhood problems, which is shared with local residents.

- Continuous communication with the community through newsletters, meetings, surveys, focuses groups and hotlines, to secure feedback and suggestions for improvement.

- Identification of the components of change needed to fully implement the strategy with concomitant action plans.

- Independent process and outcome evaluation.

CAPS has produced sustained improvements in confidence in the police, particularly among black and Hispanic communities, as well as reductions in fear of crime and victimization, but has been less obviously successful in delivering sustained reductions in recorded crime rates (Skogan and Frydl, 2004).

Community policing has also become prominent in England and Wales in recent years, first as reassurance policing and subsequently as neighbourhood policing (Fielding, 2009). Reassurance policing was introduced at a time of increasing concern about low levels of confidence in the police. Its main aim was to address what was termed 'the reassurance gap', which is where public concern about crime continued to be high despite a falling crime rate. The National Reassurance Policing pilot, implemented across 16 sites in England between 2003 and 2005, was also guided by an understanding that certain incidents of crime *and disorder* can act as 'warning signs', particularly in public spaces, about the perceived levels of risk to which local residents may be exposed (Innes, 2004). It tasked local teams with:

- Building a familiar, visible and approachable policing presence in communities through targeted foot patrol.

- Identifying the issues that mattered most to people.

- Developing problem-solving approaches to addressing local issues which might not otherwise be considered priorities.

The pilots delivered a net increase in public confidence of 12 per cent compared to comparison sites as well as improvements in public perceptions of crime levels perceived levels of antisocial behaviour and better levels of community engagement. The increases in confidence were particularly associated with joint problem solving, better community engagement and targeted foot patrol (Tuffin et al, 2006). There was little evidence of any reduction in recorded crime rates, although overall crime did fall in two

sites, but there were significant reductions in self-reported victimisation rates, which is probably a better measure of impact than changes in the recorded crime rate (Tuffin, 2006). Importantly however, the positive outcomes achieved in the pilot study were less discernible when reassurance policing was rolled out nationally as neighbourhood policing. This was due in part to the implementation difficulties encountered, although the evaluation of the national initiative was also less robust (Quinton and Morris, 2008).

Community engagement

Central to the delivery of both problem-oriented policing and community policing is effective community engagement. By working together with local residents, the police can increase their sense of security, their resilience to crime and their confidence in the police (Lloyd and Foster, 2009). Effective community engagement ensures that the police respond to community concerns and are held to account for their actions. Systematic reviews have produced strong evidence that community engagement reduces calls about disorder and antisocial behaviour and increases people's sense of safety (Myhill, 2006). The evidence on its impact on recorded crime is more equivocal, with some initiatives producing substantial and others more limited effects (Lloyd and Foster, 2009). There is, however, consistently strong evidence of improvements in police-community relations and community perceptions of the police, and fairly strong evidence of improvements in the attitudes and behaviour of police officers, all of which help to improve police legitimacy.

Efforts to reduce crime, whether through problem-solving or other approaches, emphasise

the importance of promoting trust and confidence through fair and equitable policing. However engaging with communities to improve trust and confidence requires substantial effort and takes time, particularly in areas where there have been poor relations with the police in the past (Myhill, 2006). A common concern has been that beat meetings, surveys and other conventional engagement strategies only reach a particular segment of the population and are resource intensive (Lowe and Innes, 2012). They often fail to build links with sections of the local population that may have more strained relationships with the police and hence adequately to take account of their (often quite different) needs. This raises serious questions about setting local priorities. Nevertheless, they remain a key mechanism for managing perceptions of insecurity, fostering confidence in the police, and increasing local capacity to address problems and are significant in reducing calls to address incidents of disorder.

The development of specific methods of engagement to establish the public's concerns and understand how to respond to them has lagged behind the allocation of resources to do so, which can undermine police officers' confidence in their value (Lowe and Innes, 2012). Much community engagement only involves those already engaging with the police rather than explicitly targeting sections of the community with which the police might otherwise have little contact (Lloyd and Foster, 2009). Although there have been a variety of initiatives to improve active levels of participation in decision-making, such as through social and online media (Ray et al, 2012) or participatory budgeting (Greater Manchester Police, 2009), there is still a clear need for continued development of a variety of approaches

to engagement that enables crime reduction initiatives to draw on a diversity of local knowledge and experience.

Legitimacy and police effectiveness

The relationship between the public and the police goes beyond the former's confidence in the latter. Also significant is the wider issue of legitimacy, which can be broadly defined as the right to rule and the recognition by the ruled of that right (Jackson et al, 2012). While police legitimacy is in itself important, it also goes hand in hand with effectiveness in reducing crime by both enhancing compliance with the law and promoting co-operation with the police (Mazerolle and Bennett, et al, 2013; Myhill and Quinton, 2011). If people are reluctant to co-operate with the police, they are less likely to report incidents (which can create a climate of impunity for offenders, increasing the vulnerability of those living amongst them), provide them with intelligence, act as witnesses, or co-operate with them in other ways. Public mistrust of the police can also be interpreted by officers as suspicious, which can further alienate them from their communities by creating a negative spiral of mutual mistrust.

While the concept of legitimacy is 'elusive and multifaceted' (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012), there is now a growing understanding of how to promote it. Research consistently shows that the fairness, respect and dignity with which people are treated by the police, and the degree to which people feel that their views are considered prior to police decision-making, have considerable influence on whether people see the police as exercising legitimate authority, regardless of the outcome of the interaction (Tyler, 2004; Mazerolle and Antrobus et al, 2013). Or, to put it another

way, 'a little bit of being nice during police-citizen interactions goes a long way' (Mazerolle and Bennett et al, 2013). This is in line with police officers' experience; if you treat people fairly and with respect, they are more likely to co-operate, follow your instructions and comply with the law (Myhill and Quinton, 2011). If, however, officers' actions do not coincide with how the public think they should behave, their actions will be seen as illegitimate and their authority to enforce the law will be undermined. The primary issue raised in complaints against the police, for example, is not that the contact or action was unjustified but that the demeanour of the officer was unacceptable (Fielding and Innes, 2006; May et al, 2007).

This is not to say that effectiveness itself plays no part in promoting legitimacy – for example a recent study based on a survey of London residents concludes that the police must (among other things) be seen to be effective to be legitimate (Tankebe, 2013) – but overall it seems that 'effectiveness is a necessary but not sufficient condition of legitimacy' (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012). It is therefore essential that the police also focus on improving the quality of everyday contact and ensuring that they meet public expectations of fair and legitimate behaviour. This applies not just to contact with victims or members of the public. Behaving fairly and respectfully towards suspects and offenders may also encourage greater compliance with the law and co-operation with the police in the future (Hough et al, 2010). The latter is particularly important given that many offenders are also victims.

The significance of how, and not simply whether, the law is enforced demonstrates the need to develop approaches to crime reduction that are sensitive to the way in which the police enforce the law and the social context of enforcement. Given the potentially damaging effects of just focusing resources on hotspots, how the police enforce the law has significant implications for developing local crime reduction interventions at micro-locations as well as in improving service quality at a wider level (Weisburd, 2012).

Summary and implications for the project

While the evidence of effective policing practice outlined above is relatively compelling, questions remain about the degree to which this model of local policing meets 21st century demands. The existing policing model has been put under considerable strain by the demands of a more globalised, culturally diverse and technologically connected society. Meeting those demands with fewer resources will be a considerable challenge. However, this review suggests that focusing increasingly limited resources on high crime micro-locations can be effective in reducing volume crime rates without resulting in displacement. In contrast, blanket enforcement or intensive, highly visible policing in such places tends to have limited short term impact and, if carried out in ways that are insensitive to community concerns or are perceived as heavy-handed, can have damaging consequences for police legitimacy. This suggests that crime reduction initiatives should focus on micro-locations and be especially sensitive to how the police engage with the public and enforce the law.

This review has also highlighted the potential value of being sensitive to the socio-economic

context of micro-locations, including the need to build collective efficacy. One of the strengths of problem-oriented policing is that it provides a more effective means of sustainably tackling crime and the issues that may be driving it than traditional enforcement approaches. Developing focused, multi-agency approaches that address specific crime and disorder problems and the issues that drive them while supporting the development of collective efficacy in micro-locations provides the potential for a more integrated (i.e. paying attention to the unequal distribution, and social context of, crime and disorder) approach to hotspots policing. In areas of high population turnover, this may offer a pragmatic and effective means of building greater community resilience. And in times of rising budgetary restraint, such an approach may become increasingly attractive.

Lessons from reforms that emphasise the need to demonstrate responsiveness to community concerns have highlighted the importance of providing a service to communities that slowly builds confidence in the police, particularly where relationships have been damaged. This suggests the need for innovation in public engagement. Research also highlights the dangers of a retreat from developments in policing that have recognised the impact of crime and disorder 'signals' on people's sense of security.

On the basis of this review, the Police Effectiveness in a Changing World project should focus on developing a thorough understanding of the problems in hotspots, using a variety of police, partnership and community sources, which will entail close working with police and partner agencies. It should also take account of the

increasing evidence on the degree to which *the way in which policing is carried out* is crucial to ensuring that general everyday interactions, and in particular targeted interventions, are experienced as fair and legitimate. This reinforces the need for approaches to be sensitive to the legitimacy of police conduct, fostering future co-operation and compliance. It may be possible in this way to deliver a sustained impact on crime.

2. The challenges for local policing in a changing world

The above discussion highlights the degree to which research into effective policing practice in reducing crime has focused on the role of policing in prevention and deterrence, in tackling highly localised problems and in building relationships of trust with localised communities. While this research remains relevant to local policing, there is a growing concern that current policing practice may not be attuned to, or meet the considerable challenges thrown up by rapidly changing social, economic, political and technological changes. It is therefore important that a project to improve police effectiveness and reduce crime is attentive to these changing conditions and their implications for practice. The following section explores the challenges for the police service before looking at ways of responding to them.

The challenges for the delivery of local policing in the UK are largely the result of socio-economic and technological changes over which the service has limited influence, with concomitant shifts in patterns of crime and demands for security (Manning, 2010; Brodeur, 2010). In brief, these changes include:

- The globalisation of markets for goods and services.

- The advent of fast communications, the internet, new social media and the pace of technological change.

- New patterns of individual mobility and migration arising in part, but not exclusively, from the expansion of the European Union.

- Growing income inequality and its influence on patterns of urban development.

- The fragmentation of families and communities (Bauman, 2001; Wacquant, 2007).

These characteristics of what has been variously termed the post-industrial or post-modern age have created new criminal opportunities, threats and risks. For example, a rise in the theft of relatively valuable metal from cars and various domestic, industrial and infrastructure sites has been driven by a steep rise in the international price of scrap metal driven by demand from industrial growth in China. This increase in metal theft has put significant demands on the police, with the Home Office estimating that there were between 80,000 and 100,000 police recorded metal theft offences in 2010/11 and that metal theft costs the police over £20 million in staffing costs (Home Office, 2012).

A further example is the explosion in the use of communication technology. In 2012, 80 per cent of households in Great Britain had access to the internet compared to 55 per cent in 2005 and just nine per cent of households in the UK in 1998. Coupled with increased mobility/migration, this has fundamentally changed the contemporary nature of social interaction and inter-personal relationships, which in turn have altered:

- Patterns of organisation ('flatter' peer-to-peer networks are preferred to more traditional hierarchical organisations.

- Levels of trust (interpersonal and institutional trust tend to be weaker and more contingent).

- The nature of community (the increasing importance of non-place-based affiliation).

- The construction of identity (people develop more complex conceptions of who they are and to what groups they belong) (see, for example, Castells, 1996).

They have also affected patterns of crime, including the organisation (or otherwise) of serious crime, in enabling extended but often brief networks of association, the networking of strangers and the industrialisation of false and borrowed identities for fraud and other criminal purposes (Levi, 2012). Although demand and supply dynamics continue to be experienced at the local level, this means that it no longer makes sense to tackle crime in one locality without reference to what is happening in other places; global phenomena (for example human trafficking) increasingly impact on local communities (Bullock et al, 2009). These changes present considerable challenges for the police service in terms of interoperability (i.e. working across borders, whether local, regional or national) and in staying ahead of increasingly fluid criminal networks and the proliferation of new kinds of offences and new ways of committing them.

These changes also have considerable implications for the ways in which the police engage with increasingly transient and culturally diverse communities, and with citizens connected more through communication technology and social media – 61 per cent of UK adults were found to be users in a 2011 survey – than through the places where they live. Although most crime, and of course most offenders, remain geographically located, these changes have considerable implications for developing relationships of trust and for communicating with, and acquiring reliable information about criminality from, the public.

One of the defining features of this changing social context, and in particular the so-called 'Information Age', has been the unprecedented surge in the quantity of information produced, processed and consumed. This is as true for the police as it is for the public (Innes and Roberts, 2011). These changes have been coupled with increased demands for security and order, often played out in calls for more visible and accessible policing (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary, 2011). The police are not only expected to be on call 24/7, but are also expected to respond immediately to an increasing range of problems (Fleming and Grabosky, 2009). Responding effectively to this volume and diversity of calls for service as well as to an increasingly wide range of crime and disorder issues at local and cross border levels, while attempting to meet public demands for a visible presence, presents significant pressures on police resources. There are concerns that 20th century strategies of policing, based on local street-level knowledge and local prevention/ deterrence and problem-solving, do not fully meet these 21st century challenges (Innes and Roberts, 2011).

The police service also currently faces a period of considerable organisational change as it adapts to the immediate challenges of a 20 per cent cut in the Home Office Police Grant between 2010 and 2014 and the prospect of long-term local authority budgetary restraint.[6] The police are required to 'do more with less', which is driving forces to focus on improving efficiency and reducing costs, particularly staff costs (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary, 2011). The need to reduce spending (for example on services, on non-warranted personnel or on management costs) and ensure resources are

---

[6] This may affect forces differently depending on their reliance on central grant funding and local precepts to supplement budgets. Community Safety Partner agencies also face considerable cuts to budgets which could increase the demands on the police service.

used efficiently to meet demand (for example ensuring shift patterns match demand for immediate/urgent response and focusing resource management on the most significant threats and risks) is focusing minds on meeting organisational goals more efficiently, often by adopting familiar managerial principles to organisational change.

A key concern is that these pressures could result in retrenchment to reactive, response-oriented approaches, which may not be able to meet the challenges outlined above. The concern is that managers will attempt to deploy scarce resources in response to immediate demands by disinvesting in specialist, proactive, investigative and civilian analytical staff capable of contributing to more sustainable crime reduction (Karn, 2010). These challenges may also result in pressures to reduce the allocation of resources on community engagement and neighbourhood policing as police personnel are moved to other duties. Equally, pressures on local authority and other partner agency budgets threaten the resources available for local problem-solving and for strategic partnership work, despite an acknowledgement that these are needed to maintain sustainable reductions in crime.

A parallel imperative within the current government's police reform agenda is to encourage the public to undertake more social control work, for the police in effect 'to do less with more' (Innes, 2011). This reflects a wider reform agenda focusing on promoting greater local accountability and voluntarism (evident particularly in the introduction of PCCs and the Big Society) while reducing state capacity.

The current government reforms demand a 'smaller, smarter and sharper style of policing'

(Innes, 2011), with fewer resources, better use of human and informational assets and targeting interventions to where they can make the most difference. But in the past, reform of policing has been driven largely by failures or crises, such as the murder of Stephen Lawrence, the Hillsborough tragedy and the miscarriages of justice in the 1980s and 1990s, rather than policy (Reiner, 2010). It remains to be seen how far current policy reforms will lead to real changes in operational policing, given the cultural resistance to change in the service.

As mentioned above, a key element of the recent reforms has been the replacement of Police Authorities with directly elected PCCs alongside Police and Crime Panels. Their role is to set local (force level) policing priorities, plan policing budgets and work with Chief Constables, community safety partnerships and criminal justice agencies and community groups to deliver community safety and overall security in the area.

Until these changes become more established it is difficult to predict their full implications. While their introduction may present some opportunities to promote a shift away from central (i.e. Home Office) accountability and greater responsiveness to local concerns, they may also expose the service to greater political influence (Association of Chief Police Officers, 2011). Equally, whether PCCs will be motivated to direct resources to tackling crimes that are more hidden, such as organised crime, and less likely to have popular appeal, such as domestic violence, family child abuse and hate crime, has been questioned (Innes, 2011). How responsive such arrangements will be to their local population when structured at force level, particularly in large force areas with big and sometimes very diverse populations, is also

open to question. There has been very little focus to date on how PCCs will mobilise and engage communities in decision-making, or in less formal voluntary activity, and rather more on their role as 'crime fighters' (Innes, 2011).

PCC powers to commission services present a particular challenge given the scope this gives them to invite a wide range of providers to deliver patrol or other community safety related services. This may present significant challenges for partnership working and expose local arrangements to greater fragmentation, which may also make analysis of crime trends and patterns more problematic. How responsive such arrangements will be to national and international crime trends and to using evidence of effective practice also remains to be seen. A key challenge for local level police commanders and their partners will be in juggling the demands of police management, PCCs, Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary (HMIC) and other new national arrangements (for example the National Crime Agency and the College of Policing) as well as partner agencies and local communities.

3. Meeting the challenges

Rapidly changing social, economic and technological environments, with new forms of criminal activity that increasingly transcend local and national borders, pose real challenges for neighbourhood policing, as well as for intelligence gathering, analysis and investigation. This section outlines the implications of this context for policing practice and in particular for the 'Police Effectiveness in a Changing World' project. Three of the four high crime wards identified in Luton and Slough on which the project will focus are characterised by transient, culturally diverse populations and reflect the rapid population growth contributing to a relatively young population profile in both towns. The fourth ward is a traditional white working class area, with less cultural diversity but experiencing similarly high rates of crime and multiple deprivation, which in the current economic climate, with high rates of unemployment and cuts in public services and welfare benefits, is likely to worsen.

Neighbourhood policing: adapting to the changing world

One of the challenges for neighbourhood policing is to foster and maintain trust and legitimacy in those communities with more transient and culturally diverse populations. Neighbourhood policing built around problem-solving approaches helps build trust, reduce fear and encourage reporting, particularly if combined with flexible approaches to identifying residents' concerns, understanding their expectations and involving them in developing effective responses. Such approaches might, for example, include innovative forms of community engagement, tailored to a variety of groups, such as new migrants or young people living in specific micro-location hotspots.

They may range from proactive attendance by the police at community events or meetings, to the involvement of community members in local decision-making and using new forms of communication technology and social media. With the introduction of PCCs, this is likely to be an opportune moment to focus on developing new and better forms of community engagement.

Another challenge for the police (along with their partners) concerns building collective efficacy and trust in multi-ethnic and culturally diverse neighbourhoods with high rates of deprivation and population turnover. As these are usually high crime areas with a history of police intervention, the lessons from insensitive enforcement-based approaches suggest the need for caution and in particular an awareness of how such approaches can undermine resilience and trust. However, attempts to promote police-community dialogue about problems and their solution inherently require an appeal to common values, which is more complex in multi-cultural communities. It is not possible for managers to appeal to the dominant norms of every cultural group but rather to find common ground that reflects a more universal morality (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012).

It has been suggested that in an increasingly globalised world, those in positions of power need to identify and articulate areas of shared morality and negotiate their acceptance among a range of communities with different normative cultures (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012). In practice this means that police managers and front line officers have to think about the legitimacy of their actions in the eyes of a variety of audiences, often with conflicting interests. These may include very different understandings of the priority issues and

how the police and/or partners should best respond to them (Huey, 2007). Effective engagement with different communities is therefore crucial to developing approaches that are sensitive to a range of community concerns.

In such areas, expectations of the police and whether people feel able to trust them will vary according to their previous contact with police, whether in the UK or in their countries of origin. However, strong shared values of justice are important in shaping immediate judgments about the legitimacy of contact with the police, irrespective of preconceived ideas of whether the police may be trusted in general (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012; Karn, 2007). This could have transformative potential in the long term in that it could shift expectations of policing even if previous experiences have been damaging. In practice this means improving public experiences of contact with officers, and attempting to engender this among officers by appealing to professional norms that strike a chord with their values (Bottoms and Tankebe, 2012). This may be challenging to deliver and to succeed would almost certainly need commitment from senior and especially middle managers.

Developing intelligence through structured engagement

While much of the research on local policing has focused on fostering confidence and reducing fear of crime by tackling visible crime and disorder, there has been less focus on the role of neighbourhood and response policing in building trusting relationships with those able to provide useful information about more hidden criminal activity. Notably, there is little evidence on the capacity for local policing to contribute to an

understanding of criminal or incident 'connectedness' beyond their local area. A style of neighbourhood policing that attempts to build links in fragmented communities and identify connections between local problems and issues that go beyond local boundaries is likely to require a greater emphasis on intelligence-gathering and analysis. A more structured, systematic approach to community engagement may be needed if the police are to gather 'community intelligence' proactively from residents knowledgeable about local crime (Lowe and Innes, 2012). This would help to alert the police to growing problems in areas where they lack good contacts and to access reliable information not currently reported to the police or their partners.

Public understanding of the police as the first port of call in dealing with problems in their neighbourhood can mean that the service drowns in the 'noise' of information about relatively trivial but highly visible incidents. This can result in failing to connect local knowledge to more serious (but often hidden) criminal activity. This richer understanding of how low level disorder may connect with other less visible, but more harmful activity in an area is really only obtainable from engaging residents knowledgeable about such connections. A more structured engagement approach might also help to build relationships with local residents in a position to know about more serious criminal activity. While covert human sources are one means of accessing such information, improving the conduct of local officers could potentially increase the amount and quality of local intelligence from offenders and victims with whom they are in daily contact. This suggests fostering behaviour that meets public (including victim, witness, suspect *and* offender) expectations

of police conduct and developing officers' confidence to use their discretion, with integrity, to build relationships with, in particular, more 'suspect' members of the community. As many hotspots are also offender residence hotspots, these activities may in practice go hand in hand.

Contributing street-officer knowledge to intelligence development

Greater police effectiveness and efficiency could be achieved if the information and intelligence aspects of policing were organised differently (Innes and Roberts, 2011). Although street level officers are an important source of primary information (Manning and Hawkins, 1989) and accessing information from the public is implicit in the functions of local policing, little is known about how neighbourhood officers work with intelligence analysts. Policing has always been 'knowledge work' (Ericson and Haggerty, 1997), but the demands of the 'Information Age' pose new and quite specific challenges of information management. Effective intelligence-led or problem-solving approaches to policing rely on the effective acquisition, management and use of information if it is to help forces adapt to change (Innes and Roberts, 2011). The limited degree to which 'bottom up' intelligence has been fed into higher levels [7] has, for example, been identified as a considerable weakness in the implementation of the NIM (Maguire and John 2003). In theory this model was meant to shape the way in which information could be fed through to each operational level of policing, but in practice identifying what information should be fed upwards has proved difficult and NIM has tended to be more top down than bottom up (Maguire and John, 2003). Similarly, opportunities to use

partnership information to contribute to a 'bottom up' intelligence picture, particularly in tackling serious criminality, have been rare (Van Staden et al, 2011).

There are a number of challenges to improving the capacity of local policing, working with their partners, to contribute to developing better, more relevant intelligence beyond building good relationships with knowledgeable sources. Officers need to recognise whether information they acquire by just being present in their communities is significant or otherwise and make sure they routinely record it fully and accurately into intelligence database systems (Cope, 2004). Observations of a Basic Command Unit (BCU) in London, for example, showed that a significant proportion of intelligence submissions were never entered on the system (Innes and Roberts, 2011). Some officers can also be unwilling to share what they know with civilian analysts, whose civilian status within the policing hierarchy can be ambiguous (Cope, 2004). These barriers limit the effective conversion of primary information into useful intelligence through analysis and undermine the credibility of analysis (and tasking based upon it) in the eyes of officers who are well aware of the limitations of information entered on police force databases (Innes et al, 2005).

The difficulties of converting experiential knowledge of street level policing into a form that can be used by analysts to create useful intelligence to inform tasking is a good example of one of the challenges facing the police in adjusting to a rapidly changing information environment (Innes and Roberts, 2011). Where offences committed locally originate outside the locality (or even the country), the task is further

---

[7] The NIM has three principle levels encompassing local policing, force level, and inter-force level.

complicated by needing to obtain information from other forces or countries. It requires higher level skills in the use of IT and possibly additional resources to access, for example, translation services or knowledge about other countries' criminal justice systems. Developing these kinds of skills is crucial to effective problem-solving in highly diverse and mobile communities such as those in Luton and Slough.

Analysis and intelligence

Turning information into intelligence that provides a detailed, on-going picture of rapidly changing socio-economic, demographic and crime trends in ways that can contribute to actionable interventions or investigations is a crucial component of developing effective crime reduction approaches. The value of intelligence-led policing has become accepted as a way of achieving more effective and efficient use of resources for predicting risks and threats and preventing harm. However, recent research suggests there are systemic problems in the processing and use of information that limits the capacity of the police to do this (Innes and Roberts, 2011).

A central role in the processing of information is to establish its provenance – where and from whom does it come? Is the source reliable? An increasing challenge is dealing with the sheer volume of information in a timely manner, much of which is limited in terms of quality. For example, in the study of a London BCU intelligence unit referred to above, 10 per cent of submissions were graded as containing no intelligence or information and three quarters were not progressed because they did not reflect the

force's strategic objectives (Innes and Roberts, 2011). While prioritising is clearly necessary, this limits the force's capacity to identify and respond to emerging risks and threats (Cope, 2004).

The focus of crime analysis on 'gripping' already identified problems mirrors the performance culture in the police service, which is the context in which crime analysis has developed. The influence of geo-location mapping of crime hotspots has, for example, largely arisen from its benefits in terms of efficient resource allocation, but in practice mapping rarely goes beyond the descriptive and is therefore limited in its capacity to inform tasking and problem-solving (Innes et al, 2005). Crime mapping also tends to be used to drive resources towards managing highly localised, time-limited spates of criminal activity, rather than to exploring persistent problems or to making connections with out-of-area activity.

Crime analysis tends to be shaped by traditional police understandings of crime, especially tracking the movements or networks of the 'usual suspects' (Innes et al, 2005). While this can contribute to, say, the proactive investigation of illicit markets, it tends on the whole to reinforce organisational knowledge about 'known offenders' without necessarily establishing the real position of individuals within a network or the often fleeting nature of their relationships. In conditions of increased population mobility and transience and mediated relationships between strangers, these techniques have their limits.

A recent report for HMIC found that information given to officers at briefings usually related to incidents or events that had already happened rather than what was anticipated, so they tended to be reactive rather than proactive (Her Majesty's

Inspector of Constabulary, 2012). The same report found that officers did not know what kind of real-time intelligence would be of most use to them and that their training failed to provide them with the evidence-base they needed effectively to prevent crime. Furthermore, officers tend to commission the simple collation of information rather than more sophisticated prospective or predictive analyses, while analysts remain sceptical about the degree to which their analysis is used to inform tasking (Innes et al, 2005).

To identify rapidly changing crime trends and more dispersed patterns and networks of criminal activity proactively requires a broad range of analytical and investigative skills. The essential role that analysis plays in problem-solving and successful partnership working suggests that additional resources should be invested in crime analysis and that more attention should be given to improving the ways in which analysts work and developing their status within the organisation. This is possibly one of the most urgent tasks that need to be addressed if higher quality intelligence is to better inform effective approaches to policing in a rapidly changing environment.

Conclusion

Long-term socio-economic and technological changes, with concomitant changes in patterns of crime and demands for security, present enormous operational challenges for the police service in working across borders (both local/regional and national) and in keeping up to speed with rapid changes in the *modus operandi* of criminals and their associates. Responding effectively to these developments while attempting to meet increasing public and political demands for security, and adapting to the prospect of long-term budgetary restraint and wider police reform, present some significant challenges for the service. A key concern is that these immediate pressures could result in retrenchment to reactive response-oriented approaches, likely to be inadequate in meeting these 21st century challenges.

The 'Police Effectiveness in a Changing World' project will draw on knowledge of effective, sustainable crime reduction practice, developing multi-agency problem-solving approaches to address issues in micro-location hotspots. The project will also draw on the evidence of the value of community engagement and procedural justice in securing sustainable reductions to persistent crime and disorder issues in high crime areas. It will look to introduce good practice and innovation in helping to develop interventions to increase police effectiveness and reduce crime and identify ways of improving systems, processes, skills and techniques in intelligence analysis and intelligence-led tasking. In this way the project will aim to develop the skills and infrastructure at the local level to improve the capacity of the police and their partners to address crime in this rapidly changing world.

References

Association of Chief Police Officers (2011) *Police Reform and Social Responsibility Bill: The ACPO view on the proposals*. London: ACPO. Available at: http://www.acpo.police.uk/documents/reports/2011/20110329%20PRSRB_23%20March_oc_.pdf

Bauman, Z. (2001) *Community: seeking safety in an insecure world.* Cambridge: Polity.

Berry, G., Briggs, P., Erol, R. and van Staden, L. (2011) *The Effectiveness of Partnership working in a crime and disorder context: A rapid evidence Assessment. Research Report 52*. London: Home Office.

Bittner, E. (1974) *Florence Nightingale in Pursuit of Willie Sutton – A Theory of the Police.* New York: Sage.

Bittner, E. (1990) *Aspects of Police Work.* Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Bottoms, A. (2012) *Developing Socio-Spatial Criminology.* The Oxford Handbook of Criminology, Fifth Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bottoms, A. and Tankebe, J. (2012). Beyond Procedural Justice: A Dialogic Approach to Legitimacy in Criminology. *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology,* 102(1), pp.119–170.

Bowers, K.J., Johnson, S.D., Guerette, R.T, Summers, L. and Poynton, S. (2011) Spatial displacement and diffusion of benefits among geographically focused policing initiatives: a meta-analytical review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology* 7(4), pp.347-374.

Bradford, B. (2011) *Police numbers and crime rates – a rapid evidence review.* London: HMIC.

Braga, A. and Weisburd, D. L. (2012) *The Effects of 'Pulling Levers' Focused Deterrence Strategies on Crime.* Campbell Systematic Reviews 2012: 6.

Braga, A, Papachristos, A. and Hureau, D. (2012) *Hotspots policing effects on crime.* Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2012: 8.

Bratton, W. (1998) Crime is Down in New York City: Blame the Police. *in* Dennis, N. (ed.) *Zero Tolerance: Policing a Free Society.* London: Institute of Economic Affairs.

Brodeur, J. (2010) *The Policing Web*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bullock, K. and Tilley, N. (2009) Evidence-Based Policing and Crime Reduction. *Policing*, 3 (4), pp. 381-387.

Bullock, K., Chowdury, R. and Hollings, P. (2009) *Public Concerns About Organised Crime.* Home Office Research Report 16. Home Office: London.

Burnasco, W. (2008) Them Again? Same Offender Involvement in Repeat and Near Repeat Burglaries. *European Journal of Criminology*, 5(4), pp. 411-431.

Castells, M. (1996) *The Rise of the Network Society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Chainey, S. (2012) *Predictive Mapping (Predictive Policing)*. JDI Briefs. London: UCL Jill Dando Institute of Security and Crime Science. Available at: http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1344080/3/JDIBriefs_PredictiveMappingSChaineyApril2012.pdf

Clarke, R. and Hough, M. (1984) *Crime and Police Effectiveness.* Home Office Research Study No. 79. London: HMSO.

Committee on Law and Justice (2004). *Fairness and Effectiveness in Policing: The evidence.* National Research Council of the National Academies. Washington: The National Academies Press.

Cope, N. (2004) Intelligence Led Policing or Policing led Intelligence?: Integrating Volume Crime Analysis into Policing. *British Journal of Criminology,* 44(2), pp. 188-203.

Davison, T., van Staden, L., Nicholas, S. and Feist, A. (2010) *Process Evaluation of Data Sharing Between Emergency Departments and Community Safety Partnerships in the South East.* Home Office Research Report 46. London: Home Office.

Durlauf, S. and Nagin, D. (2011) Imprisonment and Crime: Can both be reduced? *Criminology and Public Policy,* 10(1), pp.9-12.

Eck, J. and Rosenbaum, D. (1994) The New Police Order: Effectiveness, equality, and efficiency in community policing. *in*: Rosenbaum, D. (ed.) *The Challenge of Community Policing: Testing the Promises.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ericson, R.V. and Haggerty, K.D. (1997) *Policing the Risk Society*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fielding, N. (2009) *Getting the best out of Community Policing*. Ideas in British Policing. London: The Police Foundation.

Fielding, N. and Innes, M. (2006) Reassurance Policing, Community Policing and Measuring Police Performance. *Policing and Society,* 16(2), pp.127-145.

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

Flanagan, R. (2008) *The Review of Policing: Final Report.* London: Home Office.

Fleming, J. and Grabosky, P. (2009) Managing the Demand for Police Services, or How to Control an Insatiable Appetite. *Policing,* 3(3) pp. 281-291.

Florence, C., Shepherd, J., Brennan, I. and Simon, T. (2011) Effectiveness of anonymised information sharing and use in health service, police, and local government partnership for preventing violence related injury: experimental study and time series analysis. *British Medical Journal:* 342.

Goldstein, H. (1990) *Problem-oriented policing.* New York: McGraw-Hill.

Greater Manchester Police (2009) *Participatory Budgeting Pilots: Evaluation Report (Stockport & Tameside Divisions).* Manchester: Review & Evaluation Unit, Corporate Development & Performance, GMP.

Grove, L., Farrell, G., Farrington, D.F., and Johnson S.D. (2012) *Preventing Repeat Victimisation: A Systematic Review.* Stockholm: The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention.

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary (2011) *Adapting to Austerity: A review of police force and authority preparedness for the 2011/12–14/15 CSR period.* London: HMIC.

Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabulary (2012) *Taking time for crime: A study of how police officers prevent crime in the field*. London: HMIC.

Home Office (2011) *Key findings from a survey of IOM implementation.* Available at: http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/crime/reducing-reoffending/ IOM-Survey-Exec-Summary?view=Binary.

Home Office (2012) *Impact Assessment: Tackling Metal Theft – prohibit cash payments and higher fines.* Available at: http://www.justice.gov.uk/downloads/legislation/bills-acts/legal-aid-sentencing/ laspo-metal-theft-ia.pdf.

Hough, M., Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Myhill, A. and Quinton, P. (2010) Procedural Justice, Trust, and Institutional Legitimacy. *Policing,* 4(3), pp. 203-210.

House of Commons Home Affairs Committee (2005) *Sixth report of Session 2004-05: Terrorism and community relations*. London: The Stationery Office.

Huey, I. (2007) *Negotiating demands: the politics of skid row policing in Edinburgh, San Francisco, and Vancouver*. Buffalo: University of Toronto Press.

Innes, M. (2004) Signal crimes and signal disorders: notes on deviance as communicative action. *British Journal of Sociology,* 55(3), pp. 335-355.

Innes, M. (2011) Doing Less with More: The 'new' politics of policing. *Public Policy Research*, 18(2), pp. 73-80.

Innes M. and Roberts, C. (2011) *Policing, Situational Intelligence and the Information Environment: A Report to Her Majesty's Inspectorate of Constabulary*. Cardiff: Universities' Police Science Institute, Cardiff University.

Innes, M., Fielding, N. and Cope, N. (2005) 'The Appliance of Science?': The Theory and Practice of Crime Intelligence Analysis. *British Journal of Criminology,* 45(1), pp. 39-57.

Jackson, J., Bradford, B., Hough, M., Myhill, A., Quinton, P. and Tyler, T.R. (2012) Why do people comply with the law? Legitimacy and the influence of legal institutions. *British Journal of Criminology,* 52(6), pp.1051-1071.

Jones, B. and Tilley, N. (2004) *The Impact of High Visibility Patrols on Personal Robbery. Research Findings, 201*. London: Home Office.

Karn, J. (2007) *Narratives of Neglect: community, regeneration and the local governance of security.* Cullompton: Willan.

Karn, J. (2010) Softening the impact. *Police Professional*, 14 October.

Kelling, G., Pate, A., Dieckman, D. and Brown, C. (1974) *The Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment: Technical report.* Washington DC: Police Foundation.

Kelling, G. (1981) *The Newark Foot Patrol Experiment.* Washington DC: Police Foundation.

Kennedy, D.M. (2009) *Deterrence and crime prevention: Reconsidering the prospect of sanction.* New York: Routledge.

Klofas, J.M., Hipple, N.K. and McGarrell, E.F. (2010) *The New Criminal Justice: American Communities And The Changing World Of Crime Control.* London: Routledge.

Koper, C. (1995) Just enough police presence: Reducing crime and disorderly behaviour by optimizing patrol time in crime hotspots*. Unpublished paper, cited in Rosenbaum D.P. (2006) The limits of hotspots policing. *in* Weisburd, D. and Braga, A. (eds) *Police innovation: Contrasting perspectives*, pp. 245-263. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Koper, C. and Mayo-Wilson, E. (2006). Police crackdowns on illegal gun carrying: A systematic review of their impact on gun crime. *Journal of Experimental Criminology,* 2(2), pp. 227-261.

Levi, M. (2012) The Organization of serious crimes for gain. *in* Maguire, M., Morgan, R. and Reiner, R. (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levitt, S. (1997) Using Electoral Cycles in Police Hiring to Estimate the Effect of Police on Crime. *The American Economic Review*, 87(3), pp. 270-290.

Lloyd, K. and Foster, J. (2009) *Citizen Focus and community Engagement: A review of the Literature*. London: The Police Foundation.

Lowe, T. and Innes, M. (2012) Can we speak in confidence? Community intelligence and neighbourhood policing. *Policing and Society* 22(3), pp. 295-316.

McGarrell, E.F. (2010) Accumulating lessons from Project Safe Neighbourhoods. *in* Klofas, J.M., Hipple, N.K. and McGarrell, E.F. (eds) *The New Criminal Justice: American Communities and the Changing World Of Crime Control*. London: Routledge.

Maguire, M. (2008) Criminal investigation and crime control. *in* Newburn, T. (ed.) *Handbook of Policing.* Cullompton: Willan.

Maguire, M. and John, T. (2003) Rolling out the National Intelligence Model: Key Challenges. *in* Bullock, K. and Tilley, N. (eds) *Crime reduction and problem-oriented policing*. Cullompton: Willan.

Maguire, M. and John, T. (1995) Intelligence, Surveillance and Informants: Integrated Approaches. London: Home Office.

Manning, P.K. (2010) *Democratic Policing in a Changing World*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm.

Manning, P. and Hawkins, K. (1989) Police Decision-Making. *in* Weatheritt, M. (ed.) *Police Research: Some Future Prospects*. Aldershot: Avebury.

May, T., Hough, M., Herrington, V. and Warburton, H. (2007) *Local Resolution: The Views of Officers and Complainants.* London: The Police Foundation.

Mazerolle, L., Antrobus, E., Bennett, S. and Tyler, T. R. (2013) Shaping Citizen Perceptions of Police Legitimacy: A Randomized Field Trial of Procedural Justice. *Criminology,* 51(1), pp.33–63.

Mazerolle, L., Bennett, S., Davis, J., Sargeant, E. and Manning, M. (2013) *Legitimacy in Policing: A Systematic Review.* Campbell Systematic Reviews, 2013:1.

Mclean, F. and Hillier, J. (2010) *An observational study of response and neighbourhood officers*. London: National Policing Improvement Agency.

Miller, J., Bland, N. and Quinton, P. (2000) *The impact of stops and searches on crime and the community, Police Research Series 127.* London: Home Office.

Myhill, A. (2006) *Community Engagement in Policing: Lessons from the Literature*. London: Home Office.

Myhill, A. and Quinton, P. (2011*) It's a Fair Cop? Police Legitimacy, public cooperation and crime reduction.* London: National Policing Improvement Agency.

Nicholas, L. and Farrell, G. (2008) Repeat Victimisation. *in* Newburn, T. and Neyroud, P. (eds) *Dictionary of Policing.* Cullompton: Willan.

Noaks, L. (2000) Private cops on the block: a review of the role of private security in residential communities. *Policing and Society*, 10(2), pp. 143-161.

Pate, A. (1986) Experimenting with foot patrol: The Newark experience. *in* Rosenbaum, D. (ed.) *Community Crime Prevention: Does it* Work? Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pease, K. (1998) *Repeat Victimisation: Taking Stock*. London: Home Office.

The Police Foundation (2012) Stop and Search. *The Briefing,* Series 2, Edition 3. London: The Police Foundation.

Quinton, P. and Morris, J. (2008) *Neighbourhood Policing: The Impact of Piloting and Early National Implementation*. London: National Police Improvement Agency.

Ratcliffe, J.H., Taniguchi, T., Groff, E.R. and Wood, J.D. (2011) The Philadelphia Foot Patrol Experiment: A Randomized Controlled Trial of Police Patrol Effectiveness in Violent Crime Hotspots. *Criminology* 49(3), pp.795-831.

Ray, K., Davidson, R., Husain, F., Vegeris, S., and Vowden, K. with Karn, J. (2012) *Perceptions of the policing and crime mapping 'Trailblazers'.* Research Report 67. London: Home Office.

Reiner, R. (2010) *The Politics of the Police*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosenbaum, D. (2006) The limits of hot spots policing. *in* Weisburd, D. and Braga, A. (eds) *Police innovation: contrasting perspectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sampson, R. and Raudenbush, S. (1999) Systematic social observation of public spaces: a new look at disorder and crime. *American Journal of Sociology* 105(3), pp.603-651.

Shapland, J. and Vagg, J. (1990) *Policing by the Public.* London: Routledge.

Sherman, L. and Eck, J. (2002) Policing for Crime Prevention. *in* Sherman, L., MacKenzie, D. and Farrington, D. (eds) *Evidence-Based Crime Prevention.* New York: Routledge.

Van Staden, L., Leahy-Harland, S. and Gottschallk, E. (2011) *Tackling Organised Crime Through a Partnership Approach at the Local Level: A Process Evaluation,* Research Report 56. Home Office: London.

Wacquant, L. (2007) *Urban outcasts : towards a sociology of advanced marginality.* Cambridge: Polity.

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

Weatheritt, M. (1998) *Zero Tolerance Policing: What does it mean and is it right for Britain?* London: The Police Foundation.

Weisburd, D. (2012) Bringing Social Context Back into the Equation: The Importance of Social Characteristics of Places in the Prevention of Crime. *Criminology & Public Policy,* 11 (2), pp.317–326.

Weisburd, D. and Braga, A. (2006) Hot spots policing as a model for police innovation. *in* Weisburd, D. and Braga, A. (eds) *Police innovation: contrasting perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weisburd, D. and Eck, J. (1999) What Can Police Do to Reduce Crime, Disorder, and Fear? *in* Skogan, W. and Frydl, K. (2004) *Fairness and effectiveness in policing: The Evidence*. Washington DC: The National Academies Press.

Weisburd, D., Mastrofski, S., Willis, J. and Greenspan, R. (2006) Changing Everything so that Everything Can Remain the Same: Compstat and American Policing. *in* Weisburd, D. and Braga, A. (eds) *Police Innovation: Contrasting Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weisburd, D., Telep, C.W., Hinkle, J.C. and Eck, J.E. (2010) Is problem-oriented policing effective in reducing crime and disorder? *Criminology & Public Policy,* 9(1), pp.139-172.

Whitehead, T. (2013) 'Minority Report' policing comes to the UK. *The Daily Telegraph.*15 May. Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/law-and-order/10059121/Minority-Report-policing-comes-to-the-UK.html

Wilson, J.Q. and Kelling, G. (1982) Broken Windows: The police and neighbourhood safety. *Atlantic Monthly,* 249(3), pp.29-38.