DELIVERABLE 3.2
Unity – 1st Stakeholder Analysis – Shared Themes and Concepts

Executive summary

Due date: 31st January 2016
Date of submission: 31st January 2016
Lead beneficiary: Centre of Excellence in Public Safety Management/Rotterdam School of Management, Erasmus University Rotterdam

Project Title: Unity
Grant Agreement: 653729
Funding Scheme: Research and Innovation action – Safeguarding Secure Society

Duration Time: 36 months
Start date: 01/05/2015

Introduction

The objective of this second WP3 deliverable D3.2 is to provide a view on the community policing themes and concepts across stakeholder groups. The focus is on illustrating the similarities and overlaps of perspectives; on the one hand, we consider similarities across countries; on the other hand, similarities between police-internal perspective and external perspective.

Methodology

This deliverable is based on the data collected for D3.1. As described in D3.1, we used an open-ended interview protocol. The interviews captured the following information:

1. Main goals of community policing
2. Core tasks
3. Capabilities and resources needed to fulfill these tasks
4. Main stakeholders and target groups of community policing
5. Success criteria including examples of 'good' and 'bad' community policing
6. Ratings of current community policing performance
7. Challenges and possible improvements
8. Future developments and visions for community policing

We collected data from two groups: members of police forces with expertise in community policing, the other community members from five different groups. The five community groups were selected to represented members from political, economic, social, technological and legal stakeholders of community policing. Table 1 provides an overview of the number of interviews collected per country.

Table 1. Number of interviews analyzed for D3.2 per country and group

Country	Community	Police	Total per country
Belgium	28	11	39
Bulgaria	28	10	38
Croatia	28	10	38
Estonia	28	10	38
Finland	27	10	37
Germany	29	9	38
Macedonia	28	10	38
United Kingdom (including additional data collected in Scotland)	39	18	57
Total	**235**	**88**	**323**

Our analytic approach followed thematic and content analytic principles (Auerback & Silverstein, 2003; Krippendorff, 2003) to identify the main topics and themes in the data. For this, interview answers were coded in several cycles, starting with open or initial coding (Charmaz, 2006). The resulting codes were then clustered into high-order categories per main topic. In total, we coded 10.667 pieces of text, developing 7033 individual nodes in 13 themes. In this deliverable we report on the main categories and themes.

Results

Definitions of community policing

Five aspects emerged: policing performance, working with local communities and partners, fostering trust, confidence and understanding, focusing on the human aspect and empowering local communities, and policing a specific area. Three aspects were shared in most countries by police officers as well as external groups: understanding and addressing local needs and issues, prevention, protection and intervention and contact and communication (cp. Table 2). In most countries police officers also mentioned working together with the community and improving cooperation and collaboration, while members in external groups focused on being available, accessible and approachable and information gathering and sharing.

Table 2. Elements of CP DEFINITIONS shared across most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Understanding and addressing local needs and issues	Understanding and addressing local needs and issues
Prevention, protection and intervention	Prevention, protection and intervention
Contact and communication	Contact and communication
To work together with the community	Being available, accessible and approachable
To improve cooperation and collaboration	Information gathering and sharing

Core goals and tasks of community policing

Goals fell into five categories: assistance and service, increase and improvements in cooperation, managing information exchange and sharing, police-internal processes and structures and outcomes and police performance. In terms of core tasks of community policing, police members showed considerable variation across countries. External groups across countries appeared more aligned in their descriptions of community policing core tasks than police members, most of them emphasizing sufficient availability and accessibility. Strong alignment also existed in their emphasis on crime fighting to ensure safety and security.

Crime fighting emerged as the goal and task most countries agreed on as a core element of community policing. Further goals named in a majority of countries by both groups were fostering trust, confidence and respect and a need for cooperation; additional tasks were availability and accessibility and improving communication and contact. Police members across most countries further agreed on the relevance of improved safety perceptions and the role of officers to provide advice and consultations as community policing goals and on information gathering and management as core task, whereas community members agreed on availability, accessibility and approachability of police and improved communication and contact as core community policing goals.

Table 3. GOALS shared across most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Crime fighting and ensuring safety	Crime fighting and ensuring safety
Foster trust, confidence and respect	Foster trust, confidence and respect
Need for cooperation	Need for cooperation
Increase perceived safety	Be available, accessible and approachable
Provide advice and consultation	Improve communication and contact

Table 4. TASKS shared across most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Crime fighting to ensuring safety and security	Crime fighting to ensuring safety and security
Availability and accessibility	Availability and accessibility
Improve communication and contact	Improve communication and contact
Information gathering and management	

Main stakeholders and partner community groups

Interviewees mentioned 27 different groups. These groups could be split into citizen groups and intermediaries, which refer to groups and organizations supporting police forces in their community policing efforts. Taking a closer look at the specific groups mentioned, it becomes apparent that police officers vary in which citizen groups they listed as core target groups. The focus varied between specific age groups (e.g., youth, elderly) versus migrant and minority groups versus a slight emphasis on the general public or victims. In contrast, community members were mostly in agreement by focusing on specific age groups, with a lesser emphasis on migrant and minority groups. With respect to intermediaries, police officers across countries mentioned most often governmental services and organizations, which ranged from ministries, health, fire, transport, security and social services, political parties and politicians as well as intelligence services and other police forces. Community members equally mentioned governmental services and organizations as the most frequent intermediaries, and to a lesser extent private businesses and unions, media and charities and NGOs.

Looking for agreement across countries, our findings indicate that *migrant and minority groups* and *specific age groups* were considered important citizen groups in the majority of countries, as were *governmental services and organizations* as well as *private businesses* and unions with respect to intermediaries.

Table 5. GRPOUPS shared across most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Citizen groups	
Migrant and minority groups	Migrant and minority groups
Specific ages	Specific ages
General public	
Intermediaries	
Governmental services and organizations	Governmental services and organizations
Private businesses and unions	Private businesses and unions
Educational organizations	
Charities and NGOs	

Aspects within the police to help fulfill community policing tasks

Seven types of internal enablers emerged: contact and communication between police and external groups, the existence of cooperation and relationships, efforts in crime fighting, performance management, resources and capacities, and accountability and reduction of corruption. Groups and countries overwhelmingly identified resources and capabilities as the most relevant internal enablers, strengths and weaknesses. The main internal enabler mentioned were capacities of staff such as professional expertise, a positive attitude of officers and motivation and dedication; to a lesser extent also financial resources were mentioned. For resources and capacities in terms of internal strengths the emphasis lay on human capacities (e.g., diversity in police staff, officers' social competencies and skills or their professionalism); for police members to a lesser extent also on structural and cultural factors such as a good internal organization, embeddedness in the local context and an understanding of community policing as a core task of policing. Human capacities (e.g., insufficient number of

officers, lacking education and training, biased attitudes) and inadequate resources and capacities (e.g., lack of authority and power, lack of organizational flexibility or lack of vision) formed the most prominent internal weaknesses with respect to inadequate resources and capacities. Tables 6-8 show the most shared relevant aspects across countries.

Table 6. INTERNAL ENABLERS shared across most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Staff and officer capacity	Staff and officer capacity
Leadership and management	Leadership and management
Financial resources	Education and training
	Internal organization

Table 7. INTERNAL STRENGTHS shared across most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Human capacity	Human capacity
Structural and cultural factors	Structural and cultural factors

Table 8. INTERNAL WEAKNESSES shared across most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Structural and cultural factors	Structural and cultural factors
Human capacity	Human capacity
Ineffectiveness and inefficiency	
Inadequate financial resources	

Aspects in the environment to help fulfill community policing tasks

Four types of external enablers emerged: contact and communication, cooperation and relationships, trust and accountability and contextual factors. Cooperation and relationships was the most frequently mentioned aspect both by police members and community members, followed by contextual factors. Cooperation and relationships were either focused on the general cooperation or on cooperation with specific groups. Police members across most countries named a lack of capacities and resources, with the exception of Bulgaria, where societal developments played a larger role. The type of resources varied, however, across countries. Lack of capacities and resources played also an important role in interviews with community members. Interestingly, the type of resources mentioned by members of external groups frequently differed from the ones mentioned by police members in the same country. Issues with police image and attitudes towards police were especially prevalent in interviews with external groups.

Still, countries and groups also showed considerable overlap in their appreciation of the external environment and its role for the success of community policing. Tables 9-11 show the most shared relevant aspects across countries.

Table 9. EXTERNAL ENABLERS shared across most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Cooperation and partnership	Cooperation and partnership
Working with specific external parties	Working with specific external parties
Support and understanding	Support and understanding
Political and legal climate	Empowerment

Table 10. EXTERNAL OPPORTUNITIES shared across most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Cooperation with specific groups	Cooperation with specific groups
Willingness of external groups to engage with police	Willingness of external groups to engage with police
Communication means and strategies	Communication means and strategies
Positive attitudes of external groups towards police and community policing	Access to and use of various media
Degrees of diversity in the population	Societal values and perceptions
Political structures and changes	
Budget and financial support	

Table 11. EXTERNAL THREATS shared across most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Internal structures and cultural difficulties	Internal structures and cultural difficulties
Financial support	Financial support
Lack of cooperation	Lack of trust and confidence
Support and acceptance by external groups	
Workload	

Aspects of 'good' and 'bad' community policing practices

Descriptions of 'good practices' fell into five categories: supporting relationship and trust building, providing the right or sufficient resources and capacities, fostering contact, communication and dialogue between police and communities, fostering cooperation and collaboration and practices leading to good outcomes and performance. 'Bad practices' often were the negative side of these examples addressing a lack of resources and capacities, a lack of contact and communication as well as a lack of cooperation and collaboration, failures to act on or solved crimes and issues of police image. Our data indicated considerable variations in the focus of examples provided for good and bad practices.

The differences in good and bad practices may be an indication that certain aspects or practices are seen as more important or more closely linked to the local understanding of community policing. We found considerable overlap across countries and groups. *Managing consistent contact and communication* emerged consistently as good practice across nearly all countries and both interviewee groups, while *negative attitudes and lacking respect of officers towards the public* and issues with *internal structures and cultural difficulties* such as lack of authority, lacking priority of community policing or lacking of proactivity were named most consistently as examples of bad practices. Police members also largely agreed that *lacking communication, contact and engagement* should be avoided and that is relevant to *meet (local) needs and expectations*. Even more overlap existed among external groups across countries with many similar examples of good practices around *visibility and availability of officers* or bad practices such as *improper and insufficient information sharing* or *unresponsive or unwilling officers*. See tables 12 and 13 for an overview.

Table 12. GOOD PRACTICES mentioned in most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Contact and communication	Contact and communication
Information sharing and education	Visibility and availability
	Professionalism

Table 13. BAD PRACTICES mentioned in most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Negative attitudes and lacking respect	Negative attitudes and lacking respect
Internal structural and cultural difficulties	Internal structural and cultural difficulties
Lacking communication, contact and engagement	Improper and insufficient information sharing and education
Failing to meet needs and expectations	Being unresponsive or unwilling
	Ineffective performance
	Lack of officers
	Violence and abuse of power
	Lack in visibility and availability

Indicators for community policing

Outcomes and police performance played a role in all countries, although to a particularly high degree in Germany and to a lesser extent in Croatia and the UK. The category outcomes and performance summarizes ten different aspects, reaching from citizens' perceptions to crime reduction to better successes in recruiting new police staff members. Crime reduction appeared prominently across all countries in interviews with police as well as external groups.

As second indicator set emerged features of police and police officers, particularly for Finish officers. This set summarizes seven aspects such as officers' attitudes (e.g., openness, respect) to community policing as integral part of the organization to personnel's' skills, abilities and knowledge (e.g., knowledge of rights and obligations, communication skills, understanding of habits and customs).

Taking a closer look at categories across countries, *improved relationships* and *crime reduction* emerged as relevant indicators in a majority of countries for police members as well as external groups. A common indicator for police members were further *citizens' perceptions*, while external groups in most countries also named the extent and quality of *communication and cooperation* as well as the degree of *citizen participation* as important indicators of community policing performance and functioning.

See table 14 for an overview of shared indicators.

Table 14. INDICATORS shared across most countries within police and external groups

Police	External groups
Improved relationships	Improved relationships
Crime reduction	Crime reduction
Citizens' perceptions	Communication and cooperation
	Citizen participation

Conclusion

This report presented the views, opinion and experiences of these police members and external groups about community policing in their local and national contexts, aiming to outline the similarities and overlaps across our eight countries and two groups. Overall, we found considerable overlaps in perspectives across countries and the two groups, for instance, in terms of what may be considered core goals or tasks of community policing. Yet, it also became apparent that the two groups across our eight countries possess their own interpretations and foci of what community policing should look like, who should be targeted, how successful community policing should be measured, etc. This suggests that any 'European' model or perspective on community policing will have to afford local,

national and group-specific variations. Our data can contribute a first glimpse into these variations. At the same time, we want to caution against an over-interpretation and over-reliance on the specifics of the findings. Given the small number of individuals per group, our results should not be considered as representative for any stakeholder group or even country.

Still, the report can offer implications for the development of the Unity platform, as our findings indicate that tool development and evaluations will have to contend with more or less pronounced differences in expectations around community policing between members of police forces and external groups on the one hand and across countries on the other.