



DELIVERABLE 3.3

Unity – 2nd Stakeholder Analysis – Comparative view on stakeholder needs and perspectives

Executive summary

Due date: 31st May 2016

Date of submission: 31st May 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



Project funded by the European Commission within the H2020 Framework Programme

Introduction

A long tradition in management research shows (e.g. Hofstede, 1993) that the social context has a major impact on the meaning and interpretation of specific governance practices. Because modern-day communities are increasingly complex, diverse and multi-cultural, no one single approach to delivering public safety and security through policing can prove successful for everyone all of the time.

Unity Work Package (WP) 3 on Policing and Community Requirements and Best/Effective practices of community policing includes the identification of overarching themes and concepts to describe the commonalities and differences of community policing (CP) concepts and practices. This work-package focuses on the interaction of diverse groups and organizations. It thus supports the development of the Unity CP platform as well as the content and methodologies for the test beds, pilot evaluations and training. The objective of this third WP3 deliverable is to provide a view on the differences in community policing themes and concepts across stakeholder groups. The main focus is on illustrating the differences between perspectives; on the one hand, we consider differences between countries; on the other hand, differences between police-internal and external perspectives. Our findings further indicate areas in which a common understanding of community policing definitions, core goals, tasks, target groups, etc. exists or may be reached. In this report we provide an overview of our analyses of differences and possible conflicts in perspectives across groups.

Methods

This deliverable is based on the data collected for D3.1 and 3.2. As described in D3.1, we used an open-ended interview protocol. We collected data from two groups: members of police forces with expertise in community policing, and external stakeholders and community members from five different groups. We guided the selection of the external group via a so-called PESTL framework. The five external groups were selected to represent members from political, economic, social, technological and legal stakeholders of community policing. Partner organizations were asked to collect a total of 38 interviews across all six groups in their respective country. The number of interviews per group is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Number of interviews analyzed for D3.3 per country and group

Country	External	Police	Total per country
Belgium (BE)	28	11	39
Bulgaria (BG)	28	10	38
Croatia (HR)	28	10	38
Estonia (EE)	28	10	38
Finland (FI)	27	10	37
Germany (DE)	29	9	38
Macedonia (MK)	28	10	38
Great Britain (GB)	39	18	57
Total	235	88	323

Our analytical approach followed thematic and content analytic principles 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. The resulting codes were then clustered into high-order categories per main topic. The coding was conducted in the qualitative software package NVivo. In total, we coded 10.667 pieces of text, developing 7.033 individual nodes in 13 themes. In this deliverable we report on the categories and themes which show differentiation between countries and between the police-internal and external groups.

Though the sample includes a wide variety of respondents, 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. Despite the comparative nature of the report, answers represent personal accounts and opinions of the interviewees.

Results and conclusion

Our analysis did not assume any definition of CP, but aimed to derive it inductively from the different communities. We asked police officers and their surrounding communities how they define CP, what they consider core goals, tasks and resources needed to achieve – in their eyes – good CP.

Our findings show that a common understanding of community policing definitions, core goals, tasks, good community policing and target groups exists. Overall, we found considerable overlaps in perspectives across countries and the two groups (police and their communities and other stakeholders). The *police* and *communities* seem to agree largely across countries on the importance of the following aspects of CP:

- Working together, cooperation and collaboration between police and external groups
- Building relationships of trust, confidence and understanding between police and external groups
- Communication, interaction and sharing of information between police and external groups
- Addressing local needs and issues, both proactively and reactively.

However, when taking a closer look at the differences across countries and subgroups, it becomes apparent that these seemingly integrated perspectives of CP contain considerable differentiation. For example, when we zoom in on the elements of community policing mentioned to describe community policing performance, we see a fragmented picture when it comes to *Understanding and addressing local needs*. Belgian, Estonian, Finnish and British police officers frequently consider this a core aspect of CP-performance, while Bulgarian, German and Macedonian officers barely mention this local aspect. The respective external stakeholders only partly reflect this differentiation; the Belgian, British and Estonian community also largely feel that addressing local needs is a core dimension of CP performance (15%, 26% and 19% of mentions pertain to understanding and addressing local needs), while German, Macedonian, Finnish, Croatian and Bulgarian communities barely mention the local need orientation. When looking at the partnership orientation of CP, we also see that there is not an integrated perspective across our contexts: On average about 20% of the police officers and 15% of the external partners and communities mentioned *working together with local communities and partners* as one aspect of CP. Yet, there is some differentiation within the sample: none of the police officers in Bulgaria (and 9% of the communities) mentioned this aspect, but 50% of the definitions of CP by Macedonian police officers (but only 7% for their external partner and community interview partners) focused on this aspect.

Variations across countries and groups also showed up for example for the relevance of the performance dimensions *Prevention, protection and intervention* and *Fighting crime and improving safety*. About 11% of the police officers' mentions pertained to prevention as a relevant aspect of CP, compared to 7% for crime fighting as an important aspect. Here we noticed considerable variation within our police sample. Belgian, Croatian, Estonian, Macedonian, and British officers barely mention prevention as a relevant aspect of CP, but Bulgarian, Finnish and to a certain extent German officers gave prevention priority in their definition of CP performance. Particularly Croatian, and partly British officers felt that crime fighting is a relevant aspect of CP performance, while Belgian, Bulgarian, Estonian, Finnish and Macedonian officers barely mentioned it. It should be noted however that "crime fighting" is an umbrella term which may include policing aspects such as prevention and other

approaches. The communities seem to disagree with their police forces on these two dimensions. We see a rather fragmented picture when we compare the differences between police and communities, where no clear tendencies (with e.g. the communities preferring the one over the other) can be detected.

We see that police forces and communities have differing perspectives within and across countries on “community partnership” (Hail, 2015). The officers and communities from Great Britain and partly Finland seem to agree on the main point, namely that safety issues can and should be solved jointly. In most other countries we see more differentiated or even fragmented perspectives around the issue of working together, cooperation and collaboration. When zooming in on sub-aspects, it quickly becomes clear that general ideas, such as communication and interaction between the police and communities has quite different meanings in different social contexts. It can mean general contact and dialogue, but also being more accessible or gathering information. Police officers and their communities also express varying foci when it comes to general orientations, such as enhancing the public image of the police or fostering peace and social cohesion within a community. In short, though countries and groups seem to agree on the main core concepts, when zooming in on these, considerable differentiation exists regarding what constitutes these concepts to local stakeholders. Performance, cooperation, information sharing, etc. mean different things to different groups.

We follow the logic of the etic-emic distinction in our methodological design (see Deliverable 3.1 for further information). Unity aims to develop a tool and evaluation framework that captures those aspects of community policing that can be standardized across social contexts and those which are context specific. For such an approach we identified those aspects of CP which had an integrated understanding across contexts. In our search for such aspects, we deduced that the most observable aspects, thus the manifest cultures (Schein, 1992) of CP were the only ones that appeared in across all social contexts. Communication, interacting and sharing information belong to the artefacts, directly observable aspects of CP. The meaning given to it, the targets, social goals, underlying values and assumptions vary across contexts.

References

- Hail, Y. (2015). *Community policing across Europe*. Document provided for the Unity project, October 26, 2015.
- Schein, E. H. (1990). Organizational culture. *American Psychological Association*, 45(2), 109-119.
- Skogan, W.G. (2006) *Police and Community in Chicago: A Tale of Three Cities*. New York: Oxford University Press.