POLICING

Reflections on developments and changes to policing in Scotland
WE DECIDED a while ago not to tackle policing as a theme for the *SJM* until any upheavels around the creation of the single national agency, Police Scotland, in April 2013 had settled down. Over two years on, substantial aspects of the changes and subsequent performance of the new policing arrangements continues to be controversial and unresolved. However, policing is one of the most pressing issues in contemporary criminal justice in Scotland as elsewhere, and we were therefore very pleased that Professor Nick Fyfe and Alistair Hendry, two leading experts on policing from the Scottish Institute for Policing Research (SIPR) agreed to be guest editors for this special.

They have compiled contributions which place policing, and organisational change, in a wider historical and comparative context and explore some recent thinking on contemporary policing policies, and use of research. As Jackson and colleagues illustrate, the idea of a centralised force was not a new one and it can in theory have many benefits, not least in terms of cost effectiveness although there remains a need, as seen in other countries facing police reforms, such as England and Wales and the Netherlands, described by Terpstra, to recognise the implications of change for approaches to local policing and, importantly, for structures of local accountability and governance. In practice, as several contributions indicate, changes may be difficult to implement, and as Harkin points out, ‘change’ may not lead to ‘reform’.

The articles also reflect concerns with the nature of policing, which inevitably involves tensions between the police mandate of crime prevention and control and due process, seen particularly in relation to the vexed issue of stop and search in Murray’s historical account. Scottish Police are also tasked with addressing community engagement, safety and well-being. These different foci have been subject to a number of initiatives and research such as the Safer Communities Evidence Matrix described by Aston and Lum and procedural justice theory, which McVie and her colleagues draw attention to the grossly unequal effects on victimisation of the much hailed crime drop which, while reducing overall levels of crime, has not led to any decreased risk for those most vulnerable to repeated and severe victimisation. The impact of the most severe forms of victimisation is also highlighted by Fohring who alerts us to the potential secondary victimisation of those who seek to support such victims and carry out research in this area.

Finally, Rhona Hotchkiss illustrates the varied experiences of a week as a Prison Governor, and this month’s book review deals with John Carnohan’s account of the work of the Violence Reduction Unit.

**Hazel Croall and Mary Munro**
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**November 2015**: special SJM on *Poverty, Inequality and Justice* to be edited by Lesley M’Ara and Susan M’Vie of the University of Edinburgh.

Also look out for Tim Newburn’s review of the forthcoming book *Crime, Justice and Society in Scotland* edited by Hazel Croall, Gerry Mooney and Mary Munro, due to be published by Routledge in August 2015.
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The 2012 Police and Fire Reform (Scotland) Act brought about some of the most radical public sector reforms for a generation and, by establishing a national police force, arguably the biggest change to the policing of Scotland since the 19th century. The drivers behind these changes were partly economic (given the deep cuts to public spending that have occurred in recent years), partly political (given the need to address an increasingly complex landscape of police governance and accountability) and partly organisational (given the challenge of developing Scotland’s capacity and capability around the increasing threats posed by new forms of transnational criminality, organised crime and terrorism).

In the two years since Police Scotland was established, however, contrasting narratives about the impacts of reform have emerged. On the one hand, there have been a wide range of significant achievements in terms of forming a new national police organisation from the merger of the legacy forces while also delivering large scale financial savings and doing so without any discernible change in overall public confidence in local policing. On the other hand, police reform has sparked a series of high profile and increasingly acrimonious political and media debates about the nature and politics of contemporary policing in Scotland. In part these debates have focused on issues of police governance and the relationships between the new Scottish Police Authority and Police Scotland but attention has also focused on changes to the style of policing, exemplified by the controversies surrounding the increasing use of stop and search, the arming of police officers, and concerns about the emergence of a target driven culture.

It is against this background that this Special Issue of Scottish Justice Matters attempts to offer a set of broader and deeper reflections on the recent changes to policing in Scotland. A broader perspective comes from viewing Scottish police reform in a wider historical and geographical context. The contributions by Jackson and Murray, for example, remind us that debates about the structures, powers and values of policing in Scotland have a long and contested history, while the paper by Terpstra and the interview with Tomkins demonstrate that structural reforms to policing are a current feature of several other European jurisdictions. But while such macro-scale changes to policing are of considerable political and strategic importance, it is changes at the micro-level of routine police practices and interactions with the public that are arguably of greater significance in driving changes to police effectiveness and perceptions of police legitimacy. Many of the papers in this Special Issue reflect on these deeper aspects of changes to contemporary policing in Scotland. These range from studies of community engagement (Harkin) and rural policing (Wooff) to innovations in training and practice informed by the principles of procedural justice (Robertson and McMillan, and M’Queen and Bradford), to the development of toolkits that will allow police practitioners to mobilise evidence to support innovative change at a local level (Aston and Lum) to joint academic and practitioner reflections on evidence-based policing interventions to tackle crime and disorder (Eck and Royan).

Our own concluding observations to this special issue will further explore the broader context of police reform in Scotland but also highlight the opportunities that now exist to foster evidence-informed change and develop an approach to policing which is focused on prevention and on enhancing the trust and confidence of communities.

Nick Fyfe is director of the Scottish Institute for Policing Research (SIPR) and professor in the School of Social Sciences at the University of Dundee.

Alistair Henry is an associate director of the Scottish Institute for Policing Research (SIPR), leading the Police-Community Relations network, and a lecturer in criminology in the Law School at the University of Edinburgh.

Nick Fyfe and Alistair Henry are guest editors of this policing issue of SJM.
Scottish Police Force Amalgamations and Mergers: A HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Louise Jackson, Neil Davidson and David Smale

MODERN POLICE FORCES emerged as a result of local initiatives from the late-eighteenth century onwards. Glasgow City Police, founded in 1800, was the first in Britain, and in 1857 all Scottish towns and counties were compelled by act of Parliament to create their own police forces or constabularies. However, almost as soon as this nationwide patchwork of local provision came into being, calls for amalgamation were being put forward by civil servants and senior police officers. Indeed, the idea of a single policing body for Scotland can be dated back to the 1850s. Why, then, did it take so long to be realised? Examination of the earlier history of amalgamation enables us to better understand the uniqueness of the circumstances that produced Police Scotland in 2013.

It is often suggested there was an inexorable pull towards centralisation and consolidation. The number of police forces in Scotland was reduced from 89 in the late 1850s, to 48 by 1939, 33 by 1959 and finally eight from 1975 until 2013. Yet the creation of a single service was far from inevitable. The number of county constabularies in rural areas remained remarkably constant for the first 100 years, whilst reductions in the number of burgh (urban) forces were mainly concentrated in the 1930s and 1960s (Figure 1). Indeed, the eight regional ‘legacy’ forces lasted for 40 years.

Comparing the very recent reorganisation of policing in Scotland with the Netherlands, Terpstra and Fyfe have argued that a combination of factors (consistent with change in other areas of policy) helped generate reform. They point to the opening of a ‘window of opportunity’ created by specific crises or focusing events, including the threat of international terrorism and organised crime as well as pressures on public spending (Terpstra and Fyfe, 2015). Key individuals or ‘policy entrepreneurs’, with skills, resources and influence, have then acted as important agents for change. However, their capacity to act was enabled by wider political and cultural factors (devolution and the election of a majority SNP government).

Moreover, it was important that identification and analysis of the ‘problem’ chimed with policy solutions that were already in circulation. We argue here that this framework, which focuses on the existence (or lack) of policy windows, the role of policy entrepreneurs, the coupling of problems and solutions, and a responsive political context, is also useful in explaining past inertia and resistance as well as previous piecemeal reform.

There have been earlier moments of national crisis in which the arguments for a single policing body were made in Scotland. We also find early ‘policy entrepreneurs’ drawn from the new but growing elite of influential professional policemen who sought to promote the idea of a national service. Yet until very recently there was no coherent alignment of politics and policy solutions.

The first of these entrepreneurs was Alfred John List, the innovative head of Midlothian Constabulary who, in 1853 put forward a plan for a national system of police commanded by one chief constable (Second Report, 1852-3, Q3960). However, his ideas did not meet the approval of his political task masters who did not see it as a relevant solution to a recognisable problem. A few decades later, in 1886, the Crofters’ Protests in Skye and Lewis provoked Captain David Munro, HM Inspector of Constabulary for Scotland (HMICS), to draw up a plan for the creation of a national force commanded by a Chief Commissioner in Edinburgh, with the country divided into police districts. At the time it was mooted that violent disturbances had been exacerbated by Irish agitators, intensifying fears of a combined external and internal threat (Cameron, 2012). As the disturbances petered out so too did the plan.
During the Second World War emergency powers were introduced across Britain authorising government officials to enforce police force amalgamations if in the interests of military operations. Senior civil servants at the Scottish Office were convinced, in theory at least, that the nationalisation of policing was needed on a UK basis. Yet Tom Johnston, as Secretary of State for Scotland in the wartime coalition government, was reluctant to move because he thought it would neither be popular nor resolve broader problems relating to policing and security. The emergency powers remained a “dead letter in Scotland” (NRS, HH55/360). This contrasted with England and Wales where police forces on the south coast were amalgamated in 1943 and a further set of mergers took place in 1946 (Emsley, 1996).

The lack of a responsive political context for amalgamation in Scotland was a key factor that hampered efforts to consolidate police forces until the 1960s. During the course of the nineteenth century local policing meant local control through local government. Despite the increasing regulatory role of central government, services continued to be organised and delivered at the local level through a relationship of interdependence. In the years after the First World War both the UK administration (at Westminster) and the Scottish Office (newly located to Edinburgh after 1926) pressurised police forces to amalgamate on grounds of efficiency as did HMICS. In 1933 the Police Consolidation (Scotland) Committee proposed that the number of Scottish forces should be reduced to 14, although it drew short of endorsing the idea of a national force. Although supported by the cities of Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dundee and Aberdeen, the proposals were put on ice when they were vehemently opposed by the 15 remaining Royal Burghs. Scottish municipal government fought to retain local control of police forces throughout the 1940s and 1950s, with the burghs of Inverness, Motherwell and Ayr at the vanguard of resistance.

The political climate began to shift in the 1960s with wider recognition of the pace and significance of technological change, of professionalised models of policing, and of economies of scale. The 1962 Royal Commission argued that something should be done about the “extreme case of the multiplicity of small forces” in Scotland (1961-2, s. 281). Indeed the Scottish Police Federation advocated a single force as policy from the 1960s until 1976. This shifting opinion enabled the Scottish Office to reduce the number of Scottish police forces to 20 by 1968 through diplomacy and a thinly veiled threat of compulsion.

The final move to regionalisation, and the creation of the eight legacy forces that served Scotland from 1975 to 2013, was an effect of the broader strategy of local government reform rather than debate about policing needs. The very burgh councils who had opposed police reform were abolished in favour of the two-tier structure of regional and district councils. The only opposition to police regionalisation came from the Scottish borders, where there was a refusal to amalgamate with Edinburgh and the Lothians. However, MP David Steel’s attempt to stop this was blocked in the House of Commons when Labour and Conservative members voted together in support of regionalisation.

Although in place for 40 years, it can be argued that regionalisation paved the way for Police Scotland in severing ‘local’ policing from the constraints of municipal boundaries. Awareness has also emerged that communities are often pluralised (rather than homogenous), and that they may be diasporic as well as geographically embedded. Further local government reform in 1996, which replaced the model of regional two-tier government with 32 unitary authorities, meant that even the administrative logic behind the creation of the eight regional police forces was effectively lost, although they retained their cultural identities for a further twenty years.

The policy opportunity that led to the creation of Police Scotland was historically unique although, like earlier proposals for reform, it was grounded in arguments about the need for economy and ever-greater efficiency. The rapidity with which it was created was unprecedented given the procrastination that had characterised amalgamation for the previous 150 years. The idea of a single Scottish police force, the existence of enthusiastic reformers, key moments of crisis, and awareness of the limitations of existing models, can all be found in the historical record. Yet there was no prior moment when these elements coalesced within an appropriate political context.

Figure 1: Number of separate police forces in Scotland by year

Our discussion draws on extensive archival materials held by the National Records of Scotland (NRS) that have been collected and analysed as part of a two-year project, funded by the Leverhulme Trust, on ‘Police and Community in Twentieth Century Scotland’.


NRS, HH55/360, Proposed consolidation of Scottish police forces.


Second Report from the Select Committee on Police (1852-3) Parliamentary Papers XXXVI.105 HMSO.

POLICING, PREVENTION AND THE RISE OF STOP AND SEARCH IN SCOTLAND

A SHORT HISTORY

Kath Murray

The fact that Scotland has unusually high rates of stop and search is well-documented. In many ways, the numbers can be attributed to a unique set of organisational and regulatory factors; to the rigid, performance driven-style of policing adopted by Strathclyde Police force, and applied more widely in the post-reform period; and a lack of rules and restraining factors. It is clear, both from research (Murray, 2015) and the recent HMICS Audit report (2015) that stop and search is under-regulated, there is little clarity as to what a stop and search is or how to count it, and that many searches lack reasonable suspicion. Digging deeper, it can also be argued that search practices in Scotland originate from a distinctive way of thinking about the policing role; to a preventative outlook premised on the use of police powers that now seems taken for granted, but, as this article aims to demonstrate, was not always thus.

Preventative police powers

Looking back to the early 1950s, parliamentary records show that the idea of a preventative police power was considered anathema by some parts of the legislature. The Prevention of Crime Act 1953 illustrates the point. Intended to deal with increasing rates of recorded violent crime, the Act provided a constable with pre-emptive powers of arrest on suspicion that a person was carrying an offensive weapon. Interestingly, the Act did not provide a power of search, and this was intentionally designed to prevent fishing for evidence. Conservative peer Lord Derwent explained:

There is no power of search by the police: the police cannot search a person in the streets, nor can they say “turn out your pockets” and, when they find a large clasp knife in one of them, base a charge on that. (HL 14/4/1953 vol. 181 cc. 710).

Prevention was understood to result from the ability of the police to disrupt crime through pre-emptive arrest, as the Home Secretary put it, to ‘to cope with the “cosh boy” before he has used his cosh’, and from a general deterrent effect, ‘the knowledge that the mere possession of an offensive weapon carries a liability to a substantial penalty’ (HC 22/2/1953, vol. 511, c. 2325).

At first sight, the powers provided by the Act seem conservative, at least by contemporary standards. There were, after all, more than 114,000 stop searches for offensive weapons recorded in the first year of Police Scotland.

Yet in 1953, the preventative principle was viewed in some quarters as a radical departure from traditional legal values, notably by those on the political right, for whom the Bill represented ‘a revolutionary doctrine’ (Lord Saltoun, HL 14/4/1953 vol. 181, c. 701) which went ‘against all our concepts of justice’ (Baxter, Con. HC Deb 26/2/1953 vol. 511 c. 2354). As Conservative MP Ronald Bell stated:

Generally speaking, we punish for the crime and alternatively we punish an attempt to commit a crime. The Bill is an effort to go a little further than that and to get a criminal before he has started the attempt to commit the crime. The further we get away from the crime to events anterior to it, the more we begin to jostle the innocent citizen, because we are beginning now to go for something which is of an ambiguous character (HC 26/2/1953 vol. 511 c. 2366).

These concerns were however, trumped by the overriding threat to order. The Modern Law Review stated that there was ‘no use decrying this further encroachment on the liberty
of the subject’ which was ‘dictated’ by the increase in violent crime (de Smith, 1953: 483-484). Likewise Conservative MP Ronald Bell concluded ‘it is the criminal class that has forced it upon us’ (HC 26/2/1953 vol. 511 col. 2354). To summarise, the Act was deemed a necessary, if somewhat ‘un-British’ approach to justice.

**Expanding the policing role**

The Prevention of Crime Act, 1953 signalled a shift in the ways in which the political classes conceptualised the preventative role of the police from an older Peelian model based on visibility, to a pre-emptive approach, using police powers, coupled with the slippery principle of reasonable suspicion. Whilst such powers were not unknown (for example, the Poaching Prevention Act 1862 conferred search powers, as did Scottish Burgh Police Acts), the significance of the 1953 Act lay in its relevance to routine policing.

This set a precedent for the expansion of pre-emptive powers in the 1960s premised on search, rather than arrest. Between 1964 and 1971, largely under Wilson’s Labour administration, a range of search powers were conferred for drugs and firearms, variously with and without warrants, for premises and for people. By the late 1960s, the right to stop and search as an adjunct to specific offences appeared to be accepted by politicians of all shades: a legal construct that no longer went against established concepts of justice. As Conservative MP Joan Vickers stated in regard to the Dangerous Drugs Act 1967:

> There was, regrettably, a late Amendment to the 1967 Act which gives police power to stop and search without warrant any person who is suspected of being in unlawful possession of drugs. I suggest that this is really a new threat to civil liberties. It has received very little attention in Parliament, or, I am surprised to find, in the Press. Its dangers are, in my opinion, immense, and it will not help relations between the police and the public (HC Deb. 1/12/1967 vol. 755 c. 877).

**Politics and police powers**

In Scotland, the Criminal Justice (Scotland) Act 1980 conferred stop and search powers for offensive weapons. Passed by dint of an English Conservative majority, the Bill was contested by Labour, Liberal Democrat and SNP politicians. Concerns were voiced over civil liberties, police-community relations and use of the power ‘for random and mass searching of young people’ by way of deterrence (Baldwin and Kinsey, 1982: 183). As Labour MP Bruce Millan stated:

> [If] the power is used to a significant extent, it will considerably prejudice relationships between the police and many young people, and that will spill over to the rest of the community and seriously damage relationships between the police and the public. Where the action is not justified, it is an invasion of privacy and an invasion of civil liberties (HC 14/4/1980 vol. 982 c.834).

Similarly, SNP MP Donald Stewart commented, ‘If Conservative Members think that this proposal will make for good relations with the police, they delude themselves’ (ibid. col. 860).

A decade later, search powers for offensive weapons provided the legislative vehicle for the seminal high-volume stop and search campaigns undertaken by Strathclyde Police. For example:

> On Monday police in Strathclyde will exercise their right to stop and search anyone they suspect might be carrying an offensive weapon, as part of a three-month enforcement campaign. (Herald, 26/2/1993)

The Strathclyde campaigns extended the preventative remit further, introducing deterrence rationales, alongside detection, in effect, taking both detection and non-detection as successful outcomes (RHA, 2002: 22). In this way, the tactic was rendered unassailable, a commonsense solution to violent crime which could be legitimated irrespective of the outcome.

This powerful win-win outlook, which placed crime control over due process, prevailed for more than two decades in some parts of Scotland. As Chief Superintendent Niven Rennie explained, ‘if you’re truly successful in targeting your stopping and searching, you’re going to have a lower success rate’ (Holyrood Magazine, 2014). It is also shown forcefully in police statistics. Between 2005 and 2012/13, recorded searches rose 556%, from around 104,000 to 682,968. In the year prior to reform, the search rate in Scotland was seven times higher than England/Wales at 682,968 searches. Search rates began to fall in the post-reform period, by 6% in 2013/14, and more sharply in 2014/15, by 33%. Despite this fall, the search rate in 2014/15 remained over four times higher than England/Wales in the nearest comparable period, at 80 and 16 stop searches per 1,000 people respectively (Police Scotland, 2015).

This win-win orthodoxy is now subject to challenge, and further change seems imminent. Following an unprecedented degree of critical media and political attention, stop and search powers are currently under review by an independent advisory group, appointed by the Scottish Government. A fresh case will have to be made for police practice, and consideration given to the balance between crime control and due process. This short history shows how this balance has changed over time, and importantly, how different ways of thinking about the preventative role of the police can influence police practice.

Kath Murray is an SCCJR research associate at the University of Edinburgh. She blogs on stop and search at [http://scottishjusticematters.com/author/kath-murray/](http://scottishjusticematters.com/author/kath-murray/)
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Diarmaid Harkin

**WITH ALL THE TALK** about the reform of policing in Scotland, there are continuities as well. In terms of the fundamentals of what the police do and how they do it, reform has clear limits, faces resistance and the whole process must overcome drag and inertia. There are genuine shifts and changes to reckon with (see Fyfe, 2013). For instance, the new Scottish Police Authority fundamentally alters the accountability structure, and the alignment of police districts with local authority territories affects the relationship with council partners and local community organisations. The establishment of ‘policing principles’ encourages a new organisational vision and of course, the consolidation of all police in Scotland under one management structure will inevitably impact on multiple issues of strategy, leadership style, as well as on-the-ground operational matters.

These changes are not inconsequential and they do have ramifications. However, let us not overstate the newness or the extent of transformation to core practice. It is common to hear police management in many different circumstances talking up the achievements of reform, disavowing the past and speaking of transformed departments. This sort of rhetoric has clear elements of impression management as police chiefs attempt to satisfy political demands. In Scotland, the SNP made police reform a hot political topic and so a responsibility emerges for critical commentators to attempt to separate the rhetoric that surrounds ‘reform’ agendas from the genuine and important transformations to core policing.

I suggest that the key question to be answered is whether the fundamental exercise of police authority over citizens is transformed in substantial ways: does on-the-ground local policing look significantly different? If we take this perspective we can establish three key points. Firstly, police reform can be overstated. Secondly, there are permanent aspects to the police that never change: finally, that there are demonstrable ways policing can reform and will reform.

**‘Police Reform’ can be overstated**

I suggest that reform should be understood as having a strategic and deliberate goal, while change can be superficial or mundane. Change is easy while reform is hard, or as Edmund Burke suggests, “change is novelty” whereas ‘reform’ is “a direct application of a remedy to (a) grievance” (Burke, 1909). In this respect, the shift from eight police forces to one, does not necessarily qualify as a reform. Introducing new policies, new strategies, new tactics or new structures should be considered changes until their ability to solve a pre-decided problem is proven. In other words, we should be reluctant to use the word reform for what could be superficial adjustments. Reform is an outcome that does not always necessarily follow change. This principle applies whether we are considering the large scale centralisation of Scotland’s forces or smaller scale programmes.

I conducted research on local police-public consultation forums in Edinburgh that were part of a new community policing strategy launched in 2010, and asked whether these forums helped contribute to local police reform. The ‘priority-setting groups’, brought together residents, community-council members, representatives from housing associations and multiple third-sector community organisations to discuss neighbourhood policing issues and set priorities for the local community policing team. The groups were led by the police and council representatives. I observed the consultation process for 12 months across 2011/2012, interviewing the key stakeholders between meetings.
The introduction of the forums was novel and distinctive compared with what had existed in the past, but I was cautious about the level of reform achieved. To be clear, this strategy of using local consultation forums did produce some promising progress for police-public relations and accountability; however they also provided an illustration of how policy change, either big or small, pushes against certain permanent and inflexible limits of police reform.

Moreover, my research showcased a number of ways new developments face drag and resistance. For example, as shown in many classic studies, the support of frontline police is vital in ensuring that the grand plans plans of management are realised, otherwise new policy ideas can be easily sabotaged or abandoned (Holdaway, 1983). In my research there were a small number of instances where police representatives were either ill-prepared, unskilled or reluctant to engage with the public with the enthusiasm expected by management. In this respect, the ‘new policing principles’ of Scotland’s national force are merely theoretical until, and if, it is embraced by the rank and file.

**Some Things About The Police Cannot Be Reformed**

There are also fundamental aspects of public policing that are permanent and the most crucial ‘permanent’ aspect of the police is their deployment of non-negotiable coercive force. This was outlined by Egon Bittner (1970) when he observed that the defining feature of the police was their access to coercive force. This means the police deal with anything and everything where “something that ought not to be happening (is happening) and about which someone had better do something now” (132). Furthermore, use of force is exercised autonomously and with limited means for negotiation. Either looking forward, or looking back, or comparing policing across nations, Bittner’s observations hold: policing is always based on these core defining features.

When considering reform, it is always useful to be reminded of these long-term consistencies and universals. The essentials of public policing are broadly the same and constabularies have not witnessed radical transformation over time. Even in an example like the replacement of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (RUC) with the Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI), Bittner would observe both and underline the similarities in how they function. Moreover, whether he was researching in the present day or in the late nineteenth century, his core analysis would remain the same.

The example of consultation forums in Edinburgh provides a small illustration of this larger issue about police reform, that some things about the police cannot be reformed. For instance, the police will always remain in executive command over whom to apply coercion against. Even though attempts can be made to support more community negotiation over this issue, as with the consultation forums, ultimately, the public can only ever remain weak advisors to this use of force. Prime authority always rests with the police, and this was evident in the forums, as contributors recognised that the police retain clear autonomy over decisions on the use of force.

To provide another example, rules around data protection also reveal fundamental aspects that will resist transformation in dramatic ways. In my research, the consultation forums were ostensibly platforms where ‘everything, and anything’ was up for discussion. In reality, deliberation is truncated, managed and closed off by data protection protocols. Discussion had to avoid specifics and officers cannot reveal certain information about cases and generally have an obligation to mask significant detail of how they perform their job. There are many honourable reasons for this but it also illustrates that the police are a uniquely privileged authority and will always maintain a certain position of superiority and distance from public involvement, closing off certain possibilities for reform.

The point is, there are basic elements of policing that resists transformation and promotes consistency with the past. These permanent features engage and confine the way the police operate, placing clear limits on the margins for genuine transformation.

**Reform is possible**

Despite this precautionary message that there are limits to reform and that it is often overstated, progress is a real possibility and major reshuffles like the centralisation of Scottish police forces can have significant ramifications for how policing is conducted at the local level.

In my example, significant reform did take place as a result of local strategy change. The consultation forums delivered a number of progressive outcomes, including the improvement of cooperation in areas with histories of poor police-public relations and entrenched ‘no grass’ cultures. Frontline officers also largely embraced the philosophy of community policing, and changing practices did help improve public engagement and raise the democratic credentials of local policing. This was despite many unwanted habits persisting. Largely, encouraging progress was made.

This small example is indicative of the wider possibilities for reform and gives an impression of how policing reform on a larger scale can be difficult, but also very achievable. Engaging with local communities is a core principle enshrined in the Police and Fire Reform (Scotland) Act 2012, and consultation forums can be a useful means for delivering such reform.

In sum, change is easy while reform is hard. Strategies and management frameworks can be changed with relative ease, but until improved outcomes are delivered, hard fought reform is not achieved. Scottish policing has witnessed a lot of change lately. Whether this qualifies as reform, remains to be seen.

Diamid Harkin is a lecturer in Criminology at Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia and has conducted a number of studies into community policing in Scotland.


A growing literature provides evidence of increased awareness of procedural justice concepts and their relevance to policing, but also their potential value in relation to fostering better relations between the police and the public (see Mazerolle, Bennett, Davis, Sargeant and Manning, 2013). It is argued that by using a procedurally-just framework in all interaction with the public, treating everyone fairly and respectfully, having trustworthy motives, and giving them a ‘voice’, the police will benefit in various ways. On a practical level procedurally-just interaction can result in generally improved public engagement and cooperation with the police, but it can also result in greater support for, and confidence in the police, and the creation of conditions for enhanced police legitimacy.

The concept of procedural justice is increasingly reflected in the values espoused by police organisations around the world, including in Scotland. When the new single service, Police Scotland, came into existence in April 2013, its core values were presented as ‘integrity’, ‘fairness’, and ‘respect’, reflecting the new code of ethics and the police constables’ oath taken by all new officers (Police and Fire Reform Act, 2012).

The SPACE Trial

It was within this new institutional framework that the Scottish Police and Citizen Engagement (SPACE) trial was developed, and implemented over August 2013-March 2014 (Robertson, McMillan, Godwin, and Deuchar, 2015). Modelled on the Chicago Quality Interaction Training Programme (Schuck and Rosenbaum, 2011), it tested the effects of introducing specific training on procedural justice, and its relevance to policing, to probationers at the Scottish Police College (SPC).

Two groups of probationers participated in the trial: a control and an intervention group. Both received the established 12-week initial training programme for new recruits, whilst the intervention group also received additional training on procedural justice. Baseline data were collected using a survey at the beginning of training, which was then repeated at the end of training, along with additional surveys, observations, and focus groups. These were analysed to establish any differences in outcomes between the groups in relation to probationers’ attitudes and behavioural intentions, using the key procedural justice indicators of ‘respect’, ‘trust’, ‘fairness’, ‘voice’, and ‘communication’ (Schuck and Rosenbaum, 2011; Skogan, 2013).

Results

General results of the trial were favourable over a range of measures for both control and intervention groups, which implied there were no serious underlying attitudinal issues. This also suggested that recruitment methods are largely fit for purpose in terms of taking individuals into police training who already appear to have a reasonable capacity to engage with and implement the key principles of procedural justice.

Differences were found between the control and intervention groups over all the measures, with statistically-significant changes recorded for certain ‘communication’ and ‘respect’ measures. Over the course of the project:

- Four of the eight ‘communication’ measures changed in a positive direction, all of which were for the intervention group, showing the additional training had a positive impact.
- Two of the four ‘respect’ measures changed, both in a negative direction. One applied to both the control and intervention groups, and the other to the intervention group alone. This suggests potential issues with both the basic training programme and the additional SPACE inputs, which warrant further investigation.
Communication

Communication is a vital component of effective policing. SPACE inputs highlighted the importance of communication in all encounters with the public, regardless of how contact is initiated, and also provided practical advice on interacting with specific groups and/or in difficult/sensitive situations. Communication is intrinsically important, but it also underpins all of the other procedural justice principles. For example, a police officer must be able to communicate respect and impartiality in order to build trust and confidence. Consequently, the improvements noted in communication measures for the intervention group were a very positive result.

Respect

Respect is perhaps one of the most challenging values to uphold, given the diverse and demanding nature of police work. Although the procedural justice framework emphasises the approach should apply to everyone (victims, witnesses, and suspects), this may prove challenging at times. For example, it may be difficult to maintain a respectful manner when dealing with someone who is not reciprocating.

As mentioned above two statistically-significant changes were found in the respect measures. The ‘respect’ measure that became worse for both control and intervention groups was; “Officers should at all times treat people they encounter with dignity and respect”. The additional respect measure that worsened for the intervention group only was; “People should be treated with respect, regardless of their attitude”. These results indicated that probationers agreed more strongly with both statements at the start of their training than at the end.

This is a concerning outcome in both the shorter (training) and longer term (work) perspective, as ‘being respectful’ has been found to be directly associated with public perceptions of police professionalism and, therefore, with quality of service evaluations (Mazerolle, Bennett, Antrobus, and Eggins, 2012).

It is worth noting in this respect that the most common disposal (61% in 2013-14) for complaints made against police officers in Scotland was ‘concluded by explanation’ (Scottish Police Investigations and Review Commissioner, 2014), which suggests that many complaints could be avoided if both better communication and a more robust engagement with procedural justice concepts were demonstrated.

However the procedural justice approach has more to offer than simply reducing the level of public complaints, desirable as that may be: it provides an opportunity for securing greater public trust and confidence. Although the police in Scotland enjoy comparatively good rates of trust and confidence from the public, these vary across communities. For example those living in the 15% most deprived areas report lower levels of confidence (37%) in the police compared to the rest of the country (49%), and are more likely to agree (43%) that police-community relations in their area are poor compared to other areas (27%) (Scottish Government, 2011).

It was encouraging to find at the end of the trial that many probationers professed to be familiar with the concept of procedural justice and proficient in relation to associated skills and competencies. This was a positive outcome. Probationers reported knowledge and understanding of key skills and approaches related to procedural justice also improved in areas such as:

- The use of empathy in police work (83% reported a better understanding).
- The role of active listening in police work (80% reported a better understanding).
- How procedural justice approaches can help to develop positive relationships with young people (69% reported a better understanding).
- What procedural justice is and how it applies to general policing (66% reported a better understanding).
- How procedural justice approaches might be particularly pertinent for victims of sensitive crimes (64% reported a better understanding).

Probationers also highlighted active listening, engaging with young people, effective communication, and empathy as specific aspects of SPACE training that would have an impact on how they did their jobs.

However, only 28% reported that it was ‘likely’ or ‘very likely’ that they would use the knowledge and skills covered in SPACE training in their work as police officers, compared to 39% who said it was ‘unlikely’ or ‘not very likely’. There was a tendency by some to dismiss procedural justice as ‘common sense’, which may indicate some participants were not open to engagement and therefore unwilling to have their perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes challenged.

Overall the evaluation indicated a more procedure-driven approach, perhaps at the expense of procedurally-just approaches, although the two are not mutually exclusive and ideally both would be given appropriate consideration in police training. This would require a greater focus on the ‘how’ and ‘why’, as well as the ‘what’ of policing in basic training. What the police do is clearly important, but how they go about this is perhaps equally, if not more important to the public and may have a significant impact on how the latter perceive the police, engage with them, and rate the service they provide.

Annette Robertson is senior lecturer in Criminology, Glasgow Caledonian University

Lesley M’Millan is professor of Criminology and Sociology, Glasgow Caledonian University


**Procedural Justice in Practice:**

*Findings from the Scottish Community Engagement Trial (ScotCET)*

*Sarah MacQueen and Ben Bradford*

---

**Procedural Justice Theory** provides a framework through which to understand people's reactions to the use of power and authority (Tyler 2006; Tyler and Huo 2002). The theory stresses the importance of the fairness of the process of interaction between citizen and authority figure in shaping trust and confidence in, and judgements on the legitimacy of, that authority. In the context of policing, fairness means being treated with dignity and respect during encounters; being allowed a voice in the interaction; and being given clear information about what is happening and why.

Procedural justice theory is increasingly used to inform the development of policing practice in Scotland and beyond, but with only scarce evidence on how its various elements should be operationalised and what police can do in a practical sense to enhance trust and legitimacy.

The Australian Queensland Community Engagement Trial (QCET) was the first study to utilise a large-scale randomised field trial methodology to test the effect of procedurally fair policing during routine encounters with citizens. It found that the quality of interaction between public and police during random breath testing operations had a direct positive effect on: satisfaction of members of the public with the process and outcome of the encounter; perceptions of police fairness; respect for the police; trust and confidence in the police; and self-reported willingness to comply with police directives (Mazerolle et al, 2012; Mazerolle et al, 2011). Crucially, QCET found that implementing and adhering to a script designed to communicate the core elements of the procedural justice model generated these positive outcomes. The first study to demonstrate a causal link between the quality of police-public encounters and confidence in police fairness, respect for the police, trust and legitimacy, in a positive direction.

The overarching hypothesis for ScotCET was that the positive findings from the original QCET would be replicated. Analyses of the survey data asked, in essence, whether receiving the experimental intervention shifted perceptions of procedural justice, and levels of satisfaction, trust and confidence and legitimacy, in a positive direction.

Over the course of the trial, 12,431 questionnaires were issued. In total 816 questionnaires were returned by the cut-off point in April 2014: 305 in the baseline ('pre' period), comprising 122 responses from the units assigned to the experiment condition and 183 from those assigned to the control condition; and 511 in the 'post' period (176 responses from the experiment and 335 responses from the control). The overall response rate is 6.6 per cent. Of the responses achieved, the majority were male drivers (63%) and the mean age was 50.7. Three quarters (75%) of the sample were owner-occupiers, and 40% had a first degree or higher. There were no significant differences pre to post trial, or between experimental or control groups, on any of the demographic measures used.

**Results**

Overall driver opinion about the police in terms of each of the key constructs measured was highly favourable. With regard to procedural justice, over 80% of respondents answered that the police ‘completely’ met each criterion of interest. Similarly, the overwhelming majority ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with the indicators of trust in police officers and around 90% of respondents reported being ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ satisfied with officer conduct, personal treatment and encounter outcome.

**The Trial**

Direct replication of QCET was not possible due to legislative and operational differences, so an adapted experimental design was developed in partnership with road police officers working across Scotland. All 20 road police units participated in the final experiment, which took place during the Festive Road Safety Campaign 2013-14. Prior to the campaign, units were randomly assigned to experiment or control conditions.

During the first week of the campaign all officers conducted ‘business as usual’, with the addition of distributing questionnaires to drivers. Subsequently, half of the units began operating under experimental conditions, delivering a set of key messages during encounters and distributing a leaflet designed to enhance perceptions of procedural justice. The key messages aimed to introduce a level of consistency to encounters such that each included **all** of the core elements of the procedural justice model, whilst allowing officers to protect their responsivity and ‘natural’ style of interaction. The leaflet was designed to reinforce the key messages and ‘collective’ nature of campaign. The remaining units continued to operate ‘business as usual’ to provide the control group. All units continued to hand out questionnaires to the drivers they stopped.

The overarching hypothesis for ScotCET was that the positive findings from the original QCET would be replicated. Analyses of the survey data asked, in essence, whether receiving the experimental intervention shifted perceptions of procedural justice, and levels of satisfaction, trust and confidence and legitimacy, in a positive direction.

Over the course of the trial, 12,431 questionnaires were issued. In total 816 questionnaires were returned by the cut-off point in April 2014: 305 in the baseline ('pre' period), comprising 122 responses from the units assigned to the experiment condition and 183 from those assigned to the control condition; and 511 in the 'post' period (176 responses from the experiment and 335 responses from the control). The overall response rate is 6.6 per cent. Of the responses achieved, the majority were male drivers (63%) and the mean age was 50.7. Three quarters (75%) of the sample were owner-occupiers, and 40% had a first degree or higher. There were no significant differences pre to post trial, or between experimental or control groups, on any of the demographic measures used.

**Results**

Overall driver opinion about the police in terms of each of the key constructs measured was highly favourable. With regard to procedural justice, over 80% of respondents answered that the police ‘completely’ met each criterion of interest. Similarly, the overwhelming majority ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ with the indicators of trust in police officers and around 90% of respondents reported being ‘very’ or ‘fairly’ satisfied with officer conduct, personal treatment and encounter outcome.
However, examining the effect of the experimental intervention revealed interesting results.

Across the control areas there was a consistent pattern of improvement in scores on the key constructs over the course of the campaign. Yet this pattern was not repeated in the experiment areas, and driver assessments of procedural justice during encounters and subsequent driver satisfaction fell in the experiment areas relative to the control areas. The experimental intervention appeared to diminish drivers sense of procedural justice during their encounters with roads police, and led to a relative decrease in driver satisfaction (in other words, the opposite of the effect predicted). Perceptions of general trust and conferment of legitimacy were shown to be similar across both groups.

Overall, the experimental intervention had some unintended detrimental impact on policing practice, which led to some small but significant negative effects on public perception. These findings are unexpected.

The experiment was designed in line with existing evidence on procedurally just modes of policing and effective police-public communication, led by previous successful experimental intervention in the field (Mazerolle et al, 2011; 2012) and incorporating the fundamental elements of the procedural justice model: treating drivers with dignity and respect; demonstrating neutrality of decision making and trustworthy motives for action; and presenting drivers with opportunities to be an active participants during and after the encounter (Tyler, 2006; Tyler and Huo, 2002; Murphy et al, 2008). Moreover, those police officers responsible for implementing the experimental intervention were key contributors to its design. For this to have had a detrimental effect on perceptions of procedural justice and satisfaction is surprising.

The experimental intervention appeared to diminish drivers sense of procedural justice during their encounters with roads police

As yet, nothing in the data gathered explain why the observed effects occurred.

Nevertheless, our results lead us to suggest that, in policing contexts where police/citizen interaction and satisfaction are already high, it is not enough to simply up the ‘dosage’ of procedural justice to positively ‘shift’ perceptions. An encounter may contain all of the appropriate ‘ingredients’ for a procedurally just encounter, but here encounters where key ingredients may have been missed and excluded fared better. Contrary to the messages emerging in the growing literature (Mazerolle et al 2013; 2014), there appears to be more to successful operationalisation of the procedural justice model than simply ‘adding in’ the components through verbal dialogue and written messages. On their own, these are not sufficient to improve, or even maintain, public perceptions of the police.

At a time when procedural justice theory is rapidly being developed into a model of policing and practice, we have shown that the implementation of a procedural justice model of policing is not a straightforward matter. While QCET demonstrated the apparent ease with which such a model could be successfully implemented and incorporated into practice, our research suggests that, at least in policing contexts where interaction and satisfaction are already high, other factors, for example subtleties and nuances of communication context, content and style, can intervene.

Failure to acknowledge and provide for these in attempting to operationalise the procedural justice model may, perversely, undermine public trust and police legitimacy. Future research must explore these further to establish the critical elements of communication and interpersonal skill required to implement procedurally just policing.

Sarah MacQueen is a research fellow for the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research, University of Edinburgh Law School.

Ben Bradford is lecturer in Criminology in the Faculty of Law, University of Oxford.


CRIME REDUCTION THROUGH REGULATIONS

James Royan and John E. Eck on violent disorder and the licensed trade

TWO MURDERS, 5994 kilometres (3724 miles) and 45 months apart, illustrate the value of police-researcher knowledge transfer. The first murder occurred in 2010 at the Ritz Nightclub, in Cincinnati, USA. The victim was shot. The nightclub had a history of trouble with the police, including numerous violent events. The second killing occurred in 2013, at the Rowantree Inn, outside Dalkeith, Scotland. The victim was stabbed. This place too had a history of violence and other troubles. Both events illustrate the utility of taking a regulatory approach to crime prevention.

In April 2013, the Centre for Evidence Based Crime Policy (CEBCP) and the Scottish Institute of Policing Research (SIPR) assembled academics and practitioners from the United States and Scotland at George Mason University to promote the transfer of knowledge of evidence based practices. In October, 2014 SIPR and CEBCP held a second meeting at the Scottish Police College. This paper is the result of a fortuitous meeting of the authors.

At the first meeting, Eck spoke about regulating crime places, arguing that crime is concentrated on places because some create crime opportunities (Eck and Eck, 2012). Unless the opportunities that create ‘hot’ places are rectified, these addresses will stay ‘hot’. Arresting and prosecuting offenders serves justice, but leaves opportunities for crime untouched, so more crimes occur. A regulatory approach addresses the opportunities for further crime. At the second meeting, Royan spoke about his application of a regulatory approach to places within his command area using the Ritz Nightclub murder as an example. In this article, we illustrate the utility of practitioner-researcher information exchange by focusing on the direct application of Eck’s theory and the work also illustrates the utility of both police-researcher and international exchanges.

Licensing Developments in Midlothian

On 26 November 2012, Royan was appointed the Local Area Commander for Midlothian. He identified alcohol related violence and antisocial behaviour as a priority, and began exploring partnerships which could help reduce these problems identifying two specific concerns:

The Licensing Act 2005, placed a duty on all Local Licensing Boards to have a ‘Licensing Policy Statement’ containing an overprovision assessment of the number and density of licensed premises and if this caused problems. Midlothian’s Local Licensing Board had neither a ‘Policy Statement’ nor an ‘overprovision assessment’.

The Act provides for the creation of Local Licensing Forums to review its operation and to give advice and make recommendations to the Board. The Midlothian Council had a Forum but it was administered within the Licensing section of the Council, which limited its independence from the Board.

To rectify issue 1, Royan suggested to the Clerk of the Licensing Board, and it was agreed, that the Community Safety Partnership Analyst would prepare an alcohol profile for Midlothian, which would allow the Board to develop a Policy Statement, containing an overprovision assessment. In response to issue 2, Royan requested that the administration of the Local Licensing Forum be moved from the Licensing Department to the Safer Communities Team. This increased community representation at the Forum, and gave the Forum greater independence. Thus, the Forum became the key driver for creating the overprovision assessment and making recommendations to the Board.

Simultaneously, Forum membership was increased and widened to include greater representation from the community and licensed trade. This fostered effective working relationships between the Police and partners, specifically the licensed trade.
Case Study: The Rowantree Inn, Mayfield, Midlothian

The background was the culpable homicide of a 28 year old male outside the Rowantree Inn on 24 November 2013.

The Place

The Rowantree Inn is a public house within the former mining area of Midlothian. Between October 2010 and November 2011, there were 17 separate incidents on the premises requiring police intervention, including four disturbances involving multiple individuals; eight assaults and five other miscellaneous licensing offences, including patrons refusing to leave the premises and selling alcohol to underage patrons.

As a consequence, police asked the Local Licensing Board to review the premises’ operating plan. The police supported this request with documentary evidence, oral testimony, and CCTV footage. The Board upheld the grounds for the review and the Rowantree’s operating hours by one hour. The Rowantree Inn did not come to the attention of the police for any significant incident thereafter until the murder.

The Incident

At 2341 hours, the police received an emergency call reporting that a man had entered the Rowantree with a knife. He threatened the barmaid before a second man intervened and with a group of other patrons ushered the first man out, into the adjacent car park.

Within the car park, the disturbance resumed, and the first man fatally stabbed the second. A full criminal investigation ensued: the man responsible was convicted of culpable homicide and is currently serving a custodial sentence.

Licensing Interventions

To prevent further violence, Royan considered the PS internal Alcohol Licensing Toolkit, sought advice and support from the National Licensing and Violence Reduction Policy Unit, and considered the contents of Eck’s ‘Crime Place and Pollution’ article when developing his community impact assessment.

From the 24th the premises was a crime scene and was locked down for forensic examination. By 29 November, the premises was only permitted to re-open after the review and reduced the Rowantree’s operating hours by one hour. The Rowantree Inn did not come to the attention of the police for any significant incident thereafter until the murder.

Mindful of the limitations of an emergency closure, Royan considered other options. Through involvement in the Local Licensing Forum, Police Scotland had developed an enhanced working relationship with Midlothian’s Licensed Trade.

Exploiting these positive working relationships, Royan invited the Premises Manager of the Rowantree Inn to a meeting. At this meeting police informed him that the property would be returned but a licensing investigation still had to examine any malpractice. Since community tensions were still high, Royan asked the premises manager if he would agree to closure until the 16th December on a voluntary basis. This would allow for a full licensing investigation, community tensions to subside, and, a formal application for a closure order to be made to Midlothian Local Licensing Board.

The premises manager agreed and the premises closed immediately on a voluntary basis. This agreement was facilitated by the positive working relationships developed among the licensed trade, Licensing Forum, and police.

On 13 December 2013, an application was made for a formal Closure Order. This was granted until the Local Licensing Board could hear from the police on their review of and suggestions for the premises operating plan. This was only the second formal closure order to be granted within Scotland under this legislation.

A month later, the Board upheld the reasons for the review and agreed to a full implementation of the conditions requested by the police. These were that the Premises Licence Holder should:

- Be present on the Rowantree at all times that it is open.
- Hire stewards to be on duty between 9pm and close of business every Friday and Saturday.
- Pay for an independent review of stewarding needs, to the satisfaction of the police.
- Remove indoor and outdoor sports.
- Keep an up-to-date incident book.

The premises were only permitted to re-open after the review of stewarding was undertaken.

After re-opening, the police conducted regular visits and inspections to ensure all conditions were being adhered to. By this time, community tensions had gone down.

This case study deftly combined three dimensions of regulation. The first is government: here the police and Local Licensing Board. The second is ‘self-regulation’, and involves the organisation or industry imposing rules upon themselves: here the premises’ owner and representatives of the license trade. The third is community-based regulation: here the expanded Local Licensing Forum (Grabosky, 2011). This case also illustrates the interconnectedness of a problem-oriented approach and regulation (Sparrow, 2000). Finally, it shows that although theory based on evidence is useful, practitioners must artfully apply the general principles to local problems.

Eck and Eck suggest that place management practices are in part responsible for high crime and place managers can reduce the crime in their respective place. To achieve this, a regulatory approach can be useful. Through the application of specific legislation the police and partners can apply regulatory control over problematic premises. Finally, in this case, by requiring an independent review of stewarding at the premises’ manager’s expense, the burden of responsibility shifts towards place managers reducing crime.

James Royan is a Chief Inspector with Police Scotland

John E. Eck is professor of criminal justice at the University of Cincinnati


AA: You have spent two years working in Serbia. What were you trying to achieve?

PT: To help them develop an evidence-based approach to making strategic decisions in terms of constrained resources, and develop a more anticipatory approach to determining what the key challenges are likely to be. The minister, although not responsible for operational policing, was put in a position of making decisions that affect, constrain and determine operational priorities, but on a very reactive basis.

The other imperative for the MUP was that clearly everything is driven by the determination to become a member of the EU, including the adoption of models that we would be familiar with in Europol such as intelligence led policing, risk assessment models and so on.

How welcome was your presence?

PT: Within the ministry, the middle management were very open to change had seen processes working elsewhere, had seen the benefits that brought. The people at the very top were more sceptical and questioning. I think that there was active resistance and some fearfulness. Pressures to changequite dramatically were unnerving.

Did you see that scepticism change?

PT: Yes. I think it’s about engagement and talking, and helping people move from the general to the specific with examples of how that would work in the Serbian context.

What additional preparation did you have?

PT: A trawl of various inputs, assessments, reports. Very few of those were actually implemented and sustained. I don’t think that’s the fault of the beneficiary countries. It’s a fault of the donor community many of whom work with little reference to each other in a very complicated environment.

So knowing this record, how did that shape your approach when you arrived in Serbia?

PT: I looked at the strategic aim of the project, €1.5 m of public money, thinking about how I would work with key individuals and change agents or potential change agents to equip them to lead the process and have the confidence and tools to maintain momentum after I’d left.

Who did you find were the most effective change agents?

PT: It was a very much knowledge-based power rather than rank-based power. In some cases at the top it was rank-based power, but below that you could have a very influential detective inspector getting the ear of the minister. Expertise was vested throughout the hierarchy.

Is that a contrast to Scottish policing in terms of how people can cross levels in order to shape change?

PT: It was much more based on personality and relationships and individuals than I would expect to see in Scotland. Policing in Britain as a whole has vested much more effort developing systems and investing in the systems with knowledge and doctrine. There is a degree of resilience built into the Scottish model.

In terms of the task that you thought you were going out to do, how did that shift?

PT: I realised that the development of the process needed to come second to a hearts and minds campaign. Relationships, mutual trust, and mutual respect are very important. It is a huge mistake to go into any environment in international development saying that if we simply transfer the experience and the processes from one environment to another then things will get better.

Primarily it’s about supporting the development of individuals to use the lessons from those processes and to develop their own processes that are most appropriate to the environment within which they are working.
Knowing everything you know now, could you go back to 2011 and give yourself one piece of advice, what would it be?

PT: More patience! I was certainly naïve about the degree to which we could invest the process of change with the speed that I would have been familiar with in the UK.

I think that’s part of the development of opportunity for us in Scotland. Yes, we have much to offer, but we have much to learn as well. I would see this kind of interaction as not just simply giving something to Serbia or another beneficiary country, but as a mutual benefit.

The UK has a history of sending police officers off to various missions. How well do you think we prepare police officers for foreign deployment?

PT: The people that do go are obviously a minority. They probably don’t receive the degree of training and support that they merit and don’t get the understanding about how powerful their role can be in influencing perceptions of Scottish or British expertise and willingness to help others.

I learned a great deal from the experience and I think that would inevitably, were I still an operational police officer, help me think about the issues within different communities within my own country when I came back. So for officers who are still serving at different levels, it can only enhance their empathy and their ability to engage with complex social and cultural challenges in Scotland were they to be involved in this kind of activity.

What are the big challenges coming up for the MUP and the Serbian police?

PT: They have very major structural issues. For example, in Serbia the ratio of police to population was about twice that of Scotland. In common with other public services they are there to help get people jobs. It leads to a lack of focus on what the roles of police officers are within society.

There are huge operational challenges around serious organised crime. There are still significant instabilities in the region and there is an increasing expectation from EU police forces that their colleagues in Serbia and elsewhere in the western Balkans will operate at a level which they would expect from their peers.

I’ve got absolutely no doubt about the competency of the individuals but they need the right training, they need the right equipment, they need the right intelligence databases and so on.

Are there positive things in Serbian policing that you think we could learn from here?

PT: I think that one of the key lessons is that they manage, with far fewer resources than we do, to deliver a policing service in which a very significant level of population have trust and faith. The processes, the equipment, the training, the physical resources, the estate are a long way behind those which we would consider minimal and yet they are inventive and adaptable and responsive in terms of how they still enforce the law and engage with the public.

Their lack of defined processes and intelligence-led models sometimes gives them more freedom for movement than we would be comfortable with. That leads on to the issue of accountability. How do you demonstrate accountability if you’re not clear what your standards are? If you don’t have the systems to check the quality of data crime reporting, how do you hold the police service to account? So, they find more informal and individually focused approaches for holding people to account.

What now?

PT: I continue to work with Serbia and the western Balkans, but it’s encouraged me to engage in other areas. For example, I’m invited to deliver a symposium in Mexico City talking about police reform, police accountability, police governance, in a very different environment with very profound operational challenges.

Scotland’s own experience of profound reform has given me and others a lot of confidence to say that our insights and our experiences are valued just as we should value those of others. The more we do to engage in and promote a dialogue between countries in the discipline of policing, the more our respective communities will benefit.

Where do you see the relationship between police and democracy?

PT: From my perspective the police service is absolutely core to the effective operation of any democracy worthy of the name, principally because it should give the public the confidence to participate in the democratic process: to be able to expect a certain level of service from the government; to hold to account that public service; to question that public service. That’s what we seek in Scotland.

There will be a sense of confidence in Scotland that one could question, confront, and challenge policing decisions, the senior leaders of policing, and the relevant politicians and civil servants.

Thank you. Is anything else you feel that you would like to add?

PT: Policing must be local, but it must be informed by global experience. The more we do at all levels, not just operationally, but in training, development, exchanges and so on to help our people understand what it’s like to work in different environments with different constraints and different expectations, can only be beneficial and I would like to see that opportunity extended to others and possibly earlier in their careers so they can actually apply it to practice here.

A fuller version of this interview is available on the website and on SoundCloud.
CRIME PREVENTION AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SAFER COMMUNITIES EVIDENCE MATRIX SCOTLAND (SCEMS)

Liz Aston and Cynthia Lum

THE Safer Communities Evidence Matrix Scotland (SCEMS) is a knowledge exchange tool which aims to provide easy access to evidence on policing and community safety from Scotland and farther afield. It has emerged against the backdrop of a collaborative working arrangement between the Scottish Institute for Policing Research (SIPR) and the Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy (CEBCP) at George Mason University (GMU). The collaboration formed from SIPR and CEBCP’s mutual interest and leadership in not only generating impactful research, but translating and exchanging research and analysis into practical outputs for policing.

A Shared Interest: translating research evidence and the evidence-based policing matrix

One of CEBCP’s tools became a focus in this exchange – the Evidence-Based Policing Matrix (Lum, 2009; Lum et al., 2011). Developed by the CEBCP’s director Cynthia Lum and her colleagues with the support of the US Department of Justice, the Matrix is an interactive web-based tool which houses all police crime-control intervention research of moderate to high methodological quality, designed to provide law enforcement officials with easy access to the research knowledge on effective crime prevention measures. Through the Matrix, the authors collect, store, summarise, visualise and generalise from high quality evaluations of police crime control measures, updating it each year. The overall goal is to facilitate the use of existing knowledge in policing, and to serve as a resource for agencies in developing strategies and tactics for their own needs that have elements of successful interventions.

To achieve this, the Matrix classifies and maps rigorous evaluations of police interventions (see http://cebcp.org/evidence-based-policing/the-matrix/) based on three very common dimensions of crime prevention strategies: the nature and type of target, the degree to which the strategy is reactive or proactive, and how tailored a strategy is to a particular problem. Doing this allows clusters of studies and their findings to emerge revealing generalisations about crime prevention tactics that the police can deploy. For example, law enforcement officers are more likely to make an impact on crime when they design tactics that are place-based (rather than focused only on individuals), proactive (for example, using crime analysis to anticipate problems) and focused or tailored to a particular problem at hand.

The Matrix has become a starting point in disseminating information from a large body of research in a free and user-friendly online format to police officers. Further, by filtering for research with at least a moderate threshold of methodological quality, the Matrix provided the law enforcement community with the most reliable information on evaluated crime prevention efforts by the police.

How has the Safer Communities Evidence Matrix Scotland (SCEMS) developed?

SCEMS began in the context of police reform, with similar goals of linking research with practice. In late 2011, the then lead of the Reform Team’s Local Policing Work Stream approached Prof. Ken Scott and Dr Liz Aston for advice on best practice in local policing. Scott and Aston applied for and received a SIPR ‘Improving Police Action through Knowledge Transfer’ grant, and during 2012 attended the ACPOS Local Policing Working Group meetings and provided advice on evidence relating to good practice in local policing. After hearing about the Matrix at a SIPR /Scottish Government event, Scott and Aston decided to develop a similar knowledge-translation tool on research related to local policing, which developed into the Scottish Local Policing Evidence Database (SLoPED).

Having looked at Lum et al.’s Matrix, it was clear that some amendments would need to be made in order to develop something which would be suited to the Scottish context. For example, the Matrix includes only those studies which are at least quasi-experimental (that is, at a minimum, the intervention was tested with the presence of a comparable comparison group) or that use rigorous time series methods. However, similar studies on policing interventions at that methodological threshold in Scotland are scarce.

A decision was made to include grey literature from the Scottish context and studies which use a broader range of methods, including qualitative research and ‘conceptual’ pieces such as literature reviews and theoretical or policy documents. In order to reflect the principles of the Police and Fire Reform Scotland Act (2012), the focus moved beyond crime reduction as the sole outcome of interest to also include community engagement and partnership working (Aston and Scott, 2013). However, the intention of SLoPED mirrored the Matrix - to provide key messages from the body of relevant literature that could be easily accessed by police practitioners.

Subsequently it became apparent that the idea appealed to organisations beyond the Police, and a decision was...
made to look at broadening the scope beyond local policing, and developing it in line with the Building Safer Communities agenda. In 2014, Aston and Scott received a small SIPR grant to conduct a scoping exercise on the development of the Safer Communities Evidence Matrix Scotland (SCEMS). As a result the remit has been expanded beyond the policing principles, so in addition to ‘community engagement’, ‘crime reduction’ and ‘partnership working’ the Y axis now includes ‘harm reduction’ and ‘reducing reoffending’ (see Figure 1 and Aston et al., 2015).

It was clear that a user should also be able to gain a visual message and generalisations from the research when they look at SCEMS and how entries are distributed. Therefore, the X axis now reflects the ‘policing approach’, on a scale from ‘reactive’, to ‘proactive’ and ‘highly proactive’. Additionally, the SCEMS takes inspiration from the Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research’s ‘Security of Mega Events Research Grid’ (SCCJR /Hamilton-Smith et al. 2015). The intention is that SCEMS will become a dynamic matrix which will also show, for example, how successful police strategies are, the scope of the research (such as individuals, groups, communities and so on) and the research methodology employed (see Figure 1 below).

Figure 1 The Safer Communities Evidence Matrix Scotland

What are the next steps for SCEMS?

Police Scotland and partners have welcomed the development of a system which would allow users to readily access relevant research and help guide them as they seek to address policing and community safety challenges. Thus far one focus group has been conducted with a selection of local stakeholders (various representatives from Police Scotland, Scottish Fire and Rescue Service, Scottish Government, Edinburgh City Council, and Lothian and Borders Community Justice Authority). Partners are keen on the idea of having a single place where evidence relating to safer communities can be accessed and used to inform decisions about what course of action to take. Various helpful suggestions were made, particularly in relation to additional ways in which entries could be classified in order to filter searches, for example, by timescale of intervention, target population, age, and geographical area. The intention is to pursue funding which would support the development of SCEMS and enable its delivery as a fully functioning and accessible tool for use by the police and partner organisations. The development phase would involve further consultation with a broader range of users (front line practitioners and managers in a range of organisations), focusing on their requirements.

At the outset, the reform of Scottish policing understandably concentrated on restructuring and delivering cost savings. However, two years on there is a need to focus on evidence based policing, in particular learning from best research and practice in relation to the delivery of local policing. Indeed, moving towards using what we know from research evidence to develop strategies that can prevent crime, reduce harm, improve community relations and increase partnership working contributes to cost-effectiveness. There should also be an emphasis on ensuring that the principles enshrined in the Police and Fire Reform Scotland Act are upheld and underpin the activity of Police Scotland and its partners. This involves community engagement and partnership working, and in this context it is argued that the development and use of a tool like SCEMS becomes extremely important.

Most significantly, this endeavour and other exchanges between SIPR and the CEBCP highlight the importance of international partnerships and the sharing of ideas between scholars and practitioners. Although each country seems on the surface vastly different with regard to their policing practices, digging deeper reveals many more shared interests and common challenges.

Dr Liz Aston is senior lecturer in Criminology and subject group leader for Social Sciences at Edinburgh Napier University.

Dr Cynthia Lum is associate professor and director of the Centre for Evidence Based Crime Policy at George Mason University, Virginia USA.


**Policing Antisocial Behaviour in Rural Scotland**

Andrew Wooff

**Antisocial Behaviour (ASB) policy and discourse** has been developed within and focused upon urban areas, yet 94% of Scotland’s space is classed as ‘rural’. By examining the distinctive ways in which rural police officers respond to ASB it is possible to gain insights into broader rural social processes and to argue that the rural context is a key consideration when thinking about the way that the policing of ASB is carried out throughout Scotland. This has become particularly pertinent since the creation of Police Scotland, given that the focus on centralisation has significantly altered the level at which strategic decisions are made. The policing of ASB in rural areas has been entirely absent from academic and policy debates.

Policing rural Scotland can be challenging, not only because the police are often located remotely from the communities that they serve, but also because of the sheer size of rural policing beats. Yet, the rural context plays a key part of understanding the police response to ASB in rural Scotland (Wooff, 2015). It offers opportunities for the police to respond in local, context dependent ways which often amount to a ‘softer’ policing response than that in urban areas. In this article I use research findings from my ESRC-funded PhD project which involved 80 hours of participant observation, 33 interviews and eight focus groups across the two case study locations to evidence this before going on to consider the impact of Police Scotland on rural policing.

**Rural context and policing**

My research suggests that the rural context impacts on policing in a number of ways. First, rural police officers tend to negotiate the maintenance of order in response to ASB in rural communities, both at macro and micro scales. The large areas involved in their beat means that officers often have little choice other than to negotiate order because back-up is a long-distance away and transporting detainees to the nearest police cells takes a long time:

> The distance you are from custody, like here in [fieldwork site] you are at least an hour round to take someone to custody [...] you need to box cleverer here. Particularly with disturbances, because the nearest backup might be half an hour away ... by blue light (Police Inspector)

At the micro-scale, rural police officers frequently live and work in the community that they police, which means many officers have an embedded knowledge and understanding of the community they police and the associated challenges. This added situated knowledge often enables a softer policing response, whereby community solutions are sought to deal with low-key ASB in a more fundamental manner than in urban locations.

One of the ways that ‘softer’ policing happens is through the use of discretion. There is not the space to go through the arguments relating to discretion and policing here, but the rural context appears to promote it. In a US study Weisheit et al. (2005) note that rural officers tend to do activities which not only vary more but are also more wide-ranging than their urban colleagues, typically emphasising crime prevention over enforcement. Also in the US, Payne et al. (2005) suggest that this is in part because the physical...
distances involved means that discretion is used in ways to facilitate a choice between enforcement and other interventions. For example, in Scotland

Discretion is vital. It is trying to weigh up - [the officer] will make that assessment themselves, you know is something serious enough that we can’t ignore it by just giving a warning [...] So whilst there are things we can’t have discretion over - drink drivers for example - we have no discretion over this nor should we ... but there might be instances where maybe someone in [name of city] doing the same thing will get the jail where here they won’t ... (Police Inspector).

there are distinct spatial challenges associated with rural policing which mean that it is necessary for officers to use their discretion when responding to ASB

Although it is imperative not to fall into idyllised notions of rural policing, there are distinct spatial challenges associated with rural policing which mean that it is necessary for officers to use their discretion when responding to ASB. The knowledge officers have of the situation they are policing means that they can often respond by using their discretion and community-based knowledge in a way that is less possible to do in urban based situations. It is important, however, to acknowledge that rural Scotland is not a uniform space and therefore there are different geographic challenges associated with policing different rural communities. In particular, different communities require different policing responses depending on informal community structures already in place. In remote rural communities with active community groups, for example, the policing response to ASB varies from an accessibly rural community with a high percentage of social housing.

The use of discretion and negotiated order maintenance therefore relies on police-community relationships and knowledge in rural communities. This is impacted upon by the type of rural community and the length of time the officer has been policing the community and consequently the intimate knowledge that they have of the community. It is therefore important as a rural community officer, to understand how the rural context impacts on these relationships. As Fenwick et al. (2011) note, many rural police officers are required to ‘think on their feet’ and interact with the community in a different manner than their urban colleagues. As a community officer noted:

I have what I call ‘the monthly tea spots’, these are people in the community who have the gossip and know what’s going on - info that’s very useful to me. So I pop by Miss H’s, sit down, have a cuppa ... that way she thinks she’s getting good service and I get to hear about all that’s been going on ... (Community police officer).

Indeed, the fact that many officers live and work in the communities they police means that they have a situated, informal knowledge about different people, their circumstances and the way that different local factors interact. Drawing on this information allows embedded community police officers to negotiate order and respond to ASB in ways which are more nuanced. Rural policing therefore presents greater opportunity to govern through the social, where soft policing skills are used to a greater degree. It is important not to over generalise, this is not something which happens in every rural community and is dependent on structural policing decisions such as how long a community officer works in a rural community and whether the officer has a situated knowledge gained by living in the community that they police. Additionally, different rural communities have different challenges related to ASB which require locally developed and implemented policing response strategies. Nevertheless, I would argue that rural communities present greater opportunities for the police to respond in less formalised ways to ASB, negotiating order and using their discretion to a greater degree.

It is also important to remember that rural Scotland is a diverse environment, which requires different policing responses in different communities and an understanding of the complexities of policing over large areas. Police Scotland has provided a number of opportunities, particularly in relation to standardising policing delivery at a national scale. However, there are also challenges associated with this approach, in particular, the (potential) to undermine the more nuanced approach to policing described here. There are distinctive elements associated with rural policing, notably a lack of nearby back-up and a situated knowledge of the community which makes discretion a more likely route in responding to ASB.

This has important research and policy implications because given that large tracts of Scotland are considered ‘rural’, there has been a relative dearth of work examining the police in these contexts. By better understanding the spatiality of the police in rural communities and their response to ASB over space, resources can be more appropriately dispatched. This is particularly important in relation to the introduction of the single police force in Scotland, where there are concerns that the local, rural policing context has been diluted by the centralisation of power and control. Although at a strategic level this may be beneficial, as this article has highlighted, it is important that a degree of localised policing decision making is preserved and enabled within the national structure. Additionally, rural policing should be considered a core part of the skill set of Scottish police officers, a part of the policing craft which relies on ‘softer’ policing skills.

Andrew Wooff has recently been appointed as a lecturer in Criminology at Edinburgh Napier University.


IN A PIECE on ‘Reinventing policing’, Peter Neyroud observes how fundamental changes are currently re-shaping police organisations in many states across the globe:

States both old and new, across the developed and developing world, are undertaking police reforms to transform policing. Sometimes this is because the money has run out, sometimes because the government recognizes a need to rebuild the legitimacy of police forces … This is both an age of “austerity” and reform (Neyroud, 2012: 315).

These comments are an important reminder that developments in Scotland are part of a broader set of reforms to policing that are occurring internationally. In this final contribution we place the changes in Scotland in this broader context, underlining the differences in the trajectories of reform across the UK but also the underlying similarities in terms of the pressure to mobilise research evidence to demonstrate the efficiency, effectiveness and professionalism of policing. Taking up Neyroud’s theme of ‘reinventing policing’, we conclude with some observations on the opportunities for the ‘re-invention’ of Scottish policing.

Viewed against the back drop of UK policing, developments within Scotland present a starkly different trajectory of policy change compared with England and Wales. While in both jurisdictions the reforms have been framed by the economic challenges of declining budgets, there are at least two key points of difference. The approach in England and Wales has been strongly informed by a politics of localism focused on replacing centrally driven forms of ‘bureaucratic accountability’ in policing with a much stronger role for local ‘democratic accountability’ through locally elected Police and Crime Commissioners (PCCs). In Scotland, by contrast, the policy discourse has focused on the economic and technocratic rationale for reform and changes to the governance of policing have involved the replacement of locally elected police authorities with a nationally selected body, the Scottish Police Authority. Where in England and Wales the overarching political objectives of police reform appears to centre on transferring power over policing to locally elected politicians, the Scottish Government’s strategic objectives for Police Scotland are more wide ranging and include reducing duplication, strengthening connections with local communities, and using the capacity and capability of a national force to improve access to specialist expertise.

A second important and related difference within the UK police reform agenda concerns the political narrative around what the police are for. In England and Wales, the Home Secretary has made it clear that the focus must be crime reduction and that the mission of the police articulated in the nineteenth century by Sir Robert Peel as one of preventing crime and disorder has not fundamentally changed. In Scotland, the reform programme has been used as an opportunity to articulate a set of new ‘Policing Principles’ within the Police and Fire Reform Act, in which the emphasis on crime and disorder is subsumed within a broader statement of the policing mission as being to ‘improve safety and well-being of persons, localities and communities’ in ways which engage with communities and promote measures to prevent crime, harm and disorder.

Viewed against the back drop of UK policing, developments within Scotland present a starkly different trajectory of policy change compared with England and Wales

Underlying these differences in the trajectories of police reform within the UK, however, there are in fact very similar economic and political pressures to enhance the efficiency, effectiveness and professionalism of policing. One important response to these pressures there has been an increasing emphasis on the need to develop evidence-based policing and make greater use of research about ‘what works’. The identification of evidence of effective and cost-efficient practices and policies is viewed essential ‘if policing is to gain legitimacy and secure investment in an increasingly sceptical world of public services in which the competition for public finance is growing ever more acute’ (Ayling, Grabosky, and Shearing, 2009). The processes of embedding evidence-based policing are, however, far from straightforward. Bullock and Tilley (2009) highlight how there is often disagreement about what counts as evidence of effective practice, as well as further organisational constraints facing practitioners in terms of a lack of support for them to engage with research that might be seen as a threat to professional and ‘craft’ expertise.
Nevertheless, the combined impacts of austerity, reform and the desire to enhance police professionalism have prompted a renewed interest in developing the evidence base for policing. In Scotland this is exemplified by the establishment of the Scottish Institute for Policing Research (SIPR) in 2007 as a strategic partnership between universities and the police service as a new way of connecting research and practice. Now recognised internationally as a model of best practice of police-academic collaboration (see Engel and Henderson, 2014; Fyfe and Wilson, 2012), SIPR is encouraging the co-production of research between practitioners and researchers and a "culture of engagement" between research ‘users’ and research ‘providers’. These activities are important because they yield the kind of sustained involvement of practitioners and policy makers in the research process that facilitates a better mutual understanding of the different worlds of police organisations and academia. These activities also help illuminate the ways in which research can play a number of different roles in relation to policing, ranging from building knowledge around the (in) effectiveness of practices, initiatives or processes (and how they are experienced) and supporting organisational problem-solving, through to stimulating deep thinking about practice, about exploring alternative possibilities and future trajectories, all of which might productively challenge how the problems themselves are and ought to be ‘framed’. Nutley, Walter and Davies (2007) call this the ‘enlightenment’ model. Thinking about research in this way suggests that its function should not just be thought of in instrumental terms (‘can it help out with this problem?’), it can also play a role in shaping the values and aims of practice. Indeed, the research process itself, particularly when it involves collaboration between researchers and practitioners, plays a role in this ‘enlightenment’ through the very openness and transparency that such an enterprise requires.

Recognising that research may be useful for different reasons is liberating because it reminds us to value different methodological approaches and what they can individually and collectively add to our understanding. The contributions to this issue of Scottish Justice Matters demonstrate that breadth of different types of research, from Randomised Controlled Trials (RCTs) to more qualitative approaches. SIPR has also embraced different ways of connecting research and practice that range from support for the ‘research-based practitioner’ via collaborative research projects that provide opportunities to build grass roots interest in the use of evidence to inform practice (as the Royan and Eck piece illustrates), to an ‘embedded research’ model where research use is achieved by embedding findings into formal policies and processes of an organisation (as exemplified by the procedural justice ideas embedded into the protocols of Road Traffic Officers and the training provided to probations at the Scottish Police College as discussed in MacQueen and Bradford’s and Robertson and McMillan’s articles).

Finally, the growing evidence base around policing in Scotland combined with the opportunities for change created by police reform create significant scope for ‘reinventing’ policing in ways which align with the ‘Policing Principles’ set out in the Police and Fire Reform Act. As discussed above, these principles focus on the need for prevention and partnership and for the police to be accessible to and engaged with local communities. Such principles strongly resonate with key messages from the accumulated international research evidence on police effectiveness, evidence which places a focus on prevention and community confidence as the core requirements of contemporary policing in advanced democratic societies (Lum and Nagin, 2015). There is, of course, a long and strong tradition within Scottish policing of a focus on prevention and community engagement but there is now scope to build on this in ways which are informed by cutting-edge research of ‘what works’ to reduce harm and increase trust and confidence in policing. Such evidence informed approaches, supported by an infrastructure of independent research and evaluation, can provide the foundations for Scotland to be seen as a world-leader in policing.

**Nick Fyfe** is director of SIPR and professor in the School of Social Sciences, University of Dundee.

**Alistair Henry** is an associate director of SIPR (leading the Police-Community Relations network) and a lecturer in criminology in the Law School, University of Edinburgh.

---


There is growing interest in making better use of the services offered by third sector organisations (TSOs) in criminal justice. The use of TSOs is often justified with arguments such as this:

The third sector has a number of unique and positive attributes that differentiates it from the public and private sector. A distinctive feature ... is that it is value driven, characterised by a strong sense of ethics and prioritises the needs of people over all other objectives ... (The Robertson Trust 2012, 2)

TSOs are understood to be more responsive to the needs of individual offenders, less bureaucratic and able to find more innovative ways of working than the public sector. However, in England and Wales, several commentators have worried that the way in which the government is deploying the services of the TSOs, via contractual agreements, is, in fact, nullifying such benefits. For example, contract-based funding is seen as a threat to the work of TSOs, because it tends to be less open-ended than grants, which historically have provided the core of TSOs’ income. Contracts are thought to reduce the possibilities of the TSOs to engage in innovative and flexible ways of working. Furthermore, commentators have suggested that acting as a service provider to the criminal justice system will hamper the abilities of the TSOs to criticise government policies and represent the interest of their clients in policy-making (Mythen et al. 2013; Maguire 2012; Neilson 2009; Corcoran 2009; Vennard and Hedderman 2009. For the opposite view, see Tomczak 2013).

The potential effects of contract funding for TSOs working with offenders have received little attention apart from in England and Wales, although contracts as a way of funding TSOs are becoming more important, particularly in the area of health and social care. As a part of my doctoral research, I examined the situation of TSOs working with offenders in relation to contract-funding in my home country, Finland, and in two other rather similar countries, in Norway and in Sweden. I also included Scotland in my study to compare accounts of third sector representatives from different ‘civil society regimes’ (Enjolras and Sivesind, 2009). I selected the following, most significant TSOs working with offenders for study: KRIS Finland and KRIS Sweden (‘Criminals’ Return In to Society’), Probation Foundation Finland (PFF), Wayback (Norway), X-Cons from Sweden, and Apex and Sacro from Scotland.

These TSOs are fairly different in terms of their approaches. The two CRIS organisations, Wayback and X-Cons are so-called peer support organisations: the services and support that they offered was based on the idea that released convicts support other releasing convicts in their return into the society. As a rule, the peer support organisations employed only those who had their own background in criminality and/or substance abuse. The two Scottish organisations and the Finnish PFF, on the other hand, were based on services and support offered by social work professionals, although they also had a few employees as so-called peer mentors.

The organisations differed also in terms of funding. The Scottish TSOs were funded mainly via contracts with local authorities, and the Nordic TSOs had both contracts and grant...
funding. In addition, volunteering also constituted a significant resource for the peer support organisations. In all of the countries, TSOs are significant actors in supporting releasing prisoners and other ex-offenders. This is true particularly for the Nordic countries, in which there is a lack of specialised through or aftercare services offered by the state.

Interviewees’ views concerning the overall appropriateness of contracts as a funding source differed. However, there were no clear-cut differences between representatives from different countries. In fact, interestingly, the interviewees from the two Scottish organisations represented exactly the opposite views about the appropriateness of contracts as a way of funding their services. Whereas the interviewee from Apex found several problems in relation to providing services to their clients via contracts, the interviewee from Sacro did not recognise such problems. For example, Apex had often encountered situations in which it was unable to offer clients such help that it considered essential as the service was not specified in the contract it was delivering. Efforts to achieve certain outcomes stipulated in the contracts may drive the organisation to ‘cherry-picking’ its clients, thus leave out the hard cases and take in the easier ones. In contrast, the interviewee from Sacro was confident about the ability of the organisation to work in the contract environment. Nevertheless, despite of the problems highlighted, both of the Scottish TSOs were willing to continue working via contracts, which may be because other available means of funding were very scarce. The Nordic interviewees generally preferred their organisations to be funded via grants. For instance, the informant from Finnish CRIS justified this view by noting that the organisation would lose its character, if it increased service-delivery to the public sector.

**TSOs are understood to be more responsive to the needs of individual offenders, less bureaucratic and able to find more innovative ways of working than the public sector**

However, interviewees generally considered that contracts as such did not restrict organisations’ abilities to influence and engage in policy-work. It seemed that rather than service-delivery contracts, it was generally the role of these TSOs as cooperative partners of the public sector that restricted their ability to influence and criticise. For instance, the interviewees from the Swedish KRIS, which in comparison to the Scottish TSOs was much less dependent on contracts, related that the organisation was never able to criticise the prison system in the way they would have liked to, as if they did, the prisons would not let the organisation to visit prisoners. It can therefore be questioned as to whether TSOs that engage in practical work with offenders are ever able to operate in such ‘watch dog roles’ we would expect.

The interviewees disclosed also other difficulties in relation to policy-work. For instance, the Scottish representatives, in particular, highlighted that their capacity to influence policy-makers is strongly linked to their ability to provide research evidence but this is again was connected to their ability to win contracts.

Nevertheless, the most burning problems concerning contract funding seemed to relate to the abilities of the TSOs to perform meaningful practical work with their clients, although it was interesting to note how differently interviewees even from same countries experienced contracts. Consequently, this may make it difficult for those that do experience problems to oppose the system, if their colleagues in other TSOs do not recognise similar problems. Opposing can be particularly difficult for the smaller TSOs, if the larger organisations having more influence and power do not share the experiences of their colleagues.

New forms of contracting have emerged, which provide more opportunities for TSOs to influence the content of the services they provide, such as the Public Social Partnership models introduced by the Scottish Government (see Rob Strachan’s article in the March 2014 S/JM). Such models may enable provision of more meaningful services for the clients. Yet, these partnership models probably do not make it any easier for the TSOs to retain their ‘alternativeness’ in the eyes of their clients, which undeniably is one of the most important assets that TSOs have in the work with offenders.

Finally, I would like to point out that the views reported do not represent the situation of the whole sector. Nonetheless, it is important to stay attentive to the experiences of these large actors and to any barriers and disincentives to their willingness to have an independent voice.

**Maija Helminen** is a doctoral candidate at the Faculty of Law, University of Turku, Finland. Currently, she is examining the involvement of Finnish TSOs in decision-making processes in the area of criminal policy.
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THE NOVELTY of the raised eyebrows, expressions of surprise and intrigue that inevitably follow my response to the now dreaded dinner party question, ‘So, what do you do?’ wears off quickly. As the conversation continues, and I am likely relishing in the opportunity to talk about myself, or even more so, my research, my work with victims of crime inevitably comes up. ‘That must be hard’, and the truth is, it is.

When imagining your future as a young researcher, you do not often stop to consider the impact on oneself of working in criminal justice and forensic settings. Of course, academics are not the only, or I imagine, the most intensely exposed to difficult work scenarios; social workers, police officers, prison and parole officers, nurses, doctors and numerous clinicians all must cope with the burden of working with difficult populations.

Although all bound by involvement one way or another with criminal justice, people in these professions are likely to have very different resources and approaches, both at a personal level and an organisational level, for coping with working with difficult populations.

Coping with victimisation

Trauma and the criminal justice researcher

Stephanie Fohring

The potential effects of working with trauma survivors are distinct from those of working with other difficult populations, as the clinician, caseworker, or in this case, researcher, is exposed to the emotionally shocking images and suffering that are characteristic of serious trauma (McCann and Pearlman, 1990). For example, the first interview I conducted for my present research was with a young woman who suffers from an illness which has left her physically disabled. I was admittedly unprepared for the harrowing account of years of sexual abuse by her carers, culminating in the death of her resultant child. A later interview with a woman who had suffered the murder of her husband left my professional transcriber in tears.

Impact of trauma

Exposure to such material may result in one of two similar yet distinct illnesses: Vicarious Trauma (VT) and Secondary Traumatic Stress (STS). VT refers to pervasive, cumulative, and permanent harmful changes that occur in a professional’s views of themselves, others, and the world around them as a result of exposure to graphic and/ or traumatic material. This definition in itself is strikingly familiar to theory surrounding the impact of crime. Victimisation is thought to be so disruptive because it challenges at a fundamental level our beliefs in a safe and benevolent world, and of ourselves as good (and hence undeserving) people (Janoff-Bulman, 1992).

STS on the other hand, is a disorder experienced by those supporting or helping persons suffering specifically from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). The focus here is not specifically on cognitive phenomenon as in the case of VT, but on a wider spectrum of experiences directly linked to the symptoms of PTSD. Over the course of my own recent research conducting in-depth interviews with victims of crime, and the resultant process of coping with what I was hearing, I began to realise...
many parallels between my own reactions and those of the victims I was studying. I was (un)fortunately not the first to make this connection. The trauma literature is quick to point out that the process of working through vicarious trauma parallels the therapeutic process with victims. Coping with criminal victimisation is a very personal experience, as is coping with any challenging life event, and each victim, each person, will have different strategies and different resources available to cope with any trauma or challenge. Although the scale of impact tends to differ from victim to victim or person to person, ranging from little to no impact, to severe and debilitating, the type of impact tends to be similar. For example, the victim of a housebreaking may find it difficult to sleep for a night or two after the incident, whereas a victim of a sexual assault may be hindered by nightmares for years to come.

Coping as a researcher
Symptoms of VT or STS may be the culmination of continual exposure to traumatic material that can no longer be assimilated into one’s world view or worked through: in other words, the inability to process further traumatic material. Whether these changes are ultimately destructive to the researcher depends, in large part, on the extent to which they are able to engage in a parallel process to that of the victim client, the process of integrating and transforming these traumatic experiences. Again, like victims themselves, the researcher must be able to acknowledge, express, and work through these painful experiences in a supportive environment. The knowledge of this process is however not innate. This is a skill for which a need must first be acknowledged, and then must be learned.

I began to realise many parallels between my own reactions and those of the victims I was studying
Additionally, supportive environments are not always readily available. There is a semi-prevalent attitude in academia (and other areas) that if you can’t cope with this type of research/work, then perhaps you are in the wrong type of work. However, there is no predicting when, why or how, a certain case/participant may push one over the line. It may occur very gradually, and no matter how long one has been working in a particular criminal justice setting.

My own answer to the question ‘how did you get into that line of work?’ began rather early, as a research assistant at the lab of Professor John Yuille in the psychology department of the University of British Columbia. I already knew that I wanted to pursue graduate studies, and thus the need for research experience. My first job as a volunteer was transcribing research experience. My first job as a volunteer was transcribing.

Training before going into prison as a researcher consisted largely of using the psychometric tools relevant to the research, and in physical safety, particularly not wearing high heels nor revealing one’s address to psychopathic inmates. I do not recall any discussion of coping with the intense nature of the cases we were covering, despite the fact that we went through volunteers in a rather telling manner and personally, I can still vividly recall some of the stories I heard as part of this research.

Give students the tools they need to protect themselves and to become not only successful, but healthy researchers
Research training for students on the other hand, typically involves project design, quantitative and qualitative analytical methods, and report writing. Research ethics are a crucial part of this training, but the focus is entirely on protecting participants from harm. Providing informed consent and support, avoiding deception, and how to debrief are all obviously key skills for student researchers to learn, but what about safeguarding researchers? I don’t recall ever hearing the words ‘vicarious trauma’ in a class when I was a student, despite the fact that there is substantial research in this area, and numerous suggestions for how to cope when researching (or working with) traumatic events.

In addition to maintaining balance in our personal and professional lives, combining this work with other professional commitments (such as teaching), and being aware of and respecting our own boundaries, McCann and Pearlman (1990) recommend avoiding professional isolation by having contact with other professionals who work with victims. This does not necessarily have to take the form of a support group or case-conference, so long as the focus is on normalising reactions, providing a safe environment where one may feel free to share and work through reactions that are painful and disruptive.

This again reflects the similarities between researchers and their participants; wanting to know that you are not the only one, that what you are experiencing is normal, has been one of the most pervasive reactions to victimisation in my research, so much so that one of my recommendations made to support service providers was to introduce peer support groups for victims. So why not peer support groups for researchers and other criminal justice employees? And why not include information about the risks and symptoms of VT and STS in research methods modules? Give students the tools they need to protect themselves and to become not only successful, but healthy researchers.

Stephanie Fohring is a criminologist and research fellow at the School of Law, University of Edinburgh.


I WAS INVITED by Jean Urquhart MSP, to attend a cross-party meeting at the Scottish Parliament on 22 January 2015 to discuss concerns about the Scottish Government’s intention to build a large new prison for women in Inverclyde. I was pleasantly surprised at the level of political consensus that too many women are imprisoned and alternatives to custody are more effective in dealing with women who offend. There was shared concern too at the proposed overall size of the new custodial estate for women. It was agreed to write to the new Cabinet Secretary for Justice, Michael Matheson MSP to ask him to reconsider the plans and implement the recommendation of the Commission on Women Offenders (2012), namely the need to invest in therapeutic facilities and build a much smaller specialist facility for the minority of women who offend and pose a real risk to the public. Concern was expressed however of the consequences of not building HMP Inverclyde and the inevitable delays that would ensue in developing alternatives. The inherent risks of losing out on new much needed facilities altogether were also acknowledged.

There is an opportunity to divert many more women from the courts and criminal justice system

Four days later, on 26 January, Michael Matheson, on a visit to the 218 Centre in Glasgow, announced that “the current plans for a prison in Inverclyde should not go ahead. It does not fit with my vision of how a modern and progressive country should be addressing offending . . . I believe we should be investing in smaller regional and community based custodial facilities across the country rather than a large new prison for women”. This announcement was quickly followed by consultation events held in each of the eight Community Justice Authority (CJA) areas across Scotland on the future custodial estate for women. The proposition discussed was for a female custodial estate of 400 comprising a national prison for 100 women, three small regional facilities in the North (already in place at HMP Grampian), East and West accommodating 50 women in each, and 150 in a number of community based residential units, each providing 15-30 places.

These consultation events were well attended by key agencies. At the event held in the Fife and Forth Valley area there was a frustration that the focus was on the custodial estate rather than what is needed for women who offend and how to prevent their imprisonment. My understanding is that this view was repeated elsewhere and also at the recent seminar held by the Scottish Working Group for Women Offenders and SCCCJ.

There is no doubt there is a need for suitable prison accommodation for women who require to be incarcerated for the protection of the public: the Scottish Government and SPS are to be commended in their efforts to improve the custodial estate for women offenders. Considerable sums of money and resources have been provided. The SPS strategy for the Management of Women in Custody and the gender sensitive design for any new custodial facility for women are both comprehensive and impressive. Separately the Scottish Government’s Women Who Offend Project (a workstream of the Reducing Reoffending Programme) is looking at international good practice in female penal policy. Jointly the Scottish Government and SPS are holding an international symposium on female custodial policy on 27-29 May 2015. Despite this focus the Scottish Government says that it is keen to ensure that custody is seen as the sentencing option of last resort. The aspiration is to reduce the use of custody as a disposal and have as many women as possible remaining in the community.
Between 2013-15, the Scottish Government provided £3m to develop credible community-based sentences for women. A further £1.5m was provided for 2015-16. The 16 new projects established by this funding are being evaluated by the Institute of Research in Social Studies (IRISS) and a report is expected in May 2015. It can only be hoped that if the outcomes are positive, funding will be sustained. Short-term funding on a one or two year cycle can damage the credibility of projects.

There is clearly a need for a joined-up, comprehensive policy for women who offend, or are at risk of offending: a policy that pays equal attention to diverting women from the criminal justice system, the delivery of credible community-based sentences, and restricts the use of custody. There is a need to use resources differently. A single shared policy could deliver this.

Michael Matheson has placed an increased focus on alternatives to custody and remand. The new National Strategy for Offending that will be introduced as part of the new arrangements for Community Justice should help address this focus. A draft of the National Strategy is expected to be published for comment later this year.

**In Scotland we know that 70% of women who are remanded into custody do not go on to receive a custodial sentence**

Meanwhile much can still be done. We should lobby for the introduction of the ‘no real prospect’ test which was introduced in England and Wales in December 2012. This change to bail legislation prevents any sentencer remanding an accused to prison when there is no real prospect of a custodial sentence. There was a 12% reduction in the number of untried women received into prison on remand in July to September 2014 in England and Wales compared to the same period in 2013 (Offender Management Statistics Quarterly). In Scotland we know that 70% of women who are remanded into custody do not go on to receive a custodial sentence. That figure accounts for a huge number of women being needlessly remanded into prison each year: in Scotland 2011-12 there were 3100 receptions of women into custody, 1979 (64%) of these receptions into prison were for remand (SG and SPS, 2015). The use of remand can be as damaging and disruptive to women as a custodial sentence. This is especially true for issues of child care, housing and benefit claims (see Loucks, in this SJM).

There is an opportunity to divert many more women from the courts and criminal justice system. The chronic health care needs of our women who offend are well documented. Recently, following on from the transfer of responsibility for the health care needs of prisoners from the SPS to local Health Boards, a responsibility has been placed on Health Boards for the provision of health care in police custody suites. This requirement on Health Boards provides real opportunities for women to be assessed and diverted from the criminal justice system at this early stage.

Many more changes could easily be made to improving services for women who offend. As Professor Andrew Coyle stated at the SWGWO/ SCCCJ event “the starting point for this [radical reform] will not be found within the prison system, no matter how enlightened that might be” (Coyle, 2015). A policy must be developed with prevention and then early intervention as a starting point.

CJAs are concerned that the new proposals for the prison estate for women will be attractive to sentencers. The SPS will be able to articulate a very clear ‘custodial offer’ to the courts which may inadvertently result in an increase in the number of women being sent to custody. Currently there is no coherent ‘community offer’ to stand alongside this. Sentencers often have a good understanding of a woman’s presenting needs and history from criminal justice social work reports and possibly the defence solicitor. However, they may lack confidence that the woman will get access to the support services needed to ensure compliance with a community sentence, such as addictions, mental and physical health, housing, welfare, parenting and so on. Added to that is the significant variation of service availability across the country. Many projects and initiatives come and go with short-term funding making it difficult for sentencers to know what is available in their area. CJAs believe there is merit in establishing a ‘community offer’ project team that mirrors, and works alongside, the well-resourced SPS Women in Custody project team. Their purpose would be to ensure that a coherent ‘community offer’ can be strongly advocated to all Scottish courts and ensure women are not imprisoned merely for lack of, or inability to access, community based support.

My hope is for the development of a shared strategy for women who offend that is bold and aspirational. It should set clear requirements to reduce the numbers of women becoming involved unnecessarily with the criminal justice system, and reduce the numbers of women in prison. The Scottish Government in developing this shared strategy must be mindful of the new arrangements for the future delivery of community justice and provide definitive requirements for Community Planning Partnerships and its constituent partners, other key partners such as the Crown Office and Procurator Fiscal Service, and the new national body, Community Justice Scotland.

**Anne Pinkman** is chief officer of the Fife and Forth Valley CJA, and convenor of the Scottish Working Group for Women Offenders.

---

**Commission on Women Offenders (Angiolini) (2012) Scottish Government**
http://www.gov.scot/About/Review/commissiononwomenoffenders


**Scottish Government and SPS (March 2015) Women in Custody, Facts and Figures.**
The impact of a woman’s imprisonment has consequences well beyond those to the woman herself. Rather than citing statistics and publications, the following describes what imprisonment has meant for a number of women in Scotland in practice. All of the stories below are true, though the names have been changed.

By Nancy Loucks

Agnes

‘Agnes’ had committed a very serious offence and was definitely going to be sentenced to prison for a long time. It was her first offence, so she was subject to court reports. Although she was a single mum of three children under the age of 10, none of these reports investigated the impact her sentence would have on them.

Care for the children was shared between the rest of Agnes’ family, initially with one of Agnes’ sisters, a single lady with no children of her own. This placement lasted for a few years until the sister’s mental breakdown, when the children were passed between other family members and eventually on to Agnes’ boyfriend. Over the years, two of Agnes’ three children developed severe mental health issues. Though the children were offered support from social work, the family could not find any help for their own struggles with Agnes’ imprisonment and related publicity.

Later in her sentence, Agnes was transferred to HMP Edinburgh, which greatly increased opportunity for contact with her family. This went very well until she was told she had to return to HMP Cornton Vale in order to take courses to qualify for parole. Agnes asked if she could revoke her right to parole so she could stay at Edinburgh and continue close contact with her family, but was told this was not an option for her. She has since returned to Cornton Vale and is still awaiting access to her required courses.

Betty

‘Betty’, in contrast, was sentenced to four months in prison for breach of a community sentence. She spent one month in custody and one month in the community on an electronic tag (HDC). As a single mum of seven children, living in poverty with very unstable housing, this short period of custody was enough for her to lose her home and custody of her children. Two years after her release, she had still not managed to regain custody of her children.

Charlene

Remand in custody is the most common use of imprisonment for women. ‘Charlene’ was remanded in custody for one week. Having been in care herself, and fearing social work intervention, she chose not to tell anyone that she had a two-year old daughter at home and instead left a cryptic message for a friend about her imprisonment. The friend did not understand her message and, left alone in the house, the daughter died of dehydration.

The stories here are typical of the type of issues women in prison face, and we see a number of common themes. First, the women are usually dealing with multiple issues, and placement in custody is enough to tip the balance towards a whole sequence of negative events. Poverty is a particularly common feature, as is single parenthood and unstable family circumstances. Second, no one systematically asks questions about what the consequences of imprisonment might be, either for them or for the families they leave...
behind. Court reports are often thought to be adequate for this, but these reports are not always requested, nor do they apply to imprisonment on remand. Related to this is that women are more likely to have children and (often sole) caring responsibilities, though this is not exclusive to women (see, for example, Stuart Gorrie v PF Haddington 2014). SPS Prisoner Surveys suggest that about 2/3 women in prison on any day are mothers of dependent children (SPS, 2014: 2012). Children are significantly less likely to be looked after by their dads when a mother goes to prison; rather, grandmothers tend to take on this responsibility. The Corston Report (2007) found that only 9% of dads looked after their children when a mum went to prison, while 12% of children go into the care system. In England and Wales, Hamlyn and Lewis (2000) estimated that 6,000 children (and therefore about 600 in Scotland?) are cared for by other family members when a mother goes to prison.

no one systematically asks questions about what the consequences of imprisonment might be, either for them or for the families they leave behind

Next, even very short periods of custody can have a dramatic impact. Families (and children in particular) are unlikely to draw a distinction between imprisonment for remand or sentence; for them, the impact is likely to be the same, at least in the short term. Further, the impact of imprisonment has much longer-term impacts on the remaining family, lasting well beyond the period of custody. For example, a woman in touch with Families Outside recently commented that her children had already developed a deep-seated suspicion and hatred of the police and wider justice system. Longer-term impacts on mental health, housing and SHANARRI wellbeing indicators (Safe, Healthy, Active, Nurtured, Achieving, Responsible, Respected, and Included) are common features for children who experience a parent’s imprisonment.

Finally, features of the justice system itself fail women who end up in custody. As noted above, fewer options are available for women in terms of prison placements or indeed community-based supports. Women may have to choose between contact with their family and completion of required programmes, as in Agnes’ case. Women with substance misuse issues, in turn, have to choose between their children and their recovery if they need to enter residential care, something that supports such as the recently closed Aberlour Family Support Service in Glasgow worked to prevent. We also have remarkably little information about the impact of imprisonment: how many children experience a mother’s imprisonment each year? No statistics are available to tell us even this basic information.

We close with a good news story, showing the value that support to women in custody can have when needs are identified and addressed early. ‘Donna’ was referred to Circle (see the interview feature in this issue) through the Shine Mentoring Service when she was 31 weeks pregnant and remanded in custody. Donna was a young woman who was identified as not engaging with services, particularly antenatal supports. On initial enquiries, the Circle worker found that the official opinion at this stage was that the baby would be accommodated in a different local authority after birth, with no existing plans for family members to take care of the baby if Donna were to be sentenced to custody. No contact had been made with Donna’s partner (the father of baby) or her mother. A pre-birth child protection case conference had been planned, but no family members had been invited.

Donna and her family worked with Circle and, although challenging, discussions took place with statutory services to assess current family circumstances and the future plans for Donna’s baby. What made a difference for the family was having the opportunity to have complex child protection processes explained to them and how the family could be included in these discussions.

At a pre-birth case conference, the decision was made for the baby to return to the grandmother’s home after birth, with both parents having unsupervised contact (depending on Donna’s release date). Donna ended up being released with an electronic tag before the baby’s birth and, on discharge from hospital, returned to her partner’s mother’s home whilst ongoing assessments continued. After three months, the baby was removed from the Child Protection Register with positive reports from all agencies involved. Donna’s baby boy is now thriving and developing positively within his own family.

Support and information at the right time can make all the difference for children and families when someone goes to prison, particularly when a mother enters custody. Consequently questions about the impact of custody should be asked systematically at key stages throughout the criminal justice process; without knowing the impact, vulnerable and innocent people already in challenging circumstances will be left without the resources they need to cope.

Nancy Loucks is the chief executive of Families Outside (www.familiesoutside.org.uk) and a visiting professor at the University of Strathclyde’s Centre for Law, Crime and Justice.


In our November issue there will be an article on the post-Inverclyde consultation and the future of the women’s custodial estate from the perspective of the Scottish Prison Service.
Police reform in the Netherlands and Scotland compared

Jan Terpstra

IN 2013 both Scotland and the Netherlands established national police forces. These two police reforms have much in common. Both countries had long traditions of local policing. Before 2013 each jurisdiction had a regionalised systems of policing, with Scotland having eight relatively autonomous regional forces and the Netherlands having 25 forces. Despite the emphasis on the importance of local policing, in the years prior to 2013 both countries had already had a creeping process of police centralisation. In both countries, the political decision to establish a single police force was taken in a relatively short period of time and indicated a radical shift in the political landscape.

Some main arguments to reform the police were more or less similar: to stop the fragmentation of the police forces, to promote co-ordination, and to improve policing of organised crime and terrorism. There were also some important differences. In Scotland the establishment of a national police force was seen as a way to realise budgetary cuts imposed by the government in London without having to decrease the numbers of police officers. In the Netherlands, however, budgetary considerations were only of a very minor relevance in the decision to create a new police system (Fyfe and Scott, 2013; Terpstra, 2013).

Spatial organisation

The Netherlands’ Police Act 2012 identifies three organisational levels: the national level, the level of the units, and the level of the municipalities. In practice two additional levels were introduced, even before the Netherlands’ Parliament made its final decisions. This made up to five different organisational levels: the national level, 10 police units (not autonomous), 43 districts, 168 basic teams (the lowest organisational level), and 393 municipalities. The relevance of the municipal level has primarily to do with local arrangements of police governance and accountability as described below.

This proliferation of organisational levels of the police force is similar to what has happened in Scotland since April 2013. The Police and Fire Reform (Scotland) Act 2012 made a distinction between the national level and local level with the latter defined in terms of the administrative boundaries of 32 local authorities at which local policing would be delivered. In practice, Police Scotland now has also five organisational levels: national, area commands (3), police divisions (14), local policing areas aligned with local councils (32), sub-divided into local council multi-member wards (353). The increasing number of organisational levels may be seen as an early indication that, in both countries, the reform process proved to be more complex than was originally envisaged.

Governance and accountability

To understand the (local) governance and accountability of the Netherlands’ police, two legal concepts are relevant. First, there is the ‘administration’ of the police, that is the formal power to make decisions about the organisation and resources of the police. Before 2013 the administration of the 25 regional police forces was with the regional administrator, typically the mayor of the largest municipality of the region. With the Police Act 2012 this formal power was transferred to the national level and is now in the hands of the national police chief, who has to account to the Minister of Security and Justice for his use of this formal power.

Secondly, there is the ‘authority’ over the police, that is, the formal power to make decisions about what the
The increasing number of organisational levels may be seen as an early indication that, in both countries, the reform process proved to be more complex than was originally envisaged.

Local policing

The Netherlands’ Police Act 2012 does not provide much information about local policing. The only legal requirement is that there should be one community police officer for every 5000 inhabitants.

Another important element of the organisational structure of the Netherlands’ police service consists of the so-called ‘robust basic teams’. According to the Design Plan of the new force these teams should have between 60 and 200 full time equivalent posts and be responsible for all regular local police tasks.

The lack of legal regulation with regard to local policing in the Netherlands is quite remarkable in comparison with the Police and Fire Reform (Scotland) Act 2012. The Scottish Government decided to make local policing a statutory requirement. In addition, and this is in a clear contrast with the situation in the Netherlands, the Scottish government decided to establish a set of ‘policing principles’. These principles clearly reflect the Scottish ambition to have a community-oriented style of policing with a broad view on what policing should be, in close co-operation with partner agencies and communities and with much emphasis on police visibility and proximity. In contrast, the Netherlands’ Police Act 2012 does not contain any clear view on what kind of policing is seen as desirable. Except for that legal requirement of the number of community officers, legal regulations with regard to local policing are completely missing.

Reform process

A comparison of the two police reforms in terms of their consequences for local policing, shows a remarkable contrast. On the one hand it looks as if the Netherlands’ police reform is strong on its arrangements of the local police governance and accountability, but quite weak on its regulations for local policing services. On the other hand, with its emphasis on local policing and ‘policing principles’, the Scottish police reform looks much stronger on local policing services, but much weaker in relation to the local governance and accountability of the police.

In addition, recent research shows that there may be a serious implementation gap between the legal and formal aspects of police reform and how they are put in practice.

In the Netherlands there has been a serious delay of more than 18 months in the reform process because of a conflict with the police unions. On the one hand, at some locations this created the room for more diversity in local policing than had been expected (Terpstra and Fyfe, 2015). On the other hand, this delay created much tension and confusion: even after more than two years of police reform many police officers are still uncertain about their position in the new force. As a consequence, in November 2014 the police unions stated that they lost their confidence in this reform process. From that moment on they have withdrawn their support for the reform process. Moreover, in March 2015 the Minister of Security and Justice, who had been responsible for the Police Act 2012 and for the establishment of the single police force, had to resign. It is unclear what his resignation will mean for the political support for this reform process.

At this very moment it is still hard to say how the reform process will continue. One thing seems to be for sure: the transformation to a single police in the Netherlands proves to be much more complex than anyone could have thought before. The future will show if this reform process came to a dead end or that it is still possible to give it a more positive turn.

Jan Terpstra is professor of criminology at the University of Nijmegen, the Netherlands. His main research topics are police work, police policy, private security, and local security networks and strategies.


**HAS SCOTLAND’S FALLING CRIME RATE BENEFITED EVERYONE EQUALLY?**

Susan McVie, Paul Norris and Rebecca Pillinger

Both police statistics and crime surveys in Scotland agree that there has been a substantial drop in crime over the last 20 years. This suggests, at face value, that we should all be at less risk of becoming a victim. But is this really the case? Work by the Applied Quantitative Methods Network (AQMeN) Research Centre has set out to explore our relative risk of being a victim of crime and the extent to which this has changed during the course of the recent crime drop.

We know that some people are more likely to experience crime than others, and that people tend to experience different amounts and types of crime. In other words, risk profiles vary from person to person. Indeed, Hope and Norris (2012) found five groups of people who differed in terms of the number and types of incidents of property crime they were likely to experience, and four groups who differed in terms of their experience of personal crime.

A key question, therefore, is whether victim profiles have changed over time as a result of the fall in crime? For example, there may have been a decline in the number of victims in certain groups but not others; or the amount of crime experienced by all groups may simply have diminished across the board. Hope and Norris did not look at change in the group sizes or experiences over time; therefore, we decided to take this work a step further by exploring change in patterns of victimisation over time using Scottish crime survey data from 1993 to 2011.

We started by grouping property and personal crimes into four broad crime types (shown in the table below) and, like Hope and Norris, found a number of groups who differed from each other on the basis of how likely they were to experience different types of crime. We then went on to look at the change over time in prevalence of victimisation (that is, the percentage of people in each crime group) and the frequency of victimisation (that is, the number of crimes that victims experienced on average) for each group.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime types used to identify risk</th>
<th>Details of the crime type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle crime</td>
<td>Thefts and attempted thefts of and from motor vehicles and vandalism to motor vehicles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household crime</td>
<td>Housebreaking and attempted housebreaking (to dwellings and to outhouses), thefts inside and outside dwellings, and vandalism not to motor vehicles (not including fire raising).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal theft and robbery</td>
<td>Thefts from the person, other personal thefts, and robberies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaults and threats</td>
<td>Assaults and attempted assaults, and threats to or against the person.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We found four typical victim groups within the population. Firstly, around 80% of the population fell into a group of ‘Non-Victims’ who had a very low (almost zero) risk of experiencing any kind of crime. Secondly, about 15% of people were ‘One-off Property Victims’ who experienced on average one incident of crime, mostly motor vehicle or household crime, in any one year. Thirdly, around 5% of people were part of a group of ‘Multiple Mixed Victims’ who experienced an average of two incidents of crime per year, consisting of a mixture of motor vehicle crime, household crime, and assaults and threats. And finally, about 0.5% of the population were in a group of ‘Frequent Personal Victims’ who experienced on average three incidents of crime in any given year, consisting mainly of assaults and threats, but possibly also some household crime or personal theft and robbery.

So had there been a change in the relative sizes of these groups over time? Figure 1 shows the change in the percentage of people within each of the four groups each year after 1993. Only one group grew larger: that is the Non-Victims, which rose from 76% of the population in 1993 to 82% in 2011. Meanwhile, the percentage of people in the One-Off Property Victims group fell from 17% to 12%, and the percentage of Multiple Mixed Victims fell from 6% to 5% over the same period. However, there was no significant change over time in the proportion of the population who made up the Frequent Personal Victim group.
The next question we asked was whether there had been a reduction in the frequency of crime experienced by people within these four groups? Looking at change over time in the average number of incidents of crime experienced, Figure 2 shows a significant decrease in frequency of incidents amongst the One-Off Property and Multiple Mixed Victims. The risk of victimisation amongst the Non-Victim group, which was already small, also got closer to zero. However, there was no discernible change over time in the average number of incidents of crime experienced by the Frequent Personal Victims. In other words, risk of frequent victimisation remained the same in this group.

The fact that most people are less likely to be a victim of crime is hugely reassuring and should make us feel safer as a result. However, for a small proportion of Scottish society the risk of victimisation is as great or greater than it was 20 years ago and the range of crimes they experience is just as wide. In absolute terms, an estimate of 0.5% of the Scottish population of adults aged 16 or over represents around 220,000 people (based on mid-year population estimates for 2013). Our estimates suggest that this group’s share of all crime has doubled from 5% in 1993 to around 10% from 2006 onwards. Moreover, we can safely assume that these people are not randomly scattered throughout the population, but are most likely to be living in some of our more deprived communities and families.

The fact that one group of victims has not benefited from the overall crime drop and, indeed, has become more dissimilar to the rest of the population, is indicative of increasing inequality between victims and non-victims. This is concerning because it suggests that whatever factors have driven the crime drop they have not pervaded every part of our society. If this trend continues, crime will become increasingly concentrated in this group and the impact on the individuals involved is likely to be extremely damaging. The results of our analysis show that efforts need to be directed at those most at risk of victimisation if the crime drop is to be sustained.

Of course, in order to effectively target crime reduction interventions it is necessary to know what the characteristics of the people in this group are. Therefore, the next phase of our analysis will involve analysing the spatial concentration of victim groups using geographic data to see whether certain areas contain high concentrations of such victims, and using personal and household characteristics to try to predict what type of people are in these groups. This will hopefully enable policy makers and service providers to determine both who and where those most at risk of victimisation are and decide how to best target interventions to reduce the current inequality of victimisation in Scotland.

\[\text{Figure 1: Percentage of people belonging to each group over time (difference from 1993)}\]

\[\text{Figure 2: Average number of incidents of crime for each victim group over time: change from 1993}\]

Both of which mostly experienced motor vehicle or household crime, explains most of the crime drop. This fits with published recorded crime statistics that show a very large reduction in crimes of dishonesty in Scotland since 1991 (Scottish Government, 2014). However, we found no noticeable reduction in the size of the population in the highest risk group, the Frequent Personal victims, who experienced mostly violent crime. This is despite a significant fall in violent crimes recorded by the police.

The fact that most people are less likely to be a victim of crime is hugely reassuring and should make us feel safer as a result. However, for a small proportion of Scottish society the risk of victimisation is as great or greater than it was 20 years ago and the range of crimes they experience is just as wide. In absolute terms, an estimate of 0.5% of the Scottish population of adults aged 16 or over represents around 220,000 people (based on mid-year population estimates for 2013). Our estimates suggest that this group’s share of all crime has doubled from 5% in 1993 to around 10% from 2006 onwards. Moreover, we can safely assume that these people are not randomly scattered throughout the population, but are most likely to be living in some of our more deprived communities and families.

The fact that one group of victims has not benefited from the overall crime drop and, indeed, has become more dissimilar to the rest of the population, is indicative of increasing inequality between victims and non-victims. This is concerning because it suggests that whatever factors have driven the crime drop they have not pervaded every part of our society. If this trend continues, crime will become increasingly concentrated in this group and the impact on the individuals involved is likely to be extremely damaging. The results of our analysis show that efforts need to be directed at those most at risk of victimisation if the crime drop is to be sustained.

Of course, in order to effectively target crime reduction interventions it is necessary to know what the characteristics of the people in this group are. Therefore, the next phase of our analysis will involve analysing the spatial concentration of victim groups using geographic data to see whether certain areas contain high concentrations of such victims, and using personal and household characteristics to try to predict what type of people are in these groups. This will hopefully enable policy makers and service providers to determine both who and where those most at risk of victimisation are and decide how to best target interventions to reduce the current inequality of victimisation in Scotland.

\[\text{Susan M’Vie is chair of Quantitative Criminology and director of AQMeN at the University of Edinburgh.}\]

\[\text{Paul Norris is senior lecturer in Social Policy and co-investigator of AQMeN at the University of Edinburgh.}\]

\[\text{Rebecca Pillinger is an AQMeN research fellow at the University of Edinburgh.}\]


\[\text{https://www.aqmen.ac.uk/publications}\]

“THE BENEFIT SANCTIONS ARE BRUTAL”

Maura Daly, director of operations and Liz Dahl, CEO of Circle interviewed by Mary Munro

**MM:** Can you tell me something about Circle?

**LD:** Circle was originally part of the Family Service Unit across the UK which was itself set up during the war to help bombed out families. When I came here in 1996 our work was focusing on hard to reach families and especially those affected by drug and alcohol issues. We work with families who statutory services find hard to reach and difficult to engage.

Circle started as a separate organisation in Scotland in 2006 when the original FSU across the UK disbanded. We are based here in Pilton and offer services across Central Scotland.

**MD:** Like everyone else, the parents that we work with want the best for their children, and we support them to achieve this. We get very good engagement overall even with families who do not engage with statutory services. We work with kinship carers as well.

We do old fashioned social work, the preventative case work that statutory social work doesn’t have the time or capacity to do. Similarly we can provide support in a way that social worker in criminal justice cannot because of the demands on their time to produce court reports. When we have social work students here they like the experience of doing this type of hands on, helpful social work.

**LD:** Our approach is very solution focused. The resilience of our families is amazing: they have had to endure a lot in their lives more than you or I can imagine putting up with, but remarkably are able to find solutions and focus on what is going well. We can work with them together through their hopes for the children.

**MD:** There’s a lot of shame though and stigmatising. The children can feel this especially at school and many of the families are in any case not comfortable about school. Mums and Dads have often had bad experiences themselves in relation to education, so one of the things we try to do is to break through that, and offer support in their working with the school for the sake of the children.
Can you tell me about your work with parents who are offenders?

MD: First of all we don’t talk about offenders, we talk about Mums and Dads. It is important to respect people’s roles as parents rather than have them defined in other ways.

Our work in prisons really got going following a piece of research I was involved with in Cornton Vale in 2006. I found that there was very little support for Mums in prison and help on their release, so that’s when we started Circle’s work there.

LD: Because that was going so well, we were invited to also start projects working with Dads in other prisons, in HMP Addiewell we have a project that identifies and supports fathers from the Lothians and Lanarkshire. We work with them and their families in prison and then on their release, in the community.

So how does the criminal justice system impact on the families that you work with?

LD: Being sent to prison can be a disaster for families. It can result in losing a house, losing a job, losing contact with your children. Many of the children in the families that we work with have to be looked after by other members of the family or are taken into care. Sometimes that happens even for short stays in prison on remand and we know that many of the people who are remanded never actually get a prison sentence. Meanwhile the damage has been done. We believe Child Impact Assessments should be done a point of arrest and then at sentencing to reduce the impact of parental imprisonment on children.

MD: Actually at the moment it’s also benefit sanctions that are causing a lot of problems. The benefit sanctions are brutal. We’re seeing an increase in desperate poverty and hunger and major inequalities. We’re seeing families dependent on food banks to eat. We’re also seeing a big rise in obesity caused by malnutrition. There was one family we work with who was detained in a police station and then released without charge, but he’d missed reporting to the Jobcentre Plus, and even though the police gave him written evidence to say that he couldn’t attend, he was sanctioned.

LD: Another mother we work with couldn’t attend because she was in labour but still got sanctioned.

MD: If a fine is imposed as a sentence people are unable to pay them and usually end up in prison for non-payment of fine.

Can you tell me a little more about your services in criminal justice?

LD: We have 11 staff working in our FABI (Families Affected by Imprisonment) team at the moment. As we said, we originally got started working in Cornton Vale in 2008 and that work has been since been evaluated reviewing the first four years of the project (Hutton and Nugent, 2013). What that said was that we were offering a unique service and one that appeared to result in fewer custodial sentences, and also health improvements. Many of the women in the study had no contact in prison with their children because of a variety of reasons such as financial and transport problems, poor relationships with their family and the involvement of the statutory services. Although many of the women we worked with had a long history of offending, it looks as if the sooner they engage with Circle in custody the better the outcome even though all of them, have complex and multiple needs from mental health to debt.

It’s important to work with people on an emotional level as well as the practical and also to talk about endings. We make a point about meeting people at the gate to make sure that they get support at this absolutely critical time in dealing with all the essential appointments and arrangements. Otherwise the system makes it very difficult for people as soon as they are released. The key to our work is about building relationships both before and after release, so this makes sense.

MD: In 2013 we were awarded a share of funding through the Shine Public Social Partnership (PSP) for women offenders and also for the New Routes PSP for prolific male offenders, specifically to work with mums and dads in prison who were returning to areas in which we had services. Circle brings something very different to the PSPs because we are the only organisation that works with the whole family. All the literature on desistance says we have to repair existing bonds, and families have a significant impact on helping offenders desist from offending. That in essence is the Whole Systems Approach.

Given that you work with many mums who have been in prison, what’s your view about the current ideas from the SPS about how the women’s custodial estate should be organised?

LD: We were pleased that the decision was taken not to go ahead with the large institution at HMP Inverclyde but we’re disappointed that the SPS want to provide for even more places in prison for women than we have at the moment.

Although there will be a need for a small central unit, we think that the suggested 100 places is too large. Also we’re not clear about the point of the smaller units in the ‘community’. There should be fewer women being sent to prison in the first place. It would be good if voluntary sector agencies such as Circle could be funded consistently to make that happen.


Four year service evaluation (2008-2012). Available from the Circle web site: www.circle.scot

Further reading in this issue: Nancy Loucks on Imprisoning mothers: the impact on children and families on page 29
Monday

Popped in to our lifeskills centre to see how the new Tenancy and Citizenship course is going. Developed in Dumfries by two of our own officers, the course has been accredited by the SQA and is in demand across the prison estate and third sector. The aim is to help people acquire skills that most of us learned from our parents or as we went through the process of leaving home, going to university, getting our first jobs and flats. Relationships, Sexual Health, Cooking on a Budget, How to Look After a Home, Basic DIY, Being a Good Neighbour, Budgeting, Opening a Bank Account – pretty standard stuff – and the kind of things most of our guys never had the chance to learn because they were too busy trying to stay alive while slowly killing themselves. Lots of them are learning now.

Tuesday

I had a conversation with a man convicted of truly dreadful crimes who says he didn’t do it. I can only begin to imagine what it’s like to be an innocent person in prison. I have no idea how many people there are in that situation, but it would be naive to think there are none. I haven’t met many whose claims of innocence I thought were credible. Not many - but still - one or two. All I can do is trust that their lawyers are working for them, that there are systems in place to review their cases and that if they are innocent, the awful weight of that injustice doesn’t crush them before they can prove it.

Wednesday

The 2nd edition of our local prisoner-run newsletter Beans with Everything is in preparation. Asked to write an introduction for it, I took as my inspiration an article from one of the Red Tops, bemoaning the lack of punishment in our ‘holiday camp’ prisons and complaining that ‘Scottish Jail Bosses’ had rejected the tougher approach being taken in English prisons. The article failed to make any connection between that headline and others highlighting the ‘crisis’ in the English system: increasing numbers, fewer staff, increased self-harm, rises in violence and assaults on staff. The writer claims that the gulf between public perception of what prisons should be doing and what they are doing has never been wider. I don’t think that’s true. The ‘public’ in my experience, are more reasonable and more practical, especially when they see prisons for themselves. They want the heartache and misery of crime to stop and they want us to do whatever we can to help that happen. Unlike some tabloids, they’re interested in what works.

Thursday

Spent about an hour today, dealing with a complex complaint. I’ve been with the Prison Service for six years and can honestly say I have never worked with anyone who resented the fact that prisoners complain. Everyone recognises it is quite correct that people who have few of the usual outlets available to them have access to an open and transparent means of airing frustrations and grievances. However, there are a few prisoners in the system - no more than a handful - who are not interested in right, wrong, improvement or progress. Their aim is to cause maximum disruption to ‘the system’ and in the process, prove they are smarter than us. In our rush to ensure that everyone has access to every possible avenue of complaint, we are facilitating truly awful behaviour by that handful and ultimately, allowing them to behave in ways that would not be tolerated ‘outside’. Is it a price worth paying for the good complaints system we have? Of course it is. I wonder though if we can’t find a better system, one that is more finely nuanced and able to discriminate between protecting the vulnerable and fuelling frank megalomania. Good luck with that one to anyone who wants to try!

Friday

I showed a group of criminology Masters students round the prison, encouraging them to speak to staff and prisoners. One man aged 26 told them that he had been in and out of prison numerous times since the age of 17 and that it never used to bother him – he just kept his head down and did his time. “This time”, he said, “it’s different, it’s been fantastic – I’ve never been given opportunities like this in jail before and now I don’t want to come back because I think I can do better”. I enjoy my job every day, but on days like this, I love it.
Scottish Justice Matters asks our politicians to respond to questions about crime and justice. We asked:

**How can the tradition of localism in Scottish policing be enhanced within a national police force?**

---

**Michael Matheson, Cabinet Secretary for Justice, Scottish National Party**

**REFORM** was absolutely vital to sustain the level of local policing our communities depend on. Moving to a single service is safeguarding local policing in Scotland from Westminster budget cuts, helping us to continue to exceed our target of 1000 additional police officers on the street. Contrast this with the situation down south, where police numbers have fallen and are expected to eventually be slashed by 15,000.

Local policing and accountability remain fundamental to policing in Scotland and local policing decisions continue to be based on local intelligence and experience, shaped and delivered in partnership by designated Local Commanders.

In addition to this, all of Scotland’s 353 council wards have a local policing plan developed and policing now has a statutory duty to participate in Community Planning Partnerships. More than double the number of elected councillors than before are involved in local scrutiny of policing.

Policing in Scotland is undoubtedly more local than ever, but reform has created significant advantages as dedicated local officers are now supported by national and specialist expertise and equipment whenever and wherever required. We are already seeing the benefits of this approach.

For example, the National Rape Taskforce is ensuring a robust and consistent approach to sexual crime, and the Major Investigation Teams tackle murders and other serious crimes. Having specialist units allows dedicated local officers to focus solely on policing in communities.

The results speak for themselves. Recorded crime in Scotland is at a 40 year low, violent crime is down 10% in the last year and crimes of handling an offensive weapon have dropped by 62% since 2006-07.

These successes would not have been possible without the dedication and professionalism of hardworking officers and staff: they are doing a great job of ensuring our strengthened local policing is keeping Scotland safe.

---

**Hugh Henry, Scottish Labour Party**

**THE FORMATION** of Police Scotland has created significant concerns regarding the localism of Scottish policing. A one size fits all programme of centralisation and provision has led to a perceived loss of meaningful local control with the closure of local police stations, control rooms and community police desks. This has impacted on service delivery to local communities, local jobs and the local economy. Police Scotland is facing £1.1bn cuts by 2020 with around 1500 civilian jobs lost. The additional 1000 officers in Scotland are often not on the streets serving the public with many working in back offices, behind desks, doing the work of redundant civilian staff who carried out vital and often specialist jobs. These officers are not trained in such specialisms. Cuts have also seen Councils left to take on responsibilities such as road safety and traffic warden duties. This is not an effective strategy for keeping local communities safe nor is it in keeping with the statutory duty of best value or the tradition of localism we strive to uphold.

Effective local policing which provides the police with legitimacy and the confidence of their communities is essential for supporting the wider police mission of protecting the public from serious harm. Police Scotland needs to be visible, readily accessible at all times and wholly accountable to the public it represents. Scarc resources in these challenging times need to be focused on strengthening front line policing which must take account of the characteristics of different neighbourhoods. Stronger relationships need to be forged with local authorities and community planning partners. Local policing plans need to be strategic and up to date with those overseeing them ensuring that the concerns, opinions and needs of communities across Scotland remain at the heart of what Police Scotland is doing.
Margaret Mitchell, Scottish Conservatives

**THE TRANSITION** from the eight legacy forces to Scotland’s National Police force has resulted in the erosion of the service’s ties with local communities. Local policing was supposed to be an integral aspect of a single force but instead the SNP’s centralising agenda has merely weakened localism. This is evident with the closure of more than 50 of Police Scotland’s front counters and others now operating reduced hours, denying local communities the opportunity to engage directly with the police. Meanwhile the 101 non-emergency number, which the public can use to arrange to meet an officer face-to-face, has been beset by technical difficulties and long call-waiting times.

Furthermore the ongoing control room and service centre closures, (down from 11 to 5) coupled with the restructuring at the remaining sites, has resulted in the loss of crucial local knowledge which cannot easily be replaced by control from a central hub.

Crime Prevention Panels, which provide important liaison between police and local communities and provide valuable, local intelligence also face an uncertain future as Police Scotland considers withdrawing their funding.

All of which means the loss of local accountability and community liaison throughout the country but particularly in rural and remote areas. Whilst the Scottish Conservatives have voiced concerns about the loss of local accountability from the outset these concerns have been largely ignored.

A thorough review of the national police force is the way forward to ensure that vital community links are restored. In carrying out this review it should not be presumed that a single police force is the only answer. Another option would be to introduce a two-tier model, where serious crimes are dealt with by a national force, while community crimes are handled by 32 local forces accountable at council level.

In doing so a local force, directly answerable to locally elected representatives and with policing at a community level at its heart would be established.

Alison McInnes, Scottish Liberal Democrats

**SCOTTISH** Liberal Democrats consistently opposed the abolition of local police services in favour of one national force. We argued it would prove unaccountable, local priorities would be neglected, and it could never be as responsive to the needs of Scotland’s diverse communities. It gives me no pleasure whatsoever to see those concerns and more vindicated.

Officers and staff are no longer trusted to do what they know is best for their communities. They deserve credit for keeping things going but botched reforms have taken their toll.

Independent reports have exposed a one-size-fits-all approach, the erosion of discretion and the existence of an unhealthy targets culture. Alien policies focused on enforcement, rooted in Strathclyde, have been imposed on communities without consultation. The systematic use of armed police and surge of stop and search are just the most high profile examples.

Valued local services have also been removed. Dozens of police stations have locked their doors to the public. The closure of the majority of legacy forces’ control centres and service centres means soon all 999 and 101 calls will be diverted to the Central Belt, squandering vital knowledge and expertise.

Meaningful public engagement, scrutiny and accountability are key to enhancing localism.

Police Scotland has a record of setting policies unilaterally and working on a need to know basis limited to their own ranks. People’s right to know and shape how they are policed must be reinstated. Community planning partners and local councils must too be meaningfully involved in decision-making - their clout restored.

The significant devolution of budgets could also enable area spending to reflect local priorities.

Scotland’s proud tradition of local policing has been badly, but not yet irreparably, damaged by the SNP’s restructuring. The Chief Constable, SPA and Scottish Government have a great deal of work to do.

I SUSPECT the question of ‘localism’ differs greatly across Scotland. Zetland Constabulary has long gone but when Shetlanders talk about ‘the chief’ they mean the Chief Inspector in Lerwick not some far off individual.

Despite constant assurances to the contrary, it’s apparent Police Scotland, under its present chief constable, places little value on localism with the country policed as one unit.

The Parliament’s Police Committee was recently told that ‘the threat level in Lochinver is the same as it is in Leith’: a questionable statement which tells you a lot about operations but even more about a mind-set which has seen armed officers deployed on our streets and industrial levels of stop and search.

But all is not lost. The legislation that brought the single service into being ensured that every Council Ward has its own ‘Policing Plan’ and therein lies the key to returning policing to its rightful community base.

Rather than a diktat from Police Scotland Headquarters impacting on every community regardless of its composition, how much better if those Council Ward Plans are the result of proper consultation with communities giving them the style of policing they want. In turn those plans can be collectively considered at local authority level where all 32 local authorities have their own form of ‘police committee’. In turn, those local authorities feed in to make the national plan.

Of course there will be central plans and reserves to deal with terrorism, organised crime and other significant threats with resources deployed on a risk assessed basis (no armed officers for Lochinver) but the core policing style will have come from and therefore be respected by local communities.

The framework is there, all that’s required is for those communities and their elected representatives to assert themselves and genuine localism can be restored.

Scottish Justice Matters : March 2015
Conviction: Violence, culture and a shared public service agenda
Reviewed by Ali Malik

Conviction, at around 116 pages (excluding the bibliography) makes a valuable contribution to the understanding of problem-oriented preventative policing by focusing on a specific policy initiative and serves to show the virtues of asking ‘what works’ and ‘how’ in shaping wider public policy. It follows the journey of John Carnochan who worked as a police officer for 35 years and co-founded the Violence Reduction Unit (VRU), and offers an insightful account of how the existing practices were challenged by Carnochan and his team and how other public services and young people involved in gang violence, belonging to some of the most deprived areas of Glasgow, were brought together to take part in an initiative to prevent violence.

The style of the book is almost like a diary of events and at times readers may feel that the writer is pontificating, but this might actually be one of the strengths of the book. Carnochan’s introspection and honesty about the culture of violence that persists in certain parts of Scotland is evident very early on as he reflects: “I think that Scots are thrawn, that we take offence easily and we never forget” (p. 14). The scrupulous approach does not stop there as Carnochan goes on and touches on another sensitive issue in policing and police governance; the use of crime statistics, as he describes them as “notoriously inaccurate” (p.23) predominantly due to the under-reporting of violent crimes. This approach serves to highlight that an open and honest identification of the problems is a key prerequisite for any problem-oriented preventative policy to work.

The book also touches at the heart of some of the other key issues in criminology and criminal justice policy particularly in relation to the treatment of young people in deprived communities and the virtues of early intervention and diversion from criminal justice. This is evident from the author’s observation that a conscious effort was made not to include the word ‘crime’ in the name of the Violence Reduction Unit precisely because this was not an issue solely for the police and criminal justice (p. 28), but rather a wider public health issue (p.34-36).

Whilst for the most part the book documents the experiences of Carnochan and his team, their attempts to engage with other public service bodies to gain support for the VRU and the challenges they faced to convince other stakeholders, the most insightful moment comes when an initiative called CIRV (pronounced serve) is launched (p.77) and 85 young gang members are gathered in the Glasgow Sheriff Court along with police officers, surgeons, youth workers, victims and motivational speakers. This was one of the most interesting and engaging chapters of the book as it offered a first person perspective into the proceedings that took place in an emotionally charged and “electric” environment (p.83).

The book is largely successful in not only illustrating ‘what works’ but also taking a chronological approach to show ‘how’. Following the success of the Violence Reduction Unit, Carnochan makes some insightful observations on how the preventative approach has been applied to other areas of concern such as domestic violence. This book is recommended for both criminology and criminal justice students and practitioners alike, particularly those with an interest in preventative policy and problem-oriented policing.

Ali Malik is a PhD candidate at the University of Edinburgh. He is exploring the landscape of police governance and accountability in Scotland following the reforms, with a particular focus on the Scottish Police Authority.
Current legislation

**Air Weapons and Licensing (Scotland) Bill**
This Bill was introduced in May to “make provision for the licensing and regulation of air weapons” and other licensing matters relating to alcohol. The regulation of air weapons was an SNP manifesto commitment in 2007 and 2011, and the right to legislate was implemented by the Scotland Act 2012. The Local Government and Regeneration Committee has heard evidence at Stage 1 and is currently considering Stage 2 amendments.

**Alcohol (Licensing, Public Health and Criminal Justice) (Scotland) Bill**
This is a member’s Bill introduced by Richard Simpson in April. It intends to “make provision for reducing and dealing with the abuse of alcohol; to amend the legislation in relation to applications for, and to vary, licences for the sale of alcohol; and for connected purposes”. The lead committee is Health and Sport.

**Community Justice (Scotland) Bill**
Introduced on 8th May, this important legislation intends to “to make provision about community justice, including establishing a new national body to oversee community justice and introducing requirements in relation to the achievement of particular nationally and locally determined outcomes; and for connected purposes” and in so doing abolish the Community Justice Authorities. The origins of the Bill can be traced to the recommendations about the reform of community justice provision contained in the Angiolini Commission on Women Offenders. The Justice Committee has issued a call for evidence: the deadline is August 12th.

**Criminal Justice (Scotland) Bill**
“A Bill . . . to make provision about criminal justice including as to police powers and rights of suspects and as to criminal evidence, procedure and sentencing” and other matters which was originally introduced in June 2013. Most media attention was directed at the provisions to implement the proposal in the Carloway Review, to reform the Scottish evidential tradition on corroboration.

The Justice Committee’s Stage 1 report (February 2014) supported the general principles of the Bill with the exception of the corroboration proposals. Although the Bill cleared Stage 1, a surprise announcement in April 2014, in heated exchanges at Holyrood, postponed Stage 2 and therefore any further progress, until the publication of the (Bonomy) Post-corroboration Safeguards Review reference group’s final report published in April 2015. The Cabinet Secretary then announced that the Bill would proceed without the corroboration and jury reform provisions to allow further consideration of the ‘substantial and complex’ recommendations.

Stage 2 amendments to the Bill are still open.

**Human Trafficking and Exploitation (Scotland) Bill**
Introduced by Michael Matheson in December 2014, this Bill aims to “make provision about human trafficking and slavery, servitude and forced or compulsory labour, including provision about offences and sentencing, provision for victim support and provision to reduce activity related to offences.” The Stage 1 debate took place on 12th May and the Bill therefore moves to Stage 2.

**Prisoners (Control of Release) (Scotland) Bill**
“A Bill to end the right of certain long-term prisoners to automatic early release from prison at the two-thirds point of their sentences and to allow prisoners serving all but very short sentences to be released from prison on a particular day suitable for their re-integration into the community.”

The ending of automatic early release was an SNP manifesto commitment in 2006. However, a more pragmatic view against a revision of current practices held in the face of repeated criticism especially from the Conservatives. This Bill was introduced in August 2014, to end automatic release at the two-thirds point and replaces that with discretionary release overseen by the Parole Board at the halfway point, for prisoners sentenced to four years or more for a sexual offences and for those sentenced to 10 years or more for any offence. In early February, FM Nicola Sturgeon, on a visit to the offices of Victim Support Scotland, announced an extension to all prisoners serving four years or more.

The Stage 1 debate took place on 2nd April and the Justice Committee continues to hear evidence on the amendments at Stage 2.

**Events**

**Apex Annual Lecture**

**Wednesday September 2nd**
Signet Library, Edinburgh
* A fairer justice system for Scotland*
Speaker: Michael Matheson, Cabinet Secretary for Justice.

**SASO National Annual Conference**

**Friday 13th and Saturday 14th November 2015**
Dunblane Hydro, Dunblane.
www.sastudyoffending.org.uk/
Essential reading

New insights, cross cutting themes and ideas covering crime and criminal justice in Scotland.
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Forthcoming themes:

- Autumn 2015: Poverty, Inequality and Justice
- Spring 2016: Imagining Punishment and Justice (provisional)
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