

2015



University of the
West of England

Evaluation of the Police and Young People Together Project

Author: Dr Ian Walmsley

Any queries or correspondence regarding the report please contact the UWE Project Manager;

Dr. Ian Walmsley
University of the West of England
Department of Health and Applied Social Science
Frenchay Campus
Coldharbour Lane
Bristol
BS16 1QY

E-mail: ian2.walmsley@uwe.ac.uk

Tel: +44 (0) 117 32 83939

Executive summary

The Police and Young People Together Project was delivered by providers in Henbury, Lawrence Weston, Lockleaze and Southmead. It was designed to improve relations between local young people and police. It was hypothesised that improvements in this relationship would lead to a reduction in antisocial behaviour and an improvement in crime reporting by young people. Evidence from national and international studies on police-youth relations supports this hypothesis.

Context

In addition to the local context, there is a national context for the ambitions underpinning this project. In July 2014, the All Party Parliamentary Group for Children published findings from a 12 month inquiry into the nature of police-youth relations in England and Wales. Titled *“It’s all about trust”: Building good relationships between children and young people*, the report presents evidence collected from young people from a range of backgrounds, and practitioners from voluntary and statutory organisations that support young people. The inquiry found young peoples’ attitudes towards the police were characterised by feelings of mistrust and fear. The inquiry expressed concern about the limited opportunities where young people can communicate with police in non-conflict and positive environments. The aims of the Police and Young People Together Project were in line with national concerns about police-youth relations.

Methodology

The initial evaluation framework identified by the funders was confronted by a number of significant problems. These included a lack of police participation in the project and retention of core groups of young people. There were also communication problems and a lack of information sharing which prevented the full implementation of the evaluation design. Further information can be found on these problems in the methods section of this report. As a result, a pragmatic, before and after mixed methods framework was utilised in order to accommodate the challenges and emergent nature of each of the projects. A small sample of young people from each area participated in semi-structured interviews and focus groups. In addition, the young people completed a questionnaire before and after the

project. This allowed for 'before' and 'after' comparisons of their attitudes towards the police, antisocial behaviour and crime reporting. Four police community support officers were interviewed at the beginning and end of the project. The qualitative data were analysed thematically, and the quantitative data were analysed using a statistical software package. However, due to the sample size and retention issues, there are limitations to the quantitative results.

Key Findings: Young people

- First contact with police and PCSOs reported by young people happened in school and was described as positive. In addition, young people reported greater levels of trust in police and PCSOs based at their school. School-based police and PCSOs were generally described in more positive terms than those who were not based at school.
- Negative attitudes towards police were influenced by negative crime reporting experiences, hearing stories about police misconduct and police harassment. Some young people reported not feeling listened to by police as well as a general lack of respect from police. Furthermore, a large number of young people viewed police as outsiders and who have a particularly negative view of their community.
- Young people reported improved levels of trust and relationships with PCSOs after the Police and Young People Together Project. This was influenced by informal conversations and having fun during interpersonal activities. Young people valued PCSOs listening to them and expressing an interest in them as people, rather than feeling like they are gathering information.
- There were no statistically significant changes in the frequency of antisocial behaviour. However, levels of antisocial behaviour were generally low amongst the young people who started and finished the project. Fifty percent of the young people reported past victimisation.
- Correlation tests found that there were statistically significant improvements in (1) attitudes towards the police at the end of the project compared to the start, and (2) an increased willingness for young people to go to a PCSO for help after the project compared to the start. These were found in the young people who started and finished the project.

Key Findings: PCSOs

- PCSOs have opportunities to build trust and relationships with young people in their day to day activities. These opportunities, however, were not equally distributed and were more regular for PCSOs based in school. Opportunities for PCSOs not based in school were irregular and were being threatened by increases in workload.
- PCSOs described implicit styles and techniques for communicating and interacting with young people in formal and informal situations. These included speaking to young people on their level, strategic use of gender and procedurally fair and just practices. PCSOs found these techniques to be effective ways of interacting with young people.
- Involvement and ability to commit to the project was, to an extent, undermined by a lack of communication and information sharing between policing teams and youth projects in the period leading up to the start of the project. Not all policing teams had sufficient information about the project. Existing partnerships between local policing teams and youth projects were significant in terms of delivering a successful project that brought together PCSOs and young people to work on issues relating to antisocial behaviour and crime reporting. Lawrence Weston and Henbury were the only policing teams to take part in the evaluation research.
- PCSOs could have been more involved in the recruitment of young people and in the design of the police sessions and activities. They have knowledge of local young people who might fit the criteria of the target group as well as resources (within the police) that could have positively contributed to the project.
- PCSOs reported different views about the impact of the project on them and the young people. Some reported positive outcomes, including improved interpersonal relations with the young people who attended the project and a view that young people had an increased awareness of crime reporting. In contrast, some expressed the view that it did not add anything to their relationships with young people. Importantly, these views were specific to the location.

Recommendations

The challenges and obstacles associated with the delivery of the Police and Young People Together Project mean that it is difficult to properly assess its value as an intervention into police-youth relations, antisocial behaviour and crime reporting. However, there are three recommendations that would begin to improve local police-youth relations and provide a foundation for the delivery of similar projects in the future.

1. Steps should be taken to allocate resources to strengthen partnerships between local policing teams and youth projects. Good partnership working between local policing teams and youth projects would provide a foundation for similar interventions designed to improve police-youth relations.
2. School-based police and PCSOs could be better utilised as a resource for building links between police and young people. They have existing relationships with young people that can be used to break down barriers and bridge the gap between local young people and police.
3. There is a need for more in-depth research into opportunities that currently exist within day-to-day activities where police and police community support officers can build trust and relationships with local young people. These opportunities should be identified, protected and developed. Furthermore, this research should also identify and understand the range of implicit policing styles that officers develop and deploy in order to successfully communicate and interact with young people in informal and formal settings. This important resource is currently overlooked. In austere times it is logical to identify, analyse and then utilise internal resources.

Contents page

Executive summary:	Pages 2-5
Section 1: Background: Police-youth relations	Pages 7-8
Section 2: Literature review:	Pages 8-15
Section 3: Evaluation methodology:	Pages 16-22
Section 4: Views of the young people:	Pages 23-39
Section 5: Results from the questionnaires:	Pages 40-48
Section 6: Views of the PCSOs:	Pages 48-65
Section 7: Conclusion and Recommendations:	Pages 66-68
References:	Pages 69-71

Section 1: Background information

National police-youth relations

In July 2014, the All Party Parliamentary Group for Children published findings from a 12 month inquiry into the nature of the relationship between young people and the police in England and Wales. The purpose of the inquiry was to explore the experiences and attitudes of children and young people toward the police. Titled *“It’s all about trust”: Building good relationships between children and young people*, the report presents a wide range of evidence collected from children and young people from a range of backgrounds, and practitioners from voluntary and statutory organisations that work with young people. The inquiry found young people’s attitudes towards the police were characterised by feelings of mistrust and fear. Moreover, children and young people reported that during contact with the police they felt a lack of respect. It was suggested that these negative attitudes are embedded within wider familial and social relations and become further reinforced through various contacts with the police. The inquiry expressed concern about the limited opportunities where young people can communicate with the police in non-conflict and positive environments. School and community schemes which are designed to break down barriers to build more positive and trusting relationships have been developed.

Safer School Partnerships

In 2002, Safer School Partnerships were set up by the Youth Justice Board to tackle anti-social behaviour and offending behaviour among young people (Lamont et al., 2011; Police Foundation, 2011). The police-school partnerships were originally introduced to improve the security and safety of staff and students in and around the school grounds. Furthermore, the Partnerships encourage the building of positive relationships between schools and police. Although police presence in schools has declined, they continue to operate throughout England and Wales where they are an integral part of community policing. Underpinning the partnership is the assumption that anti-social behaviour and crime can be reduced by tackling bullying, truancy and exclusions in schools. Evaluations of Safer School Partnerships have found improvements victimisation, truancy rates, exclusions, anti-social behaviour and feelings of safety (Bowles, 2005; Police Foundation, 2011).

Police-youth partnerships

Community-based initiatives that bring police and young people together to build and develop positive relationships have existed since 1980s. An example of a successful project is the police engagement project delivered by StreetChance in Birmingham. The project brings young people and police together, around the game of cricket, to promote aspiration, mutual respect and enhance relationships with others. This is also accomplished by providing structured coaching and competitive opportunities for young people. Police officers regularly attend the sessions and as a result levels of antisocial behaviour and crime have fallen and the levels of police engagement have increased. Furthermore, police have noticed better relations with at risk groups in the street.

The Police and Young People Together Project came out of a previous project in Lawrence Weston delivered by Juicy Blitz between 2010 and 2012. The purpose of it was to bring together young people and the local community policing team to improve their relationship, build trust and develop local community projects. The programme led to a change in emphasis in local policing practices and improvements in the relationship between police and young people.

Section 2: Literature review of studies: Police-youth relations

The purpose of this section is to provide an overview of existing research on key themes relating to the Police and Young People Together Project. In terms of structure, it will first review studies on antisocial behaviour and young people and relevant interventions designed to reduce both antisocial behaviour and perceptions of antisocial behaviour, including relationship building approaches. From here studies on youth-police relations will be reviewed in particular the factors that influence this relationship and the impact of this relationship on antisocial behaviour, crime and crime reporting behaviour.

Young people and antisocial behaviour

Antisocial behaviour has been a significant feature of UK Government policy since the 1990s and interest in it continues to be widespread (Brown, 2013; Neary et al., 2013). Antisocial behaviour was defined in the Crime and Disorder Act (1998) as “acting in a manner that caused or was likely to cause harassment, alarm or distress to one or more persons not of the same household of the perpetrator”. The National Standard for Incident Recording introduced a simplified definition of antisocial behaviour in which it is divided into three categories; nuisance, personal and environmental (Home Office, 2011). Indicators of antisocial behaviour used in the Crime Survey include; abandoned or burnt out cars; noisy neighbours or loud parties; rubbish or litter lying around; vandalism, graffiti and other deliberate damage to property; people being drunk or rowdy in public places; people using or dealing drugs and teenagers hanging around on the streets (Mackenzie et al., 2010). The definition of antisocial behaviour, however, has been criticised for being subjective and open to interpretation. It is therefore likely to vary among individuals and communities.

Young people have been identified as being particularly at-risk of antisocial behaviour (Boeck et al., 2006; Mackenzie *et al.*, 2010). Risk factors for antisocial behaviour among young people are well-established in research (Braet et al., 2009; Carlo et al., 2013; Farrington, 2005). The major risk factors identified in the Cambridge Study in Delinquent Development include impulsiveness, poor educational attainment, parental conflict and disrupted families and socioeconomic factors (Farrington, 2005). Deuchar et al (2014), in his qualitative study of young people from a socially deprived community of Glasgow, found

that their participants drifted into antisocial behaviour because of boredom and a sense of frustration. This was associated with a lack of recreational youth facilities.

A key criticism of the antisocial behaviour agenda is that the term antisocial behaviour tends to focus on the behaviour of the perpetrator rather than on the broader social and economic problems that underpin the social patterning of the behaviour (Neary et al., 2013). It has also been pointed out how there is a tendency in the UK to negatively stereotype and recode seemingly harmless activities such as hanging around on the street as a problem (Neary et al., 2013). The limitations of the antisocial behaviour term have, in part, contributed to a move towards understanding the factors which drive perceptions of antisocial behaviour, rather the behaviour itself.

Research studies have argued that there is a mismatch between actual and perceived measures of antisocial behaviour (Mackenzie *et al.*, 2010). In the most recent review of studies of perceptions of antisocial behaviour, Mackenzie et al (2010) found that perceptions of antisocial behaviour are not only a matter of interpretation, but the way the behaviour is interpreted and perceived was influenced by other factors. For example, they found perceptions were unequally distributed across social groups, with young people, women and those with prior victim experiences as well as less affluent communities reporting higher levels of perceptions of anti-social behaviour (Mackenzie *et al.*, 2010). They conclude that perceptions of antisocial behaviour were indicative of a lack of social cohesion rather than simply the result of nuisance behaviour.

Actual antisocial behaviour and perceptions of antisocial behaviour have been tackled through strategies designed to improve relationships between young people, local residents and local policing teams (Carlo et al., 2014; Cook et al., 2009; Eagan et al., 2013; Mackenzie et al., 2010). According to Mackenzie et al (2010), relationships and interactions among these groups can be improved by interventions (e.g. increase public information, facilitating positive interactions between groups) specifically designed to build mutual respect, trust and empathy. The evidence on police-youth relations, however, continues to highlight significant limitations and barriers to improving the relationship between young people and the police.

Police contact with young people

The relationship between young people and the police has been a focus of concern among policy makers and researchers since the 1990s (Leiber et al., 1998). This concern with youth-police relations is underpinned by the claim that early contact with police is likely to have a lasting impact upon the attitudes and behaviours of young people and their willingness to assist police with their duties (Brick et al., 2009; Hinds, 2007). The importance of maintaining positive relationships between young people and the police is further illustrated by the fact that young people, compared to adults, have a disproportionate level of contact with the police (Brick et al., 2009). Contact with the police for young people is likely to be heterogeneous depending upon the context (Watkins and Maume, 2012). Meaning, in their day to day lives young people may encounter a range of police.

First contact with the police may happen during a visit to a local primary school and/or in a secondary school (Lamont et al., 2011). Evidence suggests that contact with police in school is more positive than encounters outside of school (Deuchar et al., 2014; Watkins and Maume, 2012). Interestingly, police-youth relations formed in school can be influential when tackling negative perceptions of young people and antisocial behaviour caused, in part, by disconnect between young people, community policing teams and local residents. Deuchar et al (2014) found that the mutual trust between young people and the school police officer was instrumental in breaking down barriers and establishing greater trust and social cohesion among the young people, police and local residents. The mutual trust and empathy that developed as a result of the partnership activities helped tackle negative views of young people and perceptions of antisocial behaviour.

Evidence of a more adversarial type of police contact with young people can be found in official crime statistics and stop and search figures as well as through the more recent task of dispersing young people who are causing a nuisance to the community by making noise and hanging around on the streets (Crawford, 2009; Gormally and Deuchar, 2012; Mackenzie et al., 2010). Neary et al (2013) claim that such police contact is often characterised by lack of trust, respect, integrity and fairness. Similar findings have been reported in other studies (Deuchar et al., 2014; Gormally and Deuchar, 2012; Neary et al., 2013; Mackenzie et al., 2010). The adversarial nature of such encounters between young

people and police inevitably leads to negative attitudes and less respect shown to police during contacts as well as increased hostility between the two groups due to the frequency of contacts (Hinds, 2007, 2009; Murphy, 2015). The significance of poor police-youth relations for the development of young people and policing practices has triggered an interest among researchers to better understand the factors that influence the development of attitudes towards the police.

Young peoples' attitudes toward the Police

The national and international research studies on youth-police relations report that young people's attitudes toward police can be shaped by individual-level characteristics, family and community context, commitment to the norms and values of delinquent subcultures and indirect and direct experience of police contact (Hinds, 2007; Romain and Hassell, 2014). Ethnicity has been strongly associated with attitudes towards the police, with young people from ethnic minority groups reporting less favourable attitudes towards police compared to young people from majority groups (Brick et al., 2009; Leiber et al., 1998; McAra and McVile, 2005; Stewart et al., 2014). Research findings on the influence of gender on attitudes towards the police, however, are not as consistent. Brick et al (2009) found that female attitudes towards the police were more favourable than males. Similar findings have also been reported by McAra and McVile (2005) and Stewart et al (2014). The more positive assessments of the police by females have been explained by the less frequent and confrontational nature of encounters with the police compared to males (Cao et al., 1996). In addition, female attitudes towards the police have been associated with feelings of neighbourhood safety (Romain and Hassell, 2014).

The trajectories of young people's attitudes toward the police have been investigated by Fagan and Tyler (2005) and Stewart et al (2014). In their longitudinal study of 766 young people, Stewart et al (2014) found that the majority of young people's attitudes remain stable between the ages of 12 and 16. If at 12 years of age their attitudes were negative then they remained negative throughout this period; if they were positive then they remained positive. However, one group of young people in this study experienced a noticeable downward trend in their attitudes towards the police. This trend began around the ages of 12 and 13 and reached its lowest point around the age of 16. Similarly, Fagan

and Tyler (2005) reported that young people became more cynical of the police at 12, and this increased at 14. Stewart et al (2014) argue that this downward trend can be explained by the type of police contact. Negative attitudes and assessments of the police were associated with young people who reported higher levels of arrest or had friends who reported negative police contact. Similar findings have been reported by other researchers (Clayman and Skins, 2012; Leiber et al., 1998; Murphy, 2015).

Flexon et al (2009) and Sargeant and Bond (2013) found that perceived parental attitudes toward the police were positively associated with youth attitudes. For Sargeant and Bond (2013), those who had stronger maternal attachment had more positive attitudes toward the police. However, Flexon et al (2009) found that positive attitudes towards the police were influenced by paternal attachment. Those with stronger paternal relationships had greater levels of trust in the police. In addition, McAra and McVile (2005) claim that young people from single parent families are 1.5 times more likely to report negative contact with the police. In contrast, Romain and Hassell (2014) found that parental influences were not significant. Furthermore, they found that the impact of neighbours' attitudes towards the police and listening to music containing negative attitudes toward the police were not significantly associated with youth attitudes.

There is convincing evidence that attitudes toward the police are influenced by friendship groups (Clayman and Skins, 2012; Leiber et al., 1998; Romain and Hassell, 2014; Stewart et al., 2014). According to Romain and Hassell (2014), the influence of peer groups was greater than parental influences. Young people with friends who spoke negatively about the police were more likely to have negative attitudes toward the police (Flexon et al., 2009). Similar experiences were reported by Norman (2009), who associated negative attitudes toward the police to friends sharing stories about police misconduct and negative police contact. The relationship between negative conduct and attitudes has been reported elsewhere (Hinds, 2007, 2009). McAra and McVile (2005) found that a cycle of labelling existed whereby young people who hanged around on the streets with friends with prior negative police contact had an increased risk of being labelled by police as troublesome. Fifteen year old males from single parent families living in socially deprived communities had an increased risk of being labelled (McAra and McVile, 2005). Gormally and Deuchar (2012)

found an ambivalence regarding views of the police. While their attitudes were generally negative, young people recognised the need for them.

Young people and police legitimacy

Negative and positive attitudes toward the police have been associated with perceptions of police legitimacy (Hinds, 2007, 2009; Fagan and Tyler, 2005). Legitimacy is defined as “a property of an authority or institution that leads people to feel that that authority or institution is entitled to be deferred to an obeyed” (Sunshine and Tyler, 2003: 514). The assessment that an individual makes about the legitimacy of the police, therefore, has been positively associated with whether that individual is willing or unwilling to comply and cooperate with the police. This approach can be contrasted with a deterrence approach whereby a police officer secures compliance with its rules and decisions by the threat of sanctions for non-compliance (Tyler, 1990).

In her evaluation of a community policing intervention designed to build relationships between young people and police, Hinds (2009) found a strong, consistent and positive relationship between young peoples’ willingness to assist the police and higher levels of perceived police legitimacy. She found that those who participated in the activities had improved attitudes and were more willing to assist the individual officers involved in the project. The crucial point is that perceptions of police legitimacy has implications for crime reporting behaviour and willingness to comply with the standards of behaviour set by the law and legal actors, such as the police (Fagan and Tyler, 2005).

There is extensive evidence that claims perceptions of police legitimacy can be increased or decreased by the type of contact young people have with the police (Hinds, 2007, 2009; Murphy, 2015). Young people have better attitudes toward the police and higher levels of perceptions of police legitimacy when contact is experienced as procedurally fair (Hinds, 2007; Norman, 2009; Romain and Hassell, 2014). Procedural justice, according to Hinds (2007), can be achieved when the following conditions are demonstrated during police contact; an individual is given an opportunity to express his/her views before the decision has been made; when that decision is consistent and neutral; and when the police treat that individual with dignity and respect.

The evidence supports the view that when police use procedural justice in their interactions with adults and young people they are more willing to accept police decisions, even when the outcome might be negative. In addition, people are more willing to cooperate and comply with the police. The use of the procedural justice model of policing to improve police-youth relations is supported by a large number of studies on police-community relations (Romain and Hassell, 2014). Murphy (2015) argues that procedural justice is particularly important for young people from disadvantaged communities. In terms of informal contact with young people, Norman (2009) found that relations with young people were significantly improved when the police employed a range of engagement techniques such as listening to them and offering advice and giving positive affirmations.

Studies have found that young people with higher levels of perceptions of police legitimacy were more likely to report crimes to the police (Clayman and Skinnis, 2012). Clayman and Skinnis (2012), in their qualitative interviews with 13-16 year olds, found that an increase in informal contact with the police improved personal relationships with individual officers, which enabled young people to see beyond the uniform and establish trusting relationships. Young people claimed that they would be more willing to ask these individual officers for help if they needed it. Kaariainen and Siren (2011) associate crime reporting behaviour with the level of social capital. In particular, if you have strong social networks including with family and friends then the less likely you will be to report crime.

Summary

This section has provided an up to date review of existing research studies on youth people and antisocial behaviour and police youth relations. Key themes that run through this literature review are the importance of broadening the focus of antisocial behaviour interventions to target not only individual perpetrators but also the community, and the association between contact with police and future police-youth relations. Finally, there is great weight supporting the hypothesis that improvements in police-youth relations will lead to reductions in antisocial behaviour and improve cooperation with police.

Section 3: Research Methodology

The methodological framework employed in the evaluation of the Police and Young People Together Project will be outlined in this section. The research questions will be listed first, followed by the design framework for the evaluation, and then the methods of data collection and analysis. The key challenges to the evaluation and how the design adapted as well as the reasons for this will be explained at the end of the section.

Research questions

1. What are the characteristics of a good partnership between young people, youth service providers and local community policing teams?
2. What are the barriers that prevent each of these groups working successfully within a partnership?
3. What impact, if any, has the PYPT project had on self-reported anti-social behaviour (understandings, attitudes) and crime reporting among the young people attending the projects?

Research design

The Police and Young People Together Projects were delivered by Juicy Blitz in Lawrence Weston, Wordsworth Centre in Lockleaze, Emmanuel Chapel in Henbury and Southmead Youth Project. Emmanuel Chapel invited 2 PCSOs to attend a questions and answers session about antisocial behaviour and crime with the young people. Southmead commissioned 8th Sense Media to work with young people on a documentary about antisocial behaviour and crime in Southmead. Although no PCSOs were directly involved, the young people did interview a member of the policing team. Lawrence Weston designed and delivered a series of interrelating fun and informative sessions on antisocial behaviour, crime and crime reporting. The sessions were designed to engage young people and increase interaction with PCSOs. Sessions included zombie outbreak party, crime reporting and wider impact of crime reporting and cyberbullying.

The evaluation design outlined by the funder was confronted by a number of significant issues. This led to a redesign of the evaluation framework and a decision to not include Lockleaze in the evaluation. As a result, a pragmatic, before and after mixed methods

framework was employed. The before measures for the young people were collected from Lawrence Weston, Henbury and Southmead during August and September 2014. The after measures were collected between April and May 2015. As requested by the funder, data were collected using both quantitative and qualitative methods: questionnaires and semi-structured interviews and focus groups.

Questionnaires

Measures were collected from the young people before and after the project using two questionnaires. The questionnaires were designed for this purpose and were informed by the police-youth studies discussed in the literature review. It was piloted with a small group of young people at Juicy Blitz. This was to ensure questions were worded appropriately for the age of the target group, and to estimate the average amount of time that it takes to complete. This led to the rewording of questions and a reduction in the number of questions. Furthermore, comments from a representative of one of the other projects were also acted upon. The length of the questionnaire was considered an issue, and with permission from the coordinator at North Bristol Youth Links the social capital measures were not included in the final version. For the after questionnaire, questions that were deemed unnecessary for the measure of before and after were removed. The questionnaires were administered with the help of the youth workers. No problems were experienced with this process.

Changes in the relationship between young people and PCSOs were measured using established measures found in the police-youth studies Sargeant and Bond, 2013, Stewart et al, 2013). Attitudes towards the police and PCSOs were taken, as well as measures of perceptions of police legitimacy. Six indicators were used to capture individual and social influences on attitudes toward the police. Among them were; “police officers are honest”, “most police officers are usually rude”, “Most police officers are usually friendly” and “The majority of my friends do not like police officers”.

Police legitimacy was measured using existing measures found in the academic literature: “trust and confidence in police” and “their beliefs that authorities are entitled to be obeyed” (Murphy, 2013). These two concepts were measured by four indicators / questions.

An example of indicators used are; “I have confidence in police officers” and “Everyone should follow / obey the direction of police officers”.

Responses were measured using a six-point Likert scale, which ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. A neutral response was not included. This was to encourage participants to think about their responses. Participant responses were then averaged to represent an overall attitude score. The scores were measured between 1 and 6, with one being a more positive attitude and 6 a more negative attitude.

Involvement (and witnessed) in antisocial behaviour was measured using eight indicators. Participants indicated the frequency of involvement in each indicator of antisocial behaviour on the following scale: 0 (no history), once, twice, three or four times or more (Connell et al, 2011). Furthermore, participants were asked if they thought this behaviour was antisocial behaviour, a crime, both or neither. This was included in order to assess participants’ understanding of that particular behaviour. Participants indicated the frequency of victimisation on the following scale: 0 (no history), once, twice, three or four times or more. According to Sawyer et al (2008), being a victim two or more times in the last month is an important threshold for frequent victimisation.

Semi-structured interviews and focus groups

The qualitative methods for collecting data from young people were semi-structured interviews and focus groups. The method used for collecting the data from the police was a semi-structured interview. Qualitative data were collected from both young people and PCSOs before and after the project had concluded. The semi-structured interview schedule for the young people explored family and social networks; involvement or views on antisocial behaviour and crime; experiences relating to early and current contact with the police; reasons for their attitudes towards the police; trust in the police and crime reporting behaviour.

The focus groups were carried out with a sample of young people at the end of the project. The focus groups explored experiences of interacting with PCSOs during the police sessions. Prior contact with the police before the police sessions was discussed as well as what activities they liked best and what activities they liked least. The discussion also focused on

what they particularly liked about the PCSOs and if they would attend similar police sessions in the future.

Semi-structured interviews with the PCSOs were designed to explore the policing of the local community; views on relationships between the policing team and the community; relationships with young people; attitudes towards the police; and the promises and pitfalls of partnership working on the Police and Young People Together Project. The completion interviews with the PCSOs explored the views on the young people

Sampling and Participants

The young people recruited for the evaluation were non-randomly sampled with the help of the youth workers from each project. There were no formal inclusion or exclusion criteria for the selection of research participants, only that the individual was a participant in the Police and Young People Together project and considered suitable for an interview or focus group by the project staff. Retention was a problem as some of the young people included in the evaluation dropped out and some joined part way through. The research samples reported below are for the total sample (including those who dropped out). The analysis, however, explores differences between each of the 3 groups: Groups 1, 2, and 3. Group 1 are those who started and finished. Group 2 are those who started and dropped out. Group 3 are those who joined part way through and completed.

Henbury

Gender and age	<i>Interview</i>	<i>Questionnaire</i>	<i>Focus group</i>	
Male	1	17	6	
Female	1	13	0	
11-13	1	16	4	
14-16	1	13	2	
17-19	0	1	0	
20-25	0	0	0	
Total	2	30	6	N=30
PCSOs	2	0	0	N=2

Six young people were in Group 1, 19 in Group 2 and 4 in Group 3.

Lawrence Weston

	<i>Interview</i>	<i>Questionnaire</i>	<i>Focus group</i>	
Male	0	5	2	
Female	2	15	5	
11-13	0	3	2	
14-16	2	8	2	
17-19	0	6	2	
20-25	0	3	1	
Total	2	20	7	N=20
PCSOs	2	0	0	N=2

Seven young people were in Group 1, 10 in Group 2 and 3 in Group 3.

Southmead

	<i>Interview</i>	<i>Questionnaire</i>	<i>Focus group</i>	
Male	1	9	0	
Female	2	10	0	
11-13	2	7	0	
14-16	1	8	0	
17-19	0	1	0	
20-25	0	3	0	
Total	3	19	0	N=19
PCSOs	0	0	0	N=0

Three young people were in Group 1, 8 in Group 2 and 8 in Group 3.

Research ethics

Given the age of the target group adhering to a strict ethical code of practice was a pre-requisite. Approval for the evaluation research was awarded by the University of the West of England Research Ethics Committee. The research commenced when ethical approval had been given. In addition, the researcher followed strict guidelines for research with young people. Each participant was given an information sheet and consent form for their parent or guardian to read and sign.

Data analysis

The data collected for the evaluation was analysed using both qualitative and quantitative data analytical techniques. The qualitative data were analysed using thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006). Following the initial transcribing of the interviews and focus groups, the corpus of data was read a number of times for familiarity and to identify initial thematic interests. A qualitative coding procedure was then carefully applied to the corpus of data in order to reduce the data to smaller, manageable pieces of data. The coding procedure was guided by the main research questions. The codes allowed for key themes contained in the data to be identified and relationships between themes explored.

The quantitative data for the young people were transferred from the questionnaires to the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). This computer software was used to produce descriptive statistics and then to analyse the data using relevant statistical techniques. The statistical techniques that were used to analyse the quantitative data were Chi-Square, Correlation, Mann-Whitney U and Wilcoxon. This allowed for relationships and associations between the data and differences between before and after measures to be analysed. Due to the low number of responses, some of the variables were recoded from their original format. For example, the frequency of involvement in each indicator of antisocial behaviour was measured on the following scale: 0 (no history), once, twice, three or four times or more (Connell et al, 2011). This became Yes or No. This supported the analysis of the data.

Reflections on the development of the evaluation design

The evaluation research was confronted by a number of unanticipated problems. The first challenge was the varied commitment and engagement from the police in the police-youth sessions. This proved to be a significant challenge to the successful delivery of the Police and Young People Together Project. Two PCSOs from Lawrence Weston attended all of the police-youth sessions; both PCSOs made themselves available to be interviewed at the beginning and end of the project. Two PCSOs from Henbury attended one session; both PCSOs made themselves available to be interviewed at the beginning and end of the project. A PCSO from Southmead attended one police-youth sessions; the PCSO did not take part in an interview. The researcher attempted to contact members of the Southmead Policing

Team on 10s of occasions but did not get a reply. This made it difficult to understand the barriers preventing the team from engaging in the partnership. The lack of police engagement in the police-youth sessions prevented the researcher from testing the hypothesis.

The second challenge was the direction taken by each of the providers delivering the Police and Young People Together Projects. The Lawrence Weston project had experience of delivering the Police and Young People Together Project in 2010, and was able to use this experience and existing partnership with the policing team to successfully recruit young people and police into the project. Henbury, however, only delivered one session where police and young people were brought together in a question and answer activity. The limited interaction between young people and the police further prevented the hypothesis from being tested. Similar problems were also found in Southmead. The Lockleaze project, on the other hand, did not work with the same group of young people for the duration of the project and experienced similar problems with police engagement. Furthermore, the project recruited young people into the main activity who were younger than the target group. This was a further challenge as the evaluation research was only given ethical approval for the target group. The researcher also experienced problems collecting data from the Lockleaze project. The combination of problems led to the decision to remove the Lockleaze project from the evaluation for ethical and methodological reasons.

Section 4: Views of the young people

This section will discuss the qualitative data collected from the young people at the beginning and end of the Police and Young People Together Project. It will discuss the extent of police contact and experiences of crime reporting. In addition, it will discuss the views and experiences of those who attended the project as well as its impact on antisocial behaviour, crime reporting behaviour and relationship with PCSOs. The section is divided into two parts. Part 1 looks at the nature of police contact before young people attended the project. This is structured around examples of positive contact and negative contact. This section will conclude by looking what the young people thought the police think of the area in which they live. Part 2 discusses their views of the police sessions and how they have impacted on the relationship with police as well as antisocial behaviour and crime.

Part 1

Previous contact with police and police community support officers

The “It’s all about trust” report published by the All Party Parliamentary Group for Children and Young People claimed that first contact with the police is significant in shaping a young person’s view of them. First contact for all but one of the young people who took part in the interviews was considered positive. The contact was with a group of “friendly police officers” who visited their primary school to talk about the role of the police and showcase equipment they use in order to perform this role. This can be illustrated by the following quote from one of the participants;

“yeah like police come into the school and saying this is our fire alarm, fire alarm, this is our sirens, this is our car and they showed us around the car. What their weapons was, how they used the spray ... we were all happy, we was all happy, they was laughing about the sirens having a right giggle because how they was trying to make us laugh because when he put the sirens on he tried to make a little song at the sirens and everyone was having a bit of a laugh” (14 year old male, Southmead)

The accounts given by the young people varied, though the descriptions of the primary school experience were mainly positive. Importantly, all of the descriptions included the following statement; “police were there to help you”. Although some views of the police

changed for reasons that will be outlined later in this section, they continued to refer to the police as being there to help you.

The young person who did not talk about her first contact with police as positive was a 14 year old female from Lawrence Weston. The contact happened when she was 5 years old and before police visited her primary school. When asked to describe the first time she remembered coming into contact with police, she explained that;

“It must have been when my dad got arrested but I sort of like just woke up and I only about 5 ... it was just big and scary because it was like loads of them and it was like whoa what’s going on because they were everywhere and it was like whoa” (14 year old female).

She explained that the police raided her house in the early hours of the morning to arrest her dad. After she talked through this event, she went on to tell me another example about when police visited her primary school. She used very similar language to the other young people to describe the experience. Moreover, she explained that this made her realise that not all police officers were aggressive like those who arrested her dad. Having a family member who had or was involved with the police was a common finding. This will be returned to later in this section.

Contact with police and police community support officers

Positive contact

Opportunities to build trust and develop relationships for the majority of young people were restricted to school. The young people from Emmanuel Chapel in Henbury talked about a police officer who was based at their school. His name was mentioned a number of times by the young people in both the interviews and focus group. The young people talked about him as someone that they not only liked, but that they trusted. Interestingly, the young people talked openly in front of the other young people in the focus group about how much they liked this particular police officer. Similar to the comments made by the PCSOs, school provides regular contact.

The type of contact that they had with him was typically either as a victim of an incident or as an offender of antisocial behaviour and/or crime at school. In both cases, the young people said that he listened to them and dealt with them fairly. The procedure did not negatively impact upon their perception of him. When they were asked to describe what it was that they liked about him, they said;

“{School police officer} is nice because he takes us on trips ... he actually does stuff for you ... the police just take their time but {school police officer}, he does it ... he is always there when you need him“ (13 year old male, Henbury).

The benefits of continued contact with a police officer at school have been recognised in the research literature (Clayman and Skinns, 2012; Deuchar et al., 2014). In this context, a school police officer was used to bridge the gap between, on the one side, police officers and members of the community and, on the other side, a group of disenfranchised young people (Deuchar et al., 2014). The school police officer was instrumental in breaking down barriers and establishing greater levels of trust and social cohesion among the young people, police and local residents.

Interestingly, a view of the police found in some of the interviews and focus groups was that the police have a job to do and being nice to people is not part of that job. This came across most strongly in the focus group with the young people from Henbury. As one young person explained;

“police are not supposed to be nice ... they are supposed to be nice when you are getting bullied and the police end up being involved because they see it happening then they will be polite to you and nice ... they have to be nasty to the person who did something wrong” (15 year old male, Henbury)

This expectation of being “nasty to the person who did something wrong” might impact on a young person’s assessment of police performance. Nevertheless, the type of contact that most of the young people had with police was positive. The school provided a valuable space within which young people had and continued to develop a positive and trusting relationship with both police and PCSOs.

The opportunities to build trust and develop relationships with PCSOs (as opposed to police) were more open to the young people from each of the three areas involved in the evaluation. Contact with PCSOs was more regular and happened in school, youth project and in the community. Young people referred to PCSOs by name and some of the young people talked about situations where they reported incidents to them as well as had informal conversations. However, some of the young people had not spoken to any of the PCSOs prior to the Police and Young People Together Project.

The young people from Henbury and Lawrence Weston shared similar views about the PCSOs. Many of the young people were introduced to them at school, and built up familiarity due to their visibility within the community. This point can be illustrated by the following quote from a 14 year old female from Lawrence Weston. She described the first time that she came into contact with a PCSO at school and her thoughts on them.

“Yeah like when we first went into the like ... went into there and he came like I am a PCSO I am here to help you if you have got anything, any questions and everything like that ... they are just generally nice people just to talk to and like we see them a lot around Lawrence Weston and the school and everything” (14 year old female).

The PCSOs that she referred to were those who attended the sessions. The key point is that young people described their relationships with the PCSOs as positive before the project.

Negative contact

There is extensive evidence that attitudes towards police can be increased or decreased by the type of contact that young people have with them (Hinds, 2007, 2009; Murphy, 2015). The young people talked about negative encounters with police or associated practices that led them to re-evaluate their views. The negative encounters included antisocial behaviour and crime reporting incidents, hearing stories about police misconduct and feeling harassed by the police. This type of re-evaluation was found in three of the seven interviews with young people.

A young female from Lawrence Weston explained that she did have a positive view of the police, but this changed as she got older;

“Yeah it was quite nice what I remember of it but I think as I got older they gave me a bad impression basically ...” (14 year old female)

The young person went on to explain that the bad impression that she has of the police was formed following an incident at school, where the teacher got a PCSO involved. The incident happened a year or so previous to the project, but she explained that;

“I basically reported it to one of my teachers which went to the police and {PCSO} ... kind of had an idea about like she said oh I might have to take this to the police like we will have a chat about it first and see what you want me to do about all that and I was like I don’t mind I just want something to be done ... but nothing has really happened about it that I know” (14 year old female)

The young person expressed a feeling of being let down by this individual police community support officer. In other parts of the interview when we talked about the police in general or crime reporting she returned to this incident as a way of rationalising or justifying her reluctance to report crime to the police in the future. However, this experience did not impact on her view of the other police community support officer. This view was, to an extent, re-evaluated following her involvement in the police sessions. This point will be returned to in Part 2.

The influence of how young people view the police’s response to a crime reporting incident on the assessments of young people of the police was also evident in the focus group with young people from Henbury. This point was raised by one of the young people who described an incident that happened to a friend and how the police responded to a call for help;

“basically when my friend got hurt by a gang of girls the police, they didn’t do nothing ... they phoned them and they said they would turn up later that evening ... his mum waiting up but they didn’t turn up ... they waited in the morning and they didn’t turn up” (15 year old male, Henbury).

This example is interesting as the person in question was not at the focus group but most of the young people who were at the focus group were aware of this incident. In addition, they talked about a similar crime reporting incident concerning a young person, also not at the

focus group. There is evidence in the research literature that young people share stories about police misconduct and negative contact with the police with their friends (Norman, 2009). The practice of sharing stories impacts upon attitudes towards the police.

Young people were also exposed to stories about police misconduct in the family. The negative view of the police, for the young person, was because of family members long history of negative police contact or police misconduct during an arrest;

“negative because they have had bad experiences with I have got quite a few uncles so it might become quite confusing ... one of the youngest uncle so not much older than me doesn’t really get along with the police because he was quite naughty growing up ... My auntie had a bad experience because a police officer grabbed her throat” (LW female 1).

Around half of the young people interviewed and those who participated in the focus groups described their families’ view of the police as negative. This was particularly negative amongst the three young people from Southmead who were interviewed. Similar to the influence of peers, there is evidence that stories of police misconduct shared among family members can influence young peoples’ attitude toward the police (Clayman and Skins, 2012; Leiber et al., 1998; Romain and Hassell, 2014; Stewart et al., 2014).

A 14 year old male from Southmead described incidents where he felt discriminated against by the police because of his dad’s history with them. This young male lived in Southmead with his mum, who he was a young carer for. He said that his views of the police were positive until the age of 12. His dad is currently serving a long prison sentence, and his brothers have a history of negative police contact. However, he explained that this did not influence his view of the police, until a recent incident;

“they’d seen me on the blue shelter with a crowd of people I’d say a couple of months ago now. They weren’t known to the police, we was all just sat there doing like, we was on top of the blue shelter ... it was like half seven, like half eight like I said um they came up to use. And they went oh you’re {name} then and I went yeah and then they was like, oh where’s your dad. Even though they knew, and then I they was like, oh yeah sorry I forgot he’s in prison, he’s doing nearly life and like they

wanted me to say something, like they wanted me to swear at them” (14 year old male).

This particular young person talked about other occasions where he had either seen police misconduct or where he had heard friends talk about police misconduct. In particular, the young person explained that there was a police officer in particular who he did not like. His perspective was that other young people in Southmead experience similar problems with this particular officer. He explained;

“I have been brought up like, like stories like you have heard loads of things like everyone has had encounters with like him and he has always stirred stuff up and he is just one of the officers who thinks that he is all that because he has got police on the back of his top” (14 year old male).

The view of the police that he described and the stories of police misconduct, from what he and others explained appeared to be embedded in the youth culture of which he is part of.

Thoughts on what the police think of your area

Finally, the ‘before’ questionnaire included a question about what the young people thought the police think of the area in which they live. Not all of the young people answered this question but all of the responses of those that did are presented below. It is important to stress that all of the responses to this question are cited below.

Henbury

“I think they think it is ok because they never have to come there” (Female 11-13)

“It could use some work on” (Male 14-16)

“That everyone is trouble makers and cannot be trusted. Always up to something unless you’re well dressed and middle aged mothers” (Female 14-16)

“There’s a lot of problems” (Male 14-16)

“Don’t think its very good, lots of trouble, not very safe” (Female 11-13)

There’s a lot of trouble in the area (Female 14-16)

“They don’t like it because they are round there so often” (Female 11-13)

“Amazing” (Male 14-16)

“That is not a very nice place to live in because a lot of things happen there” (Male 14-16)

“Okay” (Male 14-16)

“It’s loud in the area and it has thieves” (Female 14-16)

“It’s alright” (Male 11-13)

“Rough” (Female 14-16)

Lawrence Weston

“That’s its full of trouble because the police are always around” (Female 17-19)

“they probably think it is quite a rough area” (Male 17-19)

“It’s a troubled area” (Female 14-16)

“They think it is a terrible place” (Male)

“Im not sure” (Female 17-19)

“Hardwork” (Female 14-16)

“Troubled are” (Male 17-19)

“There are some good people” (Male)

“Not too bad” (Female 11-13)

“I don’t no” (Female 14-16)

“A bit trampy” (Male 17-19)

Southmead

“They might think that it’s a bit mad because load of people get into trouble (Female 11-13)

“They think it full of spozzes and tramps” (Female 11-13)

“It is disgusting” (Female 14-16)

“That’s its full of trouble” (Female 11-13)

“They don’t care about the community and they don’t help help” (Male 14-16)

“The police think the area is alright, with limited problems” (Male 20-25)

“Its rough full of bad behaved people” (Male 17-19)

“Disgusting and vile” (Female 11-13)

Young people believe that the police have a very negative perception of their community. This raises questions about the impact of this perception on nature of the police-youth relations.

Part 2

The Police and Young People Together sessions provided an opportunity for police community support officers to work with young people in order to build trust and improve their relationships. The participation of PCSOs varied between each of the areas. This limited the extent of relationship building. In Southmead, a police community support officer was interviewed by the young people for their documentary. In Henbury, two PCSOs attended a question and answer session. In Lawrence Weston, contact was planned, consistent and happened over a longer period of time. Although young people did meaningful work during police sessions, the focus of this section is on relationship building and the impact of this on antisocial behaviour and crime reporting.

Young people's views on the police sessions

The young people who took part in the interviews and focus groups provided a number of reasons for why they decided to attend the police sessions. These included; there was nothing else to do; they were invited to go along by the youth workers; their friends were going along; the police sessions sounded interesting; to get support from the police; learn how to prevent and report bullying. The young people did not express an interest in getting to know or improve their relationship with police or police community support officers. For the majority of young people, however, the presence of police and/or police community support officers at the sessions did not discourage them from attending. The young people who did respond negatively to the idea of police attending youth sessions were those from Southmead.

The activities delivered during the police sessions were diverse and there were noticeable differences in how the Police and Young People Together Project was interpreted and delivered by the youth projects. There were also difference in the level of organisation, structure of the sessions, consistency and duration of the police sessions across the three areas.

The 'after' questionnaire included questions about what they liked most and what they least liked about the activities and why. What they liked most varied between each area and among the young people, but there were common themes. The main themes were having an opportunity to interact and talk to the PCSOs as well as socialise with other young people. The following quotes are taken directly from the questionnaires. In response to the question about what they liked most, the young people answered;

"Having conversations with them"; "Getting to know them and what they are about"; "making friends with the police"; "PCSOs joining in"; "doing stuff with friends"; "doing stuff after school"; "I liked it because they are interesting"; "Because I like the police"; "The food"; "Having fun"; "PCSOs were respectful"; "playing games"; "I think it is very helpful for young people to know what to do and not to do"; and "To have a voice as a young person".

What they liked least about the police session also varied, but there were some common themes. The main theme was that the sessions were too long and uninteresting. In response to the question about what they liked least, the young people answered;

"The length of the session"; "Session was a bit too long"; "Sessions were boring"; "low attendance"; "When you just sit down for a discussion"; "When they ask a lot of us"; "When the youth centre is closed"; "It was too long"; and "annoying people".

Interestingly, what the young people did not like about the session did not include the attendance of the PCSOs. In fact, a high percentage of young people responded to the question in the questionnaire that they would like police and police community support officers to attend more youth sessions.

In Lawrence Weston, when the young people were asked openly about their experiences of the police sessions they talked about sessions and activities which had a fun element built-in and sessions that allowed for informal conversations with the PCSOs. Interestingly, the police community support officers talked about similar sessions to the young people when asked the same question. The PCSOs explained that these were activities or icebreakers that youth workers used to prepare the young people for the main activity. A young person from

Lawrence Weston gave an example of where an activity was both fun and encouraged interaction with PCSOs;

“Well we made cookies and like because everyone wanted a cookie they participated and what we had to do we had to decorate them and we had you had a choice of like a mobile phone, a computer, a laptop like that sort of thing and we had to decorate it and then we had to make it like a social network site for cyber bullying which I thought was quite good plus the police also got involved and they made their own and it was just fun” (14 year old female).

The young person went on explain that these were sessions where they talked most to the PCSOs, and where the officers initiated contact and conversation with them. Importantly, the PCSOs talked about these sessions as good opportunities to build trust and relationships with young people.

The views of the young people from Southmead were very positive about the experience of making the documentary. In the youth sessions that I attended, I noticed that at the start of the process the young people talked a lot about the Panorama documentary that was shown on the BBC back in October 2009. Although the documentary was 6 years old, many of the young people were keen to present a positive side to their community. This view was captured in an interview with one of the young people;

“Yeah they just give the negative side and not positive about Southmead ... they always just say oh it’s a bad place like it’s a bad place to be in. It’s stupid because they don’t know the whole side ... Panorama came in like a documentary about Southmead and there was racism but that was ... back in 2006/2007 and its 2015 now and things have changed” (14 year old male).

This appeared to be the motivation for some of the young people to make the documentary. Many of the young people who started the documentary dropped out, though those who stayed to the end said that they enjoyed learning about film making, such as editing the film as well as representing their community. The young people who stayed to the end described being positively affected by the experience. The young person who was interviewed explained that the documentary improved his confidence.

In Henbury, the views of the young people were limited due to the number of times that they met with the PCSOs. The young people who attended the question and answer session at Henbury said that they enjoyed the opportunity to ask questions about crime and antisocial behaviour to the PCSOs. This view was expressed in the questionnaires and further iterated in the focus group with the young people. Furthermore, during the focus group a few of the young people talked about enjoying informal conversations with the police community support officers after the police session.

Impact on the relationship between young people and police community support officers

The young people from Henbury and Lawrence Weston reported having some formal and informal contact and/or an existing relationship with the PCSOs prior the Police and Young People Together Project. One of them worked at the school, and the other was regularly visible in the community and/or visited the youth project. The nature of the relationship with the PCSO based in the school was described by one of the participants;

“I talk to {police community support officer} a lot and like she ... I always talk to her even when it's not really a problem I just generally she generally comes up to me and asks me how my day is going” (14 year old female)

Nevertheless, not all of the young people had had formal or informal contact or conversations with the PCSOs before the police sessions. The impact of the police sessions on relationships was most noticeable in young people from Lawrence Weston and Southmead for different reasons. In Henbury, the young people did not report or describe any significant changes to their relationship with the PCSOs. This could be related to the limited time that they had to interact with them.

The impact of the Police and Young People Together Project on relationships was, to a certain extent, different for each individual. Some of the young people were happier to interact and talk with the PCSOs than others. The young people who took part in the interviews and focus groups talked about the impact of informal conversations and feeling listened to on levels of trust in the PCSOs. This impact can be captured by the following quote from a couple of focus group participants from Lawrence Weston;

“You just like you gain trust in them because you like talk to them more and you are giving each other’s opinions and listening to each other” (14 year old female)

“Um he kind of listens to your point of view if that makes sense and then he will give his ... yeah” (13 year old female)

The opportunity to establish trust with the police community support officers was not the only outcome of the police sessions for the young people. The 14 year old female whose view of the PCSO changed following a crime reporting incident at school said that her view of the PCSO had improved. This re-evaluation, she went on to explain, was in part influenced by a greater understanding of the PCSO role. In response to a question about changes to her relationship with the police community support officers she explained that;

“I realised how much work she had. I was, I am more considerate of how I speak now towards her like before I might have been disrespectful like I wouldn’t want to speak to her I might blank her now and then but because I know kind of how much work she gets and how difficult it can be so I am kind of I am more really considerate” (14 year old female).

The young person had the view that the police community support officer “just sat in her office all day at the school rather than doing stuff”. Getting to know the PCSO was also about getting to know what other activities she carried out. The young person was still reluctant to report crime, though the relationship building activities at the youth project had improved her perception of the PCSO’s performance.

The lack of police attendance at the Southmead Police and Young People Together Project had a negative impact on the attitudes of the young people towards the police. The young people were aware that the police had been invited to attend the police sessions. Although they were resistant to the idea of police being there, their lack of attendance reinforced a view expressed by the young people that the police do not care about them.

In addition, the young person who was interviewed for the evaluation explained that on the way home from one of the police sessions he was stopped and searched by the police. The following quote from his interview describes his experience;

“I was coming back from this I was just finished at the youth project ... I was on my bike and I had a coat on and ... I seen a police car go past me a couple of times and I was like ok so I got on the road turned my lights on so they knew where I was ... they got out of the car ... they literally pulled me off my bike and put both knees on my shoulder blade and one on the centre of my back so I couldn't move and so I am like kind of getting like distressed because I didn't know what was going on because I never actually had that before ... I asked the lady officer what was going on she goes um shut your mouth or you are going to get into more trouble ... so I just shut my mouth” (14 year old male).

The young person explained that this was the first time that this had ever happened to him. However, it reinforced his belief that the police do not have respect for young people in Southmead.

Impact on antisocial behaviour

It was hypothesised that the Police and Young People Together Project would reduce antisocial behaviour among the young people who attended the sessions. The quantitative data did not reveal any meaningful changes in levels of antisocial behaviour. The topic of antisocial behaviour was explored with young people in the interviews and focus groups at Henbury, Lawrence Weston and Southmead. The focus was on what young people thought about antisocial behaviour and whether they had a better understanding or greater awareness of what was antisocial and what was not.

Some of the young people had an increased knowledge of antisocial behaviours, whilst others said that they already had an awareness of antisocial behaviour. For example, the 14 year old male interviewed in Southmead said;

“Um no nothing I knew all the basics about stuff that's all we ran over like talked about antisocial behaviour, crime and theft and obviously drugs but I've always like knew what was wrong and what was right so I didn't really change any of my point of view so I just knew what was going on” (14 year old male).

On the topic of awareness of antisocial behaviour this young person then went on to say;

“some people just think oh I am not going to listen to it and just go by their own rules” (14 Year old male).

The main impact on the young people was an understanding of the wider influence of antisocial behaviour and crime on the community. This topic came up during police sessions that were observed by the researcher in Lawrence Weston and in interviews and focus groups with the young people.

Impact on crime reporting

It was also hypothesised that improvements in the relationship between police and young people would contribute to improvements in the reporting of crime by young people. The general impact of the project was on improving understandings of the many ways that young people can report crime as well as revealing the people that they would contact in such a situation.

The young people from each area were aware of the typical ways of reporting crime and explained that if a crime was serious then they would be happy to report it to the police. Crimes that were not serious, such as having your bike or phone stolen, according to the young people, they said they would not report it. Crimes involving physical or harm against a young person or elderly person they would report to the police. However, if the crime did not involve them then they would not report it to the police. The reason for this was that “it is none of your business so you shouldn’t report it” and you “would get called a grass”. The young people in Southmead explained that you can tell the police about the crime but if you give any names to the police then you are a grass. This particular topic was not explored in any significant depth with the young people.

The majority of the young people said that they had not reported a crime. However, when asked to describe what they would do, most of the young people said that they would approach a friend or family member about what to do. As this young person described;

“I would tell my mum and dad and all that and then they would probably tell like youth workers or whatever and then the youth worker could give advice on what they should do” (14 year old female).

The young people from Southmead who did talk about crime reporting explained that they would always speak to a family member about it.

The young people from Henbury and Lawrence Weston talked about reporting an incident to the school police officer or PCSO. This, in part, depended upon the nature of the relationship between the young person and police or PCSO. The young people who had a good relationship with an individual police officer or police community support officer said that they would go to them for advice. The young people who had a relationship or felt comfortable speaking with the school police officer and/or police community support officer said that they would be happy to talk to them;

“I would like say go to school because we have police and stuff in school and just tell one of the ones in school” (13 year old female).

“Well we have got {name of police community support officer} who comes here she is really nice I get along with her quite well she deals with things how like I would” (14 year old female)

The young person from Southmead had the worse attitude towards the police. However, he explained to me that if he needed to talk to a police officer about anything then he would speak to his mum’s friend;

“my mum knows like one of the officers and they have been friends for years since they’ve grown up and then obviously so like if I need anything like serious going on I would try contact him or go straight to my mum because my mum has got his like it’s not his work phone his normal mobile number so I would contact him to see if he can off duty like some up and talk to me and see what I could do about it and then I wouldn’t actually ring up the police station” (14 year old male).

The young person from Southmead did not associate the police community support officers with crime reporting. In fact, in the interview he explained that the PCSO, from what he understands, was from the council and not the police;

“they are like promoted by the council ... so they aint really nothing so I wouldn’t really speak to them a lot about like if I am getting threats I wouldn’t really speak to them about stuff anyway” (14 year old male)

The young people talked about barriers to reporting a crime. For some of the young people, this was not necessarily to do with being seen as a snitch or grass. A young person explained that if he thought that a crime was serious enough to report to the police then he would report it. But, the problem is that the police would not do anything about it. There was a view that the police do not act on the report;

“oh it’s like we would come back to that in a minute but it’s actually a bigger situation than you would ever think of it say like oh you are getting threats then threats turn to violence and violence turns into like houses being like or cars being burnt out and then it builds on but police thinks oh it’s only a threat it might not happen ... the police need to act on stuff quicker and it takes so long (14 year old male).

The judgements about police performance underpinned many of the young people reasons for reporting or not reporting crime.

Summary

The purpose of this section was to represent the views and experiences of the young people who took part in the Police and Young People Together Project. The impact on the relationships with the PCSOs and how this affected antisocial behaviour and crime reporting varied between the projects, as well as the young people who took part. In some cases, the lack of involvement of the police in the project negatively impacted upon the young people. On the other hand, the project allowed young people to build familiarity and trust with the PCSOs.

Section 5: Results from quantitative analysis

This section will present results from the analysis of the quantitative data that were collected from the young people before and after the Police and Young People Together Project. Due to the key problems that were outlined in the methodology section of this report, there are limits to what is meaningful to say about the quantitative data. In this respect, the main limitations are the number of young people who took part in the project, coupled with the high number of young people who dropped out. This meant that only a small number of young people actually started and completed the Police and Young People Together Project. There were a couple of results that did reach the level of statistical significance. The section will be structured around the main variables that were measured. This is contact with police; victim of crime; attitudes toward police; police legitimacy; attitude towards PCSOs; report crime to police; and report crime to PCSOs.

Contact with police

The young people were asked two questions in the questionnaire about prior contact with police. They were asked if they had ever been arrested by the police and if they had ever been stopped by the police. Out of the 53 young people who participated in the evaluation, 10 had been arrested and 27 had been stopped by police. Four of them were from Henbury, 4 from Southmead and 2 from Lawrence Weston. Out of the 27 who had been stopped, 10 were from Lawrence Weston, 9 from Henbury and 8 from Southmead. A greater proportion of the police contact was reported by young people in Southmead.

Victims of crime

In addition, the young people were asked two questions about prior victimisation. They were asked if they had ever been a victim of crime and, separately, if they had been a victim of crime in the past month. Out of the 53 young people, 26 had been a victim of crime, whilst 18 had been a victim of crime in the past month. Twelve of them who had been a victim of crime were from Henbury, 7 from Lawrence Weston and 7 from Southmead. Seven of those who had been a victim of crime in the past month were from Henbury, 7 from Southmead and 4 from Lawrence Weston. A greater proportion of the victimisation was reported by young people in Southmead.

Attitudes toward police

Young people were asked about their attitudes towards the police. The police attitude scores are measured between 1 and 6, with one being a more positive attitude and 6 a more negative attitude. The scores for the young people who completed the 'before' questionnaire for Henbury were 2.4 and 2.6 for Lawrence Weston. However, the score for Southmead was considerably worse, at 4.1. The score for the influence of family and friends on their attitudes was 2.5 for Henbury, 2.5 for Lawrence Weston and 5.5 for Southmead.

The scores for the young people who started and finished the project were very different. In Southmead, the score was 1.7, 2.5 in Henbury and in 3.8 in Lawrence Weston. After the project, the Henbury score became more positive at 2.7 and the Lawrence Weston score also became more positive at 2.8. However, the score for Southmead became more negative at 2.1. The young people who dropped out in Henbury scored 2.5, and in Lawrence Weston scored 2.4 and 4.2 in Southmead.

Perceptions of police legitimacy

Young peoples' perception of police legitimacy was measured using the same 1 to 6 scoring range as above. The legitimacy scores for the young people who completed the questionnaire at the beginning were 2 for Henbury, 2.3 for Lawrence Weston and 3.7 for Southmead. The legitimacy scores for the young people who started and finished the project in Southmead remained at 1.3. The scores for Henbury and Lawrence Weston were the same. They started at 3 and finished at 2.7. The scores for the young people who dropped out were 2 in Henbury, 2.3 in Lawrence Weston and 3.8 in Southmead.

Attitudes towards police community support officers

Young people were asked about their attitudes towards PCSOs. The attitude scores are measured between 1 and 6, with one being a more positive attitude and 6 a more negative attitude. The scores for the young people who completed the 'before' questionnaire were 2.3 Lawrence Weston, 2.8 Henbury and 3.5 Southmead. The scores for the influence of family and friends was 2.5 Lawrence Weston, 3.5 Henbury and 5 Southmead.

The scores for the young people who started and finished the project were very different. Similar to the scores for the attitudes towards the police, young people in Southmead started at 1.5 and finished more negative at 1.8. The scores for the young people in Henbury started at 3.1 and finished at 2.3. In Lawrence Weston, the scores started at 3 and improved to 2.1 at the end. The young people who dropped out of the project scored 2.3 in Henbury and Lawrence Weston, but 5.5 in Southmead.

Levels of antisocial behaviour

Self-reported antisocial behaviour was generally low amongst the young people who completed the questionnaire. There were no statistically significant differences in the self-reported scores before and after the Police and Young People Together Project. The following tables show the relevant antisocial behaviour scores for the three areas involved in the evaluation.

Henbury Results

Table 1: Frequency counts for the Henbury group across the seven antisocial behaviour indicators for Group 1 (N = 6) who completed the before and after measures; Group 2 (N = 19) who completed the before measures only and Group 3 (N = 4) who completed the after measures only.

Antisocial behaviour (past month) Yes or No counts	Group 1		Group2		Group 3	
	B	A	B	A	B	A
1. Damaged or set first to a motor vehicle	1	1	1		1	
2. Throwing litter on the ground	4	3	13		3	
3. Vandalism, graffiti or other deliberate damage to property	1	1	5		2	
4. Getting drunk or being aggressive in a public space	1	0	4		2	
5. Using illegal drugs	0	0	1		1	
6. Dealing drugs	0	0	0		0	
7. Hanging around in groups on the streets	6	6	10		4	

Table 1 shows that there is no difference between the before and after measures for Group 1 for indicator 1. Seventeen percent of the young people reported this indicator before and after the project. The counts for Groups 2 and 3 are also low, with 2% of Group 2 and 25% of Group 3 reporting this indicator. There is a difference in the before and after measures for

Group 1 for indicator 2. Sixty seven percent reported it before, whilst 50% reported this indicator after. Sixty eight percent of Group 2 and 75% of Group 3 reported it. For indicator 3, there is no difference between the before and after measures for Group 1, with 17% reporting this indicator before and after the project. Twenty six percent of Group 2 and 50% of Group 3 reported this indicator.

There was one less count for Group 1 before compared to after for indicator 4. Seventeen percent reported it before the project, whilst no young person reported it after. Twenty one percent of Group 2 and 50% of Group 3 reported this indicator. There were no counts for indicator 5 before and after the intervention. However, 5% of Group 2 and 25% of Group 3 reported this antisocial behaviour. There were no counts for indicator 6 before and after the intervention for Group 1, and for Groups 2 and 3. There was no difference between the before and after measures for Group 1 for indicator 7. One hundred percent of Group 1 reported this indicator before and after the intervention, whilst 53% of Group 2 and 100% of Group 3 reported it. In summary, there were small reductions in the counts for indicators 2 and 4 for Group 1.

Lawrence Weston Results

Table 2: Frequency counts for the Lawrence Weston group across the seven indicators for Group 1 (N = 7) who complete the before and after measures; Group 2 (N = 10) who completed the before measures only and Group 3 (N = 3) who completed the after measures only.

Antisocial behaviour (past month) Yes or No counts	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3	
	B	A	B	A	B	A
1. Damaged or set first to a motor vehicle	0	0				0
2. Throwing litter on the ground	4	6	6			2
3. Vandalism, graffiti or other deliberate damage to property	0	4	0			2
4. Getting drunk or being aggressive in a public space	1	3	1			1
5. Using illegal drugs	2	2	0			0
6. Dealing drugs	0	1	0			0
7. Hanging around in groups on the streets	5	5	1			3

Table 2 shows that there is no difference between the before and after measures for Group 1 for indicator 1. There were no counts for Group 1 and Groups 2 and 3 for this indicator. There was an increase for indicator 2 for Group 1. It increased from 57% before the project to 86% after the project. Sixty percent of Group 2 and 67% of Group 3 reported this antisocial behaviour. There was an increase between the before and after measures for indicator 3 for Group 1. It increased from 0% before the project to 43% at the end. There were no participants from Group 2 who reported this indicator, though 67% of Group 3 did report it.

There was an increase in the measures for indicator 4 for Group 1. It increased from 14% before the project to 42% after the project. Ten percent of Group 2 and 43% of Group 3 reported this indicator. There is no difference between the before and after measures for Group 1 for indicator 5, with 29% reporting it at the beginning and then again at the end. However, no participants from Groups 2 and 3 reported this indicator. There was an increase in indicator 6 for Group 1. It increased from 0% before the project to 14% at the end. However, no participants from Groups 2 and 3 reported this indicator. There is no difference between the before and after measures for Group 1 on indicator 7, with 71% reporting it before and after the project. Ten percent of Group 2 and 100% of Group 3 reported this indicator. In summary, there were increases in indicators 2, 3, 4 and 6 for Group 1.

Southmead Results

Table 3: Frequency counts for the Southmead group across the seven indicators for Group 1 (N = 3) who complete the before and after measures; Group 2 (N = 8) who completed the before measures only and Group 3 (N = 8) who completed the after measures only.

Antisocial behaviour (past month) Yes or No counts	Group 1		Group 2		Group 3	
	B	A	B	A	B	A
1. Damaged or set first to a motor vehicle	0	0	3		2	
2. Throwing litter on the ground	2	1	8		6	
3. Vandalism, graffiti or other deliberate damage to property	0	0	4		2	
4. Getting drunk or being aggressive in a public space	3	3	4		2	
5. Using illegal drugs	0	0	3		0	
6. Dealing drugs	0	0	3		0	

7. Hanging around in groups on the streets**1 1****8****7**

Table 3 shows that there is no difference between the before and after measures for Group 1 for indicator 1. No participants from Group 1 reported this indicator. However, 37% of Group 2 and 25% of Group 3 reported this indicator. There was a decrease in the before and after measures for Group 1 for indicator 2. It decreased from 67% before the project to 33% after the project. No participants from Group 1 reported indicator 3 before and after the project. However, 50% of Group 2 and 25% of Group 3 reported this indicator. There is no difference between the before and after measures for Group 1 for indicator 4, with 100% of the group reporting this indicator. However, 50% of Group 2 and 25% of Group 3 reported this indicator.

There were no reported counts for indicator 5 for Group 1 before and after the project. Thirty seven percent of Group 2 and 0% of Group 3 reported this indicator. There were no reported counts for indicator 6 for Group 1 before and after the project, though 37% of Group 2 and 0% of Group 3 reported this indicator. There is no difference in the before and after measures for Group 1 for indicator 7. However, 37% percent reported it before and after. One hundred percent of Group 2 and 87% of Group 3 reported this indicator. In summary, the scores for Group 1 were very low compared to the Group 1 from Henbury and Lawrence Weston. There was only a difference in indicator 2, which went down after the project.

Report crime to the police

The young people were asked about if they would go to a police officer for help if they needed it. The responses ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The average response for the young people who completed the 'before' questionnaire in Henbury was agree and in Lawrence Weston and Southmead it was somewhat agree. The responses for the young people at the beginning of the project who started and finished the project in Southmead were agreed and in Henbury and Lawrence Weston they were disagree. There were improvements in the responses at the end of the project for each area. In Henbury and Lawrence Weston it was somewhat agree and in Southmead it was strongly agree.

Report crime to police community support officer

The young people were asked about if they would go to a PCSO for help if they needed it. The responses ranged from strongly agree to strongly disagree. The average response for the young people who completed the 'before' questionnaire in Lawrence Weston was agree, in Henbury it was somewhat agree, though in Southmead it was somewhat disagree. The responses for the young people at the beginning of the project who started and finished the project in Southmead were strongly agree and in Henbury and Lawrence Weston they were somewhat agree. There were improvements in the responses at the end of the project for two of the areas. In Henbury and Lawrence Weston it changed to agree and in Southmead it remained at strongly agree.

Statistical tests

A number of statistical tests concerning the relationship between young people in the project and police, and young people in the project and the PCSOs' achieved positive statistically significant results when comparing those relationships at the start of the project and again at the conclusion of it, in relation to those young people that completed the projects. There was no significant difference in the number of times young people have been the victim of crime when comparing those that completed the projects with those that started but did not finish. A Fisher's Exact Probability test confirmed that there was no difference in the proportions of participants who produced this response $p>0.05$.

Using Fisher's Exact Probability test, there was no significant difference between the young people who completed the project and those that did not in terms of 'being stopped by the police' $p>0.05$ or 'being arrested by the police' $p>0.05$.

There was no significant difference between young people who completed the project and those that started but did not finish on a measure of perception regarding whether the police were friendly or not $p>0.05$ (Fisher's Exact Probability). This perception did not alter for the group who completed the projects ($t = 1.165$, $df = 15$, $p>0.05$).

The results for those young people who completed the projects from start to finish ($N = 16$) for 'attitude towards police', were as follows:

Using a 'Spearman's rho ρ ' (rho ρ) test there was an improved attitude towards the police at the end of the project compared to the start (rho ρ = .529; $p < 0.05$).

There was an increased willingness for young people go to a PCSO for help after the project compared to before (rho ρ = .557; $p < 0.05$).

Summary

This section presented results from the analysis of the quantitative data collected from the young people at the beginning and end of the Police and Young People Together Project. Due to the problems that were outlined in the methodology section, there are limits to what is meaningful to say about the above results. However, the results give some indication about the contact that young people have with the police as well as how many of them had been a victim of crime. Furthermore, they give an indication about the attitudes that young people have towards police and PCSOs and whether they would go to them for help if they needed it. This included those who dropped out of the project. However, there were two results that reach the level of statistical significance. There were statistically significant improvements in attitudes towards the police at the end of the project compared to the start, and an increased willingness for young people to go to a PCSO for help after the project compared to the start. These were found in the young people who started and finished the project.

Section 6: Views of the Police and Community Support Officers

This section of the report will look at findings from the interviews with PCSOs. This section is divided into two parts. Part 1 will discuss findings from the first set of interviews with the PCSOs. It will discuss opportunities that already exist where police community support officers are able to build trust and relationships with young people. This will be complimented by a discussion of the styles or techniques employed by PCSOs to engage with young people in these situations. It will then look at how these relationships have been utilised by police community support workers in the course of their work. Part 2 will discuss findings from the second set of interviews with the PCSOs. It will discuss the influence of information sharing and communication between youth project and policing team on the levels of commitment made to the project. In addition, it will discuss the PCSOs' views on the target group and the impact of the project on their relationship with young people, antisocial behaviour and crime reporting.

Part 1

Opportunities to engage with young people

The Police and Young People Together Project aimed to provide police and young people with opportunities to build trust and develop meaningful relationships. Although many of the wider concerns about police-youth relations relate to police officers, police community support officers were selected to take part in the project. The researcher found that PCSOs currently have opportunities to create familiarity with young people and to build trust and develop relationships. These can be described as regular and irregular opportunities. These themes were common across the interview data.

The PCSOs talked about school as a place that provided regular opportunities to interact and participate in both informal and formal conversations with a wide range of young people. In fact, one of the police community support officers talked about how much easier it was to build relationships with young people in school than it was outside of school. Although he was not currently working in a school, he explained that;

“I used to work in a school as part of this job and what I found by doing that is like you’d work in a school with the kids and they love you in school but then when you’re outside they hate you” (PCSO 4).

The extent that police community support officers visited the school varied. This depended on their role. This activity was more common in the two female PCSOs who were based at a school. The two male police community support officers talked about occasional school visits.

PCSOs described their interactions and conversations with young people in school as generally positive. They explained that whilst at school they were more visible to young people, which helped create familiarity with the police. When young people were more familiar with the officers, they explained, young people were more likely to approach them for help if they needed it. The young people approached the officers for a wide range of reasons. This helped young people see beyond the police uniform. As one of the police community support officers explained;

“they’ll come to me because they need help or, even if it was just a case that they needed a pen, they’ll come into the office and then they’ll start chatting and they’ll realise that actually you are human” (PCSO 2).

The significance of the school for building relationships with young people was mentioned by all of the police community support officers, though regular opportunities to build meaningful relationships was, to a certain extent, limited to those based at a school.

The relationships established in school allowed PCSOs to support young people on a wide range of issues. This included working with victims and offenders of antisocial behaviour and crime. In describing how a meaningful relationship developed with a young person who was involved in antisocial, one PCSO explained that;

“he trusts me now and it took him a little while but once he started trusting me, he started opening up more and more and more. We got him to go to counselling sessions at school, but he would only go if I went with him ... his behaviour has got massively better” (PCSO 3).

A similar experience was reported by the other school-based police and community support officer. In describing how relationships develop with young people and the importance of those relationships, she explained that;

“I’ve had kids divulge sexual incidents, I’ve had Facebook stuff, she said, I said, he said, that sort of stuff and then it goes onto how they get on with their parents ... and you get a blow by blow of how they’ve had an argument” (PCSO 2).

This evidence further supports existing findings that schools provide an environment within which police are able to establish meaningful relationships with young people, which can have positive impacts upon that attitudes and behaviour (Bowles, 2005; Lamont et al., 2011; Police Foundation, 2011).

In addition, PCSOs talked about the importance of building relationships not only with young people but also with family members. Involvement with young people at school opened up opportunities and lines of communication with families. This allowed police community support officers to support families and understand the wider context of the behaviour of the young person. As one PCSO explained;

“you get that time to spend with people, you get to know people, you get to kind of know the ins and outs of their family set up, problems with the kids which are generally who we are dealing with, so you’ve got that time to actually spend with people” (PCSO 3).

The importance of building positive relationships with families was part of an approach for tackling antisocial behaviour and crime as well as working with victims. This topic was mentioned by all of the police community support officers. This point can be illustrated by the following comment from one of the male PCSOs;

“if the relationship with the parent is good then it’s easier and that’s a case of going in and helping them because a lot of the time we’ll say, if I see so and so out and about past a certain time, do you just want me to ... bring him in? And they’re like, yes please you know they find that helpful, you do that once or twice suddenly they’ll be, they can be more cooperative with you” (PCSO 1)

Nevertheless, PCSOs also talked about the disadvantages of strengthening ties with families. This particular police community support officer went on to explain that sometimes family involvement can have unintended consequences. It might impact on the ability to build a trusting relationship with the young person.

Relationship building opportunities were not as regular for PCSOs who were not based in a school. Opportunities were found during street patrol, visits to the local youth club and when visiting families. However, these were hampered by limited resources. In response to a question about making time to engage with young people, one PCSO replied;

“the only engagement I really do is speaking to them when I’m patrolling and I can give them some time. If I’ve got things to do then I’ve got things to do you know, but most of the time I can stop and have two, five minute chat, it’s not a problem and then popping into youth clubs as and when I can get in, try and make it regularly, shift pattern doesn’t always allow it and then again what can you do about that”
(PCSO 1).

The other male PCSO explained that he found opportunities to engage with young people in informal conversations at the skate park and local youth clubs. Although he talked about the problem of resources, he went on to explain how he has noticed improvements in the relationships since attending these spaces;

“Like I said with the skate park quiet a lot and I attend youth clubs a lot to try and build relationships with the kids, I go in and chat to them, have a good laugh, play snooker, play pool, play a bit of basketball, play football ... spend as much time with them as possible to try and you know let the barrier loose if you like, yeah but again like I said due to funding its difficult because you can’t go out and do everything”
(PCSO 4)

Nevertheless, all of the PCSOs talked about very specific examples where contact and communication with certain young people or groups of young people were particularly challenging. These challenges were not restricted to the youth club or whilst out on patrol, they were also experienced at school. As the PCSO explained;

“You try and engage with him, you want to engage with him, he’ll walk off you know. He’ll cycle his bike ... say fuck off pig or he’ll say you know he can be quiet aggressive. No matter what I do, how I adapt my styles to him ... To me that’s difficult, that’s really really difficult and its hard work you know and they’ll shout out, oh can’t do fuck all anyway, you’re just a PCSO, you can’t do nothing, you can’t do nothing, that kind of attitude” (PCSO 4).

The regularity and ability to fully maximise the opportunities to build trust and meaningful relationships with young people varied amongst those who were interviewed. The school had many advantages in terms of providing a space within which to create familiarity and the type of continuity needed to build trust with young people. The value of school has been acknowledged elsewhere (Bowles, 2005; Lamont et al., 2011; Police Foundation, 2011). This is not to say that PCSOs are unable to build trust and relationships away from the school. It is to point out that these opportunities are restricted by a lack of resources.

Techniques for engaging young people

The opportunities outlined above were in many ways accompanied by personal techniques and styles used to interact and communicate with young people. The use of specific techniques was mentioned by each of the PCSOs. This was adequately described by one of the police community support officers as having a “personal style of dealing with young people” (PCSO 4). The common techniques mentioned included; the strategic use of gender; speaking to young people on their level or at a level they understand and can relate to; and principles and practices that fit well with the model of procedural justice (Hinds, 2007; Norman, 2009; Romain and Hassell, 2014). These were based on past experiences of interacting with young people as well as being adapted by the individual to suit the needs of the situation.

The PCSOs described the different responses that they received from young people because of their gender. The explained that young people from the opposite sex were less resistant to interacting and communicating with them;

“the girls will react better to {male PCSO} and the boys are always quite calm with me. So it’s almost like a macho thing with the boys ... I don’t know whether {he}

would agree with that, I'm sure he would, but it is almost easier because I'm not sure why they will always engage better with the opposite sex, from my experience"
(PCSO 2)

This technique of policing young people, according to the PCSO, provided an effective way of dealing with potentially challenging encounters with young people. This point was also acknowledged by one of the other police community support officers. For them, this approach depended upon the young person that they were interacting with as some young people reacted better than others. As one of the PCSOs explained;

"I kind of take them as I come you know some I get on with better, some I don't and some like, there's kids that are better with males than they are with females, so I'll take a step back and allow {male PCSO} to kind of speak to those because you can see that they just know they don't have that tolerance for me as a female rather than me as a community police officer" (PCSO 3).

The next technique was speaking to young people on their level or at a level that they understand and can relate to. This refers to the choice of words and the general language that they use when speaking to young people. The advantage of speaking to young people in a way that they can relate to and understand was talked about by one of the other police community support officers. He explained that;

"I kind of lower myself to their level and I'll use the same language as they use ... they'll open up to you and that breaks, that basically removes that barrier" (PCSO 4)

It is important to mention that the majority of the young people who took part in the focus group talked positively about this particular police community support officer. They identified him by name and explained that he was easy to talk to and very supportive.

Furthermore, the topic of communicating with young people came up during an interview with a PCSO who was based at a school. They were talking about a conversation with one of the young people at school who began to describe why he found her easy to talk to about personal issues. She explained that;

“I just speak how normal people do, I don’t use big long words that he doesn’t understand or great phrases in context, I sort of give it to him direct ... he can appreciate that more and he can relate to it so and he knows, he trusts me now and it took him a little while but once he started trusting me, he started opening up more and more and more” (PCSO 2).

The attention given to language was an important technique for communicating and interacting with young people. In contrast, one of the other PCSOs talked about their observations regarding how some police officers struggle to communicate with young people, and why they do not have the same success;

“it’s the way they deal with them, it’s the way that they’ll speak to the kids, they’ll go in there not giving them a chance to speak. Not giving them a chance to know you, understand what they want, what they need” (PCSO 4)

The consequences of not communicating openly and fairly with young people are recognised in the research literature on policing and young people. The evidence claims that this can lead to negative contacts and negative attitudes with police.

The final technique used by the PCSOs resonates with the extensive findings from the research literature on procedural justice theory (Hinds, 2007; Murphy, 2015; Norman, 2009; Romain and Hassell, 2014). This type of approach to policing was used by the police community support officers to help improve links with families. In describing how they approached the family, the PCSO explained;

“I treat people how I would like to be treated myself ... I would say who I am, what I’m hoping to achieve and sort of ask them for their help, if you like for their input. I ask them what their suggestions would be, what could make it easier and what could I do to help facilitate that” (PCSO 2)

In addition, the underlying principles and practices of procedural justice were used by police community support officers to interact and communicate with young people. In explaining how they engage young people who are at risk of, or who participate in, antisocial behaviour, the PCSO explained that;

“I think probably what we’ve done is we’ve treated them fairly you know yes we’ve dealt with them for criminal stuff, we’ve dealt with them for antisocial behaviour stuff but we’ve dealt with them fairly, we haven’t been horrible to them ... I think when you are dealing with people that aren’t going to go away, you have to have a rapport” (PCSO 1).

The techniques of procedural justice are recognised in national and international research studies on police as important in improving relations with the public, including young people (Hinds, 2007; Romain and Hassell, 2014). The accumulated effect of the exercise of these techniques over a longer period of time was captured by one of the PCSOs in the following quote;

“where we use to struggle getting on with some of our main criminal kids you know the ones nicking the bikes and things like that, but that’s changed a lot recently and we get on quite well before they never used to talk to us in the street or if they do, it would be kind of not abusive but derogatory and know we’ll quite happily go out and sit by the skate part ... and I’ll give them my hat and I know they’ll bring it back you know so there’s quite a good relationship there which has been quite interesting to see” (PCSO 1).

The researcher found that PCSOs use their familiarity and relationships with local young people to assist police officers with formal encounters with them. This point can be illustrated by the following quote;

“{we} were called to help with some transport for someone who had been arrested at the local shops ... there was a large gang of young people crowding round waiting to see what the officers were doing and ... they didn’t understand how to deal with young people. And when {we} got there, it was like, oh hello you lot, and right everyone move, come over here then, tell me what’s going on and because we’ve built up that relationship with them, it’s a lot easier for us to deal with things” (PCSO 2).

Furthermore, an additional benefit that was talked about by the police community support officers was that young people talked to their friends about them. Police community

support officers described situations where a young person approached them to say hello, referred to them by name and then explained that they know their brother or sister from school;

“I’m surprised sometimes when I go around and there’s people who I’ve never met who know who I am ... because my work in the school I’ll meet younger children that I haven’t met yet because they’re siblings are at school and they’ve been told about me” (PCSO 2).

A similar experience was reported by one of the other police community support officers;

“they know me and then they tell their brothers and sisters as well, so I get a lot of them you know just stop me and have a chat and wave and its purely because I got to know them, that’s the secret” (PCSO 3)

Telling stories about police negative interactions to friends has been reported in previous research as a significant influence on young people’s attitudes toward the police (Clayman and Skins, 2012; Leiber et al., 1998; Norman, 2009; Romain and Hassell, 2014; Stewart et al., 2014). However, this reveals the importance of positive encounters with police and how young people also tell stories about positive interactions.

Part2

PCSOs views on the Police and Young People Together Project

The level of involvement of the PCSOs varied across the three areas involved in the Police and Young People Together Project. In Lawrence Weston, the police community support officers attended 6 sessions at Juicy Blitz. In Henbury, they attended one session. However, in Southmead one police community support officer was interviewed for the documentary, but no member of the team were interviewed for the evaluation. The findings reported in this section will discuss common themes found in the interviews with police community support officers, though aspects of this section will inevitably be focused on Lawrence Weston.

Information available to officers, involvement in planning and ability to commit

Information about the Police and Young People Together Project was communicated to the policing teams before the project began by either an email from a senior police officer and/or an informal conversation with a youth worker. However, there was a general lack of awareness of the project and/or when the project was due to start until they were contacted by the researcher to discuss the evaluation. The researcher found himself answering lots of questions about the Police and Young People Together Project. This suggested that information about the project was not adequately communicated to the relevant policing teams. The lack of available information, in part, had an impact on the policing teams' ability to effectively plan and commit to police sessions.

The police community support officers reported different experiences of coming to know about the Police and Young People Together Project. On the one hand, one of the Lawrence Weston policing team received an email about the project, but was also informed about it by a youth worker from the youth project that delivered the Police and Young People Together Project. As one of the PCSOs from Lawrence Weston explained;

“I had knowledge of it but I didn't know that it had been clarified until {youth worker} told me that it had ... I knew ahead of the police in many ways” (PCSO 1)

On the other hand, the police community support officers from Henbury did not report receiving an email. Instead, they heard about the project when they were approached at school by one of the youth workers. The PCSO went on to say that she did not hear anything about the project from inside the police;

“it was all eternally, that was the first I heard of it ... if there was information inside the police it wasn't passed down to us” (PCSO 3)

Although information about the project was available, there was still some uncertainty about when the project was due to start. This point can be illustrated by the following quote;

“what I can remember we had an email to say this is happening and you will probably hear something about it and then next thing I know you've contacted me

and then I was sort of still a bit like oh I still don't really know what this is all about ... it was all of a sudden one day you get an email and you are like well what's that and then you are just expected to crack on" (PCSO 2).

In terms of Southmead, it is difficult to comment on the level of information available to them for reasons explained in the methodology section of this report. Although Lockleaze did not participate in the evaluation, the policing team was contacted by the researcher at the beginning of the project to arrange the first set of interviews. One of the PCSOs replied and a meeting was arranged. At the meeting there was some uncertainty and confusion about the Police and Young People Together Project. The officer said that they were involved in a number of projects with young people and they were not sure if they were involved in this one. The data collected through the interviews and experience of the researcher when attempting to organise meetings with the policing teams about the evaluation indicate that there was a general lack of information available to them.

Participation was not consistent across the policing teams who were involved in the Police and Young People Together Project. Southmead were not involved. Lockleaze were not involved in the evaluation so the planning and sharing of information between the youth project and police is uncertain. Lawrence Weston and Henbury were involved, but to varying degrees. The levels of participation and commitment to attend police sessions were, in part, associated with the sharing of information and the nature of the relationship between youth project and policing team. This point can be illustrated by a quote from one of the police community support officers from Lawrence Weston;

"we agreed to turn up, well they held it on Tuesdays but because of the shift pattern we could only make one Tuesday in three, I think that was it, every third Tuesday we could pop in ... with a shift pattern you know when you are available if you say yep I can make this Tuesday that Tuesday and that Tuesday ... we can give a set of dates because our shift pattern just rotates ... if you know you can say you're available then then and then and unless something major comes up and you have to cancel but I don't think we ever did ... there should be no issue with organising something" (PCSO 1)

This PCSO explained that although unexpected events may arise which they would need to respond to, they were able to fulfil their commitment to the project.

In contrast, the police community support officers from the policing team in Henbury described a very different experience. At the start of the project there was limited communication between them and the youth project. The police community support officers talked about not being aware of what the project was hoping to achieve, what was expected of them and when they would be asked to attend police sessions. In response to a question about the amount of communication and level of participation in the activities, one police community support officer replied by saying;

“I was asked to go up to the church twice and that was about the extent of our contact” (PCSO 3)

Unfortunately, on one of the two occasions they were unable to attend. The experiences reported by both policing teams are clearly different. On the one hand, the communication between the policing team and the youth project allowed for the flow of information about the project and, moreover, allowed for expectations and commitments to be discussed and finalised earlier in the project. On the other hand, the limited communication between the youth project and the policing team meant that information could not be effectively shared and disseminated.

Police community support officers' views of target group

The Police and Young People Together Project targeted young people between the ages of 12 and 19 who were at risk of antisocial behaviour and/or of becoming a victim of antisocial behaviour and/or crime. The police community support officers were not involved in recruiting young people into the project. The target group were identified and recruited by the youth projects. There was a general opinion put forward by the police community support officers that many of the young people who participated in this project did not fulfil the main criteria of the target group. The police community support officers mentioned that they were aware of young people who would have benefited from this project. The PCSOs explained that the young people who they were thinking about were not likely to attend youth projects;

“the kids that we would speak to and deal with on a regular basis that I’m thinking of ... they wouldn’t go to {youth club}, they wouldn’t go anywhere near it. You might get two or three that, but they tend to be again they’ll be the younger ones” (PCSO 3).

The opinion was that those who were recruited to the project were not those at risk of antisocial behaviour, but were more likely to be at risk of becoming a victim of crime. As one of the PCSOs put it;

“they are not the kids who cause antisocial behaviour ... they are likely to be victims unfortunately” (PCSO 1).

The quantitative data on the frequency of antisocial behaviour for this group revealed that there may be antisocial behaviour or behaviour of a less serious type that goes unnoticed.

On a related topic, the police community support officers talked about community perceptions of antisocial behaviour. They described the differences between, and challenges in terms of policing, perceived and actual antisocial behaviour;

“people will say Riding Leaze has got this huge problem with ASB, from our perspective it hasn’t, from being someone who’s out on the street and seeing it and going up there, there is no issue from where I am standing. I think that’s an issue that people have seen because of maybe the number of phone calls that have come in, where five or six people may have rang about the same thing, so that doesn’t make it five or six different things ... the perception of the antisocial behaviour is worse than what it actually is” (PCSO 2)

This acknowledgement of perception vs actual antisocial behaviour was also discussed by a police community support officer from the other policing team. This suggests that this view was not isolated to one area. They acknowledged the difference and explained that it is a challenge to reduce behaviour that is, to an extent, part of growing up. They explained that;

“its kind of how the residents perceive it or how we perceive it when you’re actually sat there watching it, you think oh they’re just kids being kids, having a bit of a laugh and a joke” (PCSO 4)

The challenge of tackling actual and perceived antisocial behaviour was recently acknowledged in a report commissioned by the Home Office (Mackenzie *et al.*, 2010). The acknowledgement of perceived antisocial behaviour points to a potential area for intervention, which also involves other groups from the community.

Police community support officers' views on police sessions

PCSOs talked about their involvement in discussions about the project at the beginning and then how their involvement changed as the project progressed. Similar to topics discussed above, there is variation in the level of involvement of policing teams in the Police and Young People Together Project. Lawrence Weston police community support officers attended the initial stakeholders meeting, where the Police and Young People Together Project was discussed with interested and relevant individuals. This was organised by the youth project and provided an open forum where matters relating to the delivery of the project as well as how it can further support the wider community were discussed. The youth projects in Henbury, Lockleaze and Southmead, in contrast, did not hold initial discussion meetings.

At the heart of the delivery of the project were planned and structured sessions within which young people and police community support officers participated in a wide range of activities. The activities were directed towards the objective of building trust and improving relationships and antisocial behaviour and crime reporting. The sessions were designed by the youth workers from the youth projects. However, police community support officers said that they could have been more involved in the longer term planning and design of the sessions. As one of the police community support officers suggested;

“the clues in the name isn't it? So the thing was we were invited like they would send us an email oh we are going to do this next week could you ... and I think it would have been useful if we were more involved in the conversation” (PCSO 2)

The first and second set of interviews revealed that the PCSOs have experience of interacting and communicating with young people from the target group in their day to day activities. This resource was underutilised in the project. The experience and techniques for engaging with young people were illustrated in Part 1. Furthermore, building on the theme

of resources they mentioned, due to their position within the police, that they have access to a wide range of police officers who might have attended the sessions. For example, one police community support officer explained that they could have asked colleagues to come to the youth project to talk more specifically about their role in the police. This would have helped young people learn and understand the range of activities that the police carry out. This point resonates with the findings of Deuchar et al (2014), who used a school police officer to help bridge the gap between, on the one side, police officers and members of the community and, on the other side, a group of disenfranchised young people.

The view of the PCSOs on the impact of the activities on their relationship with young people also varied. The police community support officers from Lawrence Weston talked about activities where they recognised a softening of barriers and a sense of relationship building happening between them and the young people. The activities that they described were those where interactions between them and young people were more relational and interpersonal. For example, both police community support officers talked about a session that was structured similar to a speed dating scenario. Each person had to tell the other something interesting about themselves. The view of the PCSOs was that young people were able to find out information about them, which allowed the young people to realise that they were normal people with normal lives. The value of this type of interaction was also reported by the young people who took part in the interviews and focus groups.

The activity that helped overcome barriers that was talked about by the police community support officers from Lawrence Weston was the Halloween activity. Interestingly, the sense of a barrier being broken down was talked about, in different ways, by both the police community support officers and the young people. The specific part of this activity that was reported as significant was when young people were able to put Halloween make-up on the police community support officers. This can be illustrated by the following quote from one of the PCSOs involved in the Halloween activity;

“they talked to you more they would be like oh can I do this on you, you know or can I draw on you or yeah, yeah you can so its oh no I am not going to get in trouble because you’re the police and I’m putting blood on your hand or anything like that”
(PCSO 2)

The Halloween activity was a fun event that encouraged a more informal level of interaction and use of interpersonal skills. As a relationship building activity this particularly stood out in the minds of both groups. The activity happened closer to the beginning of the Police and Young People Together Project and therefore provided a foundation from which to build upon for the remainder of the police sessions.

In contrast, the police community support officers who attended the Henbury project did not report any noticeable changes in their relationship with young people. This is likely due to the number of times that the police community support officers and young people were brought together. In addition, the police community support officers explained that they had good relationships with the young people who attended this youth project.

The Lawrence Weston police community support officers did notice an impact on their relationship with young people. They explained that they were able to get to know them better, and that young people were also able to get to know them better. The data would suggest that this relational approach that underpinned the activities allowed police community support officers to be available and approachable to the young people. Young people were able to understand that they were not just there for when something bad happened or that they needed a reason to talk to them. A quote from one of the police community support officers can illustrate this point;

“The main impact I think ... that they can see that we are human too and that we’re not the bad guys and just that we’re approachable it’s not something you don’t only see us when something bad has happened to you ... you know we are there to give you some support” (PCSO 2)

“they got to know us as people you know to talk to us and see that oh well you do things like normal people do and you laugh at the same things and you find things funny” (PCSO 2)

The improved relationship, it was hypothesised at the start of the project, would lead to improvements in antisocial behaviour and crime reporting amongst the young people who took part in the project. The perceptions of the police community support officers about these outcomes were mixed. Similar to their responses about changes in the relationship

with the young people, the police community support officers from Henbury did not perceive any impact on the young people.

In contrast, the view of the PCSOs from Lawrence Weston was that young people had improved their understanding of not only how to report antisocial behaviour and crime to the police, but what would happen when they do. This topic came up in an interview with a police community support officer. The PCSO was talking about the impact of the project on their relationship with young people and crime reporting;

“they understand more about reporting crime ... Yeah definitely, definitely better equipped they understand that there’s a lot of different ways of doing it and they will they are more inclined to say things to you” (PCSO 2)

There was a general view that the Police and Young People Together Project would be an ideal way for police to get to know young people from the local area, or those who attend youth projects. Furthermore, the police community support officers did not see the young people as engaged in antisocial behaviour.

Challenges and barriers to building relationships with young people

The PCSOs from both policing teams talked about a lack of resources as a noticeable challenge and potential barrier to building trust and relationships with young people. These challenges and barriers did not prevent the policing teams from participating in the Police and Young People Together Project. There were other reasons that impacted upon their participation, such as poor coordination and communication of information. The main challenge which limited opportunities to build trust and relationships with young people was the encroachment of other activities on the time PCSOs have to engage in informal conversations with young people;

“it is getting to that stage for use where we don’t have the time to kind of spend talking and dealing and having a laugh and joke for them to realise that you’re normal ... I think we’re being given more and more stuff that nobody else has time for, so we lost funding for like neighbourhood watch, so that then comes out in our direction” (PCSO 3).

The PCSOs all reported on the amount of administrative tasks increasingly added to their workload. One of the PCSOs went on to report that these tasks meant that;

“it is getting to the stage where we just don’t have the time to kind of engage with them (young people) ... You don’t take on this job to be admin staff, you take it on because you like to be out and about and you like to meet people and you like to be involved in stuff” (PCSO 3)

The Lawrence Weston Policing Team did not report any barriers to participating in the activities at the youth project and were able to fulfil their earlier commitments to the project. It is likely that those policing teams who did not participate in the Police and Young People Together Project or the evaluation were experiencing similar challenges.

Summary

The purpose of this section was to discuss the main findings from the interviews with the police community support officers who took part in the Police and Young People Together Project. Although only a small number of police community support officers participated in the project, there were key themes in what they said. Police community support officers have opportunities in their day to day policing activities where they can build trust and develop relationships with young people. However, these opportunities were not equally distributed amongst the police community support officers. The Police and Young People Together, therefore, added an additional opportunity to develop relationships. The evidence suggests that there was not parity in terms of what information was available to PCSOs at the beginning of the project and this had an impact on levels of commitment. There was an issue regarding how much input police community support officers had in terms of recruiting the target group and designing sessions. There were issues concerning resources and whether continued cuts would seriously impact upon the normal opportunities to build relationships with young people.

Section 6: Conclusion and recommendation

The Police and Young People Together Project suffered from many obstacles which prevented its potential as an intervention into police-youth relations, antisocial behaviour and crime reporting from being fully realised. The activities that were delivered by the youth projects during the police sessions were diverse and, to a certain extent, had the desired impact on both young people and PCSOs. However, there were noticeable differences in terms of the degree of police participation and commitment and in the way in which the Police and Young People Together Project was interpreted and delivered by the youth projects. Police-youth relations, antisocial behaviour and crime reporting were not always at the heart of each of the projects. The most significant barriers were a lack of planning and information sharing, lack of clarity of aims, poor communication and commitment. These obstacles and the problems outlined in the methodology section prevented the hypothesis, which was at the centre of the Police and Young People Together Project, from being tested.

The Police and Young People Together Project set out to form a partnership between police and young people as well as youth workers. Partnerships are an arrangement between two or more groups to work together in order to achieve common aims. The purpose of this particular partnership was to improve police-youth relations. Moreover, it had the additional aim of reducing levels of antisocial behaviour and improving the reporting of crime by young people. However, not all police community support officers and core groups of young people were regularly brought together to participate in relevant activities for a reasonable period of time or long enough to have any significant impact on their relationships. Furthermore, police community support officers could have been more active and better utilised in the process, not just in the partnership. This was in terms of identifying and recruiting the target group of young people as well as their valuable experience of engaging with this particular group of young people from the local community.

Lawrence Weston was the only youth project to form a successful partnership between the PCSOs and the local young people. This success was, in part, underpinned by the existing partnership between the policing team and the youth work team at Juicy Blitz. This partnership allowed for relevant information about the Police and Young People Together Project to be shared and discussed. It also enabled both teams to talk through the aims of

the project and expectations and commitments within a timeframe that suited the needs of the project as well as those of the community policing team. Similar to that described by Deuchar et al (2014), this partnership was an important resource which Juicy Blitz was able to make use of in this particular situation. Although this was a small-scale evaluation research project, the findings suggests that where relationships between youth projects and policing teams are good, the young people and police were successfully brought together.

The impact of the project on police-youth relations in each of the areas that were included in the evaluation varied quite considerably. Southmead, where the researcher was unable to make contact with the policing team, young peoples' attitudes toward the police were considerably worse than any of the other areas. The difficulties that the researcher experienced in making contact with the policing team were also reflected in the challenges experienced by the Southmead youth workers in engaging local police in the project. More importantly, this had a negative impact on the young people. This was in terms of reinforcing their belief that the police do not care about them. Young people and PCSOs from Lawrence Weston, on the other hand, reported positive changes in their relationship. Young people reported that being listened to, having a PCSO initiate contact and express an interest in them (as opposed to feeling like they are gathering information about them and others), engaging in fun activities and learning about the PCSOs as positive experiences as well as trust and relationship building. The evidence suggests that there are limited opportunities for similar interactions to take place.

The impact of the Police and Young People Together Project on self-reported levels of antisocial behaviour was problematic to assess. This was due to the small sample size and the generally low levels of antisocial behaviour reported by the group of young people who started and finished the project. The group who dropped out of the project, however, did report greater levels of antisocial behaviour than those who finished. The main types of antisocial behaviour reported by the young people who stayed were throwing litter on the ground and hanging around in groups on the street. There was, however, a statistically significant improvement in whether a young person would go to a PCSO for help if they needed it. However, from the qualitative data, young people demonstrated a greater awareness and confidence in terms of reporting antisocial behaviour and crime. This was identified by the young people and the PCSOs. This change of view might not necessarily

translate into an increase in crime reporting behaviour by this group of young people. The crime reporting behaviour of this group would need to be revisited at a later date.

Recommendations

The challenges and obstacles associated with the delivery of the Police and Young People Together Project mean that it is difficult to properly assess its value as an intervention into police-youth relations, antisocial behaviour and crime reporting. However, there are three recommendations that would begin to improve local police-youth relations and provide a foundation for the delivery of similar projects in the future.

1. Steps should be taken to allocate resources to strengthen partnerships between local policing teams and youth projects. Good partnership working between local policing teams and youth projects would provide a foundation for similar interventions designed to improve police-youth relations.
2. School-based police and PCSOs could be better utilised as a resource for building links between police and young people. They have existing relationships with young people that can be used to break down barriers and bridge the gap between local young people and police.
3. There is a need for more in-depth research into opportunities that currently exist within day-to-day activities where police and police community support officers can build trust and relationships with local young people. These opportunities should be identified, protected and developed. Furthermore, this research should also identify and understand the range of implicit policing styles that officers develop and deploy in order to successfully communicate and interact with young people in informal and formal settings. This important resource is currently overlooked. In austere times it is logical to identify, analyse and then utilise internal resources.

References list

- Braet, C. Meerschaert, T. Merlevede, E. Bosmans, G. Leeuwen, K. V. Mey, W. D. (2009) Prevention of antisocial behaviour: Evaluation of an early intervention programme. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*. 6. 2. 223-240.
- Brown, D. M. (2013) Young people, antisocial behaviour and public space: The role of community wardens in policing the 'ASBO Generation'. *Urban Studies*. 50. 3. 538-555.
- Brick, B. T. (2009) Juvenile attitudes towards the police: the importance of subcultural involvement and community ties. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 37. 488-495.
- Boeck, T. Fleming, J. (2005) Social Policy – A Help or a Hindrance to Social Capital? *Social Policy and Society*. 4. 3. 259-270
- Boeck, T. Fleming, J. Kemshall, H. (2006) The Context of Risk Decisions: Does Social Capital Make a Difference. *Forum Qualitative Social Research*. 7.1. Article 17 2006. Available from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/55> (accessed 16/5/2014).
- Cao, L. Frank, J. Cullen, F.T. (1996) 'Race, Community Context and Confidence in Police'. *American Journal of Police*. 15. 1. 3-22.
- Carlo, G. Mestre, M. V. McGinley, M. Tur-Porcar, A. Samper, P. Opal, D. (2014) The protective role of prosocial behaviours on antisocial behaviours: The mediating effects of deviant peer affiliation. *Journal of Adolescence*. 37. 359-366.
- Clayman, S. Skinns, L. (2012) To snitch or not to snitch? An exploratory study of the factors influencing whether young people actively cooperate with the police. *Policing and Society*. 22. 4. 460-480.
- Cook, E. C. Buehler, C. Henson, R. (2009) Parents and Peers as Social Influences to Deter Antisocial Behaviour. *Journal of Youth Adolescence*. 38. 1240-1252.
- Crawford, A. (2009) Criminalising sociability through anti-social behaviour legislation: dispersal powers, young people and the police. *Youth Justice*. 9. 1. 5-26.
- Deuchar, R. Miller, J. Barrow, M. (2014) Breaking down barriers with the usual suspects: Findings from a research-informed intervention with police, young people and residents in the West of Scotland. *Youth Justice*. DOI: 10.1177/147322541450538.
- Eagan, M. Neary, J. Keenan, P. J. Bond, L. (2013) Perceptions of antisocial behaviour and negative attitudes towards young people: focus group evidence from adult residents of disadvantaged urban neighbourhoods (Glasgow, UK). *Journal of Youth Studies*. 16. 5. 612-627.

- Fagan, J. Tyler, T. R. (2005) Legal Socialisation of Children and Adolescents. *Social Justice Research*. 18. 3. 217-242.
- Farrington, D. (2005) Childhood origins of antisocial behaviour. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*. 12. 177-190.
- Flexon, J. L. Lurigio, A. J. Greenleaf, R. G. (2009) Exploring the dimensions of trust in the police among Chicago juveniles. *Journal of Criminal Justice*. 37. 180-189.
- Gormally, S. Deuchar, R. (2012) Somewhere between distrust and dependence: young people, the police and antisocial behaviour management within marginalised communities. *International Journal of School Disaffection*. 51-66
- Hinds, L. (2007) Building Police-Youth Relationships: The importance of procedural justice. *Youth Justice*. 7. 3. 195-209.
- Hinds, L. (2009) Youth, Police Legitimacy and Informal Control. *Journal of Police Criminal Psychology*. 24. 10-21.
- Home Office. (2011) *The National Standard for Incident Reporting: Instructions for Police Forces in England and Wales*. Home Office. Available from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/the-national-standard-for-incident-recording-nsir-counting-rules> (accessed 16/5/2014).
- Office for National Statistics. (2013) *Short Story on Anti-Social Behaviour, 2011/12*. Office for National Statistics. Available from <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/rel/crime-stats/crime-statistics/short-story-on-anti-social-behaviour--2011-12/index.html> (accessed 16/5/2014).
- Leiber, M. J. Nalla, M. K. Farnworth, M. (1998) Explaining juveniles' attitudes toward the police. *Justice Quarterly*. 15. 1. 151-174.
- MacKenzie, S. Bannister, J. Flint, J. Parr, S. Millie, A. Fleetwood, J. (2010) *The drivers of perceptions of antisocial behaviour*. Research Report 34. London: Home Office.
- McAra, L. McVie, S. (2005) The usual suspects? Street-life, young people and the police. *Criminal Justice*. 5. 1. 5-35.
- Murphy, K. (2015) Does procedural justice matter to youth? Comparing adults' and youths' willingness to collaborate with police. *Policing and Society*. 25. 1. 53-76.
- Neary, J. Egan, M. Keenan, P. J. Lawson, L. Bond, L. (2013) Damned if they do, damned if they don't: negotiating the tricky context of antisocial behaviour and keeping safe in disadvantaged urban neighbourhoods. *Journal of Youth Studies*. 16. 1. 118-134.
- Norman, J. (2009) Seen and not heard: young people's perception of the Police. *Policing*. 3. 4. 364-372.

Romain, D. M. Hassell, K. D. (2014) An exploratory examination of the sources of socialisation influencing juvenile perceptions of the police. *International Journal of Police Science and Management*. 16. 1. 36-51.

Sargeant, E. Bond, E. W. (2013) Keeping it in the family: Parental influences on young people's attitudes to police. *Journal of Sociology*. DOI: 10.1177/1440783313482817.

Stewart, D. M. Morris, R. G. Weir, H. (2014) Youth perceptions of the police: identifying trajectories. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*. 12/ 1/ 22-39.

Watkins, A. M. Maume, M. O. (2012) Rethinking the study of juveniles' attitudes toward the police. *Criminal Justice Studies*. 25. 3. 279-300.

The data collection tools can be made available by contacting the researcher, Dr Ian Walmsley.

ian2.walmsley@uwe.ac.uk