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This thesis aims to explore partnership working between the police and the NHS in a crime reduction context.

Partnership working has been adopted as a process of policy implementation since the mid 1960s when it was used in the controversial Community Development Projects. The extent and frequency of its usage has increased since this period culminating in the modern development of Community Safety Partnerships (sometimes referred to as Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships). In a sense this development of partnership has embedded it within local and national structures and it has become the answer to problems of specialisation and fragmentation amongst public services. What this means is that ‘partnership working’ as an entity has become the answer to a variety of frequently unspecified policy questions and ‘community’ need.

This research used the police and the NHS as an exemplar of this process of partnership working between very different agencies. Overtly the NHS are statutorily required to work in partnership with the police to audit their communities and provide community safety strategies. In reality the NHS have never wholly engaged in the discourse of community safety, regardless of attempts to demonstrate the long-term impact of crime on communities, including the World Health Organisation making a direct causal connection between violence and the health of nations (World Health Organisation, 2002).

This research took a deviant field site approach to identifying appropriate locations for research. Successful cases were sought but were not common. A wide definition of success was employed and centred on member testimony. Although this research mainly focuses on the work of two Community Safety Partnerships there was also a third, comparator case, which involved a high profile implementation of a drug project. This project illustrated (in close proximity) the relationship between the police and the NHS around a single issue, reflecting a local flexibility in response to a nationally imposed framework that may alter following recent legislation.
The findings from this research reveal that practitioners generally find partnership working difficult but there is an ongoing commitment to this way of working. In addition it was apparent that partnerships were still led by the police pursuing a crime reduction agenda. However, there was little evidence that the community safety partnerships or the drug project in this research had any distinctive ‘partnership’ achievements from their work. Moreover this police led endeavour enabled them to adopt a stance towards other agencies (in this case the NHS), which had an inhibiting effect on building relationships and that is documented and analysed in the thesis. Two forms of power holding were deployed in partnerships – one was hidden and the other transparent. However, regardless of the type, both resulted in disengagement by other partners. In conclusion there is an attempt to take this knowledge and apply it to the current and developing policy framework, to utilise the existing strengths and ameliorate the apparent weaknesses exposed in this way of working.
1. Chapter One

Introduction

This thesis seeks to address the following research questions:

i) What is the local and national, political and policy background to partnership working between the police and the National Health Service, which substantially contributes to or inhibits partnership working?

ii) What is the current and developing statutory framework, which frames these organisations in their endeavours to work together?

iii) How successful are these organisations in integrating cultural understandings of their own work and the work of other agencies?

iv) How can partnership working be a sustainable project for future policy development?

In the list above item (i) is primarily addressed by a systematic review of the conceptual and theoretical literature, item (ii) by reference to the developing policy literature, item (iii) will be addressed indicatively but not conclusively by the analysis of the empirical findings and item (iv) by the same in tandem with a suggestive appraisal of conclusions drawn from the literature.

To address these questions this thesis draws on a growing tradition of nuanced qualitative research on the power dynamics between agencies in a crime reduction context. In the early 1990s Gilling (1993) was one of few voices and he decried the lack of this work. At that time there was little to draw on except his own work that of the Pearson research group at Lancaster and at a similar time that of Liddle and Gelsthorpe (1994a; 1994b; 1994c). However, increasingly it has formed a noteworthy body of work on the significance of partnership working and information sharing at the multi-agency interface. Most recently the work of Skinns (2006), in considering partnership working between agencies, their structure and process and impact on the community and Souhami (2007), who examined the effects of the Crime and Disorder Act on the youth justice system and the professionals who work within it, both contribute to this. As do Hughes (1998; 2002; 2003; 2004; 2007),
Crawford (1994; 1998b; 1995) and Crawford and Jones (1995; 1996) who theorise the space in which partnership working occurs.

This empirical research neatly fits in with the work of Phillips et al (2002a) and Gilling (1993; 1994; 2005). Gilling looked at partnership working in the late 1980s with particular reference to the relationship between the police and probation services. He discovered that this was a problematic relationship because of the different conceptions each service has of their core role and how to tackle the problem of crime. The police are more likely to utilise a situational crime prevention role and the probation services were still at that time situated within a social crime prevention conception of their work. However, like Phillips he did not identify any overt conflict in this apparent ‘clash’ of cultures. Phillips considered the work of three Community Safety Partnerships (CSP) after they had undergone the ‘first round’ of auditing and strategies and to an extent, this work answers some of the questions she had after her ‘brief’ foray into the field. Phillips had experience of partnership working on a racial harassment project where working relationships had been rigid and organised but conflictual (Phillips and Sampson, 1998). In contrast, in CSPs agencies were finding the work difficult and were attempting to construct their own role but were generally positive about the work. Phillips (2002a) put the lack of conflict down to a ‘honeymoon’ period. Moreover she found that the police and local authority were likely to be the lead agencies with the expectation that they would do the most work, because they had statutory responsibility. Gilling had similar findings. However, because his study occurred before the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (CDA) he identified the closeness of crime prevention work to the core role of the police. This perhaps signified that the CDA put on a formal footing what was already occurring in locally derived projects and that community safety (as such) fundamentally fits the remit of the police.

This research overtly considers the role of the NHS in contributing to a discourse on community safety. In 2004 the NHS (in the guise of health authorities) became an agency with statutory responsibility for crime and disorder in their communities along with the police and local authorities. This research straddles this period. In the field, there was already a burgeoning dissatisfaction with the commitment of local
health structures to engage in a dialogue about crime and disorder. Moreover there was an increasing pressure on health services to engage in local crime reduction strategies, which manifested itself locally and nationally. Locally agencies were becoming increasingly loud voiced in their critique of local representatives and the difficulty of engaging in complex health structures. Nationally, there had been an increase in the production of ‘guidance’ on how to engage with the NHS and the construction of information about how a community safety agenda could meet the aims of health structures too.

Even several years after the NHS became a statutory authority for community safety purposes there remains a counter intuitive feel to the work. Early on in this research, policy advisors, practitioners and academics would look back blankly at the incongruous juxtaposition of health and police services, in a crime reduction context. This has abated somewhat in recent years, for example the police now realise the potential benefits of working with the health sector to meet their own outcomes. However for the health sector, there seems to be little immediate (or even intermediate) pay off in meeting their own organisational drivers. This remains a significant problem in securing successful partnership working between these two agencies, especially in these times of rationalised organisational output. However, as we shall see below this was not the only inhibitor to working together. Given this is the context within which partnership working takes place it is hardly surprising that these agencies have difficulty in overcoming their organisationally centrally guided but locally accountable imperatives.

As practitioners say, ‘partnership working? It’s the hardest work you’ll ever do.’ They find it difficult, time consuming and frustrating. Those with the most control are likely to find it interesting and at times rewarding. What remains compelling about this is that there was no conception amongst government that this would be a difficult enterprise. Gilling (2005) draws our attention to this surprising finding too. However, as a process for policy implementation, efficiency, fiscal parsimony and ameliorating the problems in fragmentation that were occurring in public services, it was presented as the answer. The problem seems to stem from a lack of understanding around what the question was. Community safety was not unlike
many other policy initiatives – it lacked a unified understanding about what it was meant to achieve and its remit became wider and narrower at the same time. Wider in the sense that ‘community safety’ is a sock that fits many feet and narrower as centrally derived targets and increasing legislative frameworks stymied local creativity. To some extent the above sounds like the ‘swan song’ of community safety in England and Wales. However, that is probably not the case. Partnership working has always been difficult and has had unlikely, unpredictable outcomes that have not prevented it from becoming a favoured method for policy development and implementation. Moreover, partnership structures are in place and will in all likelihood continue as we discover what it is firstly, we want them to do and secondly, what they are good at. However although they may remain they are currently undergoing considerable legislative changes in their work, which may significantly impact on their remit and responsibilities.

This work, like the work of Gilling (1993; 1994), draws on the experiences of two agencies and considers the relationship between them in a crime reduction context. It attempts to isolate what the inhibiting factors are between these two agencies, and offer techniques for ameliorating the disengagement and sometimes deeply held resentment. Unlike Gilling, who explored the relationship between two agencies who would at least seem to have a commonality because they both derived from the same criminal justice sector, this research focuses on the relationship between the police and the NHS. These two agencies would appear to have little in common, professionally, organisationally or culturally. This research explores the covert processes at work when two agencies with such different backgrounds come to work together.

This thesis begins with an exploration of the development of the police and the NHS. It was clear from contact with respondents in the field that there was a deep attachment to the historical development of their respective organisations. This was at times based in myth rather than reality. For example the birth of these two organisations was a messy affair. However, for the NHS there is a situating of it in a post-war euphoria, when its actual birth (like most large scale organisations) was characterised by conflict. This development ends with the current context of
marketisation and the proliferation of mixed economies of care and security. Chapter 2 seeks to position the NHS and the police, historically, economically and politically within their social milieu. By doing this we are able to ascertain the way in which the two agencies respond to large-scale change such as the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (CDA) and the new changes proposed under the Police and Justice Act 2006 (PJA).

Chapter 3 presents the existing research on partnership working and the development of it within a crime reduction/community safety context. It includes an exploration of the changes that partnerships have undergone since their inception in 1998 and the impact of the new raft of legislative changes partnerships are about to embark on. It positions these changes within a larger political context as well as considering the micro processes of power and its deployment within a partnership context.

Chapter 4 reflects on the work of Garland (2001), which offers a broad context within which to locate and make sense of many of the particular changes discussed in this thesis. It goes on to consider the work of Crawford (1997), Johnston and Shearing (2003) and again considers the work of Gilling (2005) and Hughes (1997; 2002; 2007), particularly their work on local governance of crime control. However, this thesis is concerned with the nature of relationships within partnerships and therefore also calls on a different analytic frame in the form of the work of political science scholars (Bachrach and Baratz, 1962; Dahl, 1958; Hunter, 1953; Lukes, 2005; Wright Mills, 1956), with reference to the relevance of their work on power.

Chapter 5 charts the three locations in this research by considering their recent local history, the national and local political context that partnership working is situated in and the partnership(s) that were in each locality. The partnerships are described in terms of who attends them, where they are placed locally, in amongst other structures and their chairmanship and administration. There are also early forays into trying to ascertain what their main business and achievements were and what constituted success for partnerships. This chapter takes a case-by-case analysis of these features and begins to draw out some common themes that are developed in the later analysis chapters. It also provides an opportunity to introduce each locality and the respondents who took part in this research.
Chapter 6 considers the methods that were used in capturing the data for this research and the methodological approach adopted in the field. This research was completed using qualitative methods.

Chapters 7 and 8 consider the relative properties of the police and the NHS, considering who the respondents were who worked within these agencies, what skills they developed throughout their careers to deploy in partnership and how they operated within their respective cultures. Chapter 7 considers the way that the police work, exploring their organisational culture and by drawing from the data, identifying their essentially social class situated response to boundary intrusions, on what is considered their core role. Chapter 8 examines the NHS in terms of the image that the police hold of this organisation by utilising the concept of the ‘atypical construction of the other’ agency and the conception that NHS workers hold of their own work. It explores the consequences for both agencies of the discrepancy between these two views.

Chapter 9 reflects on the problem of ‘personality’ within partnerships. Many partners discussed the concept of personality when describing their colleagues. One partner responded to the question ‘what makes a good partnership’ by saying – ‘I know you’re not going to want to hear this – you want processes – but when you get down to it it’s all about personality.’ Conventions for citing data extracts are discussed in chapter 6. It was apparent that social researchers are perceived as hunting down the seemingly empirically unobtainable transferable process. However, in actuality the term ‘personality’ often referred to particular identifiable traits that were deployed by partnership members, within the partnership setting. These were seen as successful characteristics if members felt it led to a positive outcome for partnership. However, often the term ‘personality’ was also used to exclude or include members and as a tool in the deployment of power.

Chapter 10 explores how power is deployed in partnership using the concept of the inner circle of decision-makers. It asks why it is adopted, what the effects are for partnerships utilising this form of decision-making, and what the potential is for
change. The following chapter considers the consequences for individuals, agencies and partnerships in deploying power in this manner, which effectively excludes large swathes of the partnership.

In the final concluding chapter we try and ascertain what this all means for partnership working and community safety in a crime reduction context. It attempts to isolate ways in which partnership working and community safety could be a project for multi-agency working and what this might look like. It does this in the context of the new raft of statutory changes that are being implemented under the Police and Justice Act 2006.
2. Chapter Two

The development of the police and the NHS

The NHS and the police seem diametrically opposed when considering the functions of their respective services. When we consider their public image, their organisation: bureaucratically, systematically and culturally, seems far apart. The police fight crime and incarcerate the ‘bad people’, the ‘evil doers’ and criminals. Health organisations in the guise of the NHS, help people, nurture the sick and prevent illness. Primarily these constructs are drawn from media sources, personal contact and intimate testimony and are situated around their perceived ‘core business’ and main consumers of services, to borrow from the language of the market and New Public Sector Management. Instinctively we feel, sick people deserve our sympathy and by association, until relatively recently, so do those who treat the sick. In apparent contrast the ‘criminal’ deserves our repugnance and ostracism and police receive our thanks and admiration – although, again in relatively recent times the image of the police has changed (Gilling, 1997; Reiner, 2000; Reiner, 2002). This is an overly simplistic dichotomy and this chapter will explore the similarities and the differences between the police and the NHS, by looking at areas such as their history, their role and culture, how they are perceived by the public and their political context. Hopefully this will illuminate the contributing and inhibiting factors in partnership working between these two agencies.

2.1 This Chapter

The history of the public health sector and of the police differ. However, notwithstanding the differences, many similar themes arise when considering their development. By comparing and contrasting the role and function of public health and the police, in this chapter, we can identify the nature of these organisations and key concepts for understanding them can be drawn. This is particularly by focusing on response to change, accountability, how they respond in partnership and how those in partnership respond to them. A resolutely historical perspective has been utilised in the ascertaining of their current social and political position within society. This was done because respondents within the field were imprinted with the
organisational memory of the agency in which they were situated. For the police and the NHS employees this meant that reliance on old forms of working was within easy reach of their current understanding of how they worked (Levitt and March, 1988). Sometimes there were explicit references to ‘times gone by’ but sometimes they were expressed in the way working had ‘always been done in this way’ which makes change a very difficult concept to introduce when embedded within unassailable historical processes.

2.2 History and development of the NHS and the police

Compared to the police, the NHS is a relatively recent organisation as is the concept of state provided welfare. Although without doubt a ‘safety net’ was available to the most impoverished only the chronic poor would avail themselves of the ‘work houses’ under the Poor Laws (Thane, 1995). The welfare state was, for all intents and purposes, a Second World War development. ‘More than any other wartime blue print for post-war social re-construction the Beveridge Report caught the popular imagination and came to symbolize the widespread hopes for a different, more just, world.’ (Thane, 1995: 253). Despite this it would be wrong to assume that the Beveridge Report was accepted by all, or indeed was the welfare state. Approximately 30% of those polled at the time of the publication were against a universal welfare state. ‘It’s just another case of taxing people who work all hours of the day and night to keep a lot of idle, boozing dog-racing crowd of toughs in luxury and unemployment.’ (Newsagent, F., 35 as recorded in Jacobs, 1992a; 21) and ‘I think it is a direct encouragement to the lowest type of humanity to do no work and at the same time breed like rabbits.’ (Temporary Civil Servant, f., 32 in Jacobs, 1992a; 21)

Notwithstanding the clear vision created by the Beveridge Report and the subsequent euphoria and Act of Parliament, the National Health Service was a ramshackle affair that incorporated elements from a bygone era. The National Health Service from its inception made concessions to those who opposed it, effectively creating a bipartite system. Bevan said about the British Medical Association at the time ‘...they were a small body of raucous-voiced politically poisoned people who completely
misrepresented the medical profession as they had misrepresented the National Health Act' (The Guardian, 1948). Despite these beliefs Bevan compromised and consultants were given private beds funded in public hospitals for private patients. Policy and process already underlined the fact that the state system although for all would not be good enough for all (Jacobs, 1992b; Lowe, 1994; Thane, 1995).

The new police in contrast emerged during the late 18th and early 19th century, a period of rapid social change. There was an urban migration in response to perceived new opportunities for work in industrialised inner cities. Unfortunately the large numbers of people caused a surplus of labour and resulted in driving wages down, exacerbating social problems (Fielding, 1991). This caused opportunities for crime that had never existed before, as was identified by Colquhoun as early as 1795: ‘acts of delinquency and the corruption of manners.... keep pace with the increase in riches’ (Colquhoun as quoted in Garland, 1996: 465).

The development of the police is well documented and falls largely into two versions: the orthodox and the revisionist view of history (Reiner, 2000). The orthodox view takes an uncritical consensus model of history and those who oppose the police are viewed as misguided (Critchley, 1979). Despite the apparent support for the police, illustrated by the orthodox view, for the protection of the gentry, middle classes and the working classes, it took five parliamentary committees to instigate the new police. Robert Peel, finally, succeeded in 1829 with the organisation of the Metropolitan Police (Reiner, 2000). The revisionist theory of development is class based. In essence the police were primarily there to protect the property of the landed gentry and keep the working classes ‘in their place’. Reiner’s synthesis of these two views offers a fuller account of the early development of the police force, its function and purpose. Reiner takes aspects of each history to combine them and offer a comprehensive account of police development (2000). As Reiner illustrates, orthodox history leads us to believe that the police are ‘good’ in that they ended a period of insecurity and social upheaval. They protected the poor and the rich. In contrast the revisionist view over-emphasises the class basis of police development. Each history of the police only unveils one face, one aspect of the complex organisation with its myriad functions (Reiner, 2000).
Before the Metropolitan Police Act 1829 was passed and during the early period of the police, the local populace was suspicious of them, in fact the upper classes who had the most to gain, rejected the new police as eroding their personal freedoms. The middle classes were used to having a local watchman, who was substantially ‘hands off’, serve the interests of the local community and were unsure that higher taxes would offer a significantly higher service. In fact for the first three decades the middle classes were concerned about having their personal freedoms eroded. From the mid 18th century some form of localised social control had been instigated by local communities under the Street Act, the Paving Act and the Police Act, whereby local authorities employed salaried staff to improve communities. Critchley suggests it is therefore inaccurate to label all old control institutions as inefficient (Critchley, 1979: 25 - 29). What the new police offered was a central, bureaucratic organisation. The first police commissioners Rowan and Mayne were determined to offer a police service which would have policemen selected from high entrance requirements on the streets, deterring crime by their mere presence (Reiner, 2000). This was an early indicator of the well documented ‘scarecrow’ role. In the provinces policing didn’t substantially change and those areas which already had some form of force continued to do so (Critchley, 1979; Reiner, 2000).

Similarly the health service was drawn from a complicated system of voluntary hospitals and public hospitals, a remnant of the Poor Law Acts of the 19th Century (Thane, 1995). Essentially a ‘mixed economy of care’ had developed on an apparently ad hoc basis but usually in response to need. The voluntary sector was working in partnership with specialist statutory sector services. The system was under-funded and over-stretched but was situated within local communities. It became less responsive to local need after statutory intervention in the form of the Poor Law Acts. Due to the haphazard nature of this system, early in the 20th Century, voluntary hospitals began a campaign for an amalgamation of the voluntary hospitals system and public hospitals. Voluntary hospitals, which would take the lead role as pioneering teaching hospitals, were to run the public sector services (Lowe, 1994; Thane, 1995). Voluntary hospitals had the backing of the British Medical Association and the Ministry of Health. The Royal Colleges had already set up a commission to plan for a post-war medical system (Thane, 1995).
Returning to policing, as already illustrated pre-1829 there was far more community based law enforcement, with middle class and working class contributions to how the local area was run; a quasi partnership between the community and systems of control. The chain of command was developed on quasi-military lines. Initially non-commissioned officers were appointed, although this changed to promotion up the ranks as the ‘rank and file’ became more experienced (Rawlings, 2002). Under the new system, chief constables over time became far more autonomous and constabulary independence developed. For the first eleven years, the police were under the control of local watch committees. It was only as work became more routinised that forces became more independent (Brogden, 1982). Various political and social groups have challenged this trend towards independence ever since. Indeed even at its commencement, questions were being raised in parliament regarding constabulary independence. This culminated in the Police Act 1964 which only served to strengthen the hands of the Home Office and chief constables at the expense of locally accountable police authorities (Rawlings, 2002; Reiner, 2000). This potentially enshrined at a very early point an inhibitor to partnership working.

Although organisational independence may not necessarily inhibit partnership growth an organisation which is inherently self-protective of its own position will. However the Act did also enshrine the tripartite system of police authority, chief constable and Home Office (Reiner, 1997), in theory prescribing a more pluralistic manner of police operation/control. However, this seemed inherently mere window dressing as the actual powers of police authorities to effect change were seriously curtailed by autocratic chief constables and an unsupportive Home Office (McLaughlin, 1994; Walker, 2000). It is also worth noting that the 1964 Act was the place where the police’s crime prevention role was first enshrined in statute (Liddle and Gelsthorpe, 1994a), although it has clearly always been part of their role. In 1829 the Metropolitan Police instructions state that ‘the principal object to be obtained is the prevention of crime’ (Gilling, 1993). Gilling (1993) situates this enduring crime prevention role within their neoclassical origins in criminological theory and the preventative ideas of ‘symbolic deterrence’. This idea was somewhat undermined over time by the notion of detection and considering why people commit crime, as
well as the consequences of this activity. In addition, Gilling goes on to identify the ‘community dimension’ of crime control – looking at the private offences of citizens in terms of an incipient moral lassitude and how this leads to public offences. This move to a positivist view of crime calls forth the wider community role. However this is identified as being a weaker discourse and the primacy of neoclassicism remains (Gilling, 1993).

2.3 Accountability

The NHS has been described as politically neutral even though its roots rest in a socialist government. Throughout all of its history and development the NHS has remained substantially untouchable. A decade after its creation, as noted by McLeod in 1958, the NHS was removed from ‘party politics’ (McLeod in Klein, 1985). As an institution ‘the NHS ranked next to the Monarchy as an unchallenged landmark in the political landscape of Britain.’ (Klein, 1985; 32). McLeod seems to be referring to the cross party support that it engendered due to the ‘overwhelming’ public backing. It was viewed as an institution which could bring down a government if it was removed from society through privatisation or any other political means (Klein, 1985). It is an organisation which is a foundation stone to society’s beliefs about what makes us good, and British society without the NHS is currently, still unimaginable. As such, successive governments tinker with the NHS in a manner which for the layperson goes largely unnoticed. Although this remains for the most part true there is an element to the apolitical position of the NHS which requires further investigation, because despite the above stance in the past ten years the NHS has increasingly become an institution which is a test case for government performance. Political success is measured by ability to manage the NHS. This change in its position is a significant development in its previously apolitical stance.

The police, in contrast, threw themselves into the political and media fray in the late 70’s with the advent of Sir Robert Mark as police commissioner. His remarks and strategy were particularly self-protective of the police as an organisation (Fielding, 1991; Reiner, 2000), an organisation which he would seem to believe needed far more resources and autonomy to fight crime. To this end he supported the then Conservative party which was taking a hard line on law and order, which would
mean more money and resources for the police, ostensibly pinning the police to the Conservative agenda. This strategy, however, was not without internal strife. Some members of the police force rued the day when they abandoned the political neutrality which had largely characterised the police since Rowan and Mayne’s day, where the police had not had the vote, and had thus been excluded from the political process (Reiner, 2000). It is debatable whether Mark’s alignment with a Conservative agenda and manipulation of the political ideology of the day is a de facto representation of the essentially right wing nature of the police. However, the strategic nature of the move does perhaps illustrate their essentially conservative stance on crime control policy, and in this sense ‘conservative’ may suggest traditional and orthodox. Contrary to this stance is partnership working, as a crime control activity, which was intended to be a collaborative exercise and perhaps more importantly ‘innovative’. Gilling offers a more nuanced interpretation of this debate, suggesting that situational crime prevention is derived from the police’s three dominant discourses of neoclassicism, positivism and rational choice theory and not what might necessarily be termed political conservatism (Gilling, 1993; Gilling, 1994). However, interestingly, the police did what the NHS seemed incapable of doing, namely utilising their position within the hearts and minds of society for their own ends. The police helped to instigate policy, whereas the NHS was the victim of it (Walshe, 2003).

Although both the NHS and the police developed from disparate organisations and came about through the clear vision of policy makers who fought their corner, the NHS developed very differently from the police. For the NHS, even at these early stages there was a dilemma between ‘bureaucratic control from the centre and freedom at the periphery.’ (Klein, 1985; 12). The NHS represented a bundle of contradictions, which came about due to the competing groups and compromise at its birth. Klein argues that the setting up of the NHS ‘was a conflict of a peculiar sort: conflict contained, and limited, by an overarching consensus – a constraint which forced compromise and caution on all the protagonists.’ (1985; 7). This was a theme that was to continue throughout the history of the NHS (Ham, 1994). The belief was that the NHS was a ‘good idea’, but how to implement such a ‘good idea’ became a challenge felt by successive governments.
As regards the police it is difficult to say whether Mark's political wrangling did much to promote the long-term development of the police or was particularly beneficial to police organisation or structure. The riots of the early 80's and the rather weak attempt at police accountability after the Scarman report into the Brixton riots had little effect in curbing police independence (McLaughlin, 1994). The debate regarding police independence and accountability is ongoing. On the face of it having a police force which wasn't subject (explicitly) to the vagaries of changing political fortune would seem the best option, as the problem with health systems has been the constant tinkering with the management and process of health service delivery in the drive for greater efficiency. However, instinctive values of the police do not coincide with groups that represent the arbiters of good taste, equality and liberal ideas; their operational values are more likely to represent the more conservative factions of the working class (Fielding, 1991; Reiner, 2000; Waddington, 1999). Therefore although more independence may be a good idea for a just and fair police force, untainted by the prejudices that encumber the rest of the population, they may not be best for the police force we have. An independent police force is, unfortunately, a prejudiced police force (Waddington, 1999) as was acknowledged by the Stephen Lawrence Inquiry where institutional racism in the police force was identified as a reason the murder of Stephen Lawrence failed to be adequately investigated by the Metropolitan Police Force (Macpherson, 1999).

One way to tackle this prejudice would be to make the police more accountable. To some extent the Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984 (PACE) does this, by making a breach of PACE a disciplinary offence and laying down detailed codes of practice. The police are also individually and organisationally accountable in civil law and through the Police Complaints Authority. Unfortunately the call for greater accountability is tempered by the knowledge that the current system allows the police a great flexibility and discretion in the enforcement of law, which allows them to respond to specific circumstances. This also allows for mistakes and prejudices to go unchecked (Crawford, 1998a) and for the beat officer to become the 'fall guy' of an overly flexible system (Reiner, 1997).
The new managerialism and marketisation of the police force was a feature of the incoming Conservative government in 1991. Nonetheless the law and order debate continued and the central position of the police within society and government rhetoric remained. The Sheehy Report was an inquiry into the future role and responsibilities of the police and after its publication there was a move to make the police a more responsive and flexible organisation (Walker, 2000). In combination the Sheehy Report and Home Office/ACPO reports into police reform and the core tasks of the police heralded a period of sweeping reform of the police role, responsibility and structure (Reiner, 2000; Walker, 2000). Prior to this period the Police Act 1964 had encouraged certain structural anomalies within the system of police accountability. While centralised decision-making had increased, certain important key decision making roles had been left outside the remit of the Home Office, for example, pay. Although the Home Office met 51% of the wages bill for the police, the police authority set the wages (Walker, 2000), similar to health care, where the most significant spending was controlled by GP's who were referring patients through the system (Holliday, 1995). To control this the Department of Health introduced the fund holding system, which gave GP's a budget to work with. Similarly, and thus regaining a more comprehensive centralised control, the Home Office via the new Police and Magistrates Court Act 1994, which was later to become the Police Act 1996, gained control of certain key areas, including pay, and became the de facto dominant party in the tripartite system of police accountability.

The new legislation was an attempt to reconfigure the system of governance to give each member of the tripartite system – the Home Office, Police Authorities and Chief Constables – a governance role; this role would rely upon cooperation and would end (hopefully) the conflict in the tripartite structure (Walker, 2000). The police authority was to be given an operational role in the development of a local policing plan, which would fit in with the national policing plan, developed by the Home Office (Walker, 2000). Previously the police authority had become a talking shop to rubber stamp Chief Constable decisions, although where local politics conflicted with the national agenda, it became, in some circumstances, a hot bed of political conflict rarely achieving or solving domestic issues (McLaughlin, 1994). The new legislation was an attempt to create better horizontal and vertical
accountability. Although the different factions within the existing tripartite structure were being encouraged to work together there was also a clear hierarchical structure, which led upwards to the Home Office. Unfortunately, as Walker argues, this system was not developed as a ‘self-justifying normative framework for the public sphere.’ (Walker, 2000: 101). Instead the reforms were developed to meet the increasing needs of marketisation; efficiency and effectiveness. Although apparently promoting partnership working between agencies by encouraging reliance and trust, in effect the reliance on the market and ‘free enterprise’ principles acted against this trend. After all, competition is inherently individualistic.

As with health there was, essentially, no ‘market’ in police work. Therefore to introduce market principles and efficiency within the police force a common police product had to be developed (Walker, 2000). When we consider the diverse nature of the responsibility of the police force it is difficult to see how it is possible to define that ‘product’, in specific terms. Essentially, that is the problem which has been encountered. Initial forms of measurement were blunt and crude, ‘…..performance indicators tend to measure ‘outputs’ rather than ‘outcomes’, what the organization does, rather than what, if anything, it achieves.’ (Garland, 1996: 458). More sophisticated forms of measurement have been developed (Mulraney, 2002), but what do they show? How effective are they in displaying the police product to the public gaze? Although at first glance it seems that the police have been more agile than the health services in accepting and reacting to the slew of changes that have developed over the past 10 years, due in some part to the protective nature of the tripartite structure (Reiner, 2000), we must wonder what the real consequences have been for the police force and partnership working.

In essence market reform of the police force has changed the nature of the police (Crawford et al., 2003). The public is not now essentially just the employer of the police as an emanation of the state but also more-selfconsciously the consumer of police services. The police are now in a position to be criticised for their poor public performance, failure to meet targets, to lower crime rates and meet public expectations. This must have real consequences for morale and performance (Dalley, 2003). Reiner (2000) identified a new vulnerability in the police after the failure of
their traditional (rigid) crime prevention role throughout the 1970s and culminating in the social unrest of the early 1980s. Gilling (1997) identifies that this was possibly one of the few times when the police were willing to consider Government guidance, when their neoclassical response no longer seemed enough.

New managerialism and marketisation was an effort to make the police force more independent. Walker (2000) has argued that this is a move back to local governance; that ‘new technologies of control’ (Walker, 2000: 145), target setting and auditing processes were the promise of governance at a distance: ‘The auditor’s leash might be made of powerful and sophisticated materials but it was still a long leash...’ (Walker, 2000: 145). Hughes (Hughes, 1998) identifies this as a period of ‘policing what is recordable’, considering what can be counted and in consequence restricting policing and potential creativity where activities like community safety are concerned. Similarly with health Shrifin (2003) sees the move toward foundation hospitals as an attempt to move control to the local. However, constant changes in the way the police are measured and the targets that are set means that the police, as with health, are operating on shifting ground and as Garland notes, governance from a distance has not led to a reduction in the size or complexity of the state (Garland, 1996). The impact that this has on the police and therefore ultimately on the police who work in partnership is in creating a compliance culture, which infiltrates the police and police authorities, who still in the main merely rubber stamp local policing plans developed by Chief Constables (Irving and Bourne, 2002; Walker, 2000). Whereas the culture of partnership, to work, demands more than compliance, it demands commitment, trust between agencies, common goals, time and commitment (Crawford et al., 2003; Gilling, 1997; Gilling, 2005; Hughes, 1998).

The NHS was distinguished from the development of the police, in that it seemed to be a coherent organisation born of the ideas of two unique men, Bevan and Beveridge. However, the compromise forced through the early origins of the organisation and the inherent contradictions that resulted from this state of affairs would lead to subsequent decades of internal and external change in an attempt to remedy these basic inconsistencies (Klein, 1985). Health too suffered from a lack of democratic accountability and consultants were allowed to award themselves ‘merits’
which could double their salary. The NHS was over budget in the first 2 years by 40%. Unfortunately those who provided the funds, the state through taxation, were not in charge of expenditure (doctors were) and so there was no real accountability (Lowe, 1994). As already mentioned, GP’s who were the ‘gatekeepers’ of the service were free to prescribe and refer patients to hospitals for treatment of any ailment. The NHS had least control over those who ultimately were the consumers of NHS resources (Klein, 1985).

2.4 Centralisation in the guise of community activity: increasing responsibilities

In addition to this discourse of marketisation, in recent years there is also a discourse of centralisation competing with a slew of policies and ideas which focus on the community: partnership working, community policing, reassurance policing, crime reduction initiatives and many others (Crawford et al., 2003). Effectively, community initiatives such as reassurance policing seem to ‘pander’ to the community desire for a ‘bobby on every beat’ (Loader and Mulcahy, 2003). Unfortunately these new initiatives create an expectations gap, between what the public or other agencies thought the new initiative would achieve and what the police are capable of providing within a centrally provided, target driven framework (Crawford et al., 2003; Fielding and Innes, 2006; Kerley and Benson, 2000; McGhee, 2003; Skogan and Hartnet, 2000). The community have high expectations that the police do not have the time, training or culture to meet (Crawford et al., 2003; Loader et al., 2003). The Police and Magistrates Court Act 1994 further restricts local control and places the power in the hands of the Home Secretary and chief constables. As Reiner states ‘we now have a de facto national police force’ (Reiner, 2000: 167). Yet in conflict with this, the Police Act 1996 appears to encourage local initiative through the National Policing Plan (Home Office, 2002) and police authorities, although again, this initiative is blunted as the composition of the police authority is largely dictated by the Home Secretary (Reiner, 2000; Walker, 2000). The police are increasingly held responsible for local failures whilst the real decision making power lies with the Home Office, and local initiatives which meet more amorphous movements, such as working in partnership, fail to meet nationally set
targets and leave police forces in a quandary about where their real commitment, and their working priorities, lie (Davis, 2003).

2.5 Targets

New policing initiatives like reassurance policing or working in partnership are imposed upon the police through central government and progress and accountability are measured through target-setting (Fielding et al., 2006). Target-setting and central government initiatives are imposed upon communities; there is little literature on successful community policing initiatives (Fielding, 1995). In contrast there is, literature on community policing ‘failures’ (Kerley et al., 2000; Skogan et al., 2000) which shows that the police take centrally produced plans and make them their own (Innes, 2005). They incorporate new policy initiatives into established routines and working practices, which then fail to be flexible enough to foster rather less robust practices such as partnership working or community participation (Kerley et al., 2000). These findings essentially go to the heart of the problems associated with partnership working. In addition current practices of performance management do not encourage adherence to softer outcomes (Fielding et al., 2006). This ability to pick and choose when faced with new policy or policy implementation is a common element shared by the police and the NHS (Crilly and Le Grand, 2004; Irving et al., 2002).

A significant and ongoing criticism of New Labour by mass media, academics, ACPO, nurses, doctors, consultants and rank and file police officers, has been the setting of targets. Articles headed ‘Targetitis’ (The Economist, 2002), ‘Careless targets cost lives’ (Browne, 2002), and ‘Targets are damaging services – watchdog’ (Perkins, 2003), give some indication of the extent of the problem and the light in which it is regarded. The media reiterates political ‘spin’ with headline phrases utilising the new language of governance and control: ‘the third way’; ‘rights and responsibilities’; ‘keeping what works’. However, frequently what the public wants is not reflected in the targets that are developed, more often they reflect some more measurable characteristic but not one that is likely to improve services. Patients want to be treated faster and they are not really concerned with the length of waiting lists.
but the time they are kept on them (Perkin, 2003). Similarly the public want to feel safe on their streets, not have lower crime rates per se, the public’s reality is experiential not statistical. Without doubt accountability is a justifiable aim for public services but actuarialism is a poor substitute for this and conflating the two leaves practitioners attempting to meet central aims with little note of local practice.

The police have become increasingly subject to targets and the effects of this are considerable (Dalley, 2003; Fielding et al., 2006; Home Office, 2002; Ledwidge, 2003; Reiner, 1992; Wintour, 2003). There is a danger that when incorporating market principles and a consumerist ethos into public services, that it will not simply increase ‘efficiencies’ but it will also increase public expectations of service delivery and thus increase a sense of dissatisfaction if unmet. However, the understanding of state provided care being situated within public services still seems to remain and therefore the negotiation between patient and service, or victim and service seems to exist outside market principles. It seems, public understanding is sophisticated enough to differentiate between being a consumer of services and a user of services (Clarke et al., 2007).

The debate around target-setting is complicated. Can correctly maintained and audited targets be a tool for progress or do they merely become a weapon to punish services which are ‘poorly performing’? It seems to be a combination of both which only increases the inherent insecurity felt by those organisations who are subject to targets and auditing, as the process is liberally sprinkled with failure (Bright, 2001). As regards partnership it seems clear that centrally located targets which are responsible to nationally held concerns cannot hope to be responsive to local crime issues, and if they are it would be a happy coincidence because your local town happened to reflect the national average. Police, like the NHS, have become subject to league tables but have yet to suffer the indignity of a ‘star rating’ system. League table position was initially achieved through the measurement of ‘detection rates, response times to serious crime, speed of answering 999 calls, complaints from the public and absenteeism’ (Bright, 2001: 17). Like most targets, such a system is unfair, as it cannot take account of local issues, problems and conditions, nor can it capture the local context and all that it entails. The inherent unfairness of the system
led to the development of the Policing Performance Assessment Framework: ‘a way of measuring performance in reducing and investigating crime, promoting public safety, helping the public, public satisfaction and resource usage’ (Mulraney, 2002: 18).

2.6 Market influences

Many feel that the framework is adopting the language of the market to assess a public service. Whether it is possible to do this is explored more fully in chapter four where we consider the inherent qualities of public services, in particular the police and whether these respond well to mechanisms which were developed to assess success in the commercial market place. Without doubt, while the police would wish to maintain constabulary independence, there is an increasing and marked centralisation of police activity and responsibility (Walker, 2000). Under the Police Reform Act 2002 the Secretary of State acquires greater powers with regards to the operational functions of the police. Despite this loss of chief constable powers, any response to increased local governance is bitterly opposed as is evidenced by the response to the ‘Going Local’ report by the Policy Exchange (Home Office, 2003b; Phillips and Reid, 2003; Wintour, 2003). The police, the Home Office and ACPO responded swiftly to any suggestion of stronger working links with local authorities. The consensus of these agencies and individuals seemed to be that dealing with the local meant dealing with parochial issues. However despite its anti ‘Going Local’ stance ACPO did express ‘...its reservations on performance indicators and the proliferation of national supervisory bodies, but standardisation of information and comparison is necessary across the police service.’ (ACPO, 2003). A similar response has occurred with regard to Foundation Hospitals which entails responsibility for health care being passed down to local communities, but maintaining central control through target-setting. The reaction by the police, ACPO, the Home Office and the health sector to greater local control, does not bode well for local partnerships and local issues.

In response to a funding crisis in the NHS a review highlighted a need to encourage greater efficiency and private insurance and healthcare (Ham, 1994). To this end, by developing the internal market and a mixed economy of care it was hoped these
problems would be ameliorated (Ham, 1994; Holliday, 1995). There was a major shift in culture, administration and function at this time and these changes go some way to explaining the current culture of the NHS. Although this represented the biggest internal shake up since its inception and a radical change in delivery and management of services there is little evidence that the measures had major short or long term effects on the NHS (Le Grand et al., 1998). Research suggests that there is some evidence that consultants became more mindful of cost after the Griffiths report but that standards of care remained paramount (Crilly et al., 2004).

There was strong belief by the Department of Health as part of the ‘modernising government’ plans (Cabinet Office, 1999) that if managers and doctors were aware of how much services cost and if they could ‘shop around’ they would do their best to secure a ‘competitive’ quote for their ‘client’ (patient). These are markets because they replace a state provider of services with competitive independent ones. However they are ‘quasi’ because they cannot fall along competitive market lines, the suppliers of services are not driven by a need to make a profit from the consumer, so it is difficult to see how this was intended to ‘drive down prices’, which would happen in a conventional market. On the purchaser side of the contract, there is an assumption that the purchaser will exhibit market behaviour in that either they or their agent (the fundholder GP) will seek services which are cost effective, low in price and high in quality (Holliday, 1995; Le Grand, 1991). Competition is meant to encourage a more cost effective service and further competition, however if you live in a remote area with only one hospital, then the idea of choice, which is crucial to this economic dynamic, is removed. Similarly, police forces are put in league tables, however most people are not in a position to choose where they live on the basis of police force or hospital performance. These targets do not help the majority and do not increase ‘choice’ for the ‘consumer’. In fact it is doubtful that a below average score will improve communities or encourage community participation or partnership between agencies. What it does is alert the ‘consumer’ that the state is not responsible for the current ‘state’ of the NHS or the current crime rates. This accords with the responsibilisation thesis in which Rose (2000) illustrates how the community is encouraged to take responsibility for its own security by installing security alarms in their houses or cars and not leaving valuables ‘on show’. By doing
this we fail to ask why crime is committed, why the government or society is failing individuals who commit crime or why criminals ‘enjoy’ crime, instead the community takes responsibility for its own crime rates (Rose, 2000). Blame gets reapportioned and in Rose and Garland’s concept of responsibilisation the community takes the biggest share (Garland, 1996; Rose, 2000).

In these false markets what is left is a monopoly, with the provider in a position to charge whatever it deems reasonable when considering the over-riding market forces. Although for the police the position is more complicated with police authorities and county councils having an interest in policing. Therefore setting force budgets can be an exercise in balancing different priorities. However, in many cases it remains that the provider is not a real provider and the purchaser is not in the position of a real purchaser. For the NHS it is arguable that the patient or ‘client’ would have seen very little difference in the NHS despite these radical reforms. In the NHS in England the prices are set by the Department of Health, which informs the Primary Care Trust. The Primary Care Trust purchases services and sets the price. As usual it was those who worked within the NHS - the doctors, nurses, healthcare professionals, administrators, managers, caterers and cleaners who bore the brunt of this ethos. ‘It is argued that public providers are inherently wasteful and inefficient, partly because they are publicly owned and hence not driven by the profit motive and partly because they face no competition.’ (Le Grand, 1991; 1263). Unfortunately, it would seem that the NHS didn’t have the opportunity to be wasteful of resources, the spending crisis of 1987 meant the NHS was effectively being run on the resourcefulness of Health Authority managers who were managing services by ‘pinching a bit from here to keep this bit open’ (Ham, 1994). Essentially the police have yet to experience the bite of market reform on their service to such an extent as the NHS, although it is an encroaching threat and their duties are being renegotiated at the boundaries of their work, for example with private security companies patrolling traditionally police territory (Walker, 2000). Furthermore, if central government can convince the public of their responsibilities, as regards crime control, then possibly moves towards hiving off peripheral services and reducing it to its core tasks, may continue (Crawford et al., 2003; Garland, 1996; Rose, 2000; Walker, 2000).
2.7 Role and culture

‘There was a time when policing was a fairly simple business. The task of the police was; to protect life and property; to prevent and detect crime; and to prosecute offenders. This was a job description and a police officer’s terms of reference. It gave certainty to those who were doing the job.’ (Dalley, 2003)

‘When a policeman puts his uniform on, he should forget all his prejudices.’
(Neville Lawrence as quoted in Macpherson, 1999; Day 42. Page 8133)

As illustrated by these two quotes, when we consider the role of the police we can ascertain that the police offer a specific but wide ranging service to the public and we the public have certain expectations of the police. Without doubt, to some extent the police role is driven by the changing expectations of the public and central and local government, as evidenced by public, government and force reaction to Scarman, Sheehy and the Macpherson enquiry. The history of policing uncovers the changing nature of policing and attitudes of those who are policed (Reiner, 1997). However the organisation of the police is also driven by its own internal traditions and culture (Chan, 1997; Fielding, 1988; Miller, 1979; Reiner, 2000). Although the culture is not ‘monolithic’ it clearly has identifying features, which are affected by its structure, and position in society (Reiner, 2000). Although not much work has been done on NHS culture (as an organisation) NHS staff seem to display a learned helplessness as conceptualised by Seligman (Seligman, 1975). NHS staff do not become involved in new initiatives or fight their corner (Sayers et al., 1993). They merely wait for the inevitable to pass (Walshe, 2003).

Clearly the police have ‘core’ tasks, which include law enforcement, crime prevention and a social service role. This includes aspects of ‘rough and ready’ care, and access to a 24 hour emergency service/information point (PA Consulting Group, 2001; Punch, 1979; Reiner, 2000). Although crime fighting is still possibly the key role ascertained by the public gaze, as Reiner suggests, the key police function is ‘order maintenance’ (Reiner, 2000) although this remains controversial amongst the police. ‘Control is not centralised but dispersed, it flows through a network of open circuits that are rhizomatic and not hierarchical.’ (Rose, 2000: 325). How much
actual crime response is required by the police to provide this role is debatable. As the social control debate illustrates, much of the nuts and bolts of social control is carried out by the public themselves (Garland, 1996). Although, not every breach of the law is enforced by the police the very presence of them maintains the fabric of society and its law and order façade (Crawford et al., 2003). Partnership would also fall within this diffuse role of ‘order maintenance’ (Reiner, 2000) or what Loader and Mulcahy (2003) would describe as a thinning of the police role.

Although ‘order maintenance’ is a convenient handle to express the diverse role that the police fulfil what is clearly of more importance is what the police consider their role to be. Here lies an additional problem – the police do not, as a homogenous force, think alike or act alike. Research into police culture highlights the inherent differences that exist between members of the police force, their skills, background and achievements (Brown and Hiedensohn, 2000; Burke, 1994; Chan, 1997; Gerber, 2001; Muir Jr., 1977). Variation and piecemeal diversity of policing lay one on top of the other, apparently frustrating any sound conclusions about this organisation. In the final instance what is important about these organisations from a partnership perspective is how they see themselves and how those they work with, in partnership, see them.

The NHS is perceived as a social ‘good’, which contributed to its ability to remain politically neutral for so long. Successive governments failed to tackle resource issues regarding the health sector because the NHS was seen to be untouchable and tampering with it a vote loser (Ham, 1994; Holliday, 1995). However, when governments did realise that they could alter the periphery of the NHS - the prescription charges, removal of free eye tests and dentistry, charging for equipment and specialist services, reorganisation of the management structure and introduction of internal markets - if they maintained the treatment levels and the ‘consumer’ or patients general experience of NHS services, then they could change the parts that the public could not see – the ‘backstage’ areas – without them particularly noticing. Essentially, if the public fails to perceive the changes then who, in the final instance, is responsible for the slow decline in NHS services? This position is reflected in how those in partnership see the NHS and NHS workers who come to work in
partnerships. Most are sympathetic of the position of the NHS, with comments like ‘it’s in a funding crisis’ and ‘it’s undergone constant changes.’ (Barbara). However tinged with this sympathy is exasperation, it seems as if the NHS has become a recalcitrant child, who is failing to perform a ‘set piece’ out of rebelliousness rather than an inability to comply, ‘they don’t get involved in partnership and if you speak to somebody they don’t know who you should speak to (sigh). I mean most other organisations if you spoke to someone and they couldn’t help you they would at least know someone who would know. Not the NHS, nobody has any idea what anybody else is doing.’ (Barbara). Again Rose’s (2000) responsibilisation thesis seems pertinent here, but applied to an organisation rather than individuals. Instead of seeing the complicated organisation that is the NHS; bureaucratically spread far and wide, with numerous responsibilities and funding streams, undergoing a process of almost constant change from successive governments. It is as if the failure of the NHS has become in a sense ‘personal’. It is responsible for its own failure and the government is, to some extent, able to step back and again reapportion blame.

2.8 Who are the police?

Although the police is made up of individuals who clearly have different ideas on what it is to be a police officer, it must also be clear that to say anything helpful about the police and the police as an organisation we must take a given reference point of personal identity and explore it. Rawlings states that, ‘The police had built a self-image as a crime-fighting organisation…’ (Rawlings, 2002: 218). This is a common understanding the police have of themselves, and the public has of them. It is seen as their primary role, despite administrative tasks taking up a large proportion of police time (Fielding, 1988; Labour Party, 2002; PA Consulting Group, 2001). When entering the force, many police officers list ‘helping people’ as their main reason for joining the police force, although Fielding (1988) notes that most people when asked would hardly list money and opportunity as their primary motivation. Sherman said that ‘Police applicants tend to see police work as an adventure, as a chance to work out-doors without being cooped up in an office, as a chance to do
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1 Please see Appendix 1 for a list of respondents, location and social characteristics
work that is important for the good of society, and not as a chance to be the toughest
guy on the block.’ (Sherman as quoted in Ford, 2003: 85). This understanding of
police work was also reflected in this research as can be seen from the following
segment of interview data.

Researcher: Were you involved in community policing?

John: Yes it's why I joined. I joined to work with the community and make
a difference. I was involved in community work in -shire. I was a beat
officer. And then I went to work with (a homeless persons charity), and
found my niche.

Researcher: Why did you leave? (pause) If you don’t mind me asking? You
don’t have to answer.

John: There was a death. And I realised that I didn't want to do that kind of
work anymore. It wasn’t what I thought it was going to be like.

The above quote seems to speak profoundly of the young police officer’s
disappointment in the reality of policing. Despite early evidence suggesting that the
police go into the force for the highest ethical considerations as early as initial
training, research suggests there is a breaking down of the recruits’ ideas of what
being a police officer is and entails (Ford, 2003). Several papers examining the
personality of the police recruit suggest they are extroverted and outgoing, although
this soon gives way to a more reserved and controlled attitude (Beutler et al., 1988;
Gudjonsson, 1983). Police officers develop traits such as cynicism, aloofness and
suspiciousness in response to traumatic events early in their career (Evans et al.,
1992). Clearly socialisation into the police force is a ‘process of identity
transformation.’ (Fielding, 1988: 1) and although traits such as kindness, strength,
intelligence, common sense, honesty, dependability, integrity, loyalty and many
others (Sanders, 2003; Villers and Adlam, 2003) seem core to the police force and a
‘good’ police officer, many of these characteristics would not seem to flourish in the
police organisation if, for example we consider trends in formal complaint statistics.
Police socialisation and personality does not, overtly, encourage traits which would
help them to work in partnership. Although the operational ‘can do’ nature of the
police can work positively to bring about change this seems to work in a job oriented
sense which calls for independent action and a complex skill mix (Muir Jr., 1977). In
partnership this action can engender anger from fellow partners as the police take
charge or take over. ‘The police come in and make pronouncements about what they
want, demands. They don’t tell us why or what purpose the information they are requesting will serve.’ (Sarah).

The ‘tainted’ service

If we consider Bittner’s conception of the police, he describes the police as a tainted occupation, but not merely tainted but harshly judged. He draws this conceptualisation by comparing police work with that of health workers, somewhat crudely, but nevertheless powerfully (Bittner, 1980).

To draw a deliberately remote analogy, the practice of medicine also has its dirty and mysterious aspects. And characteristically, dealings with physicians also elicit a sense of trepidated fascination. But in the case of medicine, the repulsive aspects, relating to disease, pain and death, are more than compensated by other features none of which are present in police work... No conceivable human interest could be opposed to fighting illness... But the evils the police are expected to fight are of a radically different nature. Contrary to the physician the policeman is always opposed to some articulated or articulable human interest. It does not take great subtlety of perception to realize that standing between man and man locked in conflict inevitably involves profound moral ambiguities.

In sum, the fact that policemen are required to deal with matters involving subtle human conflicts and profound legal and moral questions without being allowed to give the subtleties and profundities anywhere near the consideration they deserve invests their activities with the character of crudeness. Accordingly the constant reminder that officers should be wise, considerate, and just, without providing them with opportunities to exercise these virtues is little more than vacuous sermonizing. (1980: 8-9)

Without doubt Bittner adds insight to the work of the police officer but it only reflects a small part of the work that the police do, although it is their most recognised function (Reiner, 2000). The police force under current conditions is expected to carry out work that previously was not under their remit such as partnership work and other community based functions. Bittner’s portrayal of the police force as a tainted force is interesting from a partnership perspective, inviting us to consider how this analysis of the force fits in with current demands for the operational police force to work in a studied, meticulous and thorough manner. These skills are not beyond the police and it may be expected that these types of skills would be deployed in such areas of work as CID (Corsianos, 2003). However, even here the utilisation of skills is contested ground and shall be discussed further in chapter five.
How those working in partnership with the police, health workers, local authority representatives, voluntary sector workers and community representatives, see them must be drawn from personal experience of the police and through media portrayal. Although the media is critical of the police in general it will only go so far and media portrayal of the angry mob is generally done in such a way as to reflect and support the police point of view (Fielding, 1991; Reiner, 2000). Although some police see themselves as, ‘Without doubt the most abused, the most unfairly criticised and the most silent minority in this country,’ (Sir Robert Mark as quoted in Reiner, 2000: 144), many other minority groups would, no doubt, disagree but Marks’s assertion does address the issue that the police feel ‘picked on’ and are seen as separate from society. ‘Fly on the wall’ documentaries of police forces and ‘hard hitting/real life’ drama, still reflect the common portrayal of the police as crime fighters, more likely to be successful in their crime fighting occupation then the police are in reality (Reiner, 2000; Reiner, 2002). However research reveals that the police spend 43.1 per cent of their time in the station on administrative tasks (PA Consulting Group, 2001: v).

The perception of partnership working amongst the police emanates from two conflicting sources. Firstly, there is the idea that the police have of their core service role, which includes helping people but relies on an action-oriented paradigm. Here partnership working is perceived as, and inhabits, the periphery of police work. As such, as Crawford (1998b) rightly points out it is regarded as a ‘Cinderella’ service. Secondly, there is the perception that officers and their colleagues who work in partnership have of this role. During field work an officer who was very experienced in partnership working and believed his partnership to be successful, introduced himself in the following manner, ‘They all know I’m a middle manager, I’m too old now to get promotion. So I do what I can. I’m not going to be moved. I’m just a middle manager’ (Mark). What is reflected in this segment is what Fielding identifies as the career disappointment and assumed attitude of fellow officers, to the officer who has failed to develop their career or ‘go up the ranks’ and has been left behind (1988). Even officers who choose to remain in post because they judge for themselves that they do not want the additional stress and responsibility or are happy
doing frontline work, are regarded as underachieving (Fielding, 1988). This culture of competitiveness at the expense of apparent job satisfaction will contribute to workplace isolation, which will exacerbate the already identified social isolation from friends and family. A fellow member of the partnership described the same police officer as follows; ‘...we all know Mark (pseudonym) and officers like him, who do not see any action anymore. They are middle managers; they have been working in this area for a long time and are respected. Why does he have to wear his uniform to every meeting? It separates them from the rest of the group immediately’ (Sarah). This was in conflict with the officer’s desire to work in partnership on the one hand and yet retain a professional separation and maintain his role within the social setting.

2.9 Business principles in the NHS

As already mentioned, as early as the 1950s (McLeod in Klein 1985) the NHS had been urged by the Government to ‘work together’ and to implement these changes at a local level. As a response to this and the generally overburdened bureaucratic structures of the health sector, the NHS underwent another major organisational overhaul in the late 1980s. This reorganisation was an attempt to reorganise centrally and corporately and strengthen the management structures internally and systematically. ‘A major offensive against the bureaucratic structure of welfare provision was launched in 1988 and 1989; years that in retrospect will be seen as critical in the history of British social policy.’ (Le Grand, 1991; 1256). A new policy board and NHS executive were to replace the largely defunct supervisory board and management board. The composition of the new health authorities was to be along business lines. The introduction of the Health Advisory Service to inspect failing long stay hospitals, was an innovation which was to stay with the NHS up until its present form of National Frameworks and target setting (Ham, 1994; Secretary of State for Health, 2000). The Seebohm reforms which occurred as early as 1968 and the subsequent reforms which flowed from them had already begun the process of ‘modernisation’. The reforms led to a split between the functions of health and the social services (Ham, 1994). Social services were to come under the Director of Social Services and be split from NHS services in an attempt to separate the medical
and caring role (Ham, 1994). In retrospect this separation was successful (although clearly not successful for partnership working) and quickly became entrenched as is evidenced by the current necessity to raise specific initiatives to engender cooperation and partnership working between these two organisations (Snell, 2003). As we shall see in the next chapter the literature on partnership working between these two organisations highlights some of the endemic problems that were encountered between the NHS and the police.

Little has been written about the inter-organisational conflict between the health sector and the police but some has been written about the relationships that exist between social services and the police (Punch, 1979), and the NHS and social services (Hudson, 2002; Snell, 2003). These seem to reflect some of the findings of McLaughlin (1994) that where organisations have become entrenched, and have entrenched bureaucratic systems, joint working becomes problematic ideologically and physically. This will be explored more fully in the following chapters. Police and the NHS have undergone substantial changes over the past 20 years with more yet to come in the guise of foundation hospitals and centralisation of the police force with the hiving off of previously core tasks such as traffic, parks constabulary, neighbourhood watch, security agencies, community forces, specials, community safety officers, and neighbourhood wardens (Walker, 2000). In essence:

> the gradual de-centring of the sovereign state (and) the post-fordist shift away from large-scale, monolithic top-down organisations both pose broad ideological challenges to the central role of the conventional public police bureaucracy in the provision of security (Walker, 2000: 264).

This assertion could equally be applied to the NHS as a public organisation and provider of health care. Police are being encouraged (Home Office, 2002), despite evidence that it is a crime reduction failure, to go back to community patrols to reassure the public (Crawford et al., 2003; Hough, 1987). Community safety and reassurance policing have led to a renaissance in the idea of having a 'bobby on the beat'. Conversely, in spite of this trend, crime has become the responsibility of individuals, communities and partnerships (Garland, 1996; Rose, 2000).
2.10 Context

Up until this point we have been discussing the way in which targets, business principles and assessment through market mechanisms has affected (or not) the way the National Health and Police Service operationalise and maintain their role on a day to day basis. In the following section we shall consider the political and ideological context in which this takes place.

Rose’s (2000) responsibilisation thesis complements Garland’s (2001) work on the limits of the sovereign state and ideas on third way ideology. Garland views crime as a set of risks which need to be assessed. He argues that as regards crime ‘the state has a limited capacity, and they look to the every day lifeworld to bring about change’ (Garland, 1996: 451). Crime prevention is about why the crime occurred and not why the crime was committed; the cause of crime is criminal opportunity, not social dislocation. This new conception of crime has led to a new crime prevention strategy and utilises partnership to impose responsibilities onto the individual and the community (Garland, 1996).

The state seeks to renegotiate the boundaries between what is a state responsibility and what lies in the public domain (Rose, 2000). The NHS and the police come in under the auspices of a new government with a different political philosophy than that which had preceded it. The new political philosophy is described as ‘the third way’, which encompasses a new worldwide political movement towards individual rights and responsibilities. ‘New Labour evokes a stakeholding society or Third Way in which morally empowered individuals promote social cohesion and thus an economically vibrant nation. The logical progression here is from the individual to the company and finally to the state.’ (Bevir and O'Brien, 2001). As regards welfare the community should work in partnership with the providers (the state) and should not waste limited resources that the public are encouraged to view as a privilege rather than as a right. There is an onus on the public to protect, nurture and appreciate the services that they have embodied in, for example, the patients charter.
As regards the police and crime reduction new Labour seeks to instigate new policy through the ‘third way’ (Lewandowski, 2003). ‘Third way’ ideology seeks to create a society which accepts that the development and delivery of key welfare services may no longer be delivered by the state. ‘Thus, stakeholding and the Third Way represents solutions to two fundamental issues facing contemporary Britain: social fragmentation and declining economic performance.’ (Blair, 1996; web source). But will it really? Are these issues not a response to global fragmentation? Can a Labour government tackling these themes turn the tide?

The third way combined the old left – the paternalistic development of welfare services that was instigated by Bevan – with the new right of individualism, rolling back the state. The third way says ‘yes I will provide services for when you are in need, however I will not provide those services without you agreeing to be involved in the process of finding your own way.’ Essentially, this is self-reliance in a protective environment. Clearly the police are not strictly speaking a welfare service they are an essential service, or are certainly perceived as such by the public and the state, however the hiving off of police functions at the periphery mirrors what has happened to the NHS, such as with dentistry and ophthalmology, eroding its core functions (Carvel, 2003). In addition to this the introduction of performance indicators and league tables mimic the path that the NHS has trod along with the increasing marketisation of police services.

Crime as a phenomenon is no longer the problem of just the state or the community but it has also become the problem of the police. Traditionally crime and its aetiology was not the problem of the police, catching criminals was. Keeping the streets safe for ‘decent’ citizens to walk on without being subject to the threat of crime was and is the remit of the police. But crime rates were not explicitly the problem of the police. Crime rates and therefore crime and the reasons for it being committed were the province of the state, academics and society. Increasingly the police are seen as responsible for failing to reduce crime rates in their area. Crime reduction and health promotion has been relocated in the community and is the responsibility of the police and the NHS respectively (Garland, 1996; Rose, 2000).
These radical changes have had three major implications for partnership. Firstly, organisations become more entrenched over their core tasks and ‘play the game’ as regards organisational and policy development, and conflict and change (Bright, 2001; Irving et al., 2002). Secondly, partnerships can embrace change and instigate national frameworks locally, or thirdly they can do what they have to do to take nationally provided priorities and make them work for locally held concerns. The third option is a compromise between the local and the national; it is more likely to provide a successful outcome for the community and central government. Partnerships which become caught up in central government rhetoric and bureaucratic complexities are more likely to alienate the local community, which will not overtly see any benefit in working in partnership with organisations which only pay lip service to local issues (Davies, 2003b).

Notwithstanding the striking difference between the role of the police and the NHS, they clearly occupy a similarly important and strategic function upon the psyche of the British public and are equally as essential as providers of health care and crime prevention. Yet one is seen as nurturing and healing, whereas the other is concerned with the hard edge, the sharp end, with the real world of people doing bad things (Punch, 1979; Reiner, 2000; Waddington, 1999). However on closer inspection this dichotomy only creates a false idea of these two organisations, and this simple idea of their role and task does not actually hold true. Both exchange functions, the police have a social work function as a significant aspect of their role and a substantial amount of their time is utilised in non-crime tasks (PA Consulting Group, 2001; Punch, 1979). They care for people when they have reached a low ebb; this care is presented as ‘rough and ready’, when in actual fact it is a quite sophisticated deployment of skills and resources (Muir Jr., 1977). It is also portrayed by the police as the least attractive aspect of the ‘job’ of policing (Crawford et al., 2003; Kerley et al., 2000; Skogan et al., 2000), despite many police trainees listing helping people as an essential aspect of the job (Ford, 2003). Whereas those involved in health care equally carry out work which is tough, dirty, messy and puts staff at risk of crime (Elston et al., 2002), staff in A&E, paediatric units and GP’s deal with violence regularly, and are also obliged to have sophisticated strategies for dealing with ‘frontline’ incidents (Timmermans and Gabe, 2002).
As we shall see in the following chapter, partnership is a complicated framework and organisationally, bureaucratically and culturally these two agencies find it difficult to work in partnership together. However, although fulfilling fundamentally different roles, their position within the public sphere means they also have much in common – as emergency services - so why do they find it so difficult to work collectively? The answer to this question is explored in the following chapters.

2.11 Social Class

Whilst analysing the data gathered in this research it became apparent that cultural aspects of the working class experience may also be reflected in forms of practice and understanding of police occupational culture. The purpose of this section is to provide a brief guide to the thinking in the following substantive analysis chapters on this minor theme throughout this work: namely the concept of social class. It does this by briefly considering it from an economic and cultural perspective and attempts to provide some synthesis between these approaches. It also argues that there is much of value in attempting not to ‘over theorise’ the concept, an approach which, as Manning (2006) notes, increasingly overburdens social research and distances it from its substantive subject matter. Indeed recent literature on social class has attempted to try and extricate it from a dry analytical form and instead use it to give meaning in personal story telling (Hey, 2003; Walkerdine et al., 2001; Walkerdine, 2003). It provides some support for the considerations and action reported in this research.

In particular, this section pauses to reflect on the work of Marx (1977) and Weber (1970), which offers a broad context within which to locate and make sense of much of the later work on social class. It goes on to consider the work of those working in the fields of education and gender that have been particularly productive over the last decade. At times the concept of social class has been perceived as old-fashioned and lacking in explanatory value, leading Beck to term it a ‘zombie’ category and others to comment on the summary ‘dumping’ of it as a concept that seemed to be taking place (Fraser, 1997; Pile and Thrift, 1995). However, other scholars have begun to reconceptualise its importance (Hey, 2003; Medhurst, 1999; Munt, 1999; Skeggs, 2003).
1997). This section goes on to consider the work of those who have sought to situate class within a cultural framework, most notably the work of Skeggs (2004) and to a lesser extent Bourdieu (1990). Finally, it sets this within the context of this research and the way it was utilised.

The concept of social class is clearly difficult to define. Certainly in this research, a struggle ensued in attempting to give the category analytical coherency, methodological rigor and empirical meaning. As we shall see below the categorisation developed may seem ‘workman’ like in its approach but also strives for authenticity. However, it is important to assert that it remains close to its roots in providing explanatory power and an attempt to ‘keep it simple’ advocated by Manning (2006) and Medhurst (1999). The most common and earliest encounter social researchers (as researchers) have with the category of social class is as an analytical category. It is apparent that the utilisation of it as a classification system is often derived out of a desire to give meaning not (as one might think) to the apparent chaos in the social world, but instead to the inexplicable regularity of reoccurring phenomena: what is it that these people have in common? An example of this might be poor physical health and diminished life chances amongst the low income working classes (Wilkinson, 1996; Wilkinson et al., 1998; Williams, 1995). Therefore, when we discuss social class what we are often doing is describing social practices and experiences and patterns of (dis)advantage, opportunity and inequality. Social classifications over time become heavy (or permeated) with meaning and alternate interpretations. However, social class groupings maintain their origins in economic categories, or for a Marxian, the means of production.

Social class with its historically rigid boundaries of occupational groupings seems to provide a convenient heuristic device. However, people themselves are often not conveniently ascribed to particular groups such as gender, race or ethnicity (Anthias, 2001). Moreover, due to the way these systems are derived, their purpose and clarity is often variable (Duke and Edgell, 1987). To complicate matters further any form of stratification is also ‘cross-cut’ by other types of social categorisation, the most
apparent being ethnicity and gender (Anthias, 2001). The categorisation of social class and its meaning has moved far away from merely considering relationship to the means of production, status and market position, occupational grouping or paternal occupation. Social class and in particular our understanding of the terms working class, middle class (lower/middle/upper) and upper class have particular meanings which are derived from our own social class position (a Bourdieuvian might term this ‘habitus’), our interaction with others and the social world (fields) and our own production and consumption of cultural goods. Therefore, depending on the context, to assert that one is middle class (or working class) has certain connotations and these are not simply made up of economic factors - they are constituted of them, but not entirely made of them.

In addition it is clear that social class still has popular resonance. This is evidenced when the concept is tied to access to opportunities which are usually secured through social mobility. Recent reports suggest that social mobility is on the decline and class positions are becoming more fixed although society is becoming increasingly affluent - the gulf between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have-nots’ is becoming increasingly wide (Diamond and Giddens, 2005).

Marx (1977), Weber (Wrong, 1970) and to some extent Bourdieu (1990) consider social class in relation to a person’s market position, although Bourdieu attempts some synthesis of a structure and agency position. Marx’s position is primarily ruled by the relationship one has to the means of production. Weber regards class position to be reliant on a person’s economic position but he also considers their position with reference to status and authority. It is argued particularly by modern stratification theorists that these objective class positions ruled and driven by an economic position, are too rigid in a society which is dealing with rapid social movement and that is divesting itself of old ways of being – the move from industrialisation to post-industrialisation to service sector workers and a global economy (Beck, 1992; Beck
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2 Anthias (2001) offers an alternative to traditional categories and instead terms them divisions allowing for a person to be a member of several divided groups. The work in this thesis has maintained the traditional understanding of social class categories as developed by Glass (1954) and Goldthorpe (Bergman and Joye, 2001; Goldthorpe and Hope, 1974; Goldthorpe et al., 1967) but also engages with the cultural take on the traditional categories of social class.
et al., 1994; Giddens, 1979; Giddens, 1998). Bourdieu’s conceptualisation of social class is more complex and orients itself towards a significantly more cultural explanation of class and its impact on life chances. Social class becomes about lived experience, how you talk, look, walk, act and think. It forms your ability to access opportunity and understand the meaning in social situations (fields). However, this is still situated and couched in the language of economic exchange and what can be ‘purchased’ (symbolically, through an increase in status or actually, through economic exchange) with these goods to improve your cultural position. Bourdieu rejects Rational Action Theory and by doing so aligns himself with a fixed structuralist position advocated by Marxists. Inherently Bourdieuan analysis relies on an understanding of social class and learning the ‘rules of the game’ (habitus), which is comprehensive. Thus Bourdieu’s analysis ultimately results in a conceptualisation entailing a fixed social position.

These ‘rules of the game’ that Bourdieu (1990) defines as ‘a system of acquired dispositions functioning on the practical level as categories of perception and assessment... as well as being the organizing principles of action’ (p13), or what some might call secondary socialisation, are powerful and inescapable, making social mobility or change very difficult to achieve or conceptualise – especially for those with low degrees of social, cultural or symbolic capital. Bourdieu (1977) notes that awareness of habitus occurs when confronted with an incongruent situation or field but, he also suggested, in response to criticism that outcomes were not determined (by habitus or disposition), but were limited by them.³ This is rather different to the Hegelian ‘Master and Slave’ dichotomy where consciousness can only be achieved through the acknowledgement of your own and another’s position (Hegel, 1998; Russell, 1970). In Hegel’s position it is only the slave who can reach full consciousness – whereas a Bourdieuan analysis would seem to suggest that cultural resources with a low exchange value would prevent those of the lower social orders from engaging fully in social and more importantly political processes.⁴ This is

³ The extensiveness and intricacies of the debate on Bourdieus structural determinism versus his theory of reflexivity is too large a body of work to present it here. Nonetheless it is clear that Bourdieus theory indicates a fixed nature with apparent incongruities when attempting to fuse structure and agency. For a good recent summary on this consider (Mouzellis, 2007).
⁴ An idea supported by recent research on the decline of social mobility.
contrary to Marxian ideas of class-consciousness and with Marx (1977) noting that the proletariat were capable of becoming a ‘class for itself’ rather than merely a ‘class in itself’. Chris Haylett (2001) explores the idea of homogeneity, fragmentation and whiteness amongst the white working class in conjunction with developments occurring in welfare policy – developments which have conflated multiculturalism and modernism. By doing this working class whiteness begins to be seen as tainted, antiquated and out of step. For Haylett it is the hegemonic political processes which maintain the fixed class positions of the white working class, compounded by a lack of economic (welfare) resources and their inability to mimic middle class attributes.

Featherstone (1991) (unlike Haylett who is considering the white working class) notes a wider valorisation and appropriation of particular aspects of working class culture, these can be physical or cultural aspects such as mimicking a working class gait or attending traditionally working class sporting events (the football match). However, Skeggs (2004) notes that characteristics that are fundamentally working class and advertise that class position (a pattern of speech, a particular accent, deportment) are unlikely to attract appropriation – because they mark you as being working class and not merely mimicking it. She explores this idea with reference to ethnicity and considers the white person’s ability to appropriate ‘black coolness’ whereas a black person would not be able to comprehensively appropriate white characteristics. Similarly, the working class cannot appropriate middle class culture without devaluing it.

Skeggs, whilst taking a fundamentally cultural view of social class, does not avoid using the language of the marketplace and ‘exchange’ to explain the cultural position and conflict experienced by the working class. However she engages in a reworking of the Bourdieuan use value (the ability to exchange symbolic goods), instead considering the relationships of power existing in the exchange. In addition, the focus on the cultural significance of class allows for a consideration of the fixed identification of the feelings, processes and practices associated with being working class. In particular Skeggs and colleagues note the similarity in patterns of consumption that remain even after social mobility might provide increased
resources for appropriating alternate methods of living (Reay, 2005; Skeggs, 2004). It is important to note that the authors being profiled here are working from within their own experience of working class status and its friction with their own subsequent academic status. These authors experienced a seeming inability to divest themselves of working class sensibilities even when they had become adept at apparently adopting middle class lifestyles (Hey, 2003; Medhurst, 1999; Reay, 2005; Reay, 2006; Sayer, 2005; Walkerdine, 2003). They feel social class and mobility with a distinct uneasiness and even a sense of shame.

Having explored some contemporary nuances and themes in what has always been a contested concept, we now should draw out how they relate to the present research. In the research reported here it became apparent during analysis that there was a social class element to the way that inter-agency working occurred. Although respondents were not asked for their social class of origin, social class characteristics and signifiers were apparent in interview and through, as Skeggs would suggest, the accounts of the ‘processes and practices’ of everyday life that were offered therein. In interviews it became clear that the police in this research largely presented as deriving from a working class background. This was in contrast to respondents who made up the cohort of NHS managers and strategists (some of whom had their roots in practitioner communities) who presented as fundamentally middle class in origin and expression.\(^5\) As Reay (2005), notes in her research into working class and middle class pupils, it is the working class students who focus on their background and insecurities, whereas the middle class students either dwell less on their insecurities or had less (Reay argues the latter). Working class officers when asked about their background focussed on explanations of themselves in terms of their family history. These accounts were orientated towards aspects of deviancy, what Haylett (2001) would term ‘ambivalence about law-abiding behaviour’ and ‘loose attachments to conventional family life’ and, in early life, ‘fateful approaches to self-advancement’. Rather consistently these characteristics no longer applied in their current law-abiding life, which was generally also characterised by ambition, and a stable home life. In addition, their apparent social mobility had led to a disassociation

\(^5\) For further consideration of research methods please see the methods chapter 6 and the concluding chapter for the limits of this research.
from and pessimistic preoccupation with the overly fecund, lazy, disrespectful 'criminal' poor. Indeed the position adopted reflects the moralising perspective on the poor working class, common in the 19th Century and more recently (Haylett, 2001; Skeggs, 2004). Despite this they were able to rely on and utilise the most positive aspects of traditional working class whiteness, which had been transferred into performing the function of a cohesive occupational culture such as: cohesiveness, a clear sense of purpose, inherent loyalties to the group and a common understanding of the world and the way it worked. To some extent its performative nature probably had little to do with how working 'classness' was experienced by them or their cohort but more to do with a type of respectable working 'classness' most closely resembling that as defined by Thompson (1963). This characteristic probably meant that it was more easily accessible to some rather than others. However, regardless of the authenticity of the culture, the articulated nature of it had consequences for the way they acted and responded and that were revealed in the every day practices of their working life (as recorded in the fieldwork). This then became a dualistic form of social class analysis: that of origins, which was linked to economic position and understandings of poverty and inequality; coupled with a cultural reproduction of working class characteristics in their occupational culture.

This work finds Marx’s statement that '(m)en make their own history but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past' (1977:300), compelling. The idea that a person is responding to their history (personal and social) is discussed further below in association with the development of occupational culture. The current literature on cultural, moral and economic descriptions of social class and its attributes underlines the difficulty of isolating its most recognisable characteristics. The recent work, by cultural writers and those in the field of education, remains important in framing our broad understanding of this debate. However, I argue that it is the way that social class culture is used and performed, in association with occupational culture, which is the most important aspect of trying to identify the characteristics of social class; to

---

6 For more on this conception of the white working class poor see Chris Haylett (2001).
7 This idea is explored further in the concluding chapter.
8 Ibid.
identify how class culture and occupational culture impact on partnership working in a crime reduction context. This discussion, although brief, has sought to provide a basis for this theme in the analysis that occurs in the following chapters.

2.12 Conclusion

By considering the political and policy developments between these two organisations we can begin to ascertain the contributing and inhibiting factors which are effecting partnership development between them. The preceding discussion has sought to offer some clarity with regards to the first research question by situating these two organisations within their political and policy framework.\(^9\)

The history and development of the police is part of the history and development of society and is the backdrop to social class and racial inequalities (within and without the police) as well as depicting social change in areas such as domestic violence, drugs and alcohol. In essence it reflects the bureaucratisation of Britain, the politicisation of relationships between the state and the citizen, the organisation of social control as an emanation of the state and (to some) the exploitation of the disadvantaged. Undoubtedly ‘the most remarkable fact about the timing of the foundation of the modern police is that it is sequentially the last of the basic building blocks in the structure of modern executive government’ (Bittner, 1980: 15).

It seems apparent from these two organisations’ histories that they respond to change very differently. The police have challenged change in a piecemeal manner and been an engine for change if they could manipulate the situation to their own ends. They co-opt new initiatives and incorporate them into their existing framework (Crawford et al., 2003), whereas the NHS have usually waited for change to pass. Their attitude to change is crucial in understanding how they adapt to a policy such as partnership. It is also helpful to try and situate these changes within a larger policy context and try and ascertain the impact this may have on partnership processes. The police and the NHS are generally perceived as unchanging, whereas the NHS has undergone at least 20 major policy changes over the past 20 years, and it continues to

\(^9\) Please see the list of research questions in Chapter 1, page 10.
endure change after change (Walsh, 2003). Changes in the police force have tended to be more insidious such as the encroaching marketisation. The police response to these changes seem to be two fold: either to pay lip service to them ‘...to maintain traditional methods of working on the street but apply new names to what was done’ (Irving et al., 2002: 6) or, to find a way to work in conjunction with existing police processes (Reiner, 2000). So whereas neither organisation is anti-change per se, partnership requires something which these organisations must be prepared to offer at an early stage; trust and commitment to the partnership process (Hardy et al., 2000). The question is do either of these organisations have the time, resources or degree of commitment to offer this?

Realistically a response to such a question is not particularly about one organisational structure being any worse or better than any other organisational structure that could be used on such complex systems. An example of this is police advancement through the ranks as a response to a successful project or in spite of participation in local projects. There is a tension between structural aims and agency practice. The problem is the imposing of short-term goals at the expense of long-term success. In the case of partnership, the inability to follow through on a course of action makes philosophy look like cheap rhetoric and innovative policy look like spin. Although, as Garland (2001) asserts, we should not assume that ‘talk’ is inconsequential. These problems are not just the problem of the current Government. They are in essence a symptom of a political system which makes the achievement of short-term goals the only way a party can secure a further term in government (Jones et al., 1994). Whilst the NHS and other organisations such as the Police are subject to these arrangements then the new targets of successive governments will be very hard to meet, staff morale will continue to suffer and fragmentation will continue to occur (Le Grand, 1991; Revill, 2003). These are the issues that the NHS and the police bring to negotiation when they sit at the partnership table and these issues are what need to be tackled before working in partnership can be seen as a long term ethos for society rather than a political goal.

10 Please see appendix 3 for a list of changes.
To understand the partnership process between these two organisations it is necessary to comprehend the process from which the idea and framework of partnership and crime reduction arose and the political ideology in which it is embedded. This will form part of the analysis of partnership as a policy device, from its inception into its current form, under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 and on to its modern evolution under the Police and Justice Act 2006. It will also aid our understanding of partnership to consider the statutory framework, which abuts these two organisations in their attempts to work in partnership and share information in the partnership arena. Evidently the culture, history and development of these two organisations is crucial in our understanding of how they respond to the challenge of partnership working and partnership working in a crime reduction context. These are the issues that will be discussed in the following chapter.
3. Chapter Three
Partnership working

‘Institutions are structures of human beings, each with unique energy and intelligence: they are not merely counters to be moved around according to the workings of someone else’s mind. And they may, unlike metal, have their own ideas about improving the system of which they are a part ... You can move plants around a garden to a certain extent, in the right season, but if you keep pulling things up and moving them each time you have more ‘ideas’ about how it should be, you end up with a dead garden.’ (Williamson 2003).

This chapter seeks to offer some clarity around partnership, its history and development, the development of partnership in a crime reduction context and the current thinking around the distribution of power and the experience of conflict within a partnership context. Partnership working in a crime reduction context has been described as a ‘slippery’ and ‘wicked’ issue. It has become the nexus for competing organisational, community and state orientated aims. As such it is a problematic term and this chapter whilst seeking to offer clarity may only hope to offer exploration of the current and developing statutory framework11.

3.1 History and development of partnership working

Both the police and the NHS have often been encouraged to work in partnership with other agencies and the community particularly during ‘lean’ times.12 For the NHS in particular this is a frequent and persistent feature of their work. Iain McLeod who served in the Ministry Of Health between 1953 and 1955 said, ‘It is about time we stopped issuing paper and made the instructions work. I want to try and recreate local interest and above everything to get a complete partnership between voluntary effort and the state.’ (McLeod quoted in Klein, 1985; 42). It was also recognised as a potential benefit for mental health services as early as the Mental Health Act 1959, where local authorities were encouraged to provide community services for the mentally ill rather than hospitalisation (Ham, 1994). Most importantly the Gillie

11 Please see research questions Chapter 1.
12 For a good example on this please see the Community Development Projects 1969-1977 and in particular the Community Development Report ‘Gilding the Ghetto’ (Community Development Project Inter-Project Editorial Team, 1977). The Working Class Movement Library holds a good stock of this and other publications, from this fairly radical period of ‘partnership working’.
Report which considered ‘The Field of Work of the Family Doctor’, argued for closer integration between GP’s and other health services (Ham, 1994). Already we can see that the National Health Service was fragmented and many thought it should be encouraged to work in closer partnership with other agencies. This could be particularly seen when looking at the elderly who required hospital stays and then post hospital care such as ‘meals on wheels’ or occupational therapy as well as supervision by community nurses and GP’s (Hayden and Benington, 2000), or children’s services as recommended by Lord Laming in the Victoria Climbie enquiry (Lord Laming, 2003). Regardless of these changes, later developments were to only act as a wedge between services and encourage ‘silo working’ (Hayden et al., 2000; 27).

The right wing agenda and the apparent formalisation in police powers (through PACE), which occurred with the inauguration of the Conservative government may have served only to delay a process, which could have included a closer involvement with the police working alongside local authorities, health and social services. McLaughlin’s (1994) detailed and fascinating portrayal of the power conflicts which occurred between the police committee and the chief constable on Moss Side, illustrate the problematic relationship which existed between the police and local government. The obstructive working practices that the police adopted did not serve to make policing better. Rather, all it did was serve the needs of the organisation (Weber, 1981). The action taken by the Chief Constable was self-protective and organisationally so. Maintaining the status quo seemed the most important aim.

The results of this action were to make both sides of the divide - the police and those who were at the brunt of frontline policing, ethnic minorities, the poor and dispossessed of Moss Side - more entrenched. By the late 1980’s the police committee had retreated from its adversarial position into less contested ground of ‘community safety’, which initially it had labelled as the work of snoopers and informers (neighbourhood watch) (McLaughlin, 1994: 154). The fears of the white working class were adopted as the new problem for the police to tackle and ‘the people of Moss Side were effectively left out on their own to cope with the serious crime related problems they faced’ (McLaughlin, 1994: 165). Essentially the
community work which was done was that of the white majority and reflected their fears (possibly unreasonable) of the crime that they were (or perceived they may be) victims of. This increase in fear of crime and crime itself, experienced in a late modern context, no doubt exacerbated the ontological insecurity felt by communities, in response to local crime problems and fed the movement towards Reassurance Policing and other community based forms of crime control (Gilling, 1997; Innes, 2004; Loader et al., 2003). Of course partnership can also be co-opted by the well-meaning majority leaving the disenfranchised minority excluded (Crawford, 1998a), leading to what Crawford terms ‘inter-communal conflict’ (Crawford, 1995).

There appear to be several forces pulling the police in different directions. Its responsibilities have increased and yet the freedom to achieve them has largely disappeared. This policy driven confusion Garland calls ‘policy bifurcation’. In effect, it is policy driven contradiction (1996). On the one hand the police remain a public service organisation, an organisation which, to meet its public service role, has to maintain certain levels of policing and public safety. On the other hand central government and the forces of marketisation increasingly control the police, making the meeting of these core public service responsibilities progressively more torturous (Crawford et al., 2003; Davis, 2003; Martin, 2003; Reiner, 1992; Walker, 2000). Gilling (2005) also identifies this tension between the competing priorities of the central and the local and what Crawford terms increasing corporatism (Crawford, 1994) in response to late modern fragmentation and the process of distancing between the citizen and the state.

As noted earlier in the 1980’s the police became subject to the language of the market place, as did the health sector. Interestingly, it is here where there is, perhaps, an increasing commonality between public sector workers and services (Clarke et al., 2007; Gilling, 1997; Holdaway, 1986). In response to the Wolff Olins Report 1988 the ‘Plus Programme’ was launched in the Metropolitan Police, which involved providing ‘professional quality service’ to customers. There was a re-categorisation of the police ‘as a service concerned with consumer satisfaction, rather than as a force primarily preoccupied with law enforcement.’ (McLaughlin, 1994:175). This would suggest that the public had become consumers of police services in some part
illustrated by the growth in the largely unregulated private security firms. The police were beginning to operate in a crowded marketplace. This was reinforced by the Police and Magistrates Court Act 1994 which enabled police forces to effectively 'sell' their services to private consumers (Crawford et al., 2003; Walker, 2000).

These changes took place within an increasing interest in crime prevention in a partnership context. Both crime prevention and partnership are problematic terms. Hughes (1998) and Gilling (1997) do comprehensive jobs of unpicking the ontological and epistemological differences between crime prevention (adopting situational changes to prevent the commission of crime), crime reduction (situated within an actuarial process of crime and criminality attempting to lower what can be objectively 'measured') and community safety (a wider definition incorporating elements of crime prevention, reduction and a wider social remit to do with community building and economic regeneration). The emphasis on the economic element of community safety, which was seen particularly in the development of Safer Cities in the early 1990s offers local agencies an opportunity to consider the benefits to business. However, it is perhaps another point of conflict in an already contested and competitive area – although clearly business is also part of the 'community' but potentially with a very loud voice. Conversely, Tilly (1992) suggests that the reference made to 'regeneration of economic and commercial life' was merely a feature of the times and a way of jumping on the business bandwagon, which was at that time rolling through town and continued to do so for quite some time. Of course another element of this is the extent to which 'community' is involved in the process of policy development, evolution or implementation of local forms of crime control and how much crime prevention feels like a process that is done to communities rather than with them.

---

13 Community is a contested term and like the term 'partnership' is often overused and little understood. In this work the element of the 'community' is somewhat distant from the power differentials experienced by respondents, although, without doubt, most were situated within their community or communities. Community is not a concept I am going to try and unravel here – however for more on community in a crime reduction context please see (Baggott, 2003; Bauman, 2000; Crawford, 1994; Crawford, 1995; Crawford, 1996; Crawford, 1997; 1979; Etzioni, 1993; Foster, 2002; Garland, 1996; Hughes, 2002; McLaughlin, 1994; McLaughlin, 2002b; Putnam, 2000).
Hughes (1998) offers an interpretation of crime prevention which is seen as layered and loaded down with social and political meaning both locally and nationally. He highlights the ideological influence of terms such as community, partnership and crime prevention, which took on such a powerfully positive meaning in the 1980s and which seems yet to be challenged. This is without regard to researchers in the field who highlighted how meaning is not shared by different agencies working in partnership and this can lead to powerful discrepancies in outcomes for agencies (Gilling, 1994; Gilling, 1997; Pearson et al., 1992; Rosenbaum, 1988; Sampson et al., 1988). What is clear is that as development occurred the term ‘crime prevention’ was abandoned in favour of ‘crime reduction’. Tilley (2005) suggests that the use of community safety is now more common than either of the previous terms. However, in this research there was a definite shift back towards crime reduction in partnerships. This was particularly important when considering the work of the police and the NHS. As Gilling (1994) identifies, the police are more likely to feel comfortable and confident with a crime reduction remit, which is reflected in the current recentring of the state and actuarial crime control policies, whereas the NHS are more likely to be ontologically confident and committed in an area which calls for creative community safety solutions to local crime problems. Newburn (2007) identifies the development of local crime control practices as a move from situational crime prevention to community safety and then on to crime reduction. Clearly, community safety partnerships operationalise these methods rather like an eclectic ‘pick and mix’ and are not constrained by linear approaches to local forms of crime control. However, the apparent return to a community safety forum being dominated by crime reduction and therefore police concerns is clearly problematic when there is an attempt to encourage engagement with other agencies.

3.2 The development of multi-agency partnership working in a crime reduction context

In recent times partnership has become a concept, ideology and a process. It is acknowledged as being difficult to achieve by practitioners and researchers (Liddle et al., 1994a; Pearson et al., 1992; Sampson et al., 1988) and more recently also by government, particularly its auditing arm (House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, 2004). If we take a linear, historical approach to partnership development
in a crime prevention/social regeneration context there is an increase in extent and emphasis given to partnership work over the past 40 years but gaining significant momentum from the 1980s and the modern conception of community safety stemming firstly, from the Home Office circular 8/84 (1984) and then The Morgan Report (Home Office Standing Conference on Crime Prevention, 1991) onwards.

Newburn (2002), in considering the impact of partnership working in a crime reduction context on policing, Gilling (1997) in considering the development of crime prevention, and Hughes (1998; 2003) in situating crime prevention within a theoretical context, offer a comprehensive and nuanced history of partnership in a crime reduction context. The following discussion owes much to these authors. As already mentioned this development primarily occurs against a backdrop of the increasing failure of traditional forms of policing, of what Gilling (1993) identifies as the classical origins of the police which firmly situates them within the Peelian vision of crime prevention. Although he situates crime prevention and community safety policing within a rational choice discourse, he very much identifies this as secondary to the prevailing classical tradition. Gilling (1993) places crime prevention units outside the normal, standard, ‘run of the mill’ policing and hence sees them as not integrated into traditional forms.

As early as 1965 the Cornish Committee on the Prevention and Detection of Crime (Home Office, 1965) called for the creation of specialist crime prevention officers and the non-statutory development of crime prevention panels led by the police. In 1969 the more welfarist driven Community Development Projects (Community Development Project Inter-Project Editorial Team, 1977) were created to deal with urban poverty and social disintegration. The CDPs came under the Home Office however; ownership was split and was given partly to local authorities and partly to universities to conduct local evaluations. By 1976 these projects were shut down due to the extent they became overtly politicised; local politics and intellectuals formed a heady brew and had escaped control from the centre. Research was being conducted in a bottom-up rather than a top-down manner. This was perhaps the first time partnership working was utilised to implement policy, the policy being one of urban regeneration. The extent to which it succeeded or failed is difficult to assess. It was
abandoned because it was politically volatile and it also had adverse consequences for the ongoing relationship between local authorities and central government. This was to have a serious impact on the development of crime prevention at a community level after the Morgan report was published in 1991.

As early as 1978 the Ditchly Circular (Home Office, 1978) encouraged closer working between the Criminal Justice agencies and community based initiatives to deal with problematic juveniles. However, it was the 1980s which saw an increase in momentum with regards to Crime Prevention and partnership initiatives including the setting up of the Crime Prevention Unit in 1983, the Home Office interdepartmental circular 1984 (Home Office, 1984), the crime prevention unit seminars and the setting up of the Five Towns initiative some 10 years after the closing of the Community Development Projects. This time these were run from the centre and local authorities were not included in any form of local governance. This later developed into the Safer Cities initiative. This period is identified with increasing incursions into what was called community policing, essentially having closer working relationships with the public, with approaches ranging from neighbourhood policing to Neighbourhood Watch (Crawford, 1997; Newburn, 2002). The resulting inability to situate community safety within local authorities because of the problematic relationship between local and central government, which was a characteristic of the Thatcher era, meant that the development of local partnerships as suggested by Morgan (Home Office 1991) was curtailed.

Newburn (2002) identifies this period in crime prevention as problematic because government was unwilling to task a single agency with responsibility. This was problematic as there was a definite shift from purely situational forms of crime prevention to a more social approach. Therefore simply having criminal justice agencies tasked with local approaches to crime control was seen to be pointless and had been tackled as early as the ‘watershed’ interdepartmental circular of 1984 (Hughes, 1998). However, after the interdepartmental circular (Home Office, 1984) elements of crime prevention were being adopted in a piecemeal fashion, by local authorities and police forces, and this process only increased after the Morgan Report with the local Government Association campaigning for it to be adopted (Newburn,
In addition to this elements of the Morgan report did find their way into the Safer Cities initiative. This slow encroachment of crime prevention at a local level meant development of a multi-agency approach was developing in an ad hoc manner. However there was still a desire to keep control centrally located – central control with local accountability. In addition to this Gilling (1997) identifies a further problem – that it is difficult to compel other government departments into doing the bidding of one – in this case the Home Office.

As Newburn (2002) identifies, New Labour embraced the Morgan report and the increasing public and private backing of partnership as being ‘the answer’ despite research suggesting a more cautious approach should be adopted, to balance its rhetoric of ‘tough on crime, tough on the causes of crime’ in its drive to gain leadership in 1997. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 was the result of consultation and debate from the previous 10 years but it did in part form a departure from the Morgan Report. There were fundamental differences that meant that full implementation has never been fully realised. Firstly, there was a lack of any infrastructure as suggested by Morgan. The 1998 Act very much adopted the position of the 1984 interdepartmental circular that no extra funding was needed, as agencies should keep doing what they were doing but do it better and together. Secondly, the act didn’t identify one lead agency, statutory responsibility was initially placed upon Local authorities and the police (the NHS in the guise of the Primary Health Care Trust was to join in April 2004 under the auspices of the Police Reform Act 2002) in cooperation with associated other parties, such as the police authority and probation, to implement a strategy for the reduction of crime and disorder in their areas. Thirdly, the Act was quite specific about what the strategies would contain, which included objectives to be met by responsible authorities and performance targets set to monitor those objectives. This is perhaps unsurprising given the managerialist agenda that existed at the time (Newburn, 2002). Finally, s17 placed an onus on Local Authorities to consider the impact on crime and disorder and place it ‘at the heart of all its decision-making’ (Home Office, 1997: 6).

However, what does all this mean? It means that the organic locally derived process with central government support that was advocated by Morgan was largely
abandoned. As Hughes (2003) identifies, we have community safety in a Crime and Disorder Act, not crime and disorder in a Community Safety Act. He goes on to suggest that what has occurred is the excising of traditional forms of crime prevention and community safety in favour of a crime and disorder discourse. Sampson et al. (1988) identify this as the criminalisation of social policy. What was adopted instead of Morgan is a centrally driven, managerialist agenda spiked with local accountability (Garland, 1996). Although, this seems a rather dystopian conclusion to reach, it was clear at the outset that this was going to be a fundamentally ‘managed’ process and it became apparent fairly quickly that auditing regimes would place national pressure on partnerships to implement national concerns at a local level (Pitts, 2002). This was particularly revealed by the work of Phillips (2002; 2002a) when considering how partnerships had managed after the first round of local audits and strategy development. However, Hughes (1998) highlights that there are always unintended consequences to policy implementation and therefore, there remains potential for local forms of resistance to centrally located forms of control (Hughes, 1998). It is interesting to note that it is at a local level that partnerships (except Wales), decided to call themselves Community Safety Partnerships and the clumsy instrumental moniker Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships fairly quickly faded from local horizons.

What I have presented here is a largely linear development of community safety – culminating in some fairly consistent and intense policy activity in the 1980s and the following decade. However, I think it is wise to sound a note of caution. As Reiner (2000) suggests it is seductively convenient to look back at history and ascribe particular meaning to events that may not have any. It is convenient for us to situate them within a particular social, political context so that they attain the sense of a narrative which was not intended by the actors themselves and in reality social development is always much messier then it appears through the telescope of history. In addition to this it is also clear that policy and the way that it is implemented always has meaning but frequently does not have a clear rationale and as such the intended purpose is often not the purpose that it achieves (Ham and Hill, 1993). As Barrett and Fudge (1981) attest, policy implementation often occurs on a policy/action continuum where policy goes back and forth between those who create
the policy and those upon whom action depends. This is more likely to occur when considering the implementation and development of community safety as it relies on so many agencies for ‘working’ to actually occur. This process of confusion is augmented by the policy bifurcations highlighted by Garland (1996) and the rhetoric and spin which is a favourite tactic utilised by government and increasingly adopted in local contexts as witness. However as Garland (2001) suggests we should never assume that spin is meaningless or ‘talk’ inconsequential and in these circumstances it is those who work in partnership who get to mediate centrally guided intentions (Lipsky, 1980).

3.3 Partnerships, power and conflict

In their ideological development partnerships have become a ‘good thing’ (Gilling, 1993; Hughes, 1998; Liddle et al., 1994a; McLaughlin, 2004), but their use as a conduit for policy implementation seems to have been given little thought, except in terms of there being a need for a multi-agency or joined-up approach (Cabinet Office, 1999) to solve a single or ongoing, social, political or economic problem. It would be wrong to suggest that only the criminal justice agencies have been subject to the language of partnership development. The tyranny of ‘partnership’, what Gilling describes as the inescapable ‘lure of collaboration’ and the assumption that ‘two heads are better than one’ (Gilling, 1993: 145-146) has prevailed across the public sector during the past two decades and the main drive for their implementation seem to be one of efficiency (Crawford, 1994). This drive for efficiency seems to derive from two areas, firstly a desire to make financial savings and an example of this is the Five Towns initiative stemming from the financially punitive era of the Thatcher government (Gilling, 1997). Secondly is an attempt to ameliorate the problems associated with a modernist era, that of specialisation and fragmentation in public services (Crawford, 1994; Gilling, 1997). Examples of this attempt to ameliorate fragmentation and generally provide a continuity of ‘care’ rather than ‘service’ can be found in education (Millbourne et al., 2003), health (Evans and Killoran, 2000; Ong, 2000; Powell and Moon, 2001; Rummery and Coleman, 2003) and social services (Glendinning, 2003; Hudson, 2002) as well as the voluntary or
third sector services. Moreover, it seems that partnership is at the vanguard of solving social problems, this is regardless of some fairly consistent research over a long period of time warning us not to regard partnership as a panacea for all social ills (Liddle et al., 1994a) and advising caution against jumping on the partnership bandwagon (Gilling, 1993). Partnership working does not seem to need to ‘work’ to work. Rosenbaum (1988:397) called it the ‘I believe it works’ scenario, reported by community leaders when engaged in partnership work, with no evidence to suggest it did.

This lack of an ends-oriented paradigm is puzzling for a political age that relies upon the auditor’s tools to ‘evidence’ success and drive for improvement with ‘stretching targets’. There was little evidence that utilising partnership as a process for policy implementation would be a successful endeavour. There was research from Management and Organisational Theory (Blau, 1970; Bogason, 2006; Ham, 1994; Ham et al., 1993; Peters, 2006) to suggest that partnership or interagency working was actually quite problematic and there was also a growing ‘body’ of research suggesting that multi-agency work in a crime reduction settings was also difficult (Bowling and Saulsbury, 1991; Crawford, 1994; Gilling, 1993; Pearson et al., 1992; Phillips et al., 1998; Rosenbaum, 1988; Sampson et al., 1988). However, despite this there was little comprehensive assessment given to the practicalities of partnership or interagency coordination around a single or ongoing issue. Without doubt partnerships are subject to target setting or nationally negotiated joint assessment frameworks and measurement (Home Office, 2007) with regards to their outcomes and achievements (House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, 2004) but little reporting on the conducting of partnership processes as a negotiated response to state intervention; nor was there any seeming understanding of why this may be important. However, as various researchers ascertained, when considering the impact of partnerships on community and the auditing processes, agencies developed a practical response. They situated local strategies and target setting to meet already achievable organisational outcomes (Liddle and Gelsthorpe, 1994c; Newburn and Jones, 2002; Phillips et al., 2002; Phillips, 2002b; Rosenbaum, 1988). As Pitts (2002)

Please see the Compact between the Government and voluntary sector services www.thecompact.org.uk (accessed 27 April 2007).
and the National Audit Office (House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, 2004) attest, a crime reduction has been achieved during the period of Community Safety Partnerships, however, it is difficult to say how much of it is owed to their creation or ongoing existence. 15 This makes power, its formation and distribution between agencies in a partnership context of fundamental importance and one which shall be considered in further detail below.

**Partnership**

Th(e) breadth renders the term scientifically problematic, but what is scientifically problematic may conversely be politically useful, for the concept can serve as an empty vessel into which may be poured any potent brew intended to satisfy the thirsts that extend well beyond the pragmatic or technical (Gilling, 1997: 9).

The above quote is describing crime prevention. However, it could equally be made about partnership working. The term ‘partnership’ has become difficult to define. Mclaughlin (2004) proposes that is part of its success because it becomes many things to many people and as Gilling (2005) suggests, it becomes highly politicised. In answer to the question ‘what works?’ it seems the answer is partnership (despite evidence to the contrary).

However, some attempts have been made to offer guidance to partnerships and most notably attempts to offer advice on what a ‘good’ partnership looks like. Around the time of Morgan the Home Office issued guidance in the form of six key characteristics; structure, leadership, information, identity, durability and resources (Home Office, 1990). Interestingly, Liddle and Gelsthorpe (1994c) identified that at this fairly early stage of community safety work the guidance formed a framework, in which partnerships situated their own partnerships and were able to assess the success or failure of their endeavours.16 Partnership auditing of structures has been

---


16 For more on this see the comprehensively archived documents kept by Hertsmere Borough Council which show the local response to the 44/90 circular at the time in particular ‘Crime Prevention Panel Response to the Home Office Circular 44/90 Crime Prevention: The Success of the Partnership Approach’[PCG1/10/90Item7AppendixB]http://www2.hertsmere.gov.uk/democracy/uuCoverPage.asp?bcr=1 (accessed 27/04/07)
conducted on an ad hoc basis, without much in the way of systematic or procedural outcomes for partnership.

Guidance has continued to be produced, usually as Gilling (2005) suggests when an audit has highlighted that ‘all is not well’ in partnership performance. The form of this advice-giving comes in various forms from Home Office toolkits to think-tanks (Asthana et al., 2002), to assessment tools (Hardy et al., 2000; Home Office, 2003a; Partnership Performance and Support Unit, 2004) and guidance (Mullett, 2001). However, as Gilling suggests, all of these tools take a ‘problem-solving’ attitude to partnership working which he terms ‘dangerously reductionist’ (2005:736) because it only asks questions about what makes a good partnership, which, through observation, entails listing what are the successful aspects of a particularly successful or unsuccessful partnership. However, it fails to ascertain key concepts, firstly it fails to understand what makes a good partnership and secondly it fails to unpick what is meant by ‘success’. What is it that impacts upon the success or failure of a partnership? Gilling provides a thorough analysis of partnerships by considering the micro, meso and macro pressures, which are applied to partnership working. At the micro level he recognises the different power dynamics that exist between individuals and agencies, at the meso level he identifies the necessary level of organisational commitment required to make interdependence between agencies a reality. Finally he considers the political context in which decision-making occurs and concludes that it would always have been difficult for partnerships to make sense of their work within the vacillating political context in which partnership development occurs (Gilling, 2005). With regards to success he identifies that it is often judged within an actuarial crime reduction context but there are, potentially, many other criteria for success such as collaboration, self assessment and community involvement.

This political change continues. When Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships were formed there was a degree of ignorance that was shown in the complexity of what central government had asked local agencies to achieve (Gilling, 1997; Phillips et al., 2002). When looking at research conducted on the auditing process (Newburn
et al., 2002; Phillips et al., 2002) we can see that essentially local partnerships lacked capacity. This manifested itself in a number of ways, they lacked information and if they had access to information then they lacked knowledge on how to use and apply it. They had little understanding of auditing processes or how agencies’ national responsibilities impacted on what they did locally. Fragmentation and specialisation had led to a lack of knowledge in how other agencies worked and what their responsibilities were. An example of this is the work done by probation and the nationally set targets they had for Drug Testing and Treatment Orders (DTTOs). These orders occur post offending which means local drug projects which attempt ‘pre-offending’ (usually pre-conviction) work, erode their core business (a finding from field work for this thesis). Probation services need offenders to apply DTTOs, their funding had been linked to the number of DTTOs they ‘achieved’. Therefore, to engage in pre-conviction work, firstly is not their remit and secondly, would be detrimental to their core funding. Practitioners would often have to show local responsiveness and flexibility to find ways around what were often conflicting aims. In the third field site presented in this fieldwork (known as ‘Stonham’) police found it difficult to identify local pre-offenders in sufficient numbers to make the project viable. Therefore, after the project began, the probation service began utilising the project as an adjunct to their post-offending work by putting clients by way of the police, who were ‘likely to re-offend’ without the high degrees of support offered by the ‘pre-conviction’ project. None of the services involved in this decision seemed very happy about it, as it required a fairly self-evident and fundamental ontological shift in the work of the police. Essentially the police were working as probation officers but had little alternative, as the pump-priming money they had secured had to be spent.17

Most recently there have again been changes in the way that partnerships are to engage with their communities and practice their local accountabilities, under a centrally provided framework. A recent review of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 through consultation with practitioners has revealed that local partnerships are in part failing to deliver (Home Office, 2007). The most difficult aspect of the slew of

17 For more on problematic relationships between the police and probation see the work of Gilling. For more on a critique of funding streams see (House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, 2004).
Responsibilities placed on agencies and localities by central government under the CDA was the dual responsibility of annual reporting to the Home Secretary and three-yearly auditing of their communities for strategy development, reflecting what Crawford (1994; 1997) would term the recentring/decentring of the state. These were the most arduous responsibilities and necessitated the greatest increase in capacity. Indeed local partnerships are still struggling with them, some 10 years after the first local audits were conducted. In response to this, these responsibilities will be repealed under the Police and Justice Act 2006 and replaced with three year 'rolling plans' and annual plans (Home Office, 2006; Home Office, 2007). To some extent, this may reflect the overuse of the process of audit and the negative connotations it engenders.

Under the act Schedule 9(3) will replace s6 and s6A of the Crime and Disorder Act (as amended by the Police Reform Act 2002) and includes a responsibility to produce a strategy for the reduction of crime and disorder; including anti-social behaviour and other behaviour adversely affecting the local environment and a strategy for combating the misuse of drugs and alcohol and other substances. This underlies the expectation that local community safety partnerships will have successfully merged with Drug (and Alcohol) Action Teams. This new statutory guidance is being presented as substantially 'hands off', allowing partnerships to be locally receptive to community need. This is to be done by utilising local sources of knowledge, to tailor strategies to meet neighbourhood need as it arises, allowing for greater flexibility and responsiveness. This is clearly being conducted within certain parameters, with a focus on crime and disorder, but also including 'other behaviour' affecting 'local environments', perhaps lending a greater community safety aspect. There is also the ongoing battle with the 'wicked issue' of drugs. However, under Schedule 9(2) it is clear that should the 'hands off' approach not work then the Home Secretary or Welsh Assembly can make further recommendations for the formulation or implementation of the strategy including; the preparation of the strategy (guidance on the requirement for public meetings), conferring particular 'functions' on responsible authorities (duties to conduct or participate in the formulation or implementation), the development of performance targets in respect of the strategy (which may include
targets in respect of particular crime and disorder or drugs or alcohol), information sharing, publication, and preparation of reports on the implementation of strategies.

If we were to be particularly dystopian we could suggest that there is the potential here for significantly more control from the centre than had previously been available. However, there had been significant eroding of local responsiveness from very early on in the life of the policy (Gilling, 2005; Phillips, 2002a) and this perhaps merely puts all of those recommendations, requirements and reporting mechanisms on a statutory footing and in one place. Rather like Garland (2001) suggests, there seemed to be a responsibilisation of local communities and agencies to take on the ‘problem’ of crime in the form of Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships. Nevertheless in actuality, although a great deal of fragmentation has occurred the control of central government has remained very consistent, with only the appearance of a diminution in central control. It may be a very long lead but it is still a lead. What has increased is the capacity for blaming and shaming of local communities and agencies when these centrally orchestrated strategies fail to achieve the crime ‘reductions’ expected. Communities are given the responsibility for crime but not the tools or the local flexibility to manage it, hence the rather stilted success experienced by partnerships (Home Office, 2007; House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, 2004). Of course this makes sense as responsibility is a two way process – someone has to ‘bestow’ it and another ‘grasp’ or accept it. In community safety attempts at ‘responsibilising’ have largely been met by overwhelming passivity by large swathes of the community (and agencies) (Crawford, 1995; Liddle et al., 1994c; Newburn et al., 2002; Rosenbaum, 1988). This has left community safety without its target audience, whereas blaming and shaming is a one way process and needs no response from the object in question (the community or agencies) (Waltlake, 1991).

---

18 For more on measures of success in a partnership context please see Gilling (2005).
19 Although this thesis, largely, does not get into the debate around defining the nature or boundaries of community the foregoing comment is not to suggest that community is a homogenous whole or that its passivity is a form of ‘blankness’. Rather that passivity forms a clever and comprehensive form of resistance that is almost impossible to penetrate (by government agencies) and thus provides a shield against what is termed the ‘permanent campaign’ (McLaughlin, 2002a).
These are not the only new responsibilities, which were commenced in the summer of 2007. There was also an increase in the scope of s17 of the CDA. The responsibility for local authorities to consider the crime and disorder implications in all their decision-making was made ‘wider’ to include anti-social behaviour, substance misuse and behaviour which adversely affects the environment. Again, there is specificity to these new responsibilities, which could lessen creativity and in effect make considerations in decision-making ‘narrower’ to only include ‘anti-social behaviour, substance misuse and behaviour which adversely affects the environment’. After all, agencies have become adept at doing what is required and no more. In addition there is a ‘strengthening’ of s115 of the CDA, which is the power to share information between responsible authorities and probation committees, this power is to become a duty. All responsible authorities will be required to share all information, which is depersonalised (stripped of personal details such as name and address); information sharing has been considered a major inhibitor to partnership working. However, often this just seemed to be a convenient hook from which to hang problems. Issues of power and conflict as well as the ever-changing political climate in which they were operating seemed far more pertinent to partnerships then their ability to share information. Nevertheless as Gilling (1994) and Phillips (2002a) attest, the current reliance on readily available crime statistics means that Crime Prevention often becomes a conduit for the police to meet their own aims without other agencies ‘getting a look in’. Therefore it is debatable how much difference this will make to an agency like the NHS, especially when we consider the ‘quality’ of data that agencies are sharing, which has been an ongoing problem.

There are also new forms of regulation and accountability. Regulation comes in the form of new National Standards and a framework for the Assessment of Policing and Community Safety (APACS). The National Standards will introduce a set of minimum standards for partnership working which are: leadership, utilising an intelligence led business plan in decision making, having effective and responsible delivery structures, engaging with the community (especially the parts that are most affected by crime and disorder and the implementation of the plan), visible and constructive accountability utilising the ‘face the people’ sessions employed by the government’s new ‘Respect’ agenda and making sure the partnership has appropriate
knowledge and skills. New modular information has been promised with examples of good practice for partnerships to follow but there is no additional funding available to ease these potentially extensive changes. There is a duty placed on partnerships to develop a strategic team who will be given guidance on the production of three yearly plans, which will be refreshed annually. This strategic body is to ensure that robust information sharing protocols are utilised and that they are productively consulting with their communities. In addition to this they must develop effective delivery mechanisms and be accountable to their communities. This may increase pressure for agencies like the NHS to ‘fully’ engage in partnerships where currently their position on partnerships is transient. The other form of regulation is APACS, which commenced in April 2008 and were delivered with the new Crime Strategy and updated Public Service Agreements. The purpose of APACS is to increase crime reduction within existing financial constraints (Home Office, 2007).

The new mechanism for accountability is the ‘Scrutiny Committee’ where local authorities will scrutinise decisions made by responsible authorities and the discharge of their crime and disorder function. The local authority may then make recommendations with regards to the discharge of these functions and pass these to each of the responsible authorities. In addition to this, if a councillor is asked directly by a member of their constituency about a crime and disorder matter, then they should act in response, saying what they intend to do and then if appropriate refer it to the scrutiny committee, which may then pass it on to the strategic partnership. However, the partnership does not have to act on any recommendations made by the scrutiny committee but it does have to respond and have regard to it in future decisions. This is a considerable amount of additional responsibility for local authorities and whereas the CDA placed equal responsibility amongst those with statutory accountability (the police, the NHS and the local authority) here there is a clear indication that the local authority is to take the lead in local crime and disorder matters. The consequence of this may be an increase in the idea of community safety rather than just crime reduction as a form of local crime control. Councils seem to have the potential to have a wider view of local community problems which may be

more sympathetic to the NHS rather than the police. However in this research, councils seemed very sympathetic to the crime reduction stance adopted by the police (in response to central pressures). In addition there is also a recognition that learning about local crime issues often occurs in an ad hoc manner, outside the formal structures of auditing and as such has put this locally derived information into a statutory process of recording and delivering to the relevant body.

These new changes present in the form of what McLaughlin (2002a) might term the ‘permanent campaign’, such is the constancy of change that has accompanied the development of Community Safety Partnerships. The Home Office insist that these developments probably for most do not represent changes but just ‘enshrining’ what is already existing good practice (Home Office, 2007). This is perhaps confirmed in the way that the three yearly plans sound remarkably similar to the three year strategies and the annual refreshment of these plans seems a similar requirement to the annual reporting to the Home Secretary. However, the scrutiny panels appear to be the fundamental difference in providing the local accountability and statutory framework which was missing from the existing structure and there does seem to be a move backwards to Morgan, and situating crime prevention within local authorities (Morgan and Newburn, 1997). There is also a nod towards community consultation – not so much through the formal structures of the fearsomely and adversarially titled ‘face the public’ sessions but via the construction of a framework for the passing conversations delivered whilst politicians are on the hustings – potentially there could lie the real power. It will remain to be seen whether this process will be utilised by local actors or merely pass by the wayside as in other forms of discretionary practice.

This renewed focus on community could prove to be problematic because of the centrally located burden placed on partnerships, which means they have developed responsiveness to centrally created needs, targets and frameworks. Moreover, partnerships have become adept at taking on the language of central government. Apparently successful partnerships lend themselves well to local forms of adaptation rather than resistance. However their success may merely lie in their ability to adapt (Gilling, 2005) rather than respond. Therefore partnerships, which are doing well
under the current regime, may flounder if central forms of control are lessened and local accountability does become more important. It will call for a dramatic inversion of locally held practices, one which is only matched by the initial implementation of partnerships under the CDA.

*Power and Conflict*

Power and its deployment amongst agencies has increasingly been observed by researchers since the mid-1980s onwards. It is particularly important in a multi-agency setting as partnership working operates as a temporally bounded entity in which agencies progress along the road from independence to (perhaps) creative interdependence (Gilling, 1994). As such partnerships may offer a limited and perhaps accessible format in which to observe these processes in action (or non-action). As always in discussions of power and partnership it is pertinent to begin with the work of Pearson and colleagues conducted on multi-agency crime prevention projects in London and a northern town in the 1980s. Sampson et al (1988) identified that there were different power differentials running between different state agencies. Some agencies were identified as being more powerful than others. However, it is unclear where this power is derived from or the form that it takes, nor is it clear why the police are regarded as the most powerful agency. In addition, it is unclear whether it is intended that the police are the most powerful agency amongst all other agencies or merely within this setting. I am more sympathetic to the argument as interpreted by Gilling (1997), that the police in this particular setting are the most powerful because of the way situational crime prevention was located at the time and largely continues to be (although recent changes as discussed above may change this). This is mainly for two reasons, the police control the main source of information utilised in the problem solving approach employed by the police: crime statistics. Secondly, they have the most extensive experience of this area. It also seems likely that power differentials have altered between partnerships as agency relationships have become distorted due to centrally applied pressures and the adoption of actuarial and managerialist forms of
accountability – which still seems to hold sway in the new developments for local partnerships. 21

Sampson et al (1988) identify what is termed ‘shared uncertainties’, an idea which has its provenance with Holdaway (1986) and refers to common ground between otherwise quite different agencies. Sampson et al (1988) found little merit in this idea where in a multi-agency context differences between agencies occupied much of the ground between them. More recently the idea of ‘shared uncertainties’ can be seen in the public service agreements that all statutory agencies are part of as well as the expected customer service focus (Clarke et al., 2007). However it seems likely that shared uncertainties, rather than co-creating common ground merely serve to increase competition and isolate agencies as they seek to increase agency output for minimum input (Gilling, 2005). This rational response is part of the remit of partnerships where agencies attempt to ‘trade’ responsibilities to lessen their own workload (Gilling, 1993) – sometimes this is done openly and sometimes not. This deepening of power differentials is fostered by the rigidity in processes such as best value reviews and the adoption of the National Intelligence Model (Brown, 2007; Maguire et al., 2006). Increases in formality increase accountability but decrease communication and partnership working (Crawford and Jones, 1995; Liddle and Gelsthorpe, 1994b; Liddle et al., 1994c; Pearson et al., 1992; Sampson et al., 1988).

It is perhaps interesting that the new changes seek to put informal sources of information on a formal statutory footing, perhaps attempting to maintain informality in a formal structure and thus deal with this problem of accountability. Crawford (1995) rightly terms this a matter of ‘social justice’.

Sampson et al (1988) go on to utilise a conspiracy/benevolent model of power differentials in partnership working. As Gilling (1997) identifies they err on the side of conspiracy rather than benevolence. The conspiratorial view of power distribution in these partnerships meant that the police were in charge, the benevolent source suggested that those engaged in partnership believed in the process and thought partnership working was a ‘good thing’. Although they report that in the partnerships

21 For more on the impact of managerialist forms of control and the impact on agencies and forms of working please consider the work of (Brown, 2007; Cope, 2004; Hope, 2004; Maguire and John, 2006).
they studied there was a combination of both types of power distribution, they felt that largely the police were in control. This degree of control meant that partnerships were more likely to see certain types of problems and particular types of solutions to those problems. In addition it meant multi-agency partnerships were more likely to be advocated by the police. Crawford and Jones (1995) offer a critique of this work, suggesting that Sampson et al's conceptualisation of power is constraining. They argue, that power can also be an enabler of change and can implement a process whereby change can be achieved for communities (although they admit this is limited and rare). In conclusion, Gilling (1997) identifies that Sampson et al (1988) and Crawford and Jones's (1995) conceptualisations of power are not so different. Although Sampson et al (1988) and Pearson et al (1992) do not articulate the creativity that Crawford and Jones (1995) ascertain in their research, they do identify that smaller groups did form and exchange information. Interestingly, these groups were usually made up of women and met informally, bypassing the formal processes of the larger group. Although Crawford and Jones (1995) believe that partnership processes need to be carried out in formal structures the narrative that Pearson et al (1992) share is clearly one of creativity in the face of a forceful deployment of power by the police and when this same activity occurs after the implementation of the CDA, this deployment is also perpetrated by the state (Gilling, 2005).

It would seem likely that partnership would be a nexus of competing ideas, aims and objectives because it is a multi-agency initiative and agencies come with differing power sources and reliance on different ways of working for achieving those outcomes (Crawford, 1994; Gilling, 1997; Pearson et al., 1992; Sampson et al., 1988). However, there was little reporting of overt conflict in partnership processes. Sampson et al (1988) report 'non-decisions' where decisions are taken off the agenda, Pearson et al (1992), describe conflict avoidance where informal networking occurs outside formal processes away from the presence of the police, Gilling (1997) describes a desire to avoid conflict through non-decisions and forms of 'compromise', Crawford and Jones (1995) highlight how items were taken 'off the agenda' in a way that Lukes (1974) would term 'agenda setting'.
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Phillips (2002a) suggests that this lack of conflict resides in what she felt, for statutory partnerships, was a ‘honeymoon’ period. Partnership attendees seemed excited at the prospect of working together and conflict had yet to manifest itself in any visible form. She highlights three areas where she thinks there is the potential for conflict to manifest and these are, identifying the crime issue, prioritising the crime issue and solving the issue. Phillips (2002a) also identified that power, for the most part, resided with the (at the time) two statutory authorities – the police, and the local authority. Due to this it was felt by other members of the partnership that they should have most of the control and have the ‘lions share’ of the work. Gilling (1994; 1997) situates conflict in the differing organisational cultures experienced by agency representatives, which is undoubtedly compounded by the sense that was discovered in Pearson et al’s work that most agency representatives were not sure of what their role was or what was expected of them. There was also confusion amongst agencies with regards to what they could expect from one another. This is part of the frustration of partnership working when faced with unreasonable expectations of what the other agency can or cannot deliver.

Gilling (1994; 1997) considered the interagency problems experienced by the police and the probation service, this is similar to the work conducted by Hudson (2002) who observed the interagency conflict experienced by the NHS and social services. Both found that there was no interprofessional commonality between these agencies even though they may be perceived as working in the same area. For Gilling (1994; 1997) the main disjunction between the police and the probation service was the difference between situational crime prevention and social crime prevention, they drew on different sources of knowledge to understand who they were and how they worked. For Hudson (2002) the story was familiar and the main sticking point for the NHS and social services manifested itself around the issue of rationing and the perception of the patient as opposed to the ‘client’. However, even here there was little overt conflict, resistance or compromise as usually one agency had the upper hand and the other agency was co-opted into the dominant form of working. As Gilling (1994) suggests this only broke down when the other agency was asked to participate in decision-making. At the point of accessing real power, they would refer back to their dominant perception of the world and the way it worked, to reinterpret
the problem within their own framework. Therefore, partnership working becomes working by one agency, which co-options the services of others on an ad hoc basis. Clearly, if this is the case then this is only problematic if partnership working is portrayed as being a process conducted by equals. This perhaps is becoming less problematic as the new legislation outlines the need for a strategic group (although many partnerships already utilise this form and one such is included in this research) but perhaps more importantly more power is being vested within the remit of the local authority, which seems to be becoming the lead agency in community safety, in all but name.

3.4 Conclusion

In conclusion it is apparent that partnership and partnership in a community safety context remains contested terrain. As Hughes (2003) suggests

'Doubtless “community safety” will remain a capacious, slippery and seductive concept and perhaps herein lies its importance. It remains a 'wicked issue' not just for the challenges it raises for not easily compartmentalised practices and strategies about harm reduction but also for the moral and political challenges associated with its nascent and contested agenda in the new governance of public safety. (28)

This chapter has outlined some of the ambiguities that arrest the development of partnership in a crime reduction context as well as situating it within a constantly evolving statutory context with (apparently) local accountabilities. It has gone some way to identifying the developing statutory framework and the impact this may have on agencies such as the police and the NHS. Partnership remains a difficult enterprise for practitioners who juggle these competing priorities as well as occupying their own organisational and cultural territory. In part the review of this literature attempts to provide evidence to answer the research questions outlined in the first chapter: by offering a comprehensive review and critique of the developing literature on generic partnerships as a conduit for policy implementation and partnerships in a crime reduction context. However, it is hoped that by considering the rapidly changing policy field in which these partnerships reside it may make the problems faced by them more evident. These themes will be explored in more detail in the following analysis chapters.
4. Chapter Four

Theoretical Underpinnings: Review of relevant literature

An attempt to understand ‘what is going on in the world’

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a guide to the thinking in the following substantive methodological and analysis chapters. In this sense rather than a review of literature, it forms a positioning chapter. Unlike most of the work in this field it not only utilises the core criminological work in this area that one might suggest leads and forms current thinking, but it also draws on work situated at the margins. It argues that there is much of value in using other, older literature drawn from sociology and political science. It nevertheless outlines in brief, current criminological thinking on local governance of crime/community safety, as this provides a valuable context in which this work was set and therefore provides an essential framework for the considerations and action reported in this research.

In particular, it pauses to reflect on the work of Garland (2001), which was useful specifically because it offers a broad context within which to locate and make sense of many of the particular changes discussed in this thesis. It goes on to consider the work of Crawford (1997), Johnston and Shearing (2003), and then the work of Gilling (2005), and Hughes (1997; 2002; 2007), these later scholars being pertinent because they focus on some of the more particular working of CDRPs and community safety structures. In addition, they begin the process of considering the problematic position of professionals within these structures although this is done (unsurprisingly) within a criminal justice remit.

However, despite its usefulness, shortcomings of the work outlined above are explored and developed (Jones and Newburn, 2002; Newburn, 2001; Zedner, 2002). The difficulty in utilising this work as the sole primary literature for this research seemed less about the larger structural problems identified by Zedner, and its

---

23 Gilling and Hughes are considered extensively in the previous chapter on Partnership.
somewhat disputed pessimism/dystopianism etc, but in the fact that no one has previously tried to grapple with the particulars of police-health service interaction. Indeed the 'counter-intuitive' nature of this pairing is explored briefly in the subsequent methods chapter and remained a fundamental inhibitor in developing a collaborative and conducive working relationship. Thus, Garland's work, though authoritative, expansive and compelling, is at too great a level of abstraction to be anything other than contextual, and others focus on the experiences of the criminal justice system and its agents in similarly abstract terms.

By contrast, the research reported here is looking at something that is at once distinctive and more particular. Therefore, the question at this point is which literature best helps in the analysis of police-health interactions? In the course of this research the literature which presented itself as the most relevant was the sociological/political science literature which began with C.Wright Mills' (1956) reaction to the work of Hunter (1953) and reached a significant peak with the work of Lukes. This work is useful because it is interested in the ways in which people make decisions (Dahl, 2005), set and assert their agenda (Bachrach et al., 1962; Dahl, 2005; Lukes, 2005) and how they deploy or exercise that power (Bachrach and Baratz, 1970; Lukes, 2005). In addition, this research borrows the democratic framework as developed by Jones et al (1996) in their discussion of democratic criteria as applied to the police. Although, this was developed for other purposes than the one explicitly employed within this chapter it provides one way of assessing the work of such partnerships. In conclusion it is apparent that there was much to be gained in adopting an alternate analytic framework and utilising literature outside the traditional scope of community safety writing. Nevertheless the Community Safety literature offered much in making sense of 'what was going on in the world'.

4.2 Context

In recent times much has been written about local governance and forms of crime control, most specifically the work that is called to mind is that of Crawford (1997), Hughes (1998) and latterly Johnston and Shearing (2003), and more recently this has

24 In particular see the work of Hughes (2007) who takes a much more positive stance toward Garland's work than the one adopted by Zedner.
been built on by the work of again Hughes (2007), Stenson (2005) and Jones and Newburn (2002). A great deal of this work concentrates on the wider political context in which organisational and policy outcomes occur and its impact on ‘security’ and ‘policing’. Moreover, it should be noted that much of this debate is conducted in the context of and with reference to the work of Garland (1992; 1996; 2000; 2001) and in particular what has been portrayed as his ‘dystopian grand narrative’ in *The Culture of Control*, which has come to dominate the field of criminology over the past decade. It has been particularly informative when considering new movements within the criminal justice system, with particular reference to Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnerships or how they are largely described by practitioners (and in my research) as Community Safety Partnerships.

Garland’s (2001) work inhabits a central position within the field because it seeks to give form and purpose to the present. In that sense it is a representation of the grand vision of the author that he can draw upon many intellectual traditions to formulate a response to current conditions. Garland considers the modern patterns of life in a historical context and by doing so seeks to answer questions that we have about everyday life and the apparent pessimism which inveigles our criminal justice system. It is an attempt to make sense of the present and forewarn of the possibilities of the future.

Garland’s thesis is primarily concerned with change: how it has occurred and its impact. It is at this juncture – observing and describing its accelerated pace and nature that he is most compelling. Garland notes that rather than “‘change as usual” there has been an alarming sense of the unravelling of a conceptual fabric’ (2001: vii). This is said with particular reference to the criminal justice system. Here he builds on the increasing centrality of crime, criminal justice policy and criminology, the activity or practice of crime, the way we think about it and our ability to solve or contain having become the central concern of everyday life. He calls this the ‘criminologies of everyday life’.  

---

25 An interesting article on the changing nature and ‘use’ of criminology (Garland and Sparks, 2000).
26 Others have more narrowly described this process as the ‘criminalisation of social policy’ (Hughes, 1997; Sampson et al., 1988) and more recently Simon (2007) has discussed it in terms of ‘Governing
Garland ascertains that the centrality of the criminal justice system has powerful effects on other aspects of social life. He borrows from Bourdieu the concept of the field and how changes in one field can have significant impact on others. The centrality of crime to late modern life stems from the field of crime being constructed from two primary areas – that of formal criminal justice agencies and informal civil society. Hence the ability of crime to permeate large swathes of public and private life. This has occurred, he argues, because of the abandonment of ‘traditional’ (in one sense) ideals such as rehabilitation and a return of ‘punishment’ (in its most punitive guise). In addition, he identifies changes in the political positioning of crime (from bipartisan to politicisation), a shift towards public protection, risk and the new centrality of the victim to the discourse of crime and criminality. Even amongst the ‘thinkers’ (criminologists) he identifies a move towards the offender as rational actor and a new management style in managing criminal justice agencies and their staff. In amongst this and perhaps most pertinently for his work he notes a shift towards a ‘pre-crime’ society and the utilisation of the community to manage this in the guise of partnerships and private security. In the conducting of this work he notes that he has had to ‘collapse historical time and institutional space’ (2001: xxiii).

The dominance and dystopian nature of Garland’s work has been convincingly criticised by Zedner (2002; 2006), who, with her historical and normative approach, calls into question Garland’s broad and sometimes sweeping narrative. Zedner along with Jones and Newburn questions whether it is helpful to dissect history into epochs and indeed her work may be about expanding the historical time Garland has collapsed. As she asserts this may be a convenient way to view history – in bite size pieces where clear and apparent shifts can be identified from one period to the next. However, as stated previously27 and as Zedner suggests, when taken as a whole, apparent shifts in ‘security’ and its distribution can seem radical when in actuality they are not.

\footnote{Through Crime’ However, neither of these two phrases capture the expansiveness or the everyday grinding monotony and centrality of crime linked to Garland’s ‘criminologies of everyday life’.
27 c.f. 3.2 The development of multi-agency partnership working in a crime reduction context above.}
Although in parts Zedner’s argument seems overstated – perhaps in reaction to Garland’s argument whose leitmotif is ‘bad change’ – she seems to be saying ‘much of this seems to be the same as before – so why the panic?’ In addition, Zedner also questions Garland on his social responsibility, which she suggests is lacking in such an authoritative work. Inasmuch as this dystopian story telling seems to hold as much or more criminological sway then Martinson’s (1974) ‘nothing works’ - a work that Martinson later suggested was meant to read ‘looking at the research I’ve looked at nothing seems to work.’ (1997) – perhaps Garland should have been more measured. Although, grand narratives by their nature would seem to be made up of grand statements and for social science and criminology, which is often couched in uncertain language, the apparently unequivocal statement seems to fill an epistemological void.  

It is worth noting that for Hughes, Garland’s work is not as dystopian as depicted by many and does offer glimpses of a potentially more positive future, particularly in the closing pages where it is clear his work is a ‘history of the present’ and not a predictor of the future. Zedner calls this Garland’s ‘cri de coeur’ and for her a call for a more positive future in the last few pages and the occasionally positive note do not make this text any less comprehensive, grand, imposing and dystopian. In many ways the focus and celebrity given to it resembles the framework so convincingly established by Stanley Cohen (2002) in response to high profile criminological events – that of the ‘moral panic’. The sense in Garland’s work establishes a feeling that ‘if we do not do something now then all will be lost’ – a sense that also surrounded Martinson’s work. This is inherently valuable in its way as an engine for change but also perhaps inadvertently somewhat overdrawn. As Zedner suggests, in minutiae and over time, movements are at once far more diverse and often recurrent and as Hughes (1998) notes from his empirical and action orientated work with partnerships, on the ground things often are ‘a-changing’ in response to and in association with, what he would term geo-histories. Indeed, Garland comments on p.vii of *The Culture of Control* that there is an unavoidable tension between broad generalization and the specification of empirical particulars. In his work he is primarily doing the former; however as Hughes notes others have and will come

---

28 For more on the philosophy of knowledge please see the work of T.S. Kuhn (1962)
forward over time to do more of the latter. This work firmly situates itself within the ‘specification of empirical particulars’. Garland’s work then will always be valuable to provide context but something else was necessary to frame the analysis I undertook.

Outside of criminology Nikolas Rose has produced an influential body of work on the theme of ‘governmentality’, which, like Garland’s work, addresses issues of political power, expertise and the relationship between the individual and the state. The once central role of the social has, Rose (1996; 1999b; 2000) argues, receded. Traditional concerns about social cohesion and social justice are still significant in political argument, but the social is no longer a key zone, target and objective of strategies of government. With the language of globalization, economic relations are no longer easily understood as organized across a single bounded national economy and community has become a new ‘spatialization’ of government. In Inventiveness and Politics, Rose explores these themes in relation to New Labour’s ‘Third Way’, which he notes, ‘aspires to be nothing less than a founding set of principles to underpin a new politics’ (1999b: 469). Reflecting its emphasises on our mutual responsibility and belief in a common purpose’, the ‘Third Way’ centers on the notion of community and partnerships.

Within the context of the ‘Third Way’ community takes on a new meaning; one which is distinct from traditional liberal discourse which tempers the ideal of individual liberties and rights by claims that are made in the interests of communities. Under the ‘Third Way’ community is no longer primarily understood as a geographical space, a social space, a sociological space or even a space of services, though it may attach itself to any or all of these things. According to Rose (1999) the new meaning of community is encapsulated by Etzioni’s (1997: 127) definition:

Community is defined by two characteristics: first, a web of affect laden relationships among a group of individuals, relationships that often crisscross and reinforce one another (rather than merely one-to-one or chainlike individual relationships), and second, a measure of commitment to a set of shared values, norms and meaning, and a shared history and identity – in short to a particular culture.
That is to say, community is an affective and ethical field, which binds its elements into durable relations. As society gives way to community, moreover, a new image of the state is coming to the fore - the ‘social state’ and the ‘welfare state’ are giving way to the facilitating state. According to this vision the state is no longer to be required to answer all society’s needs for order, security, health and productivity. Individuals, firms, organisations, localities, schools, parents, hospitals, housing estates must take on themselves – as ‘partners’ – some of the responsibility for resolving these issues. As such, Rose argues, there has been a double movement of autonomization and responsibilization, whereby ‘partners’ are to be set free to find their own destiny, yet are, at the same time, made responsible for their destiny and that of society as a whole. ‘Politics’, in other words, ‘is to be returned to citizens themselves, in the form of individual morality and community responsibility’ (1999b: 476). Under these circumstances ‘neo liberal’ styles of government attempt to ‘control at a distance’ through the politics of behaviour (Rose and Miller, 1992) and through ‘etho-politics’, which acts upon the conduct of agents by shaping values, beliefs and moralities and: ‘concerns itself with the self-techniques necessary for responsible self-government, and the relation between one’s obligations to oneself and one’s obligations to others’. In other words, New Labour’s programme combines an emphasis on autonomy and self-realization with a call for duty and obligation to community, in which individuals are to undertake practices of personal reform as a form of re-attachment. In so doing, it skates over potentially important issues of moral diversity. Thus, for example, Rose (1999b: 476) notes that British communitarian thinking has taken on an explicitly Christian character which ignores important social tensions, including those based on ‘race’, sex and social class: as a result a ‘single set of moral principles are proclaimed as if they were self-evidently universal and applicable to all communities of reason and rectitude’ (1999b: 480).

Garland, Crawford and Rose all operate at a fairly high level of abstraction and have identified the broader socio-political context within which partnership working must be understood. Much of this work, particularly that of Garland and Rose, pays little attention to the apparently mundane realities of day-to-day partnership working, however, my analysis offers an opportunity to critically reflect on some aspects of
their work. The next section considers the purposeful nature of partnerships, focusing on the work of Garland and Crawford in more detail.

4.3 The story so far

Partnerships in practice

Increasingly, the answer to complex social problems has been seen to lie in multi-agency working; the following three quotes illustrate this issue. However, the way this multi-agency working has been operationalised is through 'partnerships' and these are very different from what one might simply term multi-agency groups.

If a rat is found in an apartment, it is a housing inspection responsibility; if it runs into a restaurant, the health department has jurisdiction; if it goes outside and dies in an alley, public works takes over. More complex undertakings compound the confusion (Mudd, 1984: 8).

...a police officer who takes public complaints about rats seriously will go crazy trying to figure out what agency in the city has responsibility for rat control and then inducing it to kill the rats (Wilson and Kelling, 1989).

It's hard to argue with the claim that complex challenges such as tackling crime and disorder require input from a variety of institutional sources and in turn people have 'joined-up' problems which do not follow the bureaucratic demarcations of traditional public services (Hughes, 2007: 46).

Crawford (1997) and Garland (2001) both use Mudd and his co-ordination problem which is a well known predicament in multi-agency work. In addition to this Mudd develops and Crawford utilises the 'responsiveness problem': the gap between agencies and the expectations of those members of the community that they serve. As Crawford suggests, Wilson and Kelling firmly situate this apparent problem within a multi-agency context highlighting the frustrations and problems when dealing with community issues for agency actors. This is set within the context of Hughes' (2007) comment that complex social problems need complex social solutions.29 In recent times the apparent solution to this seems to be multi-agency working in a partnership setting.

---

29 For more on the complexities of partnership working please see the previous chapter and Hughes (2002).
It probably goes without saying that multi-agency and in particular ‘partnership’ working is perceived as being a progressive and efficient way of working (for further discussion on this please see the previous and concluding chapter). Social problems including the one of crime are often complicated – this stands regardless if viewed through a purely crime prevention, social crime prevention, community safety or reactive lens – and their provenance is often difficult to unpick. However, it is thought that with this provenance local agencies may be able to serve one of two of the overarching aims that have come to dominate local partnership work in a crime reduction context – that of prevention. It is clear then that due to the complexity and the actuarial nature of the work, overseen and audited by the Home Office, the Audit Commission, the Community Safety Inspectorate and newly developed Scrutiny Committees, it requires a multi-agency response.

However, these organisations are not without their own cultural, occupational and organisational histories. As such partnership working and its degree of success seems largely to depend on the commitment of practitioners and, it is argued, the ‘mobilisation of local knowledge’ (Johnston and Shearing, 2003: 140) in the form of the community and other local actors. It is without doubt that to achieve the aim of Johnston and Shearing and the more positive aspects of Garland's thesis an active and engaged citizenry are crucial in developing and containing a responsive system of localised security which is as much about safety and ‘peace’ rather than security per se – or what Pease (Wiles et al., 2003) might call the containment of ‘hazard’. As such, partnership success seems largely to depend on practitioner commitment and local conditions or ‘geo-histories’. In addition, to this Stenson (2005) has usefully explored the often experienced tension between those seeking to govern from below (engaged community groups) and those seeking to govern from above in what he terms a ‘biopolitical’ struggle (over people and places). Therefore as conflict exists at many levels in the political sphere it may mean that even an engaged citizenry may face problems if it conflicts with the plans of ‘local state institutions’. These struggles often come to the fore when focussed on ‘security’. This provides important context to the present thesis, whose focus is, however, primarily on partnership actors rather than community actors.

---

Utilising Johnston and Shearing’s (2003) concept of ‘mentalities’.

---
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What was largely reflected in the research reported here was that local provision by partnerships was patchy or non-existent. Much of the work that was defined as 'partnership' had in fact been initiated, conducted and managed by a single agency. When this work was successful it was co-opted into 'partnership' activity. This reflects early fears from Laycock (1985) and early findings from Phillips (2002b). Partnerships were also influenced by local agendas; these were sometimes affected by national priorities but at times reflected local political goals (particularly by local councillors). However, as said elsewhere the dominance of local agendas need not be problematic. Indeed, it was thought, that local partnerships were developed to deal with local agendas and be responsive to local problems.\(^{31}\) Unfortunately, in this research local agencies and notables often did not seem to agree what the ‘rat’ was (see Mudd’s example above). Some had never seen the rat before, it was not conceptualised as their problem, some knew about the rat but did not own the problem and others had competing understandings of the rat and whether it was a problem or not.\(^{32}\) When adequate foundations do not support an ontological framework then it makes partnership working problematic if not tortuous for those involved.\(^{33}\) Much work has been done on identifying that partnership work is difficult and particularly so without a common language or aims. This has resulted in many guidance frameworks for partnerships which seem to be of variable quality (Gilling, 2005). Little work has been done in assessing their success but in the field they would seem difficult to implement and operationalise. Alternatively, the research reported in this thesis seeks to unpick some of these problems and perhaps offer findings toward a more productive structure than has previously been available.

### 4.4 Social organisation and theoretical frameworks

Below we shall consider the development of local forms of control with reference to the theoretical frameworks developed initially by Crawford and Garland and then Johnston and Shearing. It is hoped by doing this to provide some synthesis of current debates in this field.

\(^{31}\) Problematic in its own way see Crawford, Hughes, Garland, and Johnston and Shearing on the dangers of local protected interests or ‘vigilantism’.

\(^{32}\) See the work of Gabe and Elston (2002) on the conception of health as against crime problems particularly in the field of drug work.

\(^{33}\) c.f concluding chapter on capacity.
There seems to be considerable overlap in the work of Crawford and Garland, the following (Table 1, p88) is an attempt to summarise and highlight these similarities. Garland’s work is set in larger context and the ideas of ‘responsibilisation’ and ‘criminologies of every day life’ only comprise a small part of his overarching thesis: to make sense of a period which seems characterised by rapid change. However, it is with this discussion of what Garland terms the state’s ‘adaptive’ processes that he is more passionate and persuasive than with his psychoanalytical processes of ‘denial’ and ‘acting out’.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Crawford and Garland Compared</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crawford</strong></td>
<td><em><strong>Garland</strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Increased salience of crime: High Crime Rates</td>
<td>1 Crime shifting to affect those who had previously championed the rehabilitative ideal: the Middle Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Crime shifting to affect those who had previously championed the rehabilitative ideal: the Middle Classes</td>
<td>2 Crime and the control deficit (petty incivility decriminalised)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Crime and the control deficit (petty incivility decriminalised)</td>
<td>4 Increasing relevance of Mass Media as a mediator of ‘real crime’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dominant Explanations for the Shifts in Rhetoric</strong></td>
<td><strong>The New Predicament</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 ‘System failures’</td>
<td>1 High crime rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local criminal justice services lack ‘co-ordination, fit and systemization.’ This reflects specialisations of services, which is a feature of modernity. In association with the specialisation and fragmentation there is also a concomitant attempt by professionals to control the ‘market’ for their expertise. This approach to local services leads to the ‘co-ordination and responsiveness’ problem, highlighted by Mudd (1984)</td>
<td>2 The limits of the criminal justice state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The financial burden on the state requires a reassessment of public expectations and the responsibilities of a ‘minima state’. Markets are to replace state planning as regulators of economic activity. ‘Partnerships’ are a vehicle through which the decision making processes of social government are ‘marketized’. In addition, ‘partnerships’ are a means by which the recalibration of public expectations is sought and the conditions for a ‘responsible citizenry’ created.’ (Crawford, 1997: 69)</td>
<td>There is no... ‘settled confidence in the capacity of the criminal justice state to control crime and provide law and order, no matter what framework it adopts.’ (2001:108)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare state has caused dependency - new forms of governance mean the idea of self-help and choice is back on the agenda and new forms of responsibility. Criminal justice policy has avoided this talk for a long time as it was felt that a strong state was needed to deal with the ‘upheaval wrought by the advent of post-welfarism’.</td>
<td>2 State overload thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The dispersal of discipline thesis</td>
<td>3 The myth of the sovereign state and its monopoly on crime control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The dispersal of discipline thesis</td>
<td>3 The myth of the sovereign state and its monopoly on crime control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foucault identified appeals to the ‘community’ as representing consolidation of the disciplinary society… and the carceral archipelago of intermediary institutions which transport disciplinary techniques to the entire social body (1997:71)</td>
<td>High crime rates and the limits of the criminal justice system to control crime ‘...had the effect of eroding one of the foundational myths of modern society: the myth that the sovereign state is capable of delivering 'law and order'...’ (2001:109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Through ‘partnerships’ social welfare and non-criminal justice agencies as well as community groups are co-opted into the disciplinary process. This is seen largely as a unidirectional project in which control moves outwards from the police and criminal justice complex into the social body. In this process the former invades and colonizes the latter (1997:72). We should be cautious in engaging in a process which blurs institutional and functional boundaries and results in net-widening. Agencies and groups may become co-opted into agendas which are not their own.</td>
<td>3 The dispersal of discipline thesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Professionalisation and rationalisation of criminal justice agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) Commercialisation of justice by introducing market principles eg: managerialism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) Defining down crime (decriminalising petty incivility)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) Redefining success and becoming less ambitious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) Concentrate on the consequences of a high crime society:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Victims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Fear of crime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi) Relocating and redefining responsibility:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Community as the solution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) The responsibilisation strategy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-adaptive strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society becoming increasingly punitive with the adoption of strategies such as Zero Tolerance policing strategies, three strikes sentencing policy, ‘truth in sentencing’ and harsh penal punishments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A rudimentary synthesis of the work of Crawford and Garland may resemble this:

Context: A criminal justice system which increasingly seems unable to manage the problem of crime. In response to this apparently ‘new’ perception: the problem of crime and crime control cannot be the province of only the state or a single agency of the state.

Action: To combat this the state will, firstly, attempt to re-galvanise citizens and communities. Secondly, the active citizenry will be encouraged to engage in the local discourse of crime and safety. In addition, for Garland there is a new focus on the concept of the new criminologies of everyday life or future orientated risk.

This idea has sparked a debate to try and ascertain what these developments in governance and crime control may signify. Potentially it might mean communities have an opportunity to become more engaged with local agencies, businesses, and state institutions in making decisions about pressing local crime or safety (in response to the future orientated risk). Or it might mean as Foucault (in Crawford, 1997) suggests, a dispersal of discipline from the centre to the periphery, an example of this might be situated more firmly within the Respect Agenda and ASBOs rather than partnership per se. Many Community Safety Partnerships utilise their crime reduction agenda by maintaining and administering ASBOs and ABCs, in association with dedicated units situated within local authorities. However, it seems unlikely that it is possible to make each citizen a policeman of their own and their neighbours’ fate, since as we know, reactions to and perceptions of petty incivility (or what used to be called deviancy and possibly before that ‘rudeness’) remain complex and loaded with cultural and intergenerational burdens (Hood and Joyce, 1999). Conversely, we are also aware that much day-to-day ‘public-peace’ is maintained by ‘casual enforcement’ of civilisation (Jacobs quoted in Newburn, 2001) or what one might term informal social control (Innes, 2003) – therefore, degrees of enforcement are variable.

Alternatively, this movement may denote a wider conception of crime/behaviour control to one of safety and security. Rose, (2000) in particular, notes the advent of risk and prudentialism in the guise of a moral orthodoxy that he terms ‘ethopolitics’. Kemshall (2002) notes that this preoccupation with risk is not particularly new, but is constructed differently from what we have known before for example National
Insurance schemes to protect us against health risks. Indeed the work of Crawford, Rose (1999a; 2000) and Garland and their overlapping conceptions of what Zedner terms ‘pre-crime’ seem to indicate the fetishisation and commodification of the (potential) criminological event, with its resultant increase in fear and associated demands for security and its assorted paraphernalia. This movement is occurring within the context of New Public Management, which has occurred across most public services.

Until relatively recent times (1960’s), the criminal justice system largely remained impervious to market mechanisms due to the cross-party support for criminal justice matters and the apparent need for a strong nation state in a post-welfarist period (Crawford, 1997). However, increasingly criminal justice has become subject to similar budgetary, actuarial and market restraints as applied to other sectors. This is particularly the case with a frontline agency such as the police (Newburn, 2001) and has also become a limiting mechanism for partnerships. In addition, as Hughes (2007) asserts, this mechanistic, actuarial approach has caused CSPs to implement an approach where local creativity is stymied by short-term targets. This was reflected in the CSPs in this research whose local ambitions were closely tied to national ends. Hughes however remains optimistic for CSPs and local actors who adapt to local conditions and he believes, may respond creatively to such restrictions. Evidence of this approach is available in the NHS, which remained functioning despite chronic financial shortages during the Thatcher and subsequent Major administrations, due to the resourcefulness of local actors (Klein, 1985). Although, one might suggest that this response was due in part to the politicised nature of the era and the ‘survivor’ mentality of many public services. This is different to the managerialist agenda which exists today: meaning practitioners are practised at market ‘talk’ and cost-benefit analysis. Evidence of local creativity in response to central state concerns was relatively ‘thin’ in this research and remained the province of drug services, who maintained a vocational zeal for their work and were experienced at working at the periphery of many other services.

When moving on to consider the work of Johnston and Shearing (2003) they utilise the notion of ‘security’ and peace to explore a conception of the world which might
exist should the increasing market for safety continue to expand. They suggest that there are some underlying elements that are necessary for a position of 'optimal security' to be achieved. These are; a negotiated definition of order which could be the criminal law or may be other forms of local practice. They accept that these definitions of order are often contested; it is not clear what would or should be done at these sites of contestation. This is a problem for Johnston and Shearing's thesis which although inherently 'normative' (but not overtly so) seems strong on vision and short on the practicalities of making this work in local communities. Indeed, although concepts of communities remain 'fuzzy' – inasmuch as they are not clearly differentiated – they are also normatively configured with regards to needs, desires, aims and prospective problems. This is suggestive of a narrow understanding of what may or may not work in particular contexts. Secondly, Johnston and Shearing suggest that there should be some aspect of authority that seeks to promote security, but that this need not be the state, it could be friends or family members. Thirdly and fourthly there should be specific methods and structures of implementing programmes (e.g. CSPs) and finally these elements in combination will result in a security practice. Crucially they suggest, 'nothing that is done to govern security is natural or preordained: different modalities of governance are the product of different applications of human invention. At any time, the governance of security is the result of what people have previously brought into being, and people are constantly re-imagining and re-inventing its forms.' (Johnston et al., 2003: 13). However, as aspects of their discussion suggest they are aware, this re-imagining and re-inventing is mediated (freed and inhibited) by the yielding or possession of power (see below).

Interestingly Johnston and Shearing view CSPs as not being dominated by a police hegemony but rather as being an example of networked governance – this is comparable with Garland's state adapted responsibilisation strategy which is a call to communities not merely criminal justice professionals. However, it runs contrary to much experience by those in the field (see previous chapter) who found that partnerships were still very much dominated by the police. This was also true of this research, where a state and police agenda overlapped, resulting in a crime reduction strategy being pre-eminent. In addition, similar to Crawford and Garland they see this way of working as an answer to the 'coordination problem' where local agencies
try to solve community problems from singular pools of expertise. Finally, in their pluralistic notion of authority and negotiated security practice it is clear that they no longer see the state as definitive which has resonance with Garland’s ‘limits of the sovereign state’, Crawford’s ‘state overload’ thesis and Rose’s (1999a) ‘radically novel epoch’.

Their work is arresting in its consideration of the place the market plays in the development of security. In Crawford’s work business is co-opted into security practices but is never an engine for change. However, for Johnston and Shearing there has been a fundamental shift in this regard, the security industry has become the provider of solutions and a pool of knowledge for this future orientated, pre-crime, fearful society which is seeking a ‘peaceful’, one might suggest ‘secure’, state of mind.\textsuperscript{34} This picture which is portrayed as ‘normative’ and by Hughes as ‘a valorisation of community governance’ may arguably seem more reminiscent of the ‘Blade Runner’ future suggested by Garland.

Johnston and Shearing (2003) go on to suggest that a market in security would allow people to purchase the requisite amount of security they perceive is needed and therefore reach a position of what they term ‘optimal security’. This might be expressed as available security market + ability to pay + need = optimal security. However they acknowledge:

A further complication is added by the differential quantity and quality of public security delivered to the rich and poor communities. In particular the increased application of paramilitary techniques in areas of urban deprivation means that poor people tend to receive the maximum quantity of police 'force' and the minimum quality of police 'service'; or to put it another way, the poor get justice and the rich get security. This situation is dangerous in two respects. First, there is the prospect that those with the loudest voices and the largest pockets will demand access to the best services in order that their insecurities are met. With the consequent inequity that that implies comes the danger that security becomes polarised, the rich having access to both commercial and public police services, the poor being left to enjoy the dubious benefits of a residual public police force; a future which Bayley has referred to as 'a poor police policing the poor' (Bayley, 1994:144). Second as the commercial sector makes greater

\textsuperscript{34} Although Loader would suggest that ‘peace’ as a state of mind is almost impossible to achieve in the ontologically insecure society, which has a voracious appetite for security but an equal inability to become sated (Loader, 2005; Loader, 1999). Which would seem to be good news for the security industry.
and greater inroads into policing, concern will grow that the unregulated market forces are incompatible with the effective co-ordination of public security that partnership, itself, demands (143 – 144).

Of course, the picture that Bayley describes is not an uncommon scene in other public services such as education, social services and the health sector where a plurality of providers has not led to an increase in quality or service or a decrease in cost. Here then security may be expressed as available security market + inability to pay + need = deficit in security. However, Bayley and Shearing (1996) can conceive of a world where markets work and refer to Canada as a case study: however, it would seem that this is with regard to the unique conditions that exist there. In some areas communities become very small and sparsely populated. In these areas they may not have a dedicated ‘security’ service so if they have a spate of crime they can buy in a state security service for a period of time. This would usually be the Canadian Mounted Police. Rather then creating a ‘market’ for security this would merely seem to be ‘means testing’ a benefit. Surprisingly, the solution that Johnston and Shearing (2003) propose, to combat a residualised public police, is a system of block grants for the very poorest to purchase their own security. They also go on to suggest that this system will work in two ways. Firstly it will allow the poorest to participate in a market system and secondly, it will penalise the rich for not understanding that providing security for all is preferable to providing security for few. The implicit suggestion is that costs will be higher when markets are driven through redistributive tax systems.

There are several pressing problems with this model, with regards to utilising markets as a mechanism for distributing public goods and these have been faced in the UK. Generally, this system has not worked because market mechanisms i.e. profit, loss, efficiency and competition are not the main aims of a public goods market. In education, health or social care markets, patients or pupils do not easily transform themselves into consumers or clients. Moreover this is a market which is not truly competitive because in a (post)-welfarist state a welfare ‘safety net’ remains and thus ‘shores-up’ the market mechanism, thus becoming a semi, quasi, or ‘sort of’ market. As a result state provided services become part of two-tier provision. Quasi markets have operated within the health sector for the past twenty years and yet have
still not managed to increase efficiency (Crilly et al., 2004), insufficient providers largely indicating a lack of competition. To rectify this situation the state may have to become a provider and at times they may be the only provider offering services in an empty market place, therefore providing a market fundamentally lacking competition and choice. This occurs in services which are low yield in terms of profits and high risk in terms of specialisation.\textsuperscript{35} When considering private security, it is possible to conceive of a situation when poor communities utilise block grants in an empty market place to secure minimum security from state provided security agents (the police). This would be because other (private) security agencies would realise they were a low yield community – they would not be purchasing other pre crime services; alarms, insurance, additional patrols and high technology security devices. In a community that may not have tangible assets to save – who will save it? \textsuperscript{36} This is why many argue that it is important that public ‘security’ (in its many forms) should remain a public good (Loader et al., 2001; Newburn, 2001; Zedner, 2006).

There is little evidence to propose that the incorporation of quasi markets in this particular UK context increases competitiveness or efficiency. The experience of several state agencies suggests that markets increase bureaucracy and cost (Le Grand et al., 1998) because public services have special qualities like equity and equality, which are currently difficult for commercial markets to value (Manning, 1995). This is especially as the cost of these social values is likely to fluctuate depending on the nature of the localised market in which the security goods are trading. Moreover, practically, there is the problem of administering ‘block grants’ for security - which would constitute a means tested benefit. These types of benefits are noteworthy for their patchy coverage, their exclusion of the most vulnerable and degree of difficulty to administer.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{35} For example the most competitive tenders for health insurance are available for low risk clients. Premium services are available for low risk procedures and complex health needs are referred back into state services. The poor utilise ‘residualised’ services as Bayley and Loader suggest.

\textsuperscript{36} For more on this consider (Ayling and Shearing, 2008; Loader and Walker, 2001; Loader, 1994: Loader, 2000; Newburn, 2001)

\textsuperscript{37} This is particularly true for those marginalised communities who are the least powerful and the most vulnerable; the poor, disabled, ethnic minorities and the elderly. Indeed, those seemingly most in need of security. For more on this please see the following (Barnard and Pettigrew, 2003; Dornan, 2006; Lowe, 1994; Sykes and Hedges, 2005).
Furthermore, there is the ‘governance problem’ for communities which lack social capital: who should agree on the crime strategy? The vocal groupings in a community are not always representative of its constituent members. Research conducted by Newburn and Jones (2002) highlighted the problems of engaging with hard to reach groups. Essentially why would this system of ‘security’ be any more promising? In addition the well meaning majority do not always have the best interests of minority groupings at heart (Crawford, 1997). Moreover, Crawford and Lister’s (2006) recent work on private patrols further underlines Crawford’s earlier concerns about the parochial and exclusionary nature of local security measures. They suggest caution and state co-ordination to ameliorate the problems engendered through local markets.

Without doubt, as Zedner suggests, there has been a plurality in security markets for a very long time. Before the new police came into force, policing was conducted by a variety of local people. Ayling and Shearing (2008) point out that the ‘public’ police have been selling their own services for some time and in some constituencies this works. However, as Crawford and Lister (2006) suggest 'Left to its own devices, the market will foster competitive tendencies among plural providers that are unlikely to fit with broader conceptions of policing as a universally available "public good"' (186) – they also suggest that communities which utilise private security may find themselves being policed by a security agent that is out of the ‘network’ – of state provided security intelligence. This is comparable with Hughes’ idea of the particularities of geo-historical sites, and findings in this research where partnerships became parochial and unwilling to share good practice with neighbours in the competition to be ‘the best’.

It would seem that private security (in its widest sense) may only offer ghettoisation and fragmentation, as the concept of ‘security’ shatters into shards. This is a possibility that is considered by Johnston and Shearing who emphasise the need for ‘effective coordination’ in the local governance of crime and security – it is apparent that this might best be provided by the state – as suggested by Crawford and Lister. The conclusion Zedner reaches is that plurality in the policing family may be a
positive development but sovereignty should remain with the state (a concept very much supported by Loader (2000) and Newburn (2001)). Ayling and Shearing (2008) conclude that the benefits of the police as security vendors may be in forcing private consumers of security goods to consider the costs of their requirements – but they suggest that the police are rightly cautious about entering a security market.

The key points emerging from the above literature appear to concern what is perceived – in slightly different ways by different authors – as the changing role of the state in connection with crime control. For Crawford and Garland it is to do with responsibilisation and ‘governing at a distance’; for Johnston and Shearing it is the emergence of ‘networked or nodal governance’. What all of them appear to be exploring, particularly Crawford and Garland, is something around the changing nature and expression of state management (power) of local crime control (community) and how these mechanisms came about. This is useful in helping to analyse the general shape of modern partnership working in this field. However, the focus of this work is upon how one particular element of partnerships works in practice. Hence, it is necessary to turn to an alternative analytic framework.

When considering concepts of community and power, that which is apparently particularly relevant is the productive debates which ensue from American political community studies of the 1950/60s. Dahl and his colleagues explore the utilisation of power in local government structures by considering the degree of community participation. This work is concerned with their development of power rather than the degree to which they judged communities were able to participate in local ‘democratic’ structures. More important than the work of Dahl and his cohort of ‘pluralists’ for this work was the development of elite theory, which developed in response to the work of Dahl, and hence both are discussed here. This work is important as it seeks to ascertain the deployment of power in amongst small groups.

The importance of the political science literature seems to lie in its focus on decision-making. Particularly relevant is how decisions are made in particular contexts, their meaning, purpose and outcomes. This literature does not particularly focus on one particular strata of decision-making, although in particular contexts, searching for the provenance of decision-making is problematic and time consuming. The models that
are developed appear simple but contain a powerfully normative element which is based on established notions of what is right or wrong or good and proper or indeed, fair and justified. Lukes (1974) would argue that this normative process is inherent within notions of power. However, it is in the process of working with these conceptualisations that it is possible to consider the way decision-making affects local people, processes and contexts. Using the political science literature provides an analytic framework well-suited to the subject matter of this thesis and alternate to that found in the current criminological literature on local crime control because the research reported within this thesis was not only drawing on territory associated with many of the major scholars in the criminal justice field, but was considering an agency which has until relatively recently been situated far outside this arena: the National Health Service.

The NHS (and its functional outcomes) is not, of course, a central subject matter for the criminologist. It is here then, in the inclusion of non-traditional agencies in ‘traditional’ processes of crime prevention and the inter-agency work between organisations in a partnership context, that literature on power and its deployment seems to offer some insight. In particular, it provides a potential framework within which one can begin the task of reporting and considering the experiences of local practitioners.

4.5 Relevance

The debate around governance, security, control and responsibilisation is inherently compelling when trying to understand the current landscape of security provision, against a backdrop of apparent rapid social change. However, the debate can, at times, seem distant from the experience of practitioners. Clearly, the research reported here is no closer to identifying definitive answers to these questions than the rudimentary outline of the debate above. However, the focus of this research was considerably smaller than that tackled by the above theorists – indeed if Garland found it necessary to collapse ‘institutional space’ this work seeks to expand it. The work presented here was considering relationships between people and their constituent agencies and the impact this had on their work. It is therefore inherently
practically orientated and policy-orientated in its presentation. In the course of conducting this work some faint whispering on the wind ('small' talk in interviews or hallways) suggested that 'responsibilisation' of local communities and agencies was not occurring and it remains a minor note throughout this work that disengaged communities cannot be 'responsibilised' although they can sometimes be blamed. Local agencies did not seem to be responsibilised because central, state-provided agendas remained pre-eminent. To say that nothing had changed would not be correct – working practices had fundamentally changed as practitioners had less time to think about their work or engage in local strategic planning because they were obliged to be responsive to increasing state control, regimes of accountability and bureaucracy. Workloads had increased with little concurrent increase in output. This was not entirely true of the police whose (centrally guided) crime reduction work gained an increased profile amongst local agencies and the local authority whose work became characterised by securitisation and was closely linked to a police agenda. However, as such, in the partnerships I considered, the 'responsibilisation' project was not 'working' in the sense of greater local control and creativity.

What was fundamental in this research was to consider the way agencies worked together and what might be done to make this 'better'. What this research attempts to unpick is 'what is going wrong?' and 'why is it going wrong?' These questions seemed best served by considering local practices and policies and utilising theoretical constructs which consider the latent and apparent processes in decision-making. This is done with reference to the work of American scholars who were considering local patterns of democracy and the impact of power on local decision-making practices in the 1950s, although their arguments cleave through temporal constraints and remain relevant to current debates. A brief exposition of their work follows.

38 For more on central control in apparently diffuse governmental structures please consider Rhodes (2000) The Governance Narrative: Key Findings and Lessons from the ESRC's Whitehall Programme. 39 For more on the 'criminalisation of social policy' please see (Sampson et al., 1988) and Governing Through Crime (Simon, 2007).
4.6 Power and its adherents

The power elite is composed of men whose positions enable them to transcend the ordinary environments of ordinary men and women; they are in positions to make decisions having major consequences. Whether they do or do not make such decisions is less important than the fact that they do occupy such pivotal positions: their failure to act, their failure to make decisions, is itself an act that is often of greater consequence than the decisions they do make (Wright Mills, 1956: 4).

All forms of political organisation have a bias in favour of the exploitation of some kinds of conflict and the suppression of others, because organization is the mobilization of bias. Some issues are organized into politics while others are organized out (Schattschneider, 1960: 71).

In this research, how decisions were reached became increasingly pressing when this was not apparent through observation or scrutiny of partnership documentation. Indeed, in the partnerships considered in this research, decisions seemed to be being made by a small number of actors from particular agencies. In addition, the subject matter of meetings seemed to be derived from a narrow context (informed through state frameworks and local priorities). Over time it became apparent (through observation and interviews) that controversial or ‘non-approved’ issues were reserved for separate often-informal meetings.  

This section is an attempt to illustrate how the literature on power, specifically Lukes’ work, helps illuminate the working of police-health service partnerships in contemporary community safety. The above two often quoted phrases were fundamental in trying to unpick the underlying issues between the organisations and practitioners that were studied in this work and the problems they encountered in engaging at a strategic level. It is worth adding here that the community, although valorised and problematised in equal measure remained the ‘silent majority’ (Baudrillard, 1983) as their responses were garnered and one might say sanitised through piecemeal and/or formulaic consultation methods (Newburn et al., 2002). This position pertained throughout this fieldwork, where the ‘voice of the

40 Sampson et al (1988) consider the problem of power and its distribution amongst practitioners and they particularly consider the power differentials between genders. For more on this and the response of Crawford and Jones (1995), Crawford (1997) and Gilling (1997) please see the previous chapter with particular reference to the section on ‘Power, partnerships and conflict’.
community' only endure through the interpretation of wants and needs by the practitioners – who in effect formed a professional elite (Bayley and Shearing, 1996; Crawford, 1997; Jones et al., 1996; Loader, 1994). Whether this is problematic or not is discussed in the concluding chapter.

This work is essentially normative and value-laden, firstly because it is concerned with a set of ideas or notions on what would be the realist view of partnership working at a strategic level, which include ideas of accountability, inclusion, exclusion and decision-making. Secondly and closely allied to the first, this work is implicitly value-laden because as Lukes suggests ‘...power is one of those concepts which is ineradicably value dependent’ (2005: 30). By this he means that the exercise of power in this context is about acting (or not acting) to affect another person against their realised (or for Lukes) unrealised best interests. And what is being considered is ‘political’, in its widest sense: decisions that are being made have reference to the body politic (or a community). Consequently, to consider a partnership poorly performing one must have an understanding or conception of what a ‘high’ or ‘well’ performing partnership may look like.41 These ideas are formed thorough experience and reference to the literature.42 To reprise: the expectation for generic partnerships is for them to work together to solve single or ongoing issues. This should be done with reference to the collective experience of members and strategies to deal with problems or issues should be reached by discussion, compromise and majority rule. Evidence of this process would be joint decisions or action points reached with agencies embarking on coordinated or collaborative solutions.

4.7 Crafting an analytical frame

Jones et al (1996) develop a set of democratic criteria that was designed as a template for thinking about the 'democratic' nature of policing. Below it is applied to the community safety arena, and seemingly in this context it would most obviously apply to how partnerships work in relation to their 'publics'. However, here it has some application to the internal working of partnerships, and in particular how partners

41 For the definition that was utilised in this research please refer to the introductory chapter and partnership chapter.
42 Please see chapter three for a thoroughgoing review of the literature on partnership.
work in relation to each other. This is done with a view to later considering whether these democratic ‘features’ illustrate examples of power holding or sharing with regards to the work of Lukes and the further development by Isaac (1987).

Jones et al (1996) and Loader (1993; 1997) considered the impact of ‘democracy’ as applied to a ‘security’ service such as the police. Their thesis was that equity was essential for a democratic service, and participation, although traditionally seen as vital for democratic accountability, is difficult to uphold in modern times. They concluded that significant changes would have to occur in the ethos and structure of policing services to achieve a democratic aim but that movement towards this objective should be maintained. The following discussion of democracy attempts to utilise their work and in particular, apply the criteria for democracy as developed by Jones et al.

In embryonic terms the usual conception of democracy is ‘rule by the people’. However, in the contemporary era it is more likely to have regard to the relationship between the polity and government (ideals) or the organisation and institutions of government (systems) (Jones et al., 1996). In this research democracy underpinned the ‘idea’ of a participative partnership between agencies that is expressed above. The foundation stone of democracy is the concept of equity – meaning in this instance fairness. When considering policing and the idea of democracy Jones et al develop criteria of what this may look like. They consider of particular importance

i) Equity
ii) Delivery of service
iii) Responsiveness
iv) Distribution of power (increasing managerial control by limiting discretion and increasing accountability),
v) Information on performance (to ensure delivery of service and responsiveness),
vi) Redress (as an essential feature of all democratic systems), and
vii) Participation.

Participation is situated last, although within democratic systems usually considered vital, and Jones et al show that, increasingly, including the community at a local level is difficult. However, systems should be open to participation and processes of
accountability should be open to 'lay' members. An example of where this 'openness' should exist is when considering the composition of agencies such as the local police authority. As Reiner (1992) suggests, the 'public' is not keen to get involved in policing issues 'unless the wheel falls off' but adds that increased participation does not ensure that the rights of marginalized groups are met: as this is usually the aim of participation it may require more robust and statutory frameworks (Loader, 1993).

This research was concerned with the way partnerships and their constituent members experienced working in partnership and behaved in partnership when dealing with discreet and/or ongoing community safety or (more likely) crime control issues within their designated communities. Although the 'democratic criteria' outlined by Jones et al has obvious resonance with the analysis of the relationship between partnerships and local communities, arguably they can also be used as a means of assessing intra-partnership working. Consequently characteristics such as participation, responsiveness and redress refer to the degree this occurred within partnerships. For example the characteristic they term 'responsiveness' would indicate the degree of flexibility expressed, shown or evidenced through action or non-action to other members of the partnership, and 'redress' the extent to which members of the partnership felt their concerns were addressed when raised within partnerships. In this research an example of this would be when a member of a partnership raised a concern and it was ignored, resolved or subsumed into a larger structural concern. Only the concept of delivery relates to the degree to which partnerships seemed to deliver useful services to the community in which they served. When marrying the democratic criteria with the 'realist' or utopian version of partnerships described above it is clear that there is an apparent matching of the two.

43 These were usually bounded geographically and by speciality e.g. patients or victims.
44 Partnerships may have delivered to other interested parties that were not part of their local community, such as auditors or other state strategists.
45 For more on this please see Hughes (2007).
Table 2 is an illustration of the conceptual marrying of the realist and democratic model of partnerships discussed above. In addition it gives some indication of the extent to which the partnerships in this research met these criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership Quality</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Democratic Quality</th>
<th>Quality Illustrated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partnerships work together to solve single or ongoing issues</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Delivery</td>
<td>o/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsiveness *</td>
<td>o/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They work with reference to the collective experience of members</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution of Power *</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to deal with problems or issues should be reached by discussion</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compromise and majority rule</td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redress</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>o/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of this process would be joint decisions or action points reached with</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Delivery *</td>
<td>o/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agencies embarking on coordinated or collaborative solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Information on Performance</td>
<td>o/p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Redress</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key**

- **P** Characteristic met
- **o** Characteristic not met
- **o/p** Characteristic partially met
- **+** Indicates quality is discussed in further detail below

This table is a blunt tool as it seeks to invoke generalities across all three field sites which can only be done clumsily due to their differences. However, what was apparent during the analysis was that the democratic qualities expressed above were poorly represented amongst actual partnership characteristics. These are broken down here into four categories – the partnership’s: purpose, process, structure, and outcomes. Some of these findings are explored in more detail in the following analysis chapters. However, for example if we consider the three democratic qualities above that are indicated with an asterisk this may be instructive in the following discussion on power. These are expanded in Table 3.

---

46 For details of the differences see matrix table in chapter 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democratic Quality</th>
<th>Mechanism</th>
<th>Quality Illustrated</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness *</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>O/P</td>
<td>This characteristic is partially met because members of the partnership mobilised to meet an ongoing or single issue. This was done singly or with one other member of the partnership. This was not a ‘partnership’ activity and the members concerned would meet separately – outside or after – the main partnership meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of Power *</td>
<td>Process</td>
<td>O</td>
<td>Distribution of power was situated amongst a few rather than many. Two models of power distribution are explored in chapters 9 and 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery *</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>O/P</td>
<td>Partnership meetings afforded opportunities for ‘soft’ outcomes such as networking. When this occurred occasional ad hoc coordination of projects would occur. This aim is only partially met because it occurred outside the temporal boundaries of the partnership meeting. Therefore it could not be characterised as ‘partnership activity’ although it stemmed from the partnership process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Early forays into the field and analytical ‘moments’ occurring during the research process led this research to develop an alternate theoretical framework than that which is common for research conducted in the area of ‘Community Safety’. Rather than utilising the Local Governance framework this work considers the way that power was utilised and distributed within strategic partnerships. It does this by considering the work that sprung from the fertile ground of American community politics and the debates that occurred after the publication of a community study by Hunter (1953) and the seminal work of C. Wright Mills (1956), *The Power Elite* that was published soon after.

The family lineage of these debates is well known and expressed in some detail in Lukes’ (2005) *Power: A Radical View* and passes from Hunter and Mills onto Dahl (1958; 2005), Bachrach and Baratz (1962) Polsby (1980), Wolfinger (1974; 1971), Frey (1971) and then Lukes. The debate was not contained by just the work of these men, however it is the exposition of this dialectic that is pursued here rather than an exhaustive account. In addition the work of instrumental, structural and neo-Marxists and elite theorists also offers insight into this debate. This research draws upon the model as developed by Lukes and his ‘three faces’ conceptualisation of power – building explicitly on the work of Dahl and Bachrach and Baratz. Moreover, it
considers aspects of what might be termed ‘cultural control’, developed by Gramsci (1988) in his concept of ‘hegemony’ and utilised in part by Lukes when discussing structuralist concerns.

The three faces of power

As suggested earlier, the work of Dahl came in response to Wright-Mills’ suggestion that an elite group dominated decision-making in America. In response to this Dahl and colleagues – most notably Polsby and Wolfinger – conducted in-depth research into New Haven, a seemingly average town. The methods they primarily employed were observation, documentary analysis and interviewing. They observed meetings and local governance structures and sought out political issues of the day. When considering these issues they considered their provenance, passage and outcome and overt forms of conflict. A political issue was one which engaged with ‘legitimate’ political structures. Their research seemed fruitful in ascertaining that readily apparent, were a plurality of interests in New Haven, and these had an equal chance of ‘winning’. The notion of a ‘plurality of interests’ led to this group being called the ‘pluralists’ although Wolfinger (1971) sees this nomenclature as being overtly restrictive and unhelpful. Lukes calls this the ‘first face’ of power as it considers decision-making and conflict, which is overt and apparent. It is expressed by the ‘pluralists’ as follows: A has power over B to the extent that he can get B to do something that B would not otherwise do. This relates to the exercise of power rather than inherent capacity and sits firmly within a behaviourist model of research and analysis. It adopts a Popperian (1959), scientific understanding of causality utilising methodological nominalism to describe how something appears in various circumstances. They do not seek to understand what power really is – some might suggest an overtly essentialist argument – instead it is its exercise and effects (upon B) that is the concern of pluralists.

In response to this work Bachrach and Baratz (1970) developed Schattschneider’s (1960) idea of the ‘mobilisation of bias’ and surmise:

Of course power is exercised when A participates in the making of decisions that affect B. Power is also exercised when A devotes his energies to creating or reinforcing social and political values and institutional practices
that limit the scope of the political process to public consideration of only those issues which are comparatively innocuous to A. To the extent that A succeeds in doing this, B is prevented, for all practical purposes, from bringing to the fore any issues that might in their resolution be seriously detrimental to A's set of preferences. (7)

They go on to define 'bias' in these terms, 'a set of predominant values, beliefs, rituals, and institutional procedures ('rules of the game') that operate systematically and consistently to the benefit of certain persons and groups at the expense of others.' (1970: 43). They suggest that anyone who benefits from the mobilisation of this bias is unfairly advantaged in decision-making processes and that these 'rules of the game' are often perceived as the 'status quo'. Moreover those who are in a position to know, understand and deploy the 'rules of the game' will often be an elite grouping. However, they conclude that those who are perceived to benefit from this process are often the 'majority'. Yet if we consider the work of Gramsci (1988) we can see that the concept of hegemony would suggest that the 'status quo' is efficient in communicating a lack of alternatives. This idea is explored further in discussion of Lukes below. Secondly, Bachrach and Baratz suggest that deployment of power may be 'hidden' because controversial issues are kept off the agenda through what they term observable non-decisions. In what is termed 'agenda-setting', non-decisions occur when the interests of another member frustrate a latent or controversial issue. They suggest that this curtailment of conflict may be empirically observed. Bachrach and Baratz withdrew from their first suggestion, that power and its deployment could be an inherent part of structures, in response to criticism from the pluralists (Polsby, 1980), who suggested that it would be impossible to empirically prove the mobilisation of bias and in response to 'categorical' statements no evidence could be provided. 47 Again, similar to Dahl, Bachrach and Baratz suggest power is something that can be exercised but not possessed.

For Lukes, although Bachrach and Baratz's conceptualisation of power had considerably more analytical and explanatory force then that of the pluralists it was apparent that in their focus on observable action or non-action they were both reliant on a behaviourist model of investigation. Lukes termed Bachrach and Baratz's

---

47 For more on this retreat from the theoretical development 'mobilisation of bias' see Baratz (1977) Review of Lukes (1974) Power: a Radical View.
perceptions of power as the ‘second face of power.’ They also considered an enterprise which sought to uncover hidden uses of power as impossible to operationalise empirically. In Lukes conception of the third face of power he attempts to put paid to some of Bachrach and Baratz’s pre-emptive critique.

Unlike Bachrach and Baratz and Dahl, Lukes develops a cultural conception of power. He suggests that the ‘bias’ system that is developed above is not just one that is mobilised by individuals but it also ‘socially structures and culturally pattern(s) (the) behaviour of groups and institutions which may be manifested by individuals’ inaction’ (26). He suggests that Bachrach and Baratz as well as Dahl develop a typology of power which is too individualist and does not fully engage with an understanding of power which is part of the ‘function of collective forces and social arrangements’. He suggests that this is done in two ways. Firstly, where collective action is manifest but cannot be attributed to the action of a single person and secondly, where bias is systemic or part of organisational effects and stems from the ‘form of organisation’. 48 This clearly has reference to structural Marxism and particular the work of Althusser (1971) and the ‘ideological state apparatus’. Although it is clear that institutions and organisations are made up of individuals, the power that they exercise is not in terms of an individuals’ action or inaction but instead made up of the whole.

In addition and perhaps most controversially, Lukes proposes that power can be exercised or deployed without conflict. He describes it as follows: ‘...A may exercise power over B by getting him to do what he does not want to do, but he also exercises power over him by influencing, shaping or determining his very wants.’ (27). Lukes suggests further that the most ‘insidious’ form of power is one that averts conflict. He goes on to suggest, contrary to Bachrach and Baratz’s assertion that when no conflict can be observed then there must be a consensus, that conflict can exist without overt manifestations or representations of conflict or non-conflict. He suggests that shaping attitudes and perceptions does this and that this process will entail those who are less powerful accepting their role and the way things are. However, Lukes again puts forward that this action and non-action is observable and

48 For more on this please see Chapter 2 and 7 on police organisational culture.
as such considers the exercise of power to be one of behaviour and action. Indeed Lukes articulates that our understanding of power is about how it is exercised one against the other. However, by adopting a form of power that is insidious he suggests that power can go against the ‘best interests’ of B that may be achieved under ‘ideal democratic circumstances’. In conclusion it is clear that Lukes also never abandons the behaviourism that he criticises Dahl and Bachrach and Baratz for pursuing as he suggests that his third face of power is also capable of being observed, empirically, through the exercise and deployment of power.

A realist view of power

In Isaac’s (1987) comprehensive critique of the debate on power he develops what he terms a realist view of power. He does this against what he considers the behaviouralist account of power that has been considered so far and their inability to reconcile structure and agency in a philosophical and methodological context, which provides a heavy empiricist burden. Isaac’s development of the argument utilises Giddens’ (1979) interplay of structure and agency and attempts to reconcile some of the unexplained turns in the debate on power. Of most interest to this research is Isaac’s relatively successful attempt to include structure and capacity into the debate on power.

Firstly, Isaac suggests that by focusing on a definition of power as a ‘power to’ (get B to do something he would not normally do or against his best interests) they negate the importance of the concept of ‘power over’. By utilising the limited conjuncture ‘to’ they fail to understand that their conceptualisation is parasitic upon the ‘power over’ conceptualisation of power. ‘Power over’ is the capacity to exercise power – by

---

49 Initially although apparently culturally absolutist in his understanding of ‘democratic values’ and linking himself to a normative Habermasian stance, Lukes later distanced himself from this approach and the idea of ‘objective’ interests. For more on this please consider Lukes (1979; 1982; 2005) and Isaac (1987).

50 He is not alone in developing a critique on the grounds of the inherent behaviourism that is apparent in Dahl, Bachrach and Baratz and Lukes’ consideration of power. For a further critique of this and the somewhat confused position of Lukes within the remit of structural Marxism please consider Bradshaw (1976).


52 Something Lukes also attempts to do in the 2005 edition of Power: A Radical View.
conceptualising power in this way the essential quality of ‘conflict’ is avoided. As Isaacs suggests the relationship of dominant and subordinate exists in many contexts and whilst power exists in these contexts its exercise is not always necessary and these relationships are usually shaped by structural relations. An example of this might be the power a head teacher exerts over her teachers and pupils. Although a dominant and subordinate relationship clearly exists it is debatable how often the head is called upon to exercise this power. The power relationship is shaped by the education system and the school.

The structural relationship to power is something Bachrach and Baratz and Lukes struggled to operationalise within their work. Bachrach and Baratz regretfully withdrew from this conceptualisation of power and Lukes maintained it but never manages to satisfactorily merge it with his concept of ‘power to’ and agency. Isaac’s approach to structural relations rests on his conceptualisation of power as being one of ‘the capacity to act possessed by social agents in virtue of the enduring relations in which they participate’ (1987: 22). Therefore, to fully understand the way that power is utilised by agents/individuals it is necessary to understand their structural relations. He also suggests that,

(t)he contingency of the exercise of power is, ultimately, connected to another important reality – the openness of history, and the fact that social structures are only relatively enduring, not immutable. Insofar as the exercise of power is always contingent, it is constantly negotiated in the course of everyday life. Thus not only the exercise of power, but the very existence of relations of power themselves, can become objects of contention and struggle...Power relations approximate less a model of stimulus and response and more a model of endemic reciprocity, negotiation and struggle with both dominant and subordinate groups mobilising their specific powers and resources. A theory of power must analyse structural relations and the way they are worked out concretely by socially situated human beings (24).

Finally, in response to Lukes’ assertion of ‘objective’ interest as opposed to Dahl’s conception of the articulated ‘preference’, Isaac adds the ‘real’ interest: that which occurs in everyday social action, where individuals often conduct themselves in response to everyday demands. The example he offers is the literature student whose preference may be to read a comic, and whose objective interest may be to read a
classic but whose real interest is met by reading the set text to pass an exam. Everyday, people will subsume their preferences and objective interests in the presence of their real interests, which are shaped by their structural relationships.

4.8 Utilisation

In the present research the analytical frame and the concept of power as described above were used in two ways. Firstly, they were used in the attempt to assess the types of organisation which were participating in this research. In this instance it was the police and the NHS. This was done as practitioners had an acute sense of the history of their organisation and the way it shaped their everyday practices. When they came to work in partnership it was important to understand their organisational context. In addition, it was apparent that the organisations had certain preconceptions as to the way that they expected these organisations to work and in effect mobilised a bias against the other agency – in this research the term 'atypical construction' is adopted to indicate the way in which this bias was constructed. However, as can be seen in chapter 7, although firmly ensconced within it occupational culture is not immutable.

Secondly, the research seeks to uncover the way that power is used and deployed by agencies within partnerships. As Dahl, Polsby, Wolfinger, and Bachrach and Baratz suggest, instances of deployment of one against the other are not easy to identify where there is not overt conflict. This research did not employ the empiricism of Dahl and colleagues and it also did not seek out only examples of observable decisions and non-decisions although examples of these are reported. In addition it did not merely rely on 'objective' or real interests – although a normative sense of the aims and purposes of the agencies involved was garnered from academic and policy literature and this can be seen in chapters 2 and 3. Instead through observation and interview it sought to ascertain the underlying sense of situations as they revealed themselves. At times this was apparent through conflict, at times through non-decisions and at times through agenda-setting. However, it was also evidenced by the willingness of practitioners to state how they perceived partnership and their position within it.
Finally, in the concluding chapter the lessons learnt from the way that these partnerships worked together, meant that some policy recommendations became appropriate and a discussion of these takes place there.

4.9 Conclusion

The exploration of this material has sought to provide a basis for the discussion that occurs in the subsequent analysis chapters. The current literature on local forms of crime control and security offers a compelling narrative on state management (or not) of crime in communities and remains important in framing our broad understanding of this debate. However, I have argued that the particular concerns in this thesis with the nature of relationships within partnerships requires a different primary analytic frame; and that the classic sociological/political science literature on ‘power’ and power relationships, though rarely used by criminologists, has significant potential in this regard. In the following substantive chapters, partnerships in practice will be considered and this approach will be applied.
5. Chapter Five
The Field Sites

This chapter situates the three field sites within the research. It attempts to provide a ‘pen portrait’ of each of the field sites and what the main issues were at each locality during the time the fieldwork was conducted. It presents each site as a separate entity but also draws some comparisons between each of them where it highlights a particular commonality or theme within the data or provides evidence in answer to the research questions. The field sites were selected using a ‘deviant’ case approach using the criterion of ‘success’ for inclusion. A full account of this process is included in the methodology chapter in section 6.2 on sampling.

The first field site was located in Wales. Here the major differences between it and the other fieldwork areas occurred because of the devolution of certain governmental responsibilities in 1999. Although crime was not one of these, the derogation of other responsibilities such as health services had a serious effect on Community Safety Partnerships. This transpires in areas where the roles of the health sector and the police overlap. An example of this is prolific offending. This type of offending often occurs in response to an illegal (and therefore expensive) drug addiction (Cabinet Office, 1999; Carter, 2000; Godfrey et al., 2002; Gossop et al., 2000; Home Office, 2004). Therefore the activity could call for a response from criminal justice agencies, in response to the illegal activities. However, it could also entail the involvement of drug treatment facilities (situated within health services) (ACPO Drugs Standing Working Group, 2003).

The second field site was in the Midlands. In many ways it represented the location where partnership working had the most opportunity to be successful.53 There was a history of good partnership working between agencies stemming from the Safer Cities initiative in 1992, the city was a unitary authority, and it had an established and accountable structure and enthusiastic participants. Utilising the six characteristics identified by the Home Office (1990) – structure, leadership,

---

53 For a limited discussion on success see Chapter 3 and Gilling (1997).
information, identity, durability and resources – this partnership had a considerable share of these attributes against a background of good partnership working.

The third field site was a prolific offenders project. It was chosen because it was operating on similar principles to a project in the North of England (North Project), which had been seen as very successful in achieving crime reduction in a northern town. The model that it utilised (time-intensive interaction with prolific offenders by the police) had been very successfully marketed by that force and the Home Office. It seemed at the time (when the project in the present sample was being started) that the ‘North Project’ was being rolled out across the country and therefore this locally derived project in the south was successful in securing £140,000 in start-up money from the local government office.

Each section of the following site profiles begins with a table of those who attended the partnership. Whether an attendee was interviewed is indicated with an asterisk. Gender and social class are also included. Social class was identified by the researcher using biographical data described in interview, further discussion of the importance of social class is included in chapters six, seven, eight, eleven and twelve.\textsuperscript{54} The use of this, in practice, two-fold classification of middle and working class became important in the ongoing testimony of respondents and the way they utilised social class in the formation of occupational culture and indeed how this operationalisation was action-orientated. In consequence, it was a crucial consideration in the way respondents accounted for their work in partnership and the way they engaged in partnership working.

5.1 Field Site One: Wales the City of Bingham.

This partnership was situated in Wales and as we shall see below it was located in a busy cosmopolitan area. In the locality there was a history of good partnership working in diverse areas. The following section hopes to provide a secure footing for the reader in what it was like working in this town for practitioners. Partnership working was conducted in a period where there had been significant amounts of

\textsuperscript{54} The limitations of the research and the problematical nature of ascribing social class are discussed further in section 12.1.
change in mechanisms of local accountability and information exchange, which was brought about through the process of devolution. It is hoped that by contrasting this process with that which currently exists in England it provides some clarity with how these changes shape partnership working in Wales.


Attendees

Table 4 lists those who attended the Community Safety Partnership, Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Forum (MARAC) and the Homicide Review Committee (HRC) and indicates who was interviewed. A full list of attendees for the MARAC and HRC is omitted as these partnerships were secondary and the respondents were interviewed due to their dual position as experts in their field and practitioners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4 Bingham Partnership Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bingham</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Reduction Director (never attended)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent/Chief Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Transport Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Health Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Trust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Authority</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative of the Board and also a Councillor</td>
<td>(Did not respond to invitation)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Authority</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative of the Board and also a Councillor</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Director</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substance Misuse Action Team</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects Manager</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fire Service</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representing the Fire Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing the Fire Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YOT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recent Local History

Bingham was the first field site explored as part of the research. Fieldwork was conducted from October 2003 until June 2004. Wales was very different from the partnerships observed in England. This was primarily for two reasons: devolution and proximity to the legislature. Firstly, devolution (which occurred in 1999) had instigated a process of considerable change and allowed Wales the freedom to legislate in the fields of social justice, health and social services, economic development, education, environment, planning, countryside, culture, Welsh language and sport. When devolution occurred, there was ridicule expressed in the English press over the more limited devolution that took place in Wales when compared with Scotland (Denver, 2002). Scotland had been given control over crime with the creation of the Scotland Office whereas Wales was to still reside under the Home Office and ‘English’ rule. However, Wales has managed to exploit the areas of authority it has been given and has quietly initiated some fairly revolutionary changes, which have wide ranging direct, and indirect effect (Bransbury, 2004). An example of this was the creation of new commissioning bodies for health care known as Local Health Boards. These were smaller then Primary Care Trusts and were (more or less) coterminous with the police and council, certainly more so than had previously been the case. They were also developed with immediate statutory responsibility for crime reduction and their representatives therefore had to attend crime and disorder reduction partnerships almost 18 months before statutory responsibility occurred in England (April 2004).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MARAC HRC</th>
<th>Interviewed</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women’s Safety Unit</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Sergeant/Inspector</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55 Members interviewed from the Multi-Agency Risk Assessment Conference (not all members), these were also members of the Homicide Review Committee.
56 All city and respondent names are purely fictional.
The second significant observed difference was the proximity to the legislature. There was a familiarity with the MPs, the local characters, policy and aims that was not as apparent in England. In England there was a closer relationship with regional government (in the guise of the local government office for the region) but the relationship did not seem to contain the same elements of familiarity, affection and grudging respect for the legislature that were exhibited in Wales. In England there was much more cynicism aimed at Whitehall then was levelled at the Welsh equivalent, the Welsh Assembly Government. This may also be due to proximity; the city of ‘Bingham’ was fairly close to the Welsh Assembly Government. This led very much to the attitude of ‘oh well, I’ll send him an email and have a word as that doesn’t seem to be a very good idea’ or ‘if I see him around I’ll have a chat’ when discussing members of the cabinet. This attitude was unique to the Welsh site in this research.

Social and Cultural Structure of Bingham

Bingham was undergoing significant changes and was the fastest growing city in Europe, with visitors astounded by the ‘grace of its architecture’ and its ‘thriving coffee culture’ and wealth of leisure activities. Having described it as such it is a city which is situated in a country with the slowest growing GDP in Europe (Welsh Assembly Government, 2001). The city is small and easy to navigate with good transport links locally, and internationally. It was becoming known within Wales and Europe as a ‘good time town’ in respect of its night time economy. The local population at the last census was recorded as being just over 305,000 with 90% defining themselves as white and almost 70% as Christian. This population is swelled during term time by almost 24,000 students. There was also, with recently erected leisure facilities, room for an additional 100,000 revellers in clubs, pubs and bars. This had led to significant problems, with some members of the partnership viewing the city as a ‘no go’ area for the local populace on a Friday and Saturday.

References which refer to the city specifically have been omitted to protect the anonymity of the location. This information can be found in Tourist Information Pamphlets, on the Local Government Website or from the Office of National Statistics. Partly this information was also derived directly from field notes.
night. The superintendent and joint chair of the partnership added that as far as his officers were concerned the weekend had expanded to include Wednesday, Thursday, and Sunday. The city was gaining a reputation with stag and hen parties and the weekends would often be accompanied by groups of partygoers dressed as nurses, priests, nuns and brides. The city was perceived as having a 24-hour culture that was being fostered by Whitehall (through changes in licensing) in an attempt to bring revenue into the city.

The biggest employer in the city after the public administration, education and health was the tertiary sector.\textsuperscript{58}

The nature of this sociable city with an extensive range of evening diversions had led to it becoming known as a city with drunken, violent tendencies on the weekend. It had been showcased in a BBC documentary and had become involved in some innovative partnership working which had gained international attention for the police and health sector working together in what was primarily a street crime initiative.\textsuperscript{59} This social development fed into and exacerbated the already acknowledged heavy drinking culture in Wales which was made worse by the changing social structure experienced in the radical shift in employment in the eighties from traditional forms of work and society into a more fragmented social structure (Moore et al., 1994). This also had been responded to with the development of an alcohol strategy (Secretary of State for Wales, 1996), which was developed and implemented about eight years before the National/English alcohol strategy was published (The Cabinet Office, 2004).

\textit{The Political Structure of Bingham}

The political nature of the city was largely characterised by the city council, which had a Labour majority but required cross council collaboration for decision-making. This local context is important in considering the interplay between local and national political and policy changes and the potential impact these changes had on local partnership relations in terms of local enthusiasm and funding priorities.\textsuperscript{60} The leader of the council and joint chair of the community safety partnership was a

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{58} ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{59} ibid.
  \item \textsuperscript{60} Please see research questions Chapter 1, Page 12.
\end{itemize}
Labour councillor. There was a great deal of support for the Labour Party in the city and this no doubt sprang from the political strife surrounding the pit closures in the eighties (Spence, 1998). This remains a strong element in the political, cultural and social life of Wales and particularly affects the relationship between the police and residents of Merthyr Tydfil, who refuse to involve the police in local issues such as domestic violence (field notes October 2003). Many of the political characters of the city could be described as old Labour in that they exhibited many traditional elements of this political tradition: they felt their roots deeply within the community and believed in state provision of welfare, housing and social justice (field notes 2004). Interestingly the effect of this left wing but largely orthodox stance led to a generally traditional, almost punitive attitude, when it came to crime.

There was much time spent, during partnership meetings, discussing traditional crime fighting approaches such as a heavy police presence and incarceration. Implementation of Anti-Social Behaviour Orders was instigated as quickly and widely as possible. Ideas regarding new forms of crime prevention and dealing with the causes of crime were often the lone quiet voice and resulted in small, innovative, but under-funded, projects (field notes 2003). Soon after the fieldwork ended the results of the local council elections were published and the Labour leader of the council was replaced with a Liberal Democrat Councillor. In her opinion she lost her seat in no small part as a result of the Iraq war and what she believed was the ensuing protest vote. She had encountered a great deal of questioning on the war when on the hustings (field notes 2004). Politically, there is always a compelling interplay between international, national and local politics that was also played out in partnership relations and activities.

*The partnerships situated in Bingham*

Firstly there was innovative internationally recognised partnership working that was occurring between the NHS and the police in dealing with street crime that was associated with heavy weekend drinking. Secondly, there were considerable interagency working and innovative strategies being developed around domestic violence. Initially I looked at two partnerships in Bingham. Firstly a multi agency
risk assessment conference (MARAC) meeting that occurred bi-weekly and discussed all victims who were locally considered to be at risk from particular offenders. Secondly a Homicide Review Committee (HRC) was being conducted in an attempt to assess all the possible agency interventions that could have occurred in the lead up to the murder of a victim of domestic violence. My observation began by looking at the two latter partnership forums and then progressed on to looking at the Community Safety Partnership.

The MARAC

The MARAC and the Homicide Review Committee relied on the commitment and drive of a few personalities. I attended one MARAC, and two HRC meetings but there was (at that stage) little involvement by the NHS in either case. This was partly due to a lack of understanding with regards to who should be invited. Participants were aware that it would be beneficial to get someone from the health sector involved, but the problem was who. At a later date mental health services began to attend, although this only occurred after the MARAC had proved itself through an evaluation. The HRC encountered some resistance and defensiveness amongst agencies. The purpose of the review was a non-blame investigation into a death of a woman who was a victim of domestic violence. Contact with health agencies had revealed that the woman in question had interleaved her visits to her GP with visits to the A&E. Essentially this meant that neither the A&E or her GP had picked up on the seriousness of the assaults.

The Local Community Safety Partnership: Accountability

The second partnership was the city’s Community Safety Partnership. It consisted of between 10-14 participants and met monthly. The partnership was a complicated mishmash of agencies and people with no clear agenda or purpose. Its apparent remit was ‘community safety’ and ‘crime reduction’ but this was never made explicit and this lack of explicitness led to an apparent lack of direction, in meetings where everyone had their say but little progress was made. Admittedly in an ongoing group one might not expect explicit declarations as regards remit. However, in this group there was an underlying confusion as to what the group was trying to achieve and
issues seemed to arise on an ad hoc basis with little planning. There was a term of reference in the form of the community safety strategy, but there seemed little or no orientation to it. An example of this is the single issue which dominated the first few meetings: the Substance Misuse Action Team (SMAT) Plan. Each month two members of the SMAT would attend the meeting and give a comprehensive outline of the development of the plan, costings for proposed projects and projected outcome for their bids, and the potential for funding to come down through the Welsh Assembly Government, the Community Safety Partnership and then out to the SMAT. This structure is what led the SMAT team to attempt to feed back and engage with the CSP on what they were attempting to do with the money. At the end of each presentation the representatives of the SMAT team would ask for feedback. Feedback was usually in the form of ‘I think we should congratulate worker A and worker B on all their hard work.’ followed by applause. Later during interview both SMAT workers would talk about how difficult they found this experience and the total lack of line management they experienced having the CSP as their accountable body.

The SMAT team were not a statutory partnership but the partnership had statutory responsibility for drugs and alcohol. The SMAT team used to attend the statutory partners’ meeting so that they could inform the partnership about what they were doing. This was no doubt done in some part to try to shift responsibility to the CSP if things should go wrong at a local level. The SMAT were a strategy group: a group which should work underneath the level of the statutory partners meeting and should include other groups such as fire, street crime, and violent crime. It is usual for the targets that are highlighted through the audit and strategy to have a strategy group to develop them. At interview it became clear that the strategy groups in this city were largely defunct. They either did not meet or did not have a chair and did not meet. This was the reason that the SMAT felt they had to come and report directly to the CSP, because there was no other reporting mechanism for them to feed back changes and developments occurring in the city. This seemed to be the crux of the problem.
The Effects of Devolution on Community Safety Partnerships

In England the system worked with a fairly clear line of authority from the Home Office down, as is illustrated by the following chart.

**Figure 1  Influences on Community Safety Partnerships in England**

* the Drug Action Team or Drug and Alcohol Action Team is either separate and operates at more or less the same level as the Community Safety Partnership or has amalgamated with the Community Safety Partnership. If separate then the DAT/DAAT is accountable directly to the HO and the Department of Health. If amalgamated then the substance misuse elements of the CSP are directly accountable to the HO and the Department of Health.

In the partnership in the city, the structure was woollier and never discussed explicitly. As can be seen in figure 2 (below) the Welsh CSP had more influences then just the Home Office. There was also indirect effect from the Welsh Assembly Government through actions like health strategies.
The issue seems to stem from devolution and the effects that this has had on the scope and purpose of both health services and criminal justice in Wales. The Crime and Disorder Act 1998 encourages partnerships in England and Wales to go out into their local communities, audit them and develop a local strategy. This means that while Wales did not gain control over national crime strategy, which remained with the Home Office, it did gain control over local crime and disorder strategies, which, through the CSP, have a local commitment and 'flavour'. This tension did create conflicts. Whitehall reneged somewhat on its commitment to local issues by setting 'top three' targets for CSPs, by which local partnerships were bound. This implies a swing back to the centre and, for this partnership in Wales, a swing back to Whitehall (what is termed in Wales as 'London Government') away from what was (at one time) destined to be a 'community' activity.
Nevertheless, devolution did bring with it a local responsibility for health services. The health budget for Wales was considerable, which undeniably gave the Local Health Board significant clout, especially when considering the crime reduction implications of a group like prolific offenders, who need drug treatment. This local responsibility for health services introduced an interesting dimension to CSPs where crime strategies had a Whitehall dimension but health budgets could focus entirely on local priorities. Undoubtedly Local Health Boards were influenced by the Whitehall context and there was a focus on detoxification and rehabilitation programmes, which were also a feature of the English partnerships I worked with. However, local control of health budgets held the promise of reincorporating the community into Community Safety Partnerships and their strategies.

The Effects of Devolution on the Health Sector

Prolific offenders had, it was realised, been responsible for the majority of acquisitive crime - mainly to feed expensive ‘A’ class drug habits (Godfrey et al., 2002). This, as we have seen and as we will see, was one of the places where the police and the NHS could, would and should work closely together (Elston et al., 2002). This was also a situation where a CSP in Wales could derive local initiatives through utilising health budgets for crime reduction. Interestingly, the Welsh Assembly Government had decided to hive off part of the Local Health Board budget for Substance Misuse and ring fence it (field notes 2003). They had also decided to direct this portion through the Community Safety Partnership, at this point the Substance Misuse Action Team and the Local Health Board could bid for funds for local substance misuse initiatives. The Local Health Board could also use existing funds for additional substance misuse projects if it saw fit or additionally fund Substance Misuse Action Team plans. This it was believed locally was done to get the health service round the table.61

---

61 Interview Community Safety Manager October 2004. The flow of substance misuse money can be seen in figure 2.
Achievements

As an observer one could not identify a single tangible outcome of this partnership that would not have emerged had the partnership not existed. There were undoubtedly what are termed ‘soft’ outcomes: networking, knowing a familiar face, brainstorming etc. There were also achievements and developments made by individual agencies such as probation, the SMAT, or the Council Community Safety Team, but these were in no way ‘hard’ outcomes. In addition to this there were lots of projects and ideas, lots of things being planned, some large-scale initiatives and involvement in fairly large events. However there seemed little commitment to ‘do’ – to get past the planning stage. In interview it was clear that many in the partnership felt similarly. Those at the periphery of the decision-making core felt that they achieved little and were not involved in the planning. Those who were in the decision-making core (or felt that they were) acknowledged that decisions were being made but that these occurred outside of the partnership forum. They did this because it was easier to bypass the partnership and deal with what essentially became a smaller executive group.

The primary concerns of this partnership existed in two layers. Firstly, there was a preoccupation with Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs). At that time, despite criticism, they had been adopted but in a piecemeal manner, by community safety partnerships up and down the country (Burney, 2005). This CSP had very quickly developed ASBO strategies and was implementing them (field notes 2003/04). Bingham claimed to be the first city to use an ASBO. Secondly, what lay underneath this was competitiveness with other CSPs locally or within their ‘family’. Discussions by the partnership ensued on how to exploit good work by others for their own ends whilst holding an underlying expectation that good work derived locally would be kept local. This publicising of their own work was done for the local community, London Government and the Audit Commission. However, by far the biggest concern for approval lay with London Government and the Audit Commission. There was also a strong desire by the CSP to protect their own boundaries and stamp on what was seen by them as encroachment by external bodies or agencies on their territory. The core four decision-makers: two police officers, the
leader of the council, and the community safety officer carried out this ‘partnership maintenance’. Probation also felt that they were part of this inner group, although evidence from the field does not support this belief – they acted on the periphery.

In association with this work, there was a preoccupation with local issues at ward/street level. Arguments between neighbouring factions were discussed at meetings. This seemed to happen because many members of the partnership wore as they said, ‘two hats’ or more – they were councillors, and presented local issues but also might sit on a committee and have a portfolio. This meant that they often felt torn about the role they were called to the partnership to fulfil and an additional role that they also had. Or alternatively they were willing to exploit local connections and use the partnership to explore neighbourhood issues. This was often the case with the members who represented the police and fire authority. They were also councillors and frequently would begin a sentence ‘If I could just put on my other hat for a moment and ask: as you know I represent area a and we have been having problems with x,y and z, and I was wondering how that would fit in with your strategy.’ These comments were dealt with politely but with an edge of exasperation as apparent ‘time wasting’, but it was also clear from observation that these comments were crucial in making the partnership consider local applicability of their discussions. It illustrated the problems which resulted when there was a clear power imbalance between members. Unfortunately, the problem was that this questioning was not democratic: not all the wards were represented and not all councillors were as vocal on behalf of themselves and their local populace as these councillors (field notes 2003/04).

In Wales there was a complex interplay between the local and the national, this was exacerbated through the relatively recent process of devolution. Local structures were still ‘creaky’ with newness. However, it was clear that they had taken bold steps locally to try and forward the project of partnership working and particularly in getting the NHS on board. Unfortunately the hiving off of substance misuse money left ‘health/drug’ sector workers lacking in what they felt was clear and obvious accountability. This was due to the largely ineffectual lines of communication within the partnership because of the, in the main, hidden decision-making core (for more on this see chapter ten) and the lack of any clear strategic goals.
5.2 Field Site Two: The Midlands the City of Greenton

Greenton was situated in the Midlands. In the surrounding area there was relatively poor partnership working. I encountered Greenton’s reputation whilst attending a one-day NACRO conference in Birmingham. In a round table discussion a practitioner had commented to a colleague (who was from Greenton) ‘I don’t know why you’re here! We all know there is no problem with partnership working in Greenton.’ Within their region they were known as the best partnership.

Attendees

Table 5 shows the agencies from which partnership members were drawn, their role, gender and social class. Asterisks indicate those who were interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenton</th>
<th>Interviewed</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Social Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive (Chair)</td>
<td>Interviewed</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinet Member (Community Well-being)</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Services for Communities, Education and Libraries</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Social Services and Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Environmental Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Youth Offending Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Area Co-ordination</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Preventative Strategy Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCU Commander M1</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCU Commander M2</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCU Commander M3</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority Liaison Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands Police Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member West Midlands Police Authority</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board Member West Midlands Police Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Midlands Fire Service</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative of Station Commanders</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority Liaison Officer</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chief Executive Primary Care Trust</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Director of Public Health PCT</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director Mental Health Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Agencies</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Magistrates Court</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Probation Service</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connexions</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representative of Registered Social Landlords</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Drugs Team</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Alcohol Service</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Representative</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Representation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representing equalities (unnamed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representing neighbourhoods (unnamed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advisors and Invited Agencies</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAAT Co-ordinator and Commissioning Manager</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant DAAT Co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Reduction Co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Libraries</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands Community Support Officer</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Office for the Midlands – Regional Drugs Advisor</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Strategic Partnership</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Recent Local History**

Greenton is a metropolitan authority and has undergone considerable post-war reconstruction, which has given it the appearance and atmosphere of a new town. The city centre is pedestrianised but there is a sense that the town has been designed with the car in mind, with the belief that people will commute into and out of the city. As a commuter town there are very few leisure facilities for evening entertainment, as after work people drive out of the town. Although this was changing, this lack of night time activity left the city feeling deserted and threatening at night. This was in clear contrast to Bingham.

The city has a manufacturing past and lacked diversity in its economic profile. This had disastrous consequences in the seventies and the eighties. Factory closures led to high unemployment and the population of the city fell between 1991 and 2001. The city had a reputation in the eighties, which progressed into the nineties, of being hard-nosed, violent and grim. Its architecture inspired extreme reactions - it is either considered to be soulless and ugly or is admired for its clean lines and innovative use of modern materials.

**Social and Cultural Structure of Greenton**

The city is ethnically diverse with a large refugee population. The population stands at approximately 300,000 and just over 20 percent of this is situated in minority ethnic communities compared to a national average of 12.5. In addition to this the city is situated in a county which has exceedingly low ethnic diversity of 4.8 percent, making the city feel more ethnically diverse when compared to its surrounds. This city has some of the poorest wards in the county, the area of West Midlands in which
it is situated and the country. It is situated in the top sixth of the 2004 Index of Deprivation where ‘one’ is the most deprived area.

Unlike the rest of the UK, and despite widespread factory closures in the 1970s and the 1980s the largest employment sector remains manufacturing, along with the largest new employer – the service industry. The early 90s saw a turnaround in the city’s fortunes. Because it was poorly performing, socially, culturally and economically it became subject to many new projects to try and stem the decline. One of these was the Safer Cities Initiative, which was influenced by the Morgan Report (Home Office Standing Conference on Crime Prevention, 1991). This, as noted earlier, was a precursor to the Crime and Disorder Act (1998). The Safer Cities initiative would later become the Community Safety Partnership in this city.

**Political Structure of Greenton**

 Whilst this research was being conducted, local council elections were held and the council swung from being a hung council – with a very vocal New Labour grouping - to being led by the Conservatives. This may have occurred because of the war in Iraq and the considerable strife this had caused in the county (field notes 2004). One of the key council objectives is to reduce crime and the fear of crime. Although crime rates are close to and in some instances lower than the national average - a considerable achievement in an area dealing with such high levels of deprivation - fear of crime is two percent higher than the national average. This led to a preoccupation by the police locally and the partnership with how to make the community feel safer – to make it reassured.62

The council itself had a charismatic leader. She was generally described by all respondents as progressive, confident and at times intimidating. Colleagues rarely let her down without good reason. She had turned the council round in terms of performance although she has only been in post for three years. In 2002 this council was graded poor but by 2007 was a three star council with beacon status. The publications from the council achieved a clear strategic focus and at the time of the

---

62 ibid.
fieldwork the community safety team was extensive, full time, and knowledgeable. The head of the community safety team had been in the team for approximately 14 years and had been heading it for the past six. These two individuals provided a well-informed duo that were not only aware of every crime and disorder issue in the city but could also state its history and provenance with a considerable degree of accuracy. The head of the community safety team was also aware of how every funding stream had been introduced, developed and changed from the Safer Cities Initiative in 1992 to the present day. This had led to a dedicated team to pick-up new funding when old streams dry up.

In the five years up to the time of writing the city had become reinvigorated and there seemed to be a new pride in the city, its location, past and its potential future.

The Community Safety Partnership

The partnership I attended in Greenton was the Community Safety Partnership. It had recently amalgamated with the Drug Action Team and was coming to terms with its new remit, which was community safety and crime reduction but also harm minimisation, drug treatment and communities and availabilities (of illegal street drugs). The partnership in this authority was unitary and this co-terminosity had huge benefits for the partnership. It meant that they were interested in the same community and could see the benefit of working cooperatively with other agencies if it met their targets. In addition to this the city was compact and most members of the partnership could physically walk round the city and meet up with other colleagues relatively easily. That is not to say that this happened – inevitably a comprehensive email system was heavily utilised by the community safety team (the hub of all information dispersal), but the fact that they could meet easily appeared to mobilise them. This led to members of the partnership being more familiar with each other and each other’s problems and goals than was the case in other partnerships and indeed the other Community Safety Partnership in this research.
This partnership had very clear lines of accountability. It was situated structurally beneath the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP), it had the function of being one of the strategy groups for this forum and helped to administer the Community Plan. In addition to this the LSP did seem to have a function, in no small part derived from the drive of the council’s chief executive: the LSP became a forum for highlighting cross cutting issues for all strategy groups under the LSP, such as crime affecting the children and families group or transport. This two way process of exchange at a strategic level did regularly reinvigorate the group and led to the development of the ‘100 families project’, which had begun development as I was exiting the field. The project may have represented the first discrete piece of partnership working between agencies, in this partnership.

Similar to the Bingham partnership, Greenton did much to promote itself and its activities. In each of the interviews I asked ‘Can you tell me some of the things that you have achieved.’ In response to such a direct query respondents often floundered for a moment. This partnership was very proud of a project that had been designed to remove abandoned cars in accord with the broken windows theory (Wilson and Kelling, 1982), and the distribution of steering wheel clamps to cars that were older than a D registration as they were most likely to be stolen (field notes 2004). However it was clear that this partnership activity had really only involved the council as the primary funder of the project and the community safety team as the driving force behind organising the project, it had not involved the rest of the partnership. In practice it was difficult to identify any clear partnership derived activity. Regardless of this the self-promotion of the partnership did not rely on output as a gauge for success. Similar to the Bingham partnership the idea and experience of success apparently relied on being able to state categorically that the partnership was successful and this assertion was not subject to contradiction by fact. This trend is common in criminal justice projects and was identified by Weatheritt (1989) ‘…the kind of research that the police do on themselves should more often then not be viewed as a form of legitimation of the very activity it seeks to
investigate.' (42). However, this ‘belief’ in success was more justified then in the first partnership as in Greenton they had the ‘makings’ of success. This partnership had a clear and accountable structure and a strategic framework; they also had a clear and obvious commitment from diverse agencies, voluntary sector groups and business. Partnership working in a crime reduction context had been occurring in this city since 1992 and at the point I observed this partnership they appeared to be on the cusp of engaging with other agencies in some form of partnership working rather than simply coordination of services. However, even this fairly high profile project involved decision-making by the inner circle and only included those with responsible authority status.

**Chairmanship and Administration**

The partnership had a ‘revolving’ chair. The three statutory partners - the police, NHS and the council - chaired the meeting. They were embodied by three superintendents for the police (although only one chaired), the chief executive of the council and the Primary Care Trust for the NHS. Each of the Chairs chaired three meetings and each meeting occurred every eight weeks for three hours. At each meeting the agenda was very full. The community safety team produced high quality partnership literature and comprehensively administered the partnership in Greenton. The community safety team were also responsible for producing accurate and easy to read minutes with clear lines of accountability and actionable points. Minutes were released about a week after the meeting and partnership material for discussion was produced throughout the 8-week cycle for comment, consultation and feedback. The definitive meeting material was distributed by email about a week before each meeting occurred.

The chief executive of the council and the superintendent of a local OCU chaired the meetings which I observed. However the meeting in actuality was always chaired by the chief executive of the council who would sit beside the superintendent and whisper to him between agenda items, pass notes and always be considered first for each agenda point. The chief executive of the Primary Care Trust would sit to the right of the chief executive of the council and exercise a (slightly) devolved power,
achieved by organisational hierarchy and physical position. The chief executive of
the PCT had been involved in the partnership for about a year. He had made the
decision to act as if he had statutory responsibility about a year before it became
legislatively necessary.

Achievements

As already stated there were no distinct partnership achievements that could be
identified. There were (again) many soft outcomes: networking, discussing
organisational objectives with other agencies, coordinating project boundaries, but an
underlying question of this research is, are achieving these soft outcomes enough?
This partnership was highly developed with a significant corporate team of decision-
makers who were very aware of the crime problems locally. They could also identify
some of the levers that were involved in exacerbating these crime problems.
However many of these problems were made worse by national and international
policy, economic, foreign and domestic. There had been an increase in hate crime in
the city and racial tension alleged to be in no small part due to the war in Iraq (field
notes 2004). It is clear that there are always local issues that can be dealt with locally
– the loose cobble stones – but there are some things which need support from
national decision making bodies or at least acknowledgement of local impact.

At the time I was exiting the partnership there was a real sense of excitement over
the ‘100 families project’ or perhaps the ‘25 families project’ (the scale and scope
had not been decided). This was a project that had been developed in meetings
between the three key agencies in the partnership - the police, the NHS and the
Council. They had decided to seek funding to work intensively with ‘problem
families’ in the area. It was easy to identify who these families were because the
police, NHS and the local authority would usually have been aware of them for at
least two generations as being involved in a cycle of abuse, crime and deprivation.
Although these agencies were generally in agreement that something needed to be
done there was not complete agreement on this initiative being the right course of
action. One of the agencies thought that this project would label families and could
make their position worse. The other two agencies saw this as overstated but they
welcomed the opportunity to convince the representative of the agency with reservations that this was a chance to make a difference.

Conclusion

Greenton as opposed to Bingham is situated outside the norm as far as partnership working is concerned. Although it is difficult to ‘generalise’ from such a small sample the larger context of being in the field for five years, in association with recent reports, would suggest that on the whole practitioners find partnership working difficult (Home Office, 2007; House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, 2004). Greenton’s uniqueness is derived from the sense explored by Crawford and Jones (1996) when considering the non-transferability of the Kirkholt Burglary Project. Many aspects of its success are not transferable. These include its geographical boundaries, Second World War and post-war history, which adds a certain quality to the city’s identity, and, relative to our interests, the long, established history of partnership working in a crime reduction context. This above all means that certain aspects of partnership working in this locality are ‘bedded in’ and the effort to mobilise agencies has been ameliorated through ongoing practice. In addition, constructing it in a routinised, pragmatic way has ameliorated the time consuming practice of seeking alternative funding. As we have seen the primary characteristics of this partnership is efficiency – efficient systems and ways of working. However as we shall see efficiency does not in itself make for ‘good’, progressive or ‘successful’ partnership working.

5.3 Field Site Three: Southern England, the town of Stonham

This third field site could perhaps be regarded as a corollary study. Although it featured as prominently as the other two during the research process and drew attention to serious methodological issues (cf. the following chapter) it has a subsidiary place in this thesis. This is largely because the issues arising in the data and explored in greater depth in the analysis chapters were still undergoing change. The power discrepancies of interest require time to accumulate and in this partnership its newness meant agencies were still jostling for position, and the barely formed hierarchy was not yet ready to support their weight. Stonham was included
because of the focus it gave to a particular issue, that of drug treatment/enforcement, which was a frequent point of discussion amongst the other two partnerships and in the policy field at the time of the fieldwork. As such it offered an initial glimpse of an issue identified as important by both partnerships comprising the main sample, although results from this early stage of its operation must be treated with caution.

**Attendees**

Table 6 shows the agencies from which the Stonham partnership member sample was drawn, their role, apparent social class and gender. Asterisks indicate those who were interviewed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6 Stonham Partnership Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stonham</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Police HQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detective Sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divisional Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constable/Sergeant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation Officer (DTTO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Liaison Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Psychologist (never invited)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Locale

Stonham was situated in a medium sized settlement in the London commuter belt. It was located close to areas of considerable ethnic diversity although there was less evidence of this in Stonham itself. It presented itself as white, wealthy and well kept. It lay on the Thames and was within the bounds of the M25, it was under a Conservative council and the administrative offices of the council were within the town boundaries. The far borders of the settlement butt the Metropolitan Police Force. This fact preoccupied the police officers who were involved in the project, who felt a pressure to perform as if the project were being ‘overlooked’ by the Met. There was no direct evidence (whilst conducting this research) that this was the case. The town had a burgeoning drug problem, which involved the use of crack and heroin (field notes 2004, Interview PC Stone 2004).
This field site was brought to my attention in March 2004. The project had not yet had its first meeting and I was made aware of it through the local community safety manager for the county. She thought that this would be an interesting project because it would necessitate close partnership working between the police and the NHS. This new project was being modelled on the ‘North Town’ project an initiative then enjoying a high national profile. That project presented as a partnership initiative between the police, the NHS and the probation service. It was setup with a particular focus to reduce prolific offending related to drug use, particularly in the areas of street crime, burglary and auto crime. This was done by providing intensive service provision to these offenders. The team was police-led and involved targeting those who were ‘known’ to the police and making them aware that they were being watched and if they were caught committing further crime they would be imprisoned. The alternative to being targeted and then subsequent imprisonment was the North Town (NT) project. The project offered a quick route to treatment. It also provided a comprehensive package of benefits advice and a route into housing. The police officers involved in the project became ‘buddies’ of the drug user, and they were often on call 24 hours a day in providing help, advice and support to those who were going through withdrawal. There was also a probation officer involved in the project but her involvement was much more restricted and lacked the facility involved in the police work (availability) to be called a buddy (field notes 2005). By July 2004, although the project had been running for three years and had provided a substantial crime reduction, not one project user had been exited off of the project – essentially there was no provision for those who were on the North Project to leave it.

Nationally there had been considerable emphasis on the NT Project and although there had been some criticism with regards to the actual decrease in crime associated with the project and by practitioners with regards to the fairly high levels of dependency garnered by it, it was still highly funded and well regarded. The senior police officer involved in the project had received a promotion, an OBE and international travel to promote it. Attempts were being made to roll it out across the

63 Reference omitted to maintain anonymity.
country in a similar pattern to the Kirkholt Burglary Project (Crawford and Jones, 1996). Some lessons had been learned from this and other projects about the inability to transfer a project wholesale from one location to another, without first taking into account the specifics associated with the original location (temporal as well as geographical). However, there was still hope that local groups could take the bare bones of a project and flesh them out locally with the people, places and local knowledge to make it work elsewhere. To some extent this was what was being attempted with the Stonham initiative. Early on the senior officer directing the operational development of the project was very keen to explain that they in no way expected to achieve the crime drop that had been achieved in North Town. This was due mainly to the different pattern of drug use that was experienced in Stonham as opposed to the primary use of heroin that had been seen where the NT project had been situated. In addition to this there was the feeling about the NT project that the dramatic crime drop may have been a ‘one off’.

*Partnership working between the police and the NHS*

The Stonham partnership was interesting because it was a project which should have acted as an example in pure form of the relationship between the police and the NHS, that purity arising from its single issue focus. Also, it should have necessitated partnership working in a highly contested area, that of drug misuse and the treatment/enforcement divide, which occupied much of the territory between the police and the NHS. The second aspect was that it represented a project group which entailed both strategic decision-making from the police and the NHS and also operational decision-making and project development. It had been impossible at the other locations to look at such a project in-depth because of the large size and complexity of the strategic decision making bodies involved. Thirdly it was an opportunity to look at the transferability of a project, which represented a potential trend in the particular political context of partnership working, community safety and the enduring tension between apparently local decision-making and a backdrop of national priorities.
The background to the partnership

The police who had become aware of the North Town project initiated the partnership. Primarily, two police officers, a constable and a sergeant, pushed for the funding for the project. The constable was situated in the town and had a good local knowledge of the local drug problems and good contacts with the probation officers who were dealing with similar issues: seeing the same faces on a revolving treadmill between prison and probation. This constable was forthright, knowledgeable, in his early 40s and had been in the police for over twenty years. When he became the operational officer in charge of this project he gained a temporary promotion. He was regarded by his colleagues in the police and later in the partnership as an officer who was passionate about his work but who needed support in taking on the responsibility of the project. In particular he was perceived by his superior officer as lacking managerial experience. The second officer was a detective sergeant who hailed from the north and had some experience of working in the drugs field although his background was quite diverse. He had been engaged in partnership working at the HQ for the previous 3-4 years. These two officers were involved in introducing the local police force to the idea of the NT project, meeting with the senior officer involved, exploring possible avenues for funding and applying the project locally. The money was secured through the local Government Office, £140,000 to develop, implement and run the project with the expectation that it would be mainstream funded by all agencies at a later date. The money came with certain ties – £40,000 had to be used by April 2004 and the project had to be up and running by June. Neither of these dates was met.

Project Development

The partnership led by the police, moved for development from police headquarters to Stonham in March 2004. At this point it was joined by the probation service, the DAT, Housing, a representative from Job Centre plus, Voluntary Sector Agencies, administrative support, several other police officers (a chief superintendent and another superintendent), administrative support, the local council and occasionally, the crime and disorder reduction partnership. However, conspicuous by their absence was any representative from the NHS. It had been decided that the consultant
psychologist who controlled the treatment budget was problematic (not a team player and sceptical about the use of the project for her work) and as such would not be invited to the meetings. Although it was agreed that she was vital to the project she needed to be ‘handled with care’ and it was also apparent that the police were not the ones to do the handling. The consultant psychologist nevertheless took up considerable time in the partnership, as others discussed what she had said, what she would say and what she might do. She never attended a partnership meeting but was regularly approached with regards to project issues. She met with the police once in what was described as a ‘difficult’ but profitable meeting. I as researcher was uninvited, because it would make things ‘too difficult’ to have an audience. Relationships with the consultant psychiatrist – who was characterised by the police as ‘health’ and the ‘health sector’ were always uncomfortable as she could not be compelled to ‘come on board’. She agreed to be interviewed for this research but never committed to a time. In September a former social worker that ran the local treatment facility and worked under the consultant psychologist joined the partnership team to discuss implementation of the project. This was the first input from the health sector that came from outside the Drug Action Team.

Chairmanship and Administration

Initially the chief superintendent chaired the partnership. Later the partnership was split between the operational and strategic decision-making level. At this point the partnership was chaired by the divisional superintendent at the strategic and the operational level and the chief superintendent stopped attending. Administration occurred on an ad hoc basis by the police administrators and after 2-3 months an administrator was employed by the project on a part-time basis. Much time was spent discussing where the partnership should be housed and there were small gatherings of the partnership around various locations in the town to try to find appropriate lodgings. It was also suggested that the project join up with another group to share accommodation costs. However the project became smaller as it developed as the partnership realised that certain organisations were unwilling or unable to relinquish a member of staff to be permanently situated at the project offices. At that juncture the permanent workforce of the project was reduced to three police officers, one
probation officer (who was bought out using project funds) and a part-time administrator. All were situated at the police station.

Achievements

I exited the field when the project had completed its first three months of operation. It was very difficult at that stage to ascertain what if any actual outputs (such as a crime reduction) would result from this project. What was apparent was that the ethos of the project had changed considerably from its inception. It became clear that it was not the goal of the project team for service users to be ‘clean’ or abstinent each time they were tested. The main criterion of success was that service users were attending both their appointments at the project office and at the treatment facility. The project team would endeavour to continue to work with the service users even if they committed crime, were convicted and imprisoned. They would work with them until they were re-released and try again. It was difficult, primarily for the superintendent who was locally overseeing the project, to digest this. He worked very hard and was very organised, but in a meeting with the senior officer engaged in the NT Project it was clear that he thought of the project as something he could use to gain a target-driven crime reduction: one way or another. The NT Project officer, made it clear that this was an untenable way to work, that it would affect all who worked in the project and all who attended it if there was even a hint of a suspicion that this was what the project was really about. 64

The police involved at Stonham also gained a greater understanding of the pattern of drug use in their area. It was considerably different to that which the NT project had experienced. In North Town at the time of the Project, the majority of the drug use had been heroin. In Stonham, however, there was poly-drug use, which involved crack. Crack is a problematic substance from a treatment perspective as there is no synthetic form with which to wean someone who is addicted. Crack desistance relies on abstinence and a painful withdrawal. They therefore understood quite quickly that they were unlikely to get such a dramatic crime reduction with their project. Thus, as a corollary all agencies gained a deeper understanding of how other agencies worked.

64 The NT project officer was not interviewed as part of this research.
The Stonham project found it very difficult to coalesce around the single issue it was trying to tackle. Much of this is reflected in the work of Gilling (1997), the difference between the situational crime prevention pursued by the police and the social crime prevention preferred by agencies such as probation and the Drug Action Team. For the most part the NHS remained a dark figure on the horizon. Instinctively the police anticipated that the NHS were not going to support the project, certainly not wholeheartedly, therefore there was considerable delay in approaching them. This seemed to be because the police could not consider an alternative, or a different way of approaching the problem. In the main, this appeared to be because they already had a template in the form of the NT project, from which any deviation was seen as a failure. It was clear that the officers involved learnt a great deal from the experience. However, it was also clear that they were lessons they would rather have avoided. Partnership working was conceptualised by this group as very frustrating and working with the health sector as an unsatisfying experience.

5.4 Conclusion

This profile of three discrete field sites was done to give the reader a sense of place and an understanding of the locality at the time the fieldwork was conducted. To an extent it is a process of unveiling the uniqueness of each town; how Greenton is still situated in a post-war, manufacturing period which is slowly being eroded, or the way Bingham is to be found in booming south Wales but is still shaking off the rage that exists after the pit closures or how Stonham is placed on the boundaries of London suffering the big city problems in a medium sized town. By considering these factors it is apparent that local conditions impact on partnership working even if those local conditions are situated in a national context.

It is also clear that new processes take time to embed within existing local structures and until that happens partnership working remains on the periphery as an adjunct to existing roles rather than being incorporated into core work. Locally we can see that closed decision-making processes can be exclusionary and this way of working marks partnerships as part of a larger response to the managerialist and policy agenda, built on building efficiency but not necessarily building capacity or being sensitive to local environments.
Practitioners report that clear lines of accountability and strategic goals are important to them and the forms of decision-making discussed above can erode this process. Where clear, explicit and precise processes exist it makes partnership easier to practice and more accountable. Finally, partnership working may feel successful to practitioners but not result in any real added value, or clear ‘wins’ for service users, communities or agencies. The analysis chapters explore some of these issues in more detail, focusing for the most part on what partnership working was like for practitioners at a local level, particularly how the police and the NHS work together and how power is deployed within partnerships and what impact this has. This exploration is situated within an awareness of the larger political context where relevant.

In debating the similarities and the differences between the field sites I have drawn the reader’s attention towards particular features of partnership working, chairmanship, accountability and achievements. These areas were the most pressing to practitioners and would seem to be the most pressing for communities. This effort has gone some way to introducing and beginning to answer some of the earlier research questions outlined in Chapter One. It is apparent that local political and policy-making initiatives have significant impact on local processes; the Greenton ‘25 families’ project is an example of this. It is also clear that some agencies have a highly developed sense of the culturally situated responses of other agencies and how these can be interleaved within particular partnership relations. As we shall see the creation of these views and their successful deployment rather depends on the agency that holds the power in that interaction, although this may not always be easily discernable. When identifying ‘achievements’ is such a difficult enterprise it begins to raise questions about the nature of success and the use of partnership for future policy development.

---

65 In particular see Chapters 7, 9, and 10.
6. Chapter Six
Methodology: So what am I meant to be doing?

The above title reflects the pronounced sense of disorientation which frequently accompanies the process of discovery for qualitative researchers. I suspect from conversations with colleagues that although they are tied to their desks with fine methodological twine and are utilising more ‘technical tools’ for discovery, quantitative researchers sense of disorientation remains just as acute. However, for qualitative researchers there is always the crushing sense of defeat and inadequacy, the sense of making a mess, of impacting on the social scene, inadvertently influencing respondents (with a look, nod of the head, tap of the foot or your ethnicity, social class or gender), doing it all wrong, not collecting enough data and being absolutely convinced that you have found nothing of use at all.

In addition there is the problem of being 'out in the field' (when you were not even aware you were in one), of being isolated from your own understanding of what is acceptable, fearing you might be about to ‘go native’ when you particularly identify with a respondent and trying to develop boundaries that you never even knew you had. Finally, there is the problem of truth-telling. Analysis is an iterative process and at some point you begin to glean some understanding, that you may have insight into a story that respondents might not wish to be told. Then you find yourself perched on the horns of a dilemma. To tell or not to tell, and which story do you tell?

Although I tend to agree with Becker in this respect:

To have values or not to have values: the question is always with us. This dilemma, which seems so painful to so many, actually does not exist, for one of its horns is imaginary. For it to exist, one would have to assume, as some apparently do, that it is indeed possible to do research that is uncontaminated by personal and political sympathies. I propose to argue that it is not possible, and, therefore, that the question is not whether we should take sides, since we inevitably will, but rather whose side are we on (Becker, 1999: 33).

However, in this research there were no easy sides to reside on, no sweetly sweeping dichotomies to jump between, there was just the sense that many people were doing their best to make things work given their own understanding of the political, social
and economic milieu within which they were operating. In addition this context was often a shifting one, and as Crawford and Jones (1995) would suggest, has an open textured quality.

Therefore, this chapter seeks to unpick some of this methodological undertow, which is such a constant throughout the process of research from the reading, the talk, the listening, the analysing and the writing. This is done by considering the routes I could have taken and the route I did take to answer my research questions. Finally, I consider the personal and political context from which I was operating when attempting to enter the field, as an ‘empty vessel’ ready to be filled with knowledge.

6.1 This Research

This research was commissioned. Unlike most PhD research, which is formulated through the abiding and passionate interest of the student, this research was initially designed by my academic supervisor and my supervisor in the external institution, which partially funded this research (NPIA). This ‘context’ is discussed in more detail later in this chapter. However, to illustrate the degree of freedom I had over the direction of this research, it is worth noting that it bears very little resemblance to that which was anticipated at its start.\(^{66}\) Again, this is probably no different to the experience of other researchers because I brought my personal interest and perspective on the world with me. This research was particularly orientated to seek out instances of successful, positive, good practice of partnership working between the police and the NHS in a crime reduction context. The focus was on information sharing protocols and the inhibiting and contributing factors that made information sharing work in some areas and not others, as well as seeking a criterion for ‘success’.

After a period in the field the analytical thrust became significantly about power, its accumulation, deployment and, particularly, its effect on partners and partnership working. It uses the police and the NHS as an exemplar, which was a useful

\(^{66}\) The original research application is included in Appendix 4 courtesy of Professor Nigel Fielding and Dr Kate Paradine.
parameter of the above research proposal firstly because they are so different, although as the preceding literature review highlights, interprofessionality does not guarantee a co-ordinated response to crime reduction or community safety. Secondly, the exemplar agencies were apt because at the time this research was conducted the entry of the NHS was a sensitive issue locally and nationally and their lack of co-ordinated response, in the ‘call-to-arms’ that is community safety, was and is a constant source of frustration to practitioners (the police) and government.

I conducted six pilot interviews, which consisted of utilising collegial, professional and personal contacts in the field. This allowed me to identify the latent issues for practitioners and develop an interview schedule, and these interviews informed the thematic analysis utilised in this research. I contacted seven different field sites and entered into negotiations with them to isolate areas that felt appropriate; this is explored in more detail below in the ‘entering the field’ and ‘sampling’ sections. For various reasons detailed in chapter 5 I began developing more extensive contacts with three field sites. I entered the field in 2003 (pilots were conducted in early 2003). I spent 6 months attending meetings in each area, mostly at strategic level (Bingham and Greenton) and in the other site at strategic and project implementation level (Stonham). After approximately four months in each area I would send out faxes, letters or emails inviting attendees to interview. Appropriate follow-up emails would be sent and then telephone calls to ‘pester’ or arrange the interview. Due to the familiarity developed between respondents and myself as researcher these invitations were generally well received. In addition to this I also interviewed an ‘expert in the field’ who was situated on the periphery of one of my field sites. Only two respondents who agreed to be interviewed were subsequently unavailable and one invitee failed to respond to any queries. Other than these three respondents, all of those invited agreed to be interviewed. Thirty-eight professionals gave their time to be part of this research and were in my estimation generally honest and pragmatic in their approach to being interviewed and to the subject matter at hand.

---

67 A copy of the interview schedule is included in Appendix 5
68 I am aware that some researchers exclude pilot interviews from their data.
69 A copy of this invitation is included in Appendix 6
In addition to this I accumulated large amounts of documents, in the form of: promotional literature about the work of the partnership or the field site itself, minutes of meetings attended, minutes of meetings I did not attend, partnership strategies, plans, proposals, government documents, reports and strategies, letters, emails, notes and invitations. The invitations were to open days, consultations, workshops and conferences – some of these I attended and some I did not. The decision was largely reached through considering pressures on time, accessibility and financial resources – the normal constraints of the everyday researcher. Therefore the methodological tools utilised in this research were: interviewing, observation and documentary analysis, and what follows is a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of adopting such an approach.

6.2 Sampling

Field sites

As already mentioned the initial application for funding from the ESRC, which was not completed by me but by my supervisors, included a description of the project: this was to research partnerships which were successful inasmuch as they had a successful relationship with the health sector, normally characterised by an information sharing protocol. This became extremely influential when sampling began early on in the research process. My knowledge of the area was thin and so I relied upon the literature, contact with the field, and the research proposal to guide my choices.

Access to the field sites had been smoothed by my connection with Bramshill and in addition I was able to attend some Bramshill training on interagency work. As already noted, Bramshill and the University of Surrey advertised this research as a discreet research project. Bramshill had wanted a focus on successful community safety partnerships; these were a sub-set of the general partnership ‘type’. This is because not all CSPs can be described as successful with any easy understanding of ‘success’ and its associated criteria of achievement. Therefore, I began by seeking ‘successful’ partnerships. As already mentioned previously, success was identified and self-defined by one or more members of a partnership. In initial explorations some partnerships were rejected on the basis of an interview with a police or NHS
representative; this occurred even if the partnership had been vaunted by government as successful and rolled out nationally.

Stonham was included because I had the capacity (both in terms of the research budget and sufficient time) and it offered entry to an issue that arose with some frequency in the deliberations of the other two partnerships. Examining entire Community Safety Partnerships (as was occurring in Greenton and Bingham) did not allow for the facility to question or look at an area in detail. In the work between the police and the NHS the issue of drug treatment/enforcement was an area where they worked closely together (with drug agencies) and was often a point of conflict. Moreover, literature suggests (see in particular: Bowling et al., 1991; Crawford et al., 1996; Phillips et al., 1998) that single issue projects responding to local need have a higher level of associated success and since this research was considering the operational characteristics of success this made the third site a useful comparator. In the event, whilst responding to police led local needs, namely crime associated with drug use, the project was also responding to national prioritisation of drug crime being dealt with in a particular way. Unfortunately, the formula did not apply locally and as such the interventions were not locally responsive. Nonetheless the data collected on partnership working between the police and the NHS is included, with appropriate caveats, within the analysis chapters.

I broadly adopted theoretical sampling as a sampling tool in this research. As Patton identifies there are several strategies which fit within the theoretical sampling framework and offer some insight into the underlying reasons for sampling decisions (1987). Within this framework I adopted a ‘deviant’ methodological approach. This was done because it quickly became clear that successful cases are not the norm within partnership working. This was particularly true of those that had adopted information sharing as a formal procedure with the NHS included in the decision-making process. However, an information sharing protocol did not guarantee partnership working or information sharing.

In addition, I employed snowball sampling, identifying prospective cases through word of mouth and hearing about well-regarded partnerships at conferences and
courses. In accord with much previous qualitative research key informants drove the choice of field sites, by contacting and having at times informal discussions with a member of the police and the NHS (either face to face or via the telephone) and at times formal recorded interviews. Two of the field sites were pursued because they were politically sensitive cases, and identified as such by respondents (a specific sampling strategy commended by Patton, 1987; Patton, 1990). One was attempting to transfer a project adopted from an extremely successful partnership in a very different area, geographically and socially (Stonham). The second was in an area which had a history of high profile good partnership working between the NHS and the police (Bingham). Both were also portrayed as having good local partnership relationships.

Plainly, there would have been little point in this study in taking a random sample of all of the partnerships that existed. I had a strict criterion for inclusion, which was success, this being success as defined by the members or a member of the partnership. This meant that a number of partnerships were approached that proved unable to satisfy the selection criterion. At the early stages when I asked partnership members if they were successful they would frequently say ‘yes’. As my contacts were mainly through the police I would normally be asking a police officer. In the majority of cases an officer would usually self-define as part of a successful partnership. I would then go on to clarify and explain that for me success meant having a good working relationship with health services in their area and that this would usually include some form of information sharing protocol. After this further explanation most would say ‘no’ (usually in a sheepish manner), that they had a successful partnership but ‘we have not managed to engage health,’ or ‘health are not interested,’ or ‘we’ve given up getting someone from health round the table.’ These responses came mainly from police officers but were also expressed by probation officers, voluntary sector workers, and the local authority. Few seemed immune to ‘health fatigue’. However, some continued to say ‘yes’ even after my further explanation. They usually said that the NHS were the last ones round the table or that it had taken perseverance to engage with health services but they had managed it, and it was successful.
Theoretical sampling allows for this interplay between theory and data and in qualitative research analysis of the data occurs throughout the research project (Finch and Mason, 1990). ‘Once a theoretical category has been “saturated”, further data are collected in terms of emerging theoretical ideas. It is the relevance of the prospective people, groups or context to the emerging theoretical ideas that form the basis of the theoretical sampling strategy,’ (Bryman and Burgess, 1999: xxv). Theoretical sampling successfully allows for theory building to occur throughout the research process (Eisenhardt, 1989). This relates particularly to the case of Stonham whose selection stemmed from the emergent ‘single issue’ factor.

**Respondents**

I approached for interview those who represented the police and the NHS. In addition to this I interviewed those who inhabited the wider category ‘health sector worker’. This generally meant individuals who worked in the drugs field. This decision was reached early on in the fieldwork, due to the behaviour the police exhibited around these types of worker. Generally, it was perceived that the police treated the health sector workers in a similar way in which they treated those from the NHS. They were perceived as ‘being the same’. In addition to this other Criminal Justice employees were also invited to participate, which included those who were retired from the police, community safety managers and probation officers. Probation officers were interviewed because with the relatively new Drug Treatment and Testing Order, they had to work across the treatment/enforcement divide between the NHS and the police. Therefore, they often had a good understanding of the latent problems that inhibited these two agencies, from working productively together.

### 6.3 Entering the field

Many qualitative researchers describe ‘entering the field’ as a difficult and perilous process of finding one’s way past the gatekeeper into the forbidden world of the ‘field’ beyond. I did not have this experience. Due to my research being partly funded by the police access to a relatively closed area was generally unproblematic. Ongoing access in one field site Stonham did become problematic and is discussed in further detail below. There could also have been an expectation that my police
contacts may have alienated other members of the partnership. However this was not born out in the field. The health workers, who were included in the sample and other practitioners I ‘informally’ discussed my research with at conferences or training courses, were variously impressed by my ‘credentials’ or unresponsive to the identity of my funding partner. Therefore, as far as I am aware my funding partner did not have a harmful affect on my ability to gain access to any partnership or organisation.

In Table 7 I show the nature of my ‘immersion’ in each field site, detailing for each of the meetings that was observed, the procedure for conducting interviews, and information regarding any supplementary contact beyond these main methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bingham</th>
<th>Meeting</th>
<th>Interview Setting</th>
<th>Additional Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>This partnership met monthly at the local council offices. I attended one meeting each month. I also attended a meeting of the MARAC and the Homicide Review Committee. The meetings were conducted in one of two rooms around a large table. I was invited to sit up at the table with the rest of the partnership. I took detailed notes throughout the meeting. I did not ask questions but would respond if referred to directly. This was usually to explain my presence to a new member. Occasionally, members of the partnership would engage in conversation before the partnership meetings I would also note down these conversations.</td>
<td>Interviews were conducted in the most convenient location for the respondent. This meant we usually met at the respondent’s office during the day. I kept notes of the interview setting, date, time, my impressions before interview and after the interview was completed. I also took notes of any conversations that occurred before or after the interview.</td>
<td>At this location I was invited to a local two-day conference on Community Safety and attended and met with colleagues of those who were members of the partnership. I took notes of what occurred in each session and any contact I had with members of the partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods Utilised in the field</td>
<td>I took notes during meetings and after meetings. I stayed in the location for 3 day periods and got to know the area quite well. I also recorded my impressions of the area, the partnership and partnership working in a research diary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greentoon</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Interview Setting</td>
<td>Additional Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Safety Partnership</td>
<td>This partnership met every other month at the local community centre. I attended each meeting over a six month period. The meetings were conducted in the same room around a large table. I was invited to sit up at the table with the rest of the partnership beside the chairs of the meeting. I took detailed notes throughout the meeting. I did not ask questions but would respond if referred to directly. This was usually to explain my presence to a new member. Occasionally, members of the partnership would engage in conversation before the partnership meetings I would also note down these conversations.</td>
<td>Interviews were conducted in the most convenient location for the respondent. This meant we usually met at the respondents office during the day. Two respondents came to my hotel to be interviewed. I kept notes of the interview setting, date, time, my impressions before interview and after the interview was completed. I also took notes of any conversations that occurred before or after the interview.</td>
<td>I had some contact before conducting the main body of research with the Community Safety Manager who I had met previously at a one day conference. I also met her at the conference which I was invited to at the above field setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Interview Setting</td>
<td>Additional Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Project</td>
<td>The meetings occurred when necessary to meet the aims of the project. I attended early strategic meetings and later operational meetings. These sometimes occurred once a week or twice a week depending on the issues that were being discussed. The meetings were conducted at a variety of police localities at the Headquarters, the police station, and at the regional training centre.</td>
<td>Interviews were conducted in the most convenient location for the respondent. This meant we usually met at the respondents office during the day. I kept notes of the interview setting, date, time, my impressions before interview and after the interview was completed. I also took notes of any conversations that occurred before or after the interview.</td>
<td>I attended a training day offered by the national lead in this particular project day at a local training centre. I took notes of the presentation and conversations I had with respondents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Methods Utilised in the field

I took notes during meetings and after meetings. I stayed in the location for 3 day periods and got to know the area quite well. I also recorded my impressions of the area, the partnership and partnership working in a research diary.
Ongoing access

As already mentioned initial access is usually a problem for social researchers especially amongst institutions such as the police which are generally closed. However, in association with my contacts in the world of the police, partnership working was also an area which was becoming increasingly ‘researched’, and so there was a definite sense amongst partnerships that to be part of a research project would be a feather in their caps. This impression seemed to be promoted by my search for successful partnerships. Due to their gaze being largely uncritical, it was clear that they expected a similar response from me and this lent to a sense of having a dual role in the field, as ‘colleague’ and social researcher, with the role as social researcher dominating. As Goffman (1971) would understand, a ‘presentation of self’ for prolonged periods of time is ultimately tiring to uphold. Often when in the field there is no backstage area or infrequent access to it. In addition to this there was an unquestioning nature in response to my presence at meetings and eventually when requesting interviews, by professionals and the police because I was regarded as having professional status and my knowledge of the field was expected to be as great as theirs (Hurd Clarke, 2003).

This conception of me only became problematic when my ‘real’ persona was revealed. This seems to reflect the work of Brown (1996), who situates police researchers on a continuum between the full insider and the complete outsider. What must be remembered is that I was not a ‘police researcher’, although gatekeepers often considered me as such. I was interested in multi-agency working and my background in the voluntary and health sector gave me a certain understanding and insight into the work of the NHS, whereas my understanding and experience of the police and the way they operated was more limited. Therefore, I would often find myself sliding up and down the scale between full insider and complete outsider. Police officers would often engage me in private conversations with regards the inadequacy of other organisations, clearly expecting me to be sympathetic with their position. They would describe in halcyon detail their police training days, if they had been conducted at the police college where I was (partly) based.
This insider/outsider status was tested most rigorously in Stonham where access was withdrawn part way through the observation and before the interview stage had begun (as discussed below interviews did ultimately take place). Effectively my status as an insider was challenged as a result of my being asked to conduct an evaluation of the project as part of my doctoral research. The proposition was discussed with my supervisor and there seemed disadvantages and advantages either way. It also seemed difficult to turn down as it was presented as a quid pro quo situation. I entered into initial discussions with the project with regards to what they had in mind. When it became clear that the intended evaluation was far more extensive then I had the skills or time to complete I withdrew. This happened very rapidly – the whole situation was in question for no more than two weeks. I suggested that they contact other sources with social research skills and explained why it would be inappropriate for me to engage at the level they suggested. Within a week access was withdrawn from the project, based on the local force being unable to see why they should participate in research where there was no tangible benefit for them. My access had been arranged through officers at the force headquarters who had then moved to the station local to the project. However, soon after the ‘implementation phase’ began they were promoted or redeployed. Essentially my gatekeepers were no longer part of the team.

It was clear that the Superintendent (Frank) thought that he was excluding me from approaching all members of the partnership. This was not actually the case, as he had no authority over non-police members. It was also clear that in all likelihood they would have agreed to be interviewed even though I had been excluded from the project. However, it equally seemed unfair to put them in a place which was asking them to challenge the dominant position of the police in the partnership. The situation resolved itself because I had senior contacts and it turned out that even if I was not an insider myself, I knew enough insiders to mean that access was returned within three to four days, with the officer who initiated refusal of access offering to be the first to be interviewed. Nevertheless the episode comprised a clear example of you’re either ‘with us or against us’ and was on occasion mentioned in the interviews I conducted after the incident had been remedied. Other agencies clearly regarded it as a regrettable incident and slightly embarrassing. After this part of the research was
over a police colleague ‘in the know’ suggested that ultimately it was very difficult for the partnership in question to have a researcher in attendance. This was because the project was a politically sensitive regional prolific offenders project, which should it have been successful, would have gone ‘countywide’. Unfortunately, before I exited the field it did not appear to be living up to (possibly unreasonable) expectations. Although the experiences, and the findings from the site were ultimately useful analytically they did not come with the requisite stamp of success: a realisable crime reduction.

6.4 Methods employed

What follows is a brief profile of the component methods constituting the research design. A uniformly inquisitive approach was adopted in exploring the potential impact each method could have on the research setting, as well as the type of information it yielded.

The case study approach

‘The case study represents one of the most common frameworks or research design for the conduct of qualitative research.’ (Bryman et al., 1999: xvi) Case studies are particularly valuable for gaining unique insight into a few cases (Patton, 1987). There is some debate as regards the exact definition of a case study. What form its boundaries, context, organisation or time? In this research a case study approach was not used because of the overt differences geographically, temporally and (largely) bureaucratically that existed between each field site. Table 7 (above) on immersion in the field and Table 8 (below) depict these differences. I observed two CSPs for six months in Bingham and Greenton and the implementation of a prolific offenders project in Stonham. In Bingham, I initially observed a domestic violence partnership and a homicide review committee. They were later omitted because they had yet to engage with health services, although two of the practitioners were interviewed. However, it was clearly a successful multi-agency forum in other ways. Table 8 specifies comparative characteristics of the field sites.
### Table 8 Matrix table of Field Site Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Bingham</th>
<th>Greenton</th>
<th>Stonham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Project Delivery Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>ASB (particularly Friday and Saturday night violence)</td>
<td>Fear of Crime and ‘Cycle of Depravation’</td>
<td>Offending linked to illegal Drug use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Midlands</td>
<td>South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Suburban Town – Borough and Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Diversity</td>
<td>Pockets</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deprivation</td>
<td>No (but historically – Yes)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Governance</td>
<td>City Council: Labour</td>
<td>City Council: Labour</td>
<td>Borough and Town: Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Performance Group*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size/Attendance</td>
<td>21/13-14</td>
<td>38/24-26</td>
<td>20/8-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>4 Years</td>
<td>15-18 Years (in various forms)</td>
<td>5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Led</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sector Attendance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sector Involvement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>LHB/PCT/DAT</td>
<td>PCT/DAT</td>
<td>DAT/Mental Health Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear Local Governance of Partnership?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Observation

I used non-participant observation to observe group meetings. The pitfalls regarding observational data collection are more likely to occur around issues of participant observation when the researcher has to maintain a ‘front’ to conceal his or her real aims. To some extent, however, this problem also occurs in non-participant

---

* Numeric indicates that each policing group was different and not their actual policing group.
observation as already outlined when maintaining the 'presentation of self'. Even though data analysis occurs constantly, a complete picture of the research is not constructed until writing-up is completed and even then usually only a small amount of data is utilised.

The degree and extent of involvement is always problematic when conducting non-participant observation. I found that this only increased with any extended time in the field. In this research I attended six months of meetings in each locality. Sometimes this meant only three meetings while at others it meant eight or nine. This frequency of contact with professionals entails the building of a relationship of trust and confidence. Unfortunately, as already discussed the researcher always has another agenda. Nevertheless as Gans states '....the external pressure to participate is much weaker than the internal pressure - and desire - to become involved.' (1958). Without doubt this is certainly true and at times, as a fledgling researcher, conducting research alone there is little to do but to try and do what is 'right'. Frequently I was asked my opinion and there are only so many times where a non-committal 'grunt' is an acceptable form of discourse, especially when it begins to feel dishonest and a lack of opinion is being viewed as a lack of intelligence. When engaging with professionals it was necessary to provide them with a conduit in which they felt their opinions and views could be understood. They were not seeking a vacuous process of unloading. Clearly, within this research there were few ethical chasms to trap the unwary researcher. However, there were always going to be issues of gender, social class, and ethnicity, which are explored throughout this chapter. The role between participant and observer is easily blurred (Gans, 1958) as the research process becomes all absorbing and time consuming (Ackers, 1993; Lofland and Lofland, 1984; May, 1993b; Norris, 1993).

With observation as with many qualitative methodologies the main concern for academics and researchers seems to be one of subjectivity. It sometimes seems like it’s held as an embarrassing secret that the researcher should try to hide, that we are also human. And as a human being studying human beings, we are naturally going to have some insight and empathy about what it might be like to inhabit the human condition. It is after all on this basis that, I am able to ascribe meaning to human
Fear, anger, frustration, happiness and joy are not alien to me. I am conducting research within my own cultural milieu. The police and the NHS may have particular working practices and cultural identifiers, which are alien to me, but the similarities and the differences, held my attention. Essentially it is a subjective experience, calling on our knowledge and understanding of the social world. Indeed, might argue that what is important is both involvement and detachment in the field (Elias, 1987). Most researchers find the research process subjective but also assert that they have managed to maintain detachment.

It is an unpalatable truth that qualitative research is (undoubtedly like quantitative research) demanding, draining and at times boring. It is often presented as the gold standard, uncovering depth, deceit and dangerous places. This is true. However at times it is also dirty, uncomfortable and tiring. This tiring aspect is often manifested from the constancy of maintaining your position as researcher in the field. Therefore, it is likely that your ability to constantly sustain this façade can only last for certain periods of time. As such it is similar to a convention or a convenient lie to satisfy those who would wish sociology to be more scientific to place oneself above the ongoing social action that is continuing around you (Green, 1993; May, 1993a). Detachment is often sought and usually preserved but occasionally involvement also becomes part of the package of situating yourself in social situations, for long periods of time. Trying to maintain a veneer of detachment merely incorporates another dichotomy into a profession, which should be more confident in its discoveries and what it has to say about them (Becker, 1999). Fieldwork is about being in the field, about knowing your field site and ascertaining the types of people who engage with you in the locality and context of your research. In those circumstances detachment is difficult to preserve. I was not always objective or detached. I can say that this is a good piece of research, which stands alone and also adds to an existing body of knowledge and experience. That it is as a result of my ability to theorise from the evidence that was collected in the field. Involvement and subjectivity do not inhibit my ability to think analytically and critically about the research process and weigh my own bias against my data and research findings.
Clearly the burden of observation, as a methodological form, bears heavy upon the data. It is deep but narrow and is judged to be unable to say much about the condition of a social issue widely. However, observational data feeds into theory, which is applicable more widely. Moreover, observational research in this study was conducted by observing the participants within their local and national context. This allowed for a widening of the conceptual frame, although one must not lose sight of the constraints of any sample.

Interviewing

The methodological debate in interviewing settles within two broad areas: researcher impact and information validity. Broadly speaking there are three types of interview the structured, semi-structured or unstructured interview (Fielding, 1993; Lofland et al., 1984; Newell, 1993). Lofland and Lofland describe unstructured (semi-structured) interviewing as ‘a guided conversation whose goal is to elicit from the interviewee rich, detailed materials that can be used in qualitative analysis.’ (Lofland et al., 1984: 12) and ‘the intensive interview seeks to discover the informant’s experience of a particular topic or situation.’ (Lofland et al., 1984: 12) As with any qualitative area the more subjective, informal and involved the researcher is then the more likely there are accusations of bias and more seriously of ‘going native’ (Burgess, 1984) where the interviewer overly identifies with the group that they are researching. This is clearly a danger, although unstructured interviewing should and can lead to an informal flow of data and a discursive process of learning about the topic area.

On the other hand there is also room for the respondent to be more than a mine of information. There is an assumption that the attitude, class, ethnic origin, gender and interviewer style of the researcher which impact upon the respondent (Baxter et al., 2003; Hurd Clarke, 2003) can be ameliorated by taking a more formal approach to the addressing of questions. By taking this approach there is a presumption that the interview is a channel, through which the knowledge the interviewer needs to collect is transmitted. This is an overly simplistic view which fails to acknowledge that all

71 Respondents were asked how they felt about political developments that were occurring locally and nationally and how this may impact on their work.
knowledge is constructed and meaning ascribed in the situation which is used to create it (Holstein and Gubrium, 1997). And as such it is naive to believe that taking a more formal approach is somehow engaging at a level with the respondent which will prevent interview bias (Baxter et al., 2003; Green, 1993; Holstein et al., 1997). Interviewer effect occurs regardless of the guise the interviewer adopts. Openness, transparency and awareness are key in understanding the effect, rather than instigating various abortive attempts to prevent it, which merely serve to frustrate rapport.

Conversely, ‘treating interviewing as a social encounter in which knowledge is constructed suggests the possibility that the interview is not merely a neutral conduit or source of distortion, but is instead a site of, and occasion for, producing reportable knowledge itself.’ (Holstein et al., 1997: 106). This stance allows the research process and the respondent to become an integral part of the research process.

‘The image of the active interview transforms the subject behind the respondent from a repository of opinions and reasons of a wellspring of emotions into a productive source of knowledge. From the time one identifies a research topic, to respondent selection, questioning and answering, and finally to the interpretation of responses, interviewing itself is a concerted project for producing meaning.’ (My emphasis Holstein et al., 1997: 113).

Holstein and Gubrium’s view of ‘Active Interviewing’ is culturally specific in that it takes into account that we are an interview society, that this kind of discourse takes place on a daily basis, and that we understand its format and goal which is to discover information (1997). This was certainly the case with the respondents interviewed for this research. They were generally very comfortable with the process, accepting without questioning that confidentiality would be maintained at all costs. Holstein and Gubrium’s (1997) view is that if we give the respondent enough information about what we are seeking then the interview becomes a two way process. After all the researcher should not be parasitic upon the research process (May, 1993a) and ethically owes the respondent a duty of care in respect of their experience of the research process (Dunnighan et al., 2006).
Generally in this research respondents were confident and knowledgeable in expressing their opinion. Interviewees often thanked me after the interview and said that they had enjoyed the opportunity to talk about their work. As they were describing their work history, it often gave them an opportunity to think about how far they had come, their personal conception of their work as well as their plans for the future. One respondent commented that he felt like he had been to a counselor. The content of the interview had not been overly emotional, however it was the longest interview I conducted. Interviews were in the main conducted face to face. In this research respondents had already met me, only in the pilot interviews did I meet two respondents for the first time. In these interviews there was a ‘warming up’ phase at the beginning, which did not occur with the main field sites. In all three sites there was a definite sense expressed by the professionals that they were helping me to secure my doctorate. They would ask if they had been ‘helpful’, apologise for being too ‘long-winded’, wish me luck with my ‘studies’ and ask for progress reports. One officer even asked if he should try and type his answers whilst we talked so I would not have to transcribe at a later date. There was also a sense that the interview was a two way process. Occasionally, in each of the field sites, one or two professionals would embark on a journey throughout the interview. They would explore a concept and their relation to it and reach conclusions about how they felt about their work. There are examples of this in the discussion of particular issues in the following analysis chapters.

I would usually go to the respondents place of work and interview them in their office or at their desk. I balked for a long time at conducting interviews by phone as I believed a personal dimension would be omitted. However, this was not the case, both phone interviews were very successful. They were conducted with women with whom I had had some minimal contact in a partnership setting. The interviews were conducted with a degree of easy familiarity, and intimacy I had not expected. Partly I think this happened because the phone is a convenient and accepted tool for communication. Moreover it is ubiquitous and a constant source of pleasure (when speaking to loved ones) and pain (when speaking to cold callers). However, rather like other forms of technological advance (such as email) it allows incursions into
private space that are unprecedented and that might even be unacceptable in a face-to-face form. Warmth and familiarity marked these two interviews.

Interviews varied in length. The longer interviews were conducted with the police or other criminal justice agencies, the longest being just over three hours. The shorter interviews were conducted with health care professionals, the shortest being about 25 minutes. The police wanted to talk about their work history, which closely linked in with their personal sense of who they are. Therefore, they would often construct a personal narrative which was intertwined with their work history on the lines of ‘...in 1974 I had given up my tool making job, my wife was pregnant with our first child and I decided to join the police force – I looked at the other chaps I was working with who were missing bits of fingers and thought – yeah the money’s good but, you know...’ It was very common for the police to situate their career development within a burgeoning personal life. This did not occur with health sector workers. Their responses were often open and reflexive but were also more likely to be factual in their content and remain within the boundaries of the question. Gender may have played a role in this, however it seemed to be more about their social class identity. As Finch (1984) and Oakley (1981) attest, as a woman interviewing women there would be an expectation of a discursive open process rather than the rather factual responses that were the norm. I firmly situate myself within a working class background, although this is not apparently obvious (I have undoubtedly taken on the accoutrements of the middle class academic)72. However, it may as they say, ‘take one to know one’ and in such circumstances the apparently working class officers I interviewed may have been taking the time to explore their ‘roots’ with someone who ‘knew’. Professionalisation had undoubtedly been experienced by the officers in this sample along with a degree of embourgeoisement, however social class lies deeper than either of these processes, which occur much later in the process of socialisation.

The interview schedule comprised a list of open questions that formed an aide-mémoire or prompt should the interview slow to a standstill. In most interviews the

72 For more on this see Goffman (1971), Hobbs (1993), Walkerdine (2003), Hey (2003) and Skeggs (2004) and later subsection ‘Context’.
interviewees talked and I listened. Occasionally I would ask a question or make a
comment. In one or two interviews the dialogue took on the form of a debate but this
was rare. A discursive approach to interviewing allowed them to ‘talk outside the
box’ as it were, so that they were more likely to address themes that were unexpected
by the interviewer (Fielding, 1993; May, 1993b).

Although as already discussed above there is a certain amount of presentation of self
in the field (Ackers, 1993; Hurd Clarke, 2003; Lofland et al., 1984), there is also a
desire to be as honest as possible. This is difficult to achieve. For example, the
description of the research that is given at the beginning of the interview is only a
limited presentation of the type of research that I was undertaking. The précis that is
given by the researcher is for ‘public consumption’ and frequently does not reveal
the depth or scale of the research or the underlying issues which may in the end not
be flattering to either organization (Ackers, 1993; Hobbs, 1993; Norris, 1993). I was
seeking successful cases. However, success was narrowly defined and called for self-
identification by the gatekeeper. This meant other members of the partnership did not
need to think that the partnership was successful for it to be included in this research.
The obvious discrepancy in the image management of the partnership only
contributed to the latent conflict and disjuncture experienced by other attendees.
There is a degree of manipulation at work here, which is uncomfortable for the
researcher to endure. It stems from the academic milieu, and the investigative nature
of the academic to turn every situation into data (Hobbs, 1993). Although the
research situation is not parasitic there are elements of this, which need careful
management to prevent them from overtaking researcher/respondent interaction.

Technical Considerations

Interviews were recorded using a digital recorder and an analogue tape recorder
(with an additional microphone), but occasional notes were taken if I felt it was
appropriate and something occurred with regards to facial expression or body
language. One pilot interview was conducted utilising contemporaneous note taking
due to equipment failure and another involved occasional note taking during the
interview followed immediately by full note taking and voice notes on a dictaphone,
again due to equipment failure. All interviews in the field site utilised two forms of recording to ameliorate chances of data loss.

Each interview was saved as two Word documents. Immediately after the interview I would record the date, time, location and duration of the interview. I would also record my subjective sense of the person before the interview and after interview and then I would record what the strongest feature of the interview was, what I felt was the overarching concern or message that was most important to the respondent.

**Transcription**

The majority of the 38 interviews were transcribed by myself. Two interviews were transcribed by a professional transcription service and three by colleagues, on a *quid pro quo* basis. When an interview was transcribed it was then checked by me for consistency and accuracy. Thirty-two of the interviews were transcribed in full, with an attempt at high degrees of accuracy with regards to what the respondent was saying. This research does not utilise conversation analysis or discourse analysis and as such ‘umms’, ‘ahhs’ etc. were omitted. A short hand version using predictive typing was enabled to allow for common phrases to be typed in using 2-3 key strokes, such as ‘anti-social behaviour orders’ became ‘asb’ or frequently used location names or speech patterns such as ‘you know’ became ‘yk’. Of the six interviews that were not transcribed in full one was due to poor sound quality and in a second the respondent had a pronounced speech impediment, which meant during some parts of the interview only the ‘gist’ or general thrust was available for recording. In four interviews, where the recording time was over two hours a partial transcription approach was employed. These occurred towards the end of the transcription period, where ‘saturation’ had occurred and I had a good overall feel for the data.

**A note on the presentation of data**

Interview data is presented using the convention of a pseudonym; in the appendices each respondent is identified in terms of their occupation, field site, apparent social class of origin and gender. A table outlining these characteristics is presented in the appendices and a footnote indicating this is inserted at points throughout the text as
an aide memoir. In addition data extracts are presented in one of three ways. Firstly, as a single excerpt from a respondent to support, illustrate or juxtapose the developing argument. Secondly, on occasion two respondents views are reported on an issue at the same point in the text. This is not to suggest that the respondents are conversing on the particular issue. They are talking in separate interviews with the interviewer. Thirdly, and sparingly, notes and dialogue are presented with interviewees in the form of a conversation. This is done from field notes and interviews. On one occasion a discussion with two respondents and the researcher is presented and occasionally comments by respondents who were not interviewed but were at meetings is also presented. When this occurs there is a note in text.

*Documentary analysis*

Documentary analysis was utilised within the research to analyse the diverse documents that were produced by the partnership and the researcher. Core documents included the strategy document, partnership documents outlining scope or remit, minutes and other documentation regarding the work of the partnership or the locality. This included interim documents and press releases on current good work which was being carried out. In the main documentary analysis was used to provide context for the locality and the partnership.

*Ethics*

My ethical position is guided by the ‘British Society of Criminology Code of Ethics for Researchers in the Field of Criminology’ (Dunnighan et al., 2006) which encourage good practice in the field and acting in good faith as regards respondents wishes, highlighting the need for confidentiality and the ability of the respondent to be able to withdraw from the research process at any time. Also, researchers are encouraged to ‘recognise that they have a responsibility to ensure that the physical, social and psychological well-being of an individual participating in research is not adversely affected by participation in the research’. Whilst this should clearly be an aim of social research it is sometimes difficult to assess the long-term impact.
I also adopted point six of the ‘Guidelines on Copyright and Confidentiality: Legal issues for social science researchers’ as produced by the ESRC, which more fully outlines the legal responsibilities of the researcher and their duty of confidentiality.

Analysis

For me the process of data analysis is a physical as well as an intellectual task. It causes a striving for answers, which is rooted in the body as much as the mind. Hence the aching limbs and the unquiet mind, a reality of research that is widely experienced but surprisingly little remarked (but see Rock, 2007). And in this process I am very much indebted to the work of Turner (1981), Boyatzis (1998) and Manning (2006) who provided invaluable guides throughout the analytical process in their thorough, practical and honest approach to data analysis. This thesis represents a combination of these approaches inasmuch as it is an attempt to organise the cognitive process (Turner) from theory and data (as Boyatzis suggests) but in a way so as not to become too constrained by this process or to allow the process to become too contrived (Manning), as well as the instinctive procedure developed as part of the unique exploration experienced by each qualitative researcher. This approach involved the developing of narratives, the influence of existing theory, the challenging of existing impressions and an attempt to honestly represent what practitioners were reporting. In addition, Boyatzis allows for the adoption of a thematic-centered approach sympathetic to Glaser’s Grounded Theory and this is discussed further below. I used a qualitative data package (Atlas Ti version 6) to aid me in my storage of interviews and field notes and assist the coding process.

The theoretical approach to analysis that I adopted was a synthesis of procedures derived from various sources. Although Grounded Theory (Bryman et al., 1999; Glaser and Strauss, 1967; Strauss and Corbin, 1998) was a useful developmental process in giving form to the derivation of analytical themes, in accord with Glaser’s approach to Grounded Theory it was construed as an inductive, emergent approach to data analysis (Gilbert, 1993). It offers the researcher the ability to apply a systematic but not rigid form of analysis to qualitative data. It also encourages the researcher to think about themes from an early stage. Themes represent threads and commonalities which weave through the research (Eisenhardt, 1989). A further useful procedure
was theoretical sampling. Theoretical sampling allows the researcher to spot holes or

was theoretical sampling. Theoretical sampling allows the researcher to spot holes or
gaps in understanding and peruse new lines of enquiry throughout the research
process (Finch et al., 1990). While there is also a deductive element to Grounded
Theory the researcher inescapably goes out into the field with preconceptions about
the area they are studying or some inkling of basic theoretical constructs – it is the
inductive elements that feature most strongly both in the original statement of
Grounded Theory and my own practice of it. Moreover, our own experiences should
not be divorced from the social setting in which our research is seated. The social
world is not a tableau in which we are merely observer; our very presence affects the
world of which we are a part (Green, 1993; Strauss et al., 1998). Thus we should not
be entrenched within the initial deductive process, we should allow the data to speak
for itself and allow our preconceptions to be broken down. Construed in these terms
it is an honest, open and flexible process of analysis.

As mentioned the approach I took to grounded theory was largely influenced by the
work of Glaser (1978). It is well known that after their seminal ‘discovery’ text,
Glaser and Strauss came to diverge in their approach to GT, with Glaser favouring
‘emergence’ of ideas from data with minimal systematisation and accusing Strauss’s
efforts, in respect of systemisation, of ‘forcing’ the analysis. In general, Glaser
ascertains that the use of grounded theory is attractive to the analyst, sociologist and
layman because it ‘tells it like it is’. Indeed, perhaps glibly, he goes on to say
‘(Grounded Theory) gives traction over action; it makes sense, by making theoretical
sense of common sense. And this has tremendous grab for people in the know.’
(1978: 14). This was certainly the approach that I adopted. My work was always
embedded in policy because of the nature of the CASE studentship and the debt that
is owed to the external contributor to the award, as well as that which is owed to
respondents, inevitably has some influence on one’s work. Glaser suggests that the
only limit to analysis is the capacity and resources of the analyst. Whilst this is
seemingly obvious, he goes on to identify several other restrictions upon the analyst
such as time and money – which is certainly a pressing concern for most doctoral
research.
In Glaser, theoretical sensitivity is developed through exposure to literature but also the field, policy documentation, respondents and interviewees. Boyatzis (1998) places the analytic process of developing codes along a continuum between the theory-driven approach and the data driven approach. This certainly makes sense, as in this research, analysis was informed by theory as an ongoing process but was also verified and informed by data. Data were collected and coded and care was taken not to force data into already established codes although without doubt the meaning of codes became deeper and more multi-dimensional as coding continued. As such, a note of these extended definitions was kept. As I worked my way through the data set, over-arching or 'super codes' developed and I began to write short sections of chapters and plan what was to be included in the thesis and what left behind. This process was not engaged in lightly, and what has been left out remains interesting and compelling but does not adhere to the central concerns of this research project (as described above) as well as that which has been included. In this thesis I attempted to present that which was most pressing for respondents. Table 9, adapted from Boyatzis, further specifies the key stages of the analytic process in this project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 9</th>
<th>Approach adopted to the analytic process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage</td>
<td>Theory Driven Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Deciding on Sampling and design issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>1 Generating a code from theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Reviewing and rewriting the code for applicability to the raw information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Determining the reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>1 Applying the code to the raw information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Determining validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Interpreting results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Boyatzis (1998:44)
The approach I adopted reflects the ideal types that Boyatzis develops with an understanding that most researchers experience of handling data lies between the theoretical and data driven approach. Although there appear to be noteworthy differences between Boyatzis' 'Theory Driven Approach' and the precise approach utilised in this research, on the Boyatzis continuum the present research remains closer to the theory-driven rather than the rigid data-driven approach. This researcher remains sympathetic to the position developed by Manning where the process should not be overly reliant on purloining quantitative methodological concepts in an attempt to meet criteria developed to address the epistemological particularities and requirements of those methodologies.

6.5   Context

There are many contextual issues which may be experienced by the novice researcher. An example of this is where the funding body has expectations about findings or how the research is to be conducted. These circumstances are becoming more common, as the remit of ethics committees becomes wider and there is a decrease in the element of risk researchers are prepared to take. As already discussed this research was co-sponsored by an external body but whilst their needs definitely 'framed' it they did not drive it. This was in part because the body in question, an agency responsible for police training, reflected many of the problems that were encountered in this research. Although in social research terms PhD research may be of a relatively standard duration, in public services a three year study is a long-term affair where there is a significant lag between asking the question and getting an answer. During this research the external body changed its institutional identity and to some extent its remit three times, mirroring that which occurred 'in the field' in respect of changes in the project themselves. In addition, the answers from PhD research (when they arrive) are often to a different, although equally interesting, question. Social sciences then, for public services, often become a subtle disappointment rather than an opportunity for learning. This is a well observed characteristic predominantly of qualitative research and, rather than a defect, some argue that it can be turned into a learning opportunity given goodwill on both sides (Torrance, 2008).
For most social researchers inserting oneself into the field is not an unproblematic matter. Indeed, as suggested in the opening paragraph, there are challenges associated with qualitative and quantitative methods. However, for the qualitative researcher it is the fear of influencing the field which is uppermost in one's mind. In my case there were clear, apparent and well-documented sources of influence or impact upon the field, notably my ethnicity (white) gender (female) and social class (working class but in migration) (Ackers, 1993; Fielding, 1984; Gans, 1958; Lofland et al., 1984; Mies, 1999; Mishler, 1986; Oakley, 1981). To some extent these characteristics are highlighted in terms of their difference rather than similarities, however, in actuality either of these circumstances can rouse interesting findings from the field. This is done, usually without artifice, by either 'juxtaposing' respondent characteristics (interviewer is white and respondent is black) or 'mimicking' them (interviewer is a woman and respondent is a woman). In the literature this latter strategy is described as 'matching'. In this research, perhaps worringly, ethnicity was not an issue (and therefore a pressing latent issue) because all of my respondents were white, even in areas of considerable diversity, such as Greenton.

In terms of gender, primarily there was the issue of conducting research within two spheres that have a pronounced gendered element to them. In working with the police the majority of the respondents were men and then working with the NHS, most of the respondents were female. In addition, there was evidence to suggest that there was a pronounced gendered element to community work with a dominance of women at a community level (Pearson et al., 1992; Sampson et al., 1988). However, at a strategic level Liddle and Gelsthorpe (1994a) identified a dearth of women, perhaps as Gilling (1997) suggests due to the 'glass ceiling'. In actuality, women and men were represented in more or less equal parts in the research process, and at this

---

73 For more on interviewer matching please see the classic text by Hyman (1954) also worthy of consideration is the work of Mishler (1986) and Gubrium and Holstein (1997), as already mentioned for work on interviewing women then the classic work of Oakley (1981), Finch (1984) and Devault (1999) is of note. Bradburn (1979) is particularly good on updating the earlier work of Hyman (1954) and Spradley (1979) and Gorden (1978) consider the phenomenon of matching from the perspective of anthropology and American naturalism, respectively. In addition, for a contemporary British example there is the work of Arksey and Knight (1999). For a detailed resource on interviewing, summarising seven interview types and illustrating each with extracts from datasets held by the national social science data archive and freely available to researchers, see: [http://www.esds.ac.uk/qualidata/support/interviews/](http://www.esds.ac.uk/qualidata/support/interviews/).
strategic level, male police officers and female NHS workers seemed equally prepared to describe, discuss and critique local work practices.

As already mentioned in the section above on ‘interviewing’, social class also became a pertinent issue at the interviewer/respondent interface. As explored earlier and further developed in later chapters the influence of social class upon the research findings was an unexpected and due to its ‘cultural’ aspect, a subtle and to some extent elusive, if persistent, finding. The propensity of this characteristic to influence the field and the apparent ‘revealing’ of it within interviews with working class police officers, was surprising primarily for two reasons; firstly, because class often reveals itself in attitudes and practices which are ‘known’ and therefore ‘invisible’ or implicit and secondly, for those in apparent ‘migration’ between classes these patterns are often hidden or remain undisclosed. In addition, for the qualitative social researcher it is unlikely that one will have a ‘control’ mainly because these are clearly difficult to design, when one considers the innumerable imponderables at the outset of social research design and because such designs are often considered unethical when observing human subjects. However, in these circumstances although it would be inappropriate to say I had a ‘control’ group in the form of the self-ascribed ‘middle class’ NHS managers (as they had other differing characteristics such as gender) this group did offer a ‘comparator’. Indeed it was this ‘difference’ in interview between the ‘working class’ officers and ‘middle class’ NHS managers which illustrated the finding.

It is clear, that there are many contextual issues that arise when conducting qualitative research. My grounding in social research methods (which may have its own set of consequences)\textsuperscript{74}, made me open, reflexive and alert to methodological concerns and is reflected in the above exploration and my attempt to ascertain their impact on the research process. However, these issues are faced by all social researchers, even those whose interaction with the data is apparently less ‘personal’ (quantitative researchers). Although we must guard against bias it is apparent that our fascination with the process of social research is entwined with our fascination

\textsuperscript{74} For the impact of ‘going academic’ please see Hobbs (1993) and May (1993a)
with the human subject and that of the ‘self’ (Baxter et al., 2003; Goffman, 1971; Mead, 1934; Rock, 1979).

6.6 Conclusion

This chapter has attempted to provide an honest and exploratory account of methodological design and implementation, including the technical aspects of data collection, transcription and analysis. In so doing it has explored major methodological debates and context issues faced by social researchers.

This chapter also sets the scene for the themes which will be developed in the following analysis chapters: social class, prejudice and power, in as much as they featured in the methodological process.
7. Chapter Seven
The Police: Who are they?

7.1 Introduction

The occupational culture of the police has already been explored in some detail in the preceding literature review (in particular Chapter 2). It is apparent when the police were interviewed that this culture is compelling for academics, but also has substantial personal influence on the individuals who work in the organisation. This chapter sets out to ascertain who the police are. Rather more specifically it considers the police who are working in partnership with other agencies and for this research the most pertinent is the relationship with those who work in the NHS.

In trying to find out ‘who they were’ the researcher asked questions about the occupational history of the respondents. This was done to identify core skills accrued in employment, a primary source of socialisation and development. There was then an opportunity, through observation, to consider the degree to which observable skills were deployed in partnership working. In this chapter we can see that the commitment to police culture or the ‘ethos of the role’, longevity in post, social class and a background in the Criminal Investigation Department (CID), were the most prominent features in skill development.

In pilot observations conducted on training courses by Bramshill Police College, different skill sets were encountered in police officers who had had a ‘life before’ working in the police. This came to the fore when ‘chatting’ to a police officer during a break in training. He had been a police officer for approximately 8 years, however before this he had been a social worker in children’s services for about 10 years. His approach to community work was practical and enthusiastic. He felt that there was a ‘difference’ amongst officers who had worked before in a different sector and what he termed the ‘career officer’ – he felt that even a small amount of work elsewhere could lead to surprising dividends for the individual concerned. However in this research a ‘life before’ joining the police did not seem to add to or detract,
from the skills that officers utilised, when working in partnership. This is possibly due to the strength and commitment to the police culture or what is termed in this research as the ‘ethos of the role’. Briefly, the ‘ethos of the role’ was more than simply the organisational culture attached to the occupation ‘police officer’, it was deeper and wider than this. It was instrumental in informing their own sense of their public role, their organisational role and their role in partnership. It also, as we shall see in the following chapter, was instrumental in the way they constructed working with other agencies and how they viewed these other agencies.

The following seeks to explore, qualitatively, the deep-rooted attitudes and actions of the police who work in partnership. This chapter is an attempt to explore in more detail the type of police who were working in partnership, their history, context and their ‘drivers’. What constituted a good partnership police officer?

7.2 Lifetime commitment to the post

The majority of the officers who participated in the research were between the ages of 45 – 52.\textsuperscript{75} The mean age was 46 but this was due to the one young officer in the sample who was only 32. Almost all the officers in the sample were able to make a statement such as this when describing their longevity and commitment to the post:

James: I have been a police officer since about 21 years of age.\textsuperscript{76}

Almost all the respondents had over 20 years experience (except the youngest who had just over 10 years service), one was a chief superintendent, some were superintendents, there were also inspectors, sergeants and a constable. Longevity in their chosen career did not ensure a high rank but it did ensure expectations about the way they worked as an organisation and made them reflective about their career development. However, this is set against a more general trend towards a younger and younger force. These officers were established in their careers and this is a considerably different finding to that of Gilling (1993) and Crawford (1998b) who

\textsuperscript{75} In interview about half of police respondents gave their age. When they did not then the age was estimated by the researcher through biographical and career data given in interview.
both identified these officers as being outside the idea of ‘standard police officers’ with Crawford suggesting that multi-agency crime prevention was the ‘Cinderella’ service. Later on Reiner (2000) suggests that it did indeed gain ground and became much more important in a crime control strategy – meaning ‘Cinderella’ did get to go to the crime reduction ball. Gilling (1993) sets the basis of this form of policing within a rational choice model rather than the neo-classical model of policing. This research identified that partnership officers were often mainstream officers who had reached a position of ‘manager’ either through rank or function. Having older officers more experienced in the ‘craft’ of policing could be beneficial to partnership working. However it could also mean that they were more wedded to established forms of crime control and the ‘ethos of the role’.

James: I have something new all the time I do get bored and I think that has sort of identified itself, if you like, through my police career. I haven’t allowed myself to stay too long - in the ‘comfort zone’ and I have wanted a change to try something new.\footnote{Please see Appendix 1 for a list of respondents, location and social characteristics}

The work of policing, of being ‘in the service’ has (mostly) offered these police officers a career which has been diverse and interesting. The above officer is describing how has been able to seek new challenges. Officers often refer to this organisational ability where they have been able to move frequently on from successes and failures and ‘treat those two impostors just the same’. They have been able to learn from mistakes and have felt that their work life has been in service to the need of the organisation.

On the whole police officers are deeply entrenched in their occupational culture, what it has offered in terms of career development but also the sense of being part of something bigger than themselves. A commitment to the organisation was a characteristic of all the officers in this sample. Only one officer criticised the organisation and recent developments in recruitment of younger officers. However, this did not come close to criticising the core role of ‘law enforcement’. There was an obvious difference for this respondent, between belief in the organisation and criticism of its functioning or staff. Longevity in career was clearly an element in the
development of a commitment to the organisation but not the only factor, as we shall see when considering the ‘ethos of the role’. This does not mean that they do not understand the way other organisations work but it does mean that they face inward and answer to and are answerable to their own organisational drivers. As we shall see the police function differently to the way other organisations work and in the case of this research their approach was different to the way the NHS worked.

When considering the impact of ‘lifetime commitment to post’ on skill development it is apparent that longevity in a career offers certain generic skills, such as an understanding of the way the organisation works, what it is that it does and how partnership work ties in with organisational aims. The officers who were middle or upper managers also had an understanding of resource allocation and the strategic relevance of the work.

### 7.3 Importance of life before in forming skills

James: I was 21 in my training - so I had had about two years in leaving school and joining the police and I think that is very important when you look at the police service as a career that you have been on both sides so to speak.

It is difficult to say how true this assertion is. The presumption being (as the respondent asserts) that you can see ‘both sides’ if you have had the opportunity to occupy ‘both sides’, those who abide by the law (or break it) and those who enforce it. However, as we have seen, in matters of crime control it is rarely so simple because issues of accountability and police discretion come to the fore (Black, 1973). The following officer is describing the beginning of his police career and including the small amount of employment history before this.

Patrick: I started policing when I was 19 and a half, which was in 1976 the youngest you could join really. Prior to that left school at 15 and did a range of part-time roles and two full-time jobs - one was a batch boy just before. Batch boy makes tea for tea tasters.

Most police officers when asked the question ‘Could you tell me about your background?’ would do a thorough and lengthy description of their police career.
They would then be surprised by the prompt ‘Did you do any work before you joined the police?’ It was apparent that if they had it was considered as insignificant and as a ‘bit of work’. Respondents portrayed other work as insignificant when considered alongside their police work. They maintained this attitude even if that work had spanned 8-10 years. However, they would then often go on to talk about this ‘bit of work’ in great detail, giving it far more significance in the formation of their character and attitude to work life then would be understood in the terms in which it was initially phrased 78. As we shall see in the following section Patrick’s experience as a ‘Batch Boy’ in a class - divided tea trade led him to a career in the police. The following respondent is describing when he began working in the police,

Robert: Everything?! Well I am originally from Liverpool and I’m 46 years old and I joined the police when I was 27.

This respondent has a diverse work history. He worked ‘on the buses’ for about 5 years before he became a police officer. He decided to join the police because of the then economic situation in the North and a desire to ‘work with people’. If this were the only respondent interviewed then presumptions regarding the benefits of previous work before a police career would have been fulfilled. He was outgoing, optimistic, talkative, and liked working with people and these were the reasons he had decided to become a police officer. He spoke fondly of ‘dealing with the community’ when working on the busses. Interestingly despite these traits, he did not shine in the partnership he worked in. He was very respectful of the rank structure, committed to his organisation and initially lacked understanding as to the way other organisations worked. As we shall see in Chapter Nine being good at partnership working often means that you have to buck the organisational trend. There was little evidence that a life before created a store of skills that could be deployed in partnership working. Only one officer felt that this would be the case, James who is quoted above. Most officers expressed surprise that a researcher would show interest in this aspect of their past. With most officers in the sample having over 20 years experience in the force, they generally complied with the main tenets of police culture. This is not to suggest that police culture is monolithic. Police officers do respond differently, think

78 See interviews with James, Robert and Patrick.
differently and act differently to the same sets of social, organisational or political drivers. However, they also can respond with a remarkable degree of uniformity when their understanding of their core role is perceived as being threatened (Brown, 2007; Cope, 2004; Levitt et al., 1988). Therefore their core skills (when described) had their police source as a primary attribute.

Officers who had a work life before joining the police displayed an extensive set of skills which may have been derived from alternate work experience before the police. The above officer who had worked on the busses had also engaged in community work as a police officer in Liverpool following the Toxteth riots there in 1981. He felt that he had developed skills in working on the busses, which had allowed him to work proactively with the black community even whilst things were falling apart. This may have been the case but these skills were not apparently transferable twenty years later into a partnership setting (compromise, communication and collaborative working for example). In partnership working police officers showed a commitment to the ethos of the role and an atypical construction of other agencies which often meant working relationships were problematic.

7.4 Social class and misspent youth as a driver in social development

Most of the officers in the sample appeared to be from a working class background. They had become middle class because of their occupational status. This working class background and having a ‘misspent youth’ were something they frequently referred to. The youngest officer in the sample appeared to come from a middle class background and was educated to university level. Only one of the other police respondents mentioned having a university education and that had come later for him, in his mid-twenties.

Although very little can be said about the change in the occupational culture from this relatively small sample, there has been a change in recruitment of officers to the
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79 For further discussion of the ascription of social class categories to these respondents in this data set please see section 2.11, 5.1 and 12.1.
force, with fast tracking of officers with a university education into higher positions than if they were not university educated (first introduced in 1968). This means they avoid the traditional background of career development through the lower ranks. All of the officers in this research (besides the one younger officer) had achieved rank through length of service, promotion and experience and had not availed themselves of opportunities for education whilst in service (Punch and Lee, 2004).

Patrick: I realised at that stage that I wouldn’t get very far within the tea trade because of the culture in the tea trade - it was very sort of class orientated - or at least it was in those days. So I decided that I wanted to do something different and I ended up in the police.

This officer was very plain speaking, honest and to the point. He hid nothing and lacked a ‘poker’ or ‘partnership face’. In interview he appeared to have working class origins and his patterns of speech, his attitude and actions all seemed to reflect this. However, incongruously, when I interviewed him he was sipping milky ‘Lady Grey’ tea from a bone china teacup. It is apparent from his own testimony quoted above that his working class roots prevented him from progressing in the tea trade much above a batch boy. Conversely, a career in the police was not conceptualised in the same way; career progression seemed a possibility. Waddington (1999) makes this point and it certainly held true in this research – the police was composed of lots of working class lads ‘making good’.

Robert: (Mutual laughter) I did think about it (joining the police) and a lot of mates at school and the school I went to it was quite a select school - shall we say? Yeah all me mates were like - ‘You don’t want to do that - bloody coppers.’ So that I was swayed by that, a little bit and I just got into doing other things.

Theo: I am the black sheep of the family. So nobody else has been involved in the police service at all. And some of them have been my clients.

As Theo’s remark hints, over half of the police officers I spoke to talked about their background and described themselves as ‘having a past’ or a misspent youth. Although they never talked in any detail about particular illegal activities, they portrayed themselves as having been ‘bad lads’. They left school as early as possible, shunned education and wanted to get to work (Bowles and Gintis, 1976).
This was very much a masculinised culture portrayed most effectively by Willis (1977) in ‘Learning to Labour’. It was clear that many of these officers as young men had immersed themselves in a counter school culture and had been keen to get away with what they could. They had also denigrated authority figures, which had included the police. However, regardless of this attitude to the police it is also clear that in times of economic severity and where there were very few avenues out of poverty and a working class background, the police force has for many years offered an opportunity to escape (Fielding, 1988; Reiner, 1978).

In the present analysis it is being argued that a working class background is linked with a particular approach to work and life and this is explored in more detail in the following chapter in the process of comparison with their, generally, middle class colleagues who worked in NHS management. In the main the officers presented as blunt, open and demanding when they worked in partnership – although this reaction is obviously mediated by police culture and the commitment to the ethos of the role.80 Fielding (1988) recognises the deep isolation that can occur when officers join-up and this can be seen in the above respondent who maintains that he is now the ‘black sheep of the family.’ There is certainly a sense that officers feel the need or obligation to isolate themselves from family and friends who may have a slightly nefarious background or connections. Officers will say that their friends are fellow officers and that is whom they feel comfortable with. One might expect an ability to identify with those who are living in poverty, the bad lads, those who are living on the edge – as many officers have lived that way themselves and then used the police force as an escape route. However, this was not the case, there seemed instead a backlash against current types of criminal behaviour as a result of poverty, chaotic family backgrounds etc. A senior officer suggested this was because they had ‘escaped’ their own chaotic backgrounds and felt that everyone could if they chose to.81 This view meant that officers could appear rigid and ignorant around reasons for offending. Although this was rarely the case, they simply did not have sympathy for it.

---

80 c.f section 7.7 below and Chapter 10 on Consequences.
81 Field work diary 2007
Clearly the issue of social class is a complicated one and even more so when associated with an occupational culture which lends itself to hiding particular aspects of working life (Fielding, 1988; Reiner, 1978) not just because of the class that they are rooted in but because of the work that they conduct (Bittner, 1980). Of course it could be argued that social class is ameliorated by this sense of doing the ‘tainted work’. In this regard, police officers ‘band together’ and isolate as above because of the ‘dirty work’ they do. Moreover, there has been a professionalisation of the force starting with the pay settlement in 1979 and whilst situated in this social class dialectic the reality is that of a latent embourgeoisement. However, being paid more does not erode the essential qualities, which are part of your social class of origin. The same sources of power, conflict and insecurity remain – only remuneration increases. It seems unlikely that this change in pay scales would have had a significant difference on the self-perceived social class of those who were recruited into the force. In this research all officers were recruited 5-15 years after the key pay settlement but still presented as being working class. With regards to social mobility its occurrence is not contested, its impact is. An officer may move from one social class to another but this process is complicated. When mobility occurs it entails a sense of dislocation and displacement. You can move social class but you may always feel like a visitor in a foreign land and making a return journey becomes impossible. Essentially you can take the boy out of the working class culture but can you take the working class culture out of the boy? That is in question. Social class becomes a cultural artefact rather than a crude, rudimentary, traditional understanding of class limited to economic position. What is truer to the data is a cultural reality and one that is enmeshed in the daily practices of life (Hey, 2003; Skeggs, 2004; Walkerdine, 2003).

It could appear that I am suggesting that the police are merely driven by their occupational position, rooted within it and acting to sustain it. There is evidence to suggest that they do have – as do many organisations - strategies for maintaining a comfortable and unchallenging middle ground practice of policing (Elsmore, 2001; Levitt et al., 1988; Meyerson and Martin, 1987). The difficulty of developing change
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82 See interview with respondent ‘Mike’ who talked of the terrible things he had seen whilst working in CID. In addition, field work notes 2004, senior officer narrates horrific traumatising incident involving brutal scenes of manslaughter and sexual assault in monotone.
within policing and police services has been an un-shifting paradigmatic theme within police research for the best part of three decades (Chan, 1997). However, recent trends seem to suggest quite substantial ‘change’ within the police force and the way they conduct their core role. We can point to many examples including BVPi, New Public Sector Management, NIM, PACE, CDA. All of these changes call for substantial movement of deep structures within the police force. However, this argument, which is continued in the following section on ‘ethos of the role’ is really looking at something deeper, which seems almost impervious to change – a response to external demands of partnership work that is situated in occupational culture and amplified, at least in the biographies of the officers studied by enculturated understandings of social class.

The perspective of officers in this sample seemed inherently social class based but were only articulated in an implicit manner. This may be due to the process of socialisation where being working class is inherently deep rooted and functions as an intrinsic indicator, a life long reference point of deeply held values (Skeggs, 2004). Therefore, for police officers who have had to divorce themselves from what they know, their families and their communities, and instead turn towards their occupational self, social class becomes a dual and self-confirming process. Their occupational culture acts as a reference point for this understanding, whereby this dual process occurs, a taking and a giving of how to relate to the world around you. In the main, police officers still hail from a white male background despite strategies to increase diversity\(^{83}\) and the officers in this sample were almost uniformly working class. Therefore, when they join they bring an entrenched working class perspective and associated understanding of the world.

This trajectory reflects recruitment patterns that have been prevalent until relatively recently and in which working class, white males predominate (Office of National Statistics, 2003)\(^ {84}\). And as Willis (1977) so eloquently portrayed they characteristically engage in petty types of rule breaking and have established, orthodox and traditional understandings of the world, of women and ethnic diversity.

---

83 Class of origin is not routinely collected.
84 Referring to gender and ethnicity.
They are patriarchal and 'own the world' or their small patch of it. When some of them become police officers and are extricated from what they know and understand, aspects of police and working class culture become entwined. This goes some way to explain why parts of police working practices and reactions to outside stimuli come across as 'conservative', orthodox, rigid, formal, boundaried, parochial and hidden to outsiders not in the know (Parker, 2000). I would argue that these characteristics stem, in part from a working class background, not just for the officers in this sample but more importantly for the officers that have come before them. In this sample the single officer that presented from a middle class background did not manifest any observable characteristics that fundamentally disassociated him from his cohort as the following quote illustrates.

Frank: I mean it sounds terrible but the desire to do good and to put things back into the community however terrible it sounds that wasn't a consideration it isn't a massive consideration for me. I am a real honest man and I am far more interested in having an adventurous career...The police as I am sure you have heard are (a) real 'can-do' organisation. If you have a problem then we can do something about it. Or we'll try too. We'll give it a stab. We do tend to overestimate what it is that we can do but I think at times we underestimate the skills of other professionals because we think - to some extent 'we're the police'...

He could express and articulate views that were inherently orientated to occupational culture but that one might also regard as working class in origin. For example, a commitment to the organisation but a loyalty to hierarchy, rigid ways of working entailing protection of the inner core of police working. The main difference occurred at interview where he did not situate his work life within the context of his personal background. Rather like the middle class health care workers his interview lacked a reliance on personal history to understand his present condition. There seemed to be an inverted false class-consciousness - an aping of working class values to participate in police culture. Therefore, a working class of origin is not needed to participate in the fundamentally social class situated culture of the police, because culture is a dual process of giving and taking. Consequently, an officer situated in a middle class of origin is as capable of exhibiting essentially working class characteristics as the working class officer. However, these views may not be
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85 c.f 5.3 particularly section on 'ongoing access'.
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so intractable and the culture itself will be affected (marginally) by the middle class values they also bring. This implies that change in working practices that hinge on occupational culture can occur but only very slowly.\textsuperscript{86}

Brown (2007) has recently explored this idea of the unchanging police service when looking at issues of diversity from the perspective of gender. She draws on the work of Foster et al (2005) when considering the impact of the Stephen Lawrence Enquiry, which found that whilst there had been a spotlight thrown on the issue of ethnic diversity and police response to community issues regarding sexism and ethnic diversity within the police, and what Brown calls the ‘gender agenda’, had slipped. Brown articulates this sense that there is an inner core of police culture which is unassailable and is impervious to change – she uses the concept of ‘organisational attention’ which outlines how organisations will turn their attention to fewer and fewer sources, to self confirm the actions of the dominant group. The literature on organisational learning suggests a similar process occurs when attempts are made to implement change. Organisations then retreat to what is tried and tested – even when it no longer works – rather than adopting new forms of working (Levitt et al., 1988).

Brown (2007) and Silvestri (2007) suggest that the adoption of new forms of public management, target setting and performance indicators introduce a competitive edge within policing that encourages what Brown terms ‘macho management’. This retreat into what Brown perceives as masculine, competitive forms of management is supported by the work of Cope (2004) and Maguire and John (2006). Cope (2004) looked at two forces and the integration of crime analysts into the work of the police. She encountered real resistance to utilising non-police sources of intelligence and an extensive culture of ‘them and us’, between analysts and officers. Officers were wedded to traditional forms of working, despite an increasing need for technical forms of intelligence-led policing. Maguire and John (2006) considered the new technical forms of data gathering and its management using the National Intelligence Model and concluded that if used widely it could aid collaboration between partnerships, agencies and police. However, they concluded that there was currently an adherence to central targets and what he terms ‘silo-thinking’.

\textsuperscript{86} c.f. Concluding chapter section on police culture
What does this mean for our interest in partnership work? Brown (2007) offers evidence to suggest that when the police are threatened they will develop and use strategies such as organisational attention to retreat to familiar ground. In this research it appeared that this ‘familiar ground’ was occupied by deeply held social class understandings of role and function. However, it is not suggested that the process of formation of the ‘ethos of the role’ with fundamental social class characteristics is reducible to just their social class of origin. Since it is a dual process of giving and taking of key characteristics the process of police change will be incremental and slow to achieve. This is because, as the occupational culture literature documents, even officers who identify origins other than those deeply rooted within social class, nevertheless begin to identify, express and develop loyalties to an occupational culture which is fundamentally ‘macho’ and working class. Those who do not report feeling excluded and undervalued by their colleagues (Brown et al., 2000; Foster et al., 2005; Gerber, 2001; Holdaway and Barron, 1997). Therefore change will be fundamentally difficult to implement and manage because of the nature of this self-confirming process. Without doubt police culture is not ‘monolithic’ but is nuanced (Reuss-Ianni and Ianni, 1983). However, it has a deep inner core which utilises key features of working class culture and can be mobilised against outsiders within (Brown, 2007; Cope, 2004; Foster et al., 2005) and without (Macpherson, 1999) including other occupational cultures.

7.5 Commitment to the ethos of the role

The ‘ethos of the role’ discussed above is the sense of commitment expressed by officers to the police role. However, this was more than the cruder articulations of ‘police culture’. It was at once deeper and wider than this. As Fielding suggests ‘‘occupational culture’ is counterposed to organisational demands’ (1984: 569), however, it gives those demands form and structure. It functions as a mechanism mediating between role bearer, organisation, and working practices.
The ethos of the role was the innate sense that the police have about their role and function. The conception of their role rests on the work of the ‘rank and file’ officer and what is considered their front line work. There is an attachment to the reactive, exciting, cutting edge role of the police and this sense of their work was not eroded by years of middle management and sitting at a desk, working through budgets, and allocating resources. The core understanding that the police have about their work is unassailable. It is not affected by reality, government policy (such as the move from reactive policing to reassurance/neighbourhood policing to crime prevention), or public criticism. The ethos of the role remains secluded and protected from all comers and exhibits characteristics which are working class in origin. As already suggested in Chapter 2 this ‘working classness’ may include an inherent loyalty to the group and a common understanding of the world indeed a conception of the working class that might owe more to Thompson’s (1963) conception than that of Haylett (2001). Moreover it also has aspects of it which are boundaried, conservative and parochial – it acts within a rigid understanding of the world and how it works. It is what Fielding (1994) outlines as stereotypical perceptions of gendered policing; such as being aggressive or competitive, having a preoccupation with conflict, and misogynistic and patriarchal attitudes towards women. All of these admittedly ‘stereotypical attributes’ seem not only to be based on ‘hegemonic masculinity’ – but also a working class type of masculinity as depicted by Haylett. In addition the evidence presented by Fielding like that of Waddington (1999) and Foster (2003) in their explorations of police culture all seem to conclude that there is significant evidence that the police do portray many of these characteristics. But the picture is not confined to these characteristics, because occupational culture is not monolithic and culture will slowly be changed by the culture of new recruits and for Fielding by the changing environment in which policing takes place. In his conclusion Fielding suggests that it is a mistake to characterise an occupational group by a ‘simple bi-polar distinction’ such as gender. Fielding suggests that one might also consider canteen culture as ‘white’ this work suggests that one might also consider it as ‘working class’ (and male and white).

87 Although Brown and Silvestri would argue (as already discussed) a return to old ground when under threat by outside influences or a changing environment.
Although the ethos of the role has this discreet, secretive, protected aspect to it, where it lies at the foundation of police understanding of what they do – it also has a wider social function. It forms an organisational device which says ‘we are the police and we are a reactive frontline service.’ In addition it also says ‘you may need us one day.’ This aspect of the role is similar to that of the NHS (the emergency service), although for the NHS this aspect of their ethos of the role seemed to be constructed more by the police than themselves. This reliance on what Manning (1977) would term ‘mandate’ is an expectation that there will be an inherent understanding amongst other agencies with regards to what they do and the authority they have to do it (the ‘licence’ aspect of Manning’s development of this analytic model). This aspect of the role, the idea that we may all need to call upon the police to ‘help’ us would seem to put them in an ontologically strong position, when working with other agencies. However, this was not the case as shall be seen in the following chapter, as this conception of the police was not shared by other agencies when working in partnership with them. The police dragged their baggage into the partnership room and other agencies stepped over it, walked round it or ignored it (Gilling, 2005).

7.6 This is what I do

More than the other agencies participating in this research the police expressed consistently a commitment to the ethos of the role. This was almost matched by that of the NHS and to some extent the quasi NHS workers (mainly in the drugs field), but not quite. This is not to say that the police were not aware of the reasons they found partnership working difficult, such as ‘being do-ers’, ‘wanting to get things done and get it done yesterday’ and wanting to ‘do good’. They were adept at doing what a voluntary sector worker termed ‘empire building’. However, they would present these reasons as positive attributes because they went to the heart of maintaining the core police function and role or, what had been established as the core police function and role, through the construction of their ethos. Police research has established that the police are adept at presenting a certain image of their work to the public, government and media (Fielding, 1991; Reiner, 2000). It is also clear that
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88 See interviews with Zoë, James, Patrick, Tom, Robert, Richard.
there is a discrepancy amongst police that lurks between what the police actually do and what it is they believe they do. However whilst the police are adept at presenting their work to outside bodies in a certain light they are also adept at doing the same internally. Whilst conducting this research this discrepancy did not seem to cause any ontological insecurity amongst police about their role. However it clearly had an impact on the way that they worked in partnership as their (unarguably disputed) actual work of crime prevention is conducive to partnership working whereas their conception of their work (crime fighters) is not. The following respondent is describing his conception of the role.

Frank: But I couldn’t bear the thought of being stuck behind a desk all day but I do that quite a lot now. And I just wanted to do something a bit adventurous to be honest. Yeah, you know, traditional ideas of driving fast, dealing with public disorder and catching bad guys and gals, certainly appealed but as did the opportunity to work within a structure. I did like the structure something that was well respected as well and interesting - I like the idea that I am involved in something and that you can read the newspapers and see the news and the police appear in everything and it is very high profile. It is no coincidence that there are 101 cop shows on TV it is an interesting job. I mean nothing more deep than that really.

Interestingly, it is the youngest officer in the sample, who had utilised the fast track system to accelerate his career, who gave this description. Fast tracking does not appear to undermine his understanding or commitment to the ‘ethos of the role’. This Superintendent was concerned with meeting his targets and did this by engaging in a police-led treatment project for prolific offenders. He was willing to work in partnership to facilitate the meeting of these targets but he found engaging with the health partner a frustrating experience.

Amongst these officers there was not a sense of promotion-mindedness or their rank being overly important to a sense of how they conceptualised their work. Their perspective remained grounded in the work that was done by the ‘rank and file’ police constable, be that their understanding of that experience now (as managers) or as was more likely, their experience as constables when they began in the service. As we have seen the image of this work is core to the ethos of the role and therefore an attachment to it does not require direct experience of the work. When they described
their job, it was in these terms rather than the performance management, budget setting and target-meeting work that had become their primary role.

A commitment to the ethos of the role lends the police an organisational confidence in their approach to police work as well as a sense of belonging to an organisation with a clear focus. In partnership work it meant they could clearly articulate the expectations of the police organisation. Moreover, it was also apparent that they were representing an organisation they had a deep loyalty towards. However it also inhibited the way that they worked with other agencies as it caused a significant amount of rigidity in the way they worked.

7.7 Other partnership attendees with a criminal justice background

Included here are partnership attendees with a criminal justice background. They were included as the partnerships often had a strong criminal justice element and the effects of this are explored in more detail in Chapter Nine. However, here they offer a more rounded picture of the police and the skills they utilise in partnership. Some of these respondents were retired or ex-police officers. Other members of the partnership had other criminal justice backgrounds or operated in the criminal justice arena (such as the prison service, probation or to a certain extent the YOT team). Only the most prominent professionals who were part of the criminal justice contingent were interviewed, as the sampling at the field sites was unambiguously about the police and the NHS. Nevertheless, the point is that the police were not the only members of the partnership who operated from a criminal justice perspective. Community Safety Partnerships remain a criminal justice led endeavour and the most active members are from this background and despite the statutory context of equal responsibility between agencies, crime is still conceptualised as a problem for the police.

Retired Police Officers

As noted retired police officers were often a feature of Community Safety Partnerships. It was a legitimate means to remain in the criminal justice sphere, utilise existing skills and knowledge bases, and maintain community contacts.
Retired police officers were very different from the police officers in the following section who are termed ex-police officers. Continuing to work in a criminal justice capacity after retirement from the force meant that retired officers could maintain their attachment to the force and commitment to the ‘ethos of the role’. The following respondent is describing his background in the police as a serving officer. He joined as young as he could, he never did any other kind of work, he enjoyed the diversity of the role, had a great deal of responsibility and had ‘some superb times’.

Tom: My background is I left school at seventeen and joined the police service as a cadet. I left the police service when I was 51 and I served from police cadet up to an area commander, which is a chief superintendent grade, a BCU commander. I served in uniform but mainly CID, I have been in charge of a robbery unit, a pickpocket unit, I worked on the anti-terrorist squad, I’ve been on some major investigations football, into all sorts of serious crime, I had some superb times. Now I am the manager of the Community Safety Partnership for the council.

This commitment to the ‘ethos of the role’ led officers to be wedded to a traditional approach to community safety work that is police-led and hierarchical and meant that certain allegiances could and were formed within partnerships. Retired officers understood the work of serving officers and formed a warm and friendly rapport. Although this could be a benefit to partnership working between the council and the police it could also form an exclusive relationship, which was virtually impenetrable by agencies outside the ‘inner circle’ (HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, 2000)

Ex-police officer

In contrast ex-police officers were a challenge to the status quo. They had insider knowledge on how the organisation worked but had taken the (largely) unprecedented decision to leave. As noted earlier all officers expressed a commitment to the ‘ethos of the role’. This concept is venerated as the primary role of the police. It fixes the officer in understanding his role, history, context and operational responsibilities. It is an organisational safety net. Therefore, an officer who leaves the force is an imponderable entity because they have chosen to leave an organisation which offers stability, status and excitement. The following respondent was very knowledgeable about police culture and although some time had elapsed
since she had been a serving officer she had remained in the criminal justice field. She felt that the police-led drug project that she was working on would not succeed. This seemed to be because of the reasons why she left the force and joined the probation service some 25 years earlier.

Julie: I am a probation officer, a qualified probation officer, I have worked in the probation service for nearly 20 years in different roles, but I have been qualified as a probation officer for 11 years...My previous job before being in the probation service (laughs) was as a police officer. But that was back in 1980.

Researcher: And what made you go into probation from that?

Julie: A desire to understand more about why people offended rather than dealing with the aftermath of offending.

The police could see the offending and even the aftermath of offending to victims but they had yet to understand the reasons why people offend. This is not to say that they were not able to understand it, they were and would (at times) articulate the reasons: poverty, broken families, abuse. However, it did not integrate into the clearly defined 'ethos of the role' and therefore knowledge did not constitute understanding. As discussed above, when understanding was coupled with personal experience, it became a point of reference for officers that meant that the police could understand why but could also understand that there was a way out. Many of them had found it and so, therefore, should others. This point was critical as to why the police and the NHS found it difficult to work together when using drug misuse as an exemplar of this relationship. The NHS, drug workers or those with a social services 'type' background (such as probation) were interested in the social context of the offender. This was most important in drug treatment work where the reasons 'why people abuse' and adopting of a non-blame stance were core to stopping the behaviour. The police had not adopted this mindset and this represented the most serious problem between these two agencies when considering the allocation of resources.

The police felt that those who committed the most crime should receive treatment first – this was possibly for two reasons – local and strategic. Locally they could see that a single prolific offender could do considerable damage to a community.
Strategically a single prolific offender could solve many ‘detections’ and help them to meet targets. For the NHS the allocation of treatment places was based on need. There were only a certain number of places that were available and those in the highest need would receive that allocation. In addition to this there was the locally held belief that enforced treatment programmes did not work as substance abusers had to embark on treatment when they were ready.

The following housing worker was working with those who misused drugs and alcohol. He had, for a period, served as a police officer. Something went wrong whilst he was on duty and he felt policing had not worked out as he had expected it to.

John: Well, (long pause seems reluctant to speak) is this really confidential? Not many people know what I did before.

Researcher: Yes it is.

John: I’m an ex-policeman.

He revealed this information with a touch of embarrassment; he went on to explain that in the work he currently did a background in the police would be a stigma to effective working. In the area he worked in (he was part of the pilot study so not contained in any of the three field sites) community policing had a ‘bad’ name amongst the homeless addicts and street drinkers. He did not want it to be revealed that he was once a member of an organisation which would treat homeless people with disrespect. In this area, a new community officer had come into post and had sent a letter to all the residents of homeless hostels in the borough outlining his plan to ‘no longer tolerate petty crime and street drinking’ in the town. The linking of crime to street drinkers had caused a furore amongst the homeless who associated crime with the well-heeled, affluent, Friday and Saturday night binge drinkers. Homeless street-dwellers, frequently reported (to hostel workers) being the victim of verbal, physical and sexual abuse by these late night revellers. This breakdown in communication had made it even more crucial to this worker that his previous identity as a police officer, one who by association would not understand the
'reasons for offending', be kept a secret. This ex-officer clearly did not have a commitment to the 'ethos of the role'.

7.8 Criminal Justice

Community safety partnerships thus come with a full complement of attendees from a criminal justice sphere and with some variation of perspectives against a backdrop of police dominance. The most visible of these was the probation service. The probation service usually had officers who had a long serving history and a commitment to their post for many years such as the respondent below. The respondent below also felt that the probation service had the benefit of being an organisation which was hierarchical and arranged along military lines and in that sense 'similar' to the police. 89

Pamela: Probation for about 23/24 years I think.

The similarities between the police and the probation service meant that there was often a sense that they were allowed onto the periphery of the inner circle – into 'circles of influence' explored in more detail in Chapter Ten. They were also in the unique position of working with the police and the NHS. They would often work with the police when their clients breached probation orders and they were also working (closer than ever) with the NHS on Drug Treatment and Testing Orders, which were a form of court imposed treatment. They had a good understanding of the mindset of the police towards those who misused drugs and that of the NHS. This was apparent in all partnerships but particularly the one situated in Stonham, the partnership initiated with the purpose of conducting a drug project. The respondent below was crucial to the success of this project. She had experience of the prison, probation and police service. She had been a prison guard and had been seconded from the prison service to work on Drug Treatment and Testing Orders with the probation service. She was now seconded once again from the probation service to the police service to work on the drug project with the police.

89 The Probation Service had begun to undergo some restructuring towards the conclusion of this research, in preparation for its merger with the prison service, under the banner of the 'National Offender Management Service' or NOMS.
Lillian: I was in the prison service for nine and three quarter years. I was the first uniformed officer to come to probation. Probation in the prison service - they saw them as the fluffy brigade really - the ‘care bears’. So I applied at the probation service - BIG career change for me.

She joined the probation service regardless of organisational preconceptions about what they did. She was the most knowledgeable worker in her field about local drug markets, repeat offenders, patterns of consumption, reasons for offending, availability of treatment and pathways into and out of custody. She was also regarded by her colleagues as very good at partnership working, kind, committed, articulate and patient. This package of skills made her a powerful asset to the drug project and made her a well-respected member of the team.

7.9 Background in CID

A common theme amongst the police respondents was a background in the CID; nine out of 13 officers interviewed mentioned a period of working in CID (between 3-10 years). Many officers in the force spend time working in CID as seconded officers on a case. However, these officers had spent considerable periods of their career within the closed world of CID. Other officers who attended partnership on an ad hoc basis also talked about working in CID.

Mike: I have done most of my career well over half of it has been in CID and so it is a bit of a surprise to find myself back in uniform a bit.

Most of the research that has been conducted on officers who work in CID focuses on the manner of investigations, accountability, discretion and conduct of officers who are often investigating crimes which have a dangerous element (Corsianos, 2003; Tong and Bowling, 2006). Innes (2002) describes how police investigation is situated in a social process. The sense amongst respondents was that it was an ‘awful job’ dealing with the families of murder and rape victims. However there was also a sense of having special skills if part of your employment history was situated in ‘detection’. This highlights the differences that exist within police culture (Reuss-Ianni et al., 1983), however it does not erode ‘the ethos of the role’ and its essential core. When asked an additional question regarding his experience in working in partnership the following officer responded in this way,
Theo: I would say up until the rank of chief inspector and superintendent very little. Very little. I would say - if you are looking at my background for key indicators in that was I involved with partnerships or community at that time - naaa I wasn’t - I didn’t do any of that I was focussed; CID – surveillance. Dedicated to policing and didn’t see anything outside of that.

This respondent was clearly indicating that he had spent very little time working in partnership or with the community. He is describing the work he did in CID as being far removed from the work of partnership and community. It is dedicated policing work – there is the implication that he perceived it as ‘real police work’ as opposed to partnership work. As mentioned by Crawford (1998b), partnership working and crime reduction was seen as the Cinderella service and was not held in high regard. Today this work seemed to be a responsibility of rank. It was clearly taken seriously, but it also clearly still lacked kudos – it is far away from the ‘ethos of the role’ and the work of the rank and file officer. It was work that officers did when they had taken on a largely management role and were utilising all available tools to meet the strategic needs of the service. However working in the CID provided transferable skills that could be deployed in partnership.

Skills learned

This research intended to discover what elements of good partnership working were transferable to other areas. Therefore, for police officers who talked explicitly about a background in the CID it was important to try to develop a picture of the types of skills they developed in this work and that might be brought to bear on partnership. Only McGurk et al (1992) and Smith and Flannagan (2000) have conducted what might be called a skills audit into the most desirable traits and work practices for a Senior Investigating Officer. Smith and Flannagan identify 22 skills which they place into three clusters, investigative ability, management skills and knowledge levels.

In the following extract the officer is talking about the type of work which is done as a detective. He highlights the process of negotiation that occurs when talking to other criminal justice professionals. Other officers described the lack of training they received and that they felt ‘out of their depth’ when engaging with other
professionals. They lacked knowledge about other roles. Respondents would participate in pre-trial reviews of evidence with the Crown Prosecution Service, a potentially intimidating process. Other officers talked about the fear around having to ‘take the stand’ and give evidence, when they had never entered a courtroom before. This officer is describing the importance of learning effective communication skills in being able to present your case in a coherent manner. He also goes on to say that these types of skills make for effective senior officers and that he could tell if a colleague had experience in being a detective. He is also describing the ability to talk to people in very stressful and traumatic times.

Mike: Yeah I think you learn important skills as a DS. You investigate quite serious cases such as murder and rapes and armed robberies and before trials - you had pre-trial reviews - case conferences with the barristers and you would have to present all of the evidence as a DS to barristers and other people (who) had a vested interest and you know if you haven’t got any communication skills - it wouldn’t work. So a lot of detectives do make good supervisors and senior officers and certainly at our rank you can tell the ones that have been detectives. You have got that ability to speak to people... You’re dealing with some traumatised individuals - that may be very withdrawn - dealing with families of murdered victims.

Partnership working is often about presenting your case in a coherent manner, knowing the pros and the cons and the history and context of the situation. This allows you to build a convincing picture to your partners. Potentially experience of ‘presenting your case’ could be a benefit to officers working in partnership. This officer went on to talk about the importance of being able to listen,

Mike: Yeah, and obviously extremely good listening. I mean more so then talking. And I think partnership is as much about listening and then making a valid contribution and rather than hogging the meeting for an hour and telling the meeting your views and not letting anybody say a word.

He underlines the importance of being able to listen effectively and applies this approach to working in partnership with other agencies. Interestingly he says what partnership is not – it is not about ‘hogging the meeting for an hour’. Again preconceptions of the way police work would suggest that this is exactly the style adopted by the police. However, in the fieldwork, which included the researcher attending in total 18 months of meetings, police adopting the technique of ‘hogging’

90 See interview James and Mike
was very rare and was usually saved for when ‘all else had failed’. Techniques of control were far more subtle and involved agenda-setting (Lukes, 1974) and mobilisation of bias (Bacharach and Baratz, 1962; Bacharach and Lawler, 1981; Brogden, 1982; McLaughlin, 1994; Walker, 2000), which will be explored in more depth in the following two chapters.

Theo: I wonder if it has something to do with negotiation? I suppose the one thing that it gives me is I realise that a lot of people can affect what I do - hugely - but I think that it was that I was so focussed at one stage I didn’t work in partnerships but I could actually see the gaps.

When asked what skills he felt he may have developed over the course of his career including the time he spent in CID which might help him in working in partnership this respondent describes control. He referred to the lack of control he has and how other people can affect his work. Many respondents in the police and the NHS identified control and relinquishing control as being a key feature of partnership working. This concept was linked closely to that of ‘trust’.

This respondent, when asked about the skills she developed in the CID, answered pointedly,

Zoë: I guess my manipulative skills but I had those before.

She does not particularly associate the skill of manipulation to her work in the CID. However, she does link manipulation as a skill that is useful in partnership working. Interestingly the partnership she worked in was adept at trading in the commodities of trust and control. In expertly utilising control they were able to distribute power meantly to other partnership members – this theme will be developed more fully in Chapter 10.

7.9 Conclusion

Table 9 below presents the explicit and implicit skills and inhibitors, developed by the police, through their occupational and career development.
### Table 10 Partnership skills derived from experience: The Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are drawn from</th>
<th>Explicit Skills</th>
<th>Implicit Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime commitment to the post</td>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of life before in forming skills</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class and misspent youth as a driver in social development</td>
<td>Blunt</td>
<td>Personal knowledge of young people/ deprived communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Open</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demanding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the ‘ethos of the role’</td>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Belonging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background in the CID</td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
<td>Manipulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public Speaking</td>
<td>Guarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11 Inhibitors to partnership working derived from experience: The Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are drawn from</th>
<th>Explicit Inhibitors</th>
<th>Implicit Inhibitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime commitment to the post</td>
<td>Orthodox</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of life before in forming skills</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class and misspent youth as a driver in social development</td>
<td>Blunt, Directive, Bullying</td>
<td>Insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the ‘ethos of the role’</td>
<td>Expectation Gap</td>
<td>Rigid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ignorant of the way other agencies work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background in the CID</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>Manipulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Control, Guarded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negotiation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As you can see from Table 10 above there are several skills identified by the researcher which would work well in a multi-agency forum such as a Community Safety Partnership. Some of these skills are explicit: known, stated and agreed upon, and others are implicit. When implicit, the skill has been observed by the researcher as latent or as underpinning, core expressed skills.

It is also apparent that some of the skills identified also form inhibitors to partnership working, skills such as loyalty, control and manipulation. These inhibitors are explored in more detail and the manner in which they coalesce in the following chapters but specifically in Chapter 11. They form a core of skills which can be used for 'good or ill'. It could be argued that manipulation may not always be problematic for a partnership if it is used to guide others into making decisions more quickly then would otherwise be the case. This is the efficiency debate that is often used by partners to explain essentially closed decision-making processes and is described in more detail when looking at the distribution of power.

Although it is hoped that the above table offers some clarification to the reader and an opportunity to compare the skills with those of the NHS described at the end of the following chapter, it is clear that this is not the whole story. It fails to account for the social situation, context and influence of other partners, which makes a direct comparison of skills limited in its effectiveness. Some of these issues are explored in more detail in the following chapters.
8. Chapter Eight
The NHS: Who are they?

8.1 Introduction

As already discussed, very little research has been done into the personal history and social class of origin of those who work in the NHS. The NHS is a diverse institution and as such recruits a diverse workforce. At last count the NHS could claim a workforce of over 1.3 million employees and to be the biggest single employer in Great Britain (along with the hotel and restaurant sector) (Office of National Statistics, 2005). It is conceptualised as a health care institution, however it provides opportunities for employment in management, research, strategic and financial development, community work, health promotion and primary and secondary health amongst others. The respondents in this research were drawn mainly from management but many of them had experience of some of these other areas within the NHS.

In sociology there is also a paucity of research conducted on NHS culture and what has been done has focussed on discrete occupational cultures within the NHS such as: doctors, nurses or consultants and the way they interact. However, unlike the police, there has been no research on the defining characteristics of a ‘NHS worker’. Its difficult conception, birth and development, the twin accountabilities to state and patient and its problematic placement politically in no doubt contribute to this inability to identify the key characteristics of the ‘NHS worker’. The NHS is essentially an institution representing a socialist ideal that has had to endure periods of fairly dramatic financial deprivation and policy manoeuvring, and is constantly in the political spotlight.

In this research five respondents were interviewed at the three field site sites that worked explicitly for the NHS and were representing that body’s interests at partnership. Ruth a clinical psychologist in the third location was unavailable for interview and one respondent, a senior alcohol nurse working for the local Primary Care Trust, was interviewed as part of the pilot study. Finally, five drug workers
were interviewed in the three field site sites partly because they had a close working relationship with the police and the NHS but also because they were often viewed and treated (by the police) as ‘part of the NHS’. The funding of these posts was often complex and could have involved part or full funding at some point by the NHS. Drug workers often stayed in the same locality and other professionals would not know that periodically they had had a dramatic few months reapplying for funding and redefining their post. However, the local council, the DAT or social services, usually by utilising funding streams such as ‘Communities Against Drugs’, funded all the drug workers at the time of this research. It is also important to add that those situated within the NHS did not identify drug workers as being ‘part of the NHS’. They were regarded as important colleagues as they were often engaged in contracting out drug services but they remained outside the remit of the NHS. Perhaps this diversity in the public health role helps to account for the lack of an established and discrete occupational culture.

8.2 Atypical Construction of the Other

For the NHS working in partnership their ‘public’ image amongst other agencies and particularly the police seemed most important. This was due to the ‘expectation gap’ that was created between the construction of the other agency (through various means) and the ‘ethos of the role’ in this example by the police about the NHS. However, it is not unlikely that this process may occur amongst other agencies (to a lesser or greater degree). A significant reason for this is that the police have powerful tools at their disposal, such as self-promotion and media manipulation, which means their image of themselves and their public image closely coincide. Therefore agencies were more likely to get what they were expecting when working with the police. The NHS proved to be ‘a whole other kettle of fish’, the NHS has become a victim of bad press rather than a (co)creator of good press. The NHS as a public institution has become involved in a powerful process of negotiation between the public and the state: a social litmus test to government performance. A similar statement could be made about the police and crime rates – but political manipulation of these has made them less trustworthy, to the public and media gaze. As such, the NHS uniquely, amongst its neighbouring institutions, endures a process of ‘atypical
construction’. Atypical construction is the ascribing of characteristics, features or attitudes to another agency and by association their employees that do not wholly exist. This is explored in more detail below when looking at ‘commitment to the ethos of the role’. In this section testimonial from other agencies has been used to display the quite radical differences in perceptions held by the police about the NHS, as opposed to the view held by health care professionals with regards to their own organisation. This provides evidence for the ‘expectation gap’ between agencies preconceptions (or those staff who work within them) and atypical constructions when dealing with other agencies.

In addition to these themes this Chapter also considers the role of longevity in post, the importance of ‘life before’ in forming skills, and social class as a driver to development. It is argued that, as with the police, a life before working in the NHS or healthcare had no apparent impact on skills developed for partnership working. The impact of class as a driver was considerably different to that experienced by the police and commitment to the ethos of the role was organised around key strategic themes and was fragmented when compared to that experienced by the Police.

8.3 Lifetime commitment to the post

Partnership representatives from the NHS were split between a clinical or administrative background. All of the partnership representatives were no longer in clinical practice (except one who was interviewed as an expert in his field and the absent partnership member referred to as Ruth). However, the two most prominent and vocal had a background in clinical practice, one as a clinical psychologist and the other as a nurse.

Clinical

The majority of all NHS workers could make claims to longevity in their careers. This was in part due to the strategic importance of their role and the senior posts they occupied. In those with a clinical background it is clear that this work is also considered vocational and that, in a sense there is a ‘calling’ to do it. Those with a
Clinical background have had to undergo many years of academic and workplace training before being able to consider themselves qualified. They have then undergone further training to become NHS managers. They have a thorough understanding of all aspects of the NHS, its recent development economically and bureaucratically, how it serves patients and communities and probably most importantly for partnership, how it purchases and provides services. After all, this was probably the first formalised attempt at working in ‘partnership’ with other agencies (and within their own). As we shall see below, although the impact is perceived as being somewhat limited it did begin the process of opening the door to the NHS buying services from external suppliers and considering the impact of other voluntary and statutory agencies on its work.

Similarly to the police respondents, NHS workers were able to say:

Sandra: CV?! 24 years man and boy.

Tim: I have worked in the health service all of my working life.

Their backgrounds in clinical services and their thorough overview of how the NHS was provided gave them a unique understanding of the problems within their organisation. This respondent describes how he had witnessed a time where he felt service provision was inhibited by the organisational structures that were in place.

Tim: My background is clinical and I got into management because I thought some of the solutions for patients were about doing the services differently and it worked that kind of thinking, through learning disabilities, mental health services and community services. And at the same time PCTs were thought of, I had been working on the interface between General Practice and other health services and the fact that that is another of those boundaries, which mitigates against care for the individual.

He was very aware of the problems that were inherent in an organisation which operates from specific ‘pockets’ organisationally and theoretically. Aims for a patient’s care may be very different from each of the practitioners who are working with that patient; a GP may have one aim and a specialist another. These clinical problems that manifest themselves in continuity of care reflect the fragmented nature of the NHS and its problems in providing a cohesive approach.
Administrative

Those who have been termed ‘Administrative’ had work backgrounds which were (unsurprisingly) diverse when compared to their colleagues. They had histories that showed a commitment to public services and a gradual movement into healthcare. Two of the sample who worked for the NHS without a clinical background had a history of working in the housing sector. The housing sector seems to provide a foundation in community work and partnership working as well as an affinity for health promotion work.

Sonia: I worked for a local authority working in a housing department. So I worked in housing and was a trainee and then a housing officer responsible for a patch. So after that I went into the old Family practitioner committees - which changed into family health authorities with GPs becoming fund holding so I was head of planning there for a couple of years. And that was mainly managing and meeting people for a chat. Working with family care practitioners - this was in the early 90’s.

This respondent was the dedicated representative from the Primary Care Trust (in Wales). She worked in three Community Safety Partnerships and was a point of contact and liaison for partnerships that wanted contact with NHS services. The majority of the partnership she worked in did not understand what her role was.

8.4 Importance of ‘life before’ in forming skills

There is little evidence to suggest that a diverse work background provides more skills for partnership working. Those with a clinical background did not mention (when prompted) any other type of work before working in the NHS. Those from an administrative background talked about their career from the earliest point that seemed to characterise the ‘beginning’ of their current career and this was usually very early on in their work history as is shown by the following respondent,

Rebecca: I was originally from 1981 actually probably a bit earlier than that, I was a community development worker - working particularly around women’s health and housing - tenants and housing issues. And I worked for an independent voluntary sector body.
A social work background was a feature of four of the respondents. Two had become drug workers and two probation officers.

Moira: Social work. Before that I was - oh it was such a long time ago, I went to work at the University at the finance department and then came down here then went back to Scotland and did my social work training - so I can qualify in social work.

8.5 Social class as a driver

Class did not explicitly feature in the story told by NHS workers, perhaps because those situated within the ‘middle class’ apparently occupy the standard norm and it is thus considered unremarkable. There was very little biographical data disclosed and no talk about childhood, adolescence or families. This was a very different experience to the police, where their background was an important aspect of who they were. The interviews with NHS workers, be they from a clinical or administrative background, kept to the matter at hand. All of the healthcare professionals in the study were educated to university level. Although it is possibly inappropriate to use university education as an indicator of class today, it is interesting that almost none of the police officers attended university and all of the healthcare professionals had done so.

Occupational or social class is a thorny issue, which is notoriously difficult to define (Duke et al., 1987). Unfortunately, I did not ask all of my respondents the occupation of their father – although the Registrar General’s categorisation of class is well known to be problematic as is the National Statistics ‘Socio-economic Classifications’, because they impute class from occupation (Walkerdine, 2003). Using education as an indicator of class of origin, or current classification, is also problematic; my sample ranged in age from 32-55 and therefore could have attended university between 1970-1995. During this period there were changes in higher education – most notably the opening of polytechnics and the increase in numbers going into education. However research indicates that class differentials remain clear in higher education, with those from a working class background less likely to attend university and when they do more likely to attend a less prestigious university (Egerton and Halsey, 1993). Moreover within feminist literature there is a clear
reliance on social class for rooting or ascertaining one's identity, even amongst the ‘educated’ (Hey, 2003), suggesting the primacy of this form of stratification. Indeed, both Beck (1992) and Walkerdine (2001) identify education not as a technique to achieve upward mobility but merely an attempt to insulate against downward mobility. Drawing on information gained at interview there were clear class differences in the occupational groups in the research sample. The police presented (mainly) with a working class background and the NHS with a middle class background.

Social class of course is not just about occupation, income, education or life chances. It is about behaviour, political, social and economic. It is also indicative of what is considered socially acceptable and about the history and context of the individual and their class relations. As Kuhn suggests ‘Class is not just about the way you talk, or dress or furnish your home; it is not just about the job you do or how much money you make doing it; nor is it merely about whether or not you have ‘A’ levels or went to university, nor which university you went to. Class is something beneath your clothes, under your skin, in your reflexes, in your psyche, at the very core of your being.’ (1995: 98). All of these things remain pertinent to partnership working. An example of this remains in the observed way the police work in partnership, some of whose aspects are blunt, frank and demanding:

Patrick: (stands, leans across conference table) So, are you with us or against us? (Index finger stabs at conference table.) (Field Notes S2)

Of course, the other issue is that this reaction is mediated by the respondent being situated within police culture and the ethos of the role. This reaction ‘are you with us or against us’ is very common and a well-known attitude and phrase in police partnership circles. Therefore, as already discussed, it is difficult to isolate it as a response embedded simply within a ‘class of origin’ reaction. However, we do know that the police is (largely) a working class organisation, although as argued, lately manifesting signs of embourgeoisement through the system of fast-tracking and recruitment of the university educated. Organisational culture clearly calls upon a complex interplay between personal and professional histories (Fielding, 1984). However, the organisational resistance to change means that culture is difficult to
alter as it holds onto old forms of working and old class loyalties introduced from origin to present. On the above occasion the reaction of the (researcher identified) middle-class professionals sitting at the table was one of vague surprise and accommodation. Afterwards the DAT and probation officer had the following reaction.

Julie: So you’re doing a PhD?

Researcher: Yes I’m looking at partnership working and information sharing between the police and health (they both smile).

Julie: It’s difficult.

Oliver: Yes. It’s really difficult to make the police understand that people are not trying to be deliberately obstructive.

Researcher: Humm.

Julie: I know. I used to be a police officer and I’m married to one! It’s the way that they are. They don’t understand how other organisations work. I’m intrigued to see if this project is going to work and how it will work.

Oliver: I know look how tense things got in here. The DAT is committed to the project but we can’t force people.

Researcher: Humm.

Oliver: Exactly they don’t understand that there isn’t someone to compel someone else. There is a clinical and…. an administrative side…

Researcher: …and an administrative side… (Simultaneously)

Oliver: Health is very different from the police. (Field Notes S2)

There was a sense of acceptance that this was ‘the way that the police worked’, that if you worked with the police then this was an ‘occupational hazard’. This represented a deep inhibitor to the way the police and the NHS worked together. The police response was mediated by their apparently ‘extreme’ but class situated responses. These responses were disregarded as part of police ‘culture’ and ‘quaint’ eccentricity. Essentially, justifiable, interesting, points were hidden behind police ‘bluster’. Another manifestation of this process can be seen in the final chapter on ‘consequences’ in the reported incidences of bullying. Respondents from many agencies engaged in what other agencies labelled as ‘bullying’. The police were not the only agency to adopt this as a form of ‘partnership working’ but it was the most
high profile with the highest incidence. The researcher is not asserting that working class culture is one founded in ‘bullying’ however, it could be argued that it is one situated in physicality and action rather than through more cautious cerebral measures associated with compromise and negotiation.

8.6 Commitment to the ethos of the role

The NHS has a strong public image. The ethos of the role is connected very firmly to this image, the work and the history of the organisation. The NHS is universal and free at the point of access. Most importantly the NHS has guaranteed clinical freedom for practitioners, meaning that treatment is awarded on the basis of need. These aspirations of course have rarely been achieved. Treatment has always had a cost implication and therefore has relied on rationing and budget constraints. This has become even more so since treatment has become more technological and interventions relatively more successful in extending life. A special case now has to be made to the health authority (the administrative arm) where treatments are expensive or ongoing. Also, increasingly, the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (comprising practitioners, patients, carers and ‘members of the public’) is called upon to make high profile decisions regarding the relative benefits against costs for particular forms of treatment or drug therapy.\footnote{see: www.nice.org.uk} Interestingly, NICE does not apply in Wales (or Scotland) where they have their own body for deciding on expensive or alternative treatments. NICE was an attempt to end the ‘postcode lottery’ for medical treatment. However, the Welsh body has been agreeing treatments which are being restricted or disallowed in England meaning families that are able have been choosing to move to Wales on the basis of enhanced medical treatment and thereby re-instigating the lottery aspect to medical treatment.\footnote{For more on this see the House of Lords Debate with Baroness Finlay of Landaff (Hansard: 18th January 2007 Column 773-775)} This is another example of how things are ‘different in Wales’ and devolution, although less extensive then that of Scotland has allowed Wales to engage in quiet revolutionary policy development.
Atypical Construction of the Other

As already mentioned, the key characteristic of atypical construction is the ascribing of characteristics, features or attitudes that do not wholly exist to another agency and by association their employees. This occurs through mainly macro social processes and is not affected by personal contact. In fact, two sets of conflicting conceptions can run alongside one another without apparent conflict. These reactions are often garnered in response to the unpredictability of national policy and form a rational reaction to this element of unpredictability. Elements of this process have been displayed by other agencies working in close proximity, and have been manifested in the form of interagency conflict and ‘name calling’.

This has been the subject of research when considering the relationship between social services and health care practitioners (Hudson, 2002; Snell, 2003). However, it has yet to be tackled in such a clear example, as between the police and the NHS, where those in question cannot even rely on interprofessionality as a source of cohesion. Interprofessionality is a concept referred to by Hudson (2002) where she discusses the professional commonalities between social services and health care practitioners as a potential source of collaboration. Nevertheless, even here problems arose between the social workers and nurses on the basis of distribution of services, health care being ‘free’ and universal and social service being means tested – conflict arising around the ‘ethos of the role’. Reasons for the distribution of services also arose in this research, but this time, tellingly, between the police and the NHS in Stonham when considering the allocation of treatment places to offenders as opposed to drug users.

Public perceptions and agency associations

There is a clear duality characterising the image of the NHS. It is partly situated in the history and context of the NHS which maintains its ‘royal’ associations with Beveridge and Bevan and its ‘holy’ associations with a universal social good. These two concepts are then imprinted on the idea of the ‘core role’ of the NHS: primary, frontline, A&E healthcare. Opposed to this image is that of the NHS as struggling. Although the financial problems began almost the day after its inception the vilifying
of the NHS for its financial inadequacies is a modern phenomenon. In addition the blame for this perceived financial mismanagement and local propensity for acquiring debts, amongst respondents, remains steadfastly with the NHS at a local level. Rather than being perceived as political mismanagement - this is possibly the only area which does not act as the governmental ‘litmus test’ of success. The NHS is currently perceived as struggling financially, bureaucratically and to modernise. Its staff are overworked and underpaid. It lacks an ability to communicate internally and externally: internally within and between departments, between its administrative and clinical arm and externally with its partners. These were all views that were shared by criminal justice respondents. Although apparently critical in their view of the NHS this only added to the ‘ethos of the role’. It was an embattled service, struggling to stay afloat with dedicated staff who were committed to their job, so much so that they could endure the organisational chaos which is attendant in working in this sector. It is this social and political context which provides ample fodder for the construction of atypical agency associations.

Isolating atypicality

Isolating the construction of these views became apparent quite early in this research where there was a clear disparity in the descriptions of the NHS by the police. The police were unlikely to criticise an organisation when it was linked closely to the ‘ethos of the role’, which in turn was linked to the ‘royal’ and ‘holy’ lineage mentioned above. However, they would criticise with impunity that which could be seen as current performance. Then views would be split between atypical perceptions and actual perceptions. Yet atypical perceptions would describe features and characteristics of the NHS and these would be drawn from sources other than personal experience. Actual perceptions would rely on experience of working with NHS workers. Atypical perceptions formed the dominant view and were not affected by actual perceptions. This remained true even in Greenton where relationships with the Chief Executive of the Primary Care Trust were cordial and collaborative. This is in no way meant to indicate that the actual experience of working with the NHS was for the police, nice, constructive, easy-going and ‘fluffy’. However, it is to suggest
that it was more positive than the atypical construction, more real, more challenging and far more interesting.

**8.7 Atypical Construction**

The following perceptions recorded by respondents are describing the NHS. To do this they call upon social experience. This is drawn from many different sources, hearsay, mass media and their own occupational culture. These responses fall into three areas, first, the commitment to the 'royal and holy' association of the NHS as an organisation, doing frontline work. Secondly there are the firmly held preconceptions of NHS employees, its organisation and social position. Finally there are descriptions drawn from face to face experience – actual perceptions.

*Royal and Holy*

As we have seen above the royal and holy perception of the NHS stems from the history and context of the organisation and its positioning within the British psyche and on the political stage. The following officer's conceptualisation of the NHS is about healthcare provision, but in a particular context. It links in with the ethos of the role for police. The picture painted is dramatic – 'its like ok corral'. It is also healthcare provision at the frontline. It is dealing with patients in its most reactive sense and is portrayed as violent and chaotic. It is a picture that fits perfectly with the ethos of the role for the police, working with the people on a Friday and Saturday night, when they are drunk and dangerous.

James: Yeah. You go - and I've done it professionally and with my own family - and uh - you know going to the hospital with my sons been assaulted and em or someone has been take in on a Friday or Saturday night and I dread it and I know what its going to be like and its like 'ok corral'. It's time consuming its stressful and of course it’s a violent and chaotic situation for staff to operate in.

Of course this is part of what those working in the NHS may do. However it represents (in the same way as the police and their frontline work) only a very small amount of what is done. This was a common description of services when the police described the role of NHS workers. However, not one of the NHS workers in this
study who were working in partnership, had a history which reflected the above. Additionally of course it could represent the point of interface between the police and the NHS. The time when these two public services come together is dealing with the chaos wreaked by Friday and Saturday night drinkers. Conversely in partnership the main interface came about through drug treatment and enforcement. This work lacks the element of chaos described above, as the treatment element is voluntary. Also, for the police, drug crime by high volume offenders tends to lack drama as it is perpetrated by non-violent drug users (Chaiken and Chaiken, 1990; O'Donnell, 2007).

Tom: They do an amazing job.

This was a common response by criminal justice agencies who were responding to their conception of the ‘ethos of the role’ which is linked to the royal and holy lineage of the NHS. The idea is that the health sector is, as the above respondent describes, about primary healthcare. There is an aspect to the healthcare practitioners role, which is unassailable – that of making people better. It is the modern packaging which is problematic.

8.7.1 Preconceptions

The following preconceptions form the core of the atypical construction of the NHS by the police. They provide a rigid framework in which the police officers (current and retired) can categorise and formulate their expectations of working in partnership. These constructions then go on to instruct the way in which they work in partnership with the NHS.

Evidence-based decision-making

The following respondent is describing a process of medical investigation for an ailing patient. He is utilising the medical model of investigation, isolating the problem, providing a course of treatment and then evaluating the outcome. He is describing the course of action many NHS respondents suggest that the police do not
employ in the formulation of community projects. This officer then goes on to say that the NHS do not offer this. They offer tea, sympathy and support.

Patrick: You could say what are Anne’s problems at the outset and then let’s assess Anne’s problems after the course of treatment - but if you start to ask though there is none of that in there. In a lot of cases - but what they prefer to focus on is providing you with tea and sympathy, support.

This officer has taken what is normally portrayed as an NHS asset – the aspect of patient care - and presented it as a criticism. He is critiquing this process because he feels that they do not assess the impact of their work. This officer was working on the drug project where officers expressed their belief that drug users should get treatment first because of their adverse impact on the community. However, it was felt that those who worked in treatment would rather offer ‘tea and sympathy’ then take a hard look at their work and what it actually achieves.

The Struggle

The following retired officer and community safety manager is describing how the NHS struggles, has no long-term plans and lacks imagination.

Tom: They are very much, you know it is what have we got on the agenda today. There’s, there’s, very little blue light, you know blue skies thinking there what can be delivered. Whenever I talk to my colleagues in the health service they are really up against it. They survive in the day. If they can get through the day, it really is sometimes that way. (B4int)

This lack of imagination is due to the pressure that his health colleagues are up against. However, he then goes on to describe the NHS and its inability to manage change. It is the portrayal of an organisation that is finding it difficult to ‘survive,’ and this was a widespread view. They ‘don’t know where they are themselves’ but also their inability to fix themselves in the process of change provokes sympathy. There is a quality to the NHS organisation which attracts such comments along with a critique regarding the NHS and its inability to manage its core business. There also seems to be a tacit split in the comments between the ‘clinical’ practitioners and ‘administrative’ managers. The link with the ‘royal’ and ‘holy’ is strengthened when
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93 See interviews: James, Sean, Tom, Richard and field notes, S1.
linked to the core role of healing and healthcare – rather than the essential role of managing services. Whereas the police (until relatively recently)\textsuperscript{94} embody both aspects of this role, they are at once the administrator and the practitioner, they still maintain the ethos of the (front line) practitioner, which remains uppermost in their conception of their role.

*Communication and Change*

All agencies within this research had undergone radical changes in their core business during the proceeding 20 years. This can be particularly seen in the probation service and its movement from a social services type organisation to an extension of the criminal justice system (Newman and Nutley, 2005). The police also have undergone ‘root and branch’ reform \textsuperscript{95} and more recently changes in the scope, distribution and organisation of their services. These changes have been variable in the success of their organisational penetration. Certainly, in the police force there is a well developed resistance to change (Chan, 1997). However, the police have become adept at incorporating change whilst maintaining a loyalty to the ethos of the role (Irving et al., 2002). The NHS have undergone recurrent, often annual, policy changes for the past 25 years and this change is much more open to public scrutiny then that of any other organisation due to their positioning socially and politically.

The following respondent is describing the level of engagement in Bingham by the NHS and then goes on to describe the reaction to change. Bingham is situated in Wales, which had recently undergone quite radical changes in response to devolution of health budgets to the local parliament. There had been the creation of Local Health Boards as the commissioners of services and Primary Care Trusts as the providers of services. The Local Health Boards were smaller, more numerous and (more likely) to be coterminous with other Local Councils.

Tom: We have actually engaged health and National Health Service trust, who are the deliverers but then we have got the Local Health Board who are the commissioners. They have got problems between themselves, I don’t know if you have noticed that but the big battle, the big battle in communications is there. As I said they do tend to use it as a smokescreen.

\textsuperscript{94} There has been an increased recruitment of civilians to administrative posts within the police (Walker, 2000). Perhaps the creation of an administrative arm?

\textsuperscript{95} In particular see The White Paper on Police Reform (1993) and The Sheehy Inquiry (1993).
We've all, were all in constant change, whether you’re in the council or you yourself when you embarked on your studies. Life changes doesn’t it? You can’t use it as an excuse you have got to live with it. And if you know you are going to be in an environment that is constantly changing well then you manage that change. They don’t seem to, they don’t seem to have grasped that.

It is worth noting that this respondent was adept at ‘talking up’ the partnership he was managing. This is tackled in Chapter Ten when looking at the distribution of power within partnerships. He was also skilled at delivering sharp critiques of the way other organisations worked – especially when their perceived incompetence reflected badly on his own domain (Bingham CSP). I observed six months of meetings in this locality and interviewed both of the representatives from the LHB and PCT. Although the relationship did not seem close, it did seem cordial and business like. This was in part due to their very different roles within the respective branches of their organisation.

The LHB representative, Sandra, was the chief executive and responsible for the commissioning of services for Bingham. Sonia was a ‘point of contact’ for other agencies who wanted to communicate with the PCT, therefore her role was more about mediating the experience of other agencies and managing process then provision of outcomes. In the partnership there was a lack of understanding about what it was the LHB did and what the PCT did, additionally there was a lack of understanding about the role of Sandra and Sonia. As can be seen, it is not actually important that Sandra and Sonia have a particularly good relationship, as the purpose of their respective roles is very different. The LHB assessed need in the community, had a budget for the size of the population and then purchased primary and secondary health care from a variety of sources, but primarily the PCT. If the communication difficulties were on an organisational level between the PCT and LHB then this was not revealed in interview. The PCT representative gave a thorough and frank description of healthcare structure in Wales and although she felt there were problems in the way services were currently supplied she did not highlight a ‘rift’ between the purchaser and provider of services. The above respondent seems to be suggesting that the health sector representatives are using their own communication problems as a smokescreen – this seems more likely to refer to the
misunderstanding amongst the partnership around what it was they did and what it was they could offer. Hence, they would often ask the PCT for information or commitments that could only be provided by the LHB and vice versa.

The respondent then goes on to describe the process of change, and the degree to which it can be managed. He is suggesting that the NHS and those who work in the organisation should not have chosen to work for the NHS if they are not adept at accepting change. That is a misperception as is shown below. The NHS are skilled at adapting to change. They are also (like other organisations) good at foraging for the nuggets of policy or procedure that may improve performance – and leaving the rest. This is particularly true for practitioners or those from a practitioner background. However, the consequence of this is piecemeal reform often derived from piecemeal governmental policy. The consequence for partnership working is that the NHS is perceived as inadequate and struggling to modernise. The following respondent expands upon this perception,

Barbara: I think they are completely bogged down by the whole issue around the new organisational changes to the PCT…So health hasn’t engaged, never has and probably never will.

This respondent is describing the situation in England, where recent organisational changes (not as radical as those experienced in Wales) were causing great shifts in the provision of services. In England the PCT purchased services, and budgets, along with budgetary constraints, were passed down from the Department of Health. There is a sense in this data that the NHS had turned inwards to deal with this raft of changes, and as a consequence of this were not engaging in a crime reduction agenda. However, from this respondent and others there was a definite judgment attached to this account and it was largely negative. The only respondents who saw this as a rational reaction were a health sector employee (Sonia) and a drug worker (Emma). The perception of those situated in the criminal justice sector was uniformly pessimistic. The consequences for the NHS in partnership are that they are perceived as being unable to manage change and disinterested in a criminal justice agenda.
Organisational Complexity

The following respondent is articulating a very common statement by employees situated within the criminal justice arena:

Richard: Well the most difficult thing with health is - one is there is many elements to health and again unless you have had the opportunity to learn about it you will never learn what the structure is. It is massive.

The above respondent was situated in the Stonham partnership – the drug project. These comments about the NHS occurred most frequently in this partnership as their need to understand the NHS was most pertinent to the success of the project and therefore their failure more damaging. In other partnerships ignorance of the way the NHS was organised ranged from blatant ignorance to sloppy disinterest and finally to rational apathy. Rational apathy was when another organisation chose to only invest interest in the limited contact points that they had with the NHS. Sloppy disinterest was where an agency feigned understanding when it was clear little actually existed, so that sloppy disinterest acted as an inhibitor to future learning. Blatant ignorance was where organisations did not understand how the other organisation worked and sometimes refused to engage in any learning around how the NHS worked. In actuality the NHS is not more or less difficult to understand than any other organisation. However, it could not be more different than the police in the way that it is organised, therefore learning involves an ontological shift on the part of the police.

This preconception about the NHS and the ease with which it could be understood was severely detrimental to partnership working. Officers often attended with the attitude that it was just going to be ‘too difficult to work in partnership’ along with a sense that trying to learn about the NHS was going to be time-consuming.

Lack of Vision

The following respondent was situated in Bingham where the LHB representative was very proactive and was interested in locating a treatment service within the local prison as well as liaising with other CSP partners to facilitate this process. Whilst the
researcher was situated in the partnership, this potential project, which was highly pertinent to then national and international policy and guidance regarding treatment, was ignored. Partly this seemed to be because the police were not needed. As such, the ‘community safety’ aspect of this project was ‘invisible’. This is a form of agenda-setting and pursued in more detail in chapter nine. Despite this the following officer has this to say about the health sector engagement in Bingham.

James: I am still totally convinced that they do not realise the advantages to their own, department, agency, service, that working with other people (the CDRP) can have impact on performance. They still see that they’re really helping us to achieve our objectives and it’s not really helping them - that’s how I think they still view it.

This also contradicts what the CSP manager was saying above, where he indicates that the PCT and LHB are ‘engaged’ – unless engagement means attendance. The above description was a commonly held opinion by criminal justice agencies, who perceived disengagement as ignorance over the criminal justice agenda and the potential to link in with the NHS agenda. This actually was rarely the case. If mentioned at all, NHS professionals would often describe their lack of commitment as being about having other pressing concerns.96 There was also the sense that engaging in a criminal justice agenda may not be the best way to impact on performance (for more on this see the section on evidence-based decision-making below). The consequence for partnership working between the police and NHS of this preconception was an expectation that the NHS would not engage in the criminal justice agenda.

Money as a driver to partnership working

Money was often described as a driver to gain agency commitment and participation. Although this could be said of all agencies it was often stated as the only way to gain commitment by the NHS. The NHS was perceived as only being interested in partnership working if there was a clear and obvious pay-off such as increased revenue. Many agencies engaged in partnership working for reasons of collaboration, they attended partnership working to find out what other agencies were doing.

96 See interviews with Rebecca, Sonia, Moira.
particularly to see if there was an overlap. Could they potentially collaborate on a single issue or 'palm off' this responsibility onto another agency? This rational reaction to partnership working nevertheless lacked spontaneity and generosity. There is more about this in Chapter Nine, but in general this rationality was either accepted and incorporated into partnership working or remained in 'disguise'. When in disguise agencies who responded in a rational manner were denigrated for this approach.

Tom: Health have been invited all the time, but of course you know they said they were coYnIng, they wouldn’t come and it took me really, you know a couple of visits to their premises to sit down and tell them, you know, its not a case of we would like you to come, it’s a case of you’ve got to come to meetings, it’s a statutory obligation. But I think what brought it all home was when the substance misuse funding was given to the partnership. When I went down and saw them I asked to see their books (laughs), you know, and money talks doesn’t it. And now they realise that if they want some of that money they have to come to the meeting.

This respondent is also describing his power over another agency, the power he has to compel them to work in partnership. He is using money as a carrot, but rightly states it is a statutory obligation. As already mentioned the Welsh Assembly did funnel substance misuse money through the local CSPs. It is not clear why this was done, but in partnership circles it was regarded as a tool to secure NHS interest in the criminal justice agenda. The following excerpt is from a Detective Sergeant who was promoting a drug project he had worked on in a training event held by Stonham:

Alan: I’ve 5 tips for getting health involved. The first one is money. MONEY. Get the money and then you’ll get health involved. (Field notes S4)

This was actually the only tip for engaging the NHS that was articulated by the officer. Again it mirrors the sense above of a rational response to partnership working. The NHS will engage with the police when they have secured funding. In the session, which lacked a representative from the health sector, there was a sense of the NHS being portrayed as organisationally self-interested and that this was a problem. The effect that this had on partnership working was the NHS being
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97 This officer was not part of the interview sample or part of the pilot interviews.
perceived as essentially selfish and lacking the inherent generosity necessary for true ‘community partnership working’. Again, the source of this attitude was situated at a macro level where government policy and budgetary constraints meant most organisations have little freedom or slippage in the local implementation of their budgets.

8.7.2 Actual Perceptions

Face to face encounters with the health sector revealed a variety of reactions. They were often contradictory to the atypical construction, which has been implied from the descriptions above. At times they incorporated elements of the above, however, their concerns were more complicated and more ‘real’. This sense of realism emanated from the complexities that are inherent in working with other organisations different from your own.

**Individual**

Descriptions of individuals from the health sector would, generally, engender positive comments as illustrated below.

James: Sonia she’s umm you know she’s um sharp, she’s capable and umm…she knows her stuff…

Tom: She is a very astute woman. Very astute.

Both of these respondents were generally very critical of the health sector and the degree of contribution they made on the partnership. However, when it came to describing the individual, rather than the organisation they described characteristics which would be an asset to partnership working, such as being astute and knowledgeable. This is a very different response to that recorded above in preconceptions where the conclusion drawn is that the NHS is struggling, and struggling to change.
Dominant perceptions:

The following respondent is working in the Greenton partnership where working relationships with the PCT are good. They all talk very favourably about the new Chief Executive of the PCT:

Mike: I think the main catalyst for change has been LT he actually comes to the partnership meetings - to the party - with a refreshing outlook on what the health service can do to partnership where as before we never got the senior executive at any of the partnership meetings there was always ‘Oh I’ll nip in today.’ Or ‘Someone else will nip in-’ the following week or the following month. We never got the same person or representative. Sometimes there was no health at all. It was very difficult to build ANY relationship if there is NO ONE there! I got no sense of commitment - I have to say - he is a breath of fresh air.

However, it is also clear that he is presenting Tim as different to his experience of working in partnership in Greenton. He gives a detailed account of the problems that they have had in the past, the inconsistencies. In the time period he is describing the NHS did not have a statutory responsibility to attend CSP meetings. Therefore, to some extent, their inconsistency is justified, as it was not a priority for them. This was a problem in all partnerships where health services did not have statutory responsibility to attend partnership meetings and contribute to the local strategy until some 5 years after other agencies. As a result of this levels of commitment in the health sector were variable. Tim had decided to ‘act as if’ he had statutory responsibility as he knew – at some point- he would have to attend meetings as an equal partner. Tim is presented by the police as unique. As the atypical construction is always dominant, any action by the NHS is pressed into this framework, regardless of actual meaning behind the action – which may be as a result of macro policy processes or organisational shortcomings. The construction of an atypical image of an organisation renders unnecessary a deeper investigation of reasons for action and inhibits deeper understanding of organisational drivers.

Learning

The following respondent had moved from ignorance to learning where the NHS as an organisation was concerned. He had gone from a very limited perception of the NHS and what service provision included to gaining some insight into the NHS
works. He does this by comparing the NHS to the two organisations he has some understanding of; the police and probation. He then goes on to say how they differ and what makes it so difficult to learn about the NHS. He does something very common among police, which is to compare other organisations to their own unfavourably. They would have difficulty understanding why everyone would not choose to adopt a hierarchical structure. Actually, the NHS is exceedingly hierarchical – it is just that those hierarchies are often many in number, run in parallel and are truncated in nature.

Robert: Health are a nightmare. Not because the people are not lovely or because they don’t care it is because of the organisational set-up - I had someone describe it to me. If you look at all the agencies you’ve got the police as a Big Island and then Probation as a Big Island and you’ve got the health service and it is a load of little islands and some of those islands have got bridges to one to the other. Some speak to each other some don’t - and to us - meself and Dave and the others and to make representations and such like and to say ‘this is it we have a plan here, we want to do this we want to do that, we want to achieve that and support our people through this programme,’ to actually find someone in the health service that we could go to and say ‘can you take responsibility can you give us a Yes or No on this?’ Has been an absolute nightmare.

He is also describing the frustration of finding the one person who will take responsibility for a single project. In the drug project that he worked on in Stonham, a single point of contact was found and was responsible for the decision-making. The problem occurred when the police discovered that she was not supportive of their project and had no intention of committing any resources. Therefore the above respondent did receive an answer – but the answer was ‘No’. Eventually, when contacted by other agencies and ‘wooed’ by the DAT she did offer limited support, but it was still not the unequivocal ‘Yes’, that the police wanted to hear. The respondent continued,

Robert: If only there were one person in the NHS that you could talk to - who could do everything, then it could be so much easier.

And his colleague on the same project made the following point with regards to the above clinical psychologist who initially said, ‘No’.
Patrick: Yeah it is like okay - but who does she work for? She must work for a manager now who is that and why can't they just say - 'you do what you're told.' Now that is very simple - but that is because that is how we work ultimately. If you don't get what you want out of a certain level you just go to the chief and the chief will let you know.

What is interesting about these two descriptions is this element of 'getting real' which is explored in more detail in chapter nine. The above police respondents are expressing how frustrating they find working with the NHS. They are engaging in some problem-solving activities and isolating what would make their lives easier, a single point of contact and someone who is in charge who can make the decisions. Unfortunately, as already described, they did find someone who could make decisions but they didn't like the decision she had made. However the point made by the second respondent, reflects his own understanding. He understands that this is really reflecting the way he works and that is why he wants to find a similar response in another agency. Face to face contact and actual working with other agencies does offer the opportunity of eroding the dominant atypical construction. However, it will only take a small upset to drive organisations back into old patterns and display a reliance on traditionally held views – the atypical construction. An example of this is with the above two officers, whose understanding of the NHS was greater than many of their colleagues, but who would resort nevertheless to mainstream police orientated descriptions of the ‘other agency’ when they failed to get their own way. Therefore, even here learning is ends orientated and constituted within their own organisational needs.

8.8 Working with conflicting views

Interestingly this meant that respondents outside of the NHS had a highly developed sense of the NHS, what they did and who they were and when asked about ‘the NHS’ could respond quite clearly about what it was the NHS did. Descriptions of what it was that they did would rely on frontline healthcare provision and be linked to the ‘royal and holy’ lineage described above. Organisational descriptions would involve a retreat into the known territory of the atypical construction to make sense of their often negative experiences of working in partnership with the NHS. Whereas actual descriptions of individuals and their associated agency (rather than the NHS but the PCT, LHB or mental health services) would be generally complimentary about the
person they were working with, here descriptions were varied, descriptive and multi-
layered.

Consequences of this form of construction

The utilisation of the atypical construction as a way of making sense of partnership working and the actions of other agencies is a time consuming and inefficient way of working. It is an inhibitor to partnership working, causes walls between partners, and ascribes negative characteristics with little actual proof and leads to power discrepancies and disengagement. Reliance on the atypical construction impedes opportunities for learning and understanding, because it prevents agencies locating actual or perceived problematic working relationships in a larger social or political context.

8.9 NHS Respondents

NHS workers, be they from a clinical or administrative background, unlike the police, did not explicitly describe the ‘ethos of the role’. They were reflexive in their descriptions of their work and what they saw as the challenges the organisation had faced and was about to face. However this did not amount to any detailed description regarding the almost mythical qualities of the work. Descriptions of the work and their role largely fell into four categories; accountability, clinical responsibility, evidence-based decision-making and change.

Accountability

The respondent below is describing the effect of the Griffiths Report and the introduction of ‘general management’ in the NHS in 1982 (Hollliday, 1995; Lowe, 1994). At the time it marked the beginning of the financial backlash against the NHS and the beginning of ‘local administration’. It was an attempt to bring decision-making from the centre to the periphery; this was followed some 10 years later by the development of the internal market.
More recently, research conducted into the effects of the internal market concluded that it had little impact on the day to day working of the NHS (Le Grand et al., 1998), supporting the view that, like the police, the NHS is able to mimic change to maintain its core role. The reasons for this were felt to be complex as it is difficult to unpick all of the external and internal drivers responsible for the actions taken by workers. However further research into the character of those who work for trusts revealed that the dominant occupational group were still medical consultants. Therefore trust managers who were driven by financial priorities and central guidance did not have the upper hand. 98

Those in control and accountable remained the same power brokers who existed at the start of the NHS: the Consultants. 99 However, their aims and objectives had changed. Crilly and Le Grand (2004) identify this occupational group to be interested in quality and volume in provision, but that the concept of quality was dominant. They also went on to show that even trust managers who should have been dominated by financial constraints, were a heterogeneous group and those closest to service delivery were more likely to be influenced by quality of service. This finding concurs with the findings from this research that administrators within the NHS have a greater interest in patient provision and quality of care, as an end in itself rather than another target amongst others to be met, the closer they are to service delivery. However this research would also suggest that a history of service delivery and primary care experience also would cause a commitment to quality as the respondent below describes,

Sandra: An awful lot of the services that we can supply through the local health board aren’t with mainstream NHS - so we buy a lot of services from the independent sector - huge amount of care from the independent sector in

98 See: The Operation Of The Internal Market: Local Freedoms, National Accountabilities (NHS Executive, 1994) which considered the restriction of mergers by purchasers and providers to try and encourage competition. This is similar in function to the Monopolies and Mergers Commission for the public sector (Le Grand, 1994).

99 c.f. literature review chapter and public comments made by Bevan at the inception of the NHS (The Guardian, 1948).
nursing homes. We are actually in the process of accepting responsibility for commissioning prison health care services. We commission an awful lot of services from the voluntary sector. You can’t have these other people providing services of a lower quality they still have to abide by the same government frameworks, the same data protection - all of the quality parameters, which play a part day to day and are normal for the NHS.

This respondent had worked in the NHS for 24 years. She began as a Nurse and became a Nurse manager managing over 800 beds. She then moved into management and was the director of nursing at the Local Health Board and was in charge of commissioning. She had a great deal of autonomy in her role and a large budget. However, for her there was still a commitment to quality, which was derived from ‘quality parameters’, but this was ‘normal for the NHS.’

Clinical Responsibility

The second strand to the commitment to the role for the NHS staff is that of clinical responsibility. The majority of NHS workers who came from a clinical background would mention the primacy of clinical responsibility; usually this was done in the context of decision-making and providing care on the basis of need rather than any other criteria. This was particularly pertinent in the third location where, effectively, the police were asking the NHS to distribute resources on the basis of criminal record rather than clinical need. Of course, distribution of clinical resources is always subject to competing priorities (see above). However, there is a sense that this is the cornerstone to the ethos of the role for NHS workers. This characterisation as the fundamental aspect of their role therefore places them above other ‘petty’ concerns – such as financial constraints.

Tim: The health service is accountable to the public for doing things that make us more healthy, but on an individual basis I hold professionals accountable to their patients, primarily. They have a dual accountability and that is to our employer but we have guarded in this country the primacy of clinical responsibility - to the patient...The NHS has been very good in my view at meeting need as perceived by health professionals and we paternalistically look down on you and say what do you need and this is what we will give you.

100 For more on this see Toffiday, H (1978) Clinical Autonomy and Chapter 11 of this volume.
The above respondent is drawing a distinction between clinical responsibility and responsibility to the patient, highlighting the difference between what is clinically necessary and what is in the best interests of the patient. This respondent is well placed to tackle such debates given his background in clinical psychology and the field of learning and physical difficulties where the boundaries between social and clinical care are blurred. In a partnership context this meant that he was always concerned with the individual – how would this or that project affect the individual. Would it make the community more cohesive? Would it improve the delivery of healthcare? Was it empowering? This attitude meant that he was able to direct national priorities to a community level.

Interestingly, the police due to the legalistic nature of their work, are directed to only work with the individual in the form of a ‘case’. In a best-case scenario this would have an end point in a trial. This way of working obstructs and renders unnecessary any attempts at a longer-term engagement. Community policing, community drug projects and community enforcement such as the ‘North Town’ project are a clear exception to this way of working and are therefore highly problematic for the police. Only one officer in this sample exhibited a case study approach to working: Richard. However, he was uncomfortable with the description of his job as casework and very firmly situated it in a desire for a crime reduction, rather than the well-being of the individual.

Evidence-based decision-making

The following respondent is considering the importance of an evidence-base in decision-making processes within the NHS. It is seen as important mainly to prevent duplication and prevent wasting resources when developing projects.

Sarah: The police are talking about implementing a ‘wet house,’ somewhere the active street drinkers can go and drink. Brighton has one. A lot of the local community are up in arms about it as nobody wants it near them. The police are determined to have it. However what’s amazing is that there is no evidence that it is needed. If we make a decision in health it has to be evidenced based. The police remind me of nursing when I started. People used to come up with ideas and then go off and set up a plan without finding out how necessary it is, or if its been done before etc. Today we would have
to set up some research or pilot project and find out if it would work before ploughing money into it. They (the police) have set up no drink zones in the town to stop street drinking but they don’t enforce them and if they do move people on or confiscate alcohol they don’t keep a record.

Researcher: They don’t keep a record?

Sarah: No. So there is no evidence. If they had kept a record of how many they had moved on etc. then it is something they could provide to local residents associations as evidence of the problem but there is nothing. No evidence.

The respondent is describing how the police in her locality wanted to set-up a wet house. As far as she was aware there was no evidence of a wet house working. She had heard of one in another area and there had been various problems with it and integrating it within the local community and A&E department. However, she perceived it as being the ‘next big thing’ as far as community safety was concerned and this was the reason the police wanted to try it. This attitude was alien to her – the paradigm in which she worked encouraged her to go out and find evidence about what had worked in other areas, to bring those ideas together and then make a decision on the basis of all the evidence collected. She felt that the police did not work in this way and that the approach they adopted was old-fashioned. This was a common allegation made by the health sector against the police. Sonia in Bingham felt there that there was never a ‘base-line’ when new projects were started – therefore ‘everyone went round saying it was a success when there was no evidence’ to support the assertion (see Weatheritt, 1989). The same exasperation was exhibited in the interview with Sam who was interviewed as an expert in his field. He had been engaged in community safety initiatives for almost 20 years but felt that there was a lack of proper evaluation.

This lack of evidence-based decision-making was an inhibitor to partnership working between the police and the NHS. It meant that police-led activities were often not viewed as ‘serious’ as they were not presented in a way that offered evidence that they would actually work.101 This reliance by the police on the ‘next big thing’ is very much a part of police culture and their ability to adapt to circumstance and (politically at least) apparently ‘move with the times’. Conversely it is the inability of

101 See interviews Paul and Lillian.
the NHS to ‘move with the times’ which leads them to being the victim of political circumstance rather than creator of high profile opportunities. This also stems from their understanding of their core role: healthcare, which is situated in the social history and development of the organisation. What need have they to move with the times? Both of these organisations have taken different tacks in response to the radical changes that have occurred in the public sector.

Change

Given the constant change that has been a characteristic of the NHS since its inception but particularly in the last twenty years, it is understandable that change – ignoring it, resisting it, managing it, and incorporating it – is a fundamental part of the ethos of the role.102

Tim: The structure of primary care trusts has been the best I have worked in yet for engaging General Practitioners in health strategy, but also having a body, which had a ‘whole population’ responsibility. I think Health Authorities largely failed on that. Discharging various responsibilities for their community they focused almost entirely on acute care and I thought PCTs if they were going to do anything needed to focus on the health improvement agenda. Development of primary care and the interfaces within health and between health and other organisations in order to get the best outcome.

Researcher: Because principally services have always been very fragmented.

Tim: And still are! This is a way of engaging with those fragments, a creative way of sustaining their independence, with a way of functioning but engaging them more in responsibility - the character of responsibility. So that is where I got too.

This respondent had knowledge of context and history, which firmly embedded him within his organisation. Walshe (2003: 108) describes what he considers the effects of constant change on the health service and health service workers, he believes it makes them have a ‘deeply cynical and dismissive attitude to any innovation and change—‘we've seen it all before, nothing works, just ignore it and keep your head down because it won't last very long’’. However this is not the case with this respondent, who it seems, has always reacted positively to change in the health

102 cf Literature review chapter with particular reference to ‘market forces’ section and Appendix 3 for list of the policy changes occurring in the preceding 25 years.
service. Possibly this could have to do with his own sense of investment in his work as a consultant and as we saw above, the focus on quality in delivery linked to his closeness to service provision and commitment to patients. Here change has acted as a driver in maintaining his commitment to the core role.

8.10 Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the key skills that the NHS brings to partnership working. This has been done by drawing from their own testimony and that of the police as well as drawing on other key drivers to skill development such as social class, longevity in their chosen career and ‘having a life before’. What has been discovered is that strongly held perceptions by other agencies coalesce in the creation of an atypical construction of the other agency. The effect of this is a powerful inhibitor to partnership work and detrimental to the degree of engagement and commitment offered by the ‘victim’ agency. Although this is, to a degree, experienced by other agencies it was not so marked. This seems to be because of the placement of the NHS socially and politically. This high-profile position leads to organisational exposure. Also for an agency like the police the atypical construction of the NHS then forms the dominant view of that agency and displacing or eroding that view becomes extremely problematic.

Skills

The skills displayed by the staff of the NHS mirror many of the skills highlighted for the police in the preceding chapter. The atypical construction of the NHS as an organisation by the police was extensive and significant and therefore a separate table, Table 11, has been drawn to display these ascribed traits first. Table 12 then shows how the ascription of these traits evolves after contact with staff of the NHS. This is then followed by the traits identified by the NHS staff about themselves and their organisation (Table 13). In Table 14, as in the previous chapter on the police, inhibitors to partnership working are also considered.
### Table 12 Traits ascribed to the NHS by the Police

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As drawn from</th>
<th>Explicit ascribed traits</th>
<th>Implicit ascribed traits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal and Holy</td>
<td>Reactive, loyal, worthy, committed</td>
<td>Manages chaotic situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of evidence-based</td>
<td>Chaotic approach to work</td>
<td>Inability to learn from experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decision-making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The struggle</td>
<td>Surviving</td>
<td>Failing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication and change</td>
<td>Uncommunicative, inability to manage change</td>
<td>Unable to manage processes, stagnant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational complexity</td>
<td>Failure to implement change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of vision</td>
<td>Unimaginative</td>
<td>Stagnant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money as a driver to partnership working</td>
<td>Selfish, money grabbing, mean Unimaginative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13 Traits ascribed to the NHS by the Police after face to face contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As drawn from</th>
<th>Explicit ascribed traits</th>
<th>Implicit skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Knowledgeable, astute, committed</td>
<td>Able to understand context and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominant Perceptions</td>
<td>As above in ascribed traits</td>
<td>As above in ascribed skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>Organisationally complex, chaotic, committed individuals, infuriating.</td>
<td>Chaotic, loyal, commitment to orthodoxy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 14 Skills developed from experience: The NHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are drawn from</th>
<th>Explicit skills</th>
<th>Implicit skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime commitment to the post</td>
<td>Experience, knowledge, responsibility</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance in life before in forming skills</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class as a driver in social development</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>Confident, articulate, reflexive,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the ethos of the role</td>
<td>Responsible, flexible, reflexive, knowledgeable, committed, individual/patient orientated</td>
<td>Confident and articulate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15 Inhibitors to partnership working derived from experience: The NHS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are drawn from</th>
<th>Explicit inhibitors</th>
<th>Implicit inhibitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime commitment to the post</td>
<td>Commitment to orthodoxy</td>
<td>Rigid, organisational focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance in life before in forming skills</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class as a driver in social development</td>
<td>None identified</td>
<td>inflexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to the ethos of the role</td>
<td>Orthodoxy</td>
<td>Rigid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see from tables 11 and 12 the NHS is perceived by the police and themselves as being self-interested and ‘committed to orthodoxy,’ this indicates a commitment to the perceived organisational norms reflected in their commitment to the ‘ethos of the role’. For the NHS those norms are accountability, clinical responsibility, evidence-based decision-making and managing change. Although the statutory responsibility of working in community safety would come under the auspices of managing change – it is only a peripheral duty when considered against the other organisational norms such as clinical responsibility. As we have seen,
commitment to patient care and avenues to increase quality and quantity still feature high on the list of priorities of those within the NHS. Therefore this commitment to orthodoxy does, in its present form, produce a considerable inhibitor to partnership working, along with the ascribed institutional traits explored under the concept of the ‘atypical construction of the other.’

The police also had a commitment to the orthodoxy, which for partnership working, in this context – a crime reduction context – is not such an inhibitor to working in partnership. This is due to the fundamentally overlapping aims of the community safety partnership and their core, target driven work, of achieving a crime-reduction. Fundamentally the police are ends orientated – where the NHS is process driven. And this is the part that acts as an inhibitor – as the ends orientated ‘do-er’ nature of the police clashes with the slower pace at which other agencies work (particularly the NHS).

The impact of these traits and skills is explored in more detail in Chapter 10 and it is also necessary as stated in the previous chapter that these tables of skills have their place but are mediated by the social and political context in which they are brought to bear. This is explored in more detail in the following chapters. This chapter has sought to add clarity to the third substantive research question in attempting to explore firstly the understanding NHS practitioners have of their own role and the understanding their partner agency (the police) have of them – individually and organisationally. It is clear that whilst the NHS display good understanding of their development (also seen in Chapter 2) and the way that other organisations work – in this research the police – it is also apparent that there are considerable structural and cultural inhibitors to successful collaboration with other agencies. At this particular time in the midst of modernisation another agenda, despite its potential in terms of public health and long-term development, seems unlikely to inspire support. This is developed further in the concluding chapter.
9. Chapter Nine
The Tyranny of Personality

9.1 Introduction

Within partnerships, in this research and those encountered during the course of ‘being in the field’, there was a preoccupation amongst respondents with the description, idea or concept of ‘personality’. This preoccupation can be seen below in the frequency table. The concept of personality was viewed as a unique feature of each partnership and a key ingredient of locally defined ‘success’. The concept of personality was located in the strong and ‘good’ personalities that were situated within their partnership. As can be seen from Table 15 explicit references to it being ‘about personality’ happened most frequently in the partnership which presented as being the most successful. In Greenton the features of success were a high degree of cohesiveness and transparency and a low degree of challenge: a ‘consensus’. In addition to this key members of the decision-making core chose to identify themselves as such. Utilising this wider definition of success, both Bingham and Greenton self-defined as successful. It is of note that no other concept attracted such a degree of attention when it was not pursued explicitly as part of the interview schedule. Comments regarding personality came in response to the prompt ‘so, what are the features of a good partnership?’ They would also mention other features such as coterminosity, longevity in post of partnership members, having a good administrative resource and commitment from partners. However, the most commonly reported response by most members was the concept of personality.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Site</th>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>Explicit References</th>
<th>Implicit References</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pilots</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Explicit References refer to respondents making specific comments regarding the importance of personality in making partnership work. Examples of this are the two quotes, which follow in 8.4. Implicit references are when respondents talk at length about particular members being key to partnership stability, development or ‘achievements’ and they talk about this in the context of this member being a ‘good’ person or being unique.
9.2 Personal bias

The structural functionalists understanding of ‘role’ downplays personal agency and as a consequence, overplays the degree to which roles were precisely and clearly formulated as pre-packaged formats into which individuals could be neatly slotted, and know what was expected of them (Parsons, 1951). This expectation is clearly seen in the material that Gilling (2005) identifies as government produced guidance, which identifies the types of qualities necessary in the ‘leadership role’, for example (Hardy et al., 2000). This preoccupation with identifying roles continued with the work of Bottoms and Gelsthorpe (1991) and Skinns (2006). However in the present research there was difficulty in drawing boundaries around prescriptive role types. This is reflected in the problematic relationship between sociology and psychology on the position of ‘personality’ as a construct. The rigidity which is expressed in the structural functionalist perspective moves towards a semi-autonomous model adopted by the interactionists. Mead (1934) suggests that, ‘...self is something which has a development; it is not initially there, at birth, but arises in the process of social experience and activity, that is, develops in the given individual as a result of his relations to that process as a whole and to other individuals within that process.’ (130). Each personality is situated within their occupational culture as well as expressing the skills developed outside their organisation. In contrast with classical role theory the development of ‘personality’ suggests some autonomy within role, reactions and decision making of the self in concert with a process of interaction. In actuality relations to the partnership process and other more powerful organisations (in this setting) meant there was a lack of opportunity to express individuality or ‘personality’. The structural functionalist perspective suggests a process of adoption occurred in groups, where the individual ‘responds’ to an expressed need by the group for a particular role. The interactionists describe a process of development stemming from the individual but this research identified a return to rigidity through ascription rather than adoption of ‘role’ or, in terms used by respondents ‘personality’.

In the context of partnership, personality did not just develop within the individual from their contact to or interaction with the social world but it was also ascribed to
them. Again the development of 'personality' was a two way process which is mirrored in the development of occupational culture. There was a giving and a taking of attributes, skills and control. Practitioners would seat an assortment of skills or a role type such as 'the leader' or the 'manager', within their understanding of a personality 'type'. Shearing and Ericson (1991), by drawing on the 'interactionists' suggest role types are built by individuals, not 'taken' on already formed. However, in this research there was a powerful, rigid and ordered practice, which involved a process of ascription rather than innovative forms of role 'building' (in this research 'giving') or the individual 'taking'. So how do we explain these alternate findings? To some extent it may be true that parts of roles are emphasised, drawn into and mediated by personal experience. However in this research forms of identity were often 'layered' as individuals 'acted' out ascribed roles in different settings. In essence this forms a third option – not giving or taking of characteristics, which suggests some autonomy – but acting out ascribed meanings, as projected by the more powerful members of the group. This process is clearly mediated by power. Therefore those who controlled the power within the group were unlikely to undergo this process of ascription. They were likely to administer it by identifying desirable characteristics that would contribute to the efficiency of the group. In addition to this they were free of the process of ascription, which meant for those who held the power in the group partnership working was a more satisfying experience.

This identity construction process would take place through the interaction with other members of the partnership and their own occupational groupings. Here the mobilisation of the 'atypical construction' would occur, signifying the development of a particular member within their ascribed occupational culture. An example is the ascription of the attribute 'surviving' drawn from the police's understanding of policy development in the NHS. This attribute goes on to indicate a prevailing current and ongoing preoccupation, for the NHS, with the internal working of their own troubled organisation. The attribution of this quality would indicate a lack of commitment to an external activity such as partnership working.

104 For more on role 'types' please see the work of Liddle and Bottoms (1991), Belbin (1993) and Skinns (2006). This work is not overly concerned with typologies, more with the process of their creation and the effects on the partnership and its members to draw from such a limited 'stock' of perceived roles.
It was clear that where the portrayal of a partnership attendee was negative or dismissive they inevitably occupied territory outside of the decision making core and had low degrees of control. As a result their ability to utilise the ‘giving’ aspect of this process was severely limited – identifying and sharing their strengths both personal and organisational – and their ongoing exclusion from the seat of decision making within the partnership, was maintained. This process was most apparent with members who were excluded from decision making within the partnership. Paradoxically at interview respondents who were quiet, disaffected and who may have been disliked by other partners would present skills such as being knowledgeable, articulate and reflexive about processes. It seemed that the adoption of the ‘atypical construction’ by more powerful agencies and the construction of the exclusionary term ‘personality’ inhibited the deployment of these skills in a multi-agency setting. Essentially this obstructs the process of ‘giving’ to the partnership. Clearly the main ‘chattels’ that a multi-agency partnership is in possession of and should take every opportunity to exploit, are the capabilities of its members. Indeed this would seem to be the raison d’etre for multi-agency fora. Moreover, failure to do this will fundamentally and adversely impact on its outputs regardless of their nature. Therefore this rigidity in consensus building is self-defeating for partnership working.

This chapter sets out to further explore the construction of the concept of personality by respondents and ascertain how members applied ‘personality’ to their colleagues. In addition, it considers how the idea of personality was used by members in partnership to understand their own position as well as to control an environment which underwent frequent changes. It ends by attempting to unpick the core skills respondents identified as being key to the ‘roles’ explored in this chapter: the ‘leader’ and the ‘manager’.

There was also implicit acknowledgement of the importance of personality by respondents discussing ‘personality’ traits, which were seen as contributory factors in constituting ‘good people’ as essentially those who were ‘good’ in partnership. Explicit and implicit references to personality were least likely to occur in the third
partnership in Stonham. References that did occur were usually directed at the clinical psychologist (Ruth) who was not invited to attend partnership meetings and so never did. This was also the most recent partnership to form, with the shortest history of working together. Therefore, it could be concluded that members simply did not ‘know’ one another enough to comment on specific personality traits and that the absent health member became a convenient scapegoat for partnership conflict.

9.3 This Chapter

In this chapter I have used two examples of role types to explore how respondents use the concept of personality to explore their understanding of roles within partnership. The two roles that are being examined are the Chief Executive of the Council in Greenton and the role of the Community Safety Manager in Greenton and Bingham. The Chief Executive in Greenton was the ‘leader’ of the partnership and the decision-making core. There was not such a clear power differential in Bingham where power was situated within the police and all the officers and retired officers who attended the meeting. In Greenton the CSP was situated within the council and led by Liz. It is possible, by examining respondent’s descriptions of key members to ascertain what it is they identify as key skills for partnership working. By situating their understanding of success in personality and in their understanding of ‘good’ people they increase the sense of ‘uniqueness’ of their own partnership, as well as a sense of the fragility of the entity they have created. This sense of fragility was experienced most keenly in Greenton by those outside of the decision-making core and where decision-making processes were ‘transparent’. In effect, this was those who had the least control and were most vulnerable to change. However, as we shall see below, this ‘vulnerability’ and ‘fragility’ runs parallel with the idea of ‘policing their boundaries’ and recruiting the right type of person as well as developing robust/rigid processes to maintain partnership relationships. In conclusion it can be seen that personality is a complex social construct used by partnerships to include and exclude members and forms a key tactic in the distribution of power. In addition

105 For a full discussion of transparent and hidden forms of decision-making please see Chapter 9and10.
it provides further, often explicit, identification of core skills amongst partnership attendees.

9.4 Exploring personality

Following are a pair of quotes from two different field sites, which represent the underlying feeling that was expressed by many respondents. This was a belief that the majority of what they did or did not achieve and what constituted good partnership working, was reliant on personality.

Tom: A lot of this is down to personality - it's got to be, it's got to be.

Liz: A lot of this is down to personality. If you've got good people it will work, if you've got crap people it won't. 106

However, as can be seen Liz goes on to say that it is about good people and 'crap' people. This implies a deeper analysis then just personality - but good in what way? Good socially, good at keeping her informed of progress, good at doing what is expected of them or being good at their job? Having interviewed this respondent and others at the partnership that relied on her to be good at her job, the characteristics they described were specific and diverse. This was a common element in interviews conducted with partnership respondents; they frequently conflated the idea of 'good' personality with that of possessing good partnership/work skills. This became clear when interviewing respondents who identified partnership members who were described as inadequate at their work. If this were the case then respondents would often subtly intimate that these were not good people as a result. Conflict was often dealt with in these terms; partners who were seen to be obstructive or disinterested were seen as being poor at their jobs. There seemed to be no appreciation that this was merely a small interface that they were disengaged from or that this was only a part of their job that was defined as 'non-essential'. This can be particularly seen in the case of the NHS and was explored in the previous chapter when looking at money as a driver to partnership working (see section 8.9.1), where other members of the partnership belittled the rational response of the NHS to become involved when there was a financial incentive. The response of the NHS to a financial

---

106 Please see Appendix I for a list of respondents, location and social characteristics
incentive became part of the atypical construction and the formation of the atypical image utilised by other agencies, particularly the police.

The next respondent draws on a wider understanding of partnership processes and organisational structure to reach the following conclusion about partnership working in his area,

Tim: As I've said to other people if you can't get this partnership working right in Greenton, you won't get it right anywhere. Because it has a lot of things going for it - some of that is about individuals but it is not solely about individuals.

This respondent was illustrating his knowledge of the local area. Essentially Greenton was a unitary authority and the health sector and the police were (by and large) coterminous with other agencies. This meant they were able to view the same community as their business. This was an undeniable strength of this partnership. Therefore for him it was not all about individuals because this partnership – through often accidental but fortuitous boundary shifts had become – coterminous.

9.5 Personality as a tool for distributing power

As already highlighted the partnership that used this method of describing its members, most frequently and explicitly was Greenton (situating good partnership working in good personality). It undoubtedly used this process as a form of inclusion and exclusion and a way of ‘policing’ its boundaries. Unsurprisingly some members were more high profile than others. A high profile role was linked to length of service and/or significance of role, ability to set the agenda or add to it and access to the Chief Executive of the Council. Agenda-setting will be discussed in more depth in the following two analysis chapters and the concluding chapter but it is clear that it is a symbol of power (Lukes, 1974) utilised in all partnerships but most effectively in Greenton. The description and ascribing of ‘good’ personality traits to an individual, meaning they were ‘good’ at their job, was most effectively deployed by the ‘inner circle’ meaning those who set the agenda, made the decisions and decided who was ‘in’ or ‘out’ of the decision-making core.
9.6 Defining role types

Having described the characteristics of the most high profile members of the partnership it is unsurprising that the member of the partnership that attracted the most comment was Liz. She was the Chief Executive of the Council, one of the ‘revolving’ chairs of the Community Safety Partnership and was chair of the Greentont Partnership (the Local Strategic Partnership). The following section draws upon descriptions of her by other members of the partnership, mainly from a criminal justice background. The overriding element of the success of this partnership and the cornerstone of its cohesiveness seemed to be because it was not police led; the Council was driving it. Additionally another council role is also considered, that of the Community Safety Manager; this role has been identified as pivotal in partnership work, they are the entrepreneurs of community safety work and the keeper of partnership ‘goods’ (Hughes and Gilling, 2004). They were also, in this research, instrumental in ‘setting the tone’ for the partnership.

9.6.1 Council Employees

The Chief

In the extract below the police officer is identifying what it was that Liz brought with her when she came to the partnership process. The quote ends with the respondent recognising her dynamism. However, he also identifies her ability to have a broader view to weave the community safety work into her vision for the city.

Simon: Liz, when she arrived in the city, when Liz came - she came with a very strong purpose of community safety in its broadest agenda but also very much about crime and drugs and she had an active interest in all of those things so - quite rightly - she had broadened that but woven so much of that into what she wants to be doing in the city too. No one has Liz’s dynamism.

The following two quotes again mention ‘dynamism’ as a key feature of Liz’s role. When trying to identify what (for them) indicates dynamism it seems to be an ability to take control, be directive, have a clear vision, make plans and act on them.

---

107 This format in community safety partnerships was first suggested by Morgan in Getting to grips with crime. (Home Office, 1997).
Pamela: She is and she doesn’t suffer fools gladly. And I wouldn’t want to be on the wrong side of her. And she is and she wants things done yesterday. Sometimes I felt - ‘well actually I could just do with a bit space here Liz - stop shoving.’ But the other bit about it was that we had - a self-assessment exercise - she was I though I got much more of a clue about how she ticks and why and she very clearly has a view about Greenton and a vision of how it should be. And everything she does fits into that vision. But until then I didn’t appreciate that - I just thought she was this dynamic person who pushed everybody and in the end they did just what they wanted because it was so much easier (laughter)!

Phillip: It is a dynamic partnership. That is down to Liz - she is very dynamic. Fair play to her and that is what you need in a partnership it is someone who actually grips it and believes it. And if you criticise the partnership Liz is very defensive of it - so it is ‘I am trying my bloody hardest to do it.’ And she is trying to do it - fair play to her. You know if we loose her someone is going to have to step into those shoes and drive it again, because if nobody drives it will stop. It will wither. It depends on who is driving the damn thing and the same with the Greenton Partnership (the Local Strategic Partnership) - who is in charge of that? Liz! Usually.

The first respondent is also identifying the difficulty that a ‘dynamic’ attitude can bring with it. Liz was very forceful and directive. She would purposefully delegate work and expect to get answers. Liz never lost her temper in a partnership meeting although she would sometimes exhibit exasperation over a task, which had identified ‘glitches’ that impeded work. As the first respondent articulates she felt like she was being ‘shoved’ and that she was aware that fools were not suffered gladly. Liz often walked a thin line between being liked and disliked. However, whilst this researcher was in the field and prior to that she always managed to engender respect. Partly this is to do with what the second respondent identifies in conjunction with the concept of her ‘dynamism’, it is her sense of commitment, that she is trying her very hardest to make it work. This respondent who was cynical of partnership working and the community safety partnership in particular, clearly feels that Liz has drive and commitment. However, he also fears that if she leaves then they will need someone just like her to continue the work. It was clear in the interview that he felt that there was no one else like Liz, that she was unique and that the partnership could not function without her. This is the result of ascribing a skill set to a personality rather than a role type, although he clearly identifies particular skills that other professionals do possess such as drive and commitment. Below, the following respondent is identifying the importance of Liz’s role in the partnership and the type of leadership she utilises,
Theo: Liz is the glue that holds it together - in fairness...Lots of people come because Liz is there...[She practices] transformational leadership, emotional intelligence and all that sort of thing.

Theo: With charm and stealth. Have absolutely no doubt - Liz has a ripping edge to her.

This police officer identifies Liz as a key reason why people attend the partnership. He identifies core skills of ‘transformational leadership, emotional intelligence’ and other associated skills. However, in terms of observed skills Liz seemed to adopt a directive, leadership role (mirroring the police) rather than the more collaborative skills identified with what is known as transformational leadership (Silvestri, 2007). He then goes on to say that her skills also encompass a ‘ripping edge’. This echoes the sense that the first respondent Pamela described where she talks about her desire that Liz would stop ‘shoving’ and is developed further in Chapter 10 in the section on ‘bullying’. However it is apparent that it is the firmness, direction and sheathed power that they both respect. Theo recognises that the two elements ‘charm and stealth’ move hand in hand.

Phillip: Liz has a lot to do - she has to keep a lot of balls in the air. That is the big thing and there are people working in partnership, people like me, who don’t know what we are doing and where we are going and Liz is slapping me saying ‘What do you bloody mean you don’t know where we are going? You bloody do know what you are doing. I’ve told you what you are doing.’

Phillip: How do you get these people? How do you select them? We pay them a lot of money. But they are good people. She drives people very hard though sometimes we’ll be sitting there at quarter to nine on a Friday night and I’ll be like ‘Liz it is quarter to nine on a Friday night - sod off!’ It is finding people of that calibre it is very difficult. And those are the people that you have got to find if you want partnership to work. And they have got to be somebody who is held in esteem by all the people - well if not all, the majority of the people whose judgement that you trust and say - ‘you need someone like this’.

This respondent is clearly identifying somebody who is driven, has strategic overview and crucially someone who engenders commitment and respect. Respondents often linked the concepts of control and trust. They could only relinquish control (in a partnership sense) with someone they trusted. This is also identified by the previous respondent in the terms ‘charm’ and ‘stealth’, they are a different conceptualisation of the skills but represent this core idea that someone has
to be in charge, managing the process for others to feel safe in following them. The above respondent is also grappling with the idea of how you would replace someone of Liz’s calibre. Interestingly, as the research at this field site was ending it was revealed that the Community Safety Manager was leaving. When discussed with other partnership members it was clear that those in the ‘inner circle’ felt robust recruitment processes would result in a suitable candidate. Those outside the inner circle felt that it would have a devastating impact on the working of the partnership as Kate was seen as ‘irreplaceable’. This suggests that those who hold the power and control know that it is a suitable skill base that is important and not the personality itself, that drives it forward.

The following health sector respondent below articulates the importance of control and trust,

Tim: You take risks, you sometimes get nothing back from it, you don’t feel you’ve got control - it’s a different thing having control and feeling like you have control - but often chief execs feel like they are in control because they feel they can direct people - whereas in partnership you have to agree what you’re going to do and you have to trust the person not to be screwing you behind your back.

In this extract he is describing his own experience of being a chief executive of an organisation – the sense that you can direct people, so that you feel you are in control. He also identifies that in partnership there is a process whereby you must relinquish control and that this involves the ability for one to trust the other and make oneself vulnerable to being ‘screwed’. This sense of vulnerability was expressed by a minority of articulate, reflexive respondents, who had thought carefully about partnership working and their place within it. There was clearly a sense of being organisationally exposed when working in partnership. This vulnerability seemed two-fold, not just being vulnerable to the inadequacies of other agencies when relying on them to complete certain actions, but also the fear of revealing the inadequacies of your own organisation. The first fear was often expressed by the police when being forced to work with almost any other agency, especially the NHS, and formed part of the atypical construction, discussed earlier. The second fear was never overtly expressed by any agency but was felt to be at the core of many other agencies’ disengagement from the process or ‘secretiveness’.
In Greenton, police officers did relinquish control. The chair was revolving, however, when not acting as chair Liz managed to maintain control by being secretary and ‘...still attending and sitting at his right.’ It was apparent in partnership meetings which the researcher attended that the ‘retiring’ chair and new secretary (Liz) very much managed to maintain control, even whilst it was the police turn to chair the meeting. Directions and agenda still came through the council and Liz was the best placed to comment and direct proceedings. This partnership had a very clear mission statement and was attuned to the strategies and development of central policy, however they seemed to maintain a community focus. Liz had been canny enough to surround herself with very good people and as the police officer above stated, many people came because of the reputation of the oft times chair and her drive and commitment.

The Community Safety Manager

The Community Safety Manager is an administrative role, which is simultaneously feeding policy down from central government and responding to auditing requirements as well as maintaining the focus on local need and the community safety strategy. However, Community Safety Managers seem to be as diverse as the partnerships that populate England and Wales. As Hughes and Gilling (2004) identify, this role existed and was situated within Councils before the Crime and Disorder legislation was enacted, which to some extent accounts for the local diversity in the role. In part Managers are responding to their locally experienced conditions within councils rather than communities.

Despite the difference between the research partnerships, the Community Safety Manager role was crucial in each. The comments below stem from the two community safety partnerships in the sample; the pilot interviews and the drug project in Stonham did not have an administrative and strategic hub such as a community safety unit. Both Greenton and Bingham had community safety managers who were situated in the council offices, either as a separate, discrete working team (as was the case in Greenton) or situated within another department/portfolio, as was the case in Bingham. The Greenton team was made up of seven people but four of them were on the drugs side from the amalgamated drugs team. The Bingham
partnership had approximately 8-10 members on the team – including the ASBO strategy team.\textsuperscript{108} It is an uncertain number because the team was not discrete. It often borrowed and relinquished members of the team from/to other departments as was necessary. There were also two part-time administrators and whilst I was conducting research at the partnership there was recruitment of a finance officer. The two following comments were made about the community safety manager at Greenton,

Liz: Kate is an absolute star.

Pamela: I thought it was very well managed - I have the utmost respect for Kate - I think she does a sterling job.

Comments about Kate were uniformly positive. However Pamela mentioned that she had ascertained that Kate kept a tight rein on who met outside of meetings and when this occurred. This experience had indicated to her that a great deal of work occurred ‘behind the scenes’ to which she was not privy. This was certainly part of a larger strategy that was employed by this partnership to manage its borders and membership and will be discussed in more detail in the following section. Relationships were generally far more complicated in Bingham which may be reflected in the somewhat complex relationships between the community safety managers ‘department/team’ as described above. Tom was very much his own boss and a complicated character. He certainly, as a retired police officer, displayed the main characteristics described in the ‘ethos of the role’ for the police. He worked closely with the police/criminal justice contingent of the partnership who were all quite complimentary about him as a person and his ability to do the work of a community safety manager. Those outside of this ‘inner circle’ did not feel so attuned to him or his role. He could act as a dictator (sometimes benevolent) with those outside of the inner circle, with those inside he was often seen to engage in puzzling, obsequious, ego-stroking behaviour with those apparently more ‘senior’ or high ranking than he. The following respondent was Tara, a probation officer, who felt she was making some progress with the partnership - when compared with her predecessor, she had been dealing with personal issues in the preceeding six months and felt supported by Tom. However she also recognised the following,

\textsuperscript{108} This seemed to be one full-time person – with additional support from other ‘specialists’ on an ad hoc basis.
Tara: If you want to look at a politician – look at Tom – he is a politician with a Capital ‘P’. That’s how he gets things done. But people like him and that is how he gets away with it.

Tara is describing Tom’s charismatic qualities, which she has experienced. Probation were not part of the inner circle, however they were on its periphery and therefore there was increased access to the decision makers than was the case with others such as the NHS or drug workers. This respondent also describes Tom as a ‘politician’.

Tara is aware of the amount of manipulation which is occurring, as was Pamela in the Greenton partnership above. The following two comments are from drug workers who attended the Bingham partnership. They did not have statutory responsibility to attend, and they were the lead on the drug and alcohol theme group,

Emma: I think the frustration is about Tom being an ex-policeman, it being led by the police and it seems to be - dominated by the police.

Amanda: And probably the choice is the coordinators as well. I don’t know how many across the country are run by police officers but that seems to be a crucial issue doesn’t it? Because they come with one perspective and it is quite hard to shift. And there are quite a lot of things about the culture - it isn’t a real partnership is it?

As already mentioned, it was often difficult to have an ex-police officer as a community safety manager (CSM). CSMs occupied different territory in the two CSPs in this partnership. In Bingham there was a good deal more of what could be called ‘subversive’ or hidden control then was witnessed in Greenton. In Greenton the role was administrative, strategic and advisory, clear boundaries had developed around the role. This was yet to happen in Bingham. In addition there is the problematic influence of the ex-representative of criminal justice agencies utilising potentially outmoded sources of information in the development of crime control strategies. Clearly this would not matter so much if firstly the power the individual employed was not so influential on the partnership and secondly when decision-making occurs in a partnership context. The problem of this type of working is explored further in the following two chapters.

In Bingham, there were two police officers that regularly attended. It was chaired by the chief superintendent, but when he was absent by the leader of the council and if

109 However the CSP had statutory responsibility for the funding and monitoring of substance misuse plans and the distribution of funding, which came from the Department of Health.
she was also absent then the meeting was chaired by the CSM. The CSM, as mentioned was a retired officer, at times 1-3 other officers would attend and a British Transport Police officer attended three out of the six meetings I attended. Emma and Amanda expressed a high degree of dissatisfaction and frustration with this partnership. Their disappointment seemed to stem from a lack of clear strategic direction and transparent decision-making processes. As will be illustrated below this was not the case in Greenton where the officers were seen as open and participatory. Amanda is articulating the problems that she experienced when the partnership was police led. She isolates the problem as being one of a police perspective being hard to shift – a criminal justice perspective of crime and society being a rigid view. This was certainly true of the Bingham partnership where responses to crime were orthodox and traditional with the Chief Superintendent responding to the drug workers action plan with 'well that's good because all we know how to do is lock 'em up!' Given the police-led drug project included in this research, the rise of prolific offender projects, the home grown local street-crime initiative, the diversification of the police role and the drive towards a more 'joined-up' vision of public services (that CSPs are part of), this probably was not true. However, at this partnership the sense was that the police were deeply resistant to any attempts at eroding their conception of the 'ethos of the role'.

9.6.2 The Police and the NHS

Police Officers

As already seen the police played a pivotal role in CSPs in this research. The fieldwork CSPs were situated, physically, within the council offices. However, strategically it was often controlled or strongly influenced by the police. This was less the case in Greenton where the most significant 'controlling' influence came from Liz, the Chief Executive of the Council. The descriptions of the police officers that follow are from their non-police colleagues and illustrate the extent to which the police are integrated into the partnership, its decision-making core and the degree to which they can facilitate the relationship between the state and the local experience of crime control.
Liz: And then Theo arrived and he has been GREAT and really interested and wanted to look at it strategically and all of that he and Simon - you know Mike is very good too - but the two who make or do, are major players in a partnership angle are sort of Simon and now Theo.

Liz is describing the extent that Theo and Simon had been involved in community safety partnership. There was very much a sense that they were part of the inner circle and that Liz appreciated their support and the extent that they were ‘on the same page’ strategically. She categorises the newest and youngest officers, Theo and Simon, as being the most important to this process. It was clear from their own interviews that these officers were engaged in the CSP and the strategic vision developed by Liz for the city. What is unclear was whether the degree of respect and admiration engendered between the police and the chief executive was as a direct result of their somewhat symbiotic relationship or arose because of their commitment to the statutory responsibility placed upon them.

As Gilling (1997) and Phillips (2002a) identified, community safety work seems to fit into the profile of some agencies better than others. In Greenton the local authority was very proactive in the development of a citywide strategy (linked into its history of Five Cities and Safer Cities initiatives) of urban regeneration. Where there were problems or ‘felt’ problems in the built environment, urban ‘decay’ and deprivation and these fed through into effects on security and crime, they were keen to work in partnership. Clearly, the most apt partnership arrangement for many of these problems was between the police and the local authority. Therefore, those who engaged in (the occasional fairly gentle) challenge to police/local authority interests in the partnership were not within the inner circle and were seen as not really understanding or engaging in the process. However, it should be noted that I was not given access to the meetings of the ‘inner circle’, which occurred outside the main meetings. There was a suggestion by two of its members that, occasionally, challenges did occur. In addition, such challenges were described in terms of it being a surprising development and therefore noteworthy. However, even then the importance of the challenge was minimised and subsumed into the closely guarded partnership consensus (Meyerson et al., 1987).
The police in each of the research sites always seemed to be engaged and interested in the work of the CSP, which is unsurprising given the crime reduction and crime prevention work of these partnerships. It was other agencies that were disengaged which attracted less favourable descriptions although their disengagement was usually as rational as the overt interest of the police and the council.

Pamela: I was impressed by Zoë’s presentation at that last community safety meeting that I was at. But she wasn’t just going to say - ‘Gosh no!’ the attitude was well we’ve got to do it we’ll tweak ours to make sure it fits what they want really.

The above respondent is describing the reaction of the Local Authority Liaison Officer (Zoë) to guidance that had been issued by the Government about new attempts to deal with prolific offenders. Project initiatives had been developed nationwide following the relative success of the ‘North Town Project’. Some areas had decided to use the Project as a template and that was the path taken by the third area in this research: Stonham. However, in Greenton the response had been prosaic. A decision was made to audit what local projects were currently dealing with problems associated with prolific offenders, usually the criminal justice agencies, the drug agencies and the health sector employees. When this audit was conducted it was intended that the partnership would ‘tweak’ what was necessary and then send back a considered response to the Home Office regarding what it was the Greenton CSP was currently engaged in and the progress it was making. It was a rational response to the ‘latest thing’, a way of implementing national priorities at a local level without having to reconstruct what was already available. Instead the approach was low key and low maintenance. This response reflected the reaction by Liz when this CSP was identified as a priority area for Crack. She felt that they did not have a Crack problem, but because they had been offered money to set up a Crack project she was happy to say they now did. It was a rational response to an overly generalised national policy. Partnerships were loath to turn down money: short-term, long-term or pump priming. Although, money was usually for a specific purpose like the above ‘priority crack area’, locally, partnerships became adept at exploiting funding definitions to the nth degree. The impact that these ‘pots’ of money had locally is debatable – but in my analysis they often seemed to exacerbate local inconsistencies to community problems.
The following two segments are from the Community Safety Manager in Greenton and the Probation Officer. I have avoided drawing on the Police response to Health Sector workers in this section as the descriptions are overly burdened with the atypical construction format that we examined in the previous chapter. The following two respondents are describing Tim. Kate is a member of the inner circle and Pamela is not, and this distance from the decision-making core and those who inhabit it meant that Pat did not have any personal contact with Tim. In addition to this the Greenton partnership was very large, which meant that some members who had a smaller part to play would often only know 4-5 people when they attended partnership meetings.

Kate: Yes he is - considering the rank and position he has got he is very personable. He has a nice way with him. I am not at all worried about the PCT becoming statutory authorities.

As Tim had decided to ‘act as if’ he had statutory responsibility for about a year before statutory responsibility became a reality, he was already a part of the decision-making core. As such the PCT becoming a statutory authority was little to be concerned about.

Pamela: I have no - absolutely no - meeting/conversation even with Tim. In fact I think for the first year I didn’t even know who he was. He appeared at the community safety partnership so I worked out who he was - he never stayed very long. He is obviously a very, very busy man. How it’s going to be when he is the chair – that will – that, I think will make an interesting dynamic.

Pamela’s description is compelling because it contrasts so distinctly with every other description of Tim within this research. It was clear that not all members felt that they ‘knew’ him but this sense of not knowing him did not manifest itself in quite the same way as it did with Pamela. She goes on to talk about him being part of the ‘star chamber’ and being exclusive. Pamela is also the respondent who felt controlled and excluded from a meeting with Liz and the local drug workers by Kate. As we shall see in the following chapter, there were two types of inner circle; hidden and transparent. Although both have hidden aspects, in Greenton the partnership was
transparent yet exerted greater control. Pat identified aspects of the hidden decision-making that she had become aware of and this clearly affected the way she felt about members of the inner circle.

9.7 Conclusion

In conclusion it can be seen that personality and the ascribing of personality attributes to different role types is a powerful tool in the process of exclusion and inclusion in developing aspects of control, agenda-setting and distribution of power. In this research ‘powerful’ personality types were very important in providing a lead and setting the ‘tone’ for the partnership. The way they acted in partnership, their degree of commitment and expressed understanding of processes and their impact, was crucial to other members. Moreover, personality acted as a way of ‘policing’ the boundaries of partnerships and sorting out (for them) who was going to be good at partnership working. In this sense ‘good’ becomes layered with meaning in that it indicates who will ‘fit in’ and maintain the status quo. This reflects Meyerson and Martin’s (1987) idea of the paradigmatic consensus that exists in some organisations where there is either a lack of, or unacknowledged, ambiguity. Here consensus is maintained at the cost of what might be termed ‘person-centredness’: a setting of store amongst partnership requirements rather than personal skills. It is at this juncture that the atypical construction forms a crucial means of identifying perceived characteristics of partnership members and categorising their degree of access to decision-making power.

The partnership which utilised control most effectively was Greenton and it was the partnership that discussed personality and personal attributes most frequently. However, despite the way personality is used in partnership it is also clear that partnership members were adept at identifying what they felt were key characteristics in partnership ‘leaders’ and managers and these are presented in Table 17 and 18.
### Table 17 Skills identified by respondents for the ‘leader’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explicit skills</th>
<th>Implicit skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experience, knowledge, responsibility, trustworthy</td>
<td>Loyalty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic Visionary, Transformational Leadership and Emotional intelligence</td>
<td>None identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charm and Stealth</td>
<td>Confident, articulate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic overview</td>
<td>Organised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised</td>
<td>Bossy, pushy, ‘bullying’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 18 Skills identified by respondents for the Community Safety Manager

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explicit skills</th>
<th>Implicit skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responsible, flexible</td>
<td>Confident, articulate, creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organised</td>
<td>Manage people and processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic vision and commitment to the inner circle of decision makers</td>
<td>Politically aware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local and National Knowledge of Crime Control Measures</td>
<td>Well informed and manages diverse sources of information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bullying is included above, however, none of the respondents in the Greenton Partnership used this term to describe Liz. This will be explored in more detail in Chapter 11 but it seems to relate to the transparent versus the hidden form of decision-making. Where decision-making is transparent, as in Greenton, there seems to be less resentment. Where there is a lack of resentment then behaviour is framed in a more positive light. Hence what is ascribed as bullying in one partnership may be ascribed as being ‘pushy’ in another. However the degree of control and direction is the same.

It is clear from the above table that partnership calls upon a diverse skill set to fulfil the roles of the CSM and the ‘Leader’. However, although these skills are not
‘common or garden’ they are specific, they are capable of being articulated and they are separate from the understanding and uniqueness of the concept of personality. Personality in partnership has become a catchall concept to describe someone who is good at his or her job. When they are good at their job, other behaviours such as ‘pushiness’ are incorporated into their role type and ‘explained away’. As we shall see in the following two chapters this is more likely to happen when control is exercised more effectively.
10. Chapter Ten
The Inner Circle

10.1 Introduction

Partnerships are often the location of intense power struggles. The distribution of 'power' and the way in which it is utilised affects the way partnerships operate. Partnership as a concept comes with its own set of organisational and ideological associations.\(^\text{110}\) In addition there is an immense external pressure applied to partnerships, which asserts (at a basic level) that partnership is about joint and equal working between agencies. This chapter explores the dynamics of power in partnership work and how it is used to include and exclude members. It also considers how the 'inner circle' was constructed, how it was used and viewed by participants and the consequences of its usage.

10.2 Inner Circle

The term 'inner circle' is used in this context to describe the decision-making core usually consisting of a minority of the agencies in each partnership. The reasons for development of an inner circle seems to be two-fold, firstly, it was an expression of trust between the agencies that were included and therefore increased cohesion between these agencies, and secondly, it offered perceived efficiencies. The efficiencies were often expressed in terms of it being 'easier' to make decisions in this way rather than involving the whole partnership group. In effect this meant a seeming saving in 'time' and a minimising of the perceived bureaucratic burden, by taking a short cut past official measures. As we saw in the preceding chapter, in the development of personality a powerful process of ascription occurred. This process was complicit in the notion of 'efficiency'; it is \textit{quicker} for those in control to decide on what is needed rather than let an organic process of development occur. However, as we shall see the effects of the construct of efficiency were (on the whole) detrimental for partnerships. In the two community safety partnerships included in this research the inner circle was constituted primarily by the council (the Chief Executive and the Community Safety Manager) and the police. However, in

\(^{110}\) For more on partnerships see 'Partnership: a rocky road' Chapter 3
Greenton the inner circle also included the Chief Executive of the Primary Care Trust. Despite the apparent similarities in their constitution they were portrayed very differently in each. In Bingham the inner circle was hidden and in Greenton it was transparent. In Greenton they were able to garner some positives in the form of apparent efficiencies, by excluding the main group in the decision-making process. Nevertheless, for both partnerships, the detrimental nature of this form of decision-making remained in the stultifying passivity engendered in this approach for the larger partnership group.

Catherine: Yes - it’s a bit like a wheel. The two circles - you’ve got your hub which is your partnership team - your infrastructure and then you’ve got your outer circle but there are all these spokes going in and out between the two and it’s solid. And because it has been built properly and in a thoughtful fashion not just ‘oh we’ve got to merge’ and bunging the two sides together they have gone through processes - which has been made easy because of the history and all of the things I’ve already described but its solid and its been built sensibly.

The above respondent is describing the inner (decision-making core) and outer circle in Greenton. She explains that the inner circle has been developed in a thoughtful fashion. This partnership had undergone a merger with the DAT and it is apparent that during this merger they have undergone processes that have meant the partnership has been built sensibly and solidly. Greenton has an inner circle, which was like a central information and decision-making hub and is similar to Leavitt’s (1951) communication net – also called ‘the wheel’. It distributed information from the centre (Government and Local Government) on new strategies, on the development of new crime reduction projects, and ‘consulted’ with the partnership. The inner circle, conducted in a very controlled manner, instigated this consultation and subsequently the development of new ideas. It was seemingly, in this way, very efficient. The partnership would assign work to smaller groups, who had delegated authority from the inner circle and were police led. These smaller groups would make decisions outside the partnership meeting and report back at the following meeting. If decisions had to be made between meetings then consultation would take place via email. The smaller groups consisted of the Local Authority Liaison Officer (the police) or the Community Safety Team. It was clear that these individuals were (usually) the only members with sufficient knowledge and authority to make
decisions and plans. During the period I was attending these partnership meetings, the rest of the partnership always agreed to their proposals.

The following respondent is a member of the Bingham partnership. In this partnership every member in interview acknowledged the existence of an elite decision-making core (led by the police). However, although it was clearly common knowledge it was perceived as being hidden. Therefore, it was viewed by those excluded from its ranks as a tool for control but because it was hidden there was no trust.

Amanda: The paradigm shifts that need to happen (pause) and however you define the things that should happen you can’t shift those underlying beliefs. Those stereotypes and traditions are incredibly hard to change. You know how it is we’ll listen to this for a little while and then we’ll get something done somewhere in the corridor or in a conversation with someone in a higher position. Well at one level - on the community safety partnership – it has felt very frustrating that there is a small inner chamber; dominated by the police force.

This respondent, a drug worker, is exploring the theoretical construct of the partnership she is working in. She spoke of its rigid nature and the dramatic paradigmatic shifts that must occur to make partnership working (in a true sense of the word) work. The lack of transparency and the consequent lack of trust and faith in this partnership by those excluded from the inner circle led to an expressed sense of frustration. The decision-making is both hierarchical and hidden. It is clear that she thinks a change needs to occur but that achieving a long-term change without it being eroded, through people bypassing agreed channels, is unlikely. She also correctly identifies the police as the dominant force in this partnership.

10.3 Decision Making

As already discussed the two primary types of decision-making were either ‘hidden’ or ‘transparent’. However this researcher would argue that the ‘transparent’ form of decision-making nevertheless had some elements that were hidden, to borrow from Goffman a sense of a backstage area (1971). Therefore the control exercised in Greenton in presenting this transparent form of decision-making was more developed
and sophisticated then the ‘hidden’ form experienced in Bingham. Interestingly it was the sense in Bingham that it was hidden – that those not included were not meant to ‘know’ about it although little attempt was made to ‘hide’ it, which caused the deeply felt frustration and resentment. The transparent element to the Greenton decision-making process (mainly) allayed the concerns of those participating.

Sonia: Except I have some difficulties in the way that it is done then and that - this is probably my - in the way that partnership works is that you have no discussion outside of the meetings and then all of a sudden things are dropped on you in the meeting. I do know how (laughs). It is because Tom and James and Leo\textsuperscript{112} do it themselves. You never actually get, I've never had a paper presented to that partnership - where you are asked to discuss something.

The above respondent is a health representative (administrative) who, earlier in the interview, had expressed that she was not a member of the inner circle. When she described who was in the inner circle she mentioned almost every other agency except the NHS, the police authority and the fire authority as being part of the decision-making core or inner circle. This sense of exclusion is then deeply felt, as there is a sense of being excluded from the partnership and not just its decision-making elite. This respondent does go on to identify the lead agency when decisions occur: the police. However, she also described how she would like to (on occasion) speak to agencies outside of the formal meeting and she occasionally did this. An example of this is when the hospital implemented a new security system but the police had not been consulted about it. The lack of consultation had led to consternation amongst the police. James approached me before a meeting one day, in a side room, to explain the issue, as it seemed symptomatic to him of the problems between the police and the NHS. He explained that he was going to ‘get’ the NHS representative on this issue by putting it on the agenda at a task group meeting. At the next meeting the health representative above was confronted by an annoyed officer about the lack of partnership working. She felt that she would like to have been approached first about the potential upset rather than in a multi-agency setting. It seemed that the partnership meeting was used as a tool to ‘keep members in line’.

\textsuperscript{111}Greenton had existed as a partnership for about 14 years longer then Bingham. Please see Table 8 for more on field site characteristics.
\textsuperscript{112}Chief Superintendent not interviewed as part of this research.
but also as a system of information sharing about what constituted a community safety activity and therefore partnership property.

10.4 Formation

To those who were members of the inner circle, the formation of the group was unambiguous. The following officer is describing who is a member of the inner circle in Bingham. The constitution of the group was slightly larger in Greenton as it also included the proactive Chief Executive of the Primary Care Trust.

James: Well the core members I think have been, always have been, acknowledged - it’s the local authority and the police. The local authority and the police. Period...The prime partners are Leo, Lydia, Tom and me.

These members are the Chief Superintendent\textsuperscript{113}, the Leader of the council, the retired Police officer (current community safety manager) and the Superintendent. Even on a simple numerical basis the police dominate the inner circle. The following section explores the similarities and differences in the two different types of inner circle encountered in the field: transparent and hidden.

\textit{Transparent}

The inner circle was often presented as a tool for producing efficiency. This was certainly true in Greenton where the partnership was very large with members and advisors attending the group. This would mean that sometimes there were over thirty people at the partnership, representing different agencies, some from the voluntary sector or business, but mainly from statutory agencies. The meeting was held every other month for three hours. The community safety team had a highly developed administrative hub, which provided large document bundles for each meeting. The bundles were usually over 150 pages long and would take the researcher 4-6 hours to work through depending on the complexity of the material. Some members expressed the difficulty they experienced in working their way through all of the material. The Community Safety Team would also supply documents for consultation between meetings as was necessary to meet centrally set

\textsuperscript{113} op cit.
auditing/strategy targets. Therefore this partnership had a transparent approach to working and the development of an inner circle. The following respondent, a police officer who was a member of the inner circle, describes the evolution of the decision-making process.

Simon: There were certainly tensions in it when it was first set up as it was seen as just too big. I think the reality seems to be and it seems true of so many groups that get together - it is a big partnership - where is the work done? The work isn’t done in there. Most of the work is done by the main players - because they have the wherewithal to resource some of that, particularly the council and to some extent health and to a lesser extent the police, actually to a bigger extent ourselves because even though we are not a big player in terms of what is discretionary we hold a huge agenda so we are well engaged. If it was all coming to the partnership it would be too much.

He is describing the workload and the commitment of stakeholders where the outcomes of partnership meetings matter to them and their targets. As already discussed the community safety agenda is part of the police remit, it is also part of the work of local councils in maintaining communities. In this partnership it had also become part of the work of the NHS in health promotion, health prevention and drug treatment. These three agencies controlled the partnership. This meant that the partnership was seemingly well organised and efficient. It moved through agenda points swiftly at meetings and met targets, and those who did the work were very knowledgeable. However, partnership working is about availing yourself of the knowledge and background of all the members who are attending the meeting. This meeting was so heavily organised and controlled it lacked spontaneity, creativity and challenge. A similar experience was recorded in local authority police committees. The researcher only saw one direct challenge to the inner circle whilst attending meetings. It seemed almost orchestrated and it was clear that the member who initiated it was the acceptable face of dissent in the partnership. He was tolerated but not taken seriously. However, what Greenton managed to avoid was the sense of resentment that was prevalent in Bingham and Stonham.

Because of the mainly transparent nature of the decision making process, the majority of the respondents in Greenton were certainly aware of it and their exclusion from it. When they described this process the researcher developed a
prompt that asked about how that felt and if they felt excluded. The following two partnership members are responding to this prompt:

Pamela: Noooo. I think probation probably struggled to be a key player. I don’t have a sense of whether my predecessor felt that - I think he probably did. But that is just an impression really. From me being so new there was no way that I was going to sort of come in and have a big impact. But I do feel that probation, whilst they are all very NICE to you (laughter), you know, probation was yes it’s there but not one of the key (members).

Simon: I think that is a very important thing that we have to hold onto though (that some people make decisions and others witness them) because the imperative is to get things done. I suppose one or two people have started to think exactly that way and certainly I have had it in the sub group - one guy just didn’t bother to come and he didn’t say why - he just didn’t turn up. The feedback was that you are not serious about my agenda - am I that bothered in truth? - but we were not serious about the homophobic agenda that he was championing. Which is hugely wrong. So there is always dangers. I think you need transparency in decision-making.

Pamela is describing what she understands as her agency’s unimportance in the partnership. Given that she is a manager in a criminal justice agency (probation) the fact that she articulates this stance is perhaps surprising. However, the truth of it is that although there are undoubted benefits to probation working in a community safety partnership (‘as offenders are people too’ and therefore part of the community), in promoting continuity and cross working in the criminal justice system – essentially their work is post offending. Community safety work remains a proactive, preventative activity.

In Bingham, probation had a more integrated position then was observed in Greenton, however, they still remained on the periphery. The second respondent, who is part of the inner circle, describes why it is important to utilise the inner circle as a tool for decision-making. He uses the efficiency argument to make his point, but goes further in stating that it is ‘imperative that things get done’. This underlines the idea that this partnership has become results driven and to some extent has sacrificed process in the course. However, he also understands that people can feel excluded if they are outside the decision-making core. He retells a story where a member of a task group stops attending as he feels they are not interested in his agenda – homophobia. The officer seems to be saying that he is not bothered that someone stops attending but on the other hand he is interested in the homophobia agenda.
However he fails to understand that the best way to become involved in the anti-homophobic agenda is to engage in the experience of the man who is no longer attending because he has disengaged. Finally, the respondent feels that greater transparency in decision-making will mean that people will not feel excluded, whereas this researcher would put the disengagement experienced by partnership attendees down to a sense of exclusion from the process of decision-making. Showing people that they are excluded does not make the process any more palatable to those who are disempowered.

In conclusion it would seem that this method of decision-making utilising the tool of the ‘inner circle’ largely avoids resentment but does not manage to avoid disengagement.

Hidden

The second utilisation of the ‘inner circle’ tool is by ‘hiding’ decision making (Weber, 1919). As already mentioned, whether hidden or transparent, decision-making has parts that are hidden and parts that are viewed. The question, for partnership members, is more about what parts are being revealed to their gaze. What parts am I meant to see and what parts are meant to be hidden? The extent of this process is linked to the degree of resentment – the more the process is meant to be hidden (and the specifics usually are) the greater the resentment from partners excluded from the inner circle. However, regardless of the extent of concealment it is not linked to disengagement; disengagement is directly linked to the existence of the inner circle. Unsurprisingly, the less agencies are engaged in the inner circle the less their sense of engagement.

Researcher: In the community safety partnership things seem to get done but I’m never quite sure how they are done. I mean I’ve only been attending for 6 months.

James: (smile and ‘crafty’ look) They’re not done at those meetings.

In the above segment of data I express my bewilderment at my inability to grasp how decision-making is taking place in the partnership. I go on to suggest that this is perhaps down to inexperience. The respondent who was firmly ensconced within the deeply hidden inner circle reveals how decision-making takes place – not at the
meetings. Again, by those who are within the inner circle this process is engaged in due to its greater ‘efficiency’, no mention is ever made with regards to the greater degree of control it allows inner circle members to exercise – although this is clearly, equally as true.

Researcher: Do you see where the decisions are made?

Tara: Are they transparent do you mean?

Researcher: Yeah.

Tara: Things get done - but I am not sure how they do. They get done behind the scenes.

Researcher: And how do you feel about that?

Tara: Weeelll it depends on what you’re asking me about. Because in terms of (pause) tangible benefits for probation the fact is community safety means money. We do very well in Bingham. And that seems to be because I do things behind the scenes too. And so in terms of it benefiting me it works very well. What I don’t feel too positive about is you know the other things that happen that I don’t know about. I don’t think it is the best way to do business it isn’t - well I don’t feel comfortable in doing business in this way. And it does - although it does have its many benefits - it also has a down side of when you are - you need to account for what you are doing, nobody has written anything down. I’ve learnt in the past twelve months is that nobody ever writes it down so I write it down for myself. So I have quite a good system for myself of how I can operate in that kind of environment. But it is very limited in a contextual sense it is very limited to ‘have I had a good idea?’ ‘Had somebody else had a good idea that involves me so they told me about it?’ ‘Has somebody else had a good idea that they don’t think to tell me about because they don’t think it involves me but it might have?’ And it does all feel very –ummm (pause)...

Researcher: Piecemeal?

Tara: Yeah, Yeah! Yeah, it’s not very joined-up. I think the benefits could be more (pause) apparent, if the decision-making was more transparent.

The above quote is taken from an interview conducted with a probation representative at the Bingham partnership. She did not consider herself to be part of the inner circle and neither did those who were in the inner circle. However, she did have good personal relationships with the inner circle and may have been part of a ‘circle of influence’ that was outside the partnership and seemed to have a flexible membership in Bingham. She was part of the criminal justice system and that certainly seemed to engender some degree of additional respect by those who
occupied the inner circle. This respect was also bestowed upon the British Transport Police and the Fire Service although their representatives were very passive at partnership meetings. Only one member considered the probation service to be part of the inner circle and that was the NHS representative, however, her list was fairly extensive and she felt almost all members of the partnership were part of the inner circle except herself, so extensive was her degree of exclusion from the process.

In the above segment of data the probation officer is expressing a diversity of views. Firstly that *it works* – that having an inner circle works for probation because she has access to it. Secondly, *it works when I’m involved*, when she reaps the benefits for her agency in terms of greater access to funds then the inner circle works. Thirdly, *it does not work when I’m excluded*, when this member is excluded from the inner circle and feels excluded from the decision-making then the inner circle does not work for her or her agency. Fourthly, *when it does not work it is not a good way to work*, her sense of exclusion and ‘missing out’ on new projects or work meant that when she is not included the inner circle does not work and it is an expression of the self-interested agency. Fourthly, *this way of working is not accountable*; because this form of the inner circle is ‘hidden’ there is little recording of decisions made and agreements reached. Fifthly, *I’ve had to develop ways of protecting myself by recording conversations and agreements* – due to a lack of accountability this respondent has developed a way of keeping track of her input, the input of others, what she is and is not involved in and where the system of decision-making has failed because she has not been notified of an idea that would have worked for her. Crawford and Jones (1995) highlight the problem of accountability when informal power relations are utilised. The conclusion this respondent reaches is that this process of decision-making does not work and that the decision-making process could benefit from being more transparent. As we have seen transparency would lead to a greater sense of accountability, but it might not necessarily increase joined-up working, participation or engagement by agencies.

### 9.5 Key characteristics of hidden and transparent inner circles

Rather like Steven Lukes (1974) in studying the deployment of power, ascertaining the key characteristics of a hidden or transparent inner circle is problematic.
Similarly to Lukes it is in outcomes (or their lack of outcomes) that their existence is detected. Fielding (2005: 467-471) would suggest it lies in the interplay between rules and resources or structure and action and draws upon Giddens’ (1979) structuration theory and Archer’s (1982) morphogenesis to isolate a way in which these hidden imponderables can be isolated and exposed. Effectively by looking at the parts we can see. Here, outcomes are the extent to which individuals representing agencies report their experience of working in the particular partnership in terms of their personal sense of engagement or disengagement. A secondary source of insight comes from the analysis of observational field data, although this is often messy. Essentially, in transparent and hidden partnerships very few decisions occur which categorically commit a partnership to a project or way of working. A great deal of partnership working involves talking, planning and conjecture. Achievement is postponed until some distant time is reached. As such it is very difficult to isolate key decisions and say categorically, this is its provenance, this proportion of this decision was conducted outside of this room and this proportion inside. Deployment of power and decision-making is a subtle account of bias. Shaw (1954) identified that where information held by a group was diffuse and power not centrally controlled then the experience of group working was more satisfying. Therefore in Bingham where the hidden inner circle was utilised, partnership working was not a satisfying experience. However in Greenton where it could be said information was more ‘diffuse’ (although distribution was controlled), partnership working was more satisfying but still lacked creativity and engagement. For respondents experiencing a deployment of power it was evident in the silence that greeted suggestions, the acceptance of the way things were and the inability to challenge existing practices.

Having outlined the rather extensive caveat above there did seem to be certain observable characteristic linked to each partnership when describing the characteristics of transparent and hidden inner circles. Figure 3 summarises these.
Figure 3  Key Characteristics of Inner Circles By Type

**Transparent Inner Circles**

- Members will discuss the process of decision-making.
- They will attribute efficiency as the prime reason this form of decision-making has been adopted.
- They will discuss the concept of transparency and keeping transparency in decision-making.
- They will refer to how important it is to ‘keep people in the loop’.
- They will understand that a proportion of their work is hidden from general view.
- Other members of the partnership will be disengaged.
- This form of decision-making allows those in the inner circle to exert high degrees of power and control on the partnership.

**Hidden Inner Circles**

- The process of decision-making will not be discussed.
- If asked inner circle members will attribute efficiency as the prime reason this form of decision-making has been adopted.
- Other members of the partnership will be disengaged and resentful.
- Members of the inner circle will believe their decision-making is entirely hidden.
- Members of the inner circle will, occasionally, incorporate other members on their periphery in ‘circles of influence’ to achieve aims.
- This form of decision-making exerts low degrees of power and control on partnership due to high levels of disengagement and resentment.

The primary difference between these two methods of decision making is the degree to which power and control can be exerted over the partnership. The ability of the inner circle to exert this influence is mediated by the amount of resentment felt by the other members. Essentially, the greater the degree of apparent concealment of decision-making, the greater the extent of resentment and the decrease in the quantity and quality of power exerted over the partnership. As we saw in the previous chapter respondents identified trust and vulnerability as key concepts in relinquishing control to another agency. You had to trust that you were not going to ‘get screwed’. Transparent decision making processes allow this process to continue unabated because by its nature it is open and apparently ‘participatory’. However, as already noted there was an absence of challenges to the inner circle within this partnership. Only one clear challenge occurred whilst the researcher was in the field and this
seemed to represent more bluster than substance. The respondent in question had become the acceptable face of dissent.

Within Bingham, where the ‘hidden’ form of decision-making was utilised, anger, frustration and resentment were common experiences from those respondents excluded from the inner circle. This meant that a low degree of control was exerted over the partnership because partnership respondents had disengaged. However, disengagement came in a particular form, where potentially members could refuse to engage in the rubber-stamping exercise partnership working had become. This raises the possibility that, challenge could occur in a passive manner. The inner circle continued to make decisions outside the meeting and deploy partnership resources as they saw fit and occasionally they brought decisions to the partnership room. However, during fieldwork the degree of disengagement and resentment seemed to be reaching a point where attendance was becoming patchy or inconsistent and any attempts at reaching even internal administrative decisions were being delayed by various members of the partnership. The nature of this delay did not present as a ‘tactic’ but merely a part of the process of disengagement.

Bingham seemed more chaotic in its approach then Greenton. However, in its chaos there seemed more potential for challenge and growth than in that of Greenton, which was too well orchestrated to provide enough flexibility for genuine challenges. The drive for efficiency meant there was no room for real partnership working based on full and equal engagement.

10.6 Partnership Maintenance

The concept of partnership maintenance is key to understanding how partnerships preserve the ‘status quo’. Above the concept of ‘challenge’, both in overt and passive forms, has been explored. Challenge is part of the process of change, however in these partnerships change had been stymied by the highly developed and miserly approach to the distribution of power from the many to the few. Moreover, the lack of challenge was not the only tool used by the inner circle to maintain their way of working and in the following section further techniques are explored in more depth.
Distraction: Passivity and Activity

Distraction was used in both CSPs to maintain partnerships. This took two forms, passivity and activity. It is important to note here that we are talking about an interpersonal style that was manifested interactionally. Passivity was exclusively used by Bingham and was not as successful as the extreme activity that was deployed by Greenton. Occasionally the inner circle at Bingham would attempt to use activity as a form of distraction. However, it was so rarely used that respondents would seemingly fail to understand what the appropriate reaction was and would revert to utilising the more traditional form of distraction: passivity.

As already discussed, increasingly there seemed to be a burgeoning potential as the researcher left the field for passive forms of challenge. This was increasing with the expressed tension and frustration felt by respondents about working in partnership. However, the inner circle, to maintain established forms of decision-making in the partnership also used 'passivity,' but this was used to stifle creativity. An example was when Sandra expressed an interest in setting up a prison drug rehabilitation programme. As this was not seen as something that would engage the inner circle the suggestion was met without comment and marked interactional 'passivity'. This was used most extensively in the partnership situated in Bingham.

Amanda: It is pretty passive isn't it? You know the inner chamber. There are no crossed words. It has never been unfriendly - but that isn't helpful if it just doesn't get anything actually done is it?

The above respondent is commenting on the passivity she experiences at full partnership meetings in Bingham. She is commenting on how the inner chamber (the inner circle) is not unfriendly and there are not crossed words in partnership.114 The above respondent was not a member of the inner circle and so did not attend their private meetings. It is clear that her experience is of the 'stultifying passivity' of partnership meetings. As a drug worker she had commented previously on the lack of comment, interaction or discussion when she presented annual plans to the meeting. This is surprising, as drug money had been used as a tool in Bingham to focus interest on this particular area and bring in agencies such as health services.

---

114 This was not entirely the case as we shall see in the following chapter and the section on behaviour and techniques that were labelled as 'bullying'.
However, the reality was that decisions about ‘special interest’ areas were left to the agency that was best suited to make those decisions. This therefore effectively vitiated the partnership element to the work.

In contrast Greenton used ‘activity’ as a tool for maintaining the status quo and as a tool for screening off the hidden parts of the transparent decision-making processes, and it was very successful. This was done utilising the aforementioned administrative hub and the large amounts of high quality materials it produced for the partnership. This process of producing packs of information meant many agencies either did not have the time or inclination to wade through it. Alternatively they adopted a rational approach and focussed only on their area. Therefore it was a very successful form of distraction and in addition provided evidence to the members of the transparent nature of the decision-making process.

Decisions outside

Without doubt the clearest way the inner circle managed to maintain partnerships in their existing form was to make decisions outside of the main meetings. Liz below is describing why this happens.

Liz: It is also big - and the, again we follow the same principle which is get a lot of people around the table in the main partnership because of keeping folk in the ring. Keeping everybody in the ring, but be very careful in that where you get the real business done in terms of people working things through and complex issues and blah blah blah it is in the smaller groups (meeting outside the main partnership).

Liz is referring to the smaller groups in plural as in Greenton there was a very clearly constructed inner circle, but there were also ‘advisory’ groups that conducted research and information-gathering on an ad hoc basis. They were always led by the police or the drugs section of the community safety team.

Liz describes how partnership is about ‘keeping people in the ring’. This suggests that ‘partnership’ becomes a form of information-sharing. However, in this case partnership was a process of information giving by the inner circle rather than the sharing of information between agencies. The distribution of the partnership materials was a clear example of this process and stemmed from the very closely
guarded and fairly rigid image this partnership used: that of the ‘transparent’ decision-making body.

Not real

This sense of the portrayal of the partnership as being successful, when this was not the experience of the majority of the members, was most often articulated in Bingham. In Bingham the discrepancy between image and reality was a problem for members who were excluded from the inner circle and seemed to come to light during the research process. When interviewed, respondents sought to offer clarity of response, which could precipitate facing up to potentially unexpected realities. The following members highlight this discrepancy in their descriptions of the Bingham partnership. Tom was a member of the inner circle and Sonia was not and was experiencing high degrees of exclusion.

Tom: There is still a lot of people in Silo’s and what we have got to do is break down those Silos and get people to work together. In this partnership I think we have been quite fortunate in so much we’ve got some very very you know upfront people, politically our first deputy leader fosters, you know, working together anyway. The BCU commander he is a partnership person and I think it emanates from those sort of people down. I’m not saying it’s politically with a large p but we’ve recognised here in Bingham, we need to work together.

Sonia: I think that they say that the partnership works really well and I think that is a sign of it not being real.

Sonia is expressing her dissatisfaction at the discrepancy that occurs between the image of the partnership and the reality of it. It is what she terms as ‘not being real’. It is also of no particular surprise that the member of the partnership who is describing its positive assets is a retired police officer and the member who feels that it is not real is from the NHS (administrative). As already discussed in the previous chapter, success is a slippery concept and it is difficult to isolate its main features. However, what seemed core for members inside and outside the inner circle was their ability to ‘talk’ about the success of the partnership. Although some found it difficult to identify what it was that made them successful, others had taken on the ‘spin’ of partnership and were able to talk in general terms about ‘partnership’ achievements. The image of success was more readily and unquestioningly accepted

¹¹⁵ For more on this please see Methodology Chapter 4.
in Greenton then in Bingham. In Bingham the resentment, which was closely allied with partnership and the ‘hidden’ inner circle, seemed to prevent the acceptance of ‘success’ as reality. Also the distraction technique of ‘activity’ was an easier fit with the idea of success then that of passivity.

10.7 Conclusion

In conclusion we can see that the inner circle is a robust but rigid mechanism for the deployment of power within partnerships. The power is deployed in two ways, either utilising the hidden or the transparent method of decision making. By utilising the hidden method of control the other members of the partnership display high degrees of resentment due to the sense they have of being excluded. However regardless of which method is utilised, both result in excluded members becoming passive and disengaged. Disengagement is the key outcome to both forms of working regardless of the tools utilised in partnership maintenance.

In the following chapter we will explore the consequences of this form of working for partnerships, agencies and individuals.
11. Chapter Eleven
The consequences of this way of working

11.1 Introduction

In this chapter we shall be considering the consequences reported by respondents of the types of working which have been explored in the preceding chapters. Primarily attention will be on the impact of utilising the 'atypical construction of the other' agency and the creation of an 'inner circle' of decision makers. The consequences of these two constructions form a significant burden for the partnership, the agencies engaged in partnership working and finally for individual participants.

11.2 The sense of frustration

The following two respondents articulate the general feeling expressed by those working in partnership, who are also outside the inner circle, in explicit terms:

Rhona: And you see? You see the frustration.

Phillip: It frustrates me - the whole thing frustrates me. Partnership working frustrates me. But the delay is considerable and frustrating and I am not sure how you get over that. If there was an excellent idea, I am sure we would have articulated it by now.

While both describe how they find working in partnership frustrating Rhona's comment is a general characterisation. The second respondent situates the feeling of frustration into a larger framework about the inadequacy of partnership processes, in this case, delay. This was a commonly held perception and provided evidence for the 'efficiency' debate, which underpinned the development of the inner circle, as a form of partnership control and administration. This respondent was situated in Greenton, which had the most formal and well-developed inner circle, of which he was not a member. Regardless of this, it is apparent that he is not experiencing the main articulated reason for the development of an inner circle: efficiency, suggesting that in this respect the construct of the inner circle failed to deliver.

In addition, the second respondent states that he does not know of any other way to work. This was a common response by those in the field. They would often talk about partnership in detrimental terms and articulate the sense of frustration they felt
about having to work in partnership with other agencies. In these descriptions they would focus on the differences between agencies in working patterns, management structures and the subsequent delays this caused. This attitude was also common in Greenton, where the general image articulated by those working in partnership was one of 'success' but was tempered with the idea that success was 'hard won' and that partnership work was 'the hardest work you'll ever do'. Partnership members would be at a loss to identify other forms of working together and there was an explicit and implicit commitment to partnership working despite the apparent costs; delay, workload, time, lack of realisable outcomes. Members were in agreement that partnership is a time 'heavy' activity. Levels of work often depended on the partnership in question – but what was important to realise was that respondents were often members of more than just the CSP and therefore workloads for 'partnerships' were high. This sense of a heavy workload remained even when high degrees of disengagement meant actual workload (for those outside the inner circle) was, observably, low. This seemed to relate to the degree of materials provided. Where partnership organisation and communication with members was high, workloads were also reported as high. Where dissemination by the partnership was sporadic and low then degrees of workload were reported as lower – but perceived as still being high.116

This inability to identify alternative forms of working in a partnership seemed to stem from a policy 'blindness' which was experienced at all levels of the partnership (managerially, strategically and regardless of location inside or outside of the inner circle) and was very much rooted in the idea of partnership being a 'good way to work', but more importantly the only way to work (Pitts, 2002). This corroborates the literature on partnership working, which was explored in chapter three, where there was a lack of comprehensive critique of this form of working. Partly, this was due to the political context in which it was situated, that of third way ideology and rights and responsibilities (Blair, 1996; Etzioni, 1993; Giddens, 1998). Here partnership as a concept seems to fit neatly into this paradigm of working – apparently offering local responsibility and national rights. Therefore, it seemed as if

116 Respondents were asked how long they spent on partnership work each week and what this involved.
partnership as a form of working had become the answer. Unfortunately, the questions to which it is the answer have never clearly been articulated and this indeed may be part of the problem. This lack of direction and purpose to partnership stymies creativity, as professionals continue to embark on this form of working, despite evidence that it is very difficult to achieve outcomes using this process (House of Commons Committee of Public Accounts, 2004; Phillips et al., 2002; Phillips, 2002b).

Where agencies have found success it is in the one off, special interest, locally responsive project, be it crime reduction, hate crime or inter-agency working, which have utilised the skills of specific agencies where necessary (Bowling et al., 1991; Conroy et al., 1990; Crawford et al., 1996; Maguire et al., 2003; Warburton and Shepherd, 2002). Statutorily guided or enforced partnership working on the other hand provides fertile ground for power imbalances, local squabbling and the imposition of broad-brush national policy at a local level. In part, this seems to occur because of the lack of a unifying drive that is provided by the 'single issue'. An example of national priorities impacting on the local is in the case of street robbery, which became a locally imposed target on partnerships after considerable press interest (Cowan, 2003). This target was imposed on partnerships even when there was no local problem with street crime. When locally constructed partnerships become a conduit for national concerns and policy, which is often produced on an ad hoc basis in response to a myriad of drivers, there is a resulting tension between local and national accountability. This tension only serves to curtail local responses to crime problems and regardless of the national context in which this decision-making occurs, there is still a sense amongst partnerships that they are trying to meet local need, therefore increasing their sense of frustration.

11.3 Impact on the Partnership

In addition to the sense of frustration that respondents experienced there was the understanding they expressed about their sense of partnership processes. Passivity was a tool used by the inner circle to maintain the status quo in partnership and increasingly it was being used by the partnership in Bingham, as a form of resistance or as a symptom of encroaching disengagement. However, the respondents were not
unaware about the way work and power were being utilised in partnerships and if given the opportunity would articulate their observations. The following respondent was a drug worker in Bingham, which had a hidden inner circle led by the police.

Amanda: So this was a new experience for me to have a rather tight inner chamber who had various - who had pretty fixed ideas of voluntary sector and service providers and you know - generally were quite cross with health when we arrived.

She is describing the atypical construction of the NHS by the police, which was strongly expressed and experienced in Bingham. Furthermore this is a drug worker and drug workers commonly work in partnership. In reality their work only exists in the spaces between other agencies and thus necessarily involves engaging with, such agencies as the NHS, social services, Community Mental Health Team, Housing Departments and associations and other voluntary sector treatment and rehabilitation services. As a manager of drug services, Amanda’s experience of working in formal and ad hoc partnerships was extensive. However, despite this extensive background it is in her local CSP, which being situated in Wales offers hers a peripheral statutory responsibility, where she encounters rigid views of the way other agencies work and operate.117

Julie: Humm the problem is decisions are not being made by the strategic group - they are being made elsewhere and then being brought to the strategic group – ‘do you agree with this?’ everybody sort of saying. Whenever I speak up I am more often then not a lone voice.

Researcher: Who are making the decisions?

Julie: The police.

Researcher: And you feel they are bringing them to the meeting because they have discussions outside of the meeting.

Julie: Yeah - so it isn’t a management group it is a reporting group - I don’t think we are that involved in the big decision. I think we are highlighting the problems - we didn’t see the project plan because they haven’t got one. That seemed to be a nonsense - there is no way of measuring it. We’re just meandering along. I looked at the monitoring stuff and there was nothing

117 In Wales Substance Misuse money was passed to the CSP rather than the LHB in an attempt to secure commitment from the health sector. Therefore two drug workers presented at the partnership each month to report on the local plan. The statutory responsibility to do so was attached to the money rather than their role. Moreover, without any apparent line management they felt they needed to attend CSP meetings to maintain lines of accountability. Please See Figure 2.
about ethnicity. Why isn’t there someone there looking at these things? And saying this isn’t good enough - we’re leaving ourselves very exposed here.

The above respondent was working in the Stonham drug project, which was being developed to address local drug crime and prolific offending. Although it was based on a harm minimisation model for the drug user and the community (by lowering crime), it did not have a harm minimisation philosophy. This was mainly because the police were managing it as a crime reduction project; therefore they were interested in drug users who offended and in the meeting of local crime reduction targets, it being based on the North Town (NT) project.

Julie was a ‘vocal’ and influential member of the partnership but was not a member of the inner circle. This partnership was new and as such allegiances were still being formed and power imbalances were a crucial part of the developing relationships. The inner circle was dominated by the police who had procured the pump-priming money from the local government office for the region and who were in touch with the police officer who was managing the NT project. Within this partnership there was still a degree of challenge and Julie was a member of a small group of highly cynical ‘gainsayers’. However, despite this, the inner circle seemed to have the same effect as that reported earlier in Greenton and Bingham – that of engendering disengagement and passivity. Although Julie occupied the ‘vocal’ group of gainsayers, this tended to happen in ‘private’ after meetings, in asides and in interview. Little by way of direct challenge occurred at observed meetings. Lengthy discussions often occurred around substantive issues yet did not impact on the partnership such as location of the project, name of the project and equipment needed for the project although, at this point, there was no project plan or clear understanding amongst members of the criteria for the project. There was a lack of purpose, goal and strategy.

As Julie reports, when the project plan was developed, it occurred outside of the main meeting. It was developed by the police and emailed to the respective partners even though some of those partners were potentially providing members of their organisation on secondment to the project. Indeed, Julie isolates the sense that she has that the partnership is just ‘meandering along’ – she also feels that there should be someone who is taking responsibility for the whole project. This is possibly part
of the way in which she works in her own organisation, the probation service having a quasi-hierarchical management and reporting structure. This is an additional problem of hidden inner circles, where there is a lack of formal accountability and therefore a sense of insecurity about auditing decision-making processes, and Tara, a probation officer in Bingham, also felt this.

For partnerships, ‘partnership working’ often seems like an unsatisfactory way to work and a difficult enterprise. This is in part due to the prejudices agencies bring to partnership working about their colleagues; the ascribed characteristics which are key in the development of the atypical construction. It is also apparent in the power imbalances that one experienced in the deployment of power by the inner circles. However there was also a deep-seated insecurity that no one person has control of the entire enterprise – there is no strategic vision. Greenton was the only partnership in this sample where it was felt that there was one person who was in control. This sense remained, regardless of any attempts at ‘power-sharing’ that occurred – such as sharing the chair of the meetings between the council, the police and the NHS. The consequence of having a leader of such clarity and foresight meant there was a decrease in the degree of partnership working that occurred. It seemed that what this state of affairs lacked was firstly, a commitment to partnership formation and process and secondly, a clear understanding of the way that might occur. However, this might not necessarily mean that a structure where one person took the lead (such as Greenton) was not a viable alternative. What tended to make it less viable was the attempt to make it seem like a partnership. Potential alternatives are discussed in the concluding chapter.

11.4 Agencies

When respondents were discussing the position of their agency, in partnership, amongst others they would understand that there were those who were ‘in’ and those who were not. The following respondent is describing the position of the LHB in the Bingham partnership. Tara was not part of the inner circle, however she was trusted, and would, at times, inhabit the ‘circle of influence’ that surrounded the hidden inner circles.
Tara: I do recognise that health in particular - in particular the LHB is one of those people or organisations who is very much outside that inner clique for want of a better way of putting it and I didn’t feel comfortable about that. I mean I think as I said to you earlier - I think that I would have moved on to do something about that.

This respondent’s ability to make changes where the LHB were concerned was limited because of her own position in the partnership, which was outside of the decision-making core. However, what is clear is that she is aware of who had or was in the process of, disengaging from the partnership. In Wales, the LHB had a great deal of power, they had a large budget, significant statutory responsibility around the health promotion agenda and a desire to make effective changes that would carry them away from the English system of healthcare. Unfortunately, even though the leader of the LHB (Sandra) was seen as ‘very astute’, her position in the partnership was on the periphery and this only increased during the six months the researcher attended the partnership. In consequence, Sandra seemed to become more involved with the drug workers and the substance misuse action plan, as she attempted to put a prison treatment programme into place. It is also clear that aptitude or skills were not enough to gain access to the inner circle, it was not an egalitarian process. For this partnership an orthodox interest in crime and disorder reduction were a prerequisite. This was different in Greenton where such informally constructed criteria better reflected local responses to crime control. In Greenton the inner circle was wider and community safety was on the agenda. This was because there was a history of community safety garnered from ‘Five Towns’ and ‘Safer Cities’.

Sandra: It’ll have to change. If you want commitment if you want ‘partners’ and they don’t feel part of the decision-making then they’ll opt with their feet and they won’t engage because they’ll feel it’s just a rubber-stamping forum. And so, the trick will be to work out what the community safety agenda is for each of the constituent partners.

Sandra was the only respondent in the Bingham sample where I felt I was interviewing a ‘statutory partner’. Her interview was short, formal and strategic in orientation. All respondents were informed of the confidential and anonymous nature of the interviews. This reassurance meant that many respondents were open, discursive and at times indiscreet about their partners. In this interview that was not the case. However, she did make the above comment, which corroborated the
burgeoning sense of disengagement amongst key members that was observable in meetings.

This respondent had made attempts to uncover what it was each of the key members wanted out of the CSP and had begun a discussion with the partners to present their top three targets. These organisational targets would be used to form three joint partnership targets. This discussion happened in the second meeting the researcher attended. However, five months later none of the agencies had managed to turn up at the same meeting with any targets. The police and the CSP manager had been keen to take this on and began ‘driving’ the need for joint targets utilising the National Intelligence Model. Eventually a deadline was set – April 2004. Unfortunately, many partners did not attend that meeting because it was the end of the financial year. Moreover a promised presentation on the NIM did not occur and the project took on a crime reduction slant. 118

At the following meeting in May, Sandra did not attend but Sonia did. Sonia was asked for her top three targets. Sonia’s attendance had been somewhat patchy over the preceding four months and she was not aware of what she was being asked for. In addition to this her responsibility was partnership development and she worked for the PCT, which provided services. As she was not a commissioner of services or projects she failed to see why she should provide targets to this meeting – it seemed inappropriate. This sense of confusion only became apparent in interview. In the meeting she was dressed down by the CSP manager – who made it clear he was expecting targets at the next meeting – or else. Tom later explained in interview that he thought that it was important that he ‘made an example’ of someone in order to make people comply with the joint targets plan. Interestingly, Tom did not try and make an example of Sandra, who in meetings often asserted her authority. Generally this was not taken very seriously – however, it was clear that other partners did not wish to cause a scene (Gilling, 1993; Phillips, 2002a). Sonia left the meeting confused and angry – although this was never seen in the meeting. In addition, Sonia felt that this was symptomatic of the failure of the partnership to realise that she and

118 Gilling (1997) identifies how the police will use partnerships to meet their own targets.
Sandra were two different people working for two different services within the NHS and had very different core responsibilities.

11.5 Individuals

When we consider the impact of this way of working on individuals, we return once again to the sense of frustration they express. This is most eloquently reflected by the following respondent and was said in response to the situation described above – Sonia’s failure to provide targets.

Sonia: I have no idea of what is being done. I have no idea of what happens. I just go along and I sit there and that is it. And that is why I get to the stage where I just think that you are just banging your head against a brick wall - really.

It is important to reiterate that Sonia’s role within the PCT was as a partnership development manager. She attended three partnerships which were covered by the PCT and regardless of her experience found herself very frustrated by the process. This largely seems to stem from her lack of access to the decision-making core. Her attendance reflects the description given by her health colleague above, that of participating in a ‘rubber-stamping’ exercise. Her sense of frustration is graphic and intense.

The following respondent is describing the consequences of two Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (ASBO) that were placed on two young men that she was working with as a member of the Youth Offending Team (YOT). Anti-Social Behaviour Orders were high on the agenda for Community Safety Partnerships whilst this research was being conducted. The two CSPs in this research both claimed to be the first partnership to use one. They both had an ASBO strategy, which included the use of Acceptable Behaviour Contracts (ABC). In Bingham, where Lesley was working, the CSP team and the police developed the ASBO strategy and the CSP manager presented it to the partnership. The police were jubilant at being able to secure two high profile ASBOs against young men who were considered local ‘nominals’.

---

119 Primary Care Trusts were not coterminous, unlike LHBs which were now (largely) coterminous with councils.
Lesley: (Leans across the table and pats it with one hand) Listen I don’t want to spoil your fun or whatever (said with a tone of voice that she definitely was going to) but one of those young men was under an Intensive Supervision Order and he couldn’t go to it. One of the ASBOs helped and the other harmed. He had to get in and out of the city and this was a constant temptation to him to breach. In fact the ASBO has only served to make him more vulnerable.120 (Field notes B6)

In response to this ASBO, Lesley had to go back to the judge and ask him to vary the terms of the order, to include a temporal and geographical ‘corridor’, so the young man could make his way in and out of the city each day for his Intensive Supervision Order. This was seen as an unsatisfactory compromise as his YOT worker felt there would now always be a temptation for him to breach his ASBO.

Although this research has not been explicitly about the impact of this way of working on the community and those who access services, it is apparent that this is when failure to make local crime control measures responsive to local need (rather than national priority) can have negative consequences that are exacerbated by tenuous accountability. Lesley is addressing several concerns firstly: that as a person who does not have access to the hidden inner circle she was not consulted on the decision to bring an ASBO against these young men. Secondly, when this decision was made, no consideration was given to her local knowledge, the impact on her work or the impact on the young men. It highlighted the lack of partnership working within this partnership.

11.6 Bullying

In this final section it is necessary to consider the role and function of ‘bullying’ in partnership working. This form of coercion was used in all partnerships, and was explicitly referred to in Bingham. In Greenton, where ‘success’ was an accepted image of the partnership (amongst members) and feelings towards those in the inner circle were fairly amiable, coercive behaviour was described as ‘pushiness’. The role of behaviour ascribed as bullying seemed to be twofold, firstly to compel members to do certain work and secondly, for ‘policing the boundaries’. This use would occur when the inner circle perceived other agencies as encroaching on the core role or function of ‘crime reduction’ work. The hidden inner circle in Bingham, where there

120 This respondent worked for the Youth Offending Team. She was not interviewed as part of this research but did participate in the CSP meetings.
was less security in their role and function, as they operated without clear terms of reference, most often expressed this attitude. This lack of clarity around their role and the passivity and disengagement amongst the partners exacerbated feelings of insecurity and elicited extreme reactions to any form of encroachment.

Organisational bullying

The following respondent was the Leader of the Council in Bingham. She was passionate about working with the community and dealing with grass roots demand. She wanted to make the city of Bingham a better place to live and was committed to doing whatever she could to make that work. She had limited knowledge of the agency roles of each of the members of the partnership and it was clear in interview that she had little understanding of the difference between the PCT and the LHB. She thought they both did the same job but alternated their attendance. The second segment of data is from Tom, the manager of the Bingham CSP, who is commenting on what he had to do to get the health sector involved.

Lydia: I think that they’re starting to work now - it was very difficult and they had to be bullied in a way (researcher micro expression) not bullied but they really did have to be pressed and pressed into working - to even attend.

Tom: Health have been invited all the time, but of course you know they said they were coming, they wouldn’t come and it took me really, you know a couple of visits to their premises to sit down and tell them, you know, its not a case of we would like you to come, it’s a case of you’ve got to come to meetings, it’s a statutory obligation.

Lydia is describing how they managed to get the NHS working with the partnership. She described how they had to be bullied ‘in a way’. As sometimes happens, when Lydia explicitly referred to behaviour that had been observed in meetings, there was a slight change in facial expression by me (a momentary surprise), in response the respondent clarified her position. As has already been explored in considering the structure of this partnership, the NHS attended, but they were not engaged. There were perceived misconceptions in this partnership; that attendance indicated engagement and that the ‘partnership’ was able to compel another agency to comply with their demands. Although, here, Lydia seems to be identifying the difference between ‘work’ and attendance, there is clearly a hope that attendance will lead to work. The CSP manager also describes how the NHS failed to attend partnership
meetings so he went and visited ‘their premises’ and explained their statutory obligation to attend meetings. Under the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 s6, it is a statutory responsibility to ‘formulate and implement’ the crime reduction strategy, however it is not a statutory responsibility to ‘attend meetings’.

It is unclear from the above what form of ‘bullying in a way’ Lydia is talking about. However, it is clear that the inner circle observed behaviour by the health sector agencies (the PCT and LHB), in this circumstance ‘attendance’, and interpreted it as compliance with their demands. Whether it was or not is difficult to ascertain but seems unlikely, given the thoughts expressed by Sandra and Sonia in interview and their somewhat patchy attendance.

The following respondent is describing the way the police work in partnership,

Sonia: But I don't know if that is the way that the police are? - it might be the way that the police are - it might be the way that the police want to do things - but to me it is a bullying type of way of working, which I don't think is very helpful...I think that is a bit of a bullying culture isn't it? And I think that is a bit of what it is.

She isolates what she feels is the way that the police work in response to two episodes that were mentioned earlier. Firstly, where an officer waited until she was in a meeting, with an audience, to tackle her over a security issue. Secondly, when the retired police officer who was the CSP manager demanded targets at the next meeting. She feels that the police act in a ‘bullying type of way’ and then goes on to situate this in the ‘bullying culture’ of the police. Sonia felt bullied because the police - eventually - put themselves in the position of managing the issues she described in interview and the stance that they adopted in doing so was domineering, pro-active and adversarial. This is part of the ethos of the role and what Sonia identifies as police culture. These episodes were not initially controversial – they became so over time. It was observed, in this research, that when officers work in partnership they at times adopted a ‘partnership persona’ which involves patience at the perceived inadequacies of other agencies. Cope (2004) also identifies this as a way of working. This means they will often wait when they want to have something done, or feel they should be involved, in an attempt to be non-directive. The
consequence of this lack of immediately pressing their interests is a growing degree of irritation when their expectations are not met. The police then assuage their irritation through demands – as they would in their own organisation. The problem is that the police do not have the appropriate interpersonal skills or knowledge to sensitively manage health sector workers. Their style of management does not appreciably improve matters, when it is deployed ‘against’ health sector workers.

Policing the boundaries

The data discussed next is from two interviews that were conducted after a CSP meeting, where there was a presentation by the Local Criminal Justice Board (LCJB). They had come to do a 20-minute presentation on their work. It was clear that this was something that they had taken round many local agencies to raise their profile. What also became apparent was the degree to which their work overlapped with the work that was already being conducted locally by other agencies, members of the partnership, or that had been initiated by local high profile crime reduction projects. Such duplication is a common experience where policy implementation occurs at a fairly rapid pace and where local initiatives are not taken into account.121 Ironically one of the main policy discourses predicated by central government in the use of partnership is fiscal economy, avoidance of duplication and efficiency (Cabinet Office, 1999). CSPs should have stopped this from happening as they were designed to coordinate a local response to crime problems. Unfortunately, centrally designed crime reduction initiatives have continued unabated such as the LCJB, prolific offender projects and Reassurance Policing, which were all initiated without apparent regard to already occurring local projects.

In this case the CSP inner circle reacted negatively to any attempts at what was perceived as undermining their core role. They reacted swiftly and put the representatives from the LCJB ‘in their place’ and this place was outside of the partnership. They employed the same reaction one would commonly see delivered by the police when they are attempting to protect what they understand as their core

121 This experience of exasperation must have been common enough for the Home Office to provide guidance on how CSPs and LCJBs should work together (Office of Criminal Justice Reform and the Home Office, 2005).
role. This is unsurprising given the police-dominated nature of the inner circle. The resultant meeting led to a sense of high drama as the inner circle bullied the two young men. It is also worth noting that although some members of the partnership did try and draw lessons from the presentation by asking questions or drawing parallels to their own work the bullying continued unabated.

Amanda: They haven’t got the bigger picture. That attack on those guys - I said to Sean that is absolutely outrageous the way they were spoken too. And he said ‘oh they’ll be okay I’m sure they can cope’ or something. They were browbeaten. And I was trying to talk about drug and alcohol work - as these were all areas we could work on together. But - it would have been a positive position to take.

Researcher: It was quite an extreme reaction.

Amanda: Yes bullying.

Researcher: Humm...

Amanda: It was terrible.122

Sonia: (Rueful laugh) I felt so sorry for those blokes from the Criminal Justice Board, was it? Or the Local Youth Justice Board? Because I did I felt really sorry for them and I think in a way that sums up the partnership. And that it is not really a partnership because I thought the attitude of the Chief Superintendent, Lydia and Sean at the end was just dreadful really. I really did (rueful laugh) it was mortifying.123

Although it is clear that Amanda and Sonia found this experience a cause for concern, at the partnership meeting there was no direct challenge to the inner circle by any of the members present. It was a surprising and puzzling reaction. The room had been darkened for a Powerpoint presentation; the representatives from the LCJB were fairly young – in their late twenties and smartly dressed and there was nothing to suggest that their material was going to be so inflammatory or garner such an extreme reaction. It was perceived as a deeply unprofessional attack. An indicative ‘inner circle’ comment was when the Chief Superintendent paused to say to them ‘you haven’t done your homework, have you? We do all this anyway. All of it.’ It is apparent that the lack of challenge amongst members was a symptom of the way

122 Excerpt from an interview with Amanda.
123 Excerpt from an interview with Sonia.
power was deployed in this partnership and, by utilising the inner circle as a form of decision-making, passivity, disengagement and resentment were experienced.

11.7 Conclusion

When considering the consequences of the atypical construction of the other agency and the construction of the inner circle as a mechanism of decision-making the most common, underlying response, is one of frustration. Frustration seems to be experienced by all members, even those who are members of the inner circle. The frustration of the inner circle seems to stem from the inability to get things done because of local and national accountabilities. The frustration experienced by those outside of the inner circle seems to be as a result of the inaccessibility of power within partnerships. The partnership with the lowest expressed levels of tension was Greenton, where partnership processes were tightly controlled and outcomes (if any) carefully planned. Frustration was mainly felt in response to nationally assigned protocols such as the prolific offenders projects. In Greenton where the inner circle was small and rigid in formation there was a greater ability to be responsive to these national needs because there were fewer people to inform and deploy. Even though Greenton was situated in a large multi-agency partnership this responsiveness was possible because of the nature of the transparent inner circle.

Secondly, at least on the strength of this data there is the effect that partnership working has in legitimating the use of coercion – bullying and ‘pushiness’ - as a tactic in partnership processes and in the deployment of power by the inner circle. In Bingham and in Stonham this had a detrimental effect on partnership working which was likely to be ongoing and long-term. For other agencies, such as the NHS, working with the police in this particularly stressful forum meant ascribing or reinforcing rather negative views of the police and the way that they worked.

Thirdly, agencies had difficulty in placing their work within a larger political context and situating their responses within that. They were aware that they were working within a rapidly changing political milieu that was driven by national priorities – but they were unable to see that agency responses also passed through a filter of national policy. As such, agencies were unforgiving of what were seen as agency or personal
failures when often responses were due to prioritising agency needs above partnership processes.

In the following, concluding chapter we shall explore these issues in more depth as well as drawing the main conclusions from this research and the implications for policy.
12. Chapter Twelve

Conclusion

In this chapter we shall consider the main findings and lessons from the research. Firstly, I shall revisit the research questions and the limitations of this research. I shall then recapitulate what the current position is with regards to partnership working in a community safety (rather than crime prevention or crime reduction) context. Secondly this will be placed within the framework of the current and ongoing changes that will be enacted from late summer 2007 onwards under the Police and Justice Act 2006 (PJA). Thirdly I will reflect on the potential gains that this way of working has achieved. Finally, some suggestions will be made regarding potential alternatives to this way of working and the changes that will need to occur to achieve these outcomes.

12.1 Research questions - revisited

This thesis sought to address the following research questions:

i) What is the local and national, political and policy background to partnership working between the police and the National Health Service, which substantially contributes to or inhibits partnership working?

ii) What is the current and developing statutory framework, which frames these organisations in their endeavours to work together?

iii) How successful are these organisations in integrating cultural understandings of their own work and the work of other agencies?

iv) How can partnership working be a sustainable project for future policy development?

The first question was primarily addressed by a systematic review of the conceptual and theoretical literature in chapters 2 and 3. The literature on the police and the NHS suggested that politically, strategically and culturally these organisations occupy fairly fixed ground with regards to their actual and perceived functions. Although both organisations seem to undergo fairly frequent change this mainly addresses what is happening at the periphery of their service and they have
developed a strategy where they then retreat onto established ground to maintain traditional understandings of their role. Police officers and NHS workers (although this is less evidenced in current available literature) both seemed very aware of the history of their organisations and the apparently ‘protected’ or bipartisan policy ground in which they worked. In chapter 4 the literature on local forms of crime control/local governance was considered and although it clearly formed a compelling narrative on state management (or not) of crime in communities and remains important in framing our broad understanding of this debate – for this research it was not the whole story. Therefore in this thesis, which was considering the nature of relationships within partnerships it had substantial but not sole or dominant bearing. This research drew substantially upon classic sociological/political science literature on ‘power’ and power relationships. This literature had significant influence on the developing argument in the analysis chapters. This is most apparent when considering how partnerships worked together, deployed power and the consequences of utilising these methods, as discussed in chapters 10 and 11.

To answer the second question a comprehensive review was conducted of partnerships as a technique used by government for policy implementation and then, by reference to the developing policy literature, a systematic assessment was conducted of the implementation and development of Crime and Disorder partnerships. In the period January-July 2007 a careful summary was carried out of a rapidly changing policy field and this is also presented in chapter 3.

Point three was addressed indicatively but not conclusively, by the analysis of the empirical findings in chapters 7 and 8, the research findings suggesting that the success or not of agencies reflexively to consider their own position and that in relation to others was patchy. This research was drawing on a limited sample and therefore it is difficult to draw broad conclusions from this work. The police had a strong impression of what their work entailed although this often reflected the ‘ethos of the role’ rather than the reality. When considering the ability of the police to work with other agencies they had the least success (of the two agencies) in achieving this (perhaps) ambitious goal. The reasons for this were complex but in part appeared not due to a lack of understanding of other agencies but because they chose not to let this
burgeoning understanding affect their work. Speculatively and indicatively it seemed that this was because multi-agency working was a new experience and working collaboratively rather than leading an endeavour was uncommon but also difficult for the police. In addition, any attempts to acquire a wider skill set would have necessitated time, effort and therefore money and in the current management culture (most convincingly identified by Brown (2007)) such pursuit would not have been encouraged. Concurrently, there was little evidence that most police officers were interested in attaining these skills. However, one or two did buck this trend. For the NHS they appeared to have a good understanding of the police and the way that they worked. They also were able to perceive the current changes that were occurring within the NHS under the modernisation agenda and perceived the impact this might have on their work. They also understood (having worked for a long time in the health sector) that more changes may come along 'pretty soon'. However, neither of these perceptions made them more likely to work collaboratively in a crime reduction (née crime prevention) context when there were not clear and apparent short-term gains for their organisation.

Regarding the fourth research question this final point is substantively answered with reference to the empirical findings in tandem with a suggestive appraisal of the literature. Section 12.7 and 12.8 of this chapter substantially concludes, with reference to evidence from this research and significant literature, that substantial changes will have to occur amongst and within local structures for CSPs to be substantially more ‘successful’ then has been evidenced so far.

Limitations of this research

Regardless of how careful a researcher is there are always going to be limitations to a research project. This is true of all research but more so for the novice researcher in the field. Indeed doctoral research is an apprenticeship, which allows the student to stand back and say ‘these are the things I would have done a bit differently’ and ‘if I only knew then what I know now.’ In the spirit of this process it is appropriate to address this here, although much of this has been considered reflexively throughout the thesis and with particular reference to the Methodological chapter.
Firstly, and most apparently a CASE studentship means that it is created with a particular aim in mind. In many ways this may be considered good grounding for ‘contracted’ research that is increasingly common nowadays. However, doctoral research is a different prospect. Traditionally, doctoral research in the humanities and social sciences is initiated and developed through a pressing or emergent concern with the world. While it may address contemporary policy concerns this traditional interest-driven doctorate largely proceeds by its own lights. Of course, this view is not entirely grounded in reality, as many excellent ideas for doctoral research routinely do not see the light of day due to the nature of academia and the costs associated with research (personal, financial). However, regardless of this, a CASE studentship then is an odd hybrid of doctoral research and contracted research. As such it comes complete with the potential benefits and drawbacks associated with both types of research practice, which have been covered elsewhere but to summarise: benefits are - access, funding, resources, (possibly) support and profile; the main drawbacks are CASE partner’s expectations and pre-decided research structure.

As already discussed this research was able to take advantage of most of the advantages and avoid many of the disadvantages. However, this research was created with a specific policy investigation in mind and an idea about how that might be conducted. That did have an impact on the way this research was constructed and a fuller discussion of that can be found in the methodological chapter and chapter 4. Since this research was attempting to identify good practice amongst partnerships, it adopted a ‘deviant’ approach to the selection of field sites. It sought partnerships that were successfully engaging with the National Health Service at a strategic level. Having considered other partnerships when piloting the research and identifying potential field sites, it is important to be clear about the constraints arising from the sampling strategy, although it was a strategy reflecting both the planned research questions and the realities encountered in the field. Mainly this was because the two CSPs in this research did not look particularly different from other partnerships I

124 For more on this it may be worth considering the following references (Hey, 2003; Hobbs, 1993; May, 1993a; May, 1993b; Reay, 2006; Walkerdine, 2003).
considered but discarded because they were unsuccessfully engaging with health care. As the partnerships in this research only showed patchy outcomes in terms of success – it may be that they actually reflect wider practices in partnerships than just those associated with the two-agency story presented here. Indeed the very limited research which has been conducted on partnership processes in general and community safety partnerships in particular, seems also to identify problematic relationships amongst partners. Without further research and a larger sample size it will be difficult to test this hypothesis.

Secondly, because of the interest of the external sponsor of this research into two particular organisations, the context and influence of other partners is only seen ‘at times’ and as such a direct comparison of skills on the part of practitioners becomes limited in its effectiveness. Although it is also clear that a thesis only has limited capacity in the presentation of its findings.

Finally, during the analysis, a particular finding arose with regards to social class and its influence on the police in the formation of occupational culture. This finding became apparent in the analysis of observational field data and interview data. Due to the late emergence of this finding during the process of analysis (and having withdrawn from the field) social class of origin amongst respondents had to be assigned without being able to systematically record class using the Registrar General’s classification or other standard measures. For the researcher the data has depth that is not available to the reader even when particular regard to context is paid. If this finding had been apparent earlier in the research process (before or during data collection), corroborative evidence may have been sought and findings substantiated with ‘harder’ evidence. If this had happened then the seminal work by Reiner (1978) on social class in the police, may have been adopted and formed a structural and analytical frame for this work. However, this did not happen and moreover, work by Bourdieu (1990), Williams (1995), Sayer (2005) and Reay (2005) suggests that seeking direct responses from research participants to a sensitive subject such as social class may elicit particular responses, such as shame. Bourdieu

---

125 With particular reference to (Crawford, 1995; Crawford et al., 1995; Gilling, 1994; Phillips, 2002b; Phillips et al., 1998)
(1990) in particular suggests that direct questioning of a factor which makes up everyday life (i.e. habitus) and constitutes unthinking practice, may result in 'official accounts'. Williams suggests that the 'social nature of the research situation encourages them (the respondent) to justify rather than describe their behaviour' (1995: 584). As such, attempts at direct questioning may not have resulted in clarification of the social class point but only further confusion.

Below, with some concluding remarks, we shall consider the main findings from this research and what can be said, bearing in mind the preceding discussion, about the current policy field in the context of Community Safety Partnerships, with particular reference to the relationship between the police and the National Health Service.

12.2 Partnership Development in a Community Safety Context

Partnership working in a community safety context has undergone considerable changes in the past two decades and is characterised by what Mclaughlin (2002a) would call the 'permanent campaign'. Like many social policy initiatives it has so far lacked a period of consolidation and capacity building. Partnership has become a place where new initiatives are projected one after the other. The window dressing may change but the production remains essentially empty. Agencies have become adept at the meeting of centrally orchestrated aims but at the expense of local accountabilities. However, it will be argued that it may not always be so.

The development of partnership working in a community safety context has been characterised by the movement from chaos through consolidation to what could now be termed 'closure'.

Chaos

The period post the interdepartmental circular 1984 until the Morgan Report in 1991 is characterised as a period of 'chaos'. Chaotic social policy processes were attended by periods of intense creativity and Morgan in his report identified that response to the 'call-to-arms' that was the 1984 circular, was sporadic and uncoordinated. Morgan's reaction was to the small local projects that began to answer community
need with multi-agency working in an ad hoc way. There is no attempt here to characterise this period as 'good' or 'bad', merely an attempt to identify the underlying processes that were at work. It seems likely that these projects were addressing ongoing community issues, which potentially had reached a point where 'something' needed to be done. As such, the 1984 circular acted as a spark to the dry tinder that was available in some communities across the country. Moreover, perhaps in these areas they availed themselves of these new processes because they responded to a unique need, which could indeed only be solved by a multi-agency approach. It is also likely that these early local partnerships largely relied on one agency to identify the problem and co-ordinate the local response. Indeed research from this period identifies exactly those concomitant problems associated with current partnership processes: inequalities, power discrepancies, lack of rigorous processes, narrow agenda-setting and programme inefficiencies (Crawford et al., 1996; Gilling, 1993; Pearson et al., 1992; Phillips et al., 1998; Sampson et al., 1988). However, there was also some evidence of successes under the government’s flagship Five Cities Project and the occasionally successful one off crime prevention project such as the now well-known Kirkholt Burglary Project and Bowling and Saulsbury’s experience with the North Plaistow Racial Harassment Project (1991). It has to be said this period was also marked by a lack of central control over local processes and a seemingly genuine response to community problems. However, what is also clear is that the community problems identified were often of a certain type vocalised by the, perhaps, raucous-voiced minority (Crawford, 1995).

Consolidation

The second period is characterised by the post Morgan era of consolidation. Although the Morgan Report did not provide a statutory framework for a way of working it did provide a blueprint. It situated community safety with local authorities. In response to this, many created local teams to focus on community safety issues in their locality and foster local strategies. There was also an associated commitment by local authorities to the community safety ‘project’ that was somewhat political in nature. The Thatcher government and, with no appreciable change in this respect, the then Major government, had squeezed out local authorities from local forms of decision-making or control and the New Labour opposition was
promising a reversal in fortunes should they gain power. This meant that there was a great deal of support amongst the Local Government Association and New Labour for the Morgan report and an apparent wholesale acceptance of its recommendations.

The Morgan report, therefore, not only continued to feed the spark that was the 1984 circular but became the seat of a campaign for local accountability and community involvement in crime control. Moreover there was a concomitant understanding of what community safety partnerships might look like. However this understanding was engendered not just from Morgan but also from the Safer Cities projects which had sprung from the earlier Five Cities initiative. Regardless of the expected similarities and the undoubted ‘learning’ that was taking place during this period as agencies incorporated the ‘multi-agency’ expectation and ‘partnership’ working into their understanding of their work, there was also an associated formalisation and rationalisation of processes. There were also some important differences to the present position. A fundamental difference between Safer Cities and Community Safety Partnerships would be the degree of financial support from the centre. Firstly Safer Cities remained a fairly small scale endeavour with a great deal of local flexibility. Grants of under £500 had no requirement for central accountability and the majority of grants for local projects stayed under this figure. In addition to this larger grants were, by and large, passed to end users quickly and (fairly) efficiently by the Home Office and if necessary the Treasury (Tilley, 1992). Secondly Safer Cities projects were provided with a co-ordinator whose salary was met by central government funds. Of course this may have provided a small amount of central control but it also meant local authorities were kept ‘out of the loop’. In a period of fiscal punitiveness, a ‘rolling back’ of state forms of welfare, and apparent excessive control from the centre, the Safer Cities projects represented a counter trend. However, it should be noted that Five Cities and Safer Cities were developed due to urban disintegration and they were seen as a cost effective and rational form of response to a complex problem, one that avoided dealing with the issues on a deeper level. Moreover, Liddle and Gelsthorpe (1994c) identify how the success of local coordinators was patchy as again this was a new post with little local knowledge of what was required and again there was an associated lack of capacity.
Closure

After the enactment of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 (CDA) there was a period which one could term 'closure'. This term is used to describe the closing down of local forms of creative initiative in reaction to central forms of control. The New Labour period of government has been characterised by a rapid statutory thrust in policy making. The CDA was the nascent parliamentary response to crime control in this respect. However the CDA forms an uneasy alliance between the old and the new. The CDA was the culmination of much activity in the 1990s as has been illustrated above, however it was also as a result of the New Labour Government’s 1997 manifesto commitment to honour spending limits to those kept by the previous Conservative Government. Therefore, any new initiatives to in a sense expand a welfarist Labour movement had to be done within established spending limits. This decision meant a reliance on using ‘third way’ ideology to foster change without greater expenditure, by finding an alternative to expanding the welfare state and or to ‘rolling’ it back. In as much as this could be done it necessitated a recourse to stereotypical conservative dogma about welfare services – a stance which seems counter intuitive to any labourite in ethos and scope – to the effect that there was a great deal of ‘wastage’ within the provision of services and that this could be stopped or at least ameliorated by the utilisation of market principles and forces. This attitude to welfare services was old fashioned even in 1997, since informed parties such as practitioners and policy commentators knew that welfare services had undergone a long period of financial deprivation, which had left their tangible assets in a poor state of repair, despite the canny deployment of resources by local actors to maintain core services (Ham, 1994).

Community Safety Partnerships were affected by these decisions as much as any other policy initiative. Partnerships were instructed to audit their communities, and develop strategies, which would include target setting with locally responsible agencies. None of this is particularly surprising in itself, this form of working necessarily entails some form of consulting with the community. However, there was

126 For more on this please see the 1997 New Labour Manifesto. This can be found on the Keele University website http://www.psr.keele.ac.uk/area/uk/man/lab97.htm (accessed 16th May 2007)
no leading in period, no training and no local capacity building. Therefore it is not surprising that 10 years after the implementation of the CDA local agencies still struggle with consultation processes and hard-to-reach groups (Newburn et al., 2002). In addition there was no auditing by central government of what was already available nor any attempt at coordinating a process of consolidation. Instead new processes were hastily implemented. These characteristics seem likely to have played at least some part in local community safety processes failing to deliver. As most practitioners in the field will attest, if you want more money then ‘be crap or be good’ and in this sense many partnerships were poorly performing. As observed by Liddle and Gelsthorpe (1994c) and later by Phillips (2002a), although central government was trying to implement rational processes the local response to this was a rational reaction. The strategies adopted reflected work that agencies were already doing, particularly those agencies with statutory responsibility, primarily the police and the local authority.

The effects of this application of New Public Sector Management and the introduction of market principles, value for money and Best Value Performance Indicators meant that there was a sacrificing of outcomes for outputs. There was a reliance on what is measurable and thus a swing back to crime reduction rather than community safety with crime reduction remaining a police activity. The result of this is the excision of the partnership element of community safety partnerships and the vesting of control in the police. It is they who control the means for achieving a crime reduction and the information to judge its success.

This vesting of control in the police is reflected in the main findings drawn from this research. The police along with the local authority hold the majority of the control in partnerships, which allows them to deploy this in an attempt to meet their centrally located targets. In this research the local authority also had considerable control over processes. This seemed to be due to two reasons. Firstly they became statutorily responsible for local crime control strategies at the same time as the police and in addition ‘community safety’ falls within their remit. Whilst crime reduction has become vested in police processes of measurement, management and crime control there are clearly still benefits to be accrued by local authorities, in the form of
potential net gains of community safety (as a by product of the process of crime reduction) and reassurance. However there are few apparent gains to be realised in an agency such as the NHS where actual or potential crime reductions have little effect on their core business. Equally an agency like probation whose work and targets are situated post crime not pre-crime has little to gain in a crime prevention strategy.

Therefore the process of disengagement is two-fold, arising from the objectives and the process. The lack of engagement by an agency in the ‘project’ of crime reduction (as opposed to community safety) merely confirms the atypical construction of the other that the police utilise to keep agencies (in this case the NHS) out of the decision-making core. This process of exclusion, be it transparent or hidden, makes little difference to representatives of partner agencies, the consequence is the same: disengagement. However, inasmuch as cordial relations can be maintained between agencies this is more likely to occur in the transparent rather than the hidden form. This is because the hidden form engenders frustration and resentment.

12.3 Current Achievements

This research adopted a stringent view of the essential criteria with which to gauge partnership achievement and especially in defining ‘partnership projects’. In this research a partnership activity had to involve three or more partners to be designated as a partnership activity. This criterion was not adopted by other auditing mechanisms such as the National Audit Office, who in its audit of one of the partnerships in this sample, listed a number of achievements, that comprised projects that were actually as a result of work mainly by one and sometimes two agencies. It should also be noted that where two agencies were involved they were both members of the inner circle. Given that partnerships were meant to be the common effort of up to twenty agencies it seemed disingenuous to label local project activity (sometimes conducted by third sector agencies who did not even attend the partnership) as ‘partnership achievements’. On this basis the partnerships in this study did not offer evidence of any realisable partnership activity or what might be termed in modern parlance ‘hard’ outcomes. As was suggested in Chapter 3, Greenbore seemed on the
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cusp of initiating what could be genuine partnership activity involving the three statutory partners. However, Greenton was also apt to identify what it considered as partnership activity work that only involved one agency, such as the local authority. Members of the inner circle in Bingham were adept at articulating up-and-coming plans or co-opting other local activity as their own. However other members of this partnership, which was utilising the 'hidden' form of the inner circle, were not aware of the image maintenance that was an ongoing product of the inner circle. Therefore, unlike the Greenton partnership they were not adept in co-creating a positive image of the partnership. Accordingly in response to the question 'So, can you tell me what the partnership has achieved?' respondents would look back in blank surprise.

There were some 'soft' outcomes to partnership working, but these seemed more apparent in Stonham, the 'single' issue partnership in my analysis. This was for two reasons, firstly, many of the agencies had not worked together before and their understanding of how other agencies worked was limited. This is illustrated by one officer asking me 'So the NHS, there is actually something like that?' My response was based on the current understanding that health structures were being eroded due to the then new proposal for 'foundation hospitals' – 'Oh right, you mean because of the foundation hospitals thing?' To this officer's credit – he remained focussed and unembarrassed by this response. 'Nope, I mean there really is something called the NHS? You know, that the government owns and everything?' Therefore starting from such a low level these officers' knowledge of health structures was at least more realistic towards the end of the project then at the beginning. There was no doubt that they nevertheless often did not like what they found and that engaging with the health sector remained a problematic enterprise for them. But their knowledge gain at least counts as a soft outcome.

In Greenton, its soft outcomes were around using the partnership as a local information-sharing hub. The detrimental aspect of this process was the degree to which there was a decrease in agencies using local forms of information-gathering when they had access to such an efficient source. Therefore in Greenton local forms of control were experienced to such a high degree as to prevent agencies engaging in their own internal data gathering. There seemed to be a concomitant loss of skill and
confidence in what was relevant for this community and an orientation towards central forms of control.

Liz: ...I think what we manage to do quite successfully is make sure that we are meeting or trying to meet not to say that we are not meeting them but sometimes we're not – we're meeting or trying to meet the national targets but doing it in a way which suits our local circumstances... For example - you know we have been picked out as - what do they call it? One of the priority areas for CRACK - I can't remember what they call it but there is some proper name for it. Which actually is really BIZARRE because we don't have much of a problem with Crack here. Most of our problems are with - I think relatively to Canterbury or something we would obviously - but relative to other cities it's much more heroin and ecstasy and much less crack. SO when we got given that we thought 'that is pretty weird but okay fair enough'.

In Bingham soft outcomes were more apparent in the techniques agencies employed to avoid contact with the inner circle. This was evidenced by the activity of the Local Health Board member Sandra, who, when she realised that the community safety partnership was not interested in a prison based treatment programme (it being a post offending intervention with no clear short-term crime reduction), focussed her attention on building a relationship with the non-statutory substance misuse action team. However, the consequences for agencies outside the inner circle, when they came into contact or conflict with agencies inside the inner circle, was largely detrimental. The only agency that seemed to maintain a keen interest in working with them despite her position outside of the power-holding few, was the probation officer, who occupied the limited ‘circle of influence’. 128

12.4 New Developments

It is not my intention to repeat here the outline of new developments that are due to be implemented in the late summer of 2007 and spring of 2008 and that were covered in Chapter Three. However it is worth taking a moment to consider what the effects of these ‘new’ forms of working will be on already established processes. Firstly, it seems likely that if a greater degree of community engagement is desired then those partnerships that have become expert at a professional response to centrally

128 Members who were influential but did not occupy a position within the inner circle constituted the ‘circle of influence’ – in reality this was occupied by very few individuals and as such is not explored in any great depth in this research.
orientated demands, such as Greenton, will have the most problems in now inverting this process. This is not to say that Greenton did not conduct professional, extensive and above all formal forms of consultation, because it did. It had the most efficient forms of consultation of all partnerships in this sample. However, these new changes call for a lighter touch, local responsiveness and a community orientation, which may call for considerable adjustment in local practices.

In Bingham local forms of consultation seemed seriously limited, and regardless of this, there was also little orientation towards the strategy. The ‘partnership’ activities had more to do with the interests of the inner circle rather than any discernable external processes. However, this very indifferent attitude to local forms of accountability meant that the new processes discussed in Chapter Three would likely be less onerous. There is less need to break down existing ways of working and build something new. Therefore, although on the surface it could be argued that this partnership was in some terms less ‘successful’ than Greenton, this may paradoxically make it more able to grapple with the imminent changes. Also for this partnership there was a likelihood that the scrutiny panel, if properly constructed, could provide this partnership with the productive steer it needed for future working.

12.5 Alternatives

The following offers some suggestions regarding alternatives to the working practices that have been examined in this thesis. It tries to take some of the weaknesses in working that are identified in the current system, at least in the fieldwork sites and in the literature, and identify ways that they could potentially be strengths if enough thought was given to what particular agencies are good at. Social policy often swings between specialisation and generalisation in public services. Usually this is done to ameliorate the weaknesses in one form of working by returning to the old way of working, which did not have these problems but had others, that being why change was advocated in the first place. To some extent the third way and partnership working is a process whereby the fragmentation (specialisation) of public services could be knitted together, hopefully maintaining what they were good at whilst exploiting the expertise of other agencies at the boundary of one service with another. The problem here is the different ways in
which agencies conceptualise their work and the context of inherent competitiveness that is, associated with the current use of New Public Service Management (Martin, 2003) to control services. However the section begins with the most pressing ‘problem’ identified in this research, securing change within police culture at least to such an extent as to erode the dominant forms of police engagement in partnerships that is exhibited in the use of the atypical construction of the other as applied to the NHS.

Getting Real

This research asserts that fundamentally police culture is situated within a working class understanding of the world and that values that have been deemed characteristic of the police occupational culture are largely derived from class culture as it is mediated by the particular experience of young working class men who have joined and continue to join the police. Moreover that on the basis of current recruitment practices this is likely to be self-sustaining in its current form for some time to come. The majority of the officers in this sample were employed within 5-15 years after the pay review (1978) calling into question the argument that an increase in salary fundamentally changed the types of men who were called into the profession. As Waddington (1999) asserts, the police service offered (and would still seem to) an escape route to white working class lads. Therefore when considering police culture it is clear that implementing a process of change will be problematic as long as current recruitment practices prevail. This is mainly due to the power of culture (and those who keep it i.e. officers) and the process of what Brown (2007) refers to as ‘organisational attention’ to withstand incursions into their understanding of their core role. This research also asserts that the recruitment of relatively small numbers from minority groups (within the force) such as women or those within the black multi-ethnic communities will have only a modest or incremental effect on police culture. This is because the culture is a two way process, it relies on the taking and on the giving. However for the new recruit the taking is a profound and powerful experience as he is drawing upon the experience of generations of largely working class white men, whose response to crime control and the role of the police is traditional, orthodox and rigid (Fielding, 1988; Shearing and Ericson, 1991).
analysis this remains the case although it may appear at times to have a veneer of modernity.

Thus new forms of crime management such as partnership working are generally incorporated into a rather rigid police conception of their world. The giving of culture does also occur but it is an attempt to influence something which is deeply embedded vertically and horizontally across the police service and therefore is difficult to shift with the voice of one. This is why even women and ethnic minorities who have joined the force in recent years report that they feel undervalued by their colleagues (Foster et al., 2005). Forms of stratification are entrenched but not unchanging and therefore understandings of the world based on ethnicity or gender may inhibit a ‘taking’ of police culture but may also prevent the ‘giving’ associated with change.

Given this what would have to occur to instigate widespread change within the police force? It would seem clear that a radical change in recruitment practices would be needed to erode the above process. Brown et al (2006) tackles this by considering the position of women in the force. Currently women constitute 51% of the British population. Within the police force women only currently make up 23% of all operational police officers. The British Association of Women in Policing (BAWP) suggest that an aspirational level of 35% of women within the police force is necessary to reach a ‘critical mass’, the level that would be necessary before recruitment of women would gain its own momentum and be accepted by male colleagues. At current rates of recruitment Brown et al (2006) estimates that it will take women another 15 years to reach this level (taking into account current wastage rates amongst probationers of 26%). The target for BME communities is 7% and it is suggested this will take an additional 23 years.

However, this is not the only change that is currently taking place. The new Gender Equality Duty came into force on the 6th April 2007 and places a statutory duty amongst public sector agencies to promote equal opportunities between men and women. Moreover, this includes a duty to seek out and end examples of less favourable or disproportionate practice based on being one gender or another.
Therefore, where a post has traditionally attracted applicants from men because of the way it is advertised or the way the post is organised then changes will have to be made. However in addition to this, practices which have been implemented to encourage the recruitment of women such as flexible work practices, but that may disproportionately affect men and their working patterns, may also have to be changed (Harron, 2007). Essentially gender equality is a double-edged sword and this may help or hinder BAWPs desire to see a substantial increase in operational forces in a shorter time frame then the one described above.

Brown et al (2006) go on to make a case for derogation from the principle of merit in recruitment. The argument she adopts uses the case of the Police Service of Northern Ireland which adopted positive discrimination on the basis of religion, due to recruitment patterns not reflecting the social mix of the community they served: Protestant and Catholic. Currently in the rest of the United Kingdom special measures can be adopted to increase the applicant pool amongst women and ethnic minority communities, however, appointments must be made on merit only. In Northern Ireland the principle of merit was abandoned and as a consequence the PSNI moved from a proportion of Catholic officers of 5% to 19% in 5 years. Essentially this is positive discrimination. Brown et al (2006) uses the model developed by the Patten Report (The Report of the Independent Commission on Policing for Northern Ireland, 1999) to assess the success or failure of the adoption of this method. This model involves asking a series of questions about the effects of positive discrimination on the PSNI given the seriousness of derogating from the merit principle. The questions have regard to the promotion of effectiveness, impartiality, accountability, representativeness and fairness. Brown et al’s (2006) unsurprising conclusion is that there is no evidence, at this relatively early stage, that positive discrimination amongst the PSNI has any effects on user satisfaction or police performance in the areas of improved accountabilities or effectiveness. They also conclude that if this was applied to gender rather than religion it is expected that the results would be similar.

In addition to these alterations, as discussed in Chapter Seven there have been other considerable changes in recruitment processes into the police force, most notably the
recruitment of graduates. There also seems an encroaching dissatisfaction with a police career with record levels of resignation (Martis, 2007) and the imminent retirement of the ‘recruitment bulge’ that developed after the Lord Edmund-Davies pay review in 1978. Whereas in the past retired police officers would remain ‘in force’ for perhaps five years after their retirement this is happening less and less with this tranche felt to be the least likely to choose this option due to the recent changes in police pensions, perceived deprofessionalisation and changes in policing more generally. Perhaps this is due to the overwhelming civilianisation of police administrative posts that are mainly occupied by women and are thus considered lowly in comparison to other police posts. In 2005/06 the British police suffered a loss of over 6,500 officers and this does not include the normal wastage figure amongst probationers of perhaps 26%. However, perhaps most pertinently for this discussion resignations were highest amongst male officers from BME communities. Therefore it would seem that a change in recruitment and retention practices would need to occur concurrently.

I indicated that it is not surprising that the PSNI ‘experiment’ has yet to yield positive results in the form of higher levels of performance or satisfaction. This is because of the nature of police culture. As already discussed any new recruits go through a powerful process of socialisation which involves the taking on of dominant forms of understanding regarding what the police do and what policing is. Therefore it would seem likely that even a diverse police force would take a generation to fully embrace change, as the process of ‘giving’ to the culture is incremental. Consequently Brown et al’s (2006) estimation of a force which reaches critical mass for gender diversity by 2021 and for BME communities by 2029 would not necessarily make a great deal of difference regarding the deeply held beliefs of police officers and the way culture is currently constructed, the conduct of policing and the way police customarily respond to change. Indeed on current levels of resignation it would seem likely that it would take longer than even these figures suggest to reach a stage where we may be able to say we are in possession of a diverse police force. In addition to this it is likely that it would take a second generation of sustained diversification within forces to instigate change, given the obstinately resistant nature of police culture. Therefore, it would seem imperative that derogation from the merit
principle would be the only way to gather momentum in a process of change. However, concomitant with this would be required a process whereby new recruits from BME communities and women were nurtured, to protect them from the process of taking and encourage a giving of culture and new ways of conceptualising policing (See Silvestri, 2007).

**Myth of engagement**

The ‘myth of engagement’ is a term used by the present research to refer to partnership working between the police and other agencies, particularly the NHS. Engagement was a thorny issue and was part of the process of labelling that contributed to the atypical construction of the NHS. The lack of interest often displayed by the NHS even within this research (which sought out positive examples of partnership working where the NHS was generally engaged), frustrated the police. There is a distinct ‘myth’ to the process and reality of what is termed engagement. It would seem commonsensically that engagement would entail attendance, interest, input and action towards community safety issues arising in the locality. These would usually be embedded within the strategy document and would have arisen from the ‘community’ via rigorous and inclusive auditing techniques.

In actuality, this had not happened. Community auditing processes were generally weak (Newburn et al., 2002). Early on in the development of community safety Laycock (1985) identified the fear that local community teams expressed about identifying need that could not be met. ¹²⁹ Secondly, strategies are developed in association with what agencies can provide, rather than what communities need, raising again an issue of capacity. Thirdly, strategies reflect what is currently most important to government in meeting the national crime control strategy rather than what is locally prevalent.

In addition to this, work by Cope (2004) suggests an entrenched occupational culture which relies on traditional forms of policing for identity and current work practices. In her research there was a culture of ‘them and us’ between officers and crime analysts, with crime analysts more likely to be women. The police service had

¹²⁹ For more on this see (Loader et al., 2003).
seemed to incorporate new technical forms of policing by incorporating analysts within the 'police family'. However, more established functions generally paid little attention to what they had to say and it was almost impossible for analysts to affect change in processes of detection.

Therefore, rather as Gilling (1993) identified with the probation service when the police are given access to power, control and decision-making they will revert to traditional forms of working; in this instance a robustly crime reductionist approach to local forms of crime control. Consequently it can be seen that it is the police who are disengaged from local processes of community safety. In general they have little interest, input or action where community safety issues are concerned. They are likely to attend partnership meetings, mainly because it is a statutory duty and in this sample they took ‘law-breaking’ seriously. However, they often had little to say when the partnership was trying to discuss anything new or innovative. For instance, discussions of this type did not occur in Greenton because the partnership was highly centralised and rigid in form. There was not sufficient space for discussions to occur. In Bingham, discussions involving creative forms of crime control clearly did not interest the police and were driven out onto the periphery.

In conclusion we can see that partnership working is difficult for the police, since their present interest obliges them to focus on a particular area, crime reduction. Due to the way partnerships have been constructed, the strength of police culture and the lack of interest by other agencies in a crime reduction agenda, power has been vested in the police. However, if partnerships were truly about community safety, then the police may not have such a sure footing on what has proven to be such contested terrain.

**New changes**

The new changes being implemented under the PJA 2006 may ameliorate some of the problems discussed above. There is the move towards a lead agency, as suggested by Morgan in 1991. This is perhaps overstating the role of the scrutiny committees but they certainly represent an attempt to vest more power in the hands of local authorities. However, it does not remove any power from the hands of the police, and it maintains a process whereby CSPs must have regard to the advice or instruction
given but they may choose not to act on it. Scrutiny committees will be made up of chief executives of the local authority and other interested parties. However, in both the partnerships in this sample the local chief executive and the leader were members and occasional chairs of the CSP. Could this mean old CSPs are to be incorporated into LAs in the form of scrutiny committees to add strategic 'vision' whilst new CSPs are to become more locally operational, community orientated and yet maintain strategic control of local project groups? It remains to be seen. Regardless, to shake up local processes it will take a strong steer to divest police of their leadership role. Perhaps the increase in the scope of s17 of the CDA, the responsibility for local authorities to consider the crime and disorder implications in all their decision-making, which now includes anti-social behaviour, substance misuse and behaviour which adversely affects the environment, will add to this process of increasing local authority responsibilities above other agencies.

12.6 Organisational culture

Culture is a problematic category. Ascertaining what it is, how it operates and how it should be viewed is challenging. In this work the agencies drew on many forms of culture: organisational, occupational, social (class) and personal. Professionals relied on it to form their understanding of their own work and how it dovetailed (or not) with other agencies. However, although culture has a problematic nature there is a need to give some form to it, to ascertain its function so that we may have an opportunity to change it.

Thinking on organisational culture primarily comes from two areas, management theory and organisational theory. The first focuses on how to manage it and the second problematizes it. Management theory, in focusing on how to manage culture, identified it as a 'good' quality for an organisation to have as it indicated consensus and unity – this was especially emphasised in strong management cultures (Worthington, 2004). This idea of consensus is echoed in the work of Mayerson and Martin (1987), who identify the consensus model as an internal cultural structure but one which lacks conflict and ambiguity. Here the sense is that culture is something that an organisation ‘has’. This understanding is epitomised in the ‘excellence’ school of management, which offers a one-dimensional view of organisational
culture (Worthington, 2004). What it omits from the conceptualisation of culture, in this context, is its quality and texture.

In actuality, culture fills up the spaces, plugs the gaps and crams the crevices between the overlapping and reconstituted understandings of formal rules, informal practices and unconscious or conscious actions expressed in the daily activities of organisational actors. Schein (1985: 6) describes it as the 'glue' that holds organisations together and the ‘...deeper level of basic assumptions and beliefs’. Paconowsky and O'Donnell-Trujillo (1982) go on to identify it as not something an organisation has but what it is. This suggests that to effect cultural change within an organisation is the same as achieving organisational change (Elsmore, 2001).

**Power, control and resistance**

Organisations have long sought ways to manage and control employees in an attempt to maximise productivity, in whichever way that ‘productivity’ is understood. Evidence of this is particularly apparent in industrialised processes of rationalisation and epitomised by the work of Taylor (1967) and his *The Principles of Scientific Management*; here for the first time rational practices of resistance deployed by labour were recognised as part of the process of work. Taylor called it ‘soldiering’, which identified the belief by workers that greater work conducted by the few would lead to a decrease in the amount of work and labour required and a consequent loss of jobs. Therefore, a careful balance between maintenance of current position and productivity was maintained. Although it could be concluded that here mutual relations were fostered out of necessity, Mayo’s (1933) later work on human relations at the Hawthorne Factory identified the importance for workers of power and control over their own routine. In addition he also noted the significance of human relations as an informal element in increasing productivity. However, it was the work of Roethlisberger and Dickson (1934) that was key to identifying resistance amongst workers. They perceived several rules (unwritten but not ‘informal’) of conduct amongst workers in the ‘bank wiring room’. They were characterised by suitable rates of work as seen above in Taylor’s study but also delineated the acceptable forms of interaction between workers and supervisors and attitudes of those who became ‘inspectors’.
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What is interesting about this conceptual development is the exploration of occupational cultures and how they clearly run counter to the perceived 'organisational culture'. In these terms 'organisational culture' seems to represent 'management culture' rather than an understanding of the organisation as a whole. Therefore organisational culture is – in this sense – not monolithic and is made up of competing, apparently self-interested occupational groups. Culture here then is characterised by conflict. These sub-cultural occupational groups often embody a form of resistance, which was identified by Hall and Jefferson (1975) when looking at deviant youth groups and by Willis (1977) when identifying the practices of working class lads responding to orthodox established middle class 'culture'. Although as Walkerdine (2001) recognises, in social class based dialectics such as these, cultural resistance, ridicule and objectification of the 'other' only serve to reinforce established cultural norms of 'them and us'. They serve to maintain extant orthodoxies.

Therefore we can conclude that often occupational groups are 'sub-cultural' and coalesce around the need to create rules which form an understanding of work practices and a desire to maintain the existing conditions of work. In addition, they are formed in the context of, and often 'against', the perceived best interests of the organisation (Friedman, 1977; Friedman, 1990). However it is difficult to ascertain to what extent they serve underlying processes, which reproduce acceptable cultural norms of power and resistance.

12.7 Occupational culture

Occupational culture then is different from organisational culture. It operates within an organisational context but may be against the organisational norms. It has rules, which are understood by members, and operates with its own internal consistency. It offers powerful forms of socialisation to new members and punishment for rule breaking. However, in this research the police and the NHS often ran counter to these precepts. They had some of these features but not all. Primarily, their position as public sector organisations meant their adherence to certain conceptualisations of their work was more unified then that experienced by their colleagues in the private
sector. Organisational and occupational culture (especially for the police) are more closely linked. For the police and the NHS, management cultures were indicated as being the ‘other’, that is, as being ‘sub’-cultural. This remains true notwithstanding attempts to rationalise processes which have occurred since 1979, such as managerialism and New Public Sector Management (Martin, 2003). In fact it could be argued that these attempts at creating integrated management strategies and structures only increase the ‘otherness’ of management.

The reason for this seems to be two-fold, firstly the nature of the organisations and secondly the character of public sector cultures. Firstly the organisations themselves rely on a certain quality in a person. Taylor (1967) in fact, introduced us to the idea of selection when recruiting to organisations. Taylor needed men who were good at shifting pig iron, not all men possessed this skill. Public sector organisations involve certain processes of ‘self’-selection with regards to the type of person they attract, and even today public sector work is regarded as ‘vocational’. For the NHS and other public sector organisations in the caring services this means work is ‘client’ (to borrow from neo-managerialist concepts) focussed. It relies on working with a known individual and supporting or helping them with their problems. This can be particularly seen with health, social and probation services. Without doubt there have been radical changes in the distribution and provision of these services. However there has also been significant resistance to erosion of core understandings of their work – the key feature of this being case work. Even amongst the police there is commitment to the ethos of the role and the ‘rank and file’ understanding of their crime prevention, public orientated ‘emergency service’ role, with officers indicating a desire to ‘do good’ as being key to their joining the service (Fielding, 1988). Secondly public sector occupational culture offers characteristics which provide more autonomy over decision-making than would be the norm in equivalent private sector work. In addition stressful, high-profile public orientated work relies on close camaraderie and loyalty to support it. Therefore their ability to remain impervious to cultural change is even more assured then that of their colleagues in private sector organisations.
Police occupational culture

It is not intended to provide an overview of police occupational culture. That has been done often and extensively elsewhere. Here there is an attempt to draw out the main features that relate to police occupational culture and securing influence or change. Most recent research on police occupational change draws upon the work of Waddington (1999). Waddington effectively and efficiently shamed the academic community regarding the almost voyeuristic stance it took on ‘seeing’ police culture, although he was not the first academic to draw such parallels. He cleverly turns the mirror back on those who have the power and intellectual tools to label those who are doing work which at times may be dirty and dangerous and is almost always isolating and boring. In doing this there is a sense that academics are far more measured post Waddington’s (1999) article on sub-cultures then they ‘dared’ to be before. The main thrust of Waddington’s critique questions the existence of canteen culture and then casts doubt on its effectiveness, as he suggests canteen culture does not mean operational culture. He argues, that whilst officers may express questionable views in private this does not always translate into public displays.

Recent attempts at isolating what police culture is begin with firstly a statement that police culture is not monolithic and secondly that occupational cultures need not be negative and can indeed be a valuable resource for organisations to draw on. Indeed Foster (2003) articulates that for academics studying the police the major focus remains on the rank and file and little work has been done on the culture of ‘management cops’ (Reuss-Ianni et al., 1983). This is said because as we have seen it is management culture which is often perceived as being the most successful by management theorists (Foster, 2003; Worthington, 2004). However, the lack of extensive research into police management cultures is unsurprising given our understanding of organisational culture where sub/occupational cultures are situated against management cultures and are therefore usually more numerous, accessible, visible and interesting (Becker, 1999). In addition the term ‘canteen culture’ has been

---


131 See (Fielding, 1984) Police Socialisation and Police Competence which makes a similar point.

132 Despite Reiner’s (1978) key study (c.f) of chief constables, whose insights now largely pertain to a previous generation of senior officers.
criticised, by Waddington (1999) in assessing its validity and by the HMIC (1999) who describe it ‘as misleading as it is mischievous’ (9). Interestingly, by the end of her review of the literature, Foster (2003) acknowledges that she has returned to using police culture in its monolithic form and her experience of it is largely negative, rigid, sexist and isolated.

However, is this done because it is convenient to access police culture from this perspective so we are able to say something about how the organisation works or because it genuinely represents the lived experiences of those working within the police, interacting with it or coming under its scrutiny? It is probably a ‘bit of both’ in the sense that the production of knowledge with regards to how the police work has provided fascinating material that may indeed have become self-confirming as well as instructive to the police. Moreover it is convenient to have something to measure existing and new research against as this can only be done with reference to what has gone before.

This research, although working in somewhat of a niche area (community safety), which is accepted as attracting officers who are appreciably different to their colleagues, did not find attributes which strayed far from the action-orientated paradigm in which the police are traditionally situated. This perhaps is the ‘contra-finding’ in that police generally in this research maintained a traditional action orientated understanding of their core role. However, Fielding (1995) identifies a parallel case, in that there is an overlapping perception of their work in the community police officer role, an understanding that finds, in traditional occupational culture, strands enabling an ability to find community policing work more meaningful and less fleeting. This was also echoed in this work where occasionally officers minimally accepted the work of other agencies. In addition, this research does also accept the difference between occupational groups within the police (Reuss-Ianni et al., 1983). However it also suggests that there is an element to it which is indeed monolithic, if monolithic means experienced by, and commonly applied to all officers. Moreover, it suggests that there is an underlying understanding of their work and a production of culture which is self-perpetuating and almost unassailable. To do this it draws upon Waddington’s (1999) assertion that
the police are drawn from a particular stratum of society, which produces conservative and fairly fixed views on what is and is not acceptable, namely the working class. It also suggests that this understanding of their role is indeed drawn from what Shearing and Ericson (1991) describe as the ‘sedimented residue of generations’ (492) but that these generations are fundamentally working class, isolated from their background and seeking to create a sense of belonging elsewhere. In this case that means in their place of work and occupational group. Social class then, becomes a cultural artefact, not limited to (but still including) relations to economic resources and the world of work (Hey, 2003).

**NHS occupational culture**

The key difference between the police and the NHS, with regards to occupational culture, is their orientation towards it. For the police, occupational culture is a lived experience of their work: for those who are subject to it and those who are excluded by it. However, for the NHS there is little perception or preoccupation with their culturally specific actions, rules or practices. This research explored in some detail the perceptions of the police about the NHS and the perceptions the NHS had of their own work. It also included the impact of social class. It was apparent that those who represented the NHS on Community Safety Partnerships were mainly of middle class professional status. The effect of this was apparent in interview where respondents’ answers were thoughtful and factual but were not situated in or wedded to their social class. This was very different from police respondents who situated their understanding of their role within their own personal (usually) working class narrative. Therefore, as Skeggs (2004) suggests, social class provides a powerful source of belonging and conflict, and being working class is the equivalent of being the ‘other’. In this sense the creation, participation and maintenance of occupational culture within the police is entrenched because it forms the place where belonging occurs. As Hey suggests, social mobility is like ‘joining the club’ but that ‘...‘joining the club’ is lived as grief – a gain that is constantly spun from the recognition and experience of a loss of a previous home without the pleasure of feeling safe in the new location.’ (2003: 325). NHS professionals do not experience the isolation from
family and background that occurs within the police service and so there is no desire to create a place of belonging.

This may to some extent explain the lack of a literature on NHS organisational culture (Davies, 2003a). There is a coherence to police culture that is lacking within the annals of NHS organisational theory. There is no sense, for example that NHS culture is ‘monolithic’. Within the NHS, culture relies upon the occupational cultures of diverse groupings, primarily, the consultants, nurses and managers but also, general practitioners, anaesthetists, district nurses and midwives. Literature tends to consider the primacy of issues within occupational groupings (Degeling et al., 2003; Walby et al., 1994), their interactions (Lawton and Parker, 1999), response to specific management discourses (Irvine, 2001; Le Grand et al., 1998) and interactions with patients (Cornwall, 1984; Schouten et al., 2007). There is no attempt to provide a coherent understanding of ‘the NHS’. However, it is also clear that the constancy of one professional group has remained the most powerful throughout NHS history: the Consultants. To some extent it is the existence and mobilisation of the interests of this particular group which prevents the creation of an organisational culture. Tolliday (1978) identifies the substantive nature of clinical autonomy as the rights to independent practice and to refuse a patient, the responsibility to coordinate other health care professionals (nurses, anaesthetists, general practitioners etc), and the overarching primacy of clinical autonomy. Consultants have successfully resisted encroachment on these elements of their role. As has already been ascertained, the NHS is not adept at creating political opportunity; consultants have successfully resisted change to their role. This is done even though they may acknowledge that change is necessary to meet increasing clinical need because as a grouping they are politically astute and self interested (Hope-Hailey, 1998) but also – powerfully – have a commitment to patient care (Le Grand et al., 1998). The Consultants, unlike the police, have control over specialist knowledge and as such are able to maintain autonomy, in the process of disengagement from attempts at cultural change.
12.8 The implications for this research

For these two organisations, change has always been regarded as a difficult and at best an incremental process (Brown et al., 2006; Cope, 2004; Foster, 2003; Silvestri, 2007; Worthington, 2004; Zucker, 1987). This research has identified that for different reasons these organisations remain entrenched within their occupational (rather than organisational) culture. The reasons for this remain very different, for the NHS there is a situating of power and decision making amongst consultants whose locus of control is within their specific and unique knowledge base. Worthington (2004) sees the NHS as being difficult to manage because of the primacy of a single occupational group who are unlikely to relinquish their professional autonomy to changing work processes. Whereas for the police, occupational culture remains the seat of a sense of belonging which was lost to them through the process of social mobility and professional distancing from their origins. Zucker (1987) recognises the potential for change within organisations at their inception or during periods of radical upheaval. This research makes some challenging assertions with regards to securing occupational change within the police force. Equally radical assertions could be made with regards to the NHS (e.g. deprofessionalisation), to unseat consultants – although the primacy of specialist knowledge will probably always remain. However, it may be said that the Consultants are preserving what is ‘left’ of the NHS although there is a clear sense that they are a powerful and self-interested minority.

In the process of investigation any unfolding research narrative eventually asks some questions of the ‘what can be done?’ variety. In this research it was evident that police culture was an impediment to partnership working in a community safety context firstly, because of the ontological strength of the police within a multi-agency forum and linked to this the primacy of crime reduction. In turn this was clearly wedded to the current political climate and the recentring of the state. Secondly, there was an institutional commitment to a ‘traditional’ way of working situated in a neo-corporatist, actuarial approach to crime control (Cope, 2004; Crawford, 1994). It was apparent that this ‘traditional’ way of working was embedded within social class culture. Moreover, the power inherent in this dominant
form of working meant that police occupied substantial ground within the inner circle, which enabled them to maintain existing conditions. They were able to do this by deploying the atypical construction of other agencies (including personality) and controlling the content of meetings, by maintaining minimum levels of power sharing. To change this but preserve partnership working in its current form would necessitate a radical change in police culture. Therefore, the argument that positive discrimination is possibly the only way to secure (imminent – within a generation) long-term occupational change within the police, given what we know about instigating change within the police (Chan, 1997) or indeed any agency (Zucker, 1987). It seems that only a radical approach will have an affect on entrenched occupational norms.133

This assessment is not suggested without knowledge of the debates around positive discrimination, the feeling of injustice it incurs (in a Rawlsian (1973) sense), the anger at derogating from the merit principle, and the sense that ‘even ground’ should be good enough for all. Indeed as an Asian police officer respondent in Cashmore’s research asserts ‘All you’ll do is fill the force with more black faces. Good for PR but it won’t make a scrap of difference to how police work gets done...We can have an all black police force and it wouldn’t change a thing: you’d still have racism in the police.’ (2002: 333). This idea relates to Holdaway and Barron’s (1997) finding that officers from a BME background adopted racist stereotypes whilst policing to mimic police occupational culture. The present analysis would not fully support the assertion from the above respondent. Police culture is seen as being fundamentally working class and entrenched within that cultural context. However, occupational culture is perceived as being a two way process of giving and taking. Where there are low degrees of diversity the process of giving by individuals remains incremental. However, there is evidence that where there are high degrees of cultural or occupational diversity (which remain protected from mainstream police culture) sometimes temporary or sustained change can occur (Fielding, 1995; Silvestri, 2007). Therefore, an all black police force would cause sustained occupational change, after a time. However, that would not mean it would not engage in other forms of

133 The police as an occupational group still consider themselves to be the ‘biggest minority group in the service’ (12) suggesting a deeply entrenched and defensive attitude to perceived change (HM Inspectorate of Constabulary, 2004).
resistance, bias and prejudice which may remain similar to, but culturally different from, existing police customs (Michels, 1959).

Finally, there has to be a return to the idea that social policy is not a coherent force for good. It has unintended consequences in its implementation. It operates from non-linear narratives and political intents. As such we cannot assume that a police service whose practices are not informed by a culture drawn from social class origins will be better or worse than what is the present situation. In addition, attempts at changing the NHS seem to lack any real consistent likelihood of instigating far reaching change, given the fundamental power of the consultants as an occupational group. However, the current process of piece-meal bureaucratic change does not seem to be creating an environment for transformation for either the police or the NHS. Indeed this lack of consistent, robust, policy-making merely seems to serve to entrench current orthodoxies. The following section offers some alternatives to the current and planned changes to partnership working in a community safety context, garnered from observation in the field and the perceived wishes of practitioners.

12.9 **Strengths, weaknesses and capacity building**

What has been clear throughout this research is that agencies have particular skills. However it was often difficult to identify for an agency whether it could be considered a strength or a weakness, as often it would depend on the context. In the review of the literature and in this research, partnerships as a generic form of policy implementation and development did not seem to have the capacity to work effectively. This can be regarded as indicating the problematic and delicate nature of partnership work. Note, however, the word ‘generic’. There are undoubtedly ‘successful’ interventions by partnerships not regarded overall as being a great success. The word ‘generic’ is used to indicate that their mere structural form is no guarantee of success. Partnerships are not a panacea. This is not the same thing as to say that ‘partnerships are a failure’. However, it is surely sensible to know with clarity what problems beset partnerships with a view to identifying what needs to be done to achieve success. The discussion following is offered in that spirit. In the current period of New Public Sector Management, target setting, managerialism and actuarialism it often seems to partner agency representatives that there is little
opportunity or space for engagement with another agencies’ agenda or community problems. This research has highlighted that agencies have particular skill sets derived from their own organisational development when they attend partnership. Some of these skills will encourage engagement and participation when the issue presented falls within their remit, otherwise agencies (including the police) will remain disengaged. The danger is that statutory partners will continue to sign off plans and annual plans, will read reports from scrutiny panels, engage in ‘face the people’ sessions and contribute to national frameworks without ever actually engaging or committing to community safety.

In this research community safety worked best and had most opportunity to succeed in Greenton. This is where it had a long history and was embedded in local structures and local agencies had the benefit of being unitary. It was stymied from being truly a partnership because it was highly controlled from the centre and local adherence to attend meetings meant there was widespread disengagement amongst those partners who occupied territory outside of the inner circle. The most powerful agency in this partnership and in the inner circle that ‘pushed’ and ‘shoved’ agencies into compliance was the chief executive of the local authority - Liz. She incorporated the police and the NHS into the inner circle as they were also statutory authorities and she needed their compliance to organise local community safety partnerships. By and large the other members of the partnership regarded her and the police as equal partners but Liz was considered a ‘bit more equal’.

The amount of energy in Greenton expended by Liz and the Community Safety Team in organising the CSP, meeting central targets through ‘locally’ derived plans, and cajoling other agencies into participation was immense. Unfortunately, it would seem that new changes to be enacted under the PJA 2006 will have not gone far enough to secure the kind of practice to which such individuals are so clearly committed. Ideally what have necessarily been fairly contrived practices should be put aside in favour of a significantly more honest way of working one which does not pay lip service to either central demands or local need.

For local forms of accountability to work in a way that meets the needs of communities it needs to be much smaller than it currently is. There are many
examples of where multi-agency partnership working can engage communities on an ad hoc basis to deal with local ‘safety’, disorder, or crime problems. These projects often have a short life span and ‘run out of steam’ when the problem is dealt with. This is because they had the impetus of the single issue. As Crawford (1995) identifies there will always be a problem of social justice if communities are left to their own devices, which is why a pre-Morgan period of chaotic project development is not the answer. Equally the tightly controlled, centrally derived, overly legislated position we currently find ourselves in is also not the answer.

A compromise would seem to be situated in the hands of the local authority. By extending the remit of s17, the obligation for all statutory agencies to take into account the crime and disorder implications in all their decision-making and vesting power and control in local authorities to co-ordinate responses to local crime problems, local forms of ‘fakery’ could be abandoned. There would be no further need for ritualised monthly meetings. The local authority would hold the responsibility, it would develop plans in conjunction with local communities and ‘refresh’ them annually, and it would develop strategies within and across portfolios in response to ad hoc and ongoing need as it was identified. The local authority would also have the power to incorporate other agencies into short-term commitments when advice on their area of specialty was required. Therefore the police could be called in when advice, support or funds were needed on a crime reduction or prevention problem. The health sector could be called in if the problem involved a health improvement agenda. Or, indeed both these agencies could be asked to attend and engage to deal with Friday night drinking and violence; however, the response would be co-ordinated and implemented by the local authority.

For this to happen there would have to be an overhaul of currently locally held practices around defined roles and responsibilities as well as considerable legislative changes. Moreover with a return to a theme raised in respect of Morgan, core funding is necessary to allow for adequate capacity building amongst staff and local structures. Without central support for local flexibility new processes cannot succeed. However, that central support needs to be sufficiently hands off to allow local processes the room to grow. It seems likely that with these new forms of local accountability the competitive culture between agencies would be ameliorated. In
addition having a local coordinator for response would mean that long-term agency engagement was not necessary. In addition, exposure to other agencies would be limited to contact with the coordinating agency, therefore removing potential for conflict. Finally, having power vested legitimately in a single agency answers the desire that most local agencies had for wanting someone to be in control, but not wanting it to be the police.
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APPENDICES
### Appendix 1  Respondents

#### Inventory of interviews: Pilots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recorded</th>
<th>Known as</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Role/Rank</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Class¹³⁴</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/8/03</td>
<td>Analogue recording</td>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Sgt</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P1int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/8/03</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Alcohol Nurse (Project Manager)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P2int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/03</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>John</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Homeless project coordinator (ex Police Officer – Constable)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P3int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/8/03</td>
<td>Analogue recording</td>
<td>Rob</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>Senior Crime Analyst for two CSPs</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P4int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/8/03</td>
<td>Analogue recording</td>
<td>Barbara</td>
<td>Pilot</td>
<td>County wide CSP Manager</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>P5int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/3/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>Susan</td>
<td>Pilot -</td>
<td>Community Safety Manager</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>P6int</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹³⁴ Researcher identified
¹³⁵ Recording equipment failed
¹³⁶ ibid
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recorded</th>
<th>Known as</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Role/Rank</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10/5/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Sean</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Detective Chief Inspector (DV Project)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B1int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/5/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Emma</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Drug Worker</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B2int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Sonia</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Head of Partnership Development (Primary Care Trust)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B3int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/5/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Community Safety Manager</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B4int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/5/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>James</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Chief Inspector (Crime Reduction and Partnerships)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B5int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13/5/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Leader of the Council</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B6int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/5/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Tara</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Area Manager Probation</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>B7int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/5/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Rhona</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Coordinator DV Project (retired probation officer)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B8int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/5/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Sandra</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Chief Executive Local Health Board</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B9int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29/5/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Sam</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Surgeon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B10int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/6/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Amanda</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Senior Coordinator Drug Services</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>B11int</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

137 Researcher identified
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recorded</th>
<th>Known as</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Role/Rank</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24/8/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>William</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Health Inclusion Manager</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>G1int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/8/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Phillip</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Deputy Leader (and Police Authority Representative)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>G2int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/8/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Liz</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Chief Executive County Council</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>G3int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26/8/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Chief Inspector</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>G4int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Community Safety Manager</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>G5int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Theo</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Chief Superintendent</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>G6int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/9/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Catherine</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Drugs Liaison (Local Government Office)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>G7int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/9/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Tim</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Chief Executive PCT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>G8int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/9/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Chief Superintendent</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>G9int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/9/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Strategic Coordinator and Community Manager (Adult Substance Misuse)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>G10int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/9/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Zoë</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Inspector</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>G11int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/9/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Pamela</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Senior Manager (Probation)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>G12int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/9/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Rebecca</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Public Health</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>G13int</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recorded</th>
<th>Known as</th>
<th>Role/Rank</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1/6/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Julie</td>
<td>Senior Probation Officer</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S1int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/6/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Frank</td>
<td>Superintendent (Operations)</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S2int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/6/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Moira</td>
<td>General Manager of Drug Services For North West of County</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S3int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/6/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Paul</td>
<td>Joint Commissioner for the DAT</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S4int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/6/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>Detective Sergeant</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S5int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/6/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Lillian</td>
<td>Probation Officer</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S6int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/6/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Richard</td>
<td>Detective Constable (promotion to Sergeant for duration of project)</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S7int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/6/04</td>
<td>Digital recording</td>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>Chief Inspector of Operations (Partnership Development and Criminal Justice)</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>S8int</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 2  Observational Field Data

### Observational Field Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Recorded</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Situated</th>
<th>Identifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25/10/03</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>MARRAC</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/10/03</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>Homicide Review</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>B2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/11/03</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>B3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/12/03</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>B4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>B5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>B6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20/04/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>B7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01/05/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>B8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/03</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>Gatekeepers</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>S1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/01/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>S2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/01/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>S3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/01/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>S4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/02/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>S5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/03/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>S6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30/03/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>S7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/06/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>Stonham</td>
<td>S8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/03/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>Gatekeeper</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>G1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/05/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>G2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/07/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>G3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17/09/04</td>
<td>Contemporaneous notes</td>
<td>CSP</td>
<td>Greenton</td>
<td>G4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Additional notes were also taken soon after to record context and action before and after the meetings.*
Appendix 3 A chronology of NHS reorganization, 1980-2003

1982 Reorganization of health authority tier—abolition of area health authorities and restructuring of district health authorities

1983-1985 Introduction of general management function throughout the NHS, with appointment of general managers in all NHS health authorities and units, and establishment of separate NHS board within the Department of Health

1989-1993 Establishment of NHS trusts to manage health service provision, previously directly managed by health authorities but now accountable directly to the Department of Health while contracting with health authorities and GP fundholders as healthcare purchasers

1989-1995 Establishment of GP fundholding (and other models of GP commissioning), giving general practices direct control over an increasing proportion of healthcare services purchased from NHS trusts

1989-1995 Creation of the NHS Executive (first called the NHS Management Executive) as a separate entity from the Department of Health, and the separation of responsibility for policy development and implementation/service delivery

1990 Abolition of family practitioner committees accountable to health authorities and establishment of family health services authorities (FHSAs) as separate organizations from health authorities to manage primary care services

1991-1997 Reconfiguration of district health authorities as health authorities, and then continuing reduction in number of health authorities (from around 200 to around 100) through mergers and consolidation

1991 Restructuring of the boards of NHS organizations to create executive and non-executive membership (replacing the distinction between members and officers)

1994 Reorganization of regional health authorities to reduce numbers from 14 to 8 regions

1994 Abolition of FHSAs and incorporation of their responsibilities into those of health authorities

1995-2000 Reconfiguration of acute services involving extensive reorganization of acute trusts and many mergers

1996 Abolition of regional health authorities and their incorporation into the NHS Executive as its regional offices

1997-2000 Abolition of GP fundholding and its replacement initially with primary care groups (PCGs) and subsequently, in some areas, by primary care trusts (PCTs)

2000 Abolition of the NHS Executive and the incorporation of its functions into the Department of Health

2002 Abolition of the NHS Executive regional offices, devolution of some functions to new strategic health authorities, and the creation of four new
regional directorates of health and social care in the Department of Health

2002  Reorganization of health authorities, going from around 100 to 28 strategic health authorities in England, and the devolution of many responsibilities of health authorities to PCTs

2002  Creation of PCTs in all areas, replacing PCGs, including some mergers and restructuring, and transfer of responsibilities from health authorities

2003  Creation of first wave of foundation NHS trusts, based on existing NHS acute hospital trusts with proven good performance records

(Courtesy of Waishe, 2007)
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Background, aims and objectives

Consistent with official thinking over the last two decades the current crime and disorder legislation places significant emphasis on coordinated multi-agency partnerships as a response to crime and antisocial behaviour. Recognising the well-documented difficulties in achieving fruitful multi-agency partnerships, the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 closely specifies the forms of multi-agency partnership and indicates expected procedures and outcomes. But government is also promoting an additional model for coordinating local agencies in the form of Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs). These have been recognised as crucial for implementing and leading neighbourhood renewal, of which the reduction of crime and anti-social behaviour is a key feature. While the crime and disorder legislation acknowledges a significant contribution of NHS institutions and agencies to the multi-agency models specified in response to crime and disorder problems, the health sector role in neighbourhood renewal is more widely recognised in that sector.

The proposed CASE research seeks to evaluate the potential, implementation and delivery of outputs via multi-agency partnerships between health institutions and the agencies of the criminal justice system, particularly the police, against the context of these alternative modes of partnership working. In that a fully comprehensive evaluation is beyond the scope of a CASE studentship, the research focuses specifically on initiatives relating to offences of violence, and will address two key elements of the health service/police service interaction. The areas are (i) enhanced input to local crime audits via provision of relevant health service operational statistics and indicators (ii) evaluation by case study method of key current criminal justice initiatives where the partnership agencies have substantially engaged with the contribution that the health sector can make. The research will draw on these specialist studies, which relate to key applications of the partnership strategy, to assess whether the current crime and disorder legislation has made a tangible difference in responding to those forms of crime and antisocial behaviour involving violence, against the context of new modes of coordinating multi-agency interventions.

Area (i) noted above will assess the potential of, and scope for, the provision of internal operational statistics and indicators of demand for health services which can be applied in local crime audits. A key example is the use of Accident and Emergency statistics. Such data provide an alternative indicator of rates, causes and nature of injury arising from crime and disorder. They are independent of public reporting and police recording practices, and thus of many of the constraints which are recognised as giving police and criminal statistics a quasi-artefactual status as social constructions indexing public attitudes and agency practice more reliably than they reflect actual crime rates. Methodologically the study in area (i) will proceed by comparing health service and police records in selected sites sampled from an inner urban, outer urban and rural area. Analytically the study will draw on, and contribute to, knowledge concerning criminological research methodology. In terms of policy application the study will produce case studies to inform the practice of local crime...
audits, strategies and partnership working - major planks of current community-based response to crime.

Area (ii) noted above will analyse how partnerships have come to engage with health service input with particular regard to initiatives relating to violence. The three case studies selected are widely-regarded as successful contemporary initiatives, and the idea is to document best practice, refined as necessary to meet the particular requirements of the substantive focus of the particular initiative. The three case studies are (a) Merseyside’s schemes in respect of reducing glass-related injuries and violence against health staff (b) Cardiff’s initiatives relating to reducing alcohol-related street violence disorder (c) Leicestershire’s projects to tackle domestic violence, including a well-developed information-sharing and audit process led by the Health Action Zone. Restricting the inquiry to case studies involving the elements of the crime and disorder legislation relevant specifically to initiatives against violence will help to ensure that specified analyses are produced which can be fed into best practice guidelines. The inquiry will centre on the means by which health service input was engaged, and the extent to which it was seen as relevant and valued, by the agencies working in partnership.

Overall, the research will (i) provide case study documentation of innovative working practices engendered by the partnership approach between health and the criminal justice system (ii) contribute to the evaluation of interventions based on multi-agency ‘ownership’ of local crime and disorder problems delivered in different modes under different structural arrangements (iii) impart to the CASE student a sophisticated expertise in measuring, assessing and evaluating official initiatives in central policy arenas.

Methodology

The research will involve both quantitative and qualitative methods, and will draw on the tools and procedures of evaluation research. Regarding area (i), secondary analysis of quantitative data from the health sector, including A and E data, will be employed to establish the bounds of methodologically-rigorous application of health service data in a crime audit context. Qualitative data from analysis of audit documents will provide an indication of the way that health sector statistics have been used to date. Semi-structured interviews with health sector and police service representatives involved in the crime audits sampled will give information on the technical and analytic procedures employed in preparing health statistics for application in crime audits, and information on the ways that this information has been used.

Regarding area (ii), semi-structured interviews with staff of the health sector and police service partners in each site will be used to establish the working procedures in use, the nature of the interactions in the course of operating these procedures, and the means developed at each site to monitor the effectiveness of the coordinated intervention. Qualitative analysis of documents from the case study sites will provide contextual information. Observation of partnership meetings and of contacts with local people involved in the interventions will be used to triangulate data from the semi-structured interviews and compile case studies of each site, using the heuristic framework established in applied case study evaluation research.

Timescale

Three months detailed research design; literature review; consultations with police service and researchers who have conducted relevant previous studies, and with the National Operations Faculty’s proposed secondee from the health service. Sampling for the analysis of crime audit data, and access arrangements for the case studies, will be finalised during this period. Twelve months’ data collection. To include at least one x two-week data collection period in each of the three case study sites. To further include collection of documentation, and completion of agency interviews, in the sample crime audit sites. Three months data preparation and coding. To include transcription of interview data, entry into statistical (SPSS) and qualitative (WinMAX) software, and development of data coding scheme. Six
months data analysis. To include both statistical and qualitative data analysis. Twelve months writing up. Write-up to include Executive Summary for Police Service.

Dissemination plans
Findings will be disseminated by several means, in addition to the thesis. It is expected that the student will publish findings and analysis in the form of articles in academic and professional journals and/or a book. In addition it is expected that there will be briefings by the student to Bramshill National Operations Faculty and relevant Bramshill course(s). The student will also be expected to produce an Executive Summary for the Police Service. The supervisors will support the student in addressing these expectations.

Outcomes
Intellectually the project would contribute to the sociological conceptualisation of multi-agency work in social agencies, drawing on an up-to-date understanding of the contemporary forms of partnership working and multi-agency cooperation in health and law enforcement. The literature tends to be dominated by accounts of pitfalls and problems; the present proposal is different in seeking to apply the tools of evaluation to schemes regarded as successful or highly promising. Through the work on applying A and E and other health statistics, the study will also contribute to criminological research methods. The applied outcome will be the first detailed assessment of the workings of the health service/criminal justice system interaction in respect of current crime and disorder legislation and in respect of Local Strategic Partnerships. This will enable the identification of a set of best practice criteria applicable to the planning, procedures and evaluation of collaborations between the health sector and the police, with particular reference to collaboration in initiatives combating violent crime and disorder. Findings will be related to prevailing policy in respect of such partnership interactions and may form one source of applicable guidelines and guidance to those in the Police Service holding responsibility for partnership policing.

Bramshill has identified as a potential indirect commercial outcome the benefit to business in areas affected by violent crime and disorder of reduced disturbance and disruption arising from more effective response to such problems and the Best Value considerations in terms of reducing the cost of violence to public authorities.
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The project does not require specific ethical approval. All research students in the Department of Sociology at the University of Surrey are required to adhere to the British Sociological Association Code of Ethics.
Appendix 5  Question Plan

RESEARCH INTRO: (purpose/funding/confidentiality/recording)

1) Could you just tell me what you current post and job title is?

2) What is your Background? How did you end up doing your current job?

Skills for partnership working.

How did you get involved in this area of work?

3) Could you tell me about your current role?

How does it involve partnership working

4) How much of your time is spent on partnership working?

However they define it

5) How is it working with other organisations?

In particular – the police and or the NHS or other health sector organisations

6) What do you think are the benefits to partnership working?

7) Do you think that there is a political pressure to work together?

Locally or nationally – interested in both

8) If all financial support for partnership working stopped tomorrow – would the partnership endure? Keep going?

9) What are your hopes for the future of partnership working?

10) If you could sum up in two sentences what partnership working was what would you say?

11) Is there anything else you would like to say?

THANKS
Appendix 6  Invitation to interview

Hello - ,

As you know I have been observing (name of partnership) Partnership meetings for the past five months. I have been doing this because I am currently conducting research looking at partnership working between the police and those in the health sector. To do this I am partly funded by the police through Bramshill Police College and the Economic and Social Research Council, a government body. It is hoped that when my research is concluded I will be able to provide guidance for good practice to be utilised by the police/partnerships. The second stage of my research is to interview members of the partnership. I would like to interview you because of your monthly attendance at the meetings as the (state role and reason) Community Safety Partnership and (state additional reason if one).

The interview process goes something like this. We will arrange a date to be interviewed (at your convenience) and I will come along with my recording equipment and record the interview. The interview will usually begin with one or two questions from me, but there is not a prescribed structure and it will usually take the form of a conversation. I am interested in your views. The interviews are confidential inasmuch as you can be sure that any views or opinions that I use from your interview in my research will be anonymised. I will ensure anonymity regarding location and your identity. What will remain is your role and gender.

I understand that some partnerships wish to be identified as having participated in the research process. That would entirely be a decision for you to make in conjunction with your partnership. The partnership may wish to identify itself but it would still remain anonymous in my research. Research guidelines and ethics prevent me from identifying case studies/interviewees.

This is the list of dates that I have made available:

Interviews usually take about an hour, although I must admit to having had one last for over 2 hours. On most of the above dates I will be able to stay in (town) so if an evening slot suits you best then please don’t feel constrained by a 9-5 schedule. Researchers work all hours!

Attached to this email will be an interview consent form which will give you a bit more information regarding the interview processes and your right to anonymity. If you have any questions then please get in touch and I will be more than happy to answer them.

Looking forward to hearing from you,

Anne Brunton

T: 
M: 
E: